

# CHAPTER 19

## African Anthropological Practice in the “Era of Aid”: Towards a Critique of Disciplinary Canons

*Euclides Gonçalves*

### INTRODUCTION

In September 2015, the Department of Archeology and Anthropology at Eduardo Mondlane University in Maputo, Mozambique, launched its first Masters level course in Social Anthropology. The approved program named six fields of specialization, yet only two were to be offered in the inaugural year: Anthropology of Development; and Anthropology of Health, Disease, and Treatment. While the department staff had long been planning to introduce a Masters’s level degree, the final push came from the dean’s office. The minimum number of PhD degrees required by university policy to open a MA program could not be met partly because a number of recently minted PhDs who had just returned to Mozambique either sought better paid opportunities in managerial positions and committees within the university, or had immersed themselves in consultancy research of the campus. Ultimately however, the dean’s office was willing to override this requirement, in order to launch a program it viewed as an attractive new source of revenue.

The Anthropology Master's program that was ultimately launched was largely tailored with public servants and local NGO personnel in mind, premised on their interest in acquiring an MA degree that could look impressive on their CVs and eventually lead to salary increases. This intended audience influenced the design of the MA program in myriad ways, most obviously in the professionally-oriented concentrations and the constituent curriculum designed above all to provide skills and address themes of immediate concern to policy-makers and development practitioners. None of this seemed problematic to the department or lecturers given that in their own doctoral research most had undergone training and investigated topics that revolved around aid-based development.

With the practical concerns of working professionals in mind, the courses for the new program were also scheduled in the evenings after official public working hours. Targeted at the professional market and with profit-making foremost in mind, the high monthly fees proved largely prohibitive to recent graduates who were still unemployed. It is worth noting that even if they could have afforded the tuition, most of those students would have much preferred to pursue an immediately remunerative professional option, rather than pursuing a postgraduate degree, that would launch them on an academic career. After all, Honours graduates who are lucky to get jobs with NGOs are likely to earn an initial salary that is comparable to that of a full professor at any of Mozambique's public universities. Anthropology graduates trained in Mozambique and abroad are trying to revive the long moribund Mozambican Anthropologists Association. So far, the best they had achieved was to set up a WhatsApp group that is used to share trending issues on social media and, occasionally employment opportunities often outside of anthropology.

The vignette above offers insights into the particular challenges of professional anthropological practice in Mozambique and it is likely to resonate with comparable contemporary experiences in most African countries. Decades after decolonization and independence, the fact is, that with very few exceptions, Africans who want to obtain PhDs still need to go abroad. By and large throughout Africa, anthropologists are found in joint departments in which they are a minority. In the few places where stand-alone departments do exist and/or larger contingents of anthropologists are to be found on official faculty rosters, many offices are likely to remain empty for months at a time, as senior lecturers dedicate most of their time to successive short-term consultancies through which they are able to pay their bills and survive, while leaving their classes to be "taught" by undergraduate teaching assistants.

If the unfavorable conditions within academia drive many African anthropologists into the short-term consultancy cycles, researchers have plenty to say about the challenges – and outright injustices – that they confront in the "consultancy world" too. Accounts abound with the all too typical scenarios in which they find themselves compelled to play subordinate roles to researchers from donor countries, who are often little more than freshly minted undergraduates or Masters and doctoral students. Some of these students working as interns and others may have recently arrived in Africa to take up their first paid employment. Their frustration with this kind of subordination is amplified by the "local pay" ceilings imposed by multilateral and donor organizations who ignore professional experience, expertise, or often even that their "local African experts" may have obtained their academic degrees from the very same schools as "external consultant" counterparts. These self-serving and frankly

neo-imperialist policies are often painted with an ethical veneer by rationalizing them as measures intended to protect the national public sector or civil society by not distorting the local labor market.

While there are many aspects of truth in the rather discouraging depiction of anthropological practice in Africa I have just provided, in this chapter I want to suggest that this is perhaps only part of the story, and that the effects of even those difficulties highlighted in this narrative, may be seen to bear other fruits once what has been omitted is brought back into consideration.<sup>1</sup> This chapter describes how the political-economy of knowledge production in the continent has led African anthropologists to critically evaluate canonical expectations of the discipline such as long-term fieldwork, co-research, and forms of public engagement.

In order to illustrate my argument, I will first trace the historical arc of changing working conditions for scholars trained in anthropology who have been nationals of African countries and worked in national or local institutions in post-colonial Africa. My aim is to place the possibilities of knowledge production for professionals who are from Africa within the successive contexts of colonialism (the historical period when anthropology first “arrived” on the continent, and during which time its practice in Africa matured), followed (i) by the era that was immediately shaped by the struggles for independence and the first new nation-building projects, as well as by the convulsions of global imperialist/Cold War confrontation as it played out across the continent, and (ii) the emergence of the post-colonial dispensation in which the continent has remained mired for at least the last 40 years, namely, the “era of aid.”

In this chapter I will only very briefly attend to the colonial period and the first two decades that followed independence. These are somewhat familiar to many readers and have been subject of excellent treatments by others.<sup>2</sup> In my summaries of these two, I will highlight some of the key questions and concerns that were raised by African anthropologists – and in particular how they sought to exorcize the ideological and ethnocentric biases of a discipline that had reached its maturity in the colonial context (Goody 1995) and, in part, contributed to it (Asad 1975). My focus in those summaries will be however to establish the state of play that served as the point of departure for what has transpired during the “era of aid,” which is my primary concern here.

In my discussion of what has transpired during this “era of aid,” I will focus first on the constraints and challenges created for African professional anthropologists as a result of Africa’s transformation from a largely colonized continent into a “paradigmatic object for international development action.” I will start by focusing on the effects of what is arguably the foundational framework of development in the neoliberal era: structural adjustment. Structural adjustment not only proved to be particularly pervasive and long-lived as an explicit “blueprint” for development policy-making in Africa, but has continued to function as a sort of “ur form” by implicitly dictating many of the parameters within which shifts in development practice have occurred, and setting boundaries within which much critique has occurred and alternatives have been imagined.

Against this broader backdrop I will note the emergence of new and often interweaving currents in development/aid practice – such as decentralization and the “rise of NGO’s,” the Millennium Development Challenges and the focus on poverty alleviation, the “therapeuticization of aid” (courtesy of the HIV crisis) and ascendancy

of global health, and the “good governance/democratization turn.” While each has underwritten specific new concerns and thrusts that have shaped the thematic focus of anthropological research in Africa, my focus is primarily on how they have gradually transformed the opportunity structures of their practice largely in shared and communal ways. I will reflect on how the “era of aid” has thus at once opened up new space for anthropological professional practice in Africa and by Africans, and yet also located that space within particular boundaries. The result has been a political-economy of anthropological practice that differs in significant ways from that which has predominantly shaped professional practice by Africanist counterparts from the Global North.<sup>3</sup>

I suggest that anthropological practice in the continent has moved beyond the academic based canon that privileges long stints of fieldwork that last for more than one year. Instead, African anthropologists have learned to conduct multiple short stint fieldwork exercises and to listen and collaborate with local informants who are often intellectuals in their own right. Furthermore, in doing mostly anthropology at home African anthropologists are devising a new ethic of audience that promotes an active engagement with its publics.

### THE END OF AN ERA...

During the 1950s, as the waves of independence began to lap at the shores of the continent, anthropological research in Africa was dominated by the British tradition of Social Anthropology. Oxford, London, Cambridge and Manchester had been the main centers of production of anthropological knowledge first under the structural-functionalist tradition of Radcliffe-Brown, Fortes, and Evans-Pritchard, and later under the more critical gaze of the Manchester School led by Max Gluckman (Goody 1995; Kuper 1996; Moore 1994). The 1950s alone saw 200 different British-funded social research projects in Africa, many of which were anthropologically informed. It also saw the establishment of regional research institutes including the Rhodes Livingstone Institute (RLI) in Northern Rhodesia, the East African Institute for Social Research at Makerere College in Uganda, and the West African Institute for Social Research in Nigeria (Mills, Babiker, and Ntarangwi 2006).

The work of African researchers was hardly ancillary to these endeavors, although it took many decades before the centrality of their contributions was acknowledged. While colonial – and for that matter most post-colonial – anthropology in Africa always acknowledged that it relied on trusted informants and research assistants, explicit recognition was often limited to data collection, linguistic assistance, and negotiating access to informants, while the “real anthropological work” of analysis and theoretical formulation was always maintained as the reserve of professional, predominantly Euro-American and white anthropologists already with PhDs.

Recent studies have been challenging this view that underrates the work of Africans in anthropological research. For example, Schumaker (1996, 2001) and Bank and Bank (2013) systematically and thoroughly debunked this narrative, demonstrating the extent to which these “assistants” were in fact central contributors to analysis at all levels – and often the original formulators of insights, interpretations, and explanations – even if such contributions remained almost entirely unacknowledged.

Inasmuch as to this day there are only a handful of such in-depth studies, and almost all published in this millennium, there are grounds for questioning whether the systematic obfuscation of African intellectual contributions to Africanist anthropological knowledge has actually been confronted in any serious way by the discipline.<sup>4</sup> These studies also reveal how their relationships with the “acknowledged professionals” translated into very limited opportunities for these African researchers to ever professionalize on similar terms themselves, a factor that has also contributed to the existence of a small number of professionally recognized African anthropologists.

By the 1960s, when most African countries had obtained their independence, anthropologically trained African researchers seriously questioned the future of the discipline in the continent. The biggest question was an overtly political one: Could – and for that matter should – a discipline that was rightfully perceived as the handmaiden of colonialism have a future in independent Africa? Certainly, as colonialism waned, there was ample basis for the widespread critique of the various forms of support that anthropology had provided to colonial ideology and practice, including its instrumental and longstanding role in underwriting depictions of Africans as “primitive,” and bound to traditional practices and beliefs (Ahmed 1975; Asad 1975). While a few notable outliers within the profession had been vocal critics of colonialism (e.g. Max Gluckman), far more had either directly or indirectly participated in the colonial project. It is thus worth noting how many, who became theoretical paragons of the field, such as E. Evans-Pritchard, may be well remembered because they pushed the discipline in a more relativistic direction through still often quoted publications such as *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande* that explained African beliefs as working on a plane of rationality equal to that of Europeans – while at the very same time a form of disciplinary amnesia has relegated other rather more inconvenient facts to the inconsequentiality of footnoting. Some of their most famous studies were commissioned and funded in order to solve specific governance conundrums of colonial administrators – in Evans-Pritchard’s case the problem of “Nuer pacification” (Hutchinson 1996).

By way of contrast, many African revolutionary leaders were keenly aware of such instances – in which the field of anthropology had provided practical support to colonial administrations. Nor did it escape notice that almost the whole anthropological enterprise had been made possible by various forms of colonial government support. Some of this support came in the form of funding while other as local logistics and all manner of facilitations provided to fellow Europeans. In the field, many anthropologists made use of local administration resources and in some cases even dressed like the colonial administrators.<sup>5</sup> The fact that during the colonial period so few Africans had been trained and recognized as anthropologists only reinforced the view of anthropology as a racialized discipline, with a highly questionable history of colonial implication and involvement.

Perhaps as – or even more – condemning was the fact that the dominant theoretical frameworks within the discipline at the onset of the era of independence offered no models for the types of dynamic social, political, and economic change that so vividly animated revolutionary leaders and the visionaries of new African nation-building at this time. Certainly, the structural-functionalist school had been proven incapable of moving away from models that saw African society in terms of “synchronic sets of social relationships in small-scale, culturally and structurally fairly homogeneous, local

rural societies viewed as bounded ethnic groups, or tribes” (Binsbergen 1982, p. 3). The structural-functionalist school not only offered a vision of Africans locked in “tribalist tradition” but also entirely failed to acknowledge – and thus to critique – the political role of colonialism.

Meanwhile the incipient models of change in the Manchester School proffered possibilities of “acculturation” or plotted trajectories towards the modern that remained quite profoundly Euro/ethno-centric. More pointedly in the words of South African scholar Bernard Magubane: “These anthropologists, instead of treating the colonial system as an essential dimension of the new social structure, have tended to take for granted, or assume that its general characteristics are known,” and moreover deployed indices for gauging and exploiting social change understood as a “process of acculturation and the formation of new status groups in the urban situation” by adopting “‘European’ clothes, occupations, education, and income.” These indices reaffirmed the civilizing mission and replicated its racialized hierarchies (Magubane 1971, p. 419).

At that time, anthropology’s insistence on studying change primarily by investigating “tribalism” – and its transformation – in urban contexts, also ran directly against the aspirational grain of newly independent Africa’s leadership. It did not only seem to place emphasis on the power of tradition to impose unwanted brakes on the forms of modernist economic transformations that inspired revolutionaries (of both socialist and capitalist persuasions). It also suggested a future life for forms of identitarian politics that many avidly sought to exorcise from their bodies politic, based on a firm conviction that “tribalism” had simultaneously provided colonial powers with a mechanism through which to divide and thus rule, but also as an obvious threat to new nation-building projects.

These views of modernity and progress often produced highly schematic developmental planning (Donham 1999; Scott 1998). Nowhere would these two currents (a high modernist vision of progress that was openly hostile towards tradition, and nationalist fervor explicitly intent on transcending tribalism and the colonial oppression it had served) converge more forcefully than in post-independence Mozambique governed by Frelimo and their revolutionary leader and first President, Samora Moises Machel.<sup>6</sup>

Ultimately anthropology held little appeal to the generation of African revolutionary leaders who ushered their countries out from under the colonial yoke to independence. This was not only because of their reservations about the discipline’s complicities with colonialism, but also because anthropology’s visions of change itself had virtually no resonance with, and in certain ways were almost diametrically opposed to, the aspirations and models for change that held them in thrall. At the same time, other disciplines, which were not as theoretically mired in suspect notions of “tribalism” nor as completely implicated in colonialism, seemed to offer paradigms that had a far greater resonance with those modernist/nationalist visions. South African anthropologist Archie Mafeje noted how political scientists in particular realized that independence was fast becoming a reality and “began to move in one by one; sold on the idea of modern nation states, they brought with them a new creed – ‘modernization’” (Mafeje 1971, p. 256), replete with models of political-economy which, and despite marked differences in their capitalist and socialist variants, still shared a promise to overcome tribalism and launch trajectories of industrial and technologically-driven progress.

In this context, anthropology as a discipline was not widely welcome in the universities of newly independent Africa. It should also come as little surprise that those few Africans who had received anthropological training – or the even fewer who had received degrees – were for the most part profoundly skeptical about the discipline. Most would remain more than a little hesitant to identify with it, more often than not turning to and to some extent rebranding themselves as contributors to sociology, history, or economic research teams and departments.

A few African scholars retained some form of footing in the discipline by critiquing the predominant Africanist anthropological traditions and/or pivoting in new theoretical directions. In particular, a number of them found inspiration from new theoretical sources such as French structural Marxism where, anthropologists such as Balandier and Meillassoux, championed a form of historical analysis that was capable of critically analyzing colonialism in a manner that offered a critical frame through which to understand and engage with current challenges.<sup>7</sup> These frameworks emphasized how colonial capitalist modes of production had penetrated and shaped African modes of production, simultaneously producing the underdevelopment of African societies and the development of the colonial metropole as two sides of the same coin of “modernity” (see also Immanuel Wallerstein and Andre Gunter Frank). These critical approaches both resonated with, and justified a certain continued need for, the revolutionary politics that had intellectually underwritten the struggles for independence and the first political cohorts of many newly independent African regimes.

The influence of Meillassoux was significant at the Center for African Studies at Eduardo Mondlane University where anthropologists practicing as historians or historians who later became anthropologists worked. Not only was Meillassoux included in the training materials for the brigade like research teams but later the influence of Christian Geffray, a student of Meillassoux, also contributed to strengthen this perspective there. Outside the Eduardo Mondlane University, an important group, which later became the ARPAC Research Institute received training in France, was influenced by variants of this tradition (Dunduro 2009).

In some cases, when independence was followed by relatively brief periods of political optimism, efforts were focused on decolonizing history and/or building national identity. This provided limited opportunities for anthropologically trained African scholars to deploy ethnographic methods. This occurred largely in projects of “historical recovery” that sought to reconstruct African pasts, or “folklife inventories” that sought to re-cast African identities, in order to purge these of markedly Eurocentric biases of colonial historiographies and in order to foster nationalist pride and/or inspire revolutionary ardor.

In Mozambique, similar concerns led to a series of national cultural inventory campaigns conducted under the auspices of the recently created ARPAC that relied on the contributions of the handful of trained anthropologists, and who brought their oral history and ethnographic techniques, to contribute to larger social science teams that included specialists from multiple disciplines. At its height, this effort was institutionalized into a multi-year national campaign to “preserve culture” and involved the mobilization of public servants in the education sector and the ministry of culture who were trained to lead teams that toured rural districts throughout the country administering surveys and organizing community events in which dance and music

performances, proverbs, and important life passage rituals were recorded. As limited as this space may have been, it would be from these “folklife/cultural inventory projects” projects that the first group of Mozambicans trained in anthropology in post-colonial Mozambique would eventually emerge.

Ironically – and with tragic effects for the continental fortunes of the discipline at the time – some of anthropological efforts in Africa which garnered greatest international attention continued to delegitimize the discipline. A notable and notorious example was the Afrikaner volkekunde in South Africa which remained committed to a project of classificatory categorization of African societies purporting to provide a “scientific rationale” to the configuration of the Bantustan system (Hammond-Tooke 1997; Sharp 1981). While the critique leveled against this brand of anthropology – not least of all by a vocal and politically committed community of South African anthropologists in exile – revealed its naked complicity with the apartheid regime in the absence of strong institutional alternatives within the continent. The Marxist inspired liberal anthropology practiced in South Africa’s English-medium universities (Dickson and Spiegel 2014; Hammond-Tooke 1997; Sharp 1981) did little to dispel broader suspicions about the discipline.

### **DISCIPLINARY REVIVAL IN THE NEOLIBERAL “ERA OF AID”**

Some of the very earliest iterations of international assistance to newly independent countries in Africa planted seeds conducive to the revival and rehabilitation of anthropological practice amongst scholars from the continent. Several African countries (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zimbabwe) benefited from a post-independence flow of Nordic support for the training of African academics, including the development of social science and historical research programs at national universities. Sustained in many cases over decades, these efforts were part and parcel of larger technical assistance packages, through which a number of the Nordic nations operationalized a very particular “politics of solidarity” towards newly independent African countries (Ahmed 2015; Ahmed et al. 2003). Researchers, anthropologists, and educators arriving from these countries were far less burdened with the colonial baggage that marred so many other Western counterparts.

In countries such as Mozambique and Tanzania, Norwegian and Swedish funding for interdisciplinary African Studies and a growing group of researchers from those countries would play an important role in setting the stage for the eventual acceptance of anthropology. It was also around the same period that the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO) began to exercise comparable influence with similar effects through its support for collaborative research projects and for the professional training of multiple cohorts of African graduate students (Binsbergen 1982). By and large, the launch of these specific efforts pre-dated the full-blown and all-pervasive forms of “international developmentalism” that came into its own across the continent in the 1980s and which quickly became the hegemonic form of international aid in Africa after the end of the Cold War.

Largely, unlike the aforementioned Nordic brand of international assistance, the onset of the neoliberal era of aid would have profoundly detrimental effects on all forms of scholarly endeavor in Africa. The euphoria of independence had already



faded from much of the continent, when the last major decolonization occurred in the mid-1970s in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, São Tomé and Príncipe, Cape Verde, and Guinea-Bissau. At the outset of the 1980s, the national development ambitions so touted at independence by most of Africa's first generation of leaders had materialized. As African countries accumulated foreign debt, donors began to move away from the bi-lateral technical assistance programs that had been channeled through African states. Increasingly, their assistance sought to operationalize the new faith in private (rather than public) actors, free market solutions, a distaste for state-centered solutions, and generalized hostility towards the public sector seen as bloated and inefficient. Eventually cast under the rubric of “structural adjustment” this cluster of policies sought to roll back the state's involvement and investment in development initiatives, fostered the privatization of government-owned enterprises, and imposed fiscal austerity measures that implied large reductions in public sector employment and social service provision. By the time the Soviet Union fell in 1991, the effects of structural adjustment proved devastating for most public institutions across Africa. These effects were particularly felt in higher education, as the underfunding of public research meant that the little funding which might have once been available to the social sciences dried up completely. Salaries stagnated or shrank, as did staff and overall working conditions. Others who have surveyed the continent during this period have painted a most dismal picture of the very dire working conditions during this era of austerity (Mkandawire 1997; Zeleza 2002).

The failures of post-independence development compounded the difficulties for scholars in some countries. Political violence that swept across countries as varied as Mozambique, Angola, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo for a generation or more after independence.

In some countries like Mozambique, 15 years of war placed the very survival of many national scholars in question. At the same time, these most trying conditions would paradoxically provide a new impetus for anthropological (and social science) research by national scholars. A desperate need for solutions to subsistence led to the very first forays by national scholars into consultancies with the international organizations whose growing presence in Mozambique during the war (1978–1992) would turn into a deluge in its aftermath. At the more general level across the continent, the austerity imposed by structural adjustments on public institutions forced a growing number of African academics into a similar position. Paradoxically many of the very same ideological precepts that undermined public funding, also underwrote the new opportunities for individual consultancy in “NGO world,” whose exponential expansion was one of the most noticeable results of the international community's new funding priorities which largely eschewed the state.

In one sense, international aid in Africa during this neoliberal era has not been monolithic, since new trends and specific problems have risen and receded over time, each holding sway over donors and practitioners with varying degrees of dominance and staying power. However, despite the differences in specific focus, these have all shared certain broad features including: a certain penchant for “civil society” and local social institutions; and conversely a certain skepticism about the competency, integrity, and capacity of the African state. It can be argued that cumulatively they have underwritten a growing market for producers of “local knowledge” and for forms of

cross-cultural brokerage of the sort that anthropological training and methodologies are recognized as capable of providing.

Thus, for example, quite early on in the “era of aid,” humanitarianism emerged as one of the more dominant discourses shaping international intervention in Africa. Throughout the 1980s and for at least the following two decades, refugees and displacement remained a major concern for many practitioner organizations and donor agencies which were active in Africa, arguably underwriting opportunities to participate in field research for a whole generation of African scholars, including a number with anthropological training and/or ethnographic leanings, such as Alcinda Honwana, Ana Loforte, Francisco Machava, Iraê Lundin, Jovito Nunes, Rafael da Conceição and Victor Igreja in Mozambique.

Other thematic domains within the “consultancy world” that emerged almost hand-in-hand with the advent of “NGO-centered development” and also proved particularly amenable to anthropological input, included the increased focus on women and gender in development that started in the 1980s (Indra 1999). Although gender has over time become a requisite dimension of most practitioner/policy-informing research in Africa, demand for local knowledge about gender relations has been particularly strong in global health, a field of international assistance that has experienced explosive growth over the last three decades. In the case of Africa, growth in this field has revolved predominantly around the HIV AIDS crisis (see Upton, this volume).

In summary, the upshot of the opportunities created during and by the end of the “era of aid,” which covered roughly the last 40 years, has been that anthropology on the continent has experienced a form of revival and re-invention,<sup>8</sup> which has taken the form of anthropology of development, in which researchers are working for NGOs or as consultant researchers. Notably, within the discipline itself, this space has tended to be described in terms of a “language of deficit” – quick to explicitly emphasize “limitations” and without ever questioning implicit evaluations of the anthropology it is capable of producing as falling short of best practice standards. Anthropology via consultancy has thus been viewed as capable of being, at best, a truncated form of praxis, its practitioners regarded as the intellectual servants to other masters and thus bemoaned as being less than “fully committed to the academy” (Ntarangwi 2005).

In this chapter, conventional narrative of the discipline, most of the emphasis is placed on the constraints that have come hand-in-hand with whatever possibilities for research have been adopted during the “era of aid.” Researchers are depicted here as largely straitjacketed by “Terms of References,” which inevitably dictate the questions, circumscribe the methods, and impose (for anthropologists in particular always overly-short) timeframes for consultancy research. The knowledge produced is treated as largely tainted not only by these limitations, but also by the potential power and influence of interests that seem to lurk so close to the surface in evidence-gathering activities (feasibility studies, impact assessments, mid-project reviews, final assessments) commissioned as a requirement for the securing of funding or renewal of funding cycles, and that by definition must report on factors and impacts whose importance is dictated a priori by policy-makers and practitioners. To a large extent, all of these factors have not tended to reinforce a disciplinary-wide view of “consultancy research” as categorically distinct and inherently inferior to “basic anthropological research.” To the extent that much of the research they have been able to pursue has

occurred in the context of consultancy, this has had implications for how much of the work that has been done by African anthropologists has received recognition within the field.

In the remainder of this discussion, I want to challenge this view through a critical discussion of the relationship between one of the core canons of anthropology – namely ethnography, and the research experience of African anthropologists who have worked within the limitations imposed by the era of aid. I will discuss how anthropological canon’s conventions have been used to problematically conflate the consultancy research conducted by many African nationals in their own countries, with that of foreign experts who conduct anthropological research often as part of the same or comparable consultancies. More significantly, I will then reflect on how an understanding of differences between these two groups, also provides substantive grounds for questioning the qualitative and hierarchical distinctions that are often drawn between the knowledge produced by usually foreign anthropologists and that acquired through the research conducted by nationally based anthropologists.

### KNOWLEDGE THROUGH SOCIAL IMMERSION

Perhaps nothing is more central to the professional identity of anthropological practice than ethnography – a technique famously chartered by Malinowski, and reaffirmed many times since as a form of learning about the “other” through social immersion extensive enough to induce a form of re-socialization. Ethnography has provided methodological meeting grounds where – despite the ebb and flow of theoretical paradigms – mutual recognition has still proven possible for members of the “anthropological tribe.” It has also provided one of the more enduring and recognizable markers of the boundary between the discipline and the other social sciences. Last but not least, its anchorage in a particular Malinowskian mythology, has translated into an implicit canon of praxis.

While the epistemological authority once claimed by ethnographic conventions has been subjected to extensive critique within the discipline this has been a critique that has been largely limited to questioning the authoritativeness of the knowledge claims of the method as a whole. Much has been written to debunk the scientific authority and objectivity claimed – or at least implied – in earlier generations. However, in underscoring the subjectivity inherent in ethnography, the method as a whole has been critiqued in a manner that has to some extent insulated ethnographers from other types of critiques. For example the extent to which certain ethnographic accounts might reflect a more culturally competent understanding of the cultural and social worlds to which ethnographic immersion is supposed to provide access. The reasoning goes that to the extent that all ethnography is subject to subjectivity, there remains few grounds for evaluating the relative quality of different accounts – and by extension for ever interrogating the nature of the socially immersive experience that generates it. There is thus rarely, if ever, any reason to question the way in which the charter Malinowskian myth is operationalized, as a standard year (or maybe two) of immersive interaction by the anthropologist in their field site, allowing this to be taken, at face value, as “a sufficient time” in which to gain the forms of cultural acumen and social dexterity with which to make the kinds of usually

still quite extensive and authoritative pronouncements about the life-milieu of others that anthropologists are wont to make.

Yet from early on, and periodically since, voices from anthropologists in independent Africa raised questions about whether such assumptions should hold sway. The focus in these critiques was less about the problems of subjectivity in ethnography as a genre and more about whether the much more disconcerting question about whether the ethnography as it was conventionally being done by the majority of its practitioners from the West was in fact producing culturally competent interlocutors. Thus, in the 1970s, Ghanaian anthropologist Maxwell Owusu vocally critiqued what he called the “ethnographer bias in anthropological research,” noting that one of the most fundamental problems of socio-cultural anthropology in Africa as he had witnessed it was “data quality control in ethnographic fieldwork. This particular problem is caused in great part by the lack of familiarity with the local vernaculars, which results in serious errors of translation of cultures. Rethinking anthropology should begin with or stress rethinking the role of native languages as it affects the general quality of ethnographic data collection, organization, and presentation” (Owusu 1978, p. 311). Owusu noted with frustration that one finds that “it is virtually impossible, particularly for the native (African) anthropologist, to falsify, replicate, or evaluate (ethnography) objectively. For, frequently, it is not clear whether the accounts so brilliantly presented are about native realities at all, or whether they are about informants, about ‘scientific’ models and imaginative speculations, or about the anthropologists themselves and their fantasies” (1978, p. 312).

From this perspective, the particular “*mea culpa* of postmodernism” may have obfuscated certain sins precisely by virtue of confessing to others. To a certain extent anthropologists admitted their own partiality and the positionality, they deftly sidestepped, and in fact ultimately precluded, considerations of the potentially more troubling question of whether the standard ritual performance of the mythical Malinowskian canon of fieldwork, did in fact offer any assurances that any threshold of performative competence would be secured.

With notable exceptions (witness the Mead and Freeman controversy), the discipline has thus retained an awkwardly polite unstated agreement to not talk about – let alone look into or actually evaluate – ethnographic disagreement. Willing to shake the boat of “ethnography” it has not been willing, so to speak, to question ethnographers. Owusu again notes: “The persuasive character of ethnographic findings, which still dominate the non-Western field of scholarship – itself a function of the world power structure – is based less on their factual correctness than on the well-known fact that they are mostly consistent with or have successfully molded or manipulated over the years – because of their ‘scientific’ claims and the prestige of their authors – Western (or even thoroughly Westernized African) public [and we could add *academic*] opinion. They cannot, therefore, be substitutes for the well informed, critical, and original insights and real understanding based on native research and scholarship” (Owusu 1978, p. 327).

If we dare to carry this critique forward to the present-day, we find that it is not only that the canons of fieldwork as practiced by anthropologists from the Global North have been protected from critical scrutiny, but that they have been enshrined as a standard against which other modalities of ethnographic practice are judged. It has been from this position that Anthropology has often mounted its critiques of what it has regarded as

pseudo-appropriations of the ethnographic approach – as per Rapid Appraisals and the more recently fashionable Transect Walks used in many community mappings. While these critiques may hold some sway when they are applied to any researcher whose first and only investigative deployment relies upon these techniques, more often than not they have not represented the first or only form of social interaction that African researchers have with the communities in which they may deploy these techniques as consultancy researchers, nor are they necessarily the only or primary source of the insights they draw upon in their analysis or in formulating findings in reports.

Different problems and questions in same place, continuous engagement, relationship building, these are all opportunities for interaction. Much like others who practice “anthropology at home” (Peirano 1998), many, if not most African anthropologists, draw upon extensive prior knowledge of the contexts, social and linguistic, they are called upon to investigate in their consultancy research. Unlike other “professional applied anthropologists (or other researchers)” who may be shipped in from abroad because they are “topical experts,” their ability to assess local social dynamics is hardly a function of what they are able to learn within the temporal parameters within which any given consultancy occurs, but rather draws upon extensive prior social immersion. To draw upon a linguistic analogy, they are already knowledgeable users of a language that can draw on linguistic competence and experience that would take someone learning a language from scratch years to acquire.

This difference often fails to be recognized by the international agencies who have been criticized by African researchers for hiring foreign researchers, including anthropologists, who may have little or limited, or very dated, experience of the context in which they are supposed to be applying their ethnographic skills. Thus, the creation of some opportunities for nationals aside, foreign “experts” not always knowledgeable about the African contexts where they work, have still tended to dominate international consultancy research. Notably, these critiques have not necessarily prevented many anthropologists from participating rather extensively in such applied research endeavors themselves. In fact, such opportunities often provide mechanisms for graduate students, or even already established scholars to “get a foot into the field” and “build networks/establish contacts” which later serve as the basis for writing the funding proposals and ultimately launching the more substantive anthropological studies, which will be the focus of their writing and career advancement as Africanist scholars. Many of these foreign anthropological experts, cognizant of the limitations of their contextual knowledge have sought out and “worked with” (i.e. often sub-contracted, or hired as “assistants”) national researchers. The “neo-assistantism” characterizing such relationships they developed with local researchers and communities as a consequence at times resembles those of the colonial period. None of this has gone unnoticed by African anthropologists. In this respect, the extremely recent observations of Sudanese anthropologist Abdel Ahmed for his country are likely to reflect a reality to be found in most African countries:

Most visiting anthropologists of this period fall into two categories: students who come to do “exotic” fieldwork and at the same time assume the role of advisors; and professional anthropologists who come as “experts” even if they have never been in Sudan before. The first group lacks in experience and seems to be unable to grasp the issues of commitment and ethics. In the long run, the members of the first group simply further

scientific colonialism as they use the influence of the agencies for which they work or to which they are affiliated to gain access to, and sometimes remove, documents that indigenous scholars cannot even dream of consulting due to security arrangements. ... The impact that their research may have on the local people and the use of their reports by international agencies are matters they are seldom concerned about. The second group of anthropologists, no matter how limited their knowledge of the Sudan, assumes an “expert” role and applies a “hit-and-run” method of research. Their visits to the country usually do not exceed a few weeks, during which they consult Sudanese specialists, whether inside or outside the universities. Often, the work of the Sudanese is borrowed and later edited after a short trip to the locality or region they were sent to study. Their reports are mostly based on knowledge gained through a hasty study, and quickly written without reflections before leaving the country. (Ahmed 2015, p. 31)<sup>9</sup>

However, one of the primary questions that I aim to raise here is not merely about the difference in the socio-cultural competency of national versus international *consultancy researchers*, but rather a deeper question about the ethnographic canons of anthropology itself. One of the most crucial observations to be made is that the socio-cultural competence that national anthropologists acquire is not merely a function of being members of the societies (broadly speaking) in which they conduct their research, but that this competence is often honed at a more specific level precisely through the accumulated socially immersive experiences provided by successive consultancies – and thus on a periodic (rather than continuous) basis, that extends and develops cumulatively over many years – even decades – rather than as one single year or two-long bout of fieldwork. Moreover, the variety of topics they may be called upon to investigate over time in the same social context, and often even the very same communities – precisely because of the various interests that drive successive consultancies over time – provides many over time with a breadth of understanding, that may embody a holism that the discipline as a whole has relegated, at least in practice, to its past, even if it continues to pay a certain lip service to this ideal.<sup>10</sup>

While recognizing that for African anthropologists, research also requires a certain analytical “de-familiarization,” the experiences that have emerged in no small part from our efforts to cope with the “limitations” (or perhaps better the “demands”) of consultancy research, have taught many of us the immense value of continuous periodic re-immersions within the communities in which we conduct investigations, and upon whom we reflect anthropologically.<sup>11</sup> Take, for example, the work of Laboratoire d’Études et de Recherche sur les Dynamiques Sociales et le Développement Local (LASDEL) in West Africa which has for three decades been producing thematic country and regional research that in addition to its relevance to the concerned countries has also developed data collection approaches and tools better attuned to, and capable of capturing, local dynamics (Olivier de Sardan 2011). Nyamnjoh’s exemplary account of *disquetes* and *thiofs* in Dakar in which the author produces a nuanced ethnographic description of a practice without having remained in one well-demarcated location for a long period is another example. In his words, “one is always doing fieldwork, even when not formally in the field” (2005, p. 297). Ultimately, his published findings resulted from materials that he describes as “harvested as I went along, propelled by a fascination with the theme in question and a background of similar interests pursued among students and youth elsewhere in Cameroon and Botswana” (idem). With notable exceptions (witness for example over a half century of work

amongst the Gwambe Tonga in Zambia by Elizabeth Colson (1971, 1999)), few contemporary foreign anthropologists can lay claim to an experiential basis of comparable depth, breadth, or temporal span to that which has become quite common for many African researchers working in their own countries.

Nyamnjoh’s observations highlight another important fact that should be brought to bear in this polemic: that if the local knowledge of national anthropologists is not merely produced within the confines of consultancy research (but in fact almost always draws upon a vast repertoire of knowledge that precedes it), neither does the finding report produced for the consultancy in any way represent the totality of what the national anthropologist learns about the local social reality during the course of the consultancy. In fact, what is “written up” may be but a part of what is ultimately added as a new layer to a cumulative understanding that, under the right circumstances, could become a particularly authoritative ethnography or anthropological study.<sup>12</sup> Mills et al. recognize as much in noting that, “provided consultancy work is theoretically grounded, such reports could be rewritten into the sort of ‘thick ethnographic descriptions favoured by the scholarly community’” (2006, p. 35).

Although the exposure of such studies – at least throughout the discipline writ large – may be limited because they are produced in national languages or published and circulated locally, the resulting anthropological knowledge may be no less incisive or profound nonetheless. Evidence for this may show up in the bibliographies of foreign anthropologists before it does in the premier disciplinary journals of the Global North. Thus, for example, few anthropologists of Mozambique working on gender would neglect to engage with the full-length studies produced by national researchers like Ana Loforte, or on violence and children by Alcinda Honwana, or on post-war trauma with Victor Igreja – all of whom drew extensively upon consultancy-based research conducted over many years.

Ultimately, do not such experiences provide ample grounds for revisiting the canons of ethnographic praxis, and asking about what forms of power those canons reproduce and why? Do they not provide grounds for a critical empirical comparison of the results of the current Malinowskian canon’s conventional parameters with the possibilities of “long term immersion and re-emersion” and the grounds of knowledge provided through, but not entirely limited by, multiple social engagements that are afforded by that quietly maligned activity known as “consultancy research?” As Mills et al. note “Repeated consultancies in the same community or with the same group of people could result in an accumulated set of data that, over time, amounts to a critical ethnography” (2006, p. 35). Should not a discipline that has supposedly left its synchronic predilections far behind, ask itself, which approach, the canonical year, or the consultancy-punctuated decade, in fact provides the sounder grounding for investigating social dynamics in Africa?

#### WRITTEN FROM/IN/FOR AFRICA – RELATIONSHIPS AND THE ETHICS OF AUDIENCE

Finally, there is also much to say about the experience of African anthropologists in the “era of aid” that places into question common assumptions about the “ethics of engagement” that arise from their research endeavors. This is particularly the case

when so much of this research is generated through consultancy research which tends to be viewed as singularly responsive to the donors and practitioners who pay for the work, and are critiqued by anthropologists as being largely unresponsive to the communities in which applied research takes place.

Yet, rather ironically, while anthropologists are known for mastering the art of negotiating access to communities, it is still more the exception than the rule for many to take extensive steps in terms of bringing the results of their research back to the African communities in which they work. Certainly, far less effort tends to be spent on such endeavors – which may be “good form” but are ultimately optional for purposes of career advancement – compared to those efforts expended on giving papers, writing articles, and reaching out to and building the requisite relationships for professional advancement with their academic peers. Given the contentious history of anthropology in Africa, researchers need to reach out for broader audiences that include study participants, donor organizations, and policy-makers. In this, the medium of communication and the language used should be in tune with local contexts.

While African anthropologists are keenly sensitive to the need to continue to combat the discipline’s colonial legacy, many are also driven towards a different politics of engagement with the research communities in which they conduct their research. This is particularly true in the many communities in which multiple consultancy research engagements occur over time. Many national anthropologists conducting successive consultancies establish longstanding relationships and genuine commitments to the communities in which they work over years and decades. However, beyond that they have additional structural incentives to be more locally responsive – since these are often relationships that are not optional given the need to maintain possibilities for continued access in the future when other consultancy opportunities emerge. In short, the demands of consultancy research for many national researchers provides a strong incentive for a far more sustained ethics of local engagement than that into which foreign “basic researchers” at times opt into, and which is almost diametrically opposed to the incentives that underwrite “parachute-in” foreign consultancies.

For all these reasons, a number of African anthropologists are thus pursuing a different “ethic of engagement” often by showing that it is possible to present research results in the languages of the groups we work with. Translation of our research would go a long way in ensuring that results of our work are known. Other forms of translation or of “bringing the results of research back” that embody this “ethic of engagement” and that African scholars are pioneering include modes of communication that privilege orality and performance over writing, that communicate knowledge through popular forms of public expression such as music, fiction, drama, cartoons, or fables – all of which may resonate in African contexts.

In Mozambique, a group composed largely of anthropologists based at Kaleidoscopio is successfully engaging in new approaches to research and communication of research results by collaborating with artists and research participants from research design to dissemination of results. This work builds on a tradition that has roots on the engaged research that used to be done at the Center for African Studies at Eduardo Mondlane University in the 1980s and 1990s and then was taken up by researchers who set up research institutes outside the university (Fernandes 2017). Examples like those of



Kaleidoscopio also demonstrate how, in some cases, new research options are being developed outside academic institutions altogether. Unlike universities, where academic publications and teaching still retain a certain primacy of place, such forums respond to other priorities, in some ways similar to those of the consultancy economy in which they also participate, but also experimenting with other modalities of financing as well, striving to create new possibilities for community empowerment, operating as “think tanks” that can generate policy options, and working as forums for fostering critical public dialogue.

African anthropologists are also avidly taking anthropology to the public arena (MacClancy 2013) and exploring possibilities of communicating research in ways more accessible to broader public audiences.<sup>13</sup> While visiting anthropologists who conduct research on the continent are comfortable making often quite expansive claims about African communities back in their respective universities and at international conferences, most decidedly eschew political or cultural commentary of any sort in the countries in which they do their actual research. By way of contrast, African scholars, whose research may have direct impact in the policy of their respective countries or in the communities they live in, have a different perspective. As scholars whose work is conducted in their own country, many African scholars tend to be motivated towards much more engaged posture, positioning themselves as critical public intellectuals. In their efforts to enable their research to have an impact on political and economic dynamics in their own countries and local contexts, many African anthropologists prioritize other forms of knowledge products and are increasingly experimenting with new forms of knowledge production aimed at their fellow citizens, as well as national and international policy-makers. A very well known example was the collaboration between the late painter Tshibumba Kanda Matulu, and anthropologist Johannes Fabian that resulted in the book *Remembering the Present: Painting and Popular History in Zaire* which narrates and interprets the history of Zaire through the paintings of Kanda Matulu. The work was not intended solely for academics, nor to provide definite readings of the history of Zaire, but rather in the words of Kanda Matulu a work produced: “to make you think” (Fabian 1996).

Ultimately a review of the state of play of anthropological practice in the continent describes a “new face of the discipline [that] is developing through ever closer-association between academic anthropologists and those working in multi-disciplinary research teams, between consultants and teachers, between ‘pure’ and ‘applied’ work” (Mills 2006, p. 1). Most certainly responsive to the realities of the “era of aid” that have occasioned the revival and re-invention of disciplinary praxis, contemporary African anthropology is also creatively forging the grounds for the critical re-evaluation of ethnographic praxis, its own and that of the discipline’s practitioners on the continent writ large.

## CONCLUSION

Anthropology is one of the social sciences that goes through frequent waves of renewal.<sup>14</sup> Its practice in Africa has long been key to the development and renewal of the discipline, and this reflection aims to contribute to this process, from the particular perspective of the discipline’s contemporary practitioners who are African, work in

Africa, and whose research focuses on African social dynamics. Since the waves of African independence in 1950s and 1960s, scholars working on the continent routinely discuss the past and future of anthropological practice.<sup>15</sup> These discussions cover issues such as anthropologists' role in supporting the colonial administration, the ways the discipline's methods could adapt to a situation in which anthropological research is conducted at home and what kind of epistemological questions should be at the heart of anthropological practice.<sup>16</sup> Underlining all debates are the politics of knowledge production.

In this chapter I have attempted to provide a perspective of anthropological practice based on African experiences. To summarize, I began by presenting the conditions that led to African revolutionary elites to despise anthropology and ultimately ban it from being taught in most African countries in the period that followed independence. Central to this position was a well-founded suspicion about the discipline's support, at times explicit, often tacit, of colonial and imperial projects.

A window of opportunity opened briefly for a form of research that valued African history and identity immediately after independence, buttressed in part by early forms of aid from new international sources in the Nordic countries who had a less compromising past and were committed to a politics of solidarity with the newly independent nations. Even so, most Africans trained in anthropology sought refuge in cognate departments or African Studies centers where they continued to infuse ethnographic methods into their research.

The neoliberal turn and the rise of the "era of aid" in Africa have contributed to the renewal of the discipline in the continent, but in contradictory and highly paradoxical ways. During the first wave of "structural adjustment policies" the underfunding of research at public universities and institutes, drove the possibilities for research out of academia and into the NGO and project driven economy where a demand for "local knowledge" grew. The possibilities of research outside universities led African anthropologists to develop approaches and methods that significantly differ from anthropological canons.

In particular, African anthropologists during the "era of aid" who have had to rely on consultancies for most research opportunities, have adopted research strategies that involve punctuated engagements over longer periods of time, that leverage the breadth successive consultancies afford, and yet that are also not fully constrained by consultancy parameters, in terms of the cumulative knowledge that can be acquired. These modalities of repetitive engagement not only provide an alternative, and arguably advantageous, modality for building the forms of socio-cultural competence to which ethnography supposedly aspires, but also tend to produce far more intensive forms of relational immersion within the communities to which national anthropologists find themselves continuously returning. This is structurally conducive to an "ethics of engagement" that may be widely lauded within the discipline – but is frankly still very much one that remains an "option" for many Africanist practitioners from the Global North.

Ultimately reviewing the possibilities, and not merely the limitations, that have accompanied the re-emergence and re-invention of African anthropological praxis in the "era of aid," I have suggested that the experience and observations of African anthropologists provide important grounds for critically interrogating the conventions that currently define the discipline's methodological canons as another important step yet to be taken towards a more unflinchingly critical reflection on the epistemological premises of disciplinary praxis in Africa itself.

## NOTES

- 1 For appraisals of anthropological practices in independent Africa see Fokwang (2005), Nkwi (2006), Ntarangwi et al. (2006), Spiegel and Becker (2015), and Nyamnjoh and Boswell (2017).
- 2 See for example Werbner (1984), Hart (1985), Moore (1994) Goody (1995), Kuper (1996), and Mafeje (2001).
- 3 Discussions on these boundaries often assume that anthropological practice by northern Africanists are not bounded hence, it is all a matter of removing the boundaries that constrain Africans.
- 4 If the practitioners of the colonial era have in fact passed on, there are at least two or three, maybe more successive generations of Africanist anthropologists, many occupying the senior echelons of the academy, whose published work has arguably yet to reveal much interest in any sustained engagement with this question.
- 5 See Schumaker (1996).
- 6 Samora Machel’s line: For the nation to live the tribe must die.
- 7 The Center for African Studies at Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique had in the work of Claude Meillassoux an important reference.
- 8 In places like Cameroon and Ivory Coast where anthropology had been marginalized, it has become possible to open new anthropology departments (Anugwom 2007; G nabéli 2011; Nkwi, and Socpa 2007). In Mozambique where, since independence, social sciences had been limited to the study of history, anthropology was introduced in 1995 along with sociology and political science (Loforte 1987; Taela 2000). In 1989, the Pan African Anthropology Association (PAAA) was created and in 1996, after the end of the apartheid in South Africa, PAAA and the Association for Anthropology in Southern Africa (AASA) organized the first joint conference in South Africa prompting the chairperson of the conference organizing committee to suggest that the unification of African anthropology had the potential to help the discipline flourish in the continent and even “colonize” anthropology (de Jongh 1997). By the 2000s, these organization had registered modest gains, mostly hosting regular regional conferences. At the national level, it was possible to establish some additional anthropology departments and attract a younger generation of students (Bogopa and Petrus 2007; Nkwi 2006; Nkwi 2007; Nkwi 2015). The growth of the discipline was to be stimulated by national and continental collaborations, especially of the kinds promoted by sister organizations such as the Council for the Development of Social Sciences Research (CODESRIA) and the Organization for Social Sciences Research in Eastern Africa (OSSREA).
- 9 In Mozambique the term “Polana researchers” was coined at least a couple decades ago to refer to the many dozens, if not hundreds, of foreign researchers, including some anthropologists, whose short consultancy research seemed to revolve around interviewing more locally knowledgeable national researchers over coffee for several days at the illustrious Polana hotel in downtown Maputo, the capital city.
- 10 As Binsbergen notes, “features that used to characterize the anthropological undertaking in the past (like prolonged participatory field-work, qualitative data, open-ended questions, the emphasis on face-to-face relationships) can hardly serve as criteria anymore, now that modern so-called anthropologists are as likely to use archival and secondary sources, impersonal survey techniques and computer analysis, as any historian, sociologist, or political scientist” (1982, p. 5).
- 11 Sichone (2001) has long suggested that as a discipline, anthropology would greatly benefit if all anthropologists did some anthropology at home.
- 12 Often these documents become sources where non national anthropologists come to mine and make use of the knowledge without feeling the need to recognize its authors.
- 13 For earlier attempts at adopting this perspective see for example Assal and Abdul-Jalil (2015).

- 14 See for example Ortner (1984), Clifford and Marcus (1986), Ahmed and Shore (1995), and Comaroff (2010).
- 15 See Bank and Bank (2013), Binsbergen (2003), Goody (1995), Hammond-Tooke (1997), Kuper (1996), Mafeje (2001), Moore (1994b), Schumaker (2001), and Werbner (1984).
- 16 See Ahmed (2003), Becker (2007), Binsbergen (2003), Copans (2007), Hountondji (1992), Mafeje (2001), Magubane (1971, 1973), Nkwi (2006), Nyamnjoh (2012, 2015), Obbo (2006), Owusu (1978), Schumaker (2001), Sichone (2001), and Spiegel and Becker (2015).

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar Muhammad. 1975. "Some Remarks from the Third World on Anthropology and Colonialism: The Sudan." In *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, edited by Talal Asad, 257–70. London: Ithaca Press and Humanities Press.
- . 2003. *Anthropology in the Sudan: Reflections by a Sudanese Anthropologist*. Utrecht: International Books.
- . 2015. "The State of Anthropology in Sudan." In *Past, Present, and Future: Fifty Years of Anthropology in Sudan*, edited by Munzoul Abdalla M. Assal and Musa Adam Abdul-Jalil, 21–35. Bergen: C. Michelsen Institute.
- Ahmed, Abdel Ghaffar M., Munzoul A. M. Assal, Idris Salim El-Hassan, and M. A. Mohamed Salih. 2003. *Anthropology in the Sudan: Reflections by a Sudanese Anthropologist*. Utrecht: International Books.
- Ahmed, Akbar S., and Chris Shore, eds. 1995. *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World. First Edition*. London: Athlone Press.
- Anugwom, Edlyne. 2007. "Behind the Clouds: Teaching and Researching Anthropology in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria," *The African Anthropologist* 14 (1–2):43–64.
- Asad, Talal. 1975. "Introduction." In *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, edited by Talal Asad, 9–19. London: Ithaca Press and Humanities Press.
- Assal, Munzoul A. M., and Musa Adam Abdul-Jalil, eds. 2015. *Past, Present and Future: Fifty Years of Anthropology in Sudan*. Bergen: C. Michelsen Institute.
- Bank, Andrew, and Leslie Bank, eds. 2013. *Inside African Anthropology: Monica Wilson and Her Interpreters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, Heike. 2007. "De-provincialising South African Anthropology: On Relevance, Public Culture & the Citizen Anthropologist." *Anthropology Southern Africa* 30 (3–4):85–96.
- Binsbergen, Wim M. J. van. 1982. *Dutch Anthropology of Sub-Saharan Africa in the 1970s*, 16. Leiden: African Studies Centre.
- . 2003. *Intercultural Encounters: African and Anthropological Lessons Towards a Philosophy of Interculturality*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Bogopa, David, and Theodore Petrus. 2007. "The Politics of Teaching, Funding and Publication in South African Anthropology: 'Our Experiences'." *The African Anthropologist* 14 (1&2):1–18.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press.
- Colson, Elizabeth. 1971. *The Social Consequences of Resettlement: The Impact of the Kariba Resettlement Upon the Gwembe Tonga*. Lusaka and Manchester: University of Zambia, Institute for African Studies and Manchester University Press.
- . 1999 "Gendering Those Uprooted by 'Development.'" in *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice*, edited by Doreen Indra, 23–39, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Comaroff, John. 2010. "The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline." *American Anthropologist* 112 (4):524–538.

- Copans, Jean. 2007. “Les frontières africaines de l’anthropologie.” *Journal des Anthropologues* (110–111):337–370.
- Dickson, Jessica L., and Andrew D. Spiegel. 2014. *South African Anthropology in Conversation. An Intergenerational Interview on the History and Future of Social Anthropology in South Africa*. Mankon, Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa.
- Donham, Donald L. 1999. *Marxist Modern: An Ethnographic History of the Ethiopian Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dunduro, Silva. 2009. “Projecto para criação do Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Oral e Ciências Sociais (Beira, Moçambique).” MA Dissertation, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, São Paulo.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1996. *Remembering the Present: Painting and Popular History in Zaire by Johannes Fabian*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Fernandes, Carlos. 2017. Socialism, Post-socialism and Intellectual Legacies in Post-colonial Mozambique: The Case of the CEA (1976–1986) and IESE (2007–2016) Paper delivered at the 7th European Conference on African Studies ECAS29 June to 1 July 2017. University of Basel, Switzerland.
- Fokwang, Jude. 2005. “Cameroonising Anthropology: Some Trends and Implications.” *African Anthropologist* 12 (2):181–198.
- Gnabéli, Roch Yao. 2011. “L’anthropologie sociale dans les universités ivoiriennes entre marginalisation et subordination.” *Journal des Anthropologues*, 126–127:17–34.
- Goody, Jack. 1995. *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa 1918–1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammond-Tooke, W. D. 1997. *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa’s Anthropologists, 1920–1990*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Hart, Keith. 1985. “The Social Anthropology of West Africa.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 14 (1):243–272.
- Hountondji, Paulin. 1992. “Recapturing.” In *The Surreptitious Speech: Présence Africaine and the Politics of Otherness, 1947–1987*, edited by Valentim Y. Mudimbe, 238–248. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hutchinson, Sharon. 1996. *Nuer Dilemmas*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Indra, Doreen. 1999. “Not a Room of One’s Own.” In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice*, edited by Doreen Indra, 1–22, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Jongh, Michael de. 1997. “Africa Colonizes Anthropology.” *Current Anthropology* 38 (3): 451–453.
- Kuper, Adam. 1996. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. London: Routledge.
- Loforte, Ana. 1987. “Trabalhos realizados no âmbito da antropologia em Moçambique.” *Trabalhos de Arqueologia e Antropologia* 2:61–65.
- MacClancy, Jeremy. 2013. *Anthropology in the Public Arena: Historical and Contemporary Contexts*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Mafeje, Archie. 1971. “The Ideology of ‘Tribalism’.” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 9 (2):253–261.
- . 2001. *Anthropology in Post Independence Africa: End of an Era and the Problem of Self-Redefinition*. Nairobi: Heinrich Böll Foundation.
- Magubane, Bernard. 1971. “A Critical Look at Indices Used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa.” *Current Anthropology* 12 (4/5):419–445.
- . 1973. “The ‘Xhosa’ in Town, Revisited Urban Social Anthropology: A Failure of Method and Theory.” *American Anthropologist* 75 (5):1701–1715.
- Mills, David, Mustafa Babiker, and Mwenda Ntarangwi. 2006. “Introduction: Histories of Training, Ethnographies of Practice.” In *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*, edited by Mwenda Ntarangwi, David Mills, and Mustafa Babiker, 1–48. London: CODESRIA and Zed Books.

- Mkandawire, Thandika. 1997. "The Social Sciences in Africa: Breaking Local Barriers and Negotiating International Presence." *African Studies Review* 40 (2):15–36.
- Moore, Sally Falk. 1994. *Anthropology and Africa: Changing Perspectives on a Changing Scene*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Nkwi, Paul. 2006. "Anthropology in a Post-colonial Africa: The Survival Debate." In *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, edited by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar, 157–178. Oxford: Berg.
- . 2007. "Editorial: Resurgence of Anthropology at African Universities." *African Anthropologist* 14 (1–2). <https://doi.org/10.4314/aa.v14i1-2.57723>.
- Nkwi, Paul Nchoji. 2015. *The Anthropology of Africa: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG.
- Nkwi, Paul and Socpa, Antoine. 2007. "Anthropology at the University of Yaounde I: A Historical Overview, 1962–2008" *The African Anthropologist*, 14 (1–2): 65–88.
- Ntarangwi, Mwenda. 2005. "African Anthropology Struggling Along." *Anthropology News* 46 (9):9–10.
- Ntarangwi, Mwenda, David Mills, and Mustafa Babiker, eds. 2006. *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*. London: CODESRIA and Zed Books.
- Nyamnjoh, Francis B. 2005. "Fishing in Troubled Waters: 'Disquettes' and 'Thiofs' in Dakar." *Africa* 75 (3):295–324. <https://doi.org/10.3366/afr.2005.75.3.295>.
- . 2012. "Blinded by Sight: Divining the Future of Anthropology in Africa." *Africa Spectrum* 47 (2/3):63–92.
- . 2015. "Beyond an Evangelising Public Anthropology: Science, Theory and Commitment." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 33 (1):48–63.
- Nyamnjoh, Francis, and Rosabelle Boswell, eds. 2017. *Postcolonial African Anthropologies*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Obbo, Christine. 2006. "But We Know It All! African Perspectives on Anthropological Knowledge." In *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*, edited by Mwenda Ntarangwi, David Mills, and Mustafa Babiker, 154–169. London: CODESRIA and Zed Books.
- Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 2011. "L'anthropologie peut-elle être un sport Collectif? ECRIS, vingt ans après." In *Auf Dem Boden Der Tatsachen: Festschrift für Thomas Bierschenk*, edited by Nikolaus Schareika, Eva Spies, and Pierre-Yves Le Meur, 31–44. Cologne: Köppe (Mainzer Beiträge zur Afrikaforschung 28).
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1984. "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (1):126–166.
- Owusu, Maxwell. 1978. "Ethnography of Africa: The Usefulness of the Useless." *American Anthropologist* 80 (2):310–334.
- Peirano, Mariza G. S. 1998. "When Anthropology Is at Home: The Different Contexts of a Single Discipline." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27 (1):105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.27.1.105>.
- Schumaker, Lyn. 1996. "A Tent with a View: Colonial Officers, Anthropologists, and the Making of the Field in Northern Rhodesia, 1937–1960." *Osiris* 11:237–258.
- . 2001. *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Scott, James. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sharp, John S. 1981. "The Roots and Development of Volkekunde in South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 8 (1):16–36.
- Sichone, Owen. 2001. "Pure Anthropology in a Highly Indebted Poor Country." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27 (2):369–379.
- Spiegel, Andrew D., and Heike Becker. 2015. "South Africa: Anthropology or Anthropologies?" *American Anthropologist* 117 (4):754–760.

- Taela, Kátia. 2000. “A produção antropológica do Departamento de Arqueologia e Antropologia da Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, 1980–2000.” Honours dissertation, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo.
- Werbner, Richard P. 1984. “The Manchester School in South-Central Africa.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13 (1):157–185.
- Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe. 2002. “The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa.” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28 (1):9–23.