Applied and Academic Anthropology in Development: Distance or Engagement?

Joana Gomes Cardoso
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
joanagc@gmail.com

I. Introduction

The development sector is a key employer of anthropologists who "practice" the discipline, often called "development anthropologists". Permanently or sporadically, sometimes retaining their links to academia, sometimes working outside, these professionals work with governments, large multilateral and inter-governmental agencies such as the World Bank, or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) providing advice, often acting as "culture brokers" or "mediators" between these agencies and the intended "beneficiaries" of their projects.

At first glance it is easy to understand why so many anthropologists are attracted to this line of work after all development projects often take place in the same geographical areas and within the same communities that have been the object of study of the discipline for decades. Another strong reason is a desire to alleviate the profound inequalities that continue to divide the world. Like Edelman and Haugerud, several anthropologists see development "as a matter of life and death, an urgent global challenge" (2005:1) and believe that they have something to offer in the struggle for emancipation, well being and justice.

But a lively debate rages on about whether this non-academic work is legitimate. It consists, after all, of creating change and affecting people's lives, the very opposite of what classic anthropology is about. One has only to think of the contrast between attempting to introduce Western technology in so-called developing countries (once a prime preoccupation of development) and the cartoons stereotyping anthropology as that which appeared in The New Yorker magazine showing panicked "natives" with a caption saying: "Put away the television, the anthropologists are coming!" (Miller 1995:142 in Edelman & Haugerud 2005)

Humour aside, there are very serious ethical dilemmas to consider when one contemplates working in the development sector that has been called the "evil twin" of anthropology (Ferguson, 1994) since it challenges many of the core principles of the discipline. Indeed, many see it as a betrayal of the principle of cultural relativism, finding it unethical "for representatives of one culture to try to change relations within another" (Lewis 2005). Or as Cochrane points out: "anthropology has long queried the status of those who profess to know more than ordinary folks, making decisions on their behalf and taking aspects of their lives out of their hands (1971:65-79 in Sillitoe, 2007:08-12)

Even proponents of applied anthropology recognize that there are extra risks involved in this activity: "the stakes are often higher than in the case of research for its own sake as there is always a risk that those in power will use findings against, rather than for, intended beneficiaries of anthropological work" (Rilko-Bauer et al 2006:183).

Concerning the freedom of hired anthropologists in remaining faithful to their findings and principles, Edelman and Haugerud ask provocatively: "can anthropologists speak the truth to power and still earn and living in the era of market liberalization?" (2005:39). A straightforward "no" would be the answer of the radicals of the school of "post-development" which argue that the Western notion of progress has in fact widened the inequality gap, exposing indigenous people to exploitative capitalism and promoting environmental pollution through growing industrialization. The so-called "anthropologists of development" therefore call for a radical critique of and distancing from the development establishment. (Escobar 1997:498, Sachs 1992, Rahnema 1997)

At the same time there are those who question if anthropology can be "applied" at all to begin with. (Sillitoe 2000: 7-8). Current definitions of applied work revolve around the notion of solving contemporary human problems using the knowledge, skills and methods of anthropology. But classic anthropological work presupposes deep and time consuming ethnographic knowledge, in contrast to the fast pace of development work, and is often based in complex empirical findings that are not easily translated into development projects, usually of a technical nature.

Despite the ethical and practical problems we have briefly touched upon, the fact remains that the number of anthropologists that engage actively with development is significant and seem to be growing. In fact, to some authors the distinction between applied and academic anthropology that

so exacerbated Malinowski and Evans-Pritchard is by now obsolete since development has engaged so many currents of anthropology, in way or another. (Lewis 2005, Edelman, 2005:40).

This paper will nonetheless look at the ethical implications of applied anthropological work in development as well as its practical limitations. It will also reflect on the growing possibilities for traditional academic work in this sector and argue that it is necessary for the academia to take a deeper look at the powerful industry of development in a critical albeit constructive way, that tries to offer solutions and positive changes to the way projects are conducted (in contrast to the inherent pessimism of the work of those that reject development per se).

A key concern that motivates this paper is on one hand the failure of development, thus far, to stem the lack of equality between peoples and, on the other, the capacity of anthropology to live up to this fundamental challenge posed by Edelman and Haugerud: "are anthropologists today any more likely than their colonial predecessors to speak truth to power, to explicitly question their relationship to dominant institutions, or to critically historicize the present?" (2005: 44)

II. Anthropology in Development Revisited

Applied anthropology and the first attempts of "development" have been working closely together since the colonial times, when the quest for economic gains became influenced by a belief in the promotion of "progress" and in particular technological advance. At this time, anthropologists who engaged with colonialism helped introduce European technology, administrative systems, education and religion. According to Foster, the British were the first to recognize the practical value of anthropology and the first to employ applied anthropologists in the administration of British colonies in Nigeria in 1908. (1969: 181-187)

Today's concept of development is still shaped around the idea of "progress" but it is no longer openly presented as an imposition and the focus of interventions has been gradually changing from a purely economical perspective, towards a greater social approach, with more attention being devoted to poverty and the inclusion in decision making of the supposed beneficiaries.

Current definitions usually refer to development as a "process of change" that is associated to the enjoyment of a higher standard of living conditions, including health and education, as well as a greater control and choice for citizens over their own decisions. But as Lewis points out: "as an adjective it (still) implies a standard against which different rates of progress may be compared and it therefore takes on a subjective, judgmental element in which societies are sometimes compared and then positioned at different stages of an evolutionary development schema" (2005).

Indeed, when US President Harry Truman, in a 1949 speech, first spoke of a half of the world that needed "help" from the West because it was "underdeveloped", he inaugurated the era of current development placing its emphasis on economy, technology and modernization, a paradigm that relied in an (open) superiority complex (where the "developed" North would help the "underdeveloped Third World" to "develop") that bore striking similarities to the evolution theories of the previous century and the colonial era.

It took more than twenty years for these ethnocentric suppositions of superiority of Western knowledge and technology to be denounced by authors such as Edward Said and ECLA anthropologists, who opened the way for a new "dependency" paradigm which repudiated the modernization theory. This new approach to development helped remove the emphasis solely on economic indicators, introducing social aspects and a greater concern with poverty. It attracted many anthropologists during the 1970's, particularly Marxists, since it focused on the unequal relationship between North and South in relation to trade arguing that "an active process of underdevelopment had taken place as peripheral economies were integrated into the capitalist system on unequal terms, primarily as providers of cheap raw materials for export to rich industrialized countries". (Lewis 2005 and Bernstein in Kothari & Minogue, 2002).

Anthropology's active engagement with development expanded greatly at this time, leading to the creation of the sub-field of "development anthropology." These anthropologists were in great part motivated by an altruistic desire to denounce exploitation and help young nations that had just recently become independent. This also led to examples of "extreme applied anthropology" known as "action anthropology." A current example of this type of "direct" anthropology would be Barbara

Rose Johnston's 2005 research commissioned by communities that were adversely affected by the building of the Chixoy Dam in Guatemala.

By the 1980's however, the idealism of the previous decade quickly faded away with the demise of the Bretton Woods system, the election of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher and the subsequent rise of economic neo-liberal policies advocated by economists whom until then had been considered as eccentric radicals and the significant budget cuts in university anthropology departments. This led many anthropologists to the professional development sector no longer motivated by idealism or ideology, necessarily, but because of sheer economic necessity as they could no longer find jobs in academia and therefore became easily tempted by the (often very high) gains to be made in the professional sector, working for "development agencies."

It was not too long however, before calls for the abandonment and rejection of development started. The disastrous effects of the Structural Adjustment Funds enforced by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) during the 80's consolidated the conviction of radical anthropologists of what was to become the "post-development" school that development was in fact exploiting those most vulnerable to capitalism and creating poverty. Indeed, the statistics published by the development agencies themselves showed that a majority of development projects simply failed and even though Edelman points out that numbers can be easily manipulated "the fact is that despite the ambitions of the last 50 years, remedies are still elusive and this stark reality contributed to widespread disillusionment with agents to which the responsibility for development was entrusted". (2005:9)

In the 90's, the criticism (not just from anthropologists) was so widespread that the large multilateral agencies started to change track, turning instead to "people's projects" with emphasis on "participatory" methods and "bottom-up" approaches that include the so-called "beneficiaries", and populated by buzz words such as "empowerment", "ownership", "civil society", "gender" and "culture sensitive." Methods and language that not so long ago had been advocated by radicals became mainstream and opened even more opportunities for anthropologists. With the emphasis on understanding and involving the people whom development is supposed to benefit, skills of anthropologists such as that of "culture brokers" became increasingly recognized and valued even though "anthropologists of development" continued to denounce the "industry" and defend "the abandonment of

the whole epistemological and political field of post war development"
(Escobar 1995).

The current era of development is still living off this dramatic change in
approach that according to some, however, is only so in appearance: "the
economic paradigm continues to be the key concept that drives major
actors of development such as the World Bank" argue Kothari and
Minogue (2002: 11) In the same spirit, Simon and Narman consider that
"the pendulum is swinging back towards softer, more socially sensitive
and nuanced approaches, but there is little sign that the fundamental
ideology of development embodied by the multilateral agencies and some
major donors is changing" (1999:271)

From an optimistic point of view, however, it can be argued that positive
change, to a larger or lesser degree, nonetheless occurred, especially when
compared with the practices of the 80s. Today "cultures" and
"traditions", once seen as obstacles of modernization, are recognized as
essential features of a development project that aims to be sustainable.
And as Lewis points out, Chambers' work on power and participation in
development challenged conventional policy and training both in theory
and practice, leading to approaches such as the Participatory Rural
Appraisal methods that today are standard practice. Although imperfect,
(see Kothari & Minogue 2002: 47 and Cooke & Kothari 2001), this
approach was nevertheless an important move in the right direction.
Similarly, Ferguson's work on the World Banks' intervention in Lesotho
exposed and denounced a vast number of false assumptions it contained
in order to justify the WB's intervention.

These examples as well as developments' own history of adaptation to
criticism indicate that it is possible to for anthropologists (and others, of
course) to influence this "industry" and thus, in theory at least, improve
the lives and choices of the millions of people who are affected by it.
"This implies a moral involvement in critical contemporary issues along
the lines of Boas", argue Edelman & Haugerud, citing Gow for whom
development is in fact anthropology's "moral" rather than "evil" twin.
(2005) Anthropologists have not engaged enough however; claim several
authors, for whom development is understudied and still operating in an
unchecked fashion (see Lewis 2006, Edelman 2004, Schuurman 2000).The
challenge, as Edelman & Haugerud point out, is then not so much in
destroying development but in improving it and with it, the fate of those
it affects.

Sillitoe, for example, defends more engagement with development with the argument that "while the idea of development is offensive to some, implying that populations need to change to improve their lives, it is difficult to disagree with some of its aims and deny assistance when faced by awful poverty, starvation and disease that people endure".

But conscious of the risks involved he adds: "such efforts at relieving hardship however, can easily become unwanted interference". (Silitoe, 2007: 160).

III. Whose development? (Kothari & Minogue (ed) 2002:12)

– The Dilemmas of Speaking on Behalf of Others

Anthropologists in general are no strangers to dilemmas of ethical and political responsibility. Advocacy work in particular however carries the risk that "assisting some clients excludes or harms the interests of others". (Edelman & Haugerud 2005:45) Indeed, despite the creation of a "code of ethics" in 1949, applied anthropology has a recent history of problematic examples. The involvement of North American anthropologists in the Vietnam War, sponsored by the US Department of Defence, remains a powerful example of why academics tend to be very suspicious of professional employment of anthropologists, in particular by the State. Previously, anthropologists had also helped run American camps of Japanese prisoners under the employment of the Office of Strategic Studies (OSS), the precursor of the CIA. (Rilko-Bauer et al, 2006:181).

In the context of development, it can be argued that the anthropologist working for a multilateral agency or an NGO runs special risks or has special responsibilities since the data that he or she presents is very likely going to be invoked to justify projects that will intervene in people's lives – people who usually did not ask for interference.

Currently, anthropologists who take up work in the development world are often hired to work as cultural translators, interpreters of the "local realities" for administrators and planners but they rarely have a final say once action is decided since they are usually not part of the "managerial" body running the projects. This is problematic on two levels. First, because providing "understanding" of a community is, to a certain extent, potentially giving the means to control people's behaviours. And

second, because despite this extraordinary responsibility, the anthropologist often finds him or herself at the mercy of the "project manager" regarding to what extent his or her recommendations will be taken into consideration and the course of action that is finally decided.

But even just speaking on behalf of others is a tricky position for an anthropologist to find him/herself in, for as Sillitoe reminds us: "this implies we know more than they do about their behaviour, values and wants" (2007). He also raises the issue of subjectivity, arguing that it poses further problems in the applied context where the researchers' experiences and understandings necessarily influence the findings and recommendations, "while allegedly reflecting the subjects' knowledge and aspirations".

The solution, according to Sillitoe lies in anthropology's capability of identifying and valuing indigenous knowledge and within participatory methods that genuinely engage people in the research process and facilitate self-representation: "ensuring people take fully part in any decision making process, facilitating the use of their knowledge as they see fit: we need not to speak for them but to work with them to find the right words". (2007:158). But as he himself recognizes, current methods such as the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) are not bullet proof. It is common for people to behave and say what they believe the "developers" want to hear and it is therefore very easy to end up favouring rural elites, overlooking the concerns of the weakest who find it difficult to "participate" (at least along the Western notions of participation) especially if the issues are presented through diagrams and graphics, methods which are often completely alien to local populations. For these reasons it has been said that today's usage of participation as a "magic pill" for every situation has become a type of tyranny and that while "the rich get therapy the poor get participation" (Cooke & Kothari, 2001). Sillitoe believes, however, that if the current methods are imperfect, it is a strong reason for anthropologists to engage, offering meaningful contributions to improve them.

Development could certainly benefit from the expertise of anthropologists after all countless projects have failed because of lack of cultural understanding, for example (see Scott, 1998). Authors such as Scudder further justify professional engagement in this area "because we are uniquely placed to further understanding of poverty, with in-depth ethnographic research offering unprecedented understanding of everyday life and its problems" (1999:355 in Sillitoe, 2007:154).

But given that a vast majority of projects are created by governments, government agencies or NGOs (that are often government sponsored), it is not easy to see how an anthropologist can engage professionally, keeping freedom and independence. This is not just an ethical concern but also the best assurance that the anthropologist is able to do his/her job well, particularly if he/she finds him/herself in the position of having to advise against what he/she knows are the intentions of the project at stake. Here too the issue of subjectivity creeps up once again: if the hired anthropologist knows in advance the objective of the project, his or her interpretation of findings is likely to be influenced by this, rendering it difficult to remain truly objective.

Edelman, for example, points out that USAID blurs its research programs with its operational "what the agency funds as research is increasingly tied to its operational program exigencies, leaving little space for long-term, autonomous social science research". (2005:42) Rilko-Bauer and van Willigen, on the contrary, recognize that an outside critic has more rhetorical freedom but argues that this rarely results in significant social change, whereas the insider role, with its limitations and risks, does offer some opportunities for positive social impact. (2006: 183)

These anthropologists also find it ironic that "advocacy for the compendium of knowledge or promotion of anthropology" is legitimized whereas its usage for the very people that give their time, knowledge and other resources ("so that we in our individual careers and as a discipline might benefit") is questioned. (2006: 184) Indeed it seems only fair to "give something back" to the communities thanks to whom the anthropologist compiled his or her work, as opposed to keeping the findings solely within the "ivory tower" of academia. It is actually not uncommon for academic anthropologists to find themselves in the position of "advocates" of the people they studied and with whom they naturally created affinities. But this presupposes a deep connection which can only come from classic ethnographic work – a luxury that many working for development cannot afford, as we shall see.

IV. "To be Ethically and Politically Subjective while Methodologically Objective" (Rilko-Bauer, Singer, van Willigen, 2006: 186) - Is it possible?

For Sillitoe the essence of anthropology implies "crossing of a socio-cultural frontier, learning a different language, struggling with nuances

of foreign expression, winning trust of a small group of people, employing participating observation and engaging in holistic micro level community research". In other words: ethnography. (2007, 13: 147-165)

Solid ethnographic work demands time, Sillitoe himself confesses to be still struggling after 25 years to process and understand the ethnographic data collected in New Guinea. In the development world however, time is precious or "time is money," as the expression goes, and answers are therefore often required within short time frames. It is not easy for anthropologists to live up to this pressure which is contrary to the nature of the discipline's methods. When the anthropologist in question has previous ethnographic knowledge and expertise it is not as difficult because he or she is likely to be able to provide solid recommendations in a relatively short time. But when that is not the case the risk that the quality of the recommendations in question is poor increases, even though these – it is always important to repeat - will be affecting the lives of people.

It is interesting to open a parenthesis at this stage to note the tendency of the development sector to hire professionals (anthropologists as well as others) with general technical expertise who do not possess knowledge of the country/region in question. In a series of interviews conducted by Uma Kothari, former colonial officers who later found employment in the development sector as consultants and researchers complained of the new generation of "experts" that lacked any regional or country knowledge. Whereas in colonial times it was vital to speak the language(s) and to have lived, often in very isolated areas, for many years; contemporary development professionals were asked for very different skills. Kothari concluded: "the Africanist or Asianist was largely replaced by those with thematic and or technical expertise, for example in gender analysis or rural development, who move between and within countries with limited knowledge of the different historical social and cultural contexts in which they are required to apply it." Ironically, a former colonialist officer noted that while working with these experts he often thought: "oh my god, we were doing that 20 years ago and we failed as well." (Kothari 2005 :52-63)

Edelman & Haugerud point out that because of this tendency to privilege technical expertise career anthropologists in development face a difficult choice between remaining specialists or becoming generalists - the latter having much brighter career prospects. (2005:47)

Sillitoe, on the other hand, worries that if only those with long ethnographic acquaintance of a region and fluency in the language can undertake applied work, it would seriously restrict opportunities for such work. For him, part of the answer lies is in inter-disciplinary work. "Mutual interaction can result in fruitful synergy as in political ecology where strict disciplinary boundaries are irrelevant with environmentalists, anthropologists and geographers working closely together". (2007, 13: 147-165)

Another practical problem that applied anthropologists regularly face is that their work is often complex, reflecting doubts and uncertainties which are easily misunderstood (or not understood at all) by the other professionals working in development (economists, engineers, agriculturalists etc). According to Edelman and Haugerud, "anthropologists in development agencies can easily become flies in the ointment, bearers of unwelcome news that slow things down and makes life difficult for project managers and others". They add that in some cases employers may "sanitize" the anthropologist's reports to avoid blocking the flow of funds. (2005:48) Nolan is even more extreme, considering that "although paid specialists are allowed to complain a great deal and sometimes are allowed to persuade those in power to see things differently, one basic rule remains: if we cannot persuade them, then we either fall into line or get out" (2002: 85)

Edelman and Haugerud are also wary of the expectations of others in development of anthropological work. "As is well known, foreign technologists often overlook or ignore local technical innovation, experimentation and design successes, instead they assume that they must fill in a knowledge gap and therefore call on anthropologists to overcome the presumed irrationality of local culture or tradition, so that new technology is adopted by locals." (2005:31) They conclude that it is time development agencies avoid using anthropologists "simply to enumerate existing cultural ideas and practices for planners, so that these may be mechanically contrasted with the perspectives of development institutions" (2005:31)

Sillitoe acknowledges that, from the very beginning, it is difficult to convince other professionals that having a rigid research plan "runs the risk of gross distortion before the research even starts." He therefore argues that anthropologists need to provide more user friendly data to their employers and to spend the necessary time and effort to convince them to act on that information "even when it challenges organizations

norms and standard practices". According to him there are examples of when this has succeeded which makes it worthwhile to insist and develop further ways of influencing policy. (2007)

V. The Future

We have by now seen that while there is arguably a demand and a need for anthropologists to engage in the development sector which, as Lewis points out, "remains a powerful and complex constellation (…) that demands anthropological attention whatever point of view anthropologists may take about development;" (2005) there are numerous ethical and practical problems which may limit the contributions of anthropologists, particularly in the field of "applied" anthropology, (even though in practice the number of anthropologists engaging with agencies and NGOs does not seem to be declining).

In terms of academic contribution however, there is an important gap, which could and should be fulfilled by anthropologists. Surprisingly, and although there is a great deal of discussion and debate around the relationship of anthropology and development, there seems to be very little production, in the classical sense, of ethnography about how development actually works. There have been no major studies on the functioning of key organizations such as the World Bank or the IMF, which continue to interfere in the lives of millions of people without being challenged or held accountable.

The focus of anthropological studies has mainly been on the so-called "beneficiaries" of development assistance – the (negative) impacts on the poor, or on women, for example – and much less has been produced on the internal organization and workings of the aid industry itself. Or as Dove puts it: "so far anthropologists have been reluctant to study powerful institutions, preferring instead to study "the local and the distant" such as indigenous institutions rather than government ministries; local organizations of resistance rather than central organizations of repression" (Dove 1999: 239-240).

Thus the question that is referred to in the introduction about whether today's anthropologists, in comparison to their colonial predecessors, are ready to "speak "truth to power, explicitly question their relationship to dominant institutions and critically historicize the present". Edelman and Haugerud consider that so far anthropologists (as sociologists and

other scientists) have not lived up to the challenge, allowing governments, agencies and multinationals to get away with "opaque and secretive practices". (2005:20).

In the area of environment, for example, at a time when large corporations are actively promoting "eco-friendly" public relations images (often putting more effort in these rather than actually promoting the environment), anthropologists have been busy debating between radical and mainstream environmentalists and producing research on indigenous rights, rather than studying the economic policies or the new forms of multilateral governance that impact the environment and resource conservation. (Edelman & Haugerud 2005:35)

Until we know more, in an ethnographic sense, of how projects actually develop and "about the way in which stakeholders at multiple level negotiate meaning and outcomes with one another," we will not achieve much change, Nolan argues. Contrary to the popular assumptions that projects often fail because the local cultural angle is not taken into account, or because of incompetence or corruption, the authors claims that "the reason why large agencies do not change is because they do not have to, few directly experience the effects of their plans, projects and programs". (2002: 233)

Gardner and Lewis agree that it is time to devote attention to the "economic and social forces that profoundly shape our world," (1996) a call that is reiterated by Ferguson who defends it is necessary to devote more scholarly attention towards the international financial and governance institutions such as the IMF, WB, World Trade Organization and the United Nations, as well as a critical analysis of States, NGOs and other crucial actors "with the same type of critical scrutiny that has been applied to development recently."

Indeed, we have already seen examples of how policies and practices of development have adapted to criticism, going as far as adopting the discourse that was once property of radicals. With that in mind, it is important not to give up and on the contrary, ensure that practice on the ground is also improved and that these are not just "cosmetic" changes.

Disengagement, as is advocated by the post-development school, is understandable given the wrong doings that have and continue to be committed, but it risks promoting indifference to the brutal global inequalities which are, in the view of this paper, objective and real. To

pronounce the "death" of development whilst hundreds of unaccountable international functionaries continue to define policies everyday, all over the world, seems premature and most of all, unfair to those who are affected by these. Anthropology ought to try instead to pressure the actors of development to develop more appropriate and transparent practices and to make them more accountable.

Also, one should not hold illusions about what the "end" of development can bring, after all, as Ferguson reminds us, "development neither inaugurated the poverty and global inequalities that its discourse organized, nor can its demise be expected to make them suddenly disappear" (1994: 248)

Therefore until a credible alternative to development is offered, anthropology should continue to make contributions to improve the sector, with a critical but constructive posture. If anything because as Edelman and Haugerud remind us: "development remains a legitimate aspiration in many parts of the world, a hope, despite the loss of faith in the ethnocentric and sometimes destructive policies" (2005:51).

One problem that is often encountered by academic anthropologists, however, is that their findings often fail to reach broad audiences, which in turn makes it easier for the targeted institutions to ignore them. At the moment much anthropological knowledge "is scattered throughout journals from a broad array of disciplines and in the fugitive literature of technical and contract reports" (Rilko-Bauer 2006:185). There seems to be a need, therefore, to develop more efficient strategies for public engagement which may entail publishing in non-academic venues or even participating in radio or television programmes. (Sanjek, 2004: 452) This of course, implies however, a certain effort to render the complex nature of anthropological more accessible and perceptible to the common person.

At the same time, those who work within development agencies should strive to "move up" into more senior administrative and policy making roles, argues Nolan, because anthropologists who, besides the traditional positions as culture brokers and data collectors, also take on responsibilities as project managers or team leaders will have more control over their work. Currently, the author points out, it remains more common for them to work on programme assessment rather than the making of policy (in Edelman & Haugerud, 2005:42)

The key question is then, how to make the most of a discipline which offers a powerful analytical tool for integrating culture, power, history and economy into one analytical framework. Anthropologists should not be afraid of new, creative approaches that challenge the current focus of development on "results and manageability." One possibility, defended by Garner and Lewis (1996), is to shift the focus of the study of development per se to poverty and inequality more broadly. As the authors argue, it is perhaps time to enter a new period of engagement which goes beyond the applied-theoretical distinction and which seeks to reveal more ethnographic detail of the "black box" of development intervention, as well as a deeper analysis of the ways in which the concept of development has come to play a central role in our lives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERNSTEIN, Henry, 2005, "Development studies and the Marxists". In Uma Kothari (ed) *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*, London, Zed Books. N.6:111-137.
CHAMBERS, Robert, 1983, *Rural Development: putting the first last*, London, Longman.
COOKE, Bill & KOTHARI, Uma, 2001, *Participation: the New Tyranny?*, London, Zed Books.
DOVE, Michael, 1999, "Writing for versus about the Ethnographic Other: Issues of Engagement and Reflexivity in Working with a Tribal Ngo in Indonesia", *Identities* 6(2): 47-74.
EDELMAN, Marc & HAUGERUD, Angelique "Introduction: The Anthropology of Development and Globalization" in Edelman, Marc & Angelique Haugerud (eds), *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing,1:1-74
ESCOBAR, Arturo, 1995, *Encountering Development: the making and unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2003, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2003*, Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization
FERGUSON, James, 1994, *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
FOSTER, George M., 1969, *Applied Anthropology*, Boston, Little, Brown, and Company.

GARDNER, Kate & LEWIS, David, 1996, *Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge*, London, Pluto Press.

GOW, David, 2002, "Anthropology and Development: Evil Twin or Moral Narrative?," *Human Organization*, 64: 299-313.

JOHNSTON, Barbara R., 2005, *Chixoy Dam Legacy Issues Study*, Santa Cruz, Centre for Political Ecology.

Kothari, Uma, 2005, "From colonial administration to development studies: a post-colonial critique of the history of development studies". In Uma Kothari, (ed) *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*, London, Zed Books. N.3

KOTHARI, Uma & MINOGUE, Martin, (eds), 2002, *Development Theory and Practice – Critical Perspectives*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.

LEWIS, David, 2005, "Anthropology and Development: the Uneasy Relationship". In Carrier, James (ed.), *A handbook of economic anthropology*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar: 472-486.

NOLAN, Riall, 2002, *Development Anthropology: Encounters in the Real World*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

RAHNEMA, Majid & BAWTREE, Victoria, 1997, *The Post-Development Reader*, London: Zed Books.

RILKO-BAUER, Barbara et al, 2006, "Reclaiming Applied Anthropology: Its Past, Present and Future", *American Anthropologist*, Vol.108, No.1: 178-190

SACHS, Wolfgang, (ed), 1992, *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, London: Zed Press.

SANJEK, Roger, 2004, "Going Public: Responsibilities and Strategies in the Aftermath of Ethnography", *Human Organization Publications*, Vol 63 (4):444-456

SCOTT, James C., 1998, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed*, Yale, Yale University Press

SILLITOE, Paul, 2007, "Anthropologists only need apply: the challenges of applied anthropology", *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 13: 147-165

SIMON, David and NARMAN, Anders, 1999, Development as Theory and Practice: Current Perspectives on Development Co-operation, Essex, Longman

SCHUURMAN, Frans J, 2000, "Paradigms Lost, Paradigms Regained? Development studies in the twenty-first century", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.21, No.1: 7-20

United Nations Development Program, 1999, Human Development Report 1999, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.