DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 375   SO 002 093

AUTHOR   Nader, Laura
TITLE   Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained From
              Studying Up.
PUB DATE   [72]
NOTE   28p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Anthropology; Citizenship; Community Study; *Field
              Studies; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines;
              Lower Class; Middle Class; *Power Structure;
              Relevance (Education); Research Needs; *Social Class;
              Social Problems; Social Sciences; *Student Research;
              Upper Class
IDENTIFIERS   Social Institutions

ABSTRACT
              In this essay, the author presents a rationale (and
opportunities) for anthropologists to study the middle and upper end
of the social power structure, as well as the lower. Anthropologists
have much to contribute to an understanding of the processes whereby
power and responsibility are exercised in this country; indeed there
is a certain urgency to this kind of anthropology. Among students at
Berkeley, there is a tremendously energizing phenomenon in studying
major institutions and organizations that affect everyday lives, such
as the California Insurance Commission and the Better Business
Bureau. (Reports of these studies are discussed and the value of this
kind of research for citizenship education is pointed out.) "Studying
up" as well as down would lead us to ask many "common sense"
questions in reverse; and the consequences of not studying up as well
as down are serious in terms of developing adequate theory and
description. If one's pivot point is around those who have
power/responsibility, then the questions change. It is particularly
appropriate that anthropologists should lead the way in this work by
virture of several characteristics of our discipline. There are those
who would oppose such a reorientation of anthropology, and their
reasons are discussed here. (Author/JLB)

UP THE ANTHROPOLOGIST

Perspectives gained from studying up

Laura Nader
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

I.

In this essay I will describe some opportunities that anthropologists
nav'   r: :.
have for "studying up" in their own society, hoping to generate further

discussion of why we study what we do (Nader, 1964). Anthropologists have a

great deal to contribute to our understanding of the processes whereby power and

responsibility are exercised in the United States. Moreover, there is a certain

urgency to this kind of anthropology concerned with power (cf. Wolf, 1969), for

the quality of life and our lives themselves may depend upon the extent to which

citizens understand those who shape attitudes and actually control institutional

structures. The study of man is confronted with an unprecedented situation--

never before have so few, by their actions and inactions, had the power of life

and death over so many members of the species. I will present three reasons

for "studying up"--its energizing and integrating effect for many students;

scientific adequacy; and democratic relevance of scientific work. Finally I will

consider some frequent obstacles and objections, and try to answer them.

II.

Many of our brighter students look at the anthropology journals of

recent times and conclude that anthropology appears to be phasing out, content to

make a living for the most part by rediscovering what has been discovered or by

selling our wares to other disciplines and professions. The audience is too

narrow; the nitpicking too precious. Making a living by selling one's wares is

not an inappropriate way to subsist; it is however, in this case, symptomatic that
a talent, the perspective of a Mirror for Man, is being underused. Today we have
anthropology students who are indignant about many problems affecting the future
of homo sapiens, but they are studying problems about which they have no "feelings"
Some think this is the only appropriate stance for a science. Yet the things that
students are energetic about they do not study. I think we are losing something
here. The normative impulse often leads one to ask important questions about a
phenomenon that would not be asked otherwise, or to define a problem in a new
context. A rapid growth in civil rights studies is directly attributable to
activities whereby the victims of the system make their victimization visible.
By a process of contagion this visibility spread moral indignation into the
law schools and the legal profession, which in turn led to research into civil
rights questions and the related area of poverty law. In anthropology we have
the example of Ruth Benedict's Chrysanthemum and the Sword (1946), an effort
to understand opponents in war. The normative impulse here, generated by
patriotism and loyalty, considered appropriate in World War II was responsible
for an insightful book and the development of new techniques for studying
culture at a distance. Looking back towards an early founder of American
anthropology (and the first anthropologist to become president of the AAAS),
L.H. Morgan, we discover that he broke new ground in science as a result of
having been interested in a social problem(Resek, 1960). Throughout his career,
Morgan was indignant at how American Indians were being treated, and how they were
being pushed off the land. It was his initial indignation which led him to study
American Indians and his indignation preceded his curiosity about kinship systems
and social structure. In Morgan's case indignation had an energizing effect.

As Jules Henry puts it:

> To think deeply in our culture is to grow angry and to anger others:
> and if you cannot tolerate this anger, you are wasting the time you
> spend thinking deeply. One of the rewards of deep thought is the hot
> glow of anger at discovering a wrong, but if anger is taboo, thought
> will starve to death (Henry, 1963:146).

I see among young students at Berkeley an energizing phenomenon in studying
major institutions and organizations that affect everyday lives, such as the
California insurance commission, the Better Business Bureau, Air Pollution agencies
and the like. The following extended excerpts illustrate something about what
motivated these students to study what they did.

> I chose to study the insurance industry primarily because it is
> one of those "things (there is no term) which is made of vast
> networks of people who have effects on many aspects of the lives
> of all people in California. Most are affected in a direct way,
> by owning an insurance policy. All are affected in other ways,
> such as by the vast political influence of the "insurance industry"
> and its tremendous economic influence over our personal lives.
>
> For example, one drives to the market in one's car, which is
> itself insured. The market one arrives at is insured for loss,
> theft, damages and liability. The food was delivered by trucks
> which were insured for the cargo they carry, which is also
> protected against various problems. The price of these coverages
> also affects the price of your food. Incidently, the factories
> where the truck and your auto were manufactured is insured with
> various policies (as are all the employees). One of these,
> termed "pollution insurance," protects the company for liabilities
> incurred if they are sued for pollution damages: the price of
> this affects the other prices, as mentioned, but the ownership of
> the insurance permits the factor or the network of people who
> control the factory to pollute the air without economic risk
> to themselves. To extend this further, the auto company is
> probably owned in large part by insurance companies. To get
> an idea of the tremendous wealth of the insurance industry,
> consider that California owners of insurance policies paid over
> $6 billion in insurance premiums in 1970, which is over $300
> per person in the State of California. This is greater than the
> per-capita income of most of the world's population. As a
> matter of fact, the annual amount of premiums taken in the U.S.
> by the insurance industry is greater than the gross national
> product of all but five nations in the world. (Serber, 1971,
> pp. 2-3)

Another student had the following to say about her study of the Oakland

Better Business Bureau:

> In our complex society, we obtain many goods and services in
> a prepackaged state. Like the proverbial city child who grows
> up believing that milk grows in paper cartons, most consumers
> know little about what their purchases are made of, how they
> work, how to evaluate their potential before buying them, and
> how to repair them if they break down. This ignorance is not
> limited to goods but extends to services, investments, charities,
> to say nothing of the legal and medical professions. We rely on
> PG&E to install gas equipment, to check it for safety, even
> to relight the pilot if we cannot locate it when it is accidently
> extinguished. We take our special garments to a dry cleaner.
> When the transmission on an automobile doesn't work, the car
> must be towed to a transmission specialist. Goods are ordered
> by telephone or through the mail. Appointments at a photographer's
> studio, cosmetics, magazine subscriptions, and investments may
> be sold and contributions to charities collected by door-to-
> door solicitors. When a carpet is desired, the consumer depends
> on a salesman to explain the qualities of the constituent fibers,
> to calculate the number of yards needed to cover a given area,
> and to make sure that incidentals like matting, tacks, and
> labor are included in the quoted installation cost. We depend
> upon specialists to provide services and often even to give
> us the criteria by which we are to judge their work. Many of
> our transactions take place infrequently, which means that the
> consumer may be totally inexperienced in evaluating what he
> pays for when he buys a large appliance, an insurance policy,
> or a vacation trip.
>
> Likewise he may find himself incapable of obtaining redress of
> his grievances when he thinks he has been misled or cheated.
> Most contacts with businesses are limited to the disembodied
> voice of the switchboard operator, to the secretary or public
> relations representative in the front office, or to the salesman
> who happens to be on the floor when the customer walks into
> the store. The consumer phones the company to see what it will
> do for him, or he writes to a newspaper complaint column or a
> broadcasting station's "hotline" program. The services of these
> expediters are also "packaged"; the complainant sends in his
> story and waits for the machinery to grind out an answer. This
> situation extends even to the law enforcement and consumer aid
> organizations to which the irate customer may eventually refer
> his problem...
>
> I began this project on the BBB in total ignorance of what it
> is, what it does and does not do, and why. Like the typical
> citizen, I began with the simple knowledge that there is a
> business-supported organization called the Better Business
> Bureau and that it is customarily contacted by telephone when

> a person has a question about the dependability (or existance!)
> of a firm or has a complaint against a business that has failed
> to give satisfaction. Few people go beyond these facts to ask
> who the voice on the other end of the line is, where she gets
> her information, or what actually happens to the complaint
> form which arrives, is returned, and whose results are relayed
> back to the consumer by mail. And yet thousands of people use
> the BBB every year. (Eaton, 1971, pp. 2-3)

Maybe these are attempts to get behind the facelessness of a

bureaucratic society, to get at the mechanisms whereby far away corporations

and large scale industries are directing the everyday aspects of our lives.

Whatever the motivation, the studies raise important questions as to

responsibility, accountability, self-regulation, or on another level, questions

relating to social structure, network analysis, library research, participant

observation.

III.

If we look at the literature based on fieldwork in the United States,

we find a relatively abundant literature on the poor, the ethnic groups,

the disadvantaged; there is comparatively little field research on the

middle class, and very little first hand work on the upper classes.

Anthropologists might indeed ask themselves whether the entirety of

fieldwork does not depend upon a certain power relationship in favor of the

anthropologist, and whether indeed such dominant-subordinate relationships

may not be affecting the kinds of theories that we are weaving. What

if, in reinventing anthropology, anthropologists were to study

the colonizers rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the

culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather that the culture

of poverty?

"Studying up" as well as down would lead us to ask many "common sense"

questions in reverse. Instead of asking why some people are poor we would

ask why other people are so affluent? How on earth would a social scientist explain the hoarding patterns of the American rich and middle class? How can we explain the fantastic resistance to change among those whose options "appear to be many?" How has it come to be, we might ask, that anthropologists are more interested in why peasants don't change than why the auto industry doesn't innovate, or why the Pentagon or Universities cannot be more organizationally creative? The conservatism of such major institutions and bureaucratic organizations probably has wider implications for the species and for theories of change than does the conservatism of peasantry.

If in reinventing anthropology we were principally studying the most powerful strata of urban society our view of the ghetto might be largely in terms of those relationships larger than the ghetto. We would study the banks and the insurance industry that mark out areas of the city to which they will not sell insurance or extend credit. We would study the landlord class that "pays off" or "influences" enforcement o:- municipal officials so that building codes are not enforced. Slums are technically illegal; if building codes and other municipal laws were enforced our slums would not be slums (if enforcement were successful), or they might be called by another name which would indicate that they were results of white collar crime. One might say that if business crime is successful it will produce street crime. With this perspective on white collar crime our analysis of gang delinquency might be correspondingly affected, and in developing theories of slum gang behavior we might ask: is it sufficient to understand gangs as products of the value systems of that sub-culture alone? We might study the marketing systems or the transportation system which, as in Watts, creates virtual islands of some ghetto areas. We might study the degree to which legal practices, or the kind of legal services, mold the perceptions of law

that are present in the ghettos.

The consequences of not studying up as well as down are serious in terms of developing adequate theory and description. If one's pivot point is around those who have responsibility by virtue of being delegated power, then the questions change. From such a perspective one notices different facets of culture: the ghetto may be viewed as being without law, law-less. The courts are not geared to the complaints of the poor (which would fall in the 20 to 80 dollar range); furthermore they are not geared for cheap and quick resolution of conflict - crucial features for the poor. From this perspective ghetto communities may be said to be shut out of the legal system except as defendants, and indeed they are often shut off from other municipal services ranging from garbage collecting to police protection. From this orientation, then, the question may be raised again - in our studies of delinquency is it sufficient to understand gangs as products of the value systems of that sub-culture alone?

Let's ask another question. What have been the consequences of social science research on crime? By virtue of our concentration on lower class crimes we have aided in the public definition of the "law and order problem" in terms of lower class or street crimes. Let's assume that the taxpaying public in a democracy, after listening to a presidential speech calling for more tax money for enforcement and protection from street crimes, decides to see for itself. No matter what library they went to, the most they could get is some information on crimes committed by the lower class. They would have no way of evaluating, given present descriptive materials, whether, in a situation of limited money, they would do better to put their money on street crime or on white collar crime, both of which, after all, imperil the lives of all taxpayers everyday in many ways.

As Clyde Mitchell has noted, it was with such problems in mind that
anthropologists first introduced the concept of "social field."

> The classical anthropological study takes a unit - a
> "tribe" or "society" or "community" - and presents
> the behavior of its members in terms of a series of
> interlocking institutions, structures, norms, and
> values. It is not only anthropologists working in
> urban areas who have found this sort of assumption
> difficult to maintain, but also those who have been
> conducting "tribal" studies in modern Africa (and
> presumably also elsewhere). They have found that
> the effect of groups and institutions not physically
> present in the tribal area influences the behavior of
> people in it. The uhit of interacting relationships,
> in other words, is larger than the tribe. (Mitchell, p.56, 1966)

Lowie may have studied the Crow, Llewelyn and Hoebel the Cheyenne as if

they were "islands" unrelated to the wider society and even unrelated to

the policies and actions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but there has

raged a whole literature since the fifties challenging the limited

· community $\rho \mathcal{E} \mathcal{h} \mathcal{S} \rho \mathcal{E} \mathcal{t} \mathcal{i} \mathcal{u}$:1 and a recognition of methodological

need has been, as Mitchell noted, what has perhaps stimulated the development

of network theory, and the development of nation state studies (Adams, 1970).

If anthropology were reinvented to study up we would sooner or later need

to study down as well. We aren't dealing with an either/or proposition; we

need simply to realize when it is useful or crucial in terms of the problem

to extend the domain of study up, down, or sideways. If we become interested

in the determinants of family patterns (rather than the poor or the rich as

such) then studying this problem across class or at least on a vertical slice,

would be a way to test hypotheses regarding whether certain aspects of lower-

class or upper-class plight are somehow due to a particular kind of family

pattern (serially monogamous, matrifocal, father-absent), whether poverty for

example, is generated by certain types of employment patterns and/or external

factors. At least posing the problems in a comparative frame would help improve our chances for understanding the forces that generate excessive poverty or affluence and the origins of those forces whether intrusive from the larger society or "determined by cultural transmission within the group." Depending on one's view of the processes that generate behavior one would seek solutions to social problems either by a policy directed to reforming the society as a whole or one directed at modifying the behavior of the subculture, or both (Valentine, 1969; Gladwin, 1969:185).

On the basis of such studies of our own society we could rewrite the books on American Society whose indices make no mention of the advertising, insurance, banking, realty, or automobile industries which most people on the street know have played a major role in forming modern American society. Ethnographic reports would describe the communications industries, the agencies which regulate them, the institutions that undergrid the industrial sector such as the legislative bodies, the universities and professional organizations and such descriptions would be from the point of view of the users as well as the managers. It is appropriate that a reinvented anthropology study powerful institutions and bureaucratic organizations such as food chains in the United States, for such institutions and their network systems affect our lives and also affect the lives of people that anthropologists have traditionally studied all around the world.

It is particularly appropriate that anthropologists should lead the way in this work by virtue of a number of characteristics of our discipline. The study of man has had to be ecclectic in its methods, broad in its vision of what it takes to understand man--his past, his present, his culture, his biology. We have specialized in understanding whole cultures in a cross-cultural context. We should, for example, be at home in studying the law firms as a secret society,

in finding and analyzing the networks of power--which on paper may not be there,
in describing those unwritten customary behaviors that are completely indispensible
for understanding, for example, what makes the Congress tick. The anthropologist
above all should by virtue of his understanding of the principle of reciprocity
be able to analyze why it is that decisions of Federal Communications Commissioners
may not be "rational", of the cultural dimensions involved in the failure of
national programs ostensibly geared to reintegrate society. It is the anthropolo-
gist by virtue of his populist values that may be able to define the role of
citizen-scholar-- a science of man for man.

IV.

"Studying up" seems to be one track for integrating paramouht social concerns
with the goals and aims of the science of man. The service function we have
performed in the past could be amplified to include another service, social
as well as scientific, that is, writing ethnographies for the "natives". A
monograph that should be taken into account by managers for the benefit of
people concerned is Colson's recent book (1971) on The Impact of the Kariba
Resettlement upon the Gwembe Tonga:

> Massive technological development hurts. This is a fact
> largely ignored by economic planners, technicians, and
> political leaders. In planning drastic alterations in
> environment that uproot populations or make old adjust-
> ments impossible, they count the engineering costs but
> not the social costs. After all, they do not think of
> themselves as paying the latter . . . This book is a
> study in the impact of forced change upon some of its
> victims.

Another example is Spradley's You Owe Yourself a Drunk - an ethnographic descript-
ion of the interaction and the consequences of the interaction that drunks have
with the legal and enforcement systems. This monograph already is serving to educ-
ate managers of that system about the consequences of specific legal decisions and

procedures. This is not a novel role for social scientists to play and unfortunately our findings have often served to help manipulate rather than aid those we study. Another role, however, is related to the concept of citizenship in a country that is to be run on a democratic framework and the control that citizens must have to harness managerial manipulation. We cannot as responsible scientists educate "managers" without at the same time educating those "being managed". A democratic framework implies that citizens should have access to decision-makers, institutions of government, etc. This implies that citizens need to know something about the major institutions, government or otherwise, that affect their lives. Most members of complex societies and certainly most Americans do not know enough about nor do they know how to cope with the people, institutions and organizations which most affect their lives. I believe that anthropologists would be surprisingly good at applying their descriptive and analytical tools to a major problem--how can a citizenry function in a democracy when that citizenry is worfully ignorant of how the society works and doesn't work, of how a citizen can "plug in" as citizen, of what would happen should citizens begin to exercise rights other than voting as a way to make the "system" work for them. But first, as we know, we have to describe the bureaucracy and its culture.

Love and Eaton (1970) began their study of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control Agency with questions about the functions of the agency: How does the agency perceive itself? Who uses it? How do the users perceive the agency? Public access was a key question.

> Our approach was, at first, guarded due to our doubts. We
> pretended innocence, and in fact found out that we really were
> innocent. We then began to realize that we were "outsiders."
> We were the public who did not understand the professional
> language being spoken. The avenues we approached were
> those the public generally approached. Gradually, a picture
> of the agency and its position in the legal system emerged.

44

> its structure, the personalities of the decision makers, the
> limitations reality places on any ideal system, and finally the
> kinds of uses made of it become clearer... (ibid, 2-3).
>
> When the citizen goes to the agency, he is translated into
> statistical data which separates him from the actual procedure
> or use of the agency...Assumed in this is the notion that
> since the agency is supposed to protect the public interest,
> the public will seek access to it. The reality of the
> situation is very different. The agency acts as ·
> autonomously as possible to combat air pollution and in
> so doing, comes into close contact with the industry
> officials who speak the same technical and legal language.
> It is industry who has the greatest access to the agency,
> especially at the legislative level. It is industry who
> makes the greatest <u>use</u> of the agency to protect <u>its</u>
> interests. (ibid, 32-33)

This same study notes that in the legal division of the agency violation notices

are treated like parking tickets -- after so many are collected the violator

is prosecuted; but what does prosecution consist of, given the intimate patterns

of social interaction described above. These were not ordinary criminals.

> In the legal division, the agency lawyer emphasized that
> the principles of criminal law were not a solution, hence
> the civil fines. The type of "crime" committed does not
> merit the "responsible" official being put in jail with
> "prostitutes and muggers."...An interesting footnote
> to this procedure is that Regulation 1 which does <u>not</u>
> apply to most large industries, but to private citizens
> and land developers, is treated as a misdemeanor where
> the violator can be put in jail with the "prostitutes
> and muggers". (ibid, 33)

Apart from being a useful report on bureaucratic culture this 37 page report

is the kind of ethnographic information that citizens need prior to an attempt

to gain <u>access</u> or attempt to <u>use</u> public agencies. Such reports would introduce

them to the structure and culture of the sub-group in such a way as to allow

them to gauge whether the cards are stacked and in what direction they are

stacked in terms of real access and use of a public agency.

The study of the California Department of Insurance, and in particular

the processing of complaints by the Policy Services Bureau of that same agency,

is another attempt to describe the workings of an organization whose acts of

ommission or commission affect the lives of many. Serber concludes (ibid, p. 62)
that the Department of Complaints does not meet the needs of the people of the
State of California because "the vast majority of the people are not aware of
its existence." .ie adds by means of a quote a further insight that has been
noted by other student studies of governmental agencies (and it is not much
different for private agencies that purport to serve the public) which suggests
that such public institutions are not structured for public access:

> It is much worse to deal with someone in the public because
> you know you are very limited in what kinds of answers
> you can give them and the results you can get for them. They
> expect more and often get impatient. With the industry, it's
> different: they are usually friendly and polite, at least
> to our faces; we always know where we stand nd how far we
> can go. It's less stressful because I feel less responsible
> for the outcome of the conversations. (An Insurance Officer III).

The report goes on to note that "There is a qualitative difference in the
nature of the inter.iction between the complainants and the Insurance Officer and
the representative of the industry and the Insurance Officer."

> It's not very pleasant to arrive here at a quarter of eight
> in the morning after battling to cross the Bay Bridge for
> Forty-five minutes and before I can finish a cup of coffee
> some <u>hysterical</u> fat bitch who can hardly talk, she's so
> stupid and excited, will come in and they will call me.
> When I catch sight of her my stomach tightens and my
> mouth gets dry; sometimes the burning in my pipe starts
> before I can even get up to the desk, and I'll have to
> take a sip of water. (Insurance Officer IV) (ibid, p.46)

This same report makes a set of predictions as to what might happen to this
Department of Complaints were access by the public easily available; the
structure and function of the department would move more closely in line with
a major goal of the Department of Insurance "to enforce insurance laws so as
to achieve the highest possible degree of protection for the public in general
and all policy holders and beneficiaries in particular" (serber, p.64).

The above stated goal raises a more general question. Who is it who is
to decide what is good for the public? Eaton's paper on the Better Business

Bureau of Oakland illustrates the dilemma of a value conflict:

> A major limitation in the value of the BBB to the consumer
> lies in the very fact that it is an organization designed
> to further the interests of legitimate business. The
> movement assumes that what is good for business is good
> for the economy and for the consumer. It assumes that
> the power of conscience and the power of public opinion
> will triumph over the unbridled profit motive, that an
> informed public will be able to mold the responsible
> market to its own desires. These assumptions may be
> true on some levels, but the picture is not that simple.
> There are areas of the society in which power is
> concentrated and areas where it is dispersed or absent
> altogether. The consumer's complaint has more weight
> with the locally competitive retailer than with the
> far away corporation which made the product that the
> retailer sells. The Bureau regulates re ail advertising,
> but the consumer is also exposed to national advertising,
> especially on television. The retailer is not a free
> agent. He is limited by the distributor and the
> supplier...

> The Bureau is concerned with truth in advertising but
> is it equally concerned about relevance in advertising?
> There are many things which can be said about a product
> which are true but which have very little to do with
> its significant attributes; durability, safety,
> efficiency...The consumer is told on the one hand that
> it is his responsibility to be informed and to exercise
> his power of choice to bring the market into line with
> his needs and desires...On the other hand he is assaulted
> by national advertising which stresses the non-practical
> attributes of products, and he is confronted with a
> range of products from different manufacturers which
> have essentially no differences between them in areas
> which the consumer may think are significant. He is
> told to understand the warranty that comes with his
> new car, but he is not told what he can do if he
> does not like its terms and finds that all warranties
> from all companies are just the same. As an individual,
> he is essentially powerless to bargain in the greater
> market system than characterizes the modern complex
> society. (Eaton, p.61-62)

Understanding the differences in the perceptions of producers on the one hand

and consumers on the other allows a citizen to evaluate for himself any govern-

ment statement about the need for government not to encroach on the self-regulatory

organizations such as the BBB that are set up by business groups. Eaton's study of

the BBB touches but one tiny part of the self-regulatory attempts of business.

Since 1966 there has evolved a whole series of "complaint handling mechanisms"
from "hot lines" to corporate ombudsmen. A comparative study of such mechanisms
would be a much needed contribution to the literature on the nature of extra-
legal attempts at voicing and obtaining redress. It would be fascinating to
know to what degree "informal law" is dominated by public relations and Madison
Avenue techniques in conflict management. The use of advertising in grievance
resolution may be related to an upper class perception of upper class law and
order which says "cool it rather than resolve it."

Some years ago the criminologist Sutherland wrote a book entitled 'White
Collar Crime. A landmark finding documented in that work was the simple fact
that white collar personnel commit crimes, a fact which should have helped combat
the belief, at least among social scientists, that the poor had a monopoly on
crime. If as scientists we are interested in understanding the determinants
of crime, then the "discovery" that the rich as well as the poor commit "crimes"
(something that is well known to the average citizen and most certainly known
by the poor) is very important. The fact that crimes are differentially
stigmatized and prosecuted according to class should lead us to disregard
over-simplistic theories explaining criminal behavior. Very few sociological
works of this type followed Sutherland's study and indeed there was a long dry
period between the muckraking of the turn of the century and Sutherland.

Instead sociologists such as Lewis Coser (1968) prefer to tell us why some
poor do and why some poor do not commit crimes in terms of the theory of relative
deprivation. One can only evaluate such theories of criminal behavior if we
look at the question in relation to a vertical slice; it is well known fact
that the criminal law has been oriented towards individual crimes, preferably
street crime, and the collective criminal behavior by an agency or corporation
is often dealt with in administrative agencies or in ways which leave very
little stigma on those involved (Pound, 1906, Sutherland, 1949). 15

Yet our analyzed data base is slim. Henry Ruth, Director of the National Institute
of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice noted as late as 1970:

> ...The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal
> Justice has developed an intensive concern that so-called
> "white-collar crime" receives scant attention from the
> law enforcement and research communities. ...The entire
> field of white-collar crime represents a national priority
> for action and research - to define the problem, to examine
> its many faces, to measure its impact, to look for ways in
> which its victims can be helped, and to determine how such
> crime can be prevented, deterred, and effectively prosecuted.
> (Edelhurtz, 1970, iii)

With regard to benefit to citizens, it is astounding that in as legalistic
a a country as the United States, nowhere in the educational system does one get
a working knowledge of the law as part of a general education. In fact after
years of studying the Zapotec legal system of Oaxaca, Mexico, I would conclude
that the single most important difference between the Zapotec legal system of
southern Mexico and the American legal system (from the point of view of a
middle class consumer) is that Zapotecs have access to and know how to use
access to the legal system. In the United States most citizens do not have
access to the legal system either because they are ignorant of the workings of
the system or be ause they cannot afford the professional (lawyer) who would
have adequate knowledge of the workings of the system. In California, for
example, and I imagine this is much more widespread, there are few books for
citizens describing the legal system, what it is and how it works.

This situation is representative of the larger problem of citizen education.
Most of what we learn about the law we absorb vicariously from T.V. westerns and
Perry Mason style shows. Ethnographic works on the subject of law would be
filling a scientific and descriptive need, as well as informing the native
as to a system which at times heavily weights the direction his life takes.
For example, one student began a study of the Immigration and Naturalization

Service in an effort to find out how immigration and the INS have molded and
influenced the communities of Third World immigrants. The basic hypothesis was
that the INS is the historical product of negative American attitudes towards
non-Northern European immigrants - fear of foreigners, dislike of strange cultures,
isolationism and the like; that while there has been a major liberalization of
the laws, the administration of immigration, and indeed recruitment to the
agency, continues to be affected by these historical attitudes.

Other anthropological studies might involve the use of personal documents-
the memoirs of judges, lawyers, corporate executives are more noticeable for their
absence from the book shelves. The Washington law firms whose lobbying functions
have earned them the label of fourth branch of government would be a fascinating
place to test some of Elizabeth Bott's hypotheses about networks which she developed
in her studies of Kinship in London. What shapes and functions do the networks of
law firms have in an organization where at mid-career the majority of firm members
fan out into positions about Washington, yet still maintain relations with the
law firm even after they no longer are on the payroll. What kind of reciprocity
is involved here?

<center>V.</center>

But there are those who would not want to entertain any such reorientation
of anthropology and it is important to appreciate the reasons why present day
anthropologists would say impossible, improbably, irrelevant, off the mark, even
impertinent or more cutting, "journalistic" or "political diatribe". The
obstacles that are posed are many, but for our purposes here may be discussed in
terms of access, attitudes, ethics, and methodology.

Departments of anthropology have generally believed that students should
do their dissertation fieldwork in a non-western culture and at some points
in time that was a useful policy to implement if in training anthropologists
one valued the importance of culture shock and the detachment which accompanies

it. For many students today the experience of working in a Washington law firm, in a company town, or in an international industrial complex will be more bizarre than anything a student anthropologist could find in a Mexican village or in New Guinea for that matter. We have as anthropologists studied the cultures of the world to find in the end that ours is one of the most bizarre of all cultures and one, by virtue of its world influence for "bad" or "good", in urgent need of study. We have studied the peripheries of American culture and the strategy suggested here is really a studying up and moving into a more over all coverage of U.S. culture.

The most usual obstacle is phrased in terms of access. The powerful are out of reach on a number of different planes: they don't want to be studied; it is dangerous to study the powerful; they are busy people; they are not all in one place, itc. As some of our students found out in their studies of corporate use of the courts there are problems of secrecy and confidentiality:

> The belief that corporations work secretly and sur-
> reptitiously in their own interests has been somewhat verified.
> Their desire for secrecy, their paranoid fear of all but
> self-fashioned publicity, their refusal to discuss questions
> on their operation, and the over-conscious regard of their
> lawyers for the confidential nature of the lawyer-client
> relationship (even when the public's interests are at
> stake), all serve to eliminate any free flow of information
> which should be available to the public forum, and are
> reminiscient of secret societies. The stealth of the
> corporation is epitomized in those wily chessmasters
> they employ to handle their cases, the corporate lawyers.
> (Zeff and Bush, 1970).

These difficulties are true of the people that anthropologists have studied in many different places. That problems of access are any different or at least any more problematic in studying up in the United States is a proposition which at any rate has not been adequately tested. Anthropologists have had problems of access everywhere they have gone; solving such problems of access is part of what constitutes "making rapport". In view of our successes amongst peoples of the world who have been incredibly hostile, it is rather surprising that anthropologists could be as timid at home (see Reisman, 1954). Furthermore

19

it could be argued that access to bureaucratic organizations frequented by the wealthy and powerful such as governmental agencies should be open to social scientists by virtue of laws which protect public access to information affecting the public interest. In addition, there are wealthy anthropologists who would presumably have access "up". Cleveland Amory (1947) and J. Digby Baltzell (1964) have made substantial contributions to understanding the power status of the upper class although neither one is an anthropologist. No, there must be more plausible reasons why the less powerful are more attractive for study in the United States.

It has been said that anthropologists value studying what they like and liking what they study and in general, we prefer the underdog. Braroe and Hicks (1967) in discussing the mystique of anthropology make reference again to the traditional alienation from their own culture that characterizes anthropologists and they explore how such alienation relates to their lack of intense commitment to social reform. This could be phrased more positively: anthropologists have favored studying non-western cultures as a way of fulfilling their mission to study the diverse ways of manking; they have not had an intense commitment to social reform because of their relativistic stance and a belief that such a stance was necessary to a truly "objective, detached, scientific perspective," or because they thought that others such as sociologists, were involved in social reform. While scientific findings may be ideally viewed as "value free",   the choice of subject for scientific enquiry is certainly not "value free". Anthropologists of the future will have a greater responsibility for what they choose to study as well as how they study.

The ethical problems that are raised in studying up almost always appear to be confused, particularly in discussing ethics of working in one's own society. One student made the following comment:

19

> To say that kula ring participants don't perform in practice
> what they say they do has very different consequences from
> saying that a government agency is not living up to its
> standards. This isn't to say that the government agency
> shouldn't be studied, or that the fact it isn't living up
> to its standards shouldn't be pointed out. The question is--
> can the anthropologist do a structural study and then in
> role as citizen point out that the agency is screwing
> the American Public?

The same student asked:

> How can we gain access to the same kinds of information as
> when we "study down" without being dishonest (i.e. a fake
> secretary or other role). If we did get information without
> letting informants know we are social scientists, how
> could we publish it? It seems that the only "open" way of
> doing a study would end up being fairly superficial --
> questionnaires and formal interviews as versus what we
> learn by participant observation.

The problem raised by this student are ethical problems anthropologists have

had to face no matter what culture they are studying. In discussing such ethical

questions involved in studying up in our own society, I have the impression that

confusion results depending on whether one recognizes the implicit double

standard - is there one ethic for studying up and the other for studying down?

Or is it, as this student suggests, that the consequences of describing what

may be systemic inadequacies may be greater for government agencies than peasant

economic systems or for conflict resolution (or just plain conflict) in a small

fishing village, and that therefore our subjects of study should be treated

accordingly?

There is an important distinction to be recognized as to "public" and

"private," even though informant anonymity may be important to both sectors.

For the most part anthropologists working in the United States can be said to

have worked in the "private" sphere; we study families, small groups, those

aspects of communities which are more private than public. We should not

necessarily apply the same ethics developed for studying the private, and even

ethics developed for studying in foreign cultures (where we are guests), to the

study of institutions, organizations, bureaucracies that have a broad public
impact. In reinventing anthropology any discussion of ethics should consider
the public-private dimensions as well as the home-abroad component. Furthermore,
in the present anthropolog, work that is considered in the objective social
science mode, when carried out abroad might well be dubbed "journalistic" by
the subjects. Telling it like it is may be perceived as muckraking by the
subjects of study (Oscar Lewis' work on Mexico was so viewed), or by fellow
professionals who feel more comfortable if data is presented in social science
jargon which would protect the work from common consumption.

The concept of participant observation has played a determing role in what
anthropologists choose to study. The power of participant observation as such
was only discovered in the twentieth century. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown,
among the first to fieldwork by the techniques of participant observation,
set a new standard for ethnographic descriptions. When an anthropologist goes
to study the culture of a people he lives with them; the resultant description
is rich in contextual information and is the result of the many points of view
that one is opened to by virtue of "living with the natives". Hortense Powdermaker
has described the components of participant observation as follows:

> The conditions for successful mutual communication include
> 1) physical proximity of the field worker to the people
> he studies, 2) knowledge of their language, and 3)
> psychological involvement (1966, 287).

She goes on to say:

> The ability to be psychologically mobile is important
> in hierarchial situations where it is necessary to
> move easily between different levels in the power
> structure. Some field workers identify so completely
> with the underdog that they are unable to make
> effective contacts with those on the top level
> of the social (or political) hierarchy (ibid, 291).

At the same time that Hortense Powdermaker describes the value of participant
observations, she also alludes to the limitations of such complete acceptance

of participant observation as a distinctive feature of all social anthropological field owrk. when the anthropologist participant observes, he or she resides and generally partakes with the "natives",. Such a method has weighed heavily in the decisions as to where anthropologists study - we prefer residential situations whether the residence is in a primitive village or a modern hospital.

The degree to which our field choices might be determined by whether or not we can observe as participants was made clear to me when two of my students went to Washington to study a law firm that did not want to be studied (even though individual members would be willing to cooperate in a limited way). How could they participant observe if the firm wouldn't let them in the door, and if they couldn't participant observe, how could they do anthropology? These questions have of course been raised before in anthropology, and when anthropologists thought it important enough they surmounted the problems raised. Witness the culture studies that cropped up during World War II, or witness the work of Elizabeth Bott (1957) in her network study of kinship in London which was based principally on face-to-face interviewing.

The point is that there is a mystique about participant observation that carries points with it, yet it remains that the anthropologist's image of himself is shattered (Fischer, Ann, 1969) if he can't participant observe, and for the most part our students are not generally trained in the kinds of techniques that they would need to work on problems in non-residential settings such as banks, insurance companies, government agencies, electronics industries, and the like. Without participant observation, how many anthropologists know how to find out who owns a city? If Sol Tax is right in pointing out that anthropologists are not working on the most relevant problems of the world today - such as population, pollution, and war - because they can't participant observe such problems in a community, then in reinventing anthropology we might have to shuffle around the

value placed on participant observation, that leads us to forget that there are

other methods (see Gussow and Tracy, 1971) more useful for some of the problems and

situations we might like to investigate. The use of personal documents, memoirs,

may substitute for anthropological participation in some areas of culture that

take long years of participation to really understand. The following comments

about field methodology highlight the need for flexibility and ecclecticism.

> The principal research method of the anthropologist,
> participant observation, is, needless to say, not
> wholly applicable when one is studying a government agency
> or elite institution and its interaction with various
> people. A particulat situation can be dealt with, but
> characteristically the data gleaned would be through
> observation rather than participation. we can
> define participation in two ways. One definition
> would maintain that to say the researcher is
> a participant means he is able to interact as a
> native in the situation studied and is therefore
> able to use himself as an informant. The other
> definition considers the participant in a status
> achieved by an outsider, since he is treated as an
> insider. Ideally, the more intimate the acceptance,
> the less the participant/observer will influence
> the situation he is observing and the closer he
> will be to the status of participant. Considering
> these two definitions, the term participant/
> observer could not be applicable to the types
> of situations that the ethnographer would want
> to study in large-scale institutions, unless he
> was actually to become a member of the group he
> is studying. The term participant/observer would
> not truly apply to these researcher's techniques,
> even in the situations where I was attempting to
> fulfill the ideal. In studying one's own society,
> especially if it is complex and highly specialized
> and heterogeneous, the question is to determine
> the levels of actual participation and the level
> barred from participation.
>
> If the anthropologist is going to make a contribution
> to the understanding of the institutions which in a
> complex way affect the lives of many people, he must
> take a methodologically eclectic approach ... (Serber, 1971, pp.5-6)

Interviews of various sorts (formal/informal, face-to-face/telephone) are used

by my students. Documents were used (see NACLA Guide, 1970) public relations

documents for understanding the preferred self image or the organization, internal

documents on the structure and statistics of work planned and accomplished by
the organization - all useful in discovering trends and what is thought of as
problematic by the actors. Also important is what Mariun Eaton has labeled
"self-analysis" - an awareness on the part of the student of how he as a
social scientist is perceived, run-around, enculturated, and described in the
veiled and not-so-veiled enc unters with informants and the members of
organizations and the like whose job it is to deal with outsiders. We may
have to give higher priority to traditional anthropological values such as
using our knowledge of others as a mirror for ourselves, and such as allowing
questions to lead us to methodology (rather than vice-versa).

We may have to reorder our conception of urgent anthropology. Surely
it should be the needs of mankind for the study of man that lead the way.

NOTES

REFERENCES

ADAMS, Richard Newbold
    1970   Crucifixion by Power. Austin, University of Texas Press.

AMORY, Cleveland
    1947   The Proper Bostonians. New York, E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc.

BALTZELL, E. Digby
    1964   The Protestant establishment; aristocracy and caste in America.
        New York, Vintage Books

BENEDICT, Ruth
    1946   The Chrysanthemum and the sword. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

BOTT, Elizabeth
    1957   Family and social network: roles, norms, and external
        relationships in ordinary urban families. London, Tavistock
        Publications.

BRAROE, Niels Winther and George L. HICKS
    1967   Observations on the mystique of anthropology. The Sociological
        Quarterly VII (2): pp.173-186.

COLSON, Elizabeth
    1971   The impact of the Kariba resettlement upon the Gwembe Tonga.
        Manchester, University of Manchester Press.

COSER, Lewis A.
    1968   Violence and the social structure. In Violence in the streets,
        Shalom Enlerman, ed. Chicago, Quadrangle Books, pp. 71-84.

EATON, Marian
    1971   An ethnography of BBB Oakland: one consumer8s View.
        Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of Anthropology,
        University of California, Berkeley.

EDELHERTZ, Herbert
    1970   The nature, impact and prosecution of white-collar crime.
        Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

FELLMETH, Robert, ed.
    1971   Power and land in California, preliminary draft. Washington,
        D.C., Center for the Study of Responsive Law.

FISCHER, Ann
    1969   The personality and subculture of anthropologists and their
        study of U.S. Negroes. In Concepts and assumptions in
        contemporary anthropology, Southern Anthropological Society
        Proceedings, number 3, Stephen A. Tyler, ed. Athens,
        University of Georgia Press, PP. 12-17.

GELLHORN, Walter
    1966   When Americans complain. Cambridge, Harvard University Press

GLADWIN, Thomas
    1969   Review of Culture and Poverty, Charles Valentine. Current
           Anthropology 10 (2-3), p. 185.

GUSSOW, Zachary and George S. TRACY
    1971   The use of archival materials in the analysis and interpretation
           of field data: a case study in the institutionalization of
           the myth of leprosy as "leper." American Anthropologist,
           73 (3): pp. 695-709.

HANNERZ, Ulf
    1969   Soulside; inquiries into ghetto culture and community.
           New York, Columbia University Press.

LOVE, Norma and Marian EATON
    1970   The bay area air pollution control district: an anthropological
           perspective. Unpublished undergraduate paper, Department
           of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

MALINOWSKI, Bronislaw
    1922   Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London, Routledge and
           Kegan Paul, Ltd.

MITCHELL, J. Clyde
    1966   Theoretical orientations in African urban studies. In The
           social anthropology of complex societies. A.S.A. Monographs,
           number 4, Michael Vanton, ed. London, Tavistock Publications,
           pp. 37-68.

NADEL, Laura
    1964   Perspectives gained from fieldwork. In Horizons of anthropology.
           Sol Tax, ed. Chicago, Aldine Press. pp. 148-159.

North American Congress on Latin America
    1970   NACLA research methodology guide. New York, NACLA, Inc.

POUND, Roscoe
    1906   The causes of popular dissatisfaction with the administration
           of justice. Reports of the American Bar Association 29
           (Part I): 395-417.

POWDERMAKER, Hortense
    1966   Stranger and friend, the way of an anthropologist. New York,
           W.W. Norton and Company.

RESEK, Carl
    1960   Lewis Henry Morgan, American scholar. Chicago, University
            of Chicago Press.

RIESMAN, D.
    1954   Individualism reconsidered and other essays. Glencoe,
            Illinois, The Free Press, pp. 440-446.

SERBER, David
    1971   A discussion of the policy services bureau of the California
            Department of insurance, with specific reference to the
            interaction with the insured public and the insurance
            industry. Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of
            Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

SPRADLEY, J.P.
     1970   You owe yourself a drunk: an ethnography of urban nomads.
            Boston, Little, Brown and Company.

SUTHERLAND, Edwin H.
    1949   White collar crime. New York, The Dryden Press.

VALENTINE, Charles
    1969   CA book review of Culture and Poverty: critique and counter
            proposals. Current Anthropology 10 (2-3): pp. 181-200.

WEAKLAND, J.H.
     1960   "The double bind" hypothesis of schizophrenia and three-party
            interaction. In The etiology of schizophrenia, Don D. Jackson,
            ed. New York, Basic Books, Inc.

ZEFF, David and Peggy BUSH
    1970   Corporate use of the courts. Unpublished undergraduate paper,
            Department of Anthropology, University of California,
            Berkeley.