

Introduction

ON STUDYING UP, DOWN, AND SIDEWAYS What's at Stake?



Roberto J. González and Rachael Stryker

This book is a collection of essays that explore problems of power in the United States and beyond. It is also a series of hopeful models for transcending them. Its authors are anthropologists who are concerned about the undemocratic, sometimes authoritarian uses and abuses of power today, yet believe independent, creative thinking has the power to actualize alternatives to living with these abuses. The contributors to this volume take the firm stance that anthropologists are well positioned to speak with knowledge and insight about the workings of power. This is because the anthropological lens focuses on humans holistically and cross-culturally, while never losing sight of long-term historical processes. Anthropology integrates culture, language, biology, and history to address questions about *Homo sapiens*, the societies that we have created for ourselves, the challenges of survival facing our species, and the human talents available to meet these challenges.

Connecting the Dots

In some ways, life has become easier for millions of people in our society and around the world. Technological developments in medicine, engineering, and other fields have increased human longevity, facilitated transportation, and improved communication. In addition, more people

Notes for this chapter begin on page 20.

everywhere are contributing and connected to the global economy, potentially opening the way for cross-cultural contact and a deeper understanding of different lifeways.

But in other ways, life has become more difficult, more complicated, and more frustrating than ever before. A wide range of social problems and personal troubles weigh heavily on the lives of many. Despite the wondrous inventions and scientific breakthroughs of recent years, powerful institutions have often failed to provide citizens with security, safety, or satisfaction and indeed have stood in the way of people solving these problems at the grass roots.

Events from the last few years illustrate the scope of the problem. For example, in August 2005, Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans and other parts of the Gulf Coast, killing nearly 2,000 people in the United States. U.S. District Judge Stanwood Duval ruled that the flooding caused by the hurricane was largely a man-made disaster created by the “lassitude and failure” of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.¹

Another example comes from the field of public education. Faced with budget cuts, public-school teachers across much of the United States are resorting to unusual measures to cover classroom expenses. In one San Diego–area high school, calculus teacher Tom Farber raised \$350 to cover photocopy costs by selling advertising space on his test papers.² In the meantime, public university systems throughout the country are undergoing a series of crises related to the corporatization of higher education.

Apart from environmental and educational dilemmas, many Americans are contending with problems associated with housing. Between 2007 and 2012, banks issued foreclosure filings on more than 16 million U.S. properties. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, approximately 5 million Americans lost their homes through foreclosure between 2007 and 2012.³

On a global scale, human suffering is also an outcome of ongoing wars and military occupations. Civilian and military fatalities have steadily increased in the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan since it began in 2001. The United Nations reports that more than 3,000 Afghan civilians were killed and more than 4,500 injured in 2011, making it the war’s deadliest year on record.⁴

Meanwhile, the global energy system is dominated by inherently risky methods and technologies prone to periodic catastrophes. For example, in April 2010 an offshore well belonging to British Petroleum exploded and sank in the Gulf of Mexico, killing eleven workers and spewing more than 4 million barrels of oil into the ecosystem with disastrous ecological, economic, and health consequences. It was the largest offshore spill in U.S. history.⁵ And in March 2011, an earthquake rattled Japan’s east coast, creating a massive tsunami that severely damaged several nuclear reactors at

Fukushima in the second-largest nuclear reactor disaster in history, whose long-term effects may prove harmful to many species' environment and biological integrity.

As if this were not enough, the U.S. food supply has been compromised. In 2010, the FDA ordered the Las Vegas-based company Basic Foods to recall ten thousand products containing "hydrolyzed vegetable protein" (a flavor enhancer used in products ranging from potato chips to tofu) because of salmonella contamination. This was only the latest in a series of high-profile recalls revealing persistent problems in the American food system.⁶

At first glance, these human tragedies look unrelated. But closer consideration reveals that they share a disturbing commonality: each occurred largely as the result of the misdeeds (either intentional or unintentional) of decision makers in powerful organizations—banks and financial firms, governmental bodies, military institutions, and corporations. Compounding these actions is the apathy of the many people who feel powerless to effect meaningful change in the world around them. The pattern of "organized irresponsibility" of men and women in the higher circles—and the organized irresponsibility underlying these outrageous situations and many others—are phenomena in need of serious analysis and action.⁷ The words of the anthropologist Laura Nader appear as a warning call: "Never before have a few, by their actions and inactions, had the power of life and death over so many members of the species."⁸

There are other symptoms. Economic, natural, political, and social capital are more highly concentrated than at any other time in human history. Approximately 1 percent of the world's population owns 40 percent of the world's wealth; average CEO pay has grown 442 percent in the last twenty-five years while average worker pay has increased just 1.6 percent; and five corporations control most of America's daily newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations, book publishers, and movie companies.⁹ Ours is a time of endemic crises affecting billions of people: a man-made environmental crisis of potentially catastrophic proportions that threatens to inundate coastal regions and radically disrupt weather patterns; a housing crisis created by predatory lenders, a corrupt financial sector, and ineffective regulatory bodies; a food crisis sparked by shortsighted multinational agribusiness firms; and an energy crisis connected to shortsighted politicians, obscene revolving-door relationships between government and industry officials, and a refusal to search for alternatives.

Those confronting the problems of power—its concentration, its abuse, and its anti-democratic manifestations—must realize that at its core, these are not *technological* so much as *social* problems. If millions of people today are chronically exhausted, afraid, depressed, ill, angry, nervous, paranoid,

nauseous, addicted, overworked, desperate, or just unmotivated, no pill or machine or computer algorithm stands much chance of alleviating their maladies. As C. Wright Mills asserted, when these feelings are experienced en masse they are not only individual ailments but social problems.¹⁰

Power and Freedom

American intellectuals have a long tradition of critically examining issues of power, reason, and freedom. Revisiting some of this work is worthwhile, for much can be learned about the present state of affairs by looking to a past when thinkers wrote for a broad audience of open-minded citizens. This legacy may be partly rooted in the notion, shared by many of our country's founders, that democracy is not possible without well-informed citizens who have access to a wide range of ideas.

Thomas Jefferson's writings provide a clear example of a set of liberating and democratic ideas in American culture. Jefferson adamantly believed democracy is much more likely to survive in an egalitarian agrarian society based upon independent-minded small farmers rather than a powerful commercial class: "Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition," he noted in 1787.¹¹ His words express a sophisticated understanding of the connection between an egalitarian society and democracy—or in other words, power and freedom. Some of the founders of the United States likely were deeply influenced by the democratic practices of Native Americans, particularly the Iroquois Confederation.¹²

Another distinguished American thinker, Henry David Thoreau, further exemplifies the intellectual tradition, though from a somewhat different perspective. Perhaps Thoreau's most valuable contributions to thinking about public life are his creative ideas for confronting and challenging institutions that impede individual freedom. His powerful work and actions amount to a blueprint for defending democratic social life from the predations of totalitarian government. In his 1849 book *Civil Disobedience*, Thoreau suggested nonviolent resistance as a means by which citizens might challenge oppressive government. Vehemently opposed to slavery and the Mexican-American war, he famously wrote: "Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice. . . . I cannot for an instant recognize as my government [one] which is the slave's government also."¹³ Several years later, he based his book *Walden* on two years of living along the shores of Walden Pond in Massachusetts. It reads like an

economic declaration of independence, advocating, among other things, the ideas of self-reliance and autonomy.¹⁴

In a similar vein, the novels, essays, and characters of other nineteenth-century American writers and thinkers such as Mark Twain and Herman Melville contain critical analysis of the relationship between power, reason, and freedom. For example, Twain's protagonists—Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, and Pudd'nhead Wilson, to name but a few—are typically iconoclasts who defy authority, sometimes with wide-eyed innocence. Later, Twain played a prominent role in the American Anti-Imperialist League and staunchly opposed the U.S. colonization of the Philippines. In the early twentieth century, other intellectuals from Randolph Bourne to Upton Sinclair to Thorstein Veblen continued this tradition, though in different ways.

By the mid twentieth century, social scientists had entered this American dialogue on freedom, reason, and power. Reflecting on the first and second World Wars, psychologist Erich Fromm wrote in 1964: "Freedom is not a constant attribute which we either 'have' or 'have not.' In fact, there is no such thing as 'freedom' except as a word and an abstract concept. There is only one reality: the *act* of freeing ourselves in the process of making choices. In this process the degree of our capacity to make choices varies with each act, with our practice of life."¹⁵ In the early twentieth century, new systems—Nazism, Fascism, and an emerging Stalinism—essentially took command of humans' entire social and personal lives, effecting, as Fromm put it, "the submission of all but a handful of men to an authority over which they had no control."¹⁶ Soon after, in 1950, sociologist David Riesman, reflecting on the increasing power of government and corporate hegemonies in the United States, asked a similar question in his classic work, *The Lonely Crowd*: Why did a postwar, increasingly suburban and middle-class America seem to be so much more open, tolerant, and empathic towards others, yet also so politically and personally passive?¹⁷

Fromm and Riesman shared another important similarity: each recognized and attempted to explain a not-always-obvious "crisis of democracy" within his own culture. Fromm in particular knew that such a crisis was not a peculiarly Italian or German or "totalitarian" problem, but one that confronted every modern state. His work aimed more broadly to better understand freedom by analyzing the character structure of modern man and the problems of interaction between sociological and psychological factors. He wondered why human beings yearned for freedom even as they sought to escape opportunities for freedom when they arose. He argued that although freedom brought people independence and rationality, it also isolated them, making them anxious and powerless. This isolation, he claimed,

was unbearable, and the only alternatives confronting people were to escape the burden of this freedom by entering into new dependencies and submission, or “to advance to the full realization of positive freedom which is based upon the uniqueness and individuality of man.”¹⁸

Sociologist Robert Lynd also contributed fruitfully to this discussion, suggesting, for example, that in the “go-as-you-please culture” of the United States, institutions such as finance capitalism, organized labor, big business, and institutionalized religion, much like totalitarian states, actually enacted “coercive power of deliberate organization” that efficiently hid the very contradictions social scientists were charged to illuminate.¹⁹ Reisman was similarly concerned with Americans’ adherence to society’s prescriptions, but instead of focusing on the contradictory nature of U.S. culture, he traced a linear shift in American consciousness from what he called a nineteenth-century “inner direction” to a mid-twentieth-century “other-direction”:

Ironically, for all its moralistic rigidities, the inner-directed type looked more individualistic, hence more attractive to many Americans, although Riesman insisted that in other-direction he did not depict more conformity but rather a change in “modes of conformity”—the way people were induced to conform. . . . Ultimately, Reisman argued, other-directed people were “at home everywhere and nowhere.” They forged bonds quickly but not deeply. That is why the lonely crowd was lonely.²⁰

Clearly, this line of American scholars, writers, and thinkers stretching back to the earliest years of our country—Jefferson, Thoreau, Twain, Melville, Bourne, Veblen, Sinclair, Fromm, Riesman, Lynd, and many others—introduced a range of ideas with broad scope. They established connections between seemingly disparate phenomena to shed light on the more obscure workings of power in their own times. They were also citizen-scholars united by their concern about the directions their country and world were taking. Armed with an understanding of whom they wanted to speak to and what they were talking about, they sought to explain their concerns in terms that rang true to others who, like them, were troubled about the state of global affairs.

Anthropology with Scope

Anthropologists have also undertaken new projects, some of which relate directly to the search for a clearer understanding of the dilemmas of

contemporary social life. During the global turmoil of the late 1960s, one group of scholars set out a vision for *Reinventing Anthropology*.²¹ Among the most incisive contributions to that collection of essays was Laura Nader's groundbreaking article "Up the Anthropologist," which offered some observations on how to reinvent anthropology by studying up, down, and sideways: "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 than the culture of poverty?"²² These words ring even more clearly and urgently today than they did forty years ago, though we might add that the "few" now have the power of life and death over *all* species and the ecosystems upon which they depend.

A central theme in "Up the Anthropologist" is anthropology's need for a dramatically innovative approach to the study of social life, one much more inclusive of all of humankind. Nader argued that the scope of previous anthropology had been too narrow in terms of both method and theory. She suggested that *indignation*—particularly the indignation of anthropology students—could be a powerful energizing factor, something not to be snuffed out or repressed but rather harnessed as an engine. Indignation as a motive for doing anthropology was a new idea whose relevance stemmed from several factors, including debates about (and student opposition to) the Vietnam War; the rise of the military-industrial complex and the nuclear arms race; the rapid rise of corporations and increased concentration of power worldwide; the "de-skilling" of the workplace and the alienation of professionals from their work; the bureaucratization of society, including many faceless government agencies; and the Cold War and the lasting impact of McCarthyism, especially in universities. It is worth noting that the University of California, Berkeley (where Nader was a professor) was a flash point for these debates, and that students were more active at this institution than at most others. Rather than condemn, chastise, or ignore students' energy and indignation regarding these issues, she eschewed the possibility of "objectivity" and used the opportunity to encourage students to critically examine important aspects of the bureaucracies that wielded so much power over their lives, keeping in mind the potential for making these institutions more accountable. Just as importantly, she had students participate rather than stand by passively.

Indignation continues to motivate scholars, though the issues may have changed. The campus teach-ins developed by anthropologist Marshall Sahlins are now a frequently used method for educating people on urgent contemporary problems and spurring action. The nationwide struggle to save higher education, which has prompted massive student walkouts in

California and protests at the state capitol, tops the list of concerns, alongside the permanent war economy.²³

Intellectually, the theme of indignation might be seen as a significant contribution to the debates raging in the late 1960s and early 1970s over whether a “value-free” social science was possible, and what the nature of anthropologists’ social responsibility was:

Anthropologists have favored studying non-Western cultures as a way of fulfilling their mission to study the diverse ways of mankind; 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. . . .” While scientific findings may be ideally viewed as “value-free,” certainly the choice of subject for scientific inquiry is not.²⁴

This observation is striking because it implies that anthropology itself has been shackled by the dubious notion of scientific “objectivity.” (On this point, Thomas Kuhn’s 1962 book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, had exposed the shaky philosophical foundations underlying such claims.) The very process of selecting “a subject for scientific inquiry”—a band of hunter-gatherers rather than an investment banking firm, for example—reveals a subjective bias. In some ways, a kind of “bureaucratic ethos” was shrouding the work of many anthropologists.²⁵ Yet ethnographic analysis of the process of bureaucratization (and the bureaucratic organizations that enable them) is precisely what Nader proposes in “Up the Anthropologist.”

At this time a number of criticisms of applied anthropology emerged in Latin America regarding the approach of top-down development programs.²⁶ Such initiatives, often sponsored by nationalist governments, economic development agencies, and international financial institutions like the World Bank, tended to serve the interests of elite groups rather than the “target populations” (often indigenous people or peasant farmers). Nader, who conducted research in rural Oaxaca, Mexico, in the late 1950s and 1960s, understood how such top-down programs were likely to create more problems than they solved:

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 the peasantry.²⁷

Such proposals showed anthropologists a way out of imperialist applied anthropology to a more democratic anthropology that would meet the needs of ordinary people.²⁸

Nader also posed the innovative theme of *democratic relevance*. For much of the twentieth century, some interpreted the Boasian legacy among American anthropologists as a strong tendency toward cultural relativism—to the point that many steered clear of taking what might be considered “political” stands on their own society. This reluctance appears to have led to a double bias within the discipline: some derided research based in the United States as opposed to the more typical setting of a small-scale non-industrialized society; and some, still reeling from the red-baiting McCarthy period in the U.S. Congress, were reluctant to involve themselves in any political questions at all. The tendency toward apolitical anthropology was ironic in more ways than one. Although Boas formulated the perspective of cultural relativism, he did not equate it to *moral* relativism. Indeed, Boas famously took political stands and radical positions in very public venues. In speeches, essays, op-ed pieces and other popular media, he harshly criticized U.S. imperialism, discriminatory immigration policies, domestic racism, and war.

The idea of a more democratically relevant social science represented something that was straightforward, yet radical for a discipline in which so many practitioners had implied that cultural relativism precluded such a possibility. From this perspective, one could argue that anthropologists and others, as scientists who are also citizens, should strive to make their work relevant to the continuation (or recuperation) of a democratic society where democracy itself was under siege. For many readers, however, the most interesting part of Nader’s argument in “Up the Anthropologist” had to do with the importance of “studying up” for the purpose of *scientific adequacy*. Since anthropology purported to represent all humankind, clearly the ethnographic record of powerful contemporary societies, institutions, and individuals was impoverished. By this point in the history of anthropology, researchers had conducted hundreds of studies of foraging societies, countless ethnographies describing the minutest details of village life among agriculturalists, untold numbers of monographs analyzing the cultures of pastoral nomads. Yet precious little anthropological work had focused on contemporary U.S. society and the institutions that dominate it: multinational corporations, governmental agencies, the Supreme Court, the New York Stock Exchange, the families making up the “power elite.”

From a scientific point of view, this argument revealed a huge hole in the scholarly literature both here and elsewhere in the world. Apart from

the clear logic behind her observation, Nader's insistence on making this a key theme forestalled any criticisms from those who might charge her with taking a gratuitous ideological stand against the political and economic establishment. Had it not been for a strong position reaffirming the scientific nature of the anthropological enterprise, critics might very well have charged her thusly, or viewed "Up the Anthropologist" as little more than an anti-corporate text, suggesting as it did a class analysis that would examine the interrelationships between different groups within U.S. society in particular.²⁹

Nader was by no means the only anthropologist calling for a more sophisticated analysis of the workings of power. In fact, during the 1960s and 1970s a range of scholars produced work that pushed the limits of conventional anthropology. Eric Wolf's book *Peasants* (1966) suggested that colonialism (and resistance to it) created new kinds of cultures. In short, peasant societies resulted from political processes linked intimately to capitalist development. Wolf's work, which relied on a model that in many ways resembled what was eventually called "world systems" analysis, led to conclusions about the nature of peasant societies that differed markedly from the findings of Robert Redfield, George Foster, and others.³⁰ In a similar vein, June Nash's ethnographic work (e.g., *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us* [1979]) exposed the complex ways in which capitalist development had upended and remade indigenous Bolivians. Like Wolf, Nash chronicled the creation of an industrial proletariat.³¹ Marshall Sahlins's research on "stone age" economic systems (1974) forced readers to question basic assumptions underpinning consumer society. By analyzing the affluent lives of hunter-gatherers (who tend to have much more leisure time than their counterparts in agricultural or industrial societies), Sahlins was able to cast a spotlight on a salient aspect of our society: "Infinite Needs."³² And Sidney Mintz, who had earlier written a deeply contextualized life history of a Puerto Rican *Worker in the Cane* (1963), used sugar as a vehicle for analyzing the political and economic connections linking sugarcane plantation owners in the Americas, slaves of African descent, and the European working classes.³³ Taken together, the work of Nader, Wolf, Nash, Sahlins, Mintz, and others signaled that anthropology's reinvention had begun.

Power and Controlling Processes

Laura Nader, having clearly delineated the terms of studying up in her original 1969 article and mentioned the idea of "studying up, down, and

sideways" (implying that a reinvented anthropology should study not only power elites but also their relationships and interconnections with people and institutions of subordinate socioeconomic strata), later explicated the relationships between these three dimensions, which eventually became known as "the vertical slice." Over the 1970s and early 1980s, she published a series of works that used a spatial metaphor to illustrate the idea of analyzing the dynamics of power by examining the links between various strata of society. Nader called on anthropologists to more thoroughly connect the problems facing ordinary citizens, children, parents, and consumers to decisions and policies created by powerful people and institutions—policy makers, corporate executives, and government officials. Only by analyzing a "vertical slice" that exposes the different layers of power can the anthropologist construct a complete picture of cause and effect. In a 1976 article, "Professional Standards and What We Study," she clarified the reasons for the lack of attention to vertical linkage in the field, arguing that anthropological research of the time was less motivated by academic interest in social relationships than by the needs and desires of individual researchers. And Nader later came to more clearly define the concept of vertical linkages in her 1980 article "The Vertical Slice: Hierarchies and Children," where she challenged the notion that family life could be treated in isolation, and investigated the complex linkages between children and institutions. There is a connection, for example, between the production of a highly flammable shirt for children, Washington lobbyists, and governmental regulations. She also defined vertical linkages as the objects of study that one may anticipate upon applying the network model "vertically rather than horizontally."³⁴ By extension, "the vertical slice" refers to the act of applying the network model in this way.³⁵

By the 1980s, studying up, down, and sideways had taken Nader's research in unexpected directions. Following an invitation to participate in the National Academy of Science's Committee on Nuclear and Alternative Energy Systems, she published "Barriers to Thinking New about Energy," a short piece in the popular magazine *Physics Today* that not only described the experience of studying up, down, and sideways, but also analyzed the controlling processes that prevented physicists and engineers from assessing the full range of alternatives for future energy scenarios.³⁶ Studying up (by interacting with and analyzing the work organization and language of scientists) while studying down and sideways (by taking into account the energy consumption patterns and habits of ordinary people) allowed Nader to make striking observations: this professional group was characterized by "a good deal of standardized thinking, a lack of respect for diversity, and an absolute taboo on the word solar."³⁷ She

noted that the physicists “seem to relish something complicated, hazardous, difficult, and risky, something that requires high technology and big money,” even though simpler solutions (such as solar power or improvements in efficiency to existing technologies) were available.³⁸ They also tended to favor top-down rather than bottom-up solutions and to view human beings as objects; for example, one “risk specialist” suggested that if safety improvements were made to automobiles, household appliances, and the like, “then we could afford to have a nuclear disaster.”³⁹ Another proposition—that if sufficient energy efficiency improvements were made to automobiles, household appliances, and the like, then there would be no need to go nuclear—was apparently not obvious enough:

We have gotten to the point in our society at which we can no longer entertain obvious solutions. This is where anthropologists come in. The coming era will require practical, general, earthy types of thinkers who understand problems and conflicting value systems. We need people who can look at mundane and straightforward problems, people who will not choose complicated solutions when simple ones are available.⁴⁰

The professional mind-sets of the physicists, engineers, “risk specialists” and others were a prime example of what Nader would later call controlling processes, “the mechanisms by which ideas take hold and become institutional in relation to power”—for example, “the creation of new consumption needs . . . the internalization of codes of behavior by means of which institutional structures transform social relations and consumption patterns” for a wide range of products and services ranging from sugar and breast implants to casinos and pharmaceuticals.⁴¹ This innovative approach to ethnographic studies of systems of ideological and hegemonic controls was possible because the methodological and theoretical groundwork had already been laid and adopted by numerous anthropologists in the United States and elsewhere.⁴²

Revisiting “Up the Anthropologist”

Reinventing Anthropology, the volume in which “Up the Anthropologist” originally appeared, received mixed (and sometimes hostile) reviews in the United States.⁴³ Some accused the contributors of focusing too narrowly on anthropology’s role in constructing and maintaining hegemonic structures, some claimed that the authors too harshly judged the impact of institutionalization and bureaucratization on society, and

others bristled against what they called “muckraking anthropology.”⁴⁴ However, Nader’s piece fared better than most of the contributions to the volume and was generally recognized as proposing much more than a simple redirection of anthropological research. For example, one reviewer noted that “Nader implicitly recognizes that problem, method, and theory are locked together in a dialectic where they create each other. For this reason, Nader’s essay will be of far greater use than any of the others to an anthropologist wanting to do some reinvented anthropology rather than merely talk about it.”⁴⁵ Other reviewers might have misread Nader’s words by assuming that she was simply proposing studies of powerful people, something others had already attempted. For example, George Marcus noted that “In studying elites in the 1970s and 1980s, I was never happy with the idea of an ethnography of elites expressed as ‘studying up’ (Nader 1969), which carried the connotation of compensating for the preponderant interest of anthropology in studying the dominated, but also of ‘getting the goods’—the ethnographic ‘goods’—on elites.”⁴⁶

Comments such as these demonstrate that some anthropologists failed to understand that studying up, in its original conception, actually meant studying up, down, and sideways by seeking to locate and analyze the connections between powerful institutions (particularly bureaucracies and corporations) and relatively powerless individuals—that is, the “interlocked institutions” mentioned by Clyde Mitchell. As Hugh Gusterson has noted, studying up is more than a simple call to study powerful groups and individuals—it entails “hybrid research and writing strategies that blur the boundaries between anthropology and other disciplines” and “offer[s] the chance to incite new conversations about power in the U.S.” as part of a “democratizing project” examining the interconnections between the rich and powerful and the rest of us.⁴⁷

That said, it would be difficult to underestimate the impact of “Up the Anthropologist” across the field of anthropology, for few articles have made as deep an impression. For many, “studying up” has become synonymous with analyzing powerful institutions; for others, it represents research focusing upon elites; for others it is simply shorthand for “radical” anthropology. Some have misinterpreted studying up as an opportunity to study powerful groups so as to make them more powerful, or at least more efficient in their work. Examples of this genre include the “organizational culture” literature of some anthropologists of work.⁴⁸ Such uses of “studying up” do not address democratic relevance, scientific adequacy, and indignation as motive. In such work, Nader’s proposals ironically become mere instruments used by entrepreneurial anthropologists serving

the very institutions that have helped to erode American democracy—General Motors and the Department of Defense among them.

If we use the goals outlined in Laura Nader's original article "Up the Anthropologist" as a barometer for determining whether studying up has hit home for anthropologists, these interpretations of "studying up" prove problematic for several reasons. First, Nader originally attempted to outline a paradigm for studying power that was *both* methodological and theoretical. By contrast, current formulations of studying up sometimes reduce it to a purely methodological convention—a series of bulleted items for action about the wealthy to produce field notes and a full written representation of a culture. Second, such ethnographies isolate the concept of "studying up" from the larger epistemological project of vertical integration. Third, "Up the Anthropologist" provided a process by which anthropologists could historically and culturally contextualize power. However, in some current formulations of studying up, power is so decontextualized that such important phenomena as neoliberal projects, the "war on terror," the erosion of democratic norms in the United States and abroad, and other contemporary global transformations are divorced from their historical context or left out of the discussion altogether. Such work may claim to target power as its object of inquiry, but it actually demonstrates nothing about the source, content, and consequences of the flows of economic and cultural capital. "Up the Anthropologist," on the other hand, outlined a clear paradigm for making anthropology scientifically adequate and at the same time politically relevant.

Many anthropologists have incorporated the methodological and theoretical paradigm of studying up, down, and sideways in their work, both implicitly and explicitly. Reviewing just a few examples will reveal a wide range of the topics, settings, and situations illuminated by "vertical" analysis. The work of anthropologists studying the world of high finance describes fascinating applications of studying up, down, and sideways. Gillian Tett's book *Fool's Gold* (2009), an account of how bankers at J.P. Morgan created risky new financial products that would eventually throw the world into economic crisis, is a good example. So too is Karen Ho's *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street* (2009), which provides a fine-grained analysis of how ideologies of "shareholder value" serve as controlling processes that lock bankers into closed mind-sets.⁴⁹

Others have examined questions of war, peace, and militarism by employing a version of the "vertical slice" approach. Catherine Lutz's ethnography *Homefront: A Military City and the American Century* (2001) broke new ground by examining the political, economic, and cultural roots of

U.S. militarism. Although the ethnography is set in a single location, Fayetteville, North Carolina (near Fort Bragg, one of the biggest military bases in the United States), it explores the historical connection between this region and the broader “military-industrial complex” of defense contractors and Pentagon officials. Similarly, Carolyn Nordstrom’s *Shadows of War* (2004), for example, traces the networks linking weapons manufacturers, arms traders, smugglers, and other profiteers to people and families living in war zones. Hugh Gusterson takes a somewhat different approach in *Nuclear Rites* (1998), which delves into the complex, often contradictory worldviews of U.S. nuclear weapons scientists. Like Lutz and Nordstrom, Gusterson is not satisfied with a one-dimensional description of culture but instead places his research participants within deeper structural contexts that reveal the intersections between their lives and those of others. David Vine’s *Island of Shame* (2009) recounts the ways that military elites’ decisions have affected the lives of the Chagossians, indigenous peoples native to Diego Garcia, an island in the Indian Ocean. Over the course of the twentieth century, the United States converted the island into a massive military base, forcing the Chagossians to abandon their lands and be relocated to Mauritius and the Seychelles.⁵⁰

Others have cast a critical eye toward the most powerful institution of our time: the multinational corporation. Dimitra Doukas’s ethnography *Worked Over* (2003) details the process by which a locally based family enterprise in upstate New York was gradually taken over by corporate “trusts” in the late 1800s and early 1900s, leading to what she calls the “sabotage” of the region’s towns. Janine Wedel’s *The Shadow Elite* (2009) documents the emergence of a new network of transnational elites, men and women who are able to leverage themselves as global power brokers by virtue of their revolving positions as corporate executives, academics, and government agents.⁵¹

A vast range of other studies too numerous to mention illustrates the kind of connecting work anthropologists have undertaken in recent years. These include Paul Farmer’s *Pathologies of Power* (2004), which exposes the ways in which “structural adjustment” policies and other neoliberal arrangements undermine public health; Steve Striffler’s *Chicken: The Dangerous Transformation of America’s Favorite Food* (2005), which reveals how global agribusiness firms have evaded regulatory oversight and subjected consumers, workers, and others to grave danger; and Alisse Waterston’s *Street Addicts in the Political Economy* (1997), a book that paints a sensitive picture of people denigrated and demonized by the corporate media and demonstrates that the plight of addicts is intimately linked to gentrification and urban “redevelopment” schemes.

Taken together, these ethnographic works indicate just how thoroughly Laura Nader's call to "study up, down, and sideways" has been absorbed by anthropologists today.⁵²

This Collection

This volume contains several essays that, taken together, serve to reintroduce Laura Nader's concept of the vertical slice and demonstrate its value for historically and culturally contextualizing power in ways that make anthropology politically relevant. At the same time, the book reminds us of what is at stake when anthropologists do not study up, down, and sideways—for both anthropologists and those we study.

Coco's chapter examines institutions that contribute to global financial crisis, tracing the messaging through which *consumers* both contribute to and internalize financial failure. Specifically, she explores the institutional construction of the consumer debtor in the United States, focusing on the normative discourses that enable U.S. Federal Bankruptcy structures to practice a particular rationalized exercise of power that denies the *necessity* of debt in the wealth creation process. In particular, she asks—and answers—a pointed question: By what processes has the consumer debtor come to be considered a social failure, while the corporate debtor has not?

Ou's chapter examines one of the most pressing issues of the twenty-first century: global financial crisis. Ou's essay, an example of vertically integrated research, examines social organizations such as Korean-owned factories in Indonesia and Korea, and civil society, government, and corporations in the United States to provide a more comprehensive understanding of global corporate capitalism and its relation to society and culture. By analyzing the complex linkages connecting these social groups, he contextualizes the policies and practices that contributed to the onset of the terrible Asian financial crisis of 1997–1998. He also demonstrates the central role of institutions like corporate banks and international financial organizations in the larger global economic crises ten years later.

Ou's and Coco's chapters illuminate some fairly obvious and "lofty" centers of financial power in the United States and abroad. Hertz's chapter, however, examines the practices of power as it travels within state organizations that emulate the bureaucracies of financial institutions. She ethnographically details the seemingly benign and ordinary proceedings of minor bureaucrats at a meeting at the International Labour Organisation in Geneva, exploring attributes of "upness": high levels of generality that allow for certain forms of compromise and, more importantly,

loftiness of principle that can then be siphoned back into national and local settings. She argues that the price of this “height” is a feeling of enormous distance between the grandeur of the mission of international organizations such as the ILO and the reality of their impact “on the ground.” “Studying up” in the twenty-first century, she argues, will thus involve repeatedly taking the measure of this distance and asking whose interests it advances, when, and where.

Grandia’s chapter is the first of three that specifically address multinational corporate expansion and traces the global connections and interlocking directorates that fuel corporate globalization. These chapters also ethnographically deconstruct neoliberal abuses, or the deleterious consequences of neoliberal ideology put into practice on a large scale. For example, Grandia reviews the work of five leading voices on worldwide corporate expansion and dispossession trends: Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri on “empire,” David Harvey on “the new imperialism,” and Ugo Mattei and Laura Nader on “plunder.” Studying cattle ranchers, evangelical missionaries, petroleum companies, World Bank bureaucrats, foreign trade representatives, and transnational conservationists, she also connects the Q’eqchi’ case of land dispossession in Belize and Guatemala with global trends. The conclusion compares Q’eqchi’ dispossession with the impact of British Petroleum’s 2010 oil spill on Gulf Coast residents. In both cases, she argues, the loss or spoliation of territory threatens people’s immediate livelihoods and the cultures upon which those are based.

Roberto González’s chapter explores the important topic of food, power, and control. It first describes Zapotec foodways—which have been local, sustainable, and organic for more than fifty centuries—and then analyzes the processes that are leading to their erosion. Global migration, international trade laws, the expansion of agribusiness, and the diffusion of genetically modified organisms have all played a part in the degradation of food security among the Zapotec of Talea, a mountain village in Oaxaca, Mexico. Gonzalez examines how the loss of control over food in both Zapotec and our own society presents serious health, environmental, and economic dilemmas, some of which are being challenged by the informed actions of concerned farmers, consumers, and citizens. By tracing the linkages between different strata of global society—studying up, down, and sideways—the chapter gives some sense of the processes by which control over food can be regained.

Urteaga Crovetto’s chapter details the emergence of the Camisea Gas Project in Peru, in which the Peruvian state, Multinational Corporations, and the International Development Bank worked in tandem to pursue gas exploitation of Peru’s indigenous communities. She regards the

development of the Camisea Gas Project as a case study in which discourses of “inevitability” (of the assumedly intrinsic benefit of economic development) work to threaten communities and dispossess them of their resources. She examines the interlocking institutions that, she argues, steadily undermine indigenous peoples’ material and symbolic world, cause their gradual loss of identity, and decimate their population in the name of progress. Her essay concludes with thoughts on how identifying discourses of inevitability provides new directions for indigenous activism.

Stryker’s chapter is the first of two that use the vertical slice to deconstruct notions of public/private separations between family and commerce or governmental institutions. It looks at the tendency and consequences of American families’ over-reliance on institutional messaging (corporate or state surrogacy) to raise children in the United States, particularly within the realm of international adoption. Her chapter offers a fresh analysis of some old concerns about “neontocracy” (the child-centered culture), particularly whether institutional narratives and practice should replace parental intuition in family building. Examining the controlling processes associated with the making—and breaking—of adoptive families illuminates certain practices within a professional field where families must interact with institutions more often than is typical, prompting consideration of how institutions usurp the autonomy of the American family more broadly. The chapter discusses many ideas for rethinking the family as a site for creating present and future forms of freedom and citizenship for its members.

Kliger’s chapter explores the value of studying up, down, and sideways for understanding the proliferation in North America of sexual abuse complaints based on delayed discovery of traumatic memories. A vertical research orientation demonstrates that the law, as both discourse and site (the courtroom), has been drawn into the process of scientific fact making about traumatic memory, giving scientists incentive to conceptually shift the way they understand human memory and consequently to alter their research foci. Kliger argues that this process has resulted in a revision of legal and scientific standards, accelerating the rate at which particular types of scientific knowledge are produced and concomitantly increasing dependence upon notions of “good science” as defined by legal discourse.

Eppinger’s chapter is the first of two closing essays that draw direct parallels between studying up, down, and sideways and projecting into a future based on citizenship and collective democracy. Based on vertically integrated research in post-Soviet Ukraine, the essay outlines certain contexts of discursive rupture that studying up, down, and sideways, as

a mere methodology, may not immediately address. However, Eppinger argues, investigation and deconstruction of the spatial metaphors behind the notion of studying up, down, and sideways point us to certain quite interesting, perplexing questions of how humans discern or create which way is up, particularly at times of great political upheaval. Using theories of language, performance, and performativity, her chapter looks at these problems and makes some methodological proposals, including use of the vertical slice to address them. Ultimately, she argues for rethinking studying up, down, and sideways to understand how people construct and restore common sense in scenarios where the concept of “the commons” is in flux.

Finally, Pine’s chapter draws parallels between the act of caring about society and the act of conducting militant anthropology influenced by the vertical slice methodology. As an anthropologist who formerly served as an educator/researcher for the California Nurses Association, Pine studied the politics of the health care industry and of the small, fractious U.S. labor movement. Here, she draws from these experiences to examine how studying up, down, and sideways can inform health care providers’, health care patients’, and labor organizers’ efforts to develop effective direct-action political strategies to subvert—at various levels—an increasingly bureaucratized U.S. health care system. Ultimately, she argues that studying up, down, and sideways is integral to understanding the world in which nurses and their patients work and live, and to fighting to make it a better one.

Conclusion

Eduardo Galeano has written, “One hundred and thirty years ago, after visiting Wonderland, Alice stepped into the mirror and discovered the world of the looking glass. If Alice were born today, she’d only have to look out the window.”⁵³ Today we face daunting “upside-down” challenges to freedom, democracy, and well-being. Confronted with literal and metaphorical seismic world events, we are easily confused as to the patterns that govern them. But just as scholars like Fromm, Lynd, and Riesman found their way through the maze by illuminating contradictions, and just as Nader did so by making connections between institutions and individuals—indeed, just as Alice retooled her thinking to understand that the looking-glass world was actually a chessboard—one needs to think up, down, and sideways to figure out an upside-down world. The contributions to this volume confront some of our day’s biggest

challenges—corporate hegemony, development thinking, environmental oversight, and the standardization of thought and action, to mention just some of the most pressing. To address these challenges is to rethink not just the scope of what is visible, but of what is ultimately possible.

Notes

1. Giles Whittell, "Flooding from Hurricane Katrina Was Man-Made Disaster, Judge Rules," *The Sunday Times* (U.K.), 20 November 2009, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article6924125.ece.
2. Greg Toppo and Janet Kornblum, "Ads on Tests Add Up for Teacher," *USA Today*, 2 December 2008, http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2008-12-01-test-ads_N.htm.
3. See *Forbes.com*, "US Foreclosures Rise in December, Reach 2.2 Mln in 2007," 29 January 2008, <http://www.forbes.com/feeds/afx/2008/01/29/afx4584956.html>; RealtyTrac, "Record 2.9 Million U.S. Properties Receive Foreclosure Filings in 2010 Despite 30-Month Low in December," 12 January 2011, <http://www.realtytrac.com/content/foreclosure-market-report/record-29-million-us-properties-receive-foreclosure-filings-in-2010-despite-30-month-low-in-december-6309>; RealtyTrac, "2011 Year-End Foreclosure Report: Foreclosures on the Retreat," 9 January 2012, <http://www.realtytrac.com/content/foreclosure-market-report/2011-year-end-foreclosure-market-report-6984>; RealtyTrac, "1.8 Million U.S. Properties With Foreclosure Filings in 2012," 14 January 2013, <http://www.realtytrac.com/content/foreclosure-market-report/2012-year-end-foreclosure-market-report-7547>; Robbie Whelan, "Foreclosure Machines Still Running on 'Low,'" 31 July 2012, <http://blogs.wsj.com/developments/2012/07/31/foreclosure-machines-still-running-on-low/>.
4. Damien Pearse, "Afghan Civilian Death Toll Reaches Record High," *The Guardian*, 4 February 2012. Although civilian casualties decreased slightly in 2012, the number of attacks (including fatal attacks) on women and children increased significantly. See United Nations News Centre, "Afghan Civilian Deaths Drop but Attacks on Women, Children, and Political Targets Rise," 19 February 2013, <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=44170#.UdITdpyfb2Z>.
5. For a ground-level view of the economic devastation wrought by the BP oil spill, see Ken Wells et al., "From the Gulf, a Portrait of Business Owners on the Brink," *Bloomberg Businessweek*, 10 June 2010, http://images.businessweek.com/ss/10/07/0708_lost_summer/2.htm.
6. Lyndsey Layton, "FDA Says Basic Food Flavors Knew Plant Was Contaminated with Salmonella," *Washington Post*, 10 March 2010.
7. Sociologist C. Wright Mills developed the term "organized irresponsibility": "Organized irresponsibility, in this impersonal sense, is a leading characteristic of modern industrial societies everywhere. On every hand the individual is confronted with seemingly remote organizations; he feels dwarfed and helpless before the managerial cadres and their manipulated and manipulative minions." C. Wright Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), 111.
8. Laura Nader, "Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up," in *Re-inventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 285–311.

9. See James Randerson, "World's Richest 1 percent Own 40 percent of All Wealth, UN Report Discovers," *The Guardian* (U.K.), 6 December 2006, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/money/2006/dec/06/business.internationalnews>; Holly Sklar, "CEO Pay Still Outrageous," *Dissident Voice*, 1 May 2003, http://dissidentvoice.org/Articles4/Sklar_CEO-Pay.htm; Ben Bagdikian, *The New Media Monopoly* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004).
10. C. Wright Mills, "The Promise," in *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 3–24.
11. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (New York: Penguin Books, 1999 [1785]), 171.
12. Jack Weatherford, *Indian Givers: How Native Americans Transformed the World* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1988), 171–193.
13. Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience* (New York: Empire Books, 2011 [1849]), 3.
14. Henry David Thoreau, *Walden* (New York: Empire Books, 2013 [1854]).
15. Erich Fromm, *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good or Evil* (Religious perspectives; v. 12) (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 132. For Fromm, the need to define individual freedom was strong: many in his lifetime had anticipated World War I as the final struggle for global democracy and seen its conclusion as the ultimate victory for freedom. Indeed, immediately after that war, existing democracies appeared strengthened and new ones replaced old monarchies. But only a few years after the war's end, emerging new authoritarian systems denied everything individuals believed they had won in centuries of struggle.
16. *Escape from Freedom* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1941), 4. Around the same time that Fromm published *Escape from Freedom*, American sociologist Robert Lynd published a book called *Knowledge for What?* Like Fromm, Lynd was concerned about the rise of totalitarian regimes. He wondered why, in the face of the broadscale dismantling of intellectual freedom in Germany and the militarizing of the academy in Italy, the U.S. social sciences had failed to analyze these social phenomena to help understand and build a more democratic culture in the United States. See Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge for What?: The Place of Social Science in American Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939).
17. David Riesman (in collaboration with Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer), *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1950).
18. Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*, viii.
19. Lynd, *Knowledge for What?* 65.
20. Rupert Wilkinson, "'The Lonely Crowd,' at 60, Is Still Timely", 12 September 2010, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Lonely-Crowd-at-60-Is/124334/>.
21. Hymes, *Reinventing Anthropology*.
22. Nader, "Up the Anthropologist," 289.
23. In September 2009, tens of thousands of students and faculty from various University of California campuses walked out in what one newspaper called "the biggest student protest for more than a generation." UC President Mark Yudof responded by telling the *New York Times Magazine* that "being president of the University of California is like being manager of a cemetery." See Deborah Solomon, "Big Man on Campus," *New York Times Magazine*, 24 September 2009.
24. Nader, "Up the Anthropologist," 303.
25. The term "bureaucratic ethos" was developed by C. Wright Mills in *The Sociological Imagination*, 100–118.

26. See Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, *Diagnóstico Sobre el Hambre en Sudzal, Yucatán* (Mexico City: INAH, 1962) and “Conservative Thought in Applied Anthropology: A Critique,” *Human Organization* 25, no. 2 (1966): 89–92; Rodolfo Stavenhagen, “Decolonizing Applied Social Science,” *Human Organization* 30, no. 4 (1971): 333–344; Arturo Warman et al. (eds.), *De Eso Que Llamam Antropología Mexicana* (Mexico City: Nuestro Tiempo, 1970).
27. Nader’s article may have been impacted in part by breakthroughs in the 1950s in British social anthropology—a kind of maverick anthropology developed by scholars dissatisfied with aspects of structural functionalism. In particular, Max Gluckman and others who collectively became known as the “Manchester School” may have influenced the idea of studying up, down, and sideways. These scholars focused on problems of change and conflict rather than stability and “social solidarity.” Politically, some members of the group were controversial because they spent a great deal of time doing participant observation among blacks and “coloreds” in Africa and many insisted on including colonial administrators, mine owners, and other elites within the frame of analysis. What they found was that blacks, whites, and “coloreds,” mine managers and workers, rural people and city dwellers, colonial administrators and their subjects were connected in interlocking institutions that made notions of “tribe,” “city,” or “community” obsolete. Their work exposed the power relations inherent in the rapidly urbanizing African societies in which they conducted much of their research. Sometimes this work critically examined British colonialism’s role in destabilizing African societies. The work of Clyde Mitchell succinctly explains the approach: “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” (Clyde Mitchell, quoted in Laura Nader, “Up the Anthropologist,” 291).
28. Laura Nader, “Up the Anthropologist,” 289.
29. Nader’s call to harness indignation was also part of a more general response to currents in anthropology that for much of the 1960s favored an overly scientific cognitive model based on “componential analysis.” Critics of this model approached the methodological obsessions of the linguistically based approach as one way of escaping power analyses. Inherent in much of this sort of criticism was the idea that componential analysis was “anemic” and led to the study of trivial subject matter—hardly the kind of thing that students might be indignant about. For an example of componential analysis, see Ward Goodenough, “Componential Analysis and the Study of Meaning,” *Language* 32 (1958): 195–216. For a critique, see Gerald Berreman, “Anemic and Emetic Analyses in Social Anthropology,” *American Anthropologist* 68, no. 2 (1966): 346–354.
30. Eric Wolf, *Peasants* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966).
31. June Nash, *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).
32. Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972).
33. Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Viking, 1985). This is only a partial list of anthropological work highlighting the analysis of powerful institutions or anthropology’s potential to contribute to solving social problems. See, e.g., Thomas Weaver, *To See Ourselves: Anthropology and Modern Social Issues* (New York: Random House, 1973); James Bodley, *Anthropology and Contemporary*

- Human Problems* (Menlo Park, CA: Cummings Publishing, 1976); Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, *For We are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1983); and Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
34. Laura Nader, "The Vertical Slice: Hierarchies and Children," in *Hierarchy and Society: Anthropological Perspectives on Society*, ed. Gerald M. Britan and Ronald Cohen (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1980), 38.
 35. Nader's call to study up originated in part from the work of network theorists such as anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain, which illuminated the value and method of studying networks (temporary, egocentric social forms such as cliques, interest groups, and factions) rather than groups (enduring social groups such as tribes, villages, bands, etc.) in the social sciences. See Jeremy Boissevain, *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators, and Coalitions* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974).
 36. Laura Nader, "Barriers to Thinking New about Energy," *Physics Today* 34 (1981): 99–102.
 37. Ibid.
 38. Ibid.
 39. Ibid.
 40. Ibid.
 41. Laura Nader, "Controlling Processes: Tracing the Dynamic Components of Power," *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 5 (1997): 711–737.
 42. By the 1990s, when Nader developed the idea of controlling processes more fully, the strategy of studying up, down, and sideways had been deeply absorbed in such work as *Harmony Ideology: Justice and Control in a Mountain Zapotec Village* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990) and the edited book *Naked Science: Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 1996).
 43. Walter Goldschmidt, "Reinventing Anthropology (Review)," *Science* 180, no. 4086 (1973): 612–613; J. L. Fischer, "Reinventing Anthropology (Review)," *Journal of American Folklore* 87, no. 346 (1974): 376–377; David Kaplan, "The Anthropology of Authenticity: Everyman His Own Anthropologist," *American Anthropologist* 76, no. 4 (1974): 824–839.
 44. Walter Goldschmidt, "Reinventing Anthropology," 613.
 45. Leland Donald, "Review: Reinventing Anthropology by Dell Hymes," *American Anthropologist* 76, no. 4 (1974): 8.
 46. George Marcus, *Ethnography through Thick and Thin* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 27.
 47. Hugh Gusterson, "Studying Up Revisited," *PoLAR* 20, no. 1 (May 1997): 119.
 48. Marietta L. Baba, "Beyond Dilbert: The Cultural Construction of Work Organizations in America," in *Ethnographic Essays in Cultural Anthropology: A Problem-Based Approach*, ed. R. Bruce Morrison and C. Roderick Wilson (Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 2001), 183–210. See also Marietta L. Baba, "Organizational Culture: Revisiting the Small-Society Metaphor," *Anthropology of Work Review* 10, no. 3 (September 1989), 7–10.
 49. Gillian Tett, *Fool's Gold: The Inside Story of J.P. Morgan and How Wall St. Greed Corrupted Its Bold Dream and Created a Financial Catastrophe* (New York: Free Press, 2009); Karen Ho, *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009).
 50. Catherine Lutz, *Homefront: A Military City and the American Twentieth Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2011); Carolyn Nordstrom, *Shadows of War: Violence, Power, and International Profiteering in the Twenty-First Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); Hugh Gusterson, *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); David Vine, *Island of Shame: The Secret*

History of the US Military Base on Diego Garcia (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

51. Dmitra Doukas, *Worked Over: The Corporate Sabotage of an American Community* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003); Janine Wedel, *Shadow Elite: How the World's New Power Brokers Undermine Democracy, Government, and the Free Market* (New York: Basic Books, 2009).
52. Paul Farmer, *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); Steve Striffler, *Chicken: The Dangerous Transformation of America's Favorite Food* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Alisse Waterston, *Street Addicts in the Political Economy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997).
53. Eduardo Galeano, *Upside Down: A Primer for the Looking-Glass World* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2001), 2.