

## DISMANTLING ANTHROPOLOGY'S DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL PERIPHERIES

Faye V. Harrison

If, as Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2008) and others have argued, another knowledge or *other knowledges* are possible beyond the imperial gatekeeping of northern epistemologies, then anthropology as we know it must be decolonized and transformed (Harrison 2010 [1991]). A fuller understanding of these processes can be informed by taking theoretical trajectories within the southern hemisphere into serious consideration (e.g., Connell 2007, Nyamnjoh 2011). Social analysis and especially “theory from the south” (Comaroff & Comaroff 2012) have historically been relegated to the margins of established canons—whether in anthropology or any other field in the social sciences and humanities. However, there now appears to be growing interest in imagining an alternative status quo. This trend is reflected in recent conversations framed by the concerns of world social sciences (ISSR 2010) and, in the specific case of our discipline, world anthropologies (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006).

Granted, anthropology has come a long way since calls were issued to reinvent, recapture, and decolonize it, beginning at least four decades ago (e.g., Hymes 1972, Fox 1991, Harrison 2010[1991]). Nonetheless, Francis Nyamnjoh does us a timely service when he reminds us that even the most liberal anthropology, the beneficiary of some degree of reinvention, is still perceived negatively and “denounced . . . for its radical alterity and for talking without listening” (2011:702) to what subaltern, particularly African knowledge producers have to say. Even African intellectuals who appreciate the value of ethnography as a research methodology tend to distance themselves from anthropology. They prefer to identify with sociology, social history, and even fiction as more congenial “modes of self-writing” (Mbembe 2002, quoted in Nyamnjoh 2011:702). An embedded ethnographic and ethno-historical sensibility within creative writing is also found in some expressions of African-diasporic intellectualism, such as that among women who practice varieties of “writing culture”

(Harrison 1993, 2008:109-133; Behar & Gordan 1995). This arena of cultural production is often generative of compelling counter-narratives against the dominant regime of truth.

In this essay I wish to make a claim for an alternative space for critical anthropological praxis. The alternative space I envision would be neither a margin nor a periphery vis à vis disciplinary core knowledge. Although peripheries are often dynamic sites of significant insight and innovation, their existence implicates disparities of discursive and institutional power that engender subjugation. I imagine an alternative space as a post core-periphery setting, a democratized and decolonized environment in which a diversity of anthropologists and kindred thinkers, whether academic or not, come together, productively engaging each other at the “crossroads of knowledge” (di Leonardo 1991). As I have written elsewhere,

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, 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 (Harrison 2011:100l; also see Harrison 2008:4).

My approach to the politics of anthropology’s transformation is meant to foster productive dialogues between world anthropologies and the anthropologies of outsiders within dominant national traditions, including the metropolitan variants in which some voices have been “minoritized,” if not altogether rendered silent.

### **Remapping anthropology’s international division of labour**

Particularly as the discipline has been constituted in the United States, anthropology is made up of multiple modes of ethnographic, archaeological, and laboratory-based inquiry; sociocul-

tural and sociolinguistic analyses; and theory formulation, both nomothetic and idiographic in scale. All varieties and traditions within the field have not gained canonical recognition and legitimacy, especially in the most prestigious and resource-rich research universities and supporting institutions. According to Arjun Appadurai (1986), the prestige zones of anthropological theory have been largely concentrated in the world's metropolitan centers. In these particular places gate-keeping concepts and metonyms have been authorized for explaining key, but only partial, dimensions of sociocultural life in other places, which usually remain exoticized and far-off. Sometimes distance is more social than physical, as in the cases of European and Euro-American ethnographers "studying down" the sociocultural, class, and ethnoracial hierarchies in their own "backyards." Distant places, however they are mapped, have been the major loci for ethnographic fieldwork and anthropological theorizing and model building for more than a century. For the most part, exotic and often tropicalized field sites coincide with post- or neo-colonial legacies of a past colonial geography of political-economic interests.

Anthropology's prestige zones have been formed largely through the workings of "universities, research institutes, museums, research philanthropies, and publishing outlets in the North Atlantic, with Great Britain, France, and the United States [as] the principal sites of epistemological and institutional hegemony" (Harrison 2011: 101). These metropolitan centers have exerted far-ranging influence on anthropology's international division of labour. In the light of the field's uneven and unequal development on the global terrain, the contributions made in the so-called peripheries have largely been absent "from the metropolitan gaze" (Appadurai 1986: 360). This absence has developed despite the actual substantive and theoretical significance of the contributions. As a consequence of this pattern, Ph.D. alumni from many research institutions in the north have rarely had any rigorous "exposure to anthropological theory and practice beyond the bounds of the hegemonic canon" (Harrison 2011:101). This does not necessarily mean that "local anthropologies" are not read or cited at all.

Within the context of traditional area studies, knowledges produced within those national and regional trajectories have not been disregarded. Nonetheless, there is the problematic tendency for southern anthropologists to be treated as high-level informants or over-qualified fieldwork assistants who provide data that northern scholars mine and refine, if there is

interest in extraction and appropriation (Jones 1970). At best, local anthropologists are relegated to the role of minor-stream scholars, rather than being regarded as significant sources of theoretically-nuanced mainstream knowledge. As I have pointed out before, this troubling observation has been corroborated by a number of anthropologists from both the global south and the metaphoric southern zones within the stratified north (Harrison and Harrison 1998; Connell 2007). An example is found in Ugandan anthropologist Christine Obbo's account of her experiences in Roger Sanjek's (1990) *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. The late South African anthropologist Archie Mafeje (1998) and, more recently, Francis B. Nyamnjoh (2004, 2011), originally from Cameroon, have also interrogated the peripheralization of African anthropologists and kindred scholars whose writings are ethnographically grounded.

A hierarchical ordering of knowledges—achieved through processes of differential valuation, unequal exchange and “Western-mediated validation” (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006: 11, 13)—is sustained by a politics of stratified reception (Vincent 1991; Harrison and Harrison 1999; Harrison 2008). The result is that some categories of anthropological inquiry and analysis are relegated to the ranks of what the French philosopher Michel Foucault labelled “subjugated knowledge” in his writings on “power/knowledge” (Foucault 1980). However, the concerns of disqualifying and, on the other side of the equation, recuperating and reclaiming non-canonical knowledges have not been restricted to Foucault (e.g., Taylor 1971; Green and Driver 1976; Jordan 1982). This should be obvious, but prevailing citation patterns suggest a different story, one in which engaging Foucault is more valued and a more highly regarded measure of competitive worth in 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” (Harrison 2011: 102).

Archie Mafeje addressed this problem, which can be characterized in terms of *epistemological apartheid*. He critiqued the tendency in African studies and Africanist anthropology for Western scholars to attain authority and stature for texts that fail to acknowledge the role African intellectuals have played in debates and paradigmatic shifts (Harrison 2008: 30-31). This erasure, he pointed out, reflects the deep-seated presumption that Africans are objects of study rather than subjects who make anthropology (Mafeje 1997; see also Ntarangwi 2010 and Schmidt 2009). It is imperative to unlearn this problematic colonial presupposition.

The unfolding of my own thinking about the subjugation of knowledge and those who produce it on an uneven and unequal playing field has been influenced by trends within the sociology of knowledge—though I much prefer 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 which gender-subordinated and ethnoracially-minoritized social scientists have produced. Their critical analyses have sought to resuscitate largely neglected 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 developed parallel to and in conversation with Boas’ work (Diggs n.d., Taylor 1971; Green and Driver 1976; Harrison 1992; Baker 1998); and, beyond the boundaries of the United States, the late 19th century Haitian ethnologist Anténor Firmin (1885), whose robust *antropologie positive* contested the scientific racism of Count Arthur de Gobineau (1853-55), whose ideas resonated with his contemporaries in metropolitan Europe and Anglo-North America. Antenor’s legacy in the 20th century was a vibrant school of *ethnologie* that documented and theorized the African-derived cultural heritage shaping Haiti’s socio-cultural landscape. This ethnological project aimed to vindicate Haiti and assert the first Black Republic’s right to state and cultural sovereignty in the face of widespread international hostility and, most immediately, U.S. hegemony. At one point the latter assumed the form of a military occupation (1915-34); however, other mechanisms of constraining Haiti’s self-determination prevailed in later periods. Ethnologists of particular significance included:

Jean Price-Mars (1983[1928]) and writer Jacques Roumain (1978[1944]) [who] 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” (Harrison 2011: 103). Contemporary heirs of this intellectual history include U.S.-trained anthropologists Michel Rolph Trouillot (2000) and [transnational] feminist ethnographer Gina Ulysse (2007) (Harrison 2011: 103).

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, erasure, or peripheralization of indigenous and Afrodiasporic scholarship from mainstream anthropology’s intellectual memory is, ultima-

tely, part of a “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” (ibid.).

### **Shifting the paradigm, reversing the gaze**

The most stark patterns of negation and peripheralization in our discipline (Harrison 1988) may be eroding as more anthropologists translate notions of dialogue, multivocality, and collaboration into ethically consistent concrete practices. Such practices must be cognizant of the power differentials that influence relationships with our research consultants (i.e., “informants”) as well as with our professional counterparts who produce knowledge within other national varieties of the discipline, especially in and of the south. Nonetheless, dialogue, multivocality, and collaboration are too often merely buzzwords appropriated as rhetorical devices or textual tropes for claiming ethnographic authority. These constructs should be invoked instead to affirm an ethic of democratic worldly practice, which, ultimately, can only be accomplished collectively and collaboratively. Our goal is to create more decolonized (Harrison 2010 [1991]), and intercultural (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006; García Canclini 2004) conditions for new forms of cross-pollinated, reciprocally-negotiated knowledge. This end cannot be achieved within a single national setting from a single set of “partial perspectives” (Haraway 1988).

Another possible index of shifting away from the (neo) colonial division of intellectual labor lies in the role that “post-colonial” intellectuals are now playing in metropolitan centers. These southern scholars are situated within deterritorialized epistemic fields that span across the north/south divide. The presence of postcolonial intellectuals in the North Atlantic definitely complicates the picture I have drawn thus far—but without really altering the basic disparities that endure between northern and southern anthropologies.

Appadurai (1996) is a prime example of this new trend. He is widely read and cited in the disciplinary and interdisciplinary literature on globalization and modernity. Other prominent U.S.-based anthropologists with origins in the south or east include Arturo Escobar, Aihwa Ong, past president of the American Anthropological Association Virginia Dominguez, and Veena Das. In addition to the academic celebrities, whom Virginia Dominguez (1994) has described as a hyperprivileged new-immigrant elite, there is also a secondary tier of international

anthropologists who are largely read through an area studies lens. Their scholarship tends not to be engaged for its theoretical implications beyond specific regions or local areas. Included in this category are Ifi Amadiume and Filomina Chioma Steady, both with jobs in well-regarded universities in the United States. Their research has been undertaken in West Africa and African diasporic settings in the Americas and Europe.

Few African or Afro-descendant anthropologists have been able to break out of the radically localized “black box” into a more cross-cultural or global stage of social analysis. There are a few notable exceptions to this pattern, however. For instance, the late Haitian Caribbeanist Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1995, 2003) is widely read and theoretical implications of his analyses of globalism, the state, and the silences within history are applied well beyond the Caribbean. His scholarship has canonical status. Another noteworthy exception is the recent reception that the Cameroonian philosopher and postcolonial theorist, Achilles Mbembe (2001), who is based now in South African academe, is enjoying in U.S. anthropology. I hope this sets a precedent for a future that will transcend the paternalistic tendency of “adding and stirring” a few highly visible scholars symbolizing much more than the token change they actually materially embody. As I have argued before, “[m]ore substantive epistemological and institutional changes within the universities, professional associations, philanthropies, and publishing outlets of hegemonic varieties of anthropology require going beyond the limits of superficial symbolic representation” (Harrison 2011:105).

Members of the transnational intellectual elite (both the upper crust of hypervisible stars and the area studies scholars) work in anthropology departments or interdisciplinary centers where they enjoy advantages that their counterparts back home in the global south do not. (In fact, the most prestigious among them enjoy advantages that the majority of academics in the metropole do not.) While the immigrant “stars” enjoy high rankings in the citation index, the writings of most scholars based in the south are less accessible and largely absent from the discipline’s core discourse or canon.

Although many metropolitan universities are undergoing some measures of internationalization of their faculty and curricula, this frequently amounts to little more than impression-managing rituals of “adding and stirring” difference, others and “outsiders within” (Harrison 2008). However, tokenistic forms of diversification do not lead to fundamental shifts in how anthropology

is undertaken and taught. 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. The modifications that have already occurred sometimes generate disjunctures that underscore the need for more thorough-going retooling and re-education on the part of faculties who need to develop more heterodox toolkits and skill sets to effectively internationalize undergraduate and especially graduate training programs. If the process of internationalization is to result in more than lip service or in assigning the responsibility to the faculty representing diversity, then a great deal of sustained cooperative work is necessary. Fortunately, more anthropology faculties—but certainly not enough of them—have begun to address these issues forthrightly.

A few years ago, I was invited to be a part of a small international team of external consultants assigned to review the social anthropology graduate program at a fairly prominent Canadian university. I found it interesting that the university was aware of its relatively peripheral status in relation to major research universities south of the border in the United States. This was an issue raised in our discussions with faculty and administrators. Over three intense days, we conducted what was basically a mini-ethnography of the graduate program as it was encapsulated within the wider university, whose strategic plan gave a high priority to internationalization. The need to restructure the curriculum was a recurrent concern in our interviews with both faculty and students. The syllabi for core courses, especially that for the year-long seminar in theory, revealed a clear Eurocentric and North Atlantic bias—something that international students broached when we met with students in the master's and doctoral programs. Although the department had clearly benefited from recent hires that had brought more intellectual and ethno-national diversity to the faculty, the core courses that all graduate students were required to take were organized around a Western anthropological canon. Encouraged by the external review as well as by a workshop on decolonizing graduate training that I had facilitated several months earlier, the faculty had already begun to discuss potential strategies to revise the core curriculum along more diversal (Robeiro and Escobar 2006: 5) or *polyversal* lines—without “throwing the baby out with the bath water.” I suggested that it is not necessary to abandon the Western classics to integrate non-Western scholarship. Understanding this in principle, the



faculty, nonetheless, were struggling to reach consensus on effective strategies.

This case reveals that a considerable amount of retooling and re-education is necessary to prepare faculty, both intellectually and psychologically, to accept the challenges and unexpected consequences of decentering, parochializing or “provincializing” the West (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006: 3). Once the challenge is accepted, it may lead some faculty and students to seek a *reversal of the conventional gaze*. A recent exemplar is the provocative project of Kenyan anthropologist Mwenda Ntarangwi (2010). He has directed his ethnographic gaze at U.S. anthropology—not only its texts but also the wider social organization of the profession. He analyses U.S. anthropology’s departments, graduate training programs, and professional meetings. He compares American Anthropological Association (AAA) meetings to those of the Pan-African Anthropological Association. Relying on journals accumulated since his graduate student years at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, he has produced a thought-provoking *anthropology of anthropology*.

Ntarangwi’s courageous intervention represents the kind of work I have encouraged more of us to do in my own critical anthropology of anthropology, written from the perspective of a racially marked and gendered “outsider within” the profession as it has been constituted in the United States (Harrison 2008). While Ntarangwi is not the first African or southern-hemisphere anthropologist to conduct fieldwork in the United States, he has resisted the tendency and pressure to study down rather than up (Nader 1972). For instance, unlike the late Nigerian-born educational anthropologist John Ogbu (1978), who studied schools in which racial minorities predominated, Ntarangwi has not adhered to the convention of studying exotics or social problems in U.S. society—such as ghettos, communes, and deviants. He directs his lens at middle class, largely European-descended American anthropologists who, for the most part, study ethnographic others in Africa and other far-off places. In these exotic settings they, perhaps inadvertently, perpetuate the “nativization” of their research subjects (Appadurai 1986).

Hopefully, the discipline is now open to Ntarangwi’s and others’ “reversed gazes.” However, two decades ago, there was a strong backlash against the role reversal that Christine Obbo (1990) attempted in her research. Her white American colleagues were resistant to the idea of her applying the anthropological method to studying middle-class Euro-Americans like them. As

I have claimed elsewhere, “[i]n their eyes, her [research agenda] represented a quintessential status incongruity for which they were not yet emotionally or intellectually prepared” (Harrison 2011: 106).

The expansion and consolidation of the anthropology of North America, both intellectually and organizationally (e.g., in the establishment of the Society for the Anthropology of North American [SANA]), have elevated the status of doing ethnographic research on all aspects of U.S. society. Ntarangwi has gained from the momentum of recent trends in this area, with increasing numbers of American anthropologists working at home, sometimes due to financial or geopolitical necessity but also increasingly because of intellectual interest in a newly promulgated research agenda. The investigation of North America and other parts of the West is a logical direction for research if the comparative science of human similarities and differences is no longer restricted to so-called primitive peoples and lesser civilizations. It is also warranted if anthropology’s agenda includes interrogating the sociocultural and political-economic landscapes of metropolitan modernity and the epicenter of contemporary imperialism. New trends of ethnographic investigation have emerged around interests in the State, elites, middle classes, laboratory science, and new computer-mediated technologies in communications and health. Ntarangwi takes the shift in anthropological research a step further, following a logical direction for 21st century anthropology.

Southern anthropologists typically study their own societies or societies in the same general “culture area.” Within these contexts, they commonly study down rather than up the sociocultural hierarchy (Nader 1972). In this respect, they are comparable to most anthropologists who have done ethnographic research in Anglo-North America and Europe. In spite of the reconfiguration of research landscapes everywhere, the majority of southern anthropologists may, nonetheless, maintain a commitment to doing research in their home countries because of their chosen priorities, which often revolve around basic and applied research on problems related to national development, environmental preservation, poverty, ethnic and religious pluralism, and so forth. Their choices are often

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 [living and] working in peripheral zones are rarely recognized as leading theorists or even innovative methodologists (Harrison 2011:107).

Despite such difficult conditions, northern anthropologists have the responsibility to understand the diverse forms that theorizing assumes. Even with the effects of a structurally-sustained division of labor between metropolitan zones of theorizing and peripheral zones of "data mining and descriptive analysis," the south is not impoverished by an absence of theory if we learn to discern and respectfully engage it (ibid.).

### **Promoting intercultural dialogues in world anthropologies**

The politics of anthropology within the global context is being addressed in conversations concerning "world anthropologies" (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006), associated with *Red Antropologías del Mundo* or the World Anthropologies Network (RAN/WAN) and, at the level of national and regional anthropological associations, the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). Also, to some extent, there have been comparable or complementary discussions in some of the research commissions within the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), which predates WAN and WCAA by many years.

The emphasis on anthropology's plural trajectories (Harrison 2008: 27) signals that the dominant North Atlantic expressions of the field are not the only significant discursive and institutional settings within which anthropological knowledge is produced. The invocation of "anthropologies" may also reflect the "post-modernist and poststructuralist scepticism about totalizing narratives and discursive regimes" (Harrison 2011:108). The pluralist language, in my view, highlights the empirical reality of the differential development of the discipline over a global terrain upon which multiple varieties of inquiry and professionalization have emerged and consolidated in diverse national and regional contexts.

Ntarangwi, however, offers a caveat that merits consideration. There is a risk of overstating the distinctiveness of national anthropologies. Especially under the intensified time-space-

compression conditions of globalization, ideas, cultures, societies and nations are not and, in fact, have never been separated by impermeable boundaries (Ntarangwi, personal communication 2008). Acknowledging salient differences should not preclude recognizing and building epistemological alliances based on what is shared in common. The danger of disciplinary fragmentation is something about which many American anthropologists are concerned. In some quarters, the four-field professionalization of the discipline in the U.S. is under threat. Competing theoretical and methodological inclinations, informed in part by the impact of the postmodern turn, have positioned some anthropologists into polarizing camps of “scientists” and “anti-scientists,” or so it is sometimes perceived. This antinomy oversimplifies complex issues and reduces the terms of the debate into two erroneously homogenized categories. In view of these tensions, any further fragmentation or proliferation of difference may appear to contribute to the discipline’s disintegration.

World anthropologies’ proponents place emphasis on the importance of forging inclusive, intercultural spaces for dialogue, debate, and creating new knowledge from cross-pollinations situated on a democratically reconfigured playing field. Under such conditions, the anthropologies of the North Atlantic would undergo decentering, and the related dispersal of authority and sharing of power can take effect both within and among the various anthropologies. Admittedly, this is much easier said than done, but “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” (Harrison 2011: 109). The decentering of northern anthropologies does not prevent their participation alongside their counterparts from the south and elsewhere in the world. In the diversalist model that Ribeiro and Escobar advocate (2006: 5), inclusiveness is imperative as a matter of principle.

Since the 1930s and 1940s, the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) and the once-separate International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES) have been important fora for the international exchange of anthropological knowledge. The present-day IUAES (which merged with the ICAES in 1968) offers us a chance to claim the spaces of its constituent commissions, congresses and inter-congresses for undertaking the collaborative work of building new relationships and coalitions of knowledge. As a result,

diverse anthropologies can interact and weave productive “webs of connection” (Haraway 1988) for a world anthropology built on shared common ground. For a united front to develop, the discipline’s pluralities would need to be remapped in ways that are no longer translatable in terms of center-periphery dichotomies (Harrison 2008: 27). Both intellectual and organizational work—what I have called professional activism—are required to achieve this end. Moreover, for this agenda to achieve legitimacy within communities of anthropologists and well beyond them, we must engage the urgent issues affecting our publics around the world.

### Reworking anthropology

It is important to understand that anthropology’s margins are not only in the geographical south. There are peripheries in the north just as there are centers, often organized around transnational elites aligned with the north, in the global south. This alignment provides circuits of communication, transaction, and mobility much less accessible in institutions in the south’s south. In view of these complexities, it is important to emphasize the following point:

*The center-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 centers 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 (Harrison 2011: 109-110).*

Some of my colleagues and I have devoted a considerable portion of our careers to undertaking some of this mapping and remapping, particularly as they concern the intellectual life and history of anthropology in the Afro-Atlantic world (Baker 1998; Harrison 2008; Yelvington 2006). This is an exercise that makes visible what has been rendered unseen and unsee-able through conventional lenses. Remapping requires “building a repertoire of conceptual, theoretical, methodological tools from what would otherwise remain unseen, unknown, and unexplored” (ibid.: 110).

I characterize the project I have pursued over the years as “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" (ibid.; also see Harrison 2008:2). I was being prepared for this work long before I realized its importance. I belong to and have learned a great deal from a heterogeneous intergenerational "intellectual social formation" (Yelvington 2006: 67) comprising teachers, students, and colleagues. They have made me profoundly aware that anthropology should not be reduced to its most hegemonic expressions and institutions. Intellectual labor outside the mainstream is often a source of creative knowledge worthy of being critically engaged and reworked.

My understanding of *reworking* anthropology and undertaking projects of anthropological weaving has evolved over the course my career. As an undergraduate student I learned that I would not be exposed to the work, for instance, of African American or other African diasporic anthropologists through the formal curriculum, even in departments receptive to some degree of domestic and international diversity. I gained exposure to some authors and ideas that had been erased from anthropology's core (e.g. Zora Neale Hurston's books of fiction, folklore, and ethnography) in a Black studies program founded only a few years earlier as the university's response to the Civil Rights and Black Power movements. Their impact on students prompted them to occupy university buildings and public spaces to demand that, among other things, the curriculum be more cognizant of difference, especially race. (A bit later, a different group of students, mainly white females politicized by the earlier struggles of the period, protested and pressed administrations to revise the curriculum in light of gender.)

When I was a graduate student, I was exposed to a rich fund of heterodox knowledge through a few courses but primarily through extracurricular activities in an interdisciplinary group of faculty and graduate students. One of the most influential persons I encountered during that formative period was St. Clair Drake (1980, 1987, 1990), whose seminal writings on the history of anthropology as it relates to the Pan-African World made an indelible impression on me. From both his erudite scholarship and griot-style of *counter-storytelling*, a pedagogical and consciousness raising technique central to the later formation of critical race theory, I learned invaluable lessons, many of which were unavailable in books at that time. Most relevant here are the lessons Drake taught about anthropological histories that appropriated from, while building up their own momentum apart from, the knowledge of the metropolitan center. Today,

many decades later, the audience of scholars interested in these kinds of histories and their contemporary legacies has grown (e.g., Yelvington 2006). Today we can better understand that canonical figures such as Franz Boas and Melville Herskovits in the U.S. belonged to 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 academic and wider social inequality (Baker 1998, Yelvington 2006). Recent research recuperating these latter figures has made it possible for more of our colleagues and students to become acquainted with and remap anthropology's historically-contingent peripheral zones.

My earliest attempt at remapping examined the politics of peripheralization within U.S. urban anthropology (Harrison 1988). This field of specialization had neglected prominent African American and African Caribbean social scientists who had made important contributions to urban studies. Sociologists W.E.B. Du Bois and Oliver Cromwell Cox and, within anthropology, Allison Davis and his protégé St. Clair Drake, were the initial focus of my reclamation work. After I better understood the extent of Du Bois' influence on Davis, Drake, and other early antiracist and anticolonial anthropologists, I investigated Du Bois' interlocutor role in anthropology, especially with respect to Boasian antiracism. I learned that many of the early 20th century Black anthropologists in the U.S. were influenced as much by Du Bois as by the "Father of U.S. Anthropology," Franz Boas. The Du Boisian legacy has become a new focus of attention in the history of U.S. anthropology, thanks to a handful of authors (Harrison 1992; Baker 1998; Carbonella and Kasmir 2008).

The next step for me was to venture across a broader terrain to formulate the parameters for *decolonizing anthropology* (Harrison 2010 [1991, 1997]). At this point, I was not only concerned with the study of the African diaspora or "Black folk here and there" (drawn from the title of Drake's [1987, 1990] two-volume book). My approach to anthropology's decolonization problematized the reification of Otherness and the dichotomy between basic and applied research. It called on more ethnographers to move beyond their preoccupations with textual strategies for "writing culture" (Clifford and Marcus 1986) toward translating the tropes of dialogue and multivocality into concrete actions of ethically responsible field research. Another problem I underscored in my introductory essay in *Decolonizing Anthropology* related to the dangers of the epistemic scepticism and explanatory agnosticism

found in the most radically relativist tendency within postmodernism (Harrison 2008: 27; Shaw 1995).

A final issue highlighted in my conceptual essay (although, disappointingly, it did not generate discussion at the time) pertained to the importance of theory formulated from epistemic perspectives and lived experiences within peripheral zones. Closely related to this was the point I made concerning the need to foster dialogues and reconciliations between “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, quoted in Harrison 2011:112).

Originally, my critique of dominant conventions in anthropology was largely focused on finding a way out of the hierarchies and power dynamics inhibiting the democratization of discursive spaces in U.S. anthropology. Eventually, my purview shifted to a wider terrain. My activities in the IUAES, especially at the commission level, are in many respects responsible for my expanded view. I have begun to articulate this cumulative vision in more recent work (Harrison 2008) in which I present a framework for critically reworking what I see as the best elements and practices within the field. By collectively working to meet several interrelated objectives, anthropologists are likely to achieve a more inclusive anthropology. I think that “[i]deally, [the outcome] 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” (Harrison 2011:112).

In *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age* (Harrison 2008), I delineate several interrelated objectives that I argue can contribute to the discipline’s reconfiguration. Among them are: rehistoricizing anthropology, those who do research



and those researched; rethinking theory, what it involves, who produces it with or without formal authorization, and which formulations are acknowledged and applied; making optimal use of the cross-fertilizing potential of *intradisciplinarity* (dialogues across subfield boundaries) and *interdisciplinarity*; promoting greater cultural and epistemic diversity within the field and deepening the democratization of participation and decision-making through professional activism; finding more effective ways to link academic pursuits to urgent issues of public engagement; and developing a commitment to decentering hegemonic epistemologies and to promoting genuinely pluri-cultural and *intercultural* dialogues.

This strategic plan for reworking anthropology is informed by my experiences as a racially-marked woman socially situated to see anthropology and the world that we study from a particular set of angles. I attempt to overcome the limits of my standpoint by placing my work in what Donna Haraway (1988) characterizes as a “web of connection” that potentially bridges a multiplicity of “partial perspectives,” leading to a comprehensive, multifocal understanding of ourselves and others in the world. Nearly two decades of working in the IUAES Commission on the Anthropology of Women has enabled me to build an international network that has expanded the terms of my self-definition as an intellectual. The trajectory of my thinking has been propelled by

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, I would say, 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; 2011:113).

The more we are able to understand the interlocking dimensions of difference, inequality, and power that influence who we are

—and who we continue to become— as anthropologists belonging to wider intellectual social formations, often transnational in scope (Yelvington 2006: 67), the greater the inclusiveness we can bring into our theory and practice (Harrison 2011: 113). I would like to think that significant “re-visionings” and decolonizing practices can be accomplished through the activities of the IUAES, the WCAA, WAN, and other organizations and coalitions committed to the principles and goals of world anthropologies. This assumes that we can effectively rework anthropology by, among other strategies, troubling and eventually dismantling the boundaries of its peripheries *and its centers*, wherever they may be. It is important that we sustain an optimistic long-range view. Another anthropological knowledge is possible (Santos 2008).

### References cited

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. Theory in anthropology: Center and periphery. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 28 (2): 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.
- Behar, Ruth and Deborah Gordan (eds.). 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carbonella, August and Sharryn Kasmir. 2008. W.E.B. Du Bois’ Darkwater and an anticolonial, internationalist anthropology. *Dialectical Anthropology*. 32 (1–2): 113–121.
- Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Comaroff, Jean and John L. Comaroff. 2012. *Theory from the South or, How Euro-America Is Evolving toward Africa*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2007. *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity.
- De Gobineau, Arthur. 1915 [1853-1855]. *Essay on the Inequality of Races*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Diggs, E. Irene. (no date). Du Bois' Contribution to Anthropology and Scholarship. Unpublished manuscript.
- Di Leonardo, Micaela (ed.) 1991. *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dominguez, Virginia. 1994. A taste for the 'Other': Intellectual complicity in racializing practices. *Current Anthropology*. 35 (4): 333-348.
- Drake, St. Clair. 1980. Anthropology and the Black experience. *Black Scholar*. 11 (7): 2-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. *Black Folk Here and There: An Essay in History and Anthropology*. Vol. 1. Los Angeles: University of California.
- 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.

- Foucault, Michel 1980 *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fox, Richard (ed.). 1991. *Recapturing Anthropology*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research (SAR) 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. *Phylon*. 37 (4): 308-342.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. Situated knowledge: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14 (3): 575-599.
- Harrison, Faye V. 1988. Introduction: An African Diaspora perspective for urban anthropology. *Urban Anthropology*. 17 (2-3): 111-141.
- . 1992. The Du Boisian legacy in anthropology: W.E.B. Du Bois and anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology*. 12 (3): 239-260.
- . 1993. Writing against the grain: Cultural politics of difference in Alice Walker's work. *Critique of Anthropology* 13(4): 401-427.
- . 2008. *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- . (ed.) 2010 [1991]. *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation*. Third edition. Arlington: American Anthropological Association.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. "Remapping anthropology's peripheral zones." In: Peter J.M. Nas, Hao Shiyuan, and Zhang Xiaomin (eds.) *Keynotes in Anthropology*, pp. 100-113. Beijing: Intellectual Property Publishing House (IPPH).
- Harrison, Ira E. and Faye V. Harrison (eds.). 1999. *African-American Pioneers in Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hymes, Del (ed.). 1972. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage Books.
- International Social Science Council. 2010. *World Social Science Report: Knowledge Divides*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Jones, Delmos. 1970. Towards a native anthropology. *Human Organization*. 29 (4): 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? *African Sociological Review*. 2 (1): 1-43.
- Mbembe, Archilles. 2001. *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. African modes of self-writing. Translated by Steven Rendall. *Public Culture*. 14 (1): 239-273.
- Nader, Laura. 1972. "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: CODESRIA-Zed Books.

Nyamnjoh, Francis B. 2004. From publish to perish to publish and perish: What 'Africa's 100 best books' tell us about publishing Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. 39 (5): 331-355.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Cameroonian bushfalling: Negotiation of identity and belonging in fiction and ethnography. *American Ethnologist*. 38 (4):701-713.

Obbo, Christine. 1990. "Adventures with fieldnotes." In: Roger Sanjek (ed.), *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. pp. 290-300. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Price-Mars, Jean. 1983 [1928]. *So Spoke the Uncle (Ainsi Parla l'Oncle)*. Washington: 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 Hug-

hes 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: Sage.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2003. *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2000 [1990]. *Haiti, State against Nation: Origins and Legacy of Duvalierism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

———. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon 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.

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.