Organs
continued from page 13

all the rules of fieldwork practice and ethics seemed inadequate. These engagements required me to enter spaces and into conversations where nothing could be taken for granted or on face value and where a "hermeneutics of suspicion" replaced earlier fieldwork modes of bracketing, cultural and moral relativism, and suspension of disbelief. The research required a healthy dose of skepticism.

In other essays I've argued for a militant anthropology, for an *antropologia-pé-no-chão*, a barefoot anthropology, an anthropology-with-one's-feet-on-the-ground, and an emancipatory anthropology, modeled on the work of base communities and theologies of liberation in Brazil and South Africa ("The Primacy of the Ethical," *Current Anthropology* 36[3]). But in posing as a kidney buyer in order to understand the misery that prompts a person to bargain over the value of his kidney, as if it were a thing apart from himself—a rug or a used car—I was complicit in the behavior I was studying. Similarly, each time a kidney seller offered to strip and show me his large scar, sometimes requesting a fee to do so, I became another sort of kidney hunter. In his book about the kidney sellers of Recife (*Rim Por Rim* 2008) Julio Ludimir embarrassed me with a chapter about my detective work uncovering the kidney trade triangle among Israel, Brazil and South Africa entitled the "Caçadora" (the Huntress). Indeed, as my Brazilian friends like to say, "No one is innocent," least of all, the anthropologist herself.

These new engagements require not only militancy, but also a relentless self-reflexive and self-critical rethinking of anthropological ethics, the production of truth, and the protection of research subjects. Goffman once posed as a mental patient at St Elizabeth's Psychiatric Hospital in Washington, DC, but such covert practices are no longer permissible for researchers operating under today's human subjects guidelines. However, when one researches organized, structured and largely invisible violence, there are times one must ask if is more important to strictly follow a professional code or to intervene. What if the best method to learn of the hidden suffering of an invisible population of medically abused and mortally neglected people involves entering a facility in disguise?

By far my most difficult decision concerned sharing information on organized crime networks with authorities, including US Congress, Ministries of Health, parliamentary investigations, Moldovan and South African police and even, when all else failed, the FBI. Anthropologists are not detectives, and we are trained to hold anthropologist–informant relations as a sacred trust. But surely this does not mean that one has to be a bystander to international crimes against vulnerable populations. Thus, at the request of public heath officials in New York, I met with an FBI agent charged with investigating corruption and extortion. The case I presented—kidney extortion and transplant fraud—was something new; the agent was disbelieving and the information about the Brooklyn-based organs traffickers and their victims sat untouched for almost seven years. I've also been in the ambiguous position of interviewing international kidney traffickers in a Brazilian prison who knew that my research and formal testimony at a state investigation had contributed to their undoing. Despite this, I developed a collegial and respectful relationship with the convicted leader of the Recife scheme, Gadalya Tauber, who I now dare to call a friend and confidant (see my three-part series in *Anthropology News* 2007). The work of the dogged ethnographer, unlike that of the journalist or police, has no convenient ending. Our training in empathic listening and our habit of moral and ethical relativism mean that our lives become entangled with our informants, even when they might be criminals or sociopaths.

Anthropologists are not detectives, and we are trained to hold anthropologist–informant relations as a sacred trust. But surely this does not mean that one has to be a bystander to international crimes against vulnerable populations.

That my transgressive uses of anthropology in the Organs Watch project have made my anthropological colleagues uneasy goes without saying. Neither am I entirely comfortable with what I have taken on. Given these quandaries, I do not expect Organs Watch to become a model for engaged or public anthropology, but I do hope that it can be used in rethinking the ethnographer's craft. Despite some of the unsolvable ethical challenges this research has posed, I wonder if any other discipline is better suited than anthropology to interrogate human behavior on the margins of the global (medical) economy. Anthropological research can offer alternatives to the utilitarianism and focus on individual "choice" that underlie so much stunted bioethical thinking that contributes to the relentless growth of markets in humans, dead and alive, for their organs.

***Nancy Scheper-Hughes** is Chancellor's Professor of Medical Anthropology at UC Berkeley and director of Organs Watch.*

Taking the Next Step

Why We Should Continue Strengthening the AAA Ethics Code

Roberto J González
San Jose State U

Hugh Gusterson
George Mason U

A recent article in the *New York Times* profiled the work of Kelly Peña, a market researcher employed by the Walt Disney Company. According to the author, Brooks Barnes, "Peña and her team of anthropologists have spent 18 months peering inside the heads of incommunicative boys," aged 6 to 14 years old. In her efforts to understand the typical American child, Peña is engaged in what the *Times* calls an "undercover mission: to unearth what makes him tick and use the findings to help the Walt Disney Company reassert itself as a cultural force among boys."

The article describes a series of covert techniques employed by Peña, including some that would never be approved by any university human subjects review board. For example, her team concealed from research participants (both the boys and their parents) the fact that Disney was employing them. Furthermore, the team didn't share their results with those studied; instead, they only provided results to Disney. The entire process seems designed to manipulate children and their parents for profit, while keeping research participants largely in the dark.

If the *Times* piece is accurate, Peña's "team of anthropologists" is conducting research that blatantly violates various precepts of the AAA's Code of Ethics, and that illustrates a widening regulatory black hole. What, if anything, can the AAA do about people who call themselves anthropologists (because they have anthropology degrees) but aren't subject to the regulatory authority of a university or government agency because they work for a private company or for themselves? On a similar note, what about those who have advanced anthropology degrees, but who teach in other university departments (such as political

science or business) where there may be little interest in anthropological ethics codes?

The association's presumption that anthropologists can self-regulate in regard to the Code of Ethics is a holdover from a time when the discipline's employment situation was simpler (with more working in anthropology departments and museums) and contained fewer of the regulatory black holes than exist now.

Broad Consensus for Tougher Standards

The Disney anthropologists offer a dramatic example of why the AAA needs a tougher ethics code. In February 2009 members of the AAA approved a revised Code of Ethics designed to strengthen the protection of research participants and to encourage more open access to scholarship. The association's rank and file passed the revisions by nearly a 7-to-1 margin, indicating broad consensus on the need for tougher standards.

However, the revised code is ambiguous on several points. For example, earlier this year the AAA's director of public affairs stated that whether the code's new provisions bar classified research "depends on what classified means." According to InsideHigherEd.com, when he was asked specifically about classified US military work, "he said that the association specifically avoided using the word [classified] in its code and would not answer whether such work is possible under the code" (see "Anthropologists Toughen Ethics Code," February 19, 2009). Presumably almost all kinds of classified research are embargoed by the revised code's admonition that "anthropologists should not withhold research results from participants when those results are shared with others." However, with a little effort, one can imagine research of subjects with security clearances that would be classified without running afoul of this language. In reaction to the scandals of Project Camelot and the Thai Village Study, classified research was unambiguously prohibited by the 1971 AAA Code of Ethics, which said that "anthropologists should not communicate findings secretly to some and withhold them from others." Now classified research has slipped into a gray zone, not explicitly prohibited or proscribed.

Saying Yes to Open Research

The Turner Resolution (proposed by Terence Turner from the floor of the 2007 AAA Business Meeting) sought to reintroduce language from the 1971 Code of Ethics that would completely ban secret and clandestine research. Although this sounded like a good idea for many anthropologists, the 1971 code could have been construed, for example, as forcing archaeologists to reveal the whereabouts of sensitive sites, which could facilitate looting of artifacts. Consequently, some of us who favor saying yes to open research considered it important that an *explicit* caveat or guarantee for archaeologists be included as a part of the latest revisions. Though the newly revised 2009 Code of Ethics didn't include this language or the proposed caveat, we hope that a future ethics code will more clearly articulate the circumstances in which it is acceptable to restrict access to research results. To some degree these judgments are contextual, but the AAA also needs to offer clearer orienting principles to researchers and draw a line against attempts to restrict the free circulation of knowledge by the military and by corporations.

A different concern (and one perhaps more difficult to address) is the rise of a disturbing phenomenon: anthropologists who work for clients that view research transparency—a traditional part of the ethnographic contract—as a nuisance. Peña's Disney team is but one example of a semi-covert approach to research that seems to be on the rise in an era when corporations are increasingly interested in anthropology. Although it may be impossible for the AAA to investigate individual cases of misconduct, our association needs to do a better job of explaining to its membership, to potential sponsors of research, and to the public why such work violates the fundamental ethical covenant between anthropologists and their research participants. After all, our discipline's reputation is on the line.

Yet another sign of trouble ahead is a recent announcement by Dennis Blair, Director of National Intelligence, who plans to make permanent the controversial Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP), which requires student scholarship recipients to work for US intelligence agencies after they graduate, while simultaneously creating an ROTC-like program for training future intelligence officers on college campuses. In both cases, the identities of students involved in the programs would not be disclosed to university professors, administrators or students. As noted by David Price in a June 23, 2009 article for *CounterPunch* titled "Obama's Classroom Spies," in essence "these future intelligence analysts and agents would conduct their first covert missions in our university classrooms." According to Price, such programs risk "further blurring already hazy borders marking proper independent academic roles."

Many anthropologists in the field have had the disconcerting experience of being asked who they are spying for. Given that an anthropologist thought by his or her subjects to be a spy will find it hard to do good research and may even be in physical danger, government initiatives that ask anthropology departments to train spies and generally blur the roles of anthropologist and spy are the last thing our profession needs. Franz Boas understood this and, accordingly, condemned anthropologists engaged in espionage in World War I in the strongest terms. In view of the creation and expansion of clandestine scholarship programs like PRISP, isn't it time that the AAA, through the Code of Ethics or some other declaratory mechanism, produce unambiguous language discouraging anthropological involvement in such initiatives?

Confronting Shamelessness

Finally, there is a relatively new—perhaps unprecedented—series of challenges facing the AAA, which we call the "no shame" phenomenon. To get a better idea of this, we might conduct a thought experiment. Imagine that an anthropologist with a PhD in archaeology decides to sell on the black market a handful of valuable artifacts that he or she collected from a research

site in Chiapas, in clear violation of established professional ethical practices and the AAA Code of Ethics (not to mention Mexican cultural property laws). Now imagine that the archaeologist not only ignores these ethical norms, but keeps attending anthropology conferences, visiting university departments, and publishing articles in *Anthropology News* and other journals to recruit others to do the same. Should there be no consequences for such egregious behavior? If the AAA Executive Board says, "We've looked carefully at these activities and decided that they're not consistent with the Code of Ethics," should the archaeologist be allowed to call himself or herself an anthropologist in good standing?

Any serious discussion of future revisions to the AAA Code of Ethics needs to include the difficult question of how to deal with those (few) anthropologists who publicly ignore the AAA's interpretation of its ethical obligations. Many argue that the AAA should not have a grievance procedure for investigating potential ethics violations (see Fluehr-Lobban and Levy, this issue), but shouldn't there be some sort of response when actions clearly defy the association and its interpretation of ethical obligations? Surely we value our professional integrity enough to speak up.

***Roberto J González** and **Hugh Gusterson** (and nine other colleagues) are founding members of the Network of Concerned Anthropologists (NCA), an ad hoc group formed in 2007 to promote a more ethical anthropology. They are also contributors to the NCA's new book,* The Counter-Counterinsurgency Manual, *published by Prickly Paradigm Press.* AN

Editor's Note: Kelly Peña's response to this article will appear in October AN.

Comments?

Share them on the AAA blog.

http://blog.aaanet.org