THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE WORLD ANTHROPOLOGY NETWORK (WAN): AN ANALYSIS OF ITS GOALS AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Dong Heug Kim*

Abstract:

This essay examines the emerging World Anthropologies Network (WAN) as a global, plural, and open-ended project whose objective is to critique and reconsider the hegemonizing tendencies of mainstream Anthropology in a broader theoretical perspective. Specifically, the WAN collective is dedicated towards the inclusion of lesser-known but equally important local anthropological traditions in the anthropological discipline as a whole. It is my intention to look at the main theoretical debates surrounding the constructed dialogues within this network and how these discourses eventually permeate outwards, reaching the sphere of anthropology at large. The politics of anthropology as a whole is of crucial importance in this discussion, for the WAN project seeks to redimension anthropology and anthropological scholarship as a multi-faceted, pluralistic practice open to other non-conventionalized forms of knowledge and knowledge-production. This vision of less exclusivity and greater inclusiveness argues for a self-conscious re-evaluation of anthropology on a global scale, emphasizing the need to reconcile the divergences in power and authority that certain dominant mainstream anthropologies have over more peripheral, marginalized ones.

Introduction

In retrospect, it is fair to say that anthropology has gone through some major transformations in its theoretical orientations and epistemologically-grounded basis. Several paradigm shifts occurred in different periods since its first inception as a discipline committed to the study of mankind. With the benefit of hindsight, it is opportune to make some deliberations concerning the development and establishment of a seemingly coherent, metropolitan discipline of anthropology. It is no strange fact that anthropology is reputed to be essentially a Western-form of practice, based originally on Western ideals of progress, modernity and development that have in turn inscribed a Western cosmology of thought patterns and knowledge-production methods within the discipline. Within the sustained growth of the discipline, Escobar notes that, "anthropology has failed to construct a politics that problematizes this dependence and the relationship between the knowledge that it makes possible and the social positioning from which it operates and which it tends to reinforce" (Escobar, 1992:28).

Nevertheless, the political landscape that shapes and forms a demarcated anthropological field of practice has been a contested area, challenged by certain paradigmatic elements of great relevance. Some of the most influential and deeply resonant shifts that have offset and critiqued anthropology's systematic dependence on Western forms of knowledge-production are post-modernism, post-colonial and subaltern studies, as well as the call for a 'native anthropology.' These historical patterns have, in their own ways, contributed to a re-evaluation of anthropology and anthropology's Western epistemological

basis. Presently, with the emergence of a heightened globalization rhetoric, a new set of forces have come to the forefront to enable the formation of a unique opportunity structure that allows for the reconsideration of anthropology on a global, non-localized level. It is precisely within this moment in the relations between anthropology and globalization that a reconsideration of the discipline is being made from within by the collective organization known as the World Anthropologies Network (WAN).

In this essay, I wish to situate this emerging collective network in the context of larger developments that have instituted an unequal dynamic between localized forms of anthropological traditions such that a growing disparity between rich and poor has surfaced even within academia. Within this peculiar framework, it will be important to look at the various pronouncements that the WAN collective makes on changing these dynamics with particular attention to the inherent rhetorical strategies present within these conversations.

The World Anthropology Network (WAN) Collective

The WAN collective is an ensemble of intellectuals and non, whose aim is to orchestrate a reconsideration of the normalizing practices and standardizing influences that a dominant hegemonic anthropology enacts on local forms of knowledge production.[1] The collective movement takes its impetus to generate a constructive critique from Appadurai's observation of a growing disparity between an 'anthropology of globalization' and a 'globalization of anthropology.' This marked divide is appropriated by WAN to construct a basic framework for their claims towards a rapprochement with the various anthropologies. The network's vocation is to create a constructive space in which such a disjuncture between globalization and anthropology can be reconsidered, negotiated and actively responded to. This constructive space is bound by a set of prerogatives that combine both theory and practice meaning that, the WAN collective is not merely focused on a theoretical reconsideration of anthropology. Rather, the fundamental theoretical developments that WAN is actively engaged with are also accompanied by a set of proposals aimed at changing the way in which anthropological practices are carried out as well (such as the implications behind 'doing fieldwork' and the expansion of the conclave-nature of certain epistemic communities to include non-academics and other cultural informants). Before looking at both the theoretical debates and the proposal to revise these standardized forms of practice, it is important to situate the WAN project in its appropriate context, namely that of a heightened stage of globalization.

The Globalization Rhetoric

The era of globalization is heralded by many as an entirely novel phase in the way social relationships, networks and linkages are established among a variety of actors and agents. Transcending the local, larger forces (those of globalization) are keen on opening up frontiers and borders liberating those whose identities were relegated to local sites of imprisonment. Although it is not the intention here to espouse the multitude of views and opinions regarding globalization and its various discourses, it is enough for purposes of analysis to restate in a generic fashion what has been commonly said about globalization from an an-

thropological perspective. Namely, globalization is described as a process involving new agents of power and a new set of channels that connect distant places and peoples. Taking advantage of the advent of new information technologies, one of the defining characteristics of this age of globalization is the empowerment of local actors and the ability to contest the inherent sovereignty of the state and the institutions working within it. This has given rise to a heretofore-unknown area of development, the transnational arena of collective activism, which brings together participants as diverse as the countries and territories on the world map. This sphere of collective action, mobilizing around a common campaign, is indicative of the grassroots movements and forms of resistance that comprise just one of many agents involved in the interplay of the global arena. Yet, transnational coalitions, social movements and advocacy networks are all emergent properties provided by the favorable conditions of globalization and the skillful appropriation of this emerging political opportunity structure has led to their continued existence and eventual proliferation.

The WAN collective embodies some of the characteristics found in transnational social movements, organizations and advocacy networks. In some ways, it could even be considered as a self-proclaimed transnational movement that is conscious of its own formation processes, as a network that comprises both scholars and academics. An important insight that needs to be made on the formation of WAN is that its emergence is consolidated, if not outright based on the globalization rhetoric prevalent in anthropological discourse. By calling attention to the various 'anthroscapes' that travel from one region to another, WAN employs a language of plurality that is much en vogue in current anthropological debates concerning globalization.[2] In order to gain legitimacy as an emerging movement aimed at pluralizing the hegemonic tendencies prevalent in the anthropological theory and practice, the WAN collective will have to pay close attention to avoid becoming a standardized form of knowledge-production inspired by a heightened awareness of globalization. Thus, it remains to be seen whether or not WAN will be able to move beyond anthropologically accepted norms and ultimately create a new discursive space that is sensitive to local, more peripheral anthropologies.

Mainstream Anthropology and its discontents

How do we account for these disparities of power? How is it that a mainstream (American or Western) anthropological tradition holds so much sway over other regional anthropologies? One set of answers to these questions can be found within the WAN collective, which in its very essence is a critique of the unequal power relations that exist between a 'mainstream anthropology' and its localized counterparts. Taking inspiration from Gramsci's notion of hegemony and Foucault's idea of totalitarian power, proponents of WAN call attention to the disparities in weight, power and status that are attributed to various anthropological traditions. WAN is aptly critical of the favorable position enjoyed by certain anthropological traditions, not because of their uniqueness and novelty in the ideas that they espouse, but because of their ability to marginalize and lessen to a considerable extent the work that is carried out in other traditions. The resulting interplay between these various anthropological traditions can rarely be described as egalitarian, and it undoubtedly pass as naïve to think that such is the product of random, unplanned forms of action. These dominant anthropologies are described with various terminologies, such as hegemonic anthropology, mainstream anthropology and anthropologies of the North versus anthropologies of the South (Krotz, 1997). Such terms are synonymous with one another in the various dualism that they present

and yet, WAN's critique of these dominant anthropologies unleashes, once again, a persistent language of globalization, a language that is not territory-based and one that resounds with a totalitarian view of 'Empire.' Stated differently, proponents of WAN argue that the standardizing influences of a dominant 'mainstream anthropology' is not based exclusively on the unequal relations between national anthropological traditions, but rather they assert that this relationship is also inclusive of other, more important global dimensions.

The WAN collective defines hegemonic 'mainstream anthropology' as a tradition that leans towards exclusivity, based upon certain centers of power that have maintained a leading role due to a favorable set of historical circumstances. Upon further analysis it can be discerned that the centers of 'mainstream anthropology' are not exclusively American, European, or First-World anthropological canons and traditions (WAN Collective, 2001). Rather, these hegemonies take shape in other locales as well, such as in metropolitan centers in the Third-World that are able to appropriate these standardizing influences to suit their own purposes of power and hegemony. Furthermore, it must be noted that the disparity between 'mainstream' and 'out-of-stream' anthropology is not based on just a singular 'mainstream anthropology' versus various local anthropologies. In the language of globalization, this disparity is seen to occur between multiple sites of domination that can be both in the metropolitan West and in regions delineated as peripheral.

The demarcation of dominant anthropologies versus local, marginalized anthropological traditions leave much room for further analysis and debate. First and foremost, the theoretical debates that proponents of WAN bring up in regards to the influential, dominant anthropology are not essentially new in character. Such claims, as proponents of WAN duly note, have been in the making for several decades within the discipline, often disguised under various rubrics such as 'native anthropology' and 'anthropology of the South' (Krutz, 1997 and Narayan, 1995). While past attempts to criticize dominant forms of anthropological though and practice have not been so successful -an example being the native anthropological perspective which claims that a native insider is the only one capable of seeing the essence of his/her native culture, falling in the common trap of established dualities between us and them, First-World and Third-World - the current effort made by the WAN project goes beyond such dualities by adopting a larger perspective of pluralism in the form of a plurality or multitude of visions.[3]

Mainstream hegemonic anthropologies are defined as 'the set of discursive formations and institutional practices associated with the normalization of academic anthropology' (Escobar and Ribeiro). The history of the formation of worldwide, country-based anthropologies is a problematic issue that is considered by those participating in the WAN project. In the international symposium organized by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar entitled, 'World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power,' the main focus of the conference was to recapitulate the question of what makes certain anthropologies more dominant than others. The symposium brought together anthropologists from various regions and each one was able to contribute his or her own perspective on the development of regional, country-based anthropologies. The historical circumstances of empire building, nation-state formation were both delineated with a development of national anthropological traditions. Many examples were brought forth in the

symposium including examples from China, Japan, Mexico and Peru. In all of these regional developments, the common experience of the formation of national anthropologies was based, according to the participants of the symposium, on the discipline's embeddedness within processes of empire and nation building. What is important to note in this observation is how a mainstream anthropology is conceptually defined. Unlike previous dualities such as the ones found in 'native anthropology,' participants of the WAN-sponsored symposium noted how mainstream anthropologies were in the making in regional, somewhat autonomous ventures and developments. In other words, multiple strands of a dominant anthropology were in the making and this was initiated with the advent of regional anthropologies in the past century, particularly after World War II when these regional anthropologies and their formation were embedded within processes of modernity, nation building and colonial projects.

By this token, 'mainstream anthropology' finds its basis across multiple locales and consequently, WAN presses for a re-consideration of the relations between these centers of power and the subjugated, marginalized anthropologies that lie at the fringes of the discipline. WAN's critique of a 'mainstream anthropology' is two-fold: there is the dynamic opposition of Western hegemonic anthropologies (predominantly U.S. and British anthropology) versus other national anthropologies and secondly, within each national setting, the disparity in power and authority between a centralized mode of anthropological practice versus more subordinated, marginalized schools and traditions. In order to break this multiple divide, proponents of WAN have coalesced on a transnational dimension with each one bringing his or her own region-based perspective to the forefront. The broad concept of a 'mainstream anthropology' and the fact that participants of WAN come from various schools of anthropological traditions invites us to make certain considerations. To begin with, it is almost self-evident that the WAN collective is made up of intellectuals that are embedded within a greater scheme of power relations between dominant and subservient anthropologies. The WAN collective brings together academics from the First World (U.S. and Europe) and academics from other regions that do not enjoy the same amount of prominence in the anthropological world-map (such as Brazil, Colombia and Japan).

In response to this, WAN brings to the debate the objection that identities are not singular but formed and constituted by a set of 'multiplex subjectivities' (Narayan 1995). This is also the case for anthropologists and anthropologies that are deemed transnational. By asserting that, 'most anthropologies have always been transnational, even diasporic…and transnationalism has been an important dimension of power in anthropology' (Escobar and Ribeiro, p. 7), WAN argues that internal as well as external dynamics have developed that contains both repressive and liberating structures. In other words, singular tendencies that give rise to a dominant mainstream anthropology are in opposition to counter-tendencies that have worked to differentiate and pluralize regional anthropologies. This latter set of opposing forces is what WAN calls particular attention to and there is a consensus on the belief that this transnational dimension can work to ensue a greater dynamic between those situated within mainstream anthropology and those that are somewhat in the margins.

WAN's self-conscious formation as a movement and network that aims to appease the disparity in power and status between anthropologies creates quite a trivial, perplexing situation. This situation can be further elucidated if we consider a set of questions that seem quite relevant. The question that I wish to bring forth is the following: How does the WAN collective situate itself within this anthropological divide, taking into account the fact that

exponents of this project are distinguished professors working within such dominant frameworks of anthropology?

Although not everyone supporting the WAN project works within such a 'mainstream academia,' most if not all of the proponents hold important positions in national universities within their own countries of appartenance. This raises another set of problematic issues, which will be elaborated in due course. However for the present, it is important to begin looking at the ways in which WAN is able to engage dynamically with its own subjective constituencies and identity politics. While conducting preliminary research into the WAN project, it was important for me to collect personal views and opinions from the various proponents of this collective organization. Marisol de la Cadena and Eduardo Restrepo were kind enough to provide me with some valuable feedback.[4] Both of them argue that the WAN project should not be considered as a movement that tends to break away from the larger discipline of anthropology. They aptly note that along with their colleagues, WAN-based intellectuals are embedded in their own subjectivities within the so-called 'mainstream academia.' Professor Restrepo goes on to state that a significant aspect of the WAN project is to redefine the participants own 'subjectivities and practices in their concrete contexts, beyond what mainstream anthropology does or says about them.' In other words, a self-conscious reappraisal with the discipline's own methods is what WAN tries to embody by its emergence as a collective movement whose force comes from the strands within dominant anthropological circles.

One of the main objectives of the WAN project is to challenge the taken-for-granted, favorable position of dominant anthropology. This is carried out in an indirect fashion by gaining consistency internally within the grounds of its own constituent elements rather than on insisting on providing a set of guidelines for how anthropology 'ought to be.' Before WAN is able to establish itself as a self-sufficient, legitimate and sound network that advocates for 'planetary modes of inquiry,' a major hurdle within the structure of the network will have to be overcome. This obstacle is encountered as part of a continuous, unresolved theoretical debate regarding the persistent divide between centers and peripheries in the anthropological traditions. This divide is inclusive of three major oppositions and they are based on an overarching, incumbent First-world mainstream anthropology versus 'out-of-stream' regional/national anthropologies, a mainstream national anthropology that is present within these regional centers versus marginalized lesser known, more peripheral anthropologies and transitively, the divide between First-world and further peripheralized, local anthropologies. This divide exists between dominant anthropologies and also within regional centers; an example being the dominant position that the AAA (American Anthropological Association) enjoys over other national associations and the innate hierarchies that exist within such national organizations.

In order for WAN to actively engage and possibly change the power relationships inherent in these sets of oppositions, the transnational dimension that WAN advocates must take due notice and be carefully aligned with regional and sub-regional developments. WAN does call for an indirect re-evaluation of these hegemonies by calling for a horizontal, non-hierarchical association between members of the academy and in light of this, it is important to note that subjectivities and their embedded nature within a greater scheme of power relations must be cognizant of their own position in the anthropological world map. For

WAN to gain legitimacy and to pursue the role of being a transnational collective movement, proponents of WAN will have to note that collective action cannot take place by incorporating a transnational dimension to an already present local movement, precisely because hegemony is so diffused and totalitarian. Centers of anthropological traditions are already undermined by a hegemonic dominant anthropology and furthermore, peripheries within these centers of power are involved in a process of discursive argumentation with regional centers as well as with the more dominant mainstream anthropological centers that diffuse their influence from outside national confines. WAN tries to subsume and undermine this problematic division by appealing to a transnational dimension under the rubric of 'planetary modes of inquiry.'

Planetary Modes of Inquiry

The push for plural 'planetary modes of inquiry' is the second, most prominent feature espoused by the WAN collective. This is connected to the re-evaluation of where anthropology stands on a global level in that the WAN project considers local forms of knowledge and knowledge production just as important as those produced at the centers of the discipline. These modes of inquiry are inclusive of a variety of methods and research processes. By introducing the idea of 'planetary modes of inquiry,' WAN attempts to introduce a creative aspect that moves beyond the common boundaries of anthropology and anthropological practice. On a theoretical level, WAN is concerned with bridging the existent divide between those that hold pen and pencil and carry out research and those that lend their voices as cultural informants. WAN believes that the relationship fostered between the researcher and the informant is, in and of itself, a specific cultural process, just one of the many available paths leading to the production of knowledge. The lack of attention paid to this detail by a dominant anthropology has, according to WAN, given rise to a 'sense in which anthropology in the dominant centers is still produced by "us" about "them"-while simultaneously producing a "planetary effect," that creates an impression of being global (WAN Collective, 2001). The divide between subject-object, transcriber-narrator that constitutes one of the most important frameworks on which anthropology has developed as a discipline is called into question because it not only subordinates the position of those providing testimonies but, more importantly, it shuts away other possible areas and ways to conduct sound, anthropological research. The production of knowledge should not limit itself to conventional means and methods conforming to rigorous academic standards, but it should be more attuned to emerging actors within a transnational space. Such spaces are inclusive but not confined to subaltern sites in which local groups such as NGOs, social movements, epistemic and non-academic communities may participate in the production of cultural knowledge.

'From a WAN perspective, there are also other aspects to be considered, including the question of non-academic and non-anthropological work on culture. An important feature of the resistance to a normative anthropology is that within the spheres of subaltern anthropologies, academia is often times only one among many sites of knowledge production. Similarly, being an academic is only one among many possible modes of being an intellectual. This feature, which we believe distinguishes dominant and subaltern anthropologies (at all levels) is central to our argument and should constitute a crucial property of the network' (WAN Collective 2001).

The assertions of this project may seem bond and aspiring towards a utopian vision, however the political dimension that it raises does in fact resonate with past efforts to pluralize anthropology. Such attempts that gained a period of prominence are inclusive of regional developments such as the emergence of South Asian Subaltern Studies, warranted by a rise in the interest in post-colonialism, and the creation of a new narrative genre, *Testimonio*, by non-academic Latin American intellectuals. WAN's proposed model of incorporating 'planetary modes of inquiry' is inclusive of such developments and it attempts to further interweave the connections between such regional claims on a transnational level. Incorporating non-academics within this discursive space is appealing on a theoretical level, and many would welcome such developments as liberating and potentially legitimizing their own work as non-academics. What remains to be seen is how this can be accomplished on a practical, physical level.

The World Anthropologies Network has been established to contest the conventional separation between theory and practice. It aims to accomplish this by going beyond the academia, beyond the limits of what is considered as such by creating an opportunity structure of inclusion rather than exclusion. Based on network theory, the WAN collective sees the possibilities of linking local regions, local actors and local initiatives on a non-hierarchical, horizontal plane of action. Egalitarianism, the possibility for equal opportunities and common aspirations are all part of a vocabulary that WAN is fully resonant with. It is my belief that most of the claims put forth by proponents of WAN are legitimate, well-articulated, and in need of greater consideration by others working in the field. Certainly, a reconsideration of who gets credit for research conducted, especially ethnographic research, in a host setting is always needed. This has been brought up before within the paradigm of a 'native anthropology' (Hussein and Helmer, 1980). WAN diverges from a native critique of the foreign ethnographer by its concern with the ascribed worth and value in the multitude of ways of conducting research, whether it is academic or not. However, the network has not provided for practical ways in which to bridge this problematic divide. The theoretical debates that it has set forth and opened are intended to be the basic framework in which this network plans to operate. On a practical level, the road ahead for WAN to implement this proposal is one with many possibilities and opportunities for change. Developments that have taken place until now have yielded a set of concrete (formal and informal) events, and a network has already been established, which is in need of growth and expansion, between academics (academics and non), cultural informants, and other subjectivities from both the centers and peripheries of a mainstream anthropology.

Concluding Remarks

The WAN collective, established on the subaltern side of the debate concerning a hegemonic anthropology, risks of becoming engulfed, or as Prof Restrepo put it, 'cannibalized' by a dominant anthropological tradition. Taking this into consideration, in order for it to gain a greater sense of authority and legitimacy, it will need to redefine its own position vis-à-vis mainstream anthropology. Globalization and the language it espouses has a certain fashionable appeal, and WAN does benefit considerably by taking use of its empowering and liberating language. The transnational dimension that links the various adherents of WAN provides a certain leverage in promoting a plurality of visions. The multiple lens of a world anthropology are important in bringing about a change in how knowledge (in its wider sense) is produced and reproduced on a global scale.

Questioning the attributed worth of anthropological knowledge in such a global framework is an important aspect of challenging the existing hegemonies in a dominant anthropological tradition. Countering the hegemonic tendencies of mainstream anthropology, it is crucial for members of WAN to consider their own subjectivities within this matrix. Aligning themselves on the subaltern side, their vested authority is still present within their voices and by countering mainstream academia, by moving beyond the prescribed boundaries of the discipline, it will be essential for the WAN collective to situate their own individual identities within the discipline and its persisting traditions.

The call for a reconsideration of world anthropologies in terms of unequal power relations and hegemonic tendencies is most needed in today's globalized world. Specifically, WAN's provision for rethinking the politics of anthropology and anthropological practice urges for the establishment of greater affiliations and flows between consolidated and marginalized anthropological schools of thought. To illustrate this, I will cite an example from the South Korean case that affirms the continued existence of a disparity in weight, power and prestige between the various anthropological traditions. Korean anthropology is, on a comparative note, still in its infancy and it is progressively maturing to establish itself as a more renowned anthropological school in East Asia. From my own experiences here, without taking recourse to proper fieldwork notes and observations, it is my impression that the discipline relies heavily on the American anthropological tradition, primarily because it is ascribed with a certain status of novelty, which translates as being on the cutting-edge of research and applied methods. American anthropology has an enormous influence in present day anthropological studies, so that there is a sense, on the conscious level, to follow and keep up with the continuing tradition of American anthropology. To make this point even clearer, I can honestly say that most, if not all classes that teach anthropology or a specific branch of anthropology (anthropologic of politics, of religion, post-colonialism), rely solely on American textbooks and articles. There is an underlying implicit belief that the best way to teach anthropology is to adopt and use English-based texts that have been published in recent years. Rarely have I encountered original Korean texts that were not introductory texts to the field of anthropology written by Korean professors or that were translations of foreign, English-texts.

This contextual example illustrates one of the various causes of discontent that WAN emphasizes, namely that there is too much reliance on Western-based texts and authoritarian scholarship. There is no simple solution to the matter, for one cannot merely discredit American or English-based scholarly texts and stop using them. There is a subtler critical dimension that needs to be touched upon, and WAN has laid the first stepping-stone that hopefully will provide impetus for more considerations to be made in this direction.

Notes

* Department of Anthropology, Seoul National University

1. The WAN collective is an open-ended organization that adheres to a loosely defined principle of non-exclusivism. The WAN collective consists of Eduardo Archetti (University of Oslo), Eeva Berglund (Goldsmiths' College), Marison de la Cadena (UC-Davis), Arturo Escobar (UNC-Chapel Hill), Penelope Harvey (Manchester University), Susana Narotzky (Universitat de Barcelona), Eduardo Restrepo (ICANH-Colombia; UNC-Chapel Hill), Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (Universidad de Brasilia), Sandy Toussaint (University of Western Aus-

tralia) and the participants in the WAN Seminars (Fall 2002) at UNC-Chapel Hill and at the University of Brasilia.

2. Taking use of the various terminologies developed by Appadurai, I find this term 'anthroscapes' appropriate for several reasons. First, the term finds parallels with what Appadurai envisions as global flows of people, technologies, ideologies and so forth. The flow of world anthropologies that WAN strives to achieve should not be taken on just a physical landscape or dimension. These 'anthroscapes' intend to serve a political purpose by traveling across both physical and psychological space. By psychological space, I intend the more intimate space within each and every individual. The flow of a world anthropologies consciousness, beginning in this more intimate sphere, would serve the purpose of raising awareness and sympathy towards the cause that WAN actively supports. As a result of this, the hegemony that runs counter to the claims of the WAN collective would be criticized from within, and eventually spread outwards. Secondly, I find this term 'anthroscapes' to be an appropriate example of WAN's criticism of 'mainstream' anthropology's use and dissemination of fashionable terms and definitions. Thus I intend it to be taken as an ironic twist based on this form of criticism.

3. For a comprehensive analysis of the nativist claims behind a 'native anthropology,' see Narayan influential essay, 'How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?' The article by Fahim and Helmer, 'Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration' is of particular interest here for it provides a range of discourses that have been going on concerning the unequal divide between anthropologies in Western and non-Western contexts.

4. I have been in correspondence with Professor De la Cadena, Escobar, and Restrepo; and they were kind enough to provide me with some of their own insights on the WAN project. I asked them three questions that seemed relevant and they are stated as follows:
Firstly, without denying the novelty and originality behind WAN, I was wondering if you knew of any other such movements that have, either in the past or in recent times, formed outside of main anthropological circles. Secondly, how do you think WAN will be received by 'mainstream academia,' and in what way would 'mainstream anthropology' react to this type of network? Lastly, in what ways can WAN engage dynamically with 'mainstream academia' in such a way that WAN would benefit- without losing its scope of being an alternative, grassroots initiative- in providing flows between less pronounced local anthropologies and anthropologists?

References cited

Escobar, Arturo. 1992. "Imagining a post-development era? Critical thought, development, and social movements". *Social Text* 31-32: 20-56.

Fahim, Hussein and Katherine Helmer. 1980. "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration". *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 644-663.

Krotz, Esteban. 1997. "Anthropologies of the South. Their rising, their silencing, their characteristics". Critique of Anthropology 17(3): 237-251.

Narayan, Kirin. 1993. "How native is a 'native' anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95(3): 671-682.

Ribeiro, Gustavo and Arturo Escobar. 2003. "World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power". International Symposium #131 Report. http://www.wennergren.org/progisp131.html

Ribeiro, Gustavo and Arturo Escobar., ed. Forthcoming. "World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power". In World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power. Pp. 1-28. Berg Press.

WAN Collective. 2001. "*En-redarse*: A proposal for a World Anthropology/ies Network".UNC,ChapelHill,c.May.
http://www.unc.edu/depts/anthro/faculty/fac_pages/escobarpapers/escobarwan.pdf

WAN Collective. Forthcoming. "A Conversation about a World Anthropologies Network". *Social Anthropology.*