

Dual-Identity*continued from page 17*

that receives federal funding, must comply with 1990's Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. This stipulates a much more specific and extensive set of requirements to be met with respect to Native American "cultural items" than does the AAA code, and does not conceive of native peoples as "research subjects." These are but two examples. Anthropologists who work in the public sector could hardly be said to be groping around in the ethical dark, but our code of ethics does not complement these alternative guidelines so much as it competes with them.

The ethical standards of other intercommunicating clusters of which anthropologists form a part, and with whom we also communicate, are at present entirely outside the scope of consideration of our own disciplinary ethics. Our ethics remain insulated from the kinds of dual-identity relationships that anthropologists outside of (and increasingly within) the academy routinely confront. Perhaps our code of ethics needs to be more conversant with the varieties of ethical standards and processes that inform these other communities of practice. And perhaps we would be better served not to insist on its exclusive primacy at the expense of a broader extra-disciplinary ethics conversation. AAA's 2009 code views our ethics as "providing a framework, not an ironclad formula," which leaves the door open for us to begin to articulate our own disciplinary norms in ways more consequential for the diverse contexts of anthropological practice that exist today.

Robert Albro teaches in the School of International Service at American University. He is current chair of AAA's Ad Hoc Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the US Security and Intelligence Communities (CEAUSSIC). In addition to long-term research in Bolivia, his work examines conceptions of culture as they are incorporated into multilateral and international policymaking. ☐

Ethical Research across Power Divides

JANINE R WEDEL
GEORGE MASON U

A code of ethics for any field must be tailored to fit the world that its practitioners encounter. Today many anthropologists "study up" and "study through" to navigate the intricacies of society, politics, finance and policy. Building on Laura Nader's concept "studying up"—analyzing the powerful actors of complex societies—Cris Shore and Susan Wright describe "studying through" as tracing "policy connections between different organizational and everyday worlds even where actors in different sites do not know each other." Ethnographers who "study through" follow these policy connections, carrying out field research among the (multiple) actors and sites to which the connections take them. This approach, which many anthropologists today pursue, is ideally suited to studying much of the contemporary world—from global-local interactions to the new institutional fusions of state and private power that today govern many arenas of life. We need acknowledged methods and ethics that appreciate the challenges of working in and across diverse and dynamic field sites, not to mention across power divides.

I began my career doing fieldwork of a fairly traditional kind in an urban setting in 1980s Poland, examining how people mobilized their social networks to survive in an economy of shortage. Informal

studying how donors and recipients connected with each other via policy, politics, programs, organizations and networks. In this environment, characterized by often unequal financial, political and social relationships, did I have the same responsibility to donors (with the purse strings and presumably the power) as to aid recipients (presumably the disenfranchised)? If not, what were my responsibilities to each party, and how would that affect the relationships I formed and the work I published?

The first thing one learns in interviewing donor officials (in fact, most government officials) is that they are taught to deal with any nonofficial who wants information from them for potential publication by using the practices and ethics of journalism. Specifically, officials expect to establish ground rules with outside interviewers regarding how information acquired in an interview will be used. I responded to this expectation by adding to the anthropologist's standard self-presentation (that I am an anthropologist, with whom I am affiliated, my funding sources, and the ends for which information is gathered) practices and ethics adapted from journalism. At the start of each interview my "source" and I came to an agreement about whether the information provided would be "off the record" (used to advance the researcher's understanding or acquire other sources), "on background" (used without attribu-

COMMENTARY

practices that ultimately moved the society in profoundly un-Communist directions were the focus of my research. The cornerstone ethical principle I affirmed in my work was that every anthropologist's first responsibility is to those whose lives and cultures we study. This seemed unproblematic until the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 and I began to explore the world of Western aid and advisers that converged on the region thereafter.

Studying aid processes—which I did in the 1990s in Poland, and also in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russia and Ukraine—meant

tion), or "on the record" (used with attribution).

Pursuing research in this way—within a well-established tradition that had clear expectations for the researcher and source—helped me clarify my own sense of what it meant to work across a power divide, and to publish writing critical of those from whom I sought information. The reactions by donor officials and organizations when I was critical of aid projects defied any notion of their disenfranchisement, and reemphasized the fact that they did not lack avenues to publicize

In this environment, characterized by often unequal financial, political and social relationships, did I have the same responsibility to donors ... as to aid recipients ...?

counter-opinions or defend their policies.

In my current work, employing practices and ethics from journalism is just as crucial. My forthcoming book *Shadow Elite* deals with the privatization of official information, as manifested both in the players who have privatized it and in the system that enables them to do so. (One example of the latter is the increased contracting out of federal government functions in the United States.) In studying both the players and the system, I gleaned information through numerous interviews with individuals ranging from government and contractor officials to investigators and the players themselves—in addition, of course, to a wealth of published documents. It is difficult to imagine doing this work responsibly and effectively—or any research that studies up or studies through—without borrowing from journalism's modus operandi and concepts of ethical practice. To reflect the realities of today's anthropology, perhaps our ethics code should more directly acknowledge these interdisciplinary engagements.

Janine R Wedel is a professor in the School of Public Policy at George Mason University and a fellow at the New America Foundation. She is co-founder and convener of the Interest Group for the Anthropology of Public Policy. ☐