

Professor Vineeta Sinha

26th October 2021

Webinar Series: Decolonial Research Methods: Resisting Coloniality in Academic Knowledge Production

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n_WVnTRRfuw

Organised by: Dr Leon Moosavi, University of Liverpool, UK

Sponsored by: National Centre for Research Methods (UK)

Transcribed by: Ms Yuqi Ong

Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. I'm delighted to be here this afternoon. And I want to thank Dr. Leon Moosavi for inviting me to be a part of this very important conversation. And I also want to thank the sponsors and organizers for curating this wonderful webinar series. It's so heartening to see such tremendous interest and enthusiasm in this subject, and I look forward to a good discussion at the end of it. So I'm going to take probably the full time that's allocated to me, so I will speak for about 40 to 45 minutes. The title of my talk this afternoon is *Annihilating the "Savage Slot" from Anthropology: Materializing Reflexive Practices*. So let me begin with an anecdote and frame the problematic. In 1955, Murray Groves, an Australian anthropologist reported an encounter he had with a slight young man in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea. In this exchange, the young man in question, Lepani Watson, speaking of the Polish anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski's research in the Trobriand Islands, declared to Groves, I quote, "You may be interested to know that Malinowski was in error", end of quote. Citing knowledge given by his membership in the community, Watson explained, "I am a Trobriand Islander myself, and from what I have heard of his writings, it is clear that Malinowski did not understand our systems of clans and chiefs". Watson then presented a surprised Groves with a typewritten page of foolscap, which he said is a short account he had written himself, and which outlines the facts as they really are, and I should like you to have it. Groves surmised that the redress Watson sought, was to make the facts available to those who have been misinformed. In an obliging gesture, Groves had Watson's written account in English reproduced in the anthropology journal *MAN* with the counsel that, and I quote, "It should be compared with *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, pages 62 to 72", end of quote. This remarkable conversation, while published in *MAN* in November 1956, has remained largely unknown to anthropologists. Groves himself did not theorize this encounter any further, nor did the journal readers interrogate Malinowski's analysis on the basis of Watson's refutation. Such rare contestations even when and if acknowledged, are at best deemed isolated, and at worse, quickly forgotten. However, this exchange carries tremendous import and merits a

revisit in the context of the present discussion on decolonizing anthropology and constitutes a critical starting point in this talk. The legacy of the savage slot, its methodological importance and unequal politics persist in contemporary disciplinary practices in anthropology. This is largely because, while anthropology's entanglements with its colonial past have been noted and critiqued since at least the 1950s, calls to expunge the legacy of hierarchies and hegemonies have not been acted upon sufficiently by its practitioners or produced the requisite changes. The ensuing problematic ethnographic practices in the field, in the classroom and in professional arenas of conferences and publishing, have managed to thus survive, often sidestepping criticism of the discipline's embeddedness in imperial, neocolonial and neoliberal politics with rhetorical ornamental maneuvers. Anthropology initially pretended not to acknowledge the colonial presence and notice that the native, carefully curated as its subject matter was also colonized. Critics have rightly highlighted that unequal power structures have framed ethnographic practices and anthropological knowledge production. Much of this edifice firmly persists in contemporary ethnographic practices, as does the centrality of the savage slot, which seems to have found a permanent home in anthropology.

Let me move to the next section of the talk, which I call "Anthropology and the Savage Slot". Since the middle of the 20th century, anthropologists have highlighted the colonial legacy of the discipline's troubled past. The collective call to decolonize anthropology has seen feminist, post-colonial and third world scholars raised their voices together with a cluster of anthropologists from the Global North. However, unpacking the relationship between colonialism and anthropology has spoken loudly to the unequal power underpinnings of the discipline only since the 1990s. In theory, there has long been a level of discomfort with anthropology's blindspots and practitioners seem to agree that the discipline had to be reinvented to remain relevant. Some even predicted the demise of anthropology unless it was radically transformed. Through these moments of intense scrutiny and soul searching, the discipline has failed to sufficiently reinvent itself. No habits, fundamental assumptions and disciplinary practices shifted effectively. From the mid-19th century, anthropology molded and rendered colonized subjects into natives, primitives and others, marking the regions they inhabited as field sites such as Africa, Asia, India, China, appropriating in the process people and sites as objects of anthropological inquiry. Early British anthropologists like Haddon, Rivers, Fraser, Tyler and Malinowski drew upon a body of extant information about non-Europeans in crafting remnants of the new discipline. The corpus of travel writing, missionary reports and colonial narratives was sprinkled with spectacular images of exotic primitives and noble savages. Anthropology certainly did not invent but rather inherited one variant of the savage

slot, as has been argued by the late Michel-Rolph Trouillot. But in appropriating the slot and its associated radical alterity as the epistemological and conceptual foundations of their discipline, anthropologists have re-constituted and transformed this inheritance in critical ways. Writing in 1991, the late Michel-Rolph Trouillot noted, and I quote, "Anthropology's future depends largely on its ability to contest the savage slot and the thematic that constructs this slot. The times are ripe for this questioning", end of quote. For Trouillot, the future of anthropology demanded, I quote, "an explicit attack on the savage slot itself and the symbolic order upon which it is premised", end of quote. The savage slot clearly has had tremendous traction in anthropology and persists, demonstrating a capacity to morph and find new resting places, tinges of what Trouillot has called "the symbolic order and thematic", which I interpret as the underlying logic of difference, otherness, exoticization and stigmatization of the savage slot linger in unexpected quarters and anthropology but are often too subtle to pin down concretely. Indeed, these problematic ideas have been fortified and given a new lease of life in forging camaraderie with other blind spots like racism, sexism, and elitism, producing newer, more potent iterations. Even as the savage slot, also manifestly expressed as native, Other, indigenous, minority, marginalized remains firmly in place in the discipline, there have been growing challenges as the subjects of anthropology, talk, gaze and write back to anthropologists. But as noted earlier, this is not entirely a recent phenomenon. What is to be done with the savage slot and its very contemporary iterations? Taking inspirations from Trouillot's incisive work, I reiterate the call to confront the savage slot, and the mode in which its problematic assumptions have been wedged into the very epistemologies, methodologies and theoretical foundations of anthropology. I argue for expunging the savage slot from anthropology given its particularizing, alienating, disempowering, dehumanizing and stigmatizing effects. As an ethnographer, I see the savage slot as an idiom that expresses well the epistemological and political limits of the discipline's practices. I invoke this category in order to critically engage regnant anthropological norms and practices and move towards alternatives, which for me, are the tools for decolonizing anthropology.

I move now to the next section of the talk, which I've called "Materializing Reflexive Practices". A scrutiny of attendant disciplinary practices in anthropology, discussing, doing, reading, writing, and teaching ethnography, continue to be grounded in the savage native and Other slot, as do its epistemologies, methodologies and analytical frames. Arguably, decades of self-reflection have moved the needle well away from the discipline's original methodological and ontological template. But how can those moments which disturb and unsettled the everyday practices of the discipline be leveraged? In addition, how can spaces for dialogue and debates and the conditions

for materializing new disciplinary practices be created? I argue that it is precisely the reform of these named practices which carry the potential for decolonizing anthropology, in a refusal to take for granted the logic and methodology for reproducing disciplinary knowledge and move towards the important task of reimagining these. The savage slot framed the subject matter of classical anthropology, the study of the native, the Other, with a view to capturing the native point of view, as well as its methodological turn to fieldwork has conceived of the fieldworker, ethnographer, anthropologist and author as the objective omniscient knower. In the face of critique, the persistence of this trope has often been dismissed as a dated view of the discipline with examples cited to demonstrate that anthropologists have indeed done fieldwork at home, and more recently highlighted the emergence of autoethnography. However, it is striking that for the most part, in parts of Southeast Asia, including Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, and South Asia, in India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, et cetera, anthropology as a disciplinary practice continues to reproduce Western models institutionally. Even as growing clusters of individuals, scholars and academics are pushing back boldly in turning to decolonize and innovative modes of doing, writing and teaching anthropology. Yet, despite considerable theoretical scrutiny, the category native as well as its proxies, like informants, locals and villages have survived in anthropological discourse, accorded legitimacy and even some respectability. Even as the words “savage” and “primitive” do not find favor with anthropologists today, the notions they embody linger in the cognate categories of natives, ethnic minorities, and women. Scholars and students of anthropology from the former colonies or the Global South, based in graduate schools in North American and European universities, for example, are still unreflexively and unapologetically referred to by their peers and professors, as natives of particular cultural regions. They continue to receive the counsel that it would be best for them to study their own societies, given their familiarity with their own culture and their competency in their own languages. This guidance speaks fundamentally to the epistemological foundations of anthropology in specifying who has the authority to speak and about what. In the early 1990s to the mid-1990s, I myself remember vividly being asked to speak by some of my professors as a native of Southeast Asia during my graduate student days in the United States. Hearing this in a fresh post-writing cultural moment, some of my classmates were as outraged and disturbed as I was. Certainly I had found this imposed identity as a “native” discomfiting and felt exoticized and denigrated simultaneously. Moving from the United States to Singapore, where I have returned to live and work since the mid-1990s, while I have not been referred to as a “native” I have certainly been defined as a local academic, both by some of my own university colleagues as well as students, and by visiting scholars, a descriptor that draws on the epistemology of the category

native. In another example, despite my professional credentials as a scholar of diaspora Hinduism, I have often been recast by researchers from the Global North and the Global South as an informant given my ascribed Indian Hindu identity, which obscures my research expertise. Likewise, as a Head of Department, my authority and experience as a senior administrator are diminished when the office I occupy is mediated by an imposed identity of a brown woman, while my service competencies and skills are devalued. The point I'm trying to make is that making natives is not a thing of the past. The image of the colonized native and the category native, packed with old resonances thrive at the intersection of gender, regional location and minority group status. In a post-colonial context, numerous new natives and others have also been created. For example, anthropology has fetishized the natives of the North East and tribal communities in India, while ethnic and religious minorities in Singapore are racially and culturally exoticised and have become the other of anthropological research. In both these instances, a dominant hegemonic gaze functions to achieve what I call an internal colonization which needs to be recognized and contested. The category of native, of course, has been interrogated and unpacked by anthropologists like Lila Abu-Lughod and Kirin Narayan just to name a few good examples. Ironically, despite these efforts, the term "native" has been given a new lease of life in being embraced by anthropologists from the former colonies, as they have long self-identified as native anthropologists in an attempt to reconfigure the category native in validating and celebratory terms. This category has been offered as a partial solution in facilitating genuine self-representation, but with the detachment and distance bestowed by disciplinary training. Conventional anthropological reasoning has translated natives and native anthropologists alike as providers of data, often what is called "authentic genuine data", based on the experiences of being members of native communities. This has also meant the exoticization and valorization of native voices as untouched, pure and original. But sometimes this very apparent closeness to actualities and experiences has been seen as a problem, as native subjectivity is perceived to taint the accuracy of reportage, and sensemaking. In this logic, while natives can provide authentic and close to actual accounts, their capacity to theorize and be objective has therefore been questioned. This is something I have encountered in the classroom, in the skepticism expressed by students about the validity of native accounts, including the accounts of native anthropologists. The long-standing geopolitics of academia and the division of intellectual labor between the Global South as suppliers of data and empirical evidence, and the Global North as theorists and analysts emanates from the epistemology of the native, non-native binary and persist in the present.

A recent key learning moment was the decision to place an image of Margaret Mead holding a human skull on the cover of *American Anthropologist* in March 2020. This disturbed and outraged, refreshing historical memories for many and traumatizing many others. Critics have cited this as an unreflexive act and evidence that it is “business-as-usual” for anthropology in the 21st century. The aftermath of the event has been intriguing, despite, yet, perhaps precisely because of the multiple controversies it has triggered. The moment has facilitated debates which seldom occur amongst practitioners, but are much needed so that the deep-seated myriad of ways in which colonial thinking and the presence of the savage slot has been normalized in the discipline and the profession can be acknowledged. This has inspired both transparent exchanges and uncomfortable conversations that are tantamount to what I call “a discursive opening up” in the discipline which is much needed. Decolonizing anthropology is not about denying or erasing the discipline's colonial past. Rather, an acknowledgment of this legacy is first needed in order to ultimately free the discipline, academia and profession from the shadows of hierarchies and inequalities.

Let me move to the next section of this essay, which I've called, “Rethinking the Production of Ethnography”. I approach ethnography as a form of theoretical knowledge production that is grounded in a series of intersecting methodological and conceptual premises. Following the critique of conventional ethnographic forms and practices, alternative modes of doing, reading and writing ethnography have been conceptualized and indeed, sometimes also actualized. However, for the most part, the politics of anthropology, embodied in the unequal power relations between the observer and the observed, and its consequences, has in the past mostly been debated by established senior professionals rather than by untenured academics. Yet even the most elegant and robustly theoretical of these criticisms appear to have had little influence on the conventions through which traditional ethnographic forms and logics have endured. Today, however, it must be noted that junior faculty and graduate students in Asia and elsewhere in the Global South have underscored the persistence of the seemingly unshakable politics and problematics of othering, representing and writing in anthropology, reiterating the need to first acknowledge and then act to fix the problem. For the reasons that I have stated earlier, I argue that the category “native” signifies a particularizing rather than a universalizing category, with “non-native” as its corollary, and the two clearly have a hierarchical relationship. Every reference to the category “native” marks difference and is associated with the colonized, the indigenous, the marginalized, the peripheral and the powerless. Its utterance continues to objectify, marginalize, and dehumanize the party in question. The continued invocation of natives and

others as subjects of anthropology is a reminder of the power inequalities between natives and non-natives. For me, categories like “native anthropologist” and “indigenous anthropologist” are equally problematic. These descriptors translate into problematic notions about what natives who are anthropologists can and cannot accomplish, who, what and which societies they can study and do research with, and whether they can be objective in reporting on their own societies. By not recognizing these practitioners as also producers of theory and anthropological knowledge they are denied equal standing with their peers in the Global North. I argue that an uncomfortable silencing, containment and marginalization of native expert voices materializes when the work they produce is framed as native ethnography or native anthropology. Scholarly contributions from the Global South have typically not had a theoretical universal appeal given that the non-West/West divide, indeed insinuates an epistemic binary, and only superficially references a spatial geographical dichotomy. Without doubt, subjectivities and identities matter profoundly in ethnographic research and can enable and or constrain ethnographers and interlocutors alike, as both seek to make sense of socio-cultural political worlds and experiences. However, an anthropologist's identity and positionality are viewed as obstacles to producing meaningful knowledge, particularly when research of native anthropologists is evaluated. An ethnographer's subjectivity is indeed constitutive of all fieldwork experiences and frames the production of ethnography, but this is not determined by some ascribed inherited attributes like race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or indigeneity, but shaped rather by membership in experiences of and participation in community life. The term “native” has sometimes in practice been replaced by kindred substitutes, all of which I argue need to be displaced from anthropological discourse. Words carry meanings, but they also communicate histories of injustices and inequalities and embody painful reminders. While I admit that some words can be and have been evacuated of their inherited meanings and fashioned anew, I contend that this is not possible with the term “native”, given its entanglements with the inequalities, violence and dehumanization associated with colonial experiences. A continuous usage of this term therefore, as applied to subjects and subject matter of anthropology, and to ethnographers, from the former colonies completely undermines anthropological endeavors to make larger overarching human connections and transcending the binaries of self, other, subject, object, native, non-native.

I move to the next section, which I've entitled "Teaching Ethnography Anew" and this is where I try to suggest some concrete practices through which some of the problematics that I have identified could be addressed. While there is currently considerable support for undertaking the project of decolonizing anthropology, there are many competing interpretations of what this

means and how this might be achieved. In fact, it has even been asked whether a discipline which is so deeply rooted in colonialism can be fully and meaningfully decolonized. There are compelling grounds for decolonizing anthropology which is by definition, a critical, political and emancipatory project for me. The remit of this task is colossal and challenging, but also exciting, exposing biases in the discipline's epistemology and analytical frames, but skims the surface of the iceberg. Additionally, this task of rethinking anthropology's methodological and theoretical foundations needs to reach the very institutional, academic and professional structures that sustain multiple hierarchies. Ironically, many anthropologists are not inspired to problematize the discipline's history and indeed reproduce taken for granted disciplinary norms and practices. While the "Writing Cultural project" of the late 1980s highlighted the need for reflexivity in practicing anthropology, the decolonizing project reiterates this even more forcefully. I agree with Paulo Freire that pedagogy can be a tool for revolution and empowerment in the hands of educators and students alike. It is in conceiving and instituting new pedagogical practices that key strides can be made in the larger project of decolonizing anthropology. First, in disrupting and unsettling methodological and theoretical assumptions and unthinking pedagogical practices and second, in inviting and inspiring the current and future generations to collaboratively think through the remit of a decentered enlightened anthropology. To start, the complex layered and multifaceted encounters between anthropology and colonialism need to become what Schutz and Luckmann have termed, "the common sense stock of knowledge" for students of anthropology, while avoiding a simplistic and reductionist narrative of anthropology's colonial past. Instead, emphasizing the multiplicity of colonial encounters with anthropology and historical specificities is critical in articulating this interface. Historically, ethnographers did successfully engage in their craft due to pre-existing hegemonic relations between the colonizer and the colonized. The anthropological knowledge they produced had the potential to be exploited, utilized, for example, by colonial administrators to augment imperial interests. Often this was the case, although the relationship between colonial administrators and anthropologists was not always one of complete collegiality and complementarity. There were many tensions and rough edges here too. Yet, as Talal Asad notes in a damning observation, I quote, "There is a strange reluctance on the part of most professional anthropologists to consider seriously the power structure within which the discipline has taken shape", end of quote. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this critique of the discipline that I have outlined has been received somewhat begrudgingly by some and not deemed to be palatable by other anthropologists. Even more disturbing, apathy and indifference to anthropology's colonial past are encountered in anthropological circles, even today, although defensive and cynical responses are seldom articulated openly these days and rarely appear in

print. Anthropology's colonial past as well as the need to decolonize anthropological knowledge production needs to be normalized. Neither of these should any longer be surprising to students of anthropology. Introductory anthropology textbooks do not typically include extensive discussions of the colonial context as a backdrop against which ethnographers conceived and practice their craft. This needs to change. Discussions about the history of the discipline need to move from professional arenas of journal and book publishing, conferences, keynotes and distinguished lectures into the classrooms. Students should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the discipline's origins and its past, rather than the uncomfortable bits be denied, hidden or ignored. Students should be invited to confront and process the colonial context of anthropological knowledge production. The implications of attendant, explicit and implicit inequalities for assessing claims of objectivity and authenticity, and the facticity of the knowledge produce merit scrutiny as well. The pedagogical narrative in the classroom should include questions about how anthropological knowledge was defined in the first place, who will seem to be the legitimate producers of such knowledge, what knowledge claims were made and what epistemologies were employed. But this discussion needs to transcend history in the critical notice that despite the official end of colonial rule, these problematics are not a thing of the past. The political economy of anthropological knowledge production and the infrastructure that sustained these continued to be marked by hierarchical unequal relationships in the present. As such, there are continuities rather than a disjuncture across historical moments, rendering intact the disciplinary and institutional core against which much of anthropology is practiced and reproduced in the present. Moving beyond such critique, however, I argue that it is imperative to then dramatically re-organize the teaching of anthropology and curate foundational curricular reform. Without being prescriptive, and respecting the autonomy of individuals to craft their own course materials, it is critical to challenge the anthropological canon which is often reproduced, unthinkingly in syllabi and curricula in universities globally, a process that has been up studied by people like Bambara, and Hootfa, and many others. Challenging a given body of canonical work does not mean excluding this from reading lists. Rather this entails asking questions about how certain bodies of knowledge were identified and marked as foundational and classical in the first place, thus highlighting the selective and constructed nature of the canon, something that has been so elegantly argued for by Raewyn Connell. Creating spaces for engaging received disciplinary wisdom critically and historicizing and deconstructing the same I feel, and in my experience, pays greater pedagogical dividend than simply ignoring it. Students should also be familiarized with the corpus of critical work produced by anthropologists that has long argued for the need to decolonize anthropology. Dissenting voices calling for decolonizing anthropological

knowledge production in the past and today, however, suggest that much work remains to be done. Diverse and inclusive curricula would not only inform students, but also inspire them to engage these critically, would help them to materialize the project of decolonizing knowledge production, and above all interrupt a mechanical and unreflexive reproduction of the anthropological canon. Another powerful strategy which I have used in the classroom would be to source include and insert silenced, marginalized, and obscured voices, and personas as key players in the history of anthropological thought. In fact, my colleagues, Syed Farid Alatas and I have actually done this for classical social theories as well in the time that we taught theory at the National University of Singapore. This attention to voices and personas, which have been neglected, requires paying attention to particular kinds of blind spots like Eurocentrism and androcentrism that have functioned to recognize an anthropological canon, and which lists the discipline's founding fathers typically as the great men of ideas from Europe and America. Other figures, including women, non-Western and non-white thinkers have been either unashamedly omitted or encapsulated in terms like "female anthropologists" or "native anthropologists", which I contend are essentially categories of containment as they particularize and stigmatize the work produced by these individuals. In teaching a graduate module called "Producing ethnography" at the Department of Sociology at NUS, I have included a variety of individuals from diverse locations and timeframes, such as Francis Hsu, Jomo Kenyatta, M. N. Srinivas, and Zora Neale Hurston to broaden the canvas of anthropological thought and refuse to ghettoize them as native anthropologists. My strategy has instead been to bring these anthropologists into conversation with their peers elsewhere in order to deconstruct and unpack the category native and surface it as an imposed problematic identity, which I present as being consequential in the process of othering, which continues in the discipline today. The realization that doing, reading and writing ethnography are intimately entangled processes would lead to sophisticated classroom discussions, I can vouch for this from experience. Students would be inspired to learn from real-life examples of how other ethnographers struggle with issues and problems of objectification and otherness.

Let me now move, in the interest of time, to a conclusion which I have entitled in this talk, "An Incomplete Project". Faye Harrison underscored the value of, I quote, "Dialogues, debates and reconciliation amongst various non-Western and Western intellectuals" in 1991, and asked, "Can authentic anthropology emerge from the critical intellectual traditions and counter-hegemonic struggles of third world peoples?". Without doubt, this remains a key question today. Several related queries then follow. In decolonizing anthropology, who should be the agents of change?

Speaking realistically, and practically, who can make a powerful intervention in decentering, the dominant disciplinary discourse? Lepani Watson, our colleague from the Trobriand Islands who had a conversation with Murray Groves, Lepani Watson's early challenge to Malinowski has clearly not made a dent, even as it was reported publicly, perhaps as nothing more than an amusing novelty. If the anthropology/colonialism interface is particularized in being of interest only to former natives and their descendants, anthropologists or otherwise, the project of decolonizing anthropology will remain a marginal and marginalized endeavor. Assuming collective ownership as practitioners, the global community of anthropologists needs to be invested in acknowledging anthropology's colonial inheritance and its continuing imprint on the discipline's epistemologies, conceptual frameworks, and indeed, its politics. It has long been noted that ethnography is essentially social, although mostly undertaken by individual ethnographers. The human dimension of fieldwork and the responsibility to social relationships are priorities in ethnographic research and writing. Acknowledging that fieldwork is a collaborative effort reflects these commitments. It is another matter that this is not always acknowledged openly. A text from 2019 entitled "Decolonizing Ethnography: Undocumented Immigrants and New Directions in Social Science" is an excellent example of collaborative ethnography, which through co-authorship attempts to decenter the unequal hegemonic power dynamics between ethnographer and interlocutors. This text carries the name of four equal co-authors, Bejarano, Juárez, Mijangos and Goldstein, two of whom began their journey as research assistants and two others who were professional researchers, illustrating well that an enlightened ethnography can be the tool for decolonization and demonstrating that ethnographic practices embody a political stance, not to mention an activism. While this talk carries individual authorship, the sentiments expressed here reflect several decades of impassioned ongoing conversations I have had with like-minded colleagues and students in corridors, canteens, and classrooms. And sadly, far fewer of these animated discussions were in professional arenas like conferences and publications, although this has begun to change recently. And I think this is a very, very welcome move forward. It is only ethical that I acknowledge the collective origins of the thinking and sensibilities that I expressed here this afternoon, even as the language is mine and all inadequacies are mine alone. Finally, I see the task of decolonizing anthropology as an unfinished project, inevitably. Yet I'm not disheartened by the incompleteness of this endeavor because declaring any kind of closure in efforts of knowledge production is inherently limited as is the notion that all questions have been posed and answered, and that all problematics have been resolved. Instead, I hold that striving to make bold overtures, create spaces, and contemplate gambits, would motivate current and future generations of anthropologists to push disciplinary boundaries and conceive creative

alternatives. In this spirit, I believe that what have been registered as moments of crisis in the path anthropology has traversed, should be welcomed and seen as productive rather than debilitating. For me, these have also precisely been moments of inspiration and innovation, vital and imperative for unmaking and remaking disciplinary practices in anthropology. And I just want to end by saying that this paper is dedicated to my former supervisor, the late Michel-Rolph Trouillot from whom I learned that critique is and can be empowering and productive. Thank you so much for listening. I look forward to a good discussion.