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ABSTRACT In this review essay, I focus on how anthropologists have addressed salient public issues such as the European refugee and migrant crisis, the Black Lives Matter movement, and the attack on the Paris office of the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo. Public anthropology relies on slow ethnography and fast responses to breaking news stories. It is theoretically informed but reaches out to audiences beyond the academy. Drawing on proliferating anthropological contributions to news media and blogs, as well as scholarly articles and books, I explore how anthropologists today counter grand narratives such as the “clash of civilizations”; how they grapple with risky popular misconceptions of culture, difference, and suffering; and how they surface less visible forms of compassion, care, and solidarity that have long sustained our species. The challenges of this era of growing polarization and anti-intellectualism appear to have energized rather than quieted public anthropology. [public anthropology, Charlie Hebdo, Black Lives Matter, migrants, year in review]

RESUMEN En este ensayo de revisión, centro mi atención en cómo los antropólogos han abordado cuestiones públicas relevantes tales como la crisis de migrantes y refugiados en Europa, el movimiento las Vidas Negras Importan, y el ataque a la oficina de París del magazine satírico Charlie Hebdo. La antropología pública depende de la etnografía lenta y las respuestas rápidas a las historias de noticias de última hora. Es teóricamente informada, pero alcanza a llegar a audiencias más allá de la academia. Basada en proliferantes contribuciones antropológicas a los medios de prensa y blogs, así como artículos académicos y libros, exploro cómo los antropólogos hoy confrontan las grandes narrativas tales como “el choque de civilizaciones”; cómo ellos luchan contra concepciones erróneas populares, problemáticas de cultura, diferencia, y sufrimiento; y cómo ellos sacan a la luz formas menos visibles de compasión, cuidado, y solidaridad que han sostenido a nuestras especies por largo tiempo. Los retos de esta era de creciente polarización y anti-intelectualismo parece haber energizado en vez de silenciado la antropología pública. [antropología pública, Charlie Hebdo, Vidas Negras Importan, migrantes, año en revisión]

A decade ago, “The Seven Deadly Sins of Samuel Huntington” was Hugh Gusterson’s (2005) title for a pithy essay denouncing Harvard political scientist Samuel P. Huntington’s (1993) influential “clash of civilizations” thesis. Published the year before Twitter was founded, Gusterson’s title (as well as Huntington’s, for that matter) today would qualify as clickbait, a headline that entices Internet browsers to click on a URL and view an article. Briefly, Gusterson targeted Huntington’s argument that seven emerging civilizational blocs defined by cultural similarity, rather than ideology, constitute the “fault lines” of conflict in the post–Cold War era.¹ Huntington termed these “the ultimate human tribes” and argued that “the clash of civilizations is tribal conflict on a global scale” (Huntington 1996:125,
quoted in Gusterson 2005:25). Like many scholars, Gusterson (2005:28) rejects Huntington’s “premise that there are distinct civilizational zones that have been relatively culturally homogeneous and stable over centuries.” He finds fault as well in the actual boundaries Huntington mapped between supposed civilizations (e.g., excluding Greece from Western civilization). In short, Huntington’s “sins,” for Gusterson, include stereotyping cultures, ignoring change, denying multiculturalism, maligning Islam, using deficient scientific methods, and assuming that “the West is the only civilization capable of secular reason, liberal democracy, and true individualism.”

Gusterson’s criticisms—though shared by some of Huntington’s political science colleagues as well as anthropologists—are anything but self-evident for contemporary publics. Indeed, many pundits, policy makers, and others have been quite receptive to Huntington’s ideas. The “clash of civilizations” thesis remains, eight years after Huntington’s death, a powerful ideological frame globally among political leaders, pundits, and ordinary citizens—perhaps especially in recent debates about Islam and terrorism.

The 2015 attack on the Paris office of the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo is a case in point. The “clash of civilizations” notion (albeit often in less nuanced form than the original) cropped up frequently in public discussion of that tragic event, and for that and other reasons, anthropologists—as I discuss here—have challenged popular narratives about Charlie Hebdo. Furthermore, anthropologists’ 2015 interventions in public discussion of issues such as race and policing, the European refugee and migrant crisis, Ebola outbreak, and the ethnographic method itself also upend popular narratives that—like the “clash of civilizations” notion—have staying power in spite of frequent scholarly critique.

These remarkably persistent narratives center on ideas about culture, race, poverty, gender, biology, and modernity that have long been fundamental to anthropology. In their introduction to Why America’s Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back (a collection that includes Gusterson’s essay on Huntington), Gusterson and Catherine Besteman (2005:2) flag “a loosely coherent set of myths about human nature and culture that have a strange staying power in American public discourse: that conflict between people of different cultures, races, or genders is inevitable; that biology is destiny; that culture is immutable; that terrible poverty, inequality, and suffering are natural; and that people in other societies who do not want to live just like Americans are afraid of ‘modernity.’”

I have opened with these core critiques from Why America’s Top Pundits Are Wrong partly because they remain as pertinent as ever in succinctly framing key public issues, and they illustrate how contemporary anthropologists continue the discipline’s long tradition of reaching out to wide audiences to address issues of profound public importance. Public anthropology is not about watering down or “thinning” academic work; rather, it aims to translate complicated ideas into widely intelligible and engaging language. That can mean following the advice of editors of scholarly crossover publications: craft a compelling story, build suspense through plot or questions, avoid paralysis by nuance, connect heart and head (connect viscerally with readers), and allow bold assertions and a clear takeaway message.

Writing style, however, is by no means the only obstacle to wider public consumption of anthropology. Some wonder if the discipline’s message about complexity and context may face even steeper challenges today than it did a decade or two ago. Increased polarization and incivility in the public sphere, for example, create friction in discussions of minority issues and migration in Europe and race in the United States. The durability in public discourse of frameworks that many anthropologists reject poses particular challenges in a period of growing anti-intellectualism, corporatization of universities, and political and economic polarization. Yet, however daunting, these challenges seem to have energized public anthropology.

Here I take the term public anthropology to encompass knowledge production by professional anthropologists that is intended to reach beyond disciplinary specialists, and usually beyond the academy, in ways that differ from engaged, applied, or practicing anthropology. As this journal’s public anthropology section editors David Griffith, Shao-Hua Liu, Michael Paolisso, and Angela Stuesse (Griffith et al. 2013:125) have stated, “public anthropology is not a field of anthropology but a form of anthropological expression...that deals[es] with social problems and issues of interest to a broader public or to our nonacademic collaborators yet [is] still relevant to academic discourse and debate.” Like their predecessor editorial team—Melissa Checker, David Vine, and Alaka Wali (2010:5–6)—the current section editors welcome attention to a wide variety of sources such as conferences, blogs, websites, online videos, op-eds, art, theater, and more. Thus, I follow the practice of previous public anthropology year-in-review essay authors and emphasize such sources. Like them, I also confine my discussion mostly to cultural anthropology, and I appreciate, as Griffith and coeditors (2013:126) put it, that “much public anthropology happens in small, subtle, but important actions during meetings, in conversations, in memos or letters-to-the editor of local newspapers, or in moments of networking in which we communicate something about anthropology and its application to a public issue.” Furthermore, public anthropology in a broader sense encompasses teaching, mentorship, participation in community organizations, and multiple “public means of human coping, problem solving, relating and affiliating, teaching and learning” (Benson 2014:380). In short, this kind of review essay can capture only a fraction of the vibrant domain of public anthropology.

A glimpse of the stakes and breadth of public anthropology is provided by this journal’s previous year-in-review articles. Last year’s essay, by Courtney Desiree Morris (2015), addressed the Ebola outbreak, Black Lives Matter, climate change activism, the Israel–Palestine conflict, and
AAA discussions about appropriate actions the organization might take, including a possible Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaign. Two years ago, Peter Benson’s (2014) public anthropology year-in-review essay on 2013 literature considered anthropologists’ engagement with debates about same-sex marriage in the United States, the trial on genocide charges of Guatemala’s former dictator Efraín Ríos Montt, and publication of Napoleon Chagnon’s controversial memoir entitled Noble Savages. Three years ago, Ruth Gomberg-Muñoz’s (2013) review of public anthropology in 2012 included special attention to anthropologists’ responses to Florida governor Rick Scott’s public disparagement of the value of anthropology; public debates about the KONY 2012 viral video; the role of anthropologists in Occupy movements; and anthropological initiatives on immigration policy and immigrant rights. All of these topics have inspired insightful anthropological analysis, and many continue to be the focus of intense debate today.

Charlie Hebdo is my initial focus in this article, which goes on to consider anthropological contributions to public debates about Black Lives Matter and its international resonance, the European migrant and refugee crisis, the Ebola outbreak, public scrutiny of the ethnographic method itself, and additional key issues that drew substantial anthropological attention in 2015.

CHARLIE HEBDO
The year 2015 saw persistent atrocities by Boko Haram in Africa (Okeowo 2016) and tragic terror attacks on Garissa University in Kenya (Gettleman et al. 2015), Beirut (Barnard and Saad 2015), and elsewhere, but none of them attracted as much global media attention as the January and November attacks in Paris. The January 2015 attack on the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo in Paris, in which 12 people were killed, was quickly incorporated into narratives about naturalized and supposedly irreconcilable differences between “the West” and Islam. Anthropologists and others observed that such narratives can fuel policies that assume any Muslim in France (or elsewhere) is not to be trusted and that they downplay commonalities, dialogues, and migrations that cut across presumed civilizational divides, as well as obscure fissures within “civilizational” blocs. Dominant media narratives, for example, often efface the sentiments and ideologies that motivate volunteers and activists of many nationalities who mobilize to assist refugees and migrants and to “rehumanize” a dehumanizing situation.7 Popular master narratives also enable historical erasure of growing inequalities, such as immigrants’ experiences of discrimination, rejection, and meager economic opportunities. Some key public figures in France, for example, dismissed the latter arguments and affirmed instead neoliberal narratives about individual responsibility (Fassin 2015a). In scholarly and popular publications, blog posts, and social media, anthropologists engaged these debates. They include, among others, John Bowen, Didier Fassin, Alma Gottlieb, Bruce Kapferer, Fiona Murphy, Kevin Karpiak, and Alessandro Zagato.

John Bowen (2015), a specialist on Islam in Europe and elsewhere, contributed a commentary to Time Magazine shortly after the Charlie Hebdo attack. Countering news media tendencies toward ahistoricism, he highlights the historical roots of France’s current tensions about secularism, immigration, and Islam and notes that “France has been more closely engaged with the Muslim world longer than any other Western country” through France’s post–World War I control of Syria and Lebanon, French settlers in North Africa, and post–World War II migrations of North Africans to France for factory work that disappeared in the postindustrial era. It was the children and grandchildren of the North African migrants, Bowen writes, who “in 2005 exploded in rage over their exclusion from French society . . . these explosions had nothing to with religion”—contrary to “clash of civilizations” assumptions. Bowen (2015) also remarks on France’s continuing economic and military involvement in its former colonies in Africa and the Near East, controversies over France’s 2010 public ban on face veils and other official forms of opposition to organized religion, and the tendency for the Far Right in France to depict the Charlie Hebdo attack as confirmation of the “incompatibility of Islam and the values of France”—a position connected to the expanding appeal of Far Right anti-immigration stances elsewhere in Europe. Charlie Hebdo, Bowen (2015) notes, “succeeded a long line of satirical magazines that ridiculed religion” and reflected France’s modern tradition of “opposition to organized religion, and satire of its pretensions,” whether Christian or Islamic.

A few weeks after the Charlie Hebdo attack, Didier Fassin (2015a) wrote in the magazine Dusent that his research during the past decade on the “French police, justice, and prison systems shows that ethnic minorities living in disadvantaged neighborhoods are disproportionately subject to being stopped and frisked in the street, more severely punished in court cases, and overrepresented in jails for minor offenses.” Rather than rejecting French values, Fassin (2015a) said, most youth in the banlieues (suburbs) “silently endure this situation . . . [and] simply request that these values be extended to them.” Prime Minister Lionel Jospin dismisses such explanations as “sociological excuses,” and there is little space in the French public sphere for historical or social analysis of the country’s profound inequalities in a period of insistent national unity and proclamations of liberty and laïcité (the “French version of secularism”). Fassin (2015b:7) contributed opinion pieces to French newspapers as well, some of which he said elicited strongly negative reactions online, along with very positive responses in private.

Alessandro Zagato (2015), within months of the attack, published an edited collection, The Event of Charlie Hebdo: Imaginaries of Freedom and Control, with contributions from nine scholars based at the University of Bergen, Norway. In that volume’s introduction, Bjørn Bertelsen and Zagato (2015:7) criticize media tendencies toward ahistorical
spectacularization of the event and argue that the attack disrupts “clash of civilizations” logic and other common responses centered on a “narrowly identitarian logic.” Humor theory frames Bruce Kapferer’s (2015) afterword to the Zagato volume, which is titled “When Is a Joke Not a Joke?” In addition to joining others in criticizing insertion of Charlie Hebdo into grand narratives such as the “clash of civilizations,” Kapferer explores why the question in his title is “ultimately unanswerable.” Anthropologists who analyze the Charlie Hebdo attack, Kapferer writes, are themselves caught in paradox and in the collapse of the joke frame under the weight of the same social structural realities of suffering from which the joke sprang. Furthermore, the joke’s end sets off more jokes, as in the English satirical journal Private Eye, which mocked the almost instantly ubiquitous “Je suis Charlie” slogan by placing the bubble “Je suis Charlatan” over the heads of world leaders in the famous photo of a January 2015 solidarity march in Paris. For Kapferer (2015:98), the Private Eye cartoon “revealed the joke in the structure, the hypocrisy of the hierarchs who, in their affirmation of democracy and freedom, hid the fact that they are the instruments of the daily subversion of these values.”

In addition to these popular and scholarly publications, anthropology blogs offered lively discussions of Charlie Hebdo. The collective “Allegra Lab: Anthropology, Law, Art & World” posted Fiona Murphy’s (2015) summary of discussions that occurred during an international, multidisciplinary conference at Maynooth University (National University of Ireland) about the aftermath of the Charlie Hebdo attack. Allegra also live-tweeted the event. Conference contributors cautioned against condensing meanings of Charlie Hebdo into a symbolic singularity, as in the “Je suis Charlie” mobilizations online and offline, and they reflected on the “insertion of Charlie Hebdo into grand narratives such as the enlightenment, the clash of civilizations, race and multiculturalism and secularism” (Murphy 2015). Similarly, Kevin Karpik (2015a), in a blog post for AnthropoLife, urged attention not just to freedom of speech but also to power, inequality, and colonialism—a framework that leads him to see the Charlie Hebdo cartoons themselves as “antithetic to the liberal tradition in which they drape themselves . . . [as well as] dangerous in that their effects—in the form of security crackdowns, illegal intrusions on liberty, social ostracism . . . —will almost surely further endanger and antagonize the lives of France’s broad and complex Muslim population.” In a turn away from common public sphere questions about why anyone would even consider killing people for making distasteful jokes or how politicians believe such atrocities can be prevented, Kerim Friedman (2015a), writing at Savage Minds, crafts an anthropological response to radical Islam that highlights religious belief as a set of historically contingent social practices.

Related pedagogical contributions include Michelle Hagman (2015) on the anthropology of Islam and how Western mass media shape views of Islam and Marian-inna Villavicencio (2015) on “Muslim Immigration and Integration in France.” Both of these recent works were published via the online “Fieldsights” feature in the journal Cultural Anthropology (with discussion questions, in-class activities, and references).

In short, anthropological commentary on Charlie Hebdo has emphasized its wider political, economic, cultural, and historical contexts, upending “clash of civilizations” or other grand narratives that reduce the tragedy to stories about why foreign “others” hate “Western” democracy or modernity.

Finally, a complete inversion of popular assumptions about hatred across religious divides appears in the bravery shown by West African (Malian) Muslim immigrant Lassana Bathily when Amedy Coulibaly invaded a Kosher supermarket in Paris two days after the attacks on the offices of Charlie Hebdo. Bathily’s actions helped to save the lives of 15 people trapped inside the supermarket: “Yes, I helped Jews get out. We’re brothers. It’s not a question of being Jews or Christians or Muslims. We’re all in the same boat. You have to help each other to get through this crisis” (Gottlieb 2015). Bathily was welcomed by officials in his home country as a national hero, in France he finally received French citizenship, and he was awarded a Medal of Valor from the Simon Wiesenthal Center. Scholars in the Mande Studies Association therefore wondered in an online conversation (as reported in Gottlieb’s 2015 post in a trilingual blog): “instead of ‘Je Suis Charlie,’ why hasn’t the global meme been ‘Je Suis Lassana’?”—a symbol of the capacity of individuals to transcend “othering” stereotypes and act in the shared interests of humanity.

BLACK LIVES MATTER AND ITS INTERNATIONAL RESONANCE

The Black Lives Matter movement has stimulated wide discussion among anthropologists in social media, blogs, and popular and scholarly publications, as well as at the American Anthropological Association’s (AAA) annual meetings. Donna Auston (2015) offers a powerful firsthand account of the die-in held during the December 2014 AAA meetings in Washington, DC, when hundreds of conference attendees of varying race and ethnicity lay in silence on the hotel lobby’s marble floor for four-and-a-half minutes to symbolize the four-and-a-half hours that Michael Brown’s lifeless body lay on the hotel street after he was shot by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri. (A few days before the die-in, a grand jury had decided not to indict Darren Wilson, the police officer who shot Michael Brown.) Later that day, a AAA section assembly motion on Michael Brown, Eric Garner, racialized repression, and state violence was approved by members during a well-attended AAA business meeting. AAA president Leith Mullings met with younger scholars during the conference to guide them in “the ways of AAA bureaucracy, on task forces and sections and motions, and how to get things done” and a powerful photo of one of those meetings circulated in social media (McGranahan 2014). Follow-up actions include the AAA Executive Board’s approval of the creation
of the Working Group on Racialized Police Brutality and Extrajudicial Violence, which is part of the Committee on Minority Issues in Anthropology. Kevin Karpiak’s (2015b) video conversation with A. Lynn Bolles also addresses these events at the 2014 American Anthropological Association Meetings in Washington, DC, along with discussion of the “anthropology of policing . . . [and] the specific challenges and opportunities anthropologists face in their intersecting roles as scholars, educators, and political subjects.”

Black Lives Matter has deeply influenced debates about race, criminal justice, and economic inequality in the United States and elsewhere. Though police tactics have caused protests in U.S. urban black communities for decades, and though prominent journalists such as former New York Times op-ed columnist Bob Herbert have written often about police brutality cases, today’s pervasiveness of video-enabled smartphones, together with rapid mobilization of activist networks via social media, helped to boost the public salience of this issue. Discursive visibility of the catchphrases, if not the underlying structural violence, was apparent—as in the American Dialect Society’s (2014) choice of “#blacklivesmatter” as its word of the year and “#icantbreathe” as its hashtag of the year (a new category). While Black Lives Matter participants called for police accountability and characterized the movement as anti-police-brutality but not anti-police, conservative opponents depicted Black Lives Matter as racially divisive and violent. Preferred tactics and ideologies in Black Lives Matter vary from radical to liberal reformist and more, as is often the case in social movements. Some local community activists work with police and residents to mediate disputes and do not join in large demonstrations, while others view mass protests as a key part of the repertoire of political action to press for changes in policies and institutions (see Williams 2015a).

Black Lives Matter and related protests have become part of a revitalized politics of intersectionality (see Mullings 2005, 2015)—an interplay of race, class, gender, sexuality, and other identity markers in recent waves of protest that have focused on climate change, wages, immigration law, economic inequality, reproductive rights, access to healthcare, and voting rights. Large public demonstrations—most of them peaceful—swept across hundreds of U.S. cities in 2014 and 2015. Underpaid U.S. employees, such as fast-food workers, in demonstrations for living wages also declared “I can’t breathe” and raised their hands and shouted “Hands up, don’t shoot” (Bittman 2014). Black Lives Matter highlights acute economic inequalities that affect a wide—but often not particularly visible—swath of people in the United States and elsewhere.

Especially since 2011, the global North has seen intensified protest in opposition to austerity measures and to “a crisis of political responsibility of the so-called advanced democracies,” as Donatella della Porta (2015:3) puts it. While terms such as austerity and the precariat have become salient in European public discourse and in massive demonstrations there, such language is much less common in the United States. Nonetheless, there is transcontinental overlap in economic issues underlying protest and in the perception that surging economic inequality is connected to deteriorating political institutions.

The global resonance of the Black Lives Matter movement was apparent in 2015 “migrant lives matter” protests in London and Dublin against European Union responses to the African migrant crisis. During a period of intense political polarization in Europe, thousands of African asylum seekers and economic migrants fleeing war, persecution, and poverty have drowned while attempting to cross the Mediterranean to Europe in unsafe or flimsy boats, or they have faced neglect and abuse once they reached Europe’s shores after life-threatening journeys (see SOAS 2015). In addition, in May 2015 in downtown Tel Aviv, thousands of Ethiopian Israelis and sympathizers staged a Black Lives Matter protest against racial discrimination and police brutality (Kershner 2015). In August 2015, thousands of people in Salvador da Bahia, Brazil, protested police killings of unarmed Brazilians of African descent.

In one of the first scholarly articles about the protests in Ferguson, Yarimar Bonilla and Jonathan Rosa’s (2015) contribution to American Ethnologist focused on how social media or “hashtag activism” challenges dominant news organizations’ representations of racialized bodies and helps to create new mediatized publics and a “shared political temporality” connecting Twitter users across time and space in ways that move much more quickly than Facebook. In exploring the semiotics of digital protest, Bonilla and Rosa also probe the possibilities and limitations of “hashtag ethnography” or use of Twitter as a field site. Accompanying their article is a digital supplement (on American Ethnologist’s website) offering additional research and teaching resources, including music inspired by Ferguson, collections of tweets, sports and activism, archival resources, and more. In its online series “Fieldsights” and “Hot Spots,” the journal Cultural Anthropology also posted features on Black Lives Matter (Furnage and Rubin 2015; Williams 2015b). In her introduction to the “Hot Spot” feature, Bianca Williams (2015b) reminds readers that “Black Lives Matter demands that we recognize that all Black lives matter, including trans folk, differently abled individuals, and others who are frequently marginalized.” She also calls attention to how the “history of racism and violence in the United States [is] connected to the transnational and diasporic experience of anti-Black racism and violence” (2015b). On the latter theme, Christen A. Smith (2015b) published in this journal’s Public Anthropology section an article in which she connects U.S. Black Lives Matter protests to “an emerging global politics of race, citizenship, violence, and nation,” with particular attention to diasporic anti-black state violence in Brazil. Related issues raised by Cultural Anthropology’s “Hot Spots” contributors include U.S. black activists meeting in Geneva with the Committee Against Torture a few months after Michael Brown’s death in Ferguson (James 2015), the historical as well as contemporary contributions of black women’s “quotidian practices
that form the foundation of those overly publicized and hypertelevisioned protest moments that are impossible to ignore” (Cox 2015a), the frequent murders of black transwomen (Richardson 2015), frequent police killings of people of African descent in Brazil (Smith 2015a) and Trinidad (Kerrigan 2015), a call to consider alternatives to contemporary reformist approaches to the “anti-Black constitution of our social world” in the United States and among nations of the Black diaspora (Vargas 2015), how “the events around Ferguson expose the limitations of ethnographic methodology and disrupt the anthropology of race” (Burton 2015), limitations and possibilities of bodycams and dashcams and revised police training (Stewart 2015), and how historically deep patterns of interaction between police and African Americans obscure their common interests such as “wider class conflicts” (Waterston 2015).

Other 2015 anthropology blog posts on U.S. racial justice issues include Pem Davidson Buck’s (2015) piece in the Huffington Post on why we should look beyond legal charges against individual police officers and a series titled “Ferguson and Elsewhere” in Anthropoliteia. Paul Mutersa (2015) wrote in the wake of protests in The Hague against the police chokehold death of Aruban Mitch Henriquez, reflecting on mixed public responses to his own research on law enforcement and migrants and on possible contributions of research, advocacy, protest, and activism to reform of the criminal justice system in the Netherlands. He also contributed to American Anthropologist a 2015 article in the public anthropology section (coauthored with Jennie Simpson and Kevin Karpia) on the emergent subfield of anthropology of policing as a form of public anthropology; it draws on the authors’ research in the United States, France, and the Netherlands. Additional Anthropoliteia contributions in the “Ferguson and Elsewhere” series include Kevin Karpia’s (2015b) video interview with A. Lynn Bolles, and Bradley Dunseith’s (2015) reflections from Charleston in the aftermath of the murder of the Reverend Clementa Pinckney and eight other parishioners by a white supremacist in the historic black A. M. E. Church. That attack should have been labeled “terrorism” rather than solely a “hate crime,” Robert Launay (2015) stated in a letter to the editor of the New York Times. The Charleston church tragedy and other developments contributed to renewed challenges to public displays of the Confederate flag—and, ironically, to its “more ubiquitous [presence] than before the challenges began,” according to Robin Conley and Netta Avineri (2015). Drawing on semiotic theory in their Huffington Post editorial, Conley and Avineri invite us to explore the lives of such racialized symbols, noting that critical recontextualization of the Confederate flag in satirical cartoons depicting the symbol as toxic, for example, both convey alternative meanings and simultaneously “reproduce original, potentially damaging meanings . . . [that may] take on lives of their own over which we have little control.”

While robust anthropological theory and research understands race to be a social construct, as with the “clash of civilizations” narrative, deeply problematic alternative frameworks thrive in the public sphere, and these have profound consequences for social justice. “The specter of racism,” Paul Stoller (2015a) writes in the Huffington Post, “makes us want to avoid the discomfort of talking about how race is a central structure in the foundation of contemporary American society.”

EUROPEAN MIGRANT AND REFUGEE “CRISIS”

More than a half-million migrants and refugees traveled to European Union countries in 2015, but there are tens of millions of additional displaced persons elsewhere in the world today. Their numbers have tripled in the last decade (from 20 million to more than 60 million), creating a humanitarian “crisis” (a term that implies that the condition is not permanent) and constituting the “central problem of twenty-first century global politics,” as Elizabeth Dunn (2015) puts it in the Boston Review. Dunn, who has conducted extensive field research in refugee camps in the Republic of Georgia, argues that the refugee crisis is not “a problem of border control,” that the refugee camp is a humanitarian and political failure, and that the solution is to help resettle refugees “in ways that benefit local economies and urban environments.” The director of the Center for Migration and Diaspora Studies at SOAS, Parvathi Raman, discusses why anthropological research methods are especially suited to understanding causes and consequences of these mass population movements and describes a number of very recent ethnographic and autoethnographic studies of clandestine and “irregular” migrations of shifting status (SOAS 2015). Anthropologists are examining everyday interactions between border officials and migrants, migrants’ mutual support networks and subjective experiences, global networks of people smuggling, targeting and stigmatization of migrants, the slipperiness of distinctions between refugees and economic migrants, and media representations of migrants and their consequences, among other topics.

Though many European economies need migrant workers, Raman states, “the management of borders and the policing of migrants is now big business across the world, and governments are progressively outsourcing what is becoming a profitable migration industry to multinational companies” (SOAS 2015; see also Andersson 2015b). Furthermore, contrary to rhetorics of “hordes” or “swarms” of refugees in Europe, she notes that the per capita numbers of displaced persons in Europe are dwarfed by numbers elsewhere and that European policies directly contribute to shifting the migrant crisis to countries such as Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, and Pakistan. Yet years of austerity and increasing political polarization in Europe hamper more effective alternative policies. Echoing a critique of cultural reductionism that surfaces in much public anthropology (as in the Pandits volume [Besteman and Gusterson 2005]), Raman observes that “the alienation and marginalization of migrants are the real factors that threaten social cohesion, not
simpistic ideas of “cultural difference” (SOAS 2015; see also Eriksen 2016).

How to talk about cultural diversity, minorities, and social integration without succumbing either to cultural determinism or to utter disavowal of the explanatory value of cultural differences is Thomas Hylland Eriksen’s (2016) focus in his blog entry about the assaults and robberies in New Year’s Eve crowds near a train station in Cologne, Germany. He asks: “How can we speak of these differences without coercing people into artificially delimited groups, oversimplifying, fanning prejudices and establishing boundaries which are both politically unproductive and intellectually indefensible—in a word, contributing to a polarizing discourse from which only extreme groups . . . benefit?” He describes several recent anthropological research projects in Norway that show minorities striving to fit in, gain respect from the majority, and contribute to communities beyond their own circles of family, ethnicity, and religion. Instead of simply offering migrants courses on European values and gender equality, he argues, migrant minorities must be incorporated into European society, taught new languages, and given meaningful work—all of which create opportunities to build respect between minorities and the majority. Without government support for such adaptations, Eriksen writes, if “vast numbers of refugees end, unintegrated, on welfare, the only beneficiaries are the extreme movements on either side . . . [which] are only capable of creating distrust, divisiveness and mutual suspicion.”

Ruben Andersson (2015a)—an ethnographer of migration, borders, and security—contributed an opinion piece to The Guardian in which he criticizes the European Union for not “treat[ing] asylum and labor mobility as questions of justice or opportunity” and shared responsibility, and for instead disastrously consigning complex migration and refugee issues to interior ministries and security forces. In a National Public Radio (NPR) interview, Andersson (2015b) calls for “de-escalating the rhetoric” of crisis and addressing labor migration as an opportunity rather than a threat. Andersson won the BBC’s 2015 Thinking Allowed Ethnography award for his 2014 book Illegality, Inc.20

Other anthropological voices in the migrant debates include the Polish Ethnological Society (2015), which issued a “Statement on expressions of xenophobia and intolerance” that warns of historical parallels between the present and earlier histories of fascism, genocide, and ethnic cleansing. The Polish Ethnological Society calls for efforts to combat all forms of xenophobia, “beginning with its expression in language and acts of verbal violence” and urges initiatives that cultivate tolerance and help for the needy.21

Adopting the genre of an “open letter to decision makers” and drawing on his ethnographic research, Maurizio Albahari (2015) writes at Anthropology Now of the extraordinary strains of everyday life in some of Italy’s “less glittery neighborhoods” in Rome, Naples, and Milan. Long-term residents as well as refugees and migrants experience “austerity . . . carving its way into our public lighting, our public transportation, the cleanliness of our sidewalks, the beauty of our parks, the quality of our education, and even the vigilance of our police forces . . . infrastructure crumbles over our head.” Some turn to rebellion as their “only way to get noticed” and vote for “populists who craftily cultivate our gut feelings [and] promise moralizing simplicity instead of complexity.” Albahari illustrates the ideological and political tensions of austerity, structural violence, declining living standards, and influxes of foreigners fleeing longstanding poverty or political violence. These economic and political divisions are rooted not in Huntington’s civilizational blocs but in historical particularities and contingencies that anthropologists are well positioned to analyze.

Although economic austerity can contribute to xenophobia and the rise of far-right politics, it also accompanies expanding experiments with a solidarity economy in countries such as Greece, as discussed by prize-winning fiction author and anthropologist Theodoros Rakopoulos (Khazaleh 2015): “The new solidarity economy in crisis-ridden Greece has arguably a wider impact on peoples’ daily life than the much talked about rise in far-right parties like Golden Dawn.” Such initiatives include anti-middlemen groups who set up food centers, health clinics, and legal aid services. Like Muslim Lassana Bathily’s courageous acts to save Jews during the Paris supermarket attack, these initiatives are a reminder of qualities of compassion and care that have long sustained our species.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE EBOLA OUTBREAK

Early in the Ebola outbreak, anthropologists who have deep ethnographic expertise in West Africa or medical anthropology were not automatically contacted by global health organizations such as the World Health Organization, Centers for Disease Control, or Doctors Without Borders (Abramowitz 2014). Many anthropologists, however, soon mobilized workshops and partnerships with such organizations and contributed their expertise to media discussions and humanitarian and public health initiatives on Ebola. The American Anthropological Association sponsored an Ebola webinar and established an Emergency Ebola Anthropology Initiative in 2014, developing a network of hundreds of experts in a dozen countries.22 Sylvain Landry Faye, a health anthropologist at Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar, described in an interview how anthropologists helped mediate relations between medical teams and villagers in Guinea (Fassassi 2014). Faye emphasizes the importance of looking beyond a medical framework of “viruses, prions and sick bodies” and instead seeing individuals in relation to society, culture, and humanity. The journal Cultural Anthropology published a Hot Spots series on Ebola (Moran and Hoffman 2014), and the blog Somatosphere published an Ebola Fieldnotes Series that has addressed topics such as the financialization of Ebola and challenges of humanitarian response initiatives.23 Limn, which describes itself as “somewhere between a scholarly journal and an art magazine,” published a special issue on “Ebola Ecologies” in January 2015.24 In late
2014, the American Anthropological Association, World Council of Anthropological Associations, and Wenner-Gren Foundation assembled anthropologists from many countries for a two-day workshop at George Washington University (Washington, DC) on the Ebola outbreak. Participants produced a series of briefing papers intended to assist organizations working to stop the outbreak. Those participants were asked to set aside critique and to emphasize instead anthropology’s direct relevance in aiding international responders to the epidemic.

In a *Savage Minds* blog post, by contrast, Thurka Sangaramoorthy and Adia Benton (2015) emphasize the value of anthropological critique and historical contextualization of the epidemic, including “legacies of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, European (and U.S.) colonialism, post-colonial aid dependency, and civil wars [that] have contributed not only to patterns of the disease’s spread, but also to earlier failures of government and international actors to mount a coordinated response.” Other scholars such as historian Achille Mbembe have also criticized how humanitarian aid is depoliticized, noting harmful consequences when the Ebola crisis, for example, is framed in “purely medical and epidemiological terms”—as is discussed in Corinna Jentsch’s (2015) post about Mbembe on the popular blog *Africa Is a Country* (http://africasacountry.com).

These interventions highlight long-standing frictions between analytical critique and contextualization, on the one hand, and production of knowledge that news media and other powerful institutions and actors consider digestible and usable, on the other hand. Such friction—under ideal circumstances—can help to propel institutional rethinking. Keeping these tensions in view is essential to dismantling pernicious myths about culture, difference, and suffering.

**ETHNOGRAPHY ON TRIAL?**

Among the Associated Press’s top news stories of 2015 was the controversy over sociologist Alice Goffman’s 2014 ethnography *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Goffman lived for six years in a mixed-income neighborhood in Philadelphia, as both an undergraduate and then a graduate student participant-observer researching the lives of young black men, some of whom were caught up in the drug trade and legal proceedings. After initial acclaim and unusually wide public notice of her book, questions about her methods and some of the book’s content were raised in the media and in a lengthy anonymous document sent to her department chair and other academics (see Campos 2015; Lewis-Kraus 2016; Lubet 2015; Parry 2015; Sharpe 2015). Concerns centered on unclear distinctions between some firsthand observations and reported speech or events, details she had altered to protect the identity of her research participants (in conformity with Institutional Review Board requirements) and the resulting impossibility of fact-checking her account, procedures she followed in a neighborhood survey, and the ethics and legality of some of her actions as a participant-observer. My aim here is not to take a stand on the Goffman debates but, rather, to highlight how the controversy appeared to put ethnography itself on trial. The core critique of ethnography is summed up by Leon Neyfakh (2015) in *Slate*:

> As practiced by many scholars, what is supposed to be a scientific undertaking aimed at systematically revealing truths about the world looks more like an uncomfortable hybrid of impressionistic data gathering, soft-focus journalism, and even a dash of creative writing.

After talking with Goffman, Neyfakh (2015) concludes that though “there are indeed factual inaccuracies throughout *On the Run* . . . they are not the product of the kind of fraud we’re used to seeing in publishing scandals.” Instead, he states that they arose mostly from the process of altering details in order to meet the ethical mandate of ethnographers to anonymize research participants’ identities.

In response to the flurry of media discussion of Goffman and the ethnographic method, both David D. Perlmutter (2015) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and Paul Stoller (2015b) in the *Huffington Post* wrote pieces titled “In Defense of Ethnography.” Stoller (2015b) observes that Goffman’s critics do not refer to the “rich and highly reflexive” body of work of anthropologists during the past four decades or to the discipline’s robust code of ethics (see also Stoller 2015c). He notes that ethnography requires “an interpretative sensitivity that can only be acquired over long periods of time” and that one of its core principles is to “listen to what your subjects are saying, but pay special attention to what they do” (Stoller 2015b). A journalist’s post-publication interview with a research participant may elicit responses that differ from that same individual’s words and actions during ethnographic fieldwork, and assessing the quality of the truths produced through either pathway can be exceedingly complicated. Ethnographic research, Stoller (2015b) writes, “eventually enables the ethnographer to tell the story of a group of people with respect, power and a depth of understanding that allows us to better understand the human condition.” Perlmutter (2015), a documentary photographer and specialist in political communication who once produced “a visual ethnography of a small police department,” describes divergent methods and ethical codes in journalism and ethnography. Given the frequency of “weapons-grade fraud” in the social and physical sciences, he finds “the idea that ethnography is especially flawed . . . absurd” and states that “ethnography seems like a particularly ill-chosen scapegoat, because it’s very hard to fake outright.” Furthermore, he notes that the ethnographic method yields data that are unlikely to be discovered through other methods and that ethnographers often “give voice to people who aren’t necessarily otherwise heard.” That was the accomplishment of Aimee Meredith Cox (2015b) in her long-term study of young black women in a Detroit homeless shelter and of Laurence Ralph (2014) in his intensive research on one of Chicago’s most marginalized neighborhoods.

While media coverage of ethnographies is not common, how ethnographies are received by various publics—or
the “public afterlife of ethnography”—is a worthy object of inquiry in its own right, argues Didier Fassin (2015c) in American Ethnologist. Fassin contrasts media responses to his two recent books on urban policing (2011) and life inside a French prison (2015d), and he explores reactions from participants in those studies, as well as changes over time in South African responses to his earlier work on AIDS in that country (Fassin 2007). Fassin had worked to make his 2015 book L’ombre du monde accessible to a wide audience in the hope that it might stimulate “a national discussion of the politics of punishment in France” (Fassin 2015c:592). Instead of that wider discussion, the attack on the offices of Charlie Hebdo in early January 2015 led many journalists to ask him about religious radicalization in prison, though it was a rare phenomenon in France (Fassin 2015c:593). He was also asked about his analysis of the “overrepresentation of black and Arab men in prison,” which he had hoped would be linked to penal system practices and historical patterns of racial and ethnic discrimination rather than singled out in hyperbolic language about “apartheid” (Fassin 2015c:593). Nonetheless, Fassin found these media interactions to be helpful in having “opened new dimensions in [his own] . . . inquiry” (Fassin 2015c:597) and as illustrations of issues that can arise when any academic work enters the public sphere.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS ENGAGE THE WORLD

“Why the World Needs Anthropologists: Burning Issues of Our Hot Planet” was the focus of an international symposium held in Ljubljana, Slovenia, in November 2015. Speakers addressed the value of anthropological analysis of land grabs, migration, democratization of philanthropy, design of commodities, wealth inequality, unequal effects of climate change, and unequal production of carbon emissions around the world (Sinatti 2015). In a follow-up blog post, Jovan Maud (2015) highlights the tension in such discussions “between the capacity of anthropologists to ‘talk back’ to powerful institutional discourses and our desire to make our knowledge ‘useful’ to precisely these institutions.” He invites us to think beyond narrowly instrumental gadfly roles and to imagine “truly alternative visions of ways to be human.” Sinatti shares Tim Ingold’s (2014:383) view that ethnography is an overused identifier in anthropology and that the discipline’s most profound value lies in its capacity for “healing the rupture between imagination and real life.”

Anthropology’s imaginative range is reflected in an array of additional media contributions, including Janine Wedel’s (2015) New America Weekly article on how subtle “new corruption” damages U.S. democracy; David Vine’s (2015) New York Times op-ed about high costs and other disadvantages of the more than 700 U.S. military bases overseas; Hugh Gusterson’s (2015) discussion in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists of why the United States is at risk of a nuclear accident; Daniel M. Knight’s (2015) Huffington Post piece on how people in Greece invoke “poignant pasts” when discussing contemporary austerity; David Graeber’s (2015) opinion video in The Guardian (UK) on taboo economic principles about government and private sector debt; Tanya Luhrmann’s series of opinion pieces in the New York Times (e.g., Luhrmann 2015 on culturally distinctive assumptions about mental health in the United States); Roberto J. Gonzalez’s (2015) analysis of the collapse of the U.S. Army’s Human Terrain System (which embedded social scientists in military units in Afghanistan and Iraq so they could provide “cultural knowledge”); Mark Schuller’s (2015) reflections in Huffington Post on historical resonances in the contemporary “humanitarian occupation” of Haiti; Cati Cee’s (2015) Huffington Post piece on popular misunderstandings of family sponsorship immigration policy; Kerim Friedman (2015b) on the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling that led to legalization of same-sex marriage in all 50 states; Nancy Scheper-Hughes’s (2015) CounterPunch article on the controversial canonization of Father Junípero Serra during Pope Francis’s visit to Washington, DC; Ed Liebow’s (2015) Huffington Post article on flaws in Congressional approaches to monitoring publicly funded research. Academic governance drew public comment from anthropologists last year, as in a Savage Minds blog post by Martin Manalansan and Ellen Moodie (2015) on the University of Illinois’ unhiring of Steven Salaita for his 2014 tweets on Israel and Gaza, and Kathryn Dudley’s (2015) Yale Daily News opinion article on campus protests against institutionalized racism. In addition to these media contributions, sometimes anthropologists literally put their own bodies on the line in public anthropology, as Daniel Goldstein (2014) did on a snowy International Human Rights Day when he joined a human chain lying in the road to block vans leaving the detention center in Elizabeth, New Jersey, as a protest against the detention and deportation of the undocumented.

The devastating April 2015 earthquake in Nepal was the focus of an open forum about anthropological commitment at the 2015 AAA meeting in Denver and of much commentary by anthropologists, including a Savage Minds blog post by Carole McGranahan (2015) that highlights as well early media and blog contributions on this subject by David Citrin (2015), Sienna Craig (2015), David Gellner (2015), and Sara Shneiderman and Mark Turin (2015). December 2015 saw an international agreement in Paris to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and the trilingual anthropology portal http://antropologi.info has compiled many anthropology blog posts and scholarly journal issues focused on climate change. The March 2015 issue of Open Anthropology, titled “Hello Anthropocene: Climate Change and Anthropology,” offers a collection of articles on this theme across AAA journals.

The AAA conferred awards in 2015 on two anthropologists whose writing aims to reach wide audiences. Paul Stoller, a regular contributor to the Huffington Post
since 2010, won the AAA’s 2015 Anthropology of Media Award (see Ulysse 2015). Mark Schuller received the 2015 Margaret Mead award from the AAA and Society for Applied Anthropology for his work on disasters, NGOs, globalization, and gender in Haiti.29

AAA members are considering quite visible public action on Israel and Palestine. The Task Force on AAA Engagement on Israel-Palestine issued its final report in October 2015 (AAA 2015a). During the 2015 AAA conference in Denver, more than 1,000 members who attended the business meeting voted in favor of (and just over 100 voted against) placing a resolution to boycott Israeli academic institutions on the organization’s spring 2016 election ballot, which is open to the AAA’s 10,000 members (AAA 2015b). Following that vote, the Association’s Executive Board is to decide the terms of any action. Relevant to the debates within the AAA on this subject is Lara Deeb and Jessica Winegar’s 2015 book Anthropology’s Politics: Disciplining the Middle East, which examines how post–World War II politics in the academy and beyond affects the scholarly practices of five generations of U.S. anthropologists who work on the Middle East and North Africa. The AAA set up a blog spot for open discussion of this issue on the Anthropology News website.30

Looking beyond the AAA, organizations such as the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), the World Anthropologies Network, and the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA, a network of 52 national, regional, and international professional anthropological associations) help to make public anthropology visible globally and to foster what Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (2014:489) terms “new conditions of conversability” that . . . allow for richer, heteroglossic cross-fertilizations within a global community of anthropologists.” The IUAES holds international conferences in cities around the world, and the WCAA chair takes actions such as writing to the president of Brazil in December 2015 to urge the Brazilian State to protect the lands and rights of indigenous Kayowa and Nandeves peoples in accordance with the 1988 Federal Constitution and international law.31

Finally, the threatened loss of the open-access journal VIBRANT: Virtual Brazilian Anthropology prompted the WCAA Chair to write to the Brazilian National Research Council in December 2015 requesting that it restore the journal’s funding.32 VIBRANT is sponsored by the Brazilian Anthropological Association, and it publishes articles in English, French, and Spanish, along with audiovisual materials produced by anthropologists working in Brazil. Its annual budget is just a few thousand dollars, but when this article went to press, VIBRANT remained unfunded—a telling example of a much wider phenomenon and an illustration of challenges scholarly journals face under national austerity budgets that can undermine the diversity and transnational interchange of ideas that are vital to public anthropology everywhere.

CONCLUSION

To many, public anthropology is a conundrum. It is simultaneously professional and service work. While it is often grounded in long-term ethnography, public debate favors speed. If ethnography is “research on the slow boil,” as Ruben Andersson put it in a British Broadcasting Corporation (2016) interview about migration, how should we think about “fast ethnography”—which need not be an oxymoron? Fast ethnography, wrote Yarimar Bonilla (2015) in Savage Minds, challenges anthropologists to address rapidly moving stories “while still retaining the contextualization, historical perspective, and attention to individual experiences characteristic of a fieldworker.” In addition to favoring quick responses built on deep research, public anthropology encourages a writing style that differs sharply from conventional academic prose. Thus scholars whose works I have mentioned here have experimented with a variety of writing genres and media (blogs, video and print interviews, online supplements to scholarly articles, social media, news media opinion pieces, crossover scholarly publications), and they have become accustomed to unpredictable impact and audience responses. Anthropologists cannot necessarily assume what the public wants to know or how they want to learn about it or how their audiences will define them or even what publics their words will create (Golub and Friedman 2015). It is always tempting nonetheless, writes Orisamni Burton (2015), for anthropologists and other academics to “position their particular disciplines as especially primed to clarify the situation.” Public anthropology, then, is quixotic, paradoxical, and unpredictable. But it also can be a potent response to the moment. We have seen examples of how anthropologists dismantled essentialized depictions of culture and of refugees, migrants, protesters, and Ebola victims. Such contributions can help to counter popular prejudice, hate speech, racism, and xenophobia.

It is likely more difficult now than it was a decade ago, when the Pandits volume (Besteman and Gusterson 2005) was published, to convey and find receptive audiences for the anthropological message of nuance, context, and complexity. Public anthropology contributions today, some midcareer and senior anthropologists report, elicit not just polite agreement or disagreement but more threats and sarcastic and disparaging remarks in news media and social media. Painful though it may be, we can learn from such reactions in anthropological analysis of the public afterlife of our speech and writing. Many anthropologists appear to embrace such challenges, if the proliferation of anthropology blogs, the volume of social media discussion, and contributions to news media and other forms of public discourse—only a fraction of which can be tapped here—are any indication.

Anthropologists capture tensions and textures of everyday life in ways that can alter perceptions of spectacular events such as terror attacks, refugees arriving on Europe’s shores in flimsy and overloaded rafts, gun violence in
low-income U.S. neighborhoods, or protests that become “riots.” An Ebola outbreak becomes part of colonial and post-colonial histories of economic marginalization, civil strife, and geopolitical polarities. A terror attack is not reducible to supposedly inevitable religious hatreds, cultural differences, or a “clash of civilizations.” Poverty is reframed in relation to histories of structural violence rather than putative cultural deficiencies, and wealth inequality is shown to be the outcome of policy decisions rather than natural Darwinian processes. Stories about today’s migrants and refugees are reframed in relation to long histories of people on the move who have contributed to economic revivals, innovations, and vibrant socialities. Finally, public anthropology grounded in ethnographic research reveals the compassion, care, and solidarity that have long sustained our species.

Angelique Haugerud Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901; haugerud@rci.rutgers.edu; http://anthro.rutgers.edu/fac/department-undergrad-and-grad-faculty/angelique-haugerud; Twitter: @Prof_Haugerud

NOTES

Acknowledgments. Special thanks to the anonymous peer reviewers, Public Anthropology Section Coeditor David Griffith, and Editor-in-Chief Michael Chibnik for very helpful comments and suggestions.

1. Huntington’s (1993) seven civilizations are Sinic (Chinese), Japanese, Hindu, Islamic, Orthodox, Western, and Latin America. The latter he sometimes suggests may be part of Western civilization, and he writes that Africa is “possibly” a civilization.

2. The last phrase is from Gusterson (2005:40).


4. I thank one of this article’s peer reviewers for encouraging attention to this issue and the point in the next sentence.


7. See, for example, Goroya et al. (2015).


9. This paragraph summarizes Gottlieb’s (2015) blog post as reproduced in “The Anthropology Newspaper,” which is part of the trilingual anthropology portal http://antropologi.info (edited by Lorenz Khazaleh). Among other features, the portal includes blogs in German, Norwegian, and English.

10. The AAA earlier had established the RACE Project “to help promote a broad understanding of race and human variation.” Among other features, it includes a public education program (RACE: Are We So Different), a traveling museum exhibit, an interactive website, and educational materials for middle-school children as well as adults. http://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2062, accessed March 17, 2016.

11. See also Faye Harrison’s (2014) Savage Minds post on this topic: “The current conjuncture, articulated now as the Age of Ferguson, has severely challenged the optimism that many antiracist liberals and leftists have long embodied about the extent to which our society has changed for the better and is capable of changing at a positively discernible pace.”

12. Discussion and organizing continue via a Black Lives Matter AAA website (https://blacklivesmatteraaa.wordpress.com), on which can be found the Association of Black Anthropologists’ December 2014 “Statement Against Police Violence and Anti-Black Practices.” McGranahan (2014) includes the text of the AAA Section Assembly Motion on Anti-Black Violence in the USA (December 5, 2014).


15. This sentence and some subsequent discussion of activism below draws from or closely paraphrases passages in Haugerud (in press).


18. See Burton’s (2015) caveats about this aspect of anthropological theory.

19. There is no reliable information available about how many of the attackers were migrants or asylum seekers. See National Public Radio’s (2016) early account of competing narratives about the event.


21. See also Songin-Mokrzan’s (2015) discussion of debates about engaged anthropology and anthropology’s role in the public sphere in Poland.
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