


# Keynotes in Anthropology

Edited by

Peter J.M. Nas, Hao Shiyuan, Zhang Xiaomin

 知识产权出版社  
全国百佳图书出版单位

责任编辑：纪萍萍

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

主旨发言、名家讲座：国际人类学与民族学联合会  
第十六届大会 = Keynotes in Anthropology: 英文 /  
(荷) 纳斯 (Nas, P.), 郝时远, 张小敏主编. —北京:  
知识产权出版社, 2011. 11

ISBN 978-7-5130-0828-0

I. ①主… II. ①纳… ②郝… ③张… III. ①社会人  
类学 - 国际学术会议 - 文集 - 英文 ②民族学 - 国际学术会  
议 - 文集 - 英文 IV. ①C912.4 - 53 ②C95 - 53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2011) 第 193526 号

## 主旨发言、名家讲座/Keynotes in Anthropology

ZHUZHI FAYAN、MINGJIA JIANGZUO

(荷) 纳斯 郝时远 张小敏 主编

出版发行：知识产权出版社

社址：北京市海淀区马甸南村1号

网 址：<http://www.ipph.cn>

发行电话：010-82000860 转 8101/8102

责编电话：010-82000860 转 8130

印 刷：北京中献拓方科技发展有限公司

开 本：720mm×960mm 1/16

版 次：2011 年 11 月第 1 版

字 数：240 千字

邮 编：100088

邮 箱：[bjb@cnipr.com](mailto:bjb@cnipr.com)

传 真：010-82000860 转 8240

责编邮箱：[jpp99@126.com](mailto:jpp99@126.com)

经 销：新华书店及相关销售网点

印 张：12

印 次：2011 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

定 价：36.00 元

ISBN 978-7-5130-0828-0/C·122 (10360)

出版权专有 侵权必究

如有印装质量问题，本社负责调换。

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	Peter J.M. Nas	1
2. Quo Vadis Homo Sapientissime? Transdisciplinary Perspectives of Human Ecology .....	Napoleon Wolanski	4
3. Human Evolution in China: Viewed from Multidisciplinary Records .....	Wu Xinzhi	13
4. The Origins of the Japanese People.....	Keiichi Omoto	22
5. Historical Foundation and Current Development of Anthropology and Ethnology in China.....	Hao Shiyuan	31
6. Globalization: The Anthropological Perspective .....	Soheila Shahshahani	73
7. Global Economy and Constructed Social Imagination: Intersection of Aesthetics, Race, Gender and Caste in South Asia .....	Subhadra Mitra Channa	84
8. Remapping Anthropology's Peripheral Zones .....	Faye V. Harrison	100
9. Symbols in Place: In Search of the Soul of the City .....	Peter J.M. Nas, Marlies de Groot and Rosalie de Bruijn	117
10. The Chinese High-Tech Professionals in Silicon Valley: From Scholars to Entrepreneurs.....	Bernard P. Wong	126
11. Citizenship and the Legitimacy of Governance: Why Anthropology.....	Italo Pardo	149
12. Dispossession and Displacement to Protect Nature: The Mobile Harasiis Tribe Faces the 21st Century.....	Dawn Chatty	163
13. Contributors .....		179



## **Remapping Anthropology's Peripheral Zones**

Faye V. Harrison

*Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville, USA*

This essay represents an attempt to make a claim for an alternative space for critical anthropological praxis. This alternative space would not be a margin or periphery in relation to the discipline's centre. Instead, it is imagined as a democratized and decolonized space in which a diversity of anthropologists—diverse in terms of intellectual perspectives as well as socio-cultural, racial/ethnic, geographic, and national origins—meet and productively engage each other at the “crossroads of knowledge” (Di. Leonardo, 1991). Within this radically reconfigured intercultural and cross-fertilizing context, the anthropology “laden with [the] stark gender, racial and national hierarchies” that, within the context of the United States, for instance, marginalized Ella Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, Eslanda Goode Robeson, Ruth Landes, Allison Davis, and St. Clair Drake, will no longer hold sway. The hierarchical ordering of knowledges, depriving some of canonical status, occurs within national anthropologies as well as among them. The history and politics of canon formation and disciplinary boundaries have been important concerns among feminist, racialized ethnic minority, indigenous and world anthropologies.

### **I. Rethinking and renegotiating anthropology's international division of labour**

The discipline of anthropology comprises different varieties and traditions of ethnographic and other field- and laboratory-based inquiry, socio-cultural analysis, and theory building, all of which have not gained canonical legitimacy, recognition, and status particularly within the world's most prestigious and resource-rich research universities and supporting institutions. As Arjun Appadurai (1986) described them in his seminal essay, “Theory in



Anthropology: Centre and Periphery", the prestige zones of anthropological theory have been largely concentrated in particular places in the world, metropolitan centres, where gate-keeping concepts and metonyms have been formulated and validated for explaining key, but only partial, aspects of socio-cultural life in other places, usually distant and "exotic". These exoticized, far-off places—sometimes more socially than physically distant—have been the major loci for field research and the anthropological imagination for more than a century. Of course, most of these exotic and often tropicalized places coincide with the geography of political-economic interests that emerged from the history of European colonial expansion and its legacy in postcolonial forms of domination and empire building.

Not surprisingly, anthropology's prestige zones have been constituted largely in the universities, research institutes, museums, research philanthropies, and publishing outlets in the North Atlantic, with Great Britain, France, and the United States being the principal sites of epistemological and institutional hegemony. These metropolitan centres have exerted far-reaching influence on the international division of intellectual labour that anthropology comprises. As a consequence of the uneven and unequal development of anthropology as a world discipline, the contributions anthropologists make in the so-called peripheries, which should not be homogenized, have largely been absent "... from the metropolitan gaze" (Appadurai, 1986: 360). This absence or erasure has come to be regardless of the true intellectual merits of those contributions. Hence, graduates of Ph.D. training programs at many, if not most, research institutions in the North have not had any serious exposure to anthropological theory and practice beyond the bounds of the hegemonic canon. This is not to say that "local anthropologies" are not read and cited at all. In the context of studies (e.g., traditional "area studies") undertaken in diverse parts of the world, the anthropological knowledge produced within those national and regional traditions have not been ignored. However, there has been a problematic tendency for local or Southern hemispheric anthropologists and kindred intellectuals to be assigned the role of high-level "informants", over-qualified fieldwork assistants (Jones, 1970) or, at best, minor-stream scholars, rather than being treated as major, significant sources of theorized knowledge. This observation has been corroborated by accounts from numerous anthropologists, especially those from the Global South as well as the metaphoric Southern zones within the differentiated and stratified North (Harrison and Harrison, 1998; Connell, 2007). For example, Ugandan anthropologist Christine Obbo recounts her experiences as being treated as less than a full-fledged anthropologist in her poignant contribution to Roger Sanjek's *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology* (1990). Archie Mafeje (1998) and, more recently, Francis Nyamnjoh (2004) have also interrogated the peripheralization of African

anthropologists and kindred scholars whose writings are ethnographically oriented and inspired.

A *politics of stratified reception* (Vincent, 1991; Harrison and Harrison, 1999; Harrison, 2008) sustains a hierarchical ordering of knowledges in which the processes of differential valuation, “unequal exchange” and “Western-mediated validation” (Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006: 11, 13) are often at work, relegating some categories of anthropological inquiry and analysis to the ranks of what the French philosopher Michel Foucault labelled “subjugated knowledge” in his writings on “power/knowledge” (Foucault, 1980). Foucault, however, is by no means the only scholar to have analyzed the dynamics of discounting, disqualifying, erasing, and, on the other side of the equation, emancipating, recuperating, and reclaiming non-canonical knowledges (Taylor, 1971; Green and Driver, 1976; Jordan, 1982). This should be obvious, but citation patterns in the published literature tend to suggest a different story, a story in which respectfully acknowledging and engaging Foucault at great length carries more weight and is more likely to be considered a measure of one’s competitive worth on the academic market than organizing one’s formulation around an equally brilliant thinker whose situated knowledge (Haraway, 1988) was produced outside of the prestige zone(s) of theory. The late South African anthropologist Archie Mafeje was extremely articulate about this problem, which some have characterized as a form of *epistemological apartheid*, in the context of African studies and Africanist anthropology. He was critical of Western Africanists who write what is often touted as definitive, authoritative texts about the continent without acknowledging the role African intellectuals have played in debates and paradigm shifts (Harrison, 2008: 30-31). He challenged his colleagues to *unlearn* the too often still believed notion that Africans are anthropology’s objects of study rather than being welcomed among the subjects who make anthropology (Mafeje, 1997; see also Ntarangwi, 2010 and Schmidt, 2009).

The trajectory of my own thinking about the phenomenon of subjugated knowledge and knowledge producers has been strongly influenced by trends within what is conventionally called “the sociology of knowledge” —but I insist upon calling it “the anthropology of knowledge”. The literature that has been most informative for me (as a U.S.-based specialist in African Diaspora studies) is that to which gendered, racially marked and “minoritized” social scientists have contributed. Their critiques and analyses have been designed to reclaim scholars such as Ella Deloria, Franz Boas’ Lakota Indian research assistant; the African American philosopher and social scientist W.E.B. Du Bois, whose antiracist social research, which even included the collection of anthropometric data, developed parallel to and in dialogue with Boas’ work (Diggs and Taylor, 1971; Green and



Driver, 1976; Harrison, 1992; Baker, 1998); and, extending beyond the borders of the U.S. into the Caribbean, the late 19th century Haitian ethnologist Anténor Firmin (1885), who produced a *tour de force*, a comprehensive *antropologie positive* to contest the scientific racism of Count Arthur de Gobineau (1853–1855), which was consistent with the ideas of many of his contemporaries in metropolitan Europe and Anglo-North America. Antenor's legacy is a more elaborate 20th century school of *ethnologie* that documented and theorized the African and indigenous heritage shaping Haiti's socio-cultural landscape and peasant life ways. This neglected body of work served to vindicate Haiti and assert its right to national sovereignty in the face of deep international hostility and specifically U.S. hegemony. The latter eventually came to assume the form of a military occupation (1915–1934), but, subsequently, other mechanisms of thwarting Haiti's self-determination prevailed. Jean Price-Mars (1983 [1928]) and writer Jacques Roumain (1978 [1944]) set the tone and standard for Haitian intellectual activities, which often included folkloric projects and the production of a genre of writings that blurred the boundary between ethnography and fiction. Contemporary heirs of this intellectual history include U.S.-trained anthropologists Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2000) and feminist ethnographer Gina Ulysse (2007). Thanks to collaborations that have resulted in the translation of important texts from Haiti's intellectual history (e.g. Firmin, 1885 [2002]) into English, Anglophone audiences now have access to an otherwise unknown body of social thought and cultural analysis. The intellectuals mentioned here are only a few examples from the much more extensive *negation* (Green and Driver, 1976) of individuals and entire intellectual streams. The negation of indigenous and Afrodiasporic scholarship from mainstream anthropology's social memory is part of a more broadly and, ultimately, globally distributed pattern within the intellectual life and professional development of anthropologists and the discursive and institutional formations within which they work at national, regional, and international levels.

## II. Shifting patterns: Reversing the gaze

To some extent, stark patterns of negation and peripheralization in our discipline (Harrison, 1988) have begun to shift as more anthropologists translate the keywords of dialogue, multivocality, and collaboration into concrete praxis. These practices are cognizant of the power disparities that shape our relationships with our research consultants ("informants") as well as with our intellectual counterparts who work within other national varieties of the discipline, particularly those in and of the South. However, dialogue, multivocality, and collaboration are too often nothing more than buzzwords deployed largely as rhetorical

devices or textual tropes for claiming or recapturing ethnographic authority. These concepts should be invoked much more often to affirm and promote a genuine ethic of consistent worldly practice. Principled practice entails a great deal of hard work. Ultimately, this endeavour must be collective and collaborative. Its goal is to create more democratized, decolonized (Harrison, 2010 [1991]), and intercultural (Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006) conditions for producing new forms of cross-fertilized, reciprocally-negotiated knowledge. For this means of knowledge production to realize the possibilities of “another knowledge” that transcends the limited parameters of Northern epistemologies (Santos, 2007), it cannot be produced within a single national context from solely one set of “partial perspectives” (Haraway, 1988).

Another significant way in which there is some shift away from the (neo)colonial division of labour is evidenced in the role that those who are often labelled “postcolonial” intellectuals are now playing in metropolitan centres. They operate within deterritorialized, transnational social and epistemic fields that span across the North/South divide. Owing a great deal to the forces and flows of globalization reconfiguring national and regional landscapes everywhere, postcolonial intellectuals’ presence in the North Atlantic complicates the picture drawn thus far but without fundamentally altering the basic disparities that persist between Northern and Southern anthropological establishments.

Arjun Appadurai (1996) exemplifies the new trend, which to some degree is transnationalizing spaces within metropolitan centres. He is widely read and cited by almost any anthropologist and student of anthropology who address any aspect of globalization and modernity. There are several other prominent anthropologists whose origins are in the South or East, who have risen to the ranks of leading voices in contemporary anthropology in the United States and beyond (e.g., Arturo Escobar, Aihwa Ong, Virginia Dominguez, Veena Das). There is a secondary tier of international anthropologists whose work is largely read through an area studies lens and not engaged for its theoretical implications beyond the specific region or local area; included in this category are Ifi Amadiume and Filomina Chioma Steady, who work in West Africa and in diasporic settings. Very few African or Afrodescendant anthropologists have been able to break out of the radically localized “black box” into a more cross-cultural analysis or global analysis. Using Dominguez’s (1994) terms of reference, the elite category of hyperprivileged, minoritized, new immigrant anthropologists work in the institutional settings of prestigious U.S. anthropology departments where they enjoy benefits and advantages that their counterparts in the Global South do not. Indeed, they enjoy advantages that the majority of academics in the North Atlantic do not. While the hypervisible “stars” enjoy high rankings in the citation



index, a quantitative measure of their worth, the writings of most scholars based in the South are much less accessible and generally absent from the discourse at the discipline's centre. The inclusion of new forms of transnational and intranational diversity within metropolitan centres is certainly necessary but insufficient for thoroughly disrupting the received pattern and transforming anthropology along alternative lines of possibility.

More diverse demographic representation in metropolitan universities should be more than "adding and stirring" others or "outsiders within" (Harrison, 2008). Tokenistic forms of diversification do not lead to fundamental shifts in how anthropology is undertaken and taught. More substantive epistemological and institutional changes within the universities, professional associations, philanthropies, and publishing outlets of hegemonic varieties of anthropology requires going beyond the limits of superficial symbolic representation.

Shifts in the demographic profiles of faculty and students in North Atlantic departments of anthropology should lead to the diversification and enrichment of curricula and research agendas in more than cursory ways. Such revisions often point to the need for retooling and re-education on the part of faculties who must develop more heterodox toolkits and skill sets in order to internationalize undergraduate but especially graduate training programs. If internationalization is about more than mere lip service or assigning the task to the faculty representing or embodying diversity, then a great deal of concerted effort is required.

A couple of years ago I served as one of two external consultants charged with reviewing the graduate program in social anthropology at a Canadian university. That university was well aware of its comparatively peripheral status vis à vis leading research universities in the U.S. My teammate was from one of England's most prestigious universities. Over two and a half intense days, we conducted a mini-ethnography of the graduate program as it is embedded within the larger university, whose new strategic plan demanded some degree of reorganization—and greater internationalization. In our interviews with faculty and students, curriculum was among the many issues discussed. The syllabi for core courses, especially the year-long seminar in theory, were instructive. While the department had benefited from relatively recent hires that brought a greater measure of intellectual, ethno-national, and curricular diversity to the faculty, *the core courses that all graduate students were required to take in order to earn their degrees were clearly organized around a Western anthropological canon*. Spurred by the external review as well as by a workshop on decolonizing graduate training that I had facilitated months earlier, the faculty had begun to talk about how they might go about revising the core curriculum along more *diversal* (Robeiro and Escobar, 2006: 5) or *polyversal* lines without "throwing the

baby out with the bath water". In other words, it isn't necessary to abandon the Western classics in order to integrate non-Western scholarship. While they understood this in theory, they were struggling to figure out what would be effective strategies and best practices.

The retooling and re-education that are required must prepare faculty, both intellectually and psychologically, to be open to the unexpected consequences of decentring, parochializing or "provincializing" the West (Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006: 3). This may engender, and rightly so, some colleagues and students seeking a *reversal of the conventional gaze*. A recent example can be found in Kenyan anthropologist Mwendu Ntarangwi (2010), who has directed his gaze at U.S. anthropology—its departments, graduate training programs, and professional meetings, comparing American Anthropological Association (AAA) meetings to those of the Pan-African Anthropological Association. Drawing on journals he has kept since his years as a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, his project is a provocative and courageous *anthropology of anthropology*. This is the kind of research I have encouraged more of us to do in my own critical anthropology of anthropology, written from the vantage point of a racially marked and gendered "outsider within" the profession as it is constituted in the U.S. (Harrison, 2008). Unlike the late Nigerian-born educational anthropologist John Ogbu, whose career specialized in the study of American schools (namely, schools in which racial minorities predominated), Ntarangwi has not stuck to the tradition of "studying down" and studying exotics in U.S. society (e.g. ghettos, New Age religions, hippie communes, "deviants", etc.). Instead, he has directed his lens at middle class, largely European-descended American anthropologists who have historically and are still today inclined to study ethnographic others in Africa and other far-away places where they unwittingly (re)produce the power-mediated process of "nativizing" their research subjects, with all that concept traditionally implies (Appadurai, 1986). Whether rank and file anthropologists have grown with the disciplinary changes that have opened up space for Ntarangwi's project remains to be seen. Hopefully, there has been considerable progress since the visceral reactions and backlash against the role reversal that Christine Obbo (1990) attempted some two decades ago. She has related how some of her White American colleagues were indignant at the idea of her having the audacity to apply the anthropological method to study middle class White Americans. In their eyes, her project represented a quintessential status incongruity for which they were not yet emotionally or intellectually prepared.

Ntarangwi has gained from the momentum of growing numbers of American anthropologists working at home, sometimes out of financial or geopolitical necessity but



also increasingly because of a genuine intellectual interest in North American societies. The study of North America is clearly warranted if the comparative science of human commonality and variation is no longer restricting its scope to “primitive peoples” and “lesser civilizations”. This was the case for much of the discipline’s historical development within the broader division of labour among the social sciences and humanities. The status quo has now shifted, perhaps not radically, but it is shifting in promising ways. Ntarangwi takes the transformation of anthropology a step further with his reversed gaze, which follows one of the logical directions for the 21st century anthropology.

African, South Asian, East Asian, and Latin American anthropologists typically study their own societies or societies in the same general “culture area”. Within that context, they commonly study down rather than up the class, caste or ethnic hierarchy (Nader, 1969). In this way, they share a great deal in common with anthropologists who work in Anglo-North America and Europe—although this is changing as ethnographic analyses of middle classes, elites, science labs, and new computer-mediated technologies in communication and health become more of a trend. The horizon is opening up for more anthropologists to break out of the conventional mould. However, even with slightly reconfigured research landscapes, Southern anthropologists may retain their commitment to working in their home countries because of the priorities and choices they make. Those choices, however, are usually constrained by the structured access to resources in environments where “research [is often] driven by local or international donors”, which restrict what and where research is done and also the extent to which these anthropologists can “produce...contributions to ethnography... [and] comparative theory” (Ntarangwi, Babiker, and Mills, 2006: 37). This is a good part of the reason why anthropologists working in peripheral zones are rarely recognized as leading theorists or even innovative methodologists. Notwithstanding these difficult conditions, metropolitan anthropologists are not relieved of the responsibility of having to come to terms with the multiplicity of forms that theory and theorizing can assume. Despite the effects of a structurally enforced division of labour between metropolitan zones of theorizing and peripheral zones of data mining and descriptive analysis, the South does not suffer from an absence or dearth of theory if our lens allows us to discern it when it may be staring us in the face.

### III. World anthropologies and possibilities for intercultural dialogues

Recent trends in addressing these complex dynamics are evidenced in the “world anthropologies” endeavour (Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006) associated with *Red Antropologías del Mundo* or the World Anthropologies Network (RAN/WAN) and, at the level of



national/regional anthropological associations, the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). Arturo Escobar, Gustavo Lins Ribeiro, Marisol de la Cadena, and leaders of a growing list of anthropological associations around the world, including Junji Koizumi, Andrew “Mugsy” Spiegel, Thomas Reuter, Setha Low, and Paul Nkwi have collaborated in these efforts. Mwenda Ntarangwi, David Mills, and Mustafa Babiker (2006) have also addressed these issues from the perspective of African and Africanist anthropology.

The use of the word anthropology in plural form, expressed as “anthropology’s pluralities” in my own writing (Harrison, 2008: 27), emphasizes that the dominant North Atlantic expressions of the field are not the only significant discursive and institutional settings within which anthropological knowledge is produced or has been produced over the past century. Although this usage is also consistent with postmodernist and poststructuralist scepticism about totalizing narratives and discursive regimes, in my view the language appropriately highlights the empirical reality of the pluralist development of the discipline of anthropology across a global terrain where multiple varieties of anthropological inquiry and institutional formations have unfolded within historically-specific national and regional contexts.

Emphasizing the differences and tensions among anthropology’s discursive and institutional complexes may run the risk of overstating the extent to which national anthropologies are actually distinct in a context in which ideas, cultures, societies and nations are not and have never been separated by impermeable, fixed boundaries (Ntarangwi, personal communication, 2008). On the other hand, acknowledging differences need not divert us from recognizing and building upon what we share in common. At the current historical moment, the four-field professionalization of the discipline in the U.S. is under threat in some quarters. Also, debates on competing theoretical and methodological proclivities, informed to a great extent by the impact of the “postmodernist turn”, have polarized many anthropologists into opposing camps of “scientists” and “anti-scientists”. This is an antinomy or dichotomy that, in my view, oversimplifies complex issues and erroneously homogenizes the two categories. In this context, any further fragmentation or proliferation of difference on any level may appear to contribute to the disintegration of the discipline from some anthropologists’ perceptions.

The proponents of world anthropologies, however, underscore the importance of forging more open, inclusive, and intercultural spaces for dialogue, debate, and producing new knowledge that emerges from cross-fertilizations situated on a democratically reconfigured playing field. Under these more ideal conditions, the anthropology, or

anthropologies, if you prefer, of the North Atlantic can undergo decentring, and the logics of decentring and its related dispersal of authority and sharing of power can be encapsulated both within and among the various anthropologies. Of course, this is much easier said than done in the concrete. Nonetheless, it is a constructive exercise to imagine a more levelled playing field that can potentially be conducive to more equal exchanges and coalitions of knowledges, including those initiated through South-South interactions without the mediation of Northern actors and institutions. The erosion of Northern mediation does not preclude the participation of North Atlantic or Western anthropologists. In fact, the pluralist, diversalist model described in Ribeiro and Escobar's introductory essay in *World Anthropologies* (2006: 5) advocates inclusiveness as a matter of principle.

Since its official founding in 1948, the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) (which in 1968 merged with the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences [ICAES], established in 1934) has provided an important forum for the international exchange of anthropological knowledge. Today it presents us with the challenge and the opportunity to claim the spaces its congresses, inter-congresses, and commissions present to do the hard, collective work of building new kinds of relationships and coalitions of knowledge. This will allow diverse anthropologists and anthropologies to interact and weave productive "webs of connection" (Haraway, 1988) for a world anthropology built on common ground. For such a united front to emerge, the discipline's pluralities must be remapped in ways that are no longer translatable in terms of centre-periphery dichotomies (Harrison, 2008: 27). The critical and creative reintegration required to achieve or approximate this outcome entails both intellectual and organizational work. Moreover, for the restructuring of our interactions and exchanges to have legitimacy both within and beyond communities of anthropologists, we must engage the urgent issues that concern and affect our various publics around the world.

#### IV. Remapping and reworking anthropology

In thinking about centres and peripheries in anthropology, we must understand that the discipline's margins are not only located in the geographical South. There are peripheries in the North just as there are centres often organized around transnational elites in the Global South. The centres in much of the South are subordinated too, but in many cases aligned with Northern centres (Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006). Such alignments provide circuits of communication, transaction, and mobility that are much less accessible in peripheral institutions—the South's south, so to speak. *The centre-periphery nexus must be understood as a relation of power and structural disparities that exist at different levels and in different*



*modalities across anthropological landscapes.* Accordingly, in order to undertake a cartography of centres and peripheries, we must locate or situate them within a complex matrix of intersecting and fluid hierarchies of regions, nations, universities, peoples, genders, classes, races, castes, and cultures.

Some of my colleagues and I have devoted much of our careers to doing some of this mapping, particularly as it relates to the intellectual life and history of anthropology in the Afro-Atlantic world (Baker, 1998; Harrison, 2008; Yelvington, 2006). Mapping leads to the serious exercise of *remapping* connections and entanglements that have been rendered invisible when observed through a conventional prism or lens. Remapping entails shedding light on and building a repertoire of conceptual, theoretical, methodological tools from what would otherwise remain unseen, unknown, and unexplored. I characterize my project as one of weaving and producing new syntheses from the most useful elements that can be drawn from both the canon and knowledge that has been excluded from it.

To prepare me for this project long before I realized its significance, I had the good fortune of belonging to a heterogeneous intergenerational intellectual social formation (Yelvington, 2006: 67) made up of teachers, students, and colleagues. They have collectively made me acutely aware that anthropology cannot and should not be reduced to or defined by its most hegemonic expressions and institutional clusters. Intellectual production outside the disciplinary mainstream is often a source of critically creative theoretical, methodological, and substantive knowledge worthy of being critically engaged and reworked.

My understanding of what I call *reworking* anthropology has evolved over the course of my career. I began my preparation for becoming an anthropological weaver early in my career. It was as an undergraduate student that I learned that I would not be exposed to the work of African American or other African diasporic anthropologists through the anthropology department's formal curriculum as it existed at that time, even in departments that were receptive to some degree of domestic and international diversity. I received some exposure to authors and ideas that had been erased from anthropology's core (e.g. Zora Neale Hurston's books) in an ethnic studies, specifically Black studies, program established only two or three years earlier as an academic response to the mass social movement for African Americans' freedom, equality and civil rights.

This basic pattern was then repeated in my graduate studies, where I was, however, exposed to a wealth of heterodox knowledge through a few courses but mainly through extracurricular interactions with an interdisciplinary group of diverse faculty and graduate students. One of the most influential persons whom I encountered during that formative



period was the late St.Clair Drake (1980), an erudite, encyclopaedic Pan-Africanist anthropologist whose seminal writings on the history and politics of anthropology as they related to the African World made an indelible impression on me. From his seminal writings and *counter-storytelling*, I learned about anthropological and ethnological histories that drew upon yet built their own momentum apart from metropolitan centres. Now decades later, the community of scholars interested in these histories and their present-day legacies has expanded (e.g., Yelvington, 2006). Because of this growing body of knowledge, we now understand more clearly that canonical figures such as Franz Boas and Melville Herskovits in the U.S. were embedded in networks of unequal exchange with American Indian, African American, Cuban, Haitian, Brazilian, African, and other ethnologists, whose scholarship was peripheralized within the prevailing structures of difference, inequality, and power. Because of recent research designed to unbury and recuperate these latter figures, it is now possible for anthropologists and their students to become acquainted with, unpack and remap anthropology's historically contingent peripheral zones.

My earliest remapping attempts addressed the politics of peripheralization within U.S. urban studies and urban anthropology. These interrelated fields of specialization neglected to bring into the disciplinary picture prominent African American and African Caribbean social scientists such as W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cromwell Cox, and, within anthropology, Allison Davis and his protégé St. Clair Drake, who was my teacher. Davis, Drake, and other early antiracist and anticolonial anthropologists in the U.S. were influenced as much by Du Bois as Franz Boas. The Du Boisian legacy is now a focus of attention in the history of anthropology (Harrison, 1992; Baker, 1998; Carbonella and Kasmir, 2008).

The next step I followed was to conceptualize the parameters for *decolonizing anthropology* (Harrison, 2010 [1991, 1997]) more generally, not just in the study of the African diaspora or "Black folk here and there" (which is the title of Drake's [1987, 1990] final book in two volumes). My approach to the decolonization of anthropological knowledge, articulated initially in the early 1990s, challenged the pervasive reification of Otherness in anthropology; it also problematized the dichotomy between basic and applied research; and urged that more ethnographers move beyond preoccupations with textual strategies for "writing culture" (Clifford and Marcus, 1986), so that they can translate the concepts of dialogue and multivocality into concrete goals for research practice. I underscored the importance of producing and legitimating theory formulated from perspectives and lived experiences within peripheral zones and of the need to create conditions for having more productive dialogues and reconciliations between what were commonly labelled then as "First and Third World" intellectuals. I assumed that through

reconciliation, cross-fertilization and intercultural convergence could potentially engender new forms of knowledge or intellectual “creolization”. I was aware that reconciliation was easier said than done, and pointed out that: “[t]he political authority structure and the political economy of professional anthropology must be seriously dealt with and changed before conditions can exist [so that]... Western and non-Western anthropologists can truly work together as partners with equalized access to institutional resources and power” (Harrison, 2010 [1991]: 10). A final issue raised in *Decolonizing Anthropology* was the danger of the epistemic scepticism and explanatory agnosticism found in the most radically relativist tendency within postmodernism (Harrison, 2008: 27; Shaw, 1995).

Originally, my critique was primarily focused on challenging and finding a way out of the particular hierarchies and power dynamics constraining the democratization of dialogic spaces within U.S. anthropology. However, my focus later shifted to a much wider terrain. My work within the IUAES, especially at the commission level, is in good part responsible for the expanded and enhanced view of anthropology’s possibilities that I have been able to develop. I have attempted to articulate this vision in more recent work (Harrison, 2008) in which I present a multidimensional framework for a critical project that reworks the best elements and practices within anthropology. Through the collective pursuit of several interrelated objectives, outcomes may be achieved that lead to a more inclusive anthropology. Ideally, this would be an anthropology in which the dominance of North Atlantic epistemologies and organizational power would erode as more anthropologists rise to the challenge of transcending the limits of prevailing racial, gender, class, and national hierarchies.

As I have delineated in *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age* (Harrison, 2008), the several interrelated objectives that may potentially contribute to the reconfiguration of the disciplinary field are: 1) the rehistoricization of anthropology, both the researchers and those researched; 2) the rethinking of theory, what it entails, who are authorized to formulate it, and which formulations are acknowledged and valued; 3) exploring the cross-pollinating potential of both intradisciplinarity (dialogues across subfield boundaries) and interdisciplinarity; 4) creatively facing the challenges of ethically and politically responsible research; 5) mapping connections among local and supralocal spheres of culture, power, and political economy as they are realigned and restructured in the age of neoliberal globalization; 6) interrogating the ways anthropology is and could or should be practiced within academic and non-academic settings; 7) promoting greater cultural and epistemic diversity within the profession and deepening the democratization of participation and decision-making through professional activism; 8) finding more effective



ways to link academic pursuits to urgent issues of public engagement; and 9) developing a commitment to decentring hegemonic epistemologies and to promoting genuinely pluricultural and, eventually, *intercultural* dialogues.

This model building and strategic plan for reworking anthropology have been informed and driven by my experiences as an anthropologist who is a racially-marked woman socially positioned to view anthropology and the world that anthropologists study from a particular set of angles. I have attempted to offset the limitations of my vantage point by situating my work in what Donna Haraway (1988) has described as a “web of connection” that bridges a multiplicity of “partial perspectives” in hopes of achieving a more comprehensive and multifocal understanding of ourselves and others in the world. The past 16 years of working with the IUAES Commission on the Anthropology of Women has helped me build an international network that has been integral to my professional identity and *raison d’être* as an anthropologist.

My perspective is grounded in the complex social facts that condition my struggle to “live in the West with ‘other-than-Western eyes’”, as American feminist political theorist Zillah Eisenstein (2004: 115) has characterized the double (and sometimes multiple) consciousness that W.E.B. Du Bois (1961) formulated in his 1903 *Souls of Black Folk*. For more than a century, the notion of double consciousness has resonated deeply with thinkers and politicians working within peripheral zones of theory and practice. Feminists have been among them, especially those who have become cognizant of how enormously “racialized and gendered bodies matter” and how interlocking inequalities of gender, class, race, nation, and transnational positioning operate at the very heart of the global system (Harrison, 2010: 3).

The more we come to understand the multiple dimensions of difference, inequality, and power that shape who we are as individual anthropologists and members of larger “intellectual social formations” (Yelvington, 2006: 67), the greater the vision of inclusiveness we bring into our theory and practice, into our “re-visionings” of what is possible to achieve in democratic intercultural spaces of concerted action (Eisenstein, 2004: 114). I think that significant re-visionings and decolonizing disciplinary practices can be achieved within the IUAES, provided that we effectively rework anthropology by, among other things, remapping and troubling the boundaries of its peripheries and centres—wherever they are. Another cartography and knowledge are possible (Santos, 2008).

## References

- Appadurai, Arjun (1986) ‘Theory in anthropology: Center and periphery.’ In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 356-361.



- (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baker, Lee D. (1998) *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carbonella, August and Sharryn Kasmir (2008) 'W.E.B. Du Bois' *Darkwater* and an anticolonial, internationalist anthropology.' In: *Dialectical Anthropology*, vol. 32, No. 1-2, pp. 113-121.
- Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds.) (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, Raewyn (2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity.
- De Gabineau, Arthur (1915 [1853-1855]) *Essay on the Inequality of Races*. Translated by Adrian Collins. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Diggs, E. Irene (no date) Du Bois' Contribution to Anthropology and Scholarship. Unpublished manuscript.
- Dominguez, Virginia (1994) "A taste for the 'Other': Intellectual complicity in racializing practices." In: *Current Anthropology*, vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 333-348.
- Drake, St. Clair (1980) 'Anthropology and the Black experience.' In: *Black Scholar*, vol. 11, No. 7, pp. 2-31.
- (1987) *Black Folk Here and There: An Essay in History and Anthropology*. vol. 1. Los Angeles: Center for African American Studies, University of California at Los Angeles.
- (1990) *Black Folk Here and There: An Essay in History and Anthropology*. vol. 2. Los Angeles: Center for African American Studies, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1961 [1903]) *Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Fawcett.
- Eisenstein, Zillah (2004) *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racisms, and the West*. London: Zed Books.
- Firmin, Anténor (2002 [1885]) *The Equality of the Human Races*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- García Canclini, Nestor (2004) *Diferentes, Desiguales, y Desconectados: Mapas de la Interculturalidad*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Green, Dan S. and Edwin D. Driver (1976) 'W.E.B. Du Bois: A case in the sociology of sociological negation.' In: *Phylon*, vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 308-342.
- Haraway, Donna (1988) 'situated knowledge: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective.' In: *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 575-599.
- Harrison, Faye V. (1988) 'Introduction: An African Diaspora perspective for urban

- anthropology.' In 'Black Folks in Cities Here and There,' special issue. In: *Urban Anthropology*, vol. 17, No. 2-3, pp. 111-141.
- (1992) 'The Du Boisian legacy in anthropology: W.E.B. Du Bois and anthropology, special issue.' In: *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 239-260.
- (2008) *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- (ed.) (2010 [1991]) *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation*. Third edition. Arlington: American Anthropological Association.
- Harrison, Ira E. and Faye V. Harrison (eds.) (1999) *African-American Pioneers in Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Jones, Delmos (1970) 'Towards a native anthropology.' In: *Human Organization*, vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 251-259.
- Jordan, Glenn H. (1982) *Reading St. Clair Drake: A Methodological Essay with a Focus on Black Metropolis*. Urbana: Afro-Scholar Working Papers. Afro-American Studies and Research Program, University of Illinois.
- Mafeje, Archie (1998) 'Anthropology and independent Africans: Suicide or end of an era?' In: *African Sociological Review*, vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1-43.
- Nader, Laura (1969) 'Up the anthropologist: Perspectives gained from studying up.' In: Dell Hymes (ed.), *Reinventing Anthropology*, pp. 284-311. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ntarangwi, Mwenda (2010) *Reversed Gaze: An African Ethnography of American Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ntarangwi, Mwenda, David Mills and Mustafa Babiker (eds.) (2006) *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*. Dakar: COESRIA and London: Zed Books.
- Nyamnjoh, Francis B. (2004) 'From publish or perish to publish and perish: What 'Africa's 100 best books' tell us about publishing Africa.' In: *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 331-355.
- Obbo, Christine (1990) 'Adventures with fieldnotes.' In: Roger Sanjek (ed.), *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, pp. 290-300. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Price-Mars, Jean (1983[1928]) *So Spoke the Uncle (Ainsi Parla l'Oncle)*. Translated by Magdaline W. Shannon. Washington, D.C.: Three Continents Press.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins and Arturo Escobar (eds.) (2006) *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Roumain, Jacques (1978[1944]) *Masters of the Dew (Gouverneurs de la Rosée)*. Translated

- by Langston Hughes and Mercer Cook. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Sanjek, Roger (ed.) (1990) *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (ed.) (2008) *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*. London: Verso.
- Shaw, Carolyn Martin (1995) *Colonial Inscriptions: Race, Sex, and Class in Kenya*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schmidt, Peter (ed.) (2009) *Postcolonial Archaeologies in Africa*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Taylor, Council (1971) 'Clues for the future: Black urban anthropology reconsidered.' In: Peter Orleans and William R. Ellis, Jr. (eds.), *Race, Change, and Urban Society*, pp. 219-227. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (2000) *Haiti, State against Nation: Origins and Legacy of Duvalierism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ulysse, Gina Athena (2007) *Downtown Ladies: Informal Commercial Importers, a Haitian Anthropologist, and Self-Making in Jamaica*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vincent, Joan (1991) 'Engaging historicism.' In: Richard Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology*, pp. 45-58. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press (now School for Advanced Research Press).
- Yelvington, Kevin (2006) 'The invention of Africa in Latin America and the Caribbean.' In: K. Yelvington (ed.), *Afro-Atlantic Dialogues: Anthropology in the Diaspora*, pp. 35-82. Santa Fe: School of Advanced Research (SAR) Press.