28 / 2022

Anthropological Knowledge and Power Relations
Savoirs anthropologiques et relations de pouvoir
Anthropologisches Wissen und Machtbeziehungen

The Swiss Journal of Sociocultural Anthropology is the peer-reviewed, open-access journal of the Swiss Anthropological Association (SAA), dedicated to current issues and debates in anthropology. It was established in 1979, and was previously published under the name of Ethnologica Helvetica (1979–1995) and Tsantsa (1996–2022). The online edition is published by Bern Open Publishing, the print issue is published by Seismo Press.

La Revue suisse d'anthropologie sociale et culturelle est la revue évaluée par des pairs ("peer-review") et en libre accès de la Société Suisse d'Ethnologie (SSE), dédiée aux questions d'actualités et aux débats en anthropologie. Elle a été fondée en 1979, et a été publiée auparavant sous le nom Ethnologica Helvetica (1979–1995) et Tsantsa (1996–2022). L'édition digitale est publiée par Bern Open Publishing, l'édition imprimée est publiée par les Éditions Seismo.

Die Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie ist die Open-Access-Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Ethnologie (SEG). Die Beiträge unterliegen dem Peer-Review-Verfahren und beleuchten aktuelle Themen und Debatten der Anthropologie. Die Zeitschrift wurde 1979 gegründet und wurde zuvor als Ethnologica Helvetica (1979–1995) und Tsantsa (1996–2022) veröffentlicht. Die digitale Ausgabe wird von Bern Open Publishing herausgegeben, die Druckversion erscheint im Seismo Verlag.

CONTENT/SOMMAIRE / INHALT

RESEARCH ARTICLES/ARTICLES DE RECHERCHE/ARTIKEL

CURRENT RESEARCH/RECHERCHES EN COURS/LAUFENDE FORSCHUNG

BOOK REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS/REZENSIONEN

EDITORIAL

This is the first issue of *the Swiss Journal of Sociocultural Anthropology / Revue suisse d'anthropologie sociale et culturelle / Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie.*

It continues the publication activity of the Swiss Anthropological Association SAA, which started in 1979 with the first issue of *Ethnologica Helvetica*. After 20 issues, *Ethnologica Helvetica* was relaunched under the name *TSANTSA* in 1996. Since then, the SAA has published an annual issue. With TSANTSA 27 (2022), the first online-only issue in the journal's history, the editorial team concluded this chapter last spring. Starting with this autumn issue, the journal sets sail with its new name and with a new crew of responsible editors.

Why this name change at all? The name *TSANTSA* has triggered controversial debates time and again. While our editorial team understands the original motivation for choosing this name – the valuation and emphasis of cultural diversity and the rejection of (US-)imperialism – we do not think that it captures the journal's mission anymore (if it ever did), nor do we think it is an appropriate name for an anthropological journal today. The name *TSANTSA* carries too much of a burden of the multi-cultural ideology of the early 1990s. Since then, the world has changed, and it seems particularly odd that, of all things, an anthropological journal still makes explicit reference in its title to a debate that has become worn out in the discipline.

Shrunken Heads and the Burden of Colonial Anthropology

Tsantsa is the name for a severed fist-sized, dissected human head used as a trophy and for ritual as well as trade purposes by some Jivaroan peoples in parts of Peru and Ecuador. In colonial times, it was fashionable to display tsantsa as souvenirs from the tropics in upper class homes alongside other artifacts brought back from the colonies – often acquired by violent means and traded under dubious circumstances. The tsantsa was a symbol of the household's cosmopolitanism, gazed at by the observer with a mixture of fascination and disgust.[1] With this, tsantsa were transformed from ritual objects serving as containers for the avenging spirits of Jivaoran warfare victims to decontextualized trophies of colonial expansion on the shelves of the European upper-class Bourgeoisie.

Quite often, the artifacts that reached Europe were forged. Inventive craftsmen somewhere along the colonial supply chain filled the gap between the scarce supply in Latin America and the high demand for these artifacts in Europe with more or less well-made counterfeits (Bennett Ross 1984, 89–90). Some of these forged shrunken heads even found their way into renowned ethnographic institutions such as the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford

---

[1] Rubinstein (2004, 16) cites the travelogs of Up de Graff (1923) as an example of the colonial gaze on Jivaroan warfare practices, characterized by the mixture of fascination and disgust, switching between true admiration for the craftmanship behind each tsantsa and contempt for the "uncivilized" indigenous customs.

Seismo

University, where observant ethnographers occasionally uncovered the forgery (e. g. Turner 1944).[2]

During the early days of professional anthropology, tsantsa gained attraction as a symbol of a "distant" and "exotic" culture, expressed in the practice of preparing artifacts from human remains, and representing the fascinating result of fine craftmanship at the same time. They were thus the perfect object to represent the dichotomy of the early anthropological project. Tsantsa depicted the exotic Other as a human being with appalling and uncivilized practices far from one's own culture. Simultaneously, anthropology admired the Other's skilful practices and craftmanship that relied on rich and detailed cultural and material knowledge (Rubinstein 2004, 16). Arguably this mixture of fascination and repulsion is the reason why tsantsa remained the source of legends and myths to be found not only amongst the broader public, but even in professional anthropological literature (see Harner 1962).

Today, the remaining tsantsa in the collections of ethnographic museums are often stowed away in the archive, as they raise two fundamental ethical questions: How should museums deal with the display of human remains? And how should ethnographic museums deal with artifacts acquired under colonial rule and often under unknown circumstances?

In short, tsantsa remind us of the highly controversial and problematic position anthropology has occupied in the context of the colonial project.

Erase or Acknowledge the Dark Side of Anthropology?

The use of "Tsantsa" as the title for an anthropological journal unavoidably evokes the discipline's colonial entanglements sketched above. But how does the journal position itself against this historical background? The journal's initial mission statement remains surprisingly silent on this issue. "Enigmatic for the broader public", the journal's name should "provoke irritations and initiate debates". As such a source of irritation, "Tsantsa" as the title of an anthropological journal could indeed serve as a reminder of anthropology's complicity in the colonial project. Yet the question remains whether the critique of anthropology's complicity can be made explicit enough through a title.

At a time when anthropology as a discipline prefers to highlight its anti-racist, empowering, and critical potential, the name reminds readers of anthropology's dark side: its racist and oppressive acts during the colonial era. It is of course important to acknowledge the discipline's intellectual and moral baggage, and we agree that anthropology is only at the beginning of its own decolonialization. However, we think that a journal's name and a short mission statement is the wrong place to conduct this debate. The supposedly thought-provoking and ambiguous journal title and accompanying mission statement rather provoke further confusion than bring clarification. There is just too thin a line between acknowledging the dark side of anthropology's history and affirming appropriation as the guiding principle of the discipline. We firmly reject the idea that appropriation in any way should form the vision of anthropology today – even if "only" as a "metaphorical description". The intention of our

---

[2] The museum recently moved their collection of tsantsa as well as "a group of Naga trophy heads and the mummy of an Egyptian child" to storage (McGreevy 2020).

name change is thus in no way to erase this dark side of our discipline, but rather to acknowledge and go beyond it.

Finding a new name was not easy and took us almost two years during which our editorial board held many stimulating workshop-like discussions. Amongst other things, our aim was to find a brand name that worked in the three languages of the journal as *TSANTSA* had. This revealed much more complicated than we initially thought, and the decision was taken by the board that a descriptive name that causes no confusion was more fitting and in line with our journal's vision. We are now very happy to publish this issue under the name of *SJSCA– the Swiss Journal of Sociocultural Anthropology / Revue suisse d'anthropologie sociale et culturelle / Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie.*

Acknowledgments

References

Bennett Ross, Jane. 1984. "Effects of Contact on Revenge Hostilities among the Achuara Jivaro." In *Warfare, Culture, and Environment*, edited by R. Brian Ferguson, 83–124. Orlando: Academic Press.

Harner, Michael J. 1962. "Jivaro Souls." *American Anthropologist* 64 (2): 258–72. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1962.64.2.02a00020

McGreevy, Nora. 2020. "Oxford Museum Permanently Removes Controversial Display of Shrunken Heads." *Smithonian Magazine*, September 16, 2020. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/oxford-museum-moves-controversial-human-remains-storage-180975805/

Rubinstein, Steven L. 2004. "Shuar Migrants and Shrunken Heads Face to Face in a New York Museum." *Anthropology Today* 20(3): 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0268-540X.2004.00268.x

Turner, Geoffry E. S. 1944. "53. Counterfeit 'Tsantsas' in the Pitt Rivers Museum." *Man* 44(May): 57. https://doi.org/10.2307/2792098

Up de Graff, F. W. 1923. *Head Hunters of the Amazon: Seven Years of Exploration and Adventure*. Garden City, N. Y.: Garden City Pub. Co.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND POWER RELATIONS

Introduction

Frédérique Leresche

Abstract

This special issue provides an opportunity to reflect on the conditions for knowledge production by interpreting the social world in a way that recognizes the interconnected nature of power relations. Building on existing research that has emphasized the situated character of knowledge and its production, the contributing authors develop a reflexive understanding of sites of expression to better highlight how power relations shape research (including through an intersectional approach that considers interactions between dynamics of sex, class, race, ableism, age, etc.) and how individuals challenge, accept, and/ or subvert power relations.

Keywords: *situated knowledge, power relations, intersectionality*

In the field of anthropology, a great number of methodological and epistemological insights have been based on the wide-ranging knowledge produced by people who find themselves in a subaltern position (Sarker 2015). As a result, such contributions tend to be ignored or even denigrated.

Consider the knowledge that can be traced to feminists, to othered and / or racialized groups, to Indigenous peoples … What sets these diverse voices apart is the way in which they question power. In the 1990s, the feminist contributors to *Women Writing Culture* (Behar and Gordon 1995) responded to the ideas put forward by James Clifford and George Marcus (1986) in *Writing Culture*, a collection of essays that challenged the objectivity of ethnographic research by emphasizing its situated and even fictional character. Meanwhile, researchers like Lila Abu-Lughod (1996) were developing more radical critiques of the binary opposition between the Self and the Other, often based on the argument that the construction of otherness is rooted in the history of colonialism. Later, Indigenous researchers set about the task of decolonizing research methodologies (Smith 2021). More recently, people who see themselves as part of the *Global South* (Santos 2016) and members of racialized groups have further developed these ideas (Parnell-Berry and Michel 2021).

However, heeding the emic dimension of domination does not automatically bring *minority* knowledge to the forefront since, "to gain theoretical and academic recognition," such knowledge "must shed the stigma of activism and must therefore be withdrawn from those who gave voice to it in the first place" (Bentouhami-Molino 2017, 101). Beyond rethinking who should have a place at the table, the time has come to reconsider what is on

the menu (Bilge 2020). This would allow for a more fundamental shift in the criteria for determining not only what makes an idea *worthy of serious reflection* by researchers, but also what makes it interesting.

Among other key challenges, this would involve considering sites of knowledge production from an epistemological perspective (Bentouhami-Molino 2015; Grosfoguel 2007), with a view to highlighting their situated nature and reflecting on how perspectives migrate and come to be applied in other contexts. For instance, how have insights that originated in the Global South shed light on issues facing the Global North (Leresche 2019)?

This special issue seeks to build on existing research that has emphasized the situated character of knowledge and its production. The contributing authors develop a reflexive understanding of sites of expression to better show how power relations shape research (including through an intersectional approach that considers interactions between dynamics of sex, class, race, ableism, age, etc.) and how individuals challenge, accept, and / or subvert power relations.

This can be accomplished from a range of viewpoints, as reflected in the diverse theoretical and methodological contributions contained in the included articles. These viewpoints help determine both the research processes favored by the different authors (decolonial, intersectional, participatory, collaborative, etc.) and the various themes addressed, which cover issues related to publishing, representation, methodology, and the material conditions under which research is conducted.

The articles are rich in theoretical and methodological insights that reflect a shared effort to not only decompartmentalize and decolonize the discipline in a way that challenges established academic norms, but also develop practical tools for doing so. The contributors address topics that I discuss below in terms of three main concerns: research conditions (precarious employment and the pressure to publish); sites of expression and the authority to speak (Who can speak? For whom? How?); and researchers' family environments (interconnected private and professional spheres).

Furthermore, the process of producing and coordinating a special issue raised certain questions that intersect with those explored in the articles themselves. Accordingly, the final section of the introduction discusses the main concerns highlighted by the publication process.

Research Conditions: Precarious Employment and the Pressure to Publish

As I was writing this introduction, the Swiss Federal Council endorsed a postulate calling for younger academic researchers to receive support and enjoy equality of opportunity (Postulate 22.3390). A committee of researchers with first-hand experience of precarious employment at various Swiss universities had long been working toward this goal. The petition that led to the adoption of the postulate was designed to draw attention to various negative aspects of work in academia, especially the lack of permanent positions, the growth of inse-

cure and poorly paid jobs, the limited recognition for the work performed by researchers early in their careers, and the overly competitive research environment.

Of course, these are issues faced by young researchers the world over. For instance, the article by Cheshta Arora and Debarun Sarkar focuses on the situation in India. The authors clearly explain how debates on precarious employment in academia remain disconnected from that country's specific circumstances and have failed to spark the emergence of an alternative approach to knowledge production. In addition to the demanding publication requirements faced by applicants to Indian doctoral programs, the article also addresses the issue of translating articles into local languages.

My colleagues and I faced a related problem while planning this special issue: In what language should the articles and the introduction be published? Based in multilingual Switzerland, the journal normally issues calls for papers in French and German (two of the country's national languages), as well as in English (to reach an international audience). For the most part, the article proposals we received were written in English. The five published articles include four in English, one in French, and none in German. Obviously, the English language dominates much of the academic landscape. As a result, the choice of language becomes a political choice – and a particularly sensitive one, given how language and its descriptive power draw on the imagination, as well as on mental and emotional constructs (Thiong'o 1986). Accordingly, our way of conveying the world around us, of naming its components, says something about power relations, as so well explained in this issue's editorial on changing the journal's title.

The Authority to Speak: Who can speak?
About whom? How?

The knowledge produced by researchers is shaped by the material conditions under which they produce it. In turn, these conditions depend on the researcher's position in social space. In her article, Karen Mogendorff takes a heuristic approach to analyzing matters of scientific recognition in a context where issues of ableism and gender intersect. She shows how the integration of persons with disabilities does not always guarantee them access to legitimacy in their field of expertise. In fact, it may even reinforce the categorization and hierarchization of knowledge. Working from the idea that knowledge is partial because of its situated character, the author demonstrates how knowledge production is also shaped by a person's more or less normative relationship to the human body. According to certain associated feminist theories, this relationship can also help determine what is perceptible, as well as which senses are used when perceiving and describing the social world.

Karen Mogendorff's article strongly resonates with the one on epistemic justice by the Capdroit team (Arnaud Béal, Chantal Bruno, Benoît Eyraud, Valérie Lemard, Jacques Lequien, and Isabel Miranda), although the latter text focuses on issues related to publishing. Whereas critical research (decolonial, participative, feminist, Indigenous, subaltern, etc.) has frequently raised the question of who speaks for whom and about what, few studies have considered the question of how. The article seeks to fill this gap by directly addressing

the attribution of authorship to individuals involved in a research project, whether as researchers or participants. It highlights how publishing involves the dual process of acknowledging a voice and acknowledging its authority.

Finally, Juliane Neuhaus contributes to these reflections on who speaks for whom (and how) with an article that analyzes relationships between researchers from Oceania and those based in the West (especially Switzerland). Building on an exhaustive genealogy of the decolonization of anthropology in Oceania, she proposes different pedagogical and methodological tools for fostering better dialogue within the field.

Interconnected Private and Professional Spheres

Clearly, professional contexts and sites of expression are key to understanding the circumstances under which research is conducted. However, there is also a need to consider the experiences of those involved across all aspects of their lives. Far from plying their trade in rarefied air, researchers remain rooted in individual realities shaped by the material and personal conditions that define the family or private environment.

This is what Madeleine Ayeh argues in her article on assessing the impact of parenthood on the research process. She illustrates the ambiguous nature of ethnographic authority by describing how shared experiences of parenthood have served as a catalyst for relationships, simultaneously facilitating access to the field and complicating efforts to organize research.

Taken together, the five articles provide some answers to the practical questions that feed debates on the conditions for knowledge production: What ethnographic practices best acknowledge collaboration between partners in the field (co-authoring, participative and collaborative research, linking private and professional concerns, etc.)? What are the limitations of such practices? Several contributors point out the potential advantages (and limitations) of alternative approaches, both theoretical and practical, to analyzing power relations in the context of knowledge production. They generally call for constant and close attention to the partial nature of research, even at the risk of circumscribing the applicability of conclusions.

Indeed, the articles all reveal how the ability to critique power relations in the context of the research process is limited by emerging hierarchies. The contributions from the Capdroit team and Karen Mogendorff offer skillful descriptions of how the participation of those directly concerned by a research project does not necessarily confer scientific legitimacy. In fact, it may even reinforce the distinction between legitimate (normalized) bodies and illegitimate ones. For their part, Cheshta Arora and Debarun Sarkar show how an emphasis on postcolonial criticism in India has impeded criticism of the frameworks responsible for the insecurity faced by doctoral students. Likewise, Juliane Neuhaus reveals how efforts to decolonize anthropology can produce exclusionary results if they fail to consider specific sites where expressions of criticism originate (in this case, Oceania). Moreover, Madeleine Ayeh provides a detailed description of how dependence on the family can be misused as a tool for securing field access.

Making and Breaking: Behind the Scenes of Preparing a Special Issue

This special issue aims to reflect on the conditions for knowledge production by interpreting the social world in a way that acknowledges the interconnected nature of power relations. This objective remained front-of-mind throughout the different stages of production. In fact, it seems impossible to probe the conditions for knowledge production and the means of decolonizing associated processes without reflecting on the conditions under which a special issue such as this one can be produced. Since we[1] had asked prospective authors to pay special attention to reconfigurations of power underway in the context of their own research, we decided to engage in a similarly reflexive exercise as a way of identifying the limitations of the publication process. This section provides a chronological description of the various steps involved, starting from the time when the article proposals were received. The account provided is therefore incomplete, insofar as it overlooks earlier stages of the process (the call for coordinators, the planning and preparation of a proposal, the assessment process, and the preparation of a call for submissions).

First, we had to decide which articles to publish. We received a total of 39 submissions from a mix of graduate students, professors, postdoctoral scholars, research assistants, and individuals from outside academia. Beyond their close alignment with the terms set out in the call for papers, the proposed articles consistently promised to provide new answers and explore new questions. As a result, we were forced to expand our selection criteria.

Naturally, we considered research topics, the geographic areas under study, and where the prospective contributors were based. Indeed, we saw sites of production as an essential consideration in the context of a special issue on the conditions for knowledge production. And yet, we only received proposals from Europe and Canada, along with a single one from India. Could it be that a journal's distribution networks reproduce a hierarchy of sites associated with "legitimate" knowledge production? Or does a journal's international reputation determine the level of interest it attracts from scholars? Looking at the situation in India, Cheshta Arora and Debarun Sarkar come to the latter conclusion.

Sites of expression also reflect an individual's position in social space. Accordingly, we also considered gender, ableism, academic age, professional status, and ethnicity when selecting contributors. To the extent that our choices were subjective, they also remain debatable. Furthermore, they highlight our roles as editors and coordinators, roles that endowed us with the power to decide who would be given a voice.

Our next task involved recruiting experts to review the articles. We were careful to recognize the capacity of individuals who do not necessarily enjoy stable academic employment to play such a role. The work of young researchers is an important source of fresh insights and recognizing the critical expertise of emerging scholars could constitute an approach to decolonizing the field. On the other hand, asking people already affected by precarious employment to carry out unpaid and unacknowledged work (since they must remain anon-

---

[1] Here, the use of the first-person plural reflects the fact that many individuals were involved in the process of reflection, to varying extents and at different times.

ymous, external experts cannot list such experience on a CV) would mean upholding an unfair system of knowledge construction.[2]

The journal relies on a process of double-blind peer review involving two external experts, in addition to a review by a member of the scientific committee. That makes for three expert assessments per article, meaning that the publication of an issue like this one, containing five articles, depends on the unpaid work of fifteen people. That is in addition to the work performed by the journal's editors and guest editors.

So why does the publication process require the mobilization of such extensive resources?

Coordinating a special issue on power relations in anthropology provided an opportunity to open new perspectives on not only the conditions for knowledge production, but also a certain form of care ethics. All the articles included in this issue refer to dependent relationships variously based on social norms or on academic, political, or family dynamics. The publication process therefore involved adopting a care perspective whose "ethical and political dimensions are inseparable, insofar as it produces a truly critical analysis of hidden or overlooked social relationships based on dependence and vulnerability" (Laugier 2013, 165)

We sought to address the issues raised in the course of our work as best we could, although satisfactory answers sometimes proved evasive. Perhaps publishing the articles constitutes an end in itself, given that it represents the culmination of a larger care process that is necessary for the development of scientific knowledge (through the sharing of time, experiences, attention, and ideas), and whose existence depends on it being brought to light.

But one question remain … A person's ability to disseminate the results of their research by writing an article, a book, a thesis, a paper, etc. depends on having the means to do so. In other words, such a person must find themselves in an environment conducive to the writing and editing process. However, not everyone enjoys equal access to the necessary resources, time, energy, mental focus, computer equipment, online journals, etc. Not everyone is in a position to have their voice heard and acknowledged as legitimate. In such a context, how can researchers be expected to secure the means to challenge the conditions for knowledge production and seek new insights, when the circumstances under which they produce knowledge (including material, symbolic, moral, and political circumstances) prevent them from taking epistemological risks?

Acknowledgements

---

[2] At the same time, it is important to recognize that various other unacknowledged and often unpaid tasks are already being performed by those in the early stages of their careers.

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1996. "Writing Against Culture." In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, edited by Richard G. Fox, 137–162. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Behar, Ruth, et Deborah A. Gordon (eds.). 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Bentouhami-Molino, Hourya. 2017. "Audre Lorde, la poésie n'est pas un luxe." *Ballast* 6(1): 90–103. https://doi.org/10.3917/ball.006.0090

Bentouhami-Molino, Hourya. 2015. *Race, cultures et identités. Une approche féministe postcoloniale*. Philosophies. Paris: PUF.

Bilge, Sirma. 2020. "We've joined the table but we're still on the menu", *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms*, edited by John Solomos, 317–331. Routledge: Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY.

Clifford, James and George Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn". *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162514

Laugier, Sandra. 2013. "Veena Das, Wittgenstein et Stanley Cavell. Le care, l'ordinaire et la folie". In *Face aux désastres. Une conversation à quatre voix sur la folie, le care et les grandes détresses collectives*, edited by Anne M. Lovell, Stefania Pandolfo, Veena Das, and Sandra Laugier, 161–192. Paris: Les Éditions d'Ithaque.

Leresche, Frédérique. 2019. "La critique portée par le non-recours aux droits sociaux: propositions pour développer une approche subalterne." *Sociologie*S [En ligne] mis en ligne le 23 mai 2019. http://journals.openedition.org/sociologies/11438

Parnell-Berry, Bel, and Noemi Vanessa Michel. 2021. "Editing as Anti-Racism." *ISRF Bulletin* 23: 63–70.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2016. *Épistémologies du Sud, Mouvements citoyens et polémique sur la science*, translated by Jean-Louis Laville. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Sarker, Sonita. 2015. "Subalternity In and Out of Time, In and Out of History." In *Gramsci and Foucault: A Reassessment*, edited by David Kreps, 91–110. Ashgate: Farnham & Burlington.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2021. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Third edition. London: Zed.

Thiong'o, Ngugiwa. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey-Heinemann.

Author

Frédérique Leresche ⓘ is an actor and an anthropologist. Her research focuses on social rights and the relationship between individuals and the state. She has a special interest in agency-based strategies and the capacity for individuals to subvert norms.

frederique.leresche@hefr.ch

School of Social Work, HES-SO (University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland), Fribourg
Haute École de travail social de Fribourg, HES-SO

SAVOIRS ANTHROPOLOGIQUES ET RAPPORTS DE POUVOIR

Introduction

Frédérique Leresche

Résumé

Ce dossier thématique propose de réfléchir aux conditions de production du savoir à partir d'une lecture du monde social qui tente de rendre compte de l'imbrication des rapports de domination. Il s'inscrit ainsi dans le prolongement des recherches qui explicitent la dimension située des savoirs et de leur production et rassemble des travaux qui mettent en lumière, en prenant en compte de manière réflexive le lieu d'énonciation, comment la recherche est façonnée par les relations de pouvoir – y compris dans une perspective intersectionnelle qui considère, entre autres, les imbrications des systèmes de sexe, de classe, de race, de validisme, d'âge – et comment les individus questionnent, acceptent et/ou subvertissent les relations de pouvoir.

Mots-clés : *savoir situé, rapports de pouvoir, intersectionnalité*

ANTHROPOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND POWER RELATIONS
INTRODUCTION

Abstract

This special issue provides an opportunity to reflect on the conditions for knowledge production by interpreting the social world in a way that recognizes the interconnected nature of power relations. Building on existing research that has emphasized the situated character of knowledge and its production, the contributing authors develop a reflexive understanding of sites of expression to better highlight how power relations shape research (including through an intersectional approach that considers interactions between dynamics of sex, class, race, ableism, age, etc.) and how individuals challenge, accept, and/or subvert power relations.

Keywords: *situated knowledge, power relations, intersectionality*

L'anthropologie a construit nombre de ses réflexions méthodologiques et épistémologiques en s'intéressant à une série de savoirs produits par des personnes en situation de subalternité (Sarker 2015) et qui pour cette raison tendent à être ignorés ou dénigrés.

Celles, par exemple, des féministes, celles des personnes altérisées et / ou racisées, ou celles des autochtones. Ces différentes voix se distinguent dans leur manière d'interroger le pouvoir. Dans les années quatre-vingt-dix, les féministes de *Women Writing Culture* (Behar et Gordon 1995) réagissent au postulat du *Writing Culture* proposé par James Clifford et George Marcus (1986) qui visait à questionner l'objectivité de la recherche ethnographique et son caractère situé, voire fictionnel. Certaines chercheuses, à l'instar de Lila Abu-Lughod (1996), proposent alors une critique plus radicale de la construction binaire entre soi et un Autre, argumentant notamment que la construction de l'altérité est le fruit d'une histoire coloniale. Par la suite, les chercheuses et chercheurs autochtones se sont attelés à décoloniser les méthodologies de recherche (Smith 2021). Plus récemment, les personnes qui se réclament du *Global South* (Santos 2016) et les personnes racisées ont encore développé ces réflexions (Parnell-Berry et Michel 2021).

Cependant, l'attention à la dimension émique de la domination ne revalorise pas automatiquement des savoirs *minoritaires* puisque ces derniers, «pour gagner en dignité théorique et universitaire, doivent se défaire du stigmate du militantisme et doivent par conséquent être détachés de ceux qui en portaient la voix en première instance» (Bentouhami-Molino 2017, 101). Au-delà de repenser qui inclure autour de la table, il s'agit aujourd'hui de questionner «ce qui figure au menu» (Bilge 2020), pour pouvoir modifier en profondeur les critères de ce qui fait que quelque chose devient *bon à penser* en recherche et ce qui définit son intérêt.

Un des principaux enjeux est alors de considérer les lieux de production des savoirs dans une perspective épistémologique (Bentouhami-Molino 2015; Grosfoguel 2007) pour mettre en évidence leur caractère situé, mais aussi pour s'interroger sur la façon dont les perspectives voyagent ou sont utilisées dans d'autres contextes. Par exemple en s'intéressant à la manière dont les apports produits dans le sud global peuvent éclairer les questionnements du nord global (Leresche 2019).

Ce dossier thématique s'inscrit ainsi dans le prolongement des recherches qui explicitent la dimension située des savoirs et de leur production. Il rassemble des travaux qui mettent en lumière, en prenant en compte de manière réflexive le lieu d'énonciation, comment la recherche est façonnée par les relations de pouvoir – y compris dans une perspective intersectionnelle qui considère, entre autres, les imbrications des systèmes de sexe, de classe, de race, de validisme, d'âge – et comment les individus questionnent, acceptent et / ou subvertissent les relations de pouvoir.

Différents angles peuvent être privilégiés pour le faire, comme le montre la pluralité des apports théoriques et méthodologiques proposés dans les articles de ce dossier. Ces angles concernent autant les démarches choisies comme la perspective décoloniale, l'approche inter-sectionnelle, l'approche participative ou collaborative, que les différentes thématiques étudiées qui portent sur les enjeux de publication, les enjeux de représentation, les questions méthodologiques et les contextes matériels dans lesquels la recherche se produit.

Les contributions théoriques et méthodologiques qui traversent ce dossier thématique ont comme projet commun de décloisonner / décoloniser la discipline au sens d'opérer une mise à distance de ce qui fait la norme de la scientificité et de proposer des outils concrets pour le faire. Ces contributions abordent des sujets que nous allons détailler en trois points: les contextes d'énonciation (précarité et injonction à la publication), les lieux d'énonciation et l'autorité de

la prise de parole (qui parle, pour qui et comment), les contextes familiaux des chercheurs et des chercheuses (imbrication des sphères privées et professionnelles).

La construction et la coordination d'un dossier thématique ont également engagé des questionnements qui s'imbriquent dans les problématiques présentées dans les articles. La dernière partie de cette introduction revient sur les principaux enjeux qui ont traversé la réalisation de ce dossier thématique.

Les contextes d'énonciation: la précarité dans la recherche et l'injonction à la publication

Au moment de rédiger cette introduction, un postulat pour l'égalité des chances et le soutien de la relève académique vient d'être adopté par le Conseil fédéral (postulat 22.3390). Cette adoption est le résultat d'un long travail réalisé par un comité de chercheurs et de chercheuses directement concerné par la précarité de l'emploi et travaillant dans différentes hautes écoles en Suisse. La pétition, qui a amené à l'adoption de ce postulat, avait comme vocation de rendre visible la précarité dans le monde académique suisse: notamment le manque de postes fixes et l'accumulation d'emplois précaires et mal rémunérés, la faible reconnaissance du travail des chercheuses et des chercheurs en début de carrière, le climat compétitif dans le monde de la recherche. La question de la précarité de l'emploi dans le monde académique est une réalité qui concerne l'ensemble des espaces nationaux.

C'est l'objet de l'article de Cheshta Arora et Debarun Sarkar qui est particulièrement éclairant pour la situation en Inde. Il montre que les débats sur la précarité dans le monde académique n'ont pas été articulés à la situation spécifique de l'Inde et n'ont pas profité à l'émergence d'un autre mode opérationnel de production des connaissances. L'injonction à la publication, qui est un critère d'admissibilité en thèse de doctorat en Inde, est doublée de la question de la traduction des articles dans des langues locales.

Nous avons rencontré un problème similaire dans la conception de ce dossier thématique. La question posée était de savoir en quelle langue publier les articles et l'introduction. Les appels de la revue (dans un contexte suisse plurilingue) sont généralement diffusés en français et en allemand (deux langues nationales) ainsi qu'en anglais pour pouvoir atteindre un public international. La majeure partie des propositions d'article reçues pour ce dossier avait été faite en anglais. Sur les cinq articles publiés, quatre sont en anglais, un en français et aucun en allemand. Or l'anglais est aussi la langue dominante dans une partie du monde académique.

Le choix de la langue est donc un choix politique, mais il est aussi sensible parce que la langue comme ce qu'elle permet de décrire participent de nos imaginaires et de nos constructions mentales et émotionnelles (Thiong'o 1986). Ainsi, la façon de traduire, de nommer la réalité qui nous entoure raconte quelque chose des rapports de pouvoir, comme le décrit très bien l'éditorial de ce numéro qui porte sur le changement de nom de la revue.

La légitimité de la prise de parole: qui parle, de qui et comment

Ce que nous produisons comme savoir dépend donc des conditions matérielles dans lesquelles nous pouvons le faire. Mais ces conditions dépendent aussi de la place qu'occupe celui ou celle qui parle dans l'espace social. L'article de Karen Mogendorff éclaire de manière heuristique les enjeux de reconnaissance scientifique à l'intersection du validisme et du genre, et montre que l'intégration de personnes en situation de handicap ne garantit pas toujours à ces dernières d'accéder à une légitimité dans l'expertise, voire peut renforcer le processus de catégorisation et de hiérarchisation des savoirs. À partir du postulat que le savoir est partiel, car situé, elle démontre que produire des connaissances est aussi déterminé par la relation plus ou moins normative que l'on a aux corps. Comme le montrent aussi certaines théories féministes du point de vue, cela a aussi des incidences sur ce qui est perceptible et sur les sens qui sont mobilisés pour percevoir et rendre compte du monde social.

Cet article fait évidemment écho à l'article signé par Arnaud Béal, Chantal Bruno, Benoît Eyraud, Valérie Lemard, Jacques Lequien et Isabel Miranda (Capdroit) sur l'injustice épistémique. Mais ce dernier concentre son analyse sur les enjeux de publication. Si les recherches critiques (décoloniales , participatives, féministes, autochtones, subalternes, etc.) ont posé la question de savoir qui parle pour qui et de quoi, peu se sont encore posées pas question de savoir comment. Ainsi, l'article de Capdroit porte sur les enjeux de la publication et plus précisément sur l'auteurisation des personnes impliquées dans une recherche (qu'elles soient celles qui mènent la recherche ou celles qui en font l'objet) pour montrer que la publication porte un double enjeu de reconnaissance d'une parole et de son autorité.

Dans le prolongement de ces questionnements, ceux notamment de savoir qui parle pour qui et comment, l'article de Juliane Neuhaus porte sur les relations entre les chercheurs et chercheuses d'Océanie et celles et ceux du monde occidental et de la Suisse en particulier. A partir d'une généalogie très complète de la décolonisation de l'anthropologie en Océanie, elle propose des outils pédagogiques et méthodologiques pour permettre un meilleur dialogue au sein de la discipline.

L'imbrication des sphères privées et professionnelles

Si les contextes professionnels et les lieux d'énonciation sont déterminant pour comprendre les conditions dans lesquelles la recherche se produit, il semble aussi nécessaire de prendre en compte les expériences des personnes dans l'ensemble des sphères dans lesquelles elles naviguent. Les chercheuses et les chercheurs n'exercent en effet pas leur métier «hors sol», mais sont au contraire ancré·e·s dans des réalités qui leur sont propres. On parle ici des conditions matérielles et personnelles (familiales ou privées) des chercheurs et chercheuses.

C'est ce que propose Madeleine Ayeh dans son article sur la prise en compte de la parentalité dans les processus de recherche. Elle montre le caractère ambigu de l'autorité ethnographique en décrivant la façon dont les expériences communes de parentalité ont joué comme catalyseur des relations et ont pu, dans un même mouvement, faciliter l'entrée sur les terrains et compliquer le travail organisationnel de recherche.

De manière transversale, les articles répondent en partie aux questions concrètes qui nourrissent les débats sur les conditions de production du savoir: quelles sont les pratiques ethnographiques qui permettent de rendre visible la collaboration avec les divers partenaires de terrain (co-rédaction, recherches participatives ou collaboratives, imbrication des sphères privées et professionnelles ...), et quelles sont les limites de telles approches. Plusieurs d'entre eux proposent des pistes alternatives – et leurs limites – non seulement théoriques, mais aussi pratiques pour prendre en considération les relations de pouvoir dans la production des savoirs. Le constat général est qu'une attention constante et très fine du caractère partiel de la recherche semble nécessaire, même si cela risque de limiter la portée généralisante des conclusions.

Les articles dévoilent en effet tous comment la critique des relations de pouvoir au sein des processus de recherche est limitée par de nouvelles configurations hiérarchiques. Les articles de Capdroit et de Karen Mogendorff décrivent très bien comment la participation des personnes concernées par l'objet d'étude ne garantit pas à ces dernières d'accéder à une légitimité scientifique, voire renforce l'écart entre corps normés et légitimes et corps illégitimes. Cheshta Arora et Debarun Sarkar montrent comment le focus sur la critique postcoloniale en Inde aveugle la critique des infrastructures à l'origine de la précarité des candidat·e·s au doctorat. Dans le même sillage, l'article de Juliane Neuhaus dévoile comment le processus de décolonisation de la discipline peut également être excluant, dès lors qu'il ne prend pas en compte certains lieux d'énonciation de la critique, ici l'Océanie. Madeleine Ayeh quant à elle, décrit finement comment la dépendance à la famille peut être détournée pour en faire un outil d'accès au terrain.

Faire et défaire: les coulisses de la production d'un numéro spécial

L'objectif de ce dossier thématique est de réfléchir aux conditions de production du savoir à partir d'une lecture du monde social qui tente de rendre compte de l'imbrication des rapports de domination. Cet objectif a ainsi animé les différentes étapes de la construction du numéro. Il semble en effet impossible de questionner les conditions de production du savoir et les moyens de décoloniser les processus, sans réfléchir aux conditions dans lesquelles un dossier spécial comme celui-ci peut se faire. Puisque nous[1] avons demandé aux auteur·ice·s de porter une attention spécifique aux reconfigurations de pouvoir à l'œuvre dans leurs recherches, nous avons choisi de faire ce même exercice de réflexivité, car nous pensons qu'il éclaire les limites du processus de publication. Cette partie suit de manière chronologique les différentes étapes du processus, mais démarre au moment où les propositions sont reçues et ignore ainsi ce qui lui précède (appel à coordonner un dossier spécial, invention et rédaction d'une proposition, évaluation, rédaction de l'appel), dans ce sens le compte rendu est partiel.

D'abord le choix des propositions. Trente-neuf propositions ont été envoyées à la revue par des personnes en doctorat, en master, en poste de professeur·e, en postdoctorat, assistant·e de recherche, sans statut académique. Outre l'intérêt des propositions, leur caractère prometteur,

---

[1] La première personne du pluriel est privilégiée ici car elle permet de rendre compte du fait que de nombreuses personnes ont été impliquées dans ce processus réflexif, à des degrés variables ou à des moments différents.

leur cohérence avec l'appel, les réponses proposées ou les nouveaux questionnements qu'elles apportaient, s'est alors posée la question de savoir quels autres critères prendre en compte.

L'objet de recherche, la zone géographique étudiée et les lieux de travail des chercheurs et chercheuses étaient des critères qui allaient de soi. Il semblait en effet impossible de réaliser un dossier sur les conditions de production des savoirs sans prendre en compte les lieux de production. En l'occurrence, nous n'avons reçu que des propositions venant d'Europe, du Canada et une d'Inde. Peut-on suggérer que les réseaux de diffusion d'une revue reproduisent une distinction des lieux de production du savoir légitime? Ou que les revues sont inégalement positionnées sur l'échelle de reconnaissance internationale et reflètent des intérêts variés pour les scientifiques? C'est en tout cas le constat que font Cheshta Arora et Debarun Sarkar sur la situation en Inde.

Les lieux d'énonciation renvoient aussi à la position des personnes dans l'espace social. Les critères de genre, de validisme, d'âge académique, la position professionnelle, l'appartenance ethnique ont alors fait partie des critères de sélection. Cela reste des choix subjectifs, donc contestables, mais qui montrent aussi notre propre rôle d'éditeur·ice·s et de coordinateur·rice·s de numéro, notre pouvoir de décider à qui donner la parole ou non.

Ensuite l'expertise des articles. Il paraissait important que l'expertise puisse aussi être produite par des personnes qui n'occupent pas forcément des postes stables. Encourager le renouvèlement de la pensée par les contributions de jeunes chercheuses et chercheurs, de les faire participer à ce qu'on définit comme l'expertise, semble être une voie pour décoloniser la discipline. Cependant en demandant à des personnes déjà précarisées professionnellement d'effectuer des tâches non rémunérées et invisibilisées – les expertises devant être faites de manière anonyme, elles ne peuvent pas être valorisées dans les curriculum vitae – nous encouragions alors un système inégal de construction du savoir[2].

La revue fonctionne avec une relecture en double aveugle, par deux expert·e·s externes, plus une relecture par une personne du comité scientifique. Cela donne trois expertises par article. Pour un dossier de cette taille, avec cinq articles rédigés, cela fait quinze personnes qui ont travaillé gratuitement. Et cela sans compter le travail des éditeur·trice·s responsables de la revue et des éditeur·trice·s invité·es.

Alors pourquoi autant de ressources mobilisées pour publier un dossier thématique?

Coordonner un numéro thématique sur le pouvoir en anthropologie est l'occasion d'ouvrir des chantiers de réflexions sur les conditions de production du savoir, mais aussi sur une forme d'éthique du soin. L'ensemble des articles présentés ici font état de relations de dépendance à des contextes académiques, politiques, familiaux, ou à des normes sociales. Publier un numéro thématique qui rende compte de ces relations s'inscrit alors dans la perspective du care qui est «indissociablement éthique et politique, car elle élabore une analyse éminemment critique des relations sociales masquées ou dévalorisées et organisées autour de la dépendance et de la vulnérabilité» (Laugier 2013, 165).

Nous avons tenté d'y répondre le mieux possible, même si parfois aucune réponse satisfaisante n'a été trouvée. Peut-être que la publication des articles est une fin en soi, dans le sens

---

[2] Cette critique est pourtant à nuancer, tant les tâches non valorisées et souvent gratuites sont déjà effectuées par des personnes qui se trouvent en début de carrière.

qu'il est l'aboutissement de l'ensemble de ce processus de soin nécessaire à la construction du savoir scientifique – par le partage du temps, des expériences, de l'attention et des idées - et qui a besoin d'être visibilisé pour exister.

Reste une question ouverte: rédiger des articles, des livres, des thèses, des communications, ou toute autre forme qui permette de rendre visible un travail de recherche, suppose de pouvoir le faire, c'est-à-dire de se trouver dans des conditions qui permettent de faire un travail de rédaction et de révision. En effet, tout le monde n'a pas accès de manière égale aux ressources, de temps, d'énergie, de disponibilité mentale, de matériel informatique, ou encore de revues en ligne, etc. Tout le monde n'est pas dans la position de pouvoir faire entendre sa voix comme une voix légitime. Dans ce contexte, comment se donner les moyens de questionner les conditions de production du savoir et de renouveler la pensée, lorsque les conditions de production des savoirs (matérielles, symboliques, morales ou politiques) des chercheurs et des chercheuses ne permettent pas de prendre des risques épistémologiques?

Remerciements

Références

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1996. « Writing Against Culture ». In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, édité par Richard G. Fox, 137–162. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Behar, Ruth, et Deborah A. Gordon (dir.). 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Bentouhami-Molino, Hourya. 2017. « Audre Lorde, la poésie n'est pas un luxe ». *Ballast* 6(1): 90–103. https://doi.org/10.3917/ball.006.0090

Bentouhami-Molino, Hourya. 2015. *Race, cultures et identités. Une approche féministe postcoloniale*. Philosophies. Paris: PUF.

Bilge, Sirma. 2020. We've joined the table but we're still on the menu ». *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms*, édité par John Solomos, 317–331. Routledge: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY.

Clifforf, James et George Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. « The Epistemic Decolonial Turn ». *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162514

Laugier, Sandra. 2013. « Veena Das, Wittgenstein et Stanley Cavell. Le care, l'ordinaire et la folie ». In *Face aux désastres. Une conversation à quatre voix sur la folie, le care et les grandes détresses collectives*, édité par Anne M. Lovell, Stefania Pandolfo, Veena Das, et Sandra Laugier, 161–192. Paris : Les Éditions d'Ithaque.

Leresche, Frédérique. 2019. «La critique portée par le non-recours aux droits sociaux : propositions pour développer une approche subaltern». *SociologieS* [En ligne] mis en ligne le 23 mai 2019. http://journals.openedition.org/sociologies/11438

Parnell-Berry, Bel, et Noemi Vanessa Michel. 2021. «Editing as Anti-Racism». *ISRF Bulletin* 23: 63–70.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2016. *Épistémologies du Sud, Mouvements citoyens et polémique sur la science*, traduit par Jean-Louis Laville. Paris : Desclée de Brouwer.

Sarker, Sonita. 2015. «Subalternity In and Out of Time, In and Out of History». In *Gramsci and Foucault : A Reassessment*, edited by David Kreps, 91–110. Ashgate: Farnham & Burlington.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2021. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Third edition. London: Zed.

Thiong'o, Ngugiwa. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind : The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey-Heinemann.

Autrice

Frédérique Leresche ⓘ est comédienne et anthropologue. Ses recherches portent sur les droits sociaux et la relation des individus à l'État. Elle s'intéresse en particulier aux stratégies agentives des individus et à leurs capacités à subvertir les normes.
frederique.leresche@hefr.ch
Haute École de travail social de Fribourg, HES-SO

DOING FIELDWORK WHILE PARENTING

Between Challenging and Intensifying Structural Power Imbalances in Anthropological Knowledge Production

Anna Madeleine Ayeh

Abstract

Conducting fieldwork as a White woman researcher from the Global North on women's practices of religious knowing in Benin, my work is based on multiple entwined positionalities that require critical reflection. The political categories of race, gender, age, religion, and family status at times linked, at times distanced me from my interlocutors in Benin as well as my colleagues at University of Bayreuth. This article explores the multiple ways parenting has informed my work in Benin and its institutional integration in a German Anthropology department. Using difference as a lens, I enquire how parenting, intersecting with gender, sexuality, and family normativity, has been used to undo difference during fieldwork, while exacerbating structural inequalities with reference to academic funding structures and research organization.

Parenting and Power Relations in Anthropological Knowledge Production

Discussions around power relations and positionality underlying and informing anthropological knowledge production have gained momentum in recent years. Equally, debates around accompanied research were enriched by a number of fresh publications from anthropologists who took their children on long-term field trips. Looking at two aspects of knowledge production – the establishment of research relationships during fieldwork, and the obtaining of funding for long-term research – this article examines the relationship of parenthood and power in Anthropology, and academia. Parenthood is theorized as a category of difference that stands on its own while interacting with other categories of difference such as gender, race, age, and career stage. Investigating my own experiences in researching Muslim women's religious knowledge practices in Benin, it becomes clear that my positioning as a parent had highly diverging outcomes in the two aspects under analysis: While it proved very beneficial in the establishment of research relationships across Benin, it presented as a disadvantage in financing and organizing said research.

After laying out the situation of researcher-parents conducting fieldwork with their children, I turn to describe the context of my research. Following a segment on ways of theorizing difference in unequal power relations, with the two approaches of *Intersectionality* and *un/doing difference* at heart, the empirical examples of my relationship with Amina in Benin, and my interaction with *Bayerisches Reisekostengesetz,* a German state law governing official trips of academics, illustrate the divergent outcomes of being positioned as a parent in an Anthropology Department.

With Children in the Field – A Long Her*story

As early as 1987, Joan Cassell helped to deconstruct the iconic image of the lonesome (male) anthropologist setting off to the unknown in Malinowskian spirit to describe life in the possibly furthest away corner of the world. She published the edited volume *Children in the Field* (Cassell 1987), a compilation of reflections by anthropologists who had taken their children along to do fieldwork. Ever since, a host of experiences have been shared by academics doing research accompanied by their children, ascribing to them the responsibility of conducting fieldwork while providing care for their children (Braukmann et al. 2020). By focusing on accompanied researcher-parents,[1] I explicitly draw the analytical line not between academic parents and non-parents, but between those who travel together with their children – and in doing so, sharing the fieldwork experience with them – and those who embark on their field trips alone. While parents in academia face particular challenges rooted in academic working culture and organizational structure that has been labelled as intrinsically non-harmonizing with parenting in general (Alber 2005), I here wish to highlight the specific challenges as well as gains that come with doing long-term research accompanied by one's children.[2] Further, I centre being a parent because my interlocutors in Benin did: Being perceived as a parent had – irrespective of my interlocutors' divergent positionalities and social roles – a surprisingly consistent effect on how I was perceived and how people interacted with me. This effect played out in a twofold way. With reference to *parenthood status* on the one hand, being perceived of as a mother meant an upwards shift on the scale of social recognition with all its consequences, i.e., being considered a full adult (in an age-hierarchical society), as more serious and respectable etc. Regarding *parenting* as a (gendered) practice and discourse on the other hand, shared experiences of pregnancy, birthing, and parenting, worries, joys, fears, knowledge, etc. that stem from, in my case, mothering were enacted to create proximity, belonging, and a space of shared enthusiasm and vulnerability. This is already hinting at

[1] In the course of this paper, I at times write "accompanied fieldwork" in order to keep things short. In any case, "accompanied fieldwork" in the context of this paper always refers to researchers who travel together with their child(ren), while I acknowledge that there are other forms of accompanied fieldwork, e. g., partners or colleagues travelling together or researchers travelling with assistants or students.

[2] Speaking about the specific challenges of accompanied fieldwork, I am fully aware that parents conducting fieldwork while leaving their children in their home countries a) don't cease to parent while being in the field and b) face particular difficulties on their own part, one of which being the possibly long-term separation from their kids, (Farrelly et al. 2014). Their experiences shall not be erased in this paper but put aside for analytical reasons.

the different levels and scopes – macro-structural and micro-interactional, public and private – that parenting is salient in and that will occupy us further in this paper.

Joan Cassell describes fieldwork as a "risk of self,"[3] a "profound and emotional experience" (1987, 257f.; cf. Flinn 1998, 7) that leads us, as researchers, to confront our own background, our preconceptions, and eventually our inner selves. In this view, doing fieldwork is way more than one of many elements of anthropological work and career-making, much like teaching, grading student papers, and organizing conference panels. Following Cassell, it should be conceptualized as a highly personal, emotional, and consuming practice of the self. Long-term anthropological field research appears an aspect of academic work that transcends demands, practices, and organizational principles of other parts of the job: In the field, there is often no closing time, boundaries between the public and the private are oftentimes blurred (e.g. between public, familial, and private space or between work and family time), and demands of adaptation and stepping out of one's comfort zone are high (which is feasible for an adult but might be difficult to endure for a toddler). Whereas the university back home often protects the interests of caregivers through family-friendly policies, e.g. with regard to working hours, the field does not know any such measures that enable boundary-making between wage and care work. These are just some reasons why the ideal researcher is still imagined single-travelling and, much like a blank page in their notebook, ever ready to engage 24/7 with the life of the field, stripped of all supposedly private day-to-day care responsibilities. Accompanied researchers disrupt this normalized image of the detached, single-travelling researcher by moving together with their child(ren) and sometimes co-parents or other family members who provide care for the children.

Besides exploring the field and establishing research relationships, researcher-parents engage in the day-to-day care of their children. This leads to a juggling of needs and requires organizational skills and a well-thought-out care arrangement in the field. Yet still, the model of accompanied research is not one of deficiencies. Instead, many researchers stress the methodical and epistemic benefits of doing research accompanied by their children (Dannenberg 2019, 175). One's own parenthood is often described as a status change beneficial to the work – even more by those who have entered the same field once without and later accompanied by their own kids and are therefore able to draw comparisons. It seems to be a shared observation that the presence of children simplifies access to the field and has a "door opening" effect – seemingly irrespective of whether the researcher actively involves their child(ren) in the process of fieldwork or carefully maintaining boundaries between research and family life. Not only with regard to accessing the field, accompanied anthropological researching yields great potentials. The presence of children can render fieldwork more dialogic, as it opens opportunities for exchange about bearing and raising children (Canosa 2018). It disrupts the binary of observer and observed, because the anthropologist and their children and / or partner, their mutual engagement, housing, transportation, and food will be scrutinized by those around them just like the researcher and their family are getting to know all these aspects about their new, temporal home. Research with family facilitates a

---

[3] Using the term "risk of self," she follows Rosalie Wax, who initially titled her book *Doing Fieldwork* on anthropological fieldwork *The Risk of Self.*

reverse of gaze, as it exposes the observer in a configuration of intimate sociality – that to partners and children, as part of a family of one's own. This comes with normativity: The accompanied researcher is interacting with "the field" with all their values, norms, and moralities on board – aspects that the lone travelling anthropologist is imagined to leave at home when embarking on fieldwork in order to manifest a radical openness towards their interlocutors' reasoning, towards the normativity of the field, and towards the logic behind all the practices they travelled to understand. By entering the field with their children, accompanied researchers lose control about just how much they want to open their inner selves towards their interlocutors. The exchange with research partners may become dialogic when talking about and observing each other's experience of parenting. Finally, one aspect becomes clear when reading through the literature: Accompanied field research within anthropology is a gendered mode of working. The majority of researchers travelling together with their children are women; fathers conducting research accompanied by their kids are still an exception (Krämer 2020; Funk 2020). The challenge of juggling paid work and care work as a gendered mode of working translates neatly into the fieldwork context, while men more often than women choose to leave their children in their home countries while conducting fieldwork. The story of long-term research with children is a *her*story,* affecting women at a much larger proportion than their male colleagues.[4] The institutional marginalization of (women) researcher-parents with their particular needs related to long-term fieldwork is thereby directly pointing to the political question of gender equity – a highly virulent and timely question in academia. Recent conferences and new publications as well as the experiences made during the Corona pandemic[5] testify for the heightened need to address this issue.

In this paper, I reflect on my research by exploring how my positioning as a mother informed my work with Muslim women in Benin on the one hand, and as part of an academic structure framed as "excellent"[6] on the other. I am interested in the question of positioning in a twofold way: Firstly, I am curious to examine how a particular positioning (as a parent) may produce diverging, ambivalent, or even contradicting outcomes in differently structured fields of interaction. Secondly, I am intrigued by the question of multiple positionings and how various categories of difference are (im)mobilized and brought into relation. This paper thereby adds to anthropological discourses on knowledge production and to political debates on gender equality within academia, as well as to debates on difference and power. Theoretically, I am drawing on intersectionality theory because it centres the question of

---

[4] In Joan Cassell's edited volume, we find four accounts of men taking their children to the field, all accompanied by their wives to fully take care of the children while even helping their husbands conducting fieldwork and typing fieldnotes (Cassell 1987, 259). In contemporary accounts, those configurations are rarely to be found, suggesting a more evenly distributed responsibility for wage labour between co-parents and care arrangements that accommodate the careers of both partners.

[5] The effects of the Corona pandemic have been labelled as a rollback to old gender roles (Allmendinger 2020). In the context of academic publishing, the pandemic is described as harmful to women scientists at a large proportion (cf. Kitchener 2020).

[6] After September 2018, my graduate school at University of Bayreuth, the Bayreuth International Graduate School of African Studies (BIGSAS), was subsequently integrated in the Cluster of Excellence "Africa Multiple – Reconfiguring African Studies" funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

structural power with regard to multiple entwined positionalities and the un / doing differences approach because it offers a helpful theoretical outlook on the (un)making of difference in micro-interactions.

Researching Muslim Women's Practices of Religious Knowing in Benin

My PhD project focuses on practices of religious learning and knowing among Muslim women and girls in Benin. I travelled two times to Benin to conduct research on this topic: First in 2017 for three months with my then 18 months old child and pregnant with my second child. The second trip of eight months was together with both of them at ages three years and one year. Both times, I was accompanied by a family member and partly by my partner, the children's father.[7] During a total of eleven months of fieldwork that I worked in Cotonou, Parakou, and Djougou, I attended classes, group meetings, and informal circles of girls' and women's engagement with Islamic knowledge – namely the knowledge of reading and reciting the Qur'an, and cognizance of Islamic legal and historic sources such as *ḥadīṯ* and *sunna*. I conducted interviews with women learners and teachers, and accompanied my research participants in their everyday – as sellers on the market, during religious festivities, and in their homes. Muslim women in Benin are offered a vast array of learning spaces: They may congregate in mosques, vacant school buildings, or in the backyards of their teachers, who themselves are a highly diverse group: high-aged religious scholars, youth-aged boys, young men, or women past the age of marriage. The learners congregate by profession (e. g. the Central Market group consists mainly of market sellers), or by proximity or affiliation to the space where knowledge is offered – one's mosque, a learning circle in the neighbourhood, an uncle's Qur'anic school. The learning contexts differ in character, ranging from highly formalized school settings to intimate private gatherings. Consequently, the participants form a diverse sample in terms of class, age, and languages, while all sharing that they are Muslim women living in an urban setting in Benin.

Modes of knowledge transmission, teaching and learning practices and the atmosphere of the learning groups diverge starkly depending on the age of the learners: Children and youth are taught in Qur'anic schools with clearly defined learning goals and a hierarchical organization. For women past the age of marriage and first childbirth, the groups are organized more freely and are less hierarchical concerning the relationship between instructors and learners. Here, interactions between teachers and learners are much more dialogic and freer than in the children's groups. Most adult women's groups fulfil solidary functions as well, with members supporting each other in times of sickness, marriage, childbirth, and death. Some organize communal activities during festive seasons, such as joint excursions to villages during the holy month of Ramaḍān in order to educate other women on questions of religious ritual. Interestingly, there seems to be a life-course related gap in terms of religious

---

[7] I offer a more detailed description of the organization of both trips and the care arrangement for the children in the part "No Official Trips with Family."

learning: Girls normally complete Qur'anic schools around their age of marriage, resuming their learning some years later when their children have outgrown toddler age. This holds especially true for highly formalized learning settings that women with babies rarely attend. Neighbourhood-based groups, mainly those headed by women, are much more suitable for mothers to visit alongside their small children. Different aspects may explain this: First, a female-headed group constitutes a women-only space that creates ease for women to breast-feed during the sessions – an act that is deemed inappropriate within a mosque. Also, some groups are more loosely organized in terms of curriculum, making space for the close and flexible engagement small children demand. Another factor is space, with neighbour-hood-based groups happening in family closures where smaller children can easily move around alongside older children in the private realm of the house while their mothers are reading the Qur'an. In general, though, the first years after marriage and having first children appear to be a phase of intense occupation for women, who are often traders, characterized by high demands in terms of care work and economic activity. Religious learning, I argue, has a specific timing as well as specific life-course related functions: During youth, it is understood to prepare for marriage and parenting, endowing the women with an Islamic morality to make a good wife and mother. After years of procreation, care work and *trouver* ("finding" resources) to provide for the children, women return to the field of religious learning in order to cultivate their own spiritual selves, to attain knowledge to be passed on to one's children,[8] and to enjoy community with other women in a highly gendered social context.

With reference to the question of motherhood (as a status) and mothering (as a practice) relating to positionality and power, I want to emphasize two aspects here: Firstly, motherhood is not framed as a choice in my research context, but a) as an integral part of a woman's life-course. It appears thereby as a normative element of a proper biography, and b) an occurrence that rests on God's grace and may not be tempered with by (wo)man. Apart from influencing the timing of children, e. g. by refraining from sexual contact for some time after the birth of a child, people may not seek to govern their sexuality in ways that may prevent pregnancy. Consequently, other biographical trajectories, such as attaining a higher level of education, or working on their professional careers or business, are subordinated to that of mother-hood / mothering. Secondly, as the remarks about hierarchies, age, and teacher-learner-inter-actions above exemplify, motherhood status, along with marriage, plays out as a powerful marker of identity and positioning within society in Benin. Even within Islamic education – which is discursively framed as a uniform education, a life-long endeavour of acquiring knowl-edge about one's religion for everyone irrespective of their gender or age – motherhood equips womanhood with certain privileges, such as being able to tease and joke with the teacher, expose one's breasts in order to feed a baby, etc.

---

[8] This aspect is central to the discourse of the schools' founders, and the argument is often expanded to the question of the future of society in a broad sense. In this view, mothers are understood to be the child's first teacher. Bestowing mothers with an Islamic morality in the sense of the respective founders, they would educate the children to be good Muslims and eventually contribute to a better future for society as a whole.

On being White,[9] Woman, Non-Muslim … Mother – Entwined Axes of Positionality and Ways of Theorizing Them

Generally speaking, (anthropological) research is grounded in multiple axes of positionality in the field – that is, of positioning oneself as well as being positioned by others. The researcher's positionality impacts how they "see" and construct the field, how they process information and show up in research relationships. It also informs how people "see" the researcher, what they share with them and where they take them to (Adjirakor et al. 2021). Reflecting on positionality, then, is of major importance to contextualize research findings and knowledge production (Chiseri-Strater 1996, 119). Positionality results from an ensemble of categorizations (ascribed by the self and others) ranging from difference to belonging. Self-positioning and being positioned by others can thereby present as identical, disputing or even opposing. Further, particular categories of difference or belonging may be underscored, while others may be suppressed. Yet still, positioning does not only operate on an interpersonal level, but is integrally shaped by histories, societal discourses, and power structures – making positionality a deeply relational issue. In order to approach the question of positionality theoretically, I am drawing on two approaches: First, *intersectionality theory* as established by Crenshaw (1989), and, secondly, the *un/doing differences* approach by West and Fenstermaker (1995), expanded on by Hirschauer (2014).[10]

Timely approaches to human differentiation generally emanate from two shared conceptions – (1) that categories of difference are constructed and not given, and that they are made (ir)relevant by actors/agents, and (2) that there is multiple membership to various categories of difference that presents as overlapping or entangled. A considerable number of works on the second aspect revolve around the question of how to imagine this multitude of memberships – e. g., as addition or multiplication, as overlapping circles, road intersections or hybrid new units.[11] Further, different approaches focus on different levels on which differentiation plays out, such as the structural versus the micro-interactional level. Finally, the approaches differ in the scale of empiricism they demand.

Intersectionality theory focuses on structural positioning, more precisely (and politically) speaking on structural discrimination and privileging. This is no surprise considering its origin: Intersectionality theory stems from the analysis of legal discrimination and yields a stance of political research-activism. In 1989, American lawyer Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term intersectionality, inviting us to imagine one's social positioning as crystallizing at an intersection of a number of selected "roads" that represent central categories of discrimination. At the intersection, these categories do not simply add up, but form specific forms of positioning, as Crenshaw points out:

> *Discrimination, like traffic through an intersection, may flow in one direction, and it may*
> *flow in another. If an accident happens in an intersection, it can be caused by cars travelling*

---

[9] Racial categories in this paper are spelt with capital intial letters to highlight their constructedness.

[10] While West and Fenstermaker speak of doing, Hirschauer has added the dimension of the undoing – the ignoring and the making irrelevant – of differences.

[11] For an overview on sociological conceptualizations of multiple belongings see Hirschauer 2014, 175–180.

from any number of directions and, sometimes, from all of them. Similarly, if a Black woman is harmed because she is in the intersection, her injury could result from sex discrimination or race discrimination. 1989, 149)

While in early intersectional analyses, a triad of categories – gender, race, class – took centre stage, its perspective was subsequently expanded in order to include sexual orientation, (dis) ability, age, and religion. The discussion around which categories to enclose in an intersectional approach is ongoing and has theoretical as well as political saliency. Broadened approaches to intersectionality that circulate today include body, attractiveness or beauty, nationality, social background / family / social networks, health, income, and reproduction / generativity (the latter being important for the context of this paper), analysed as subjugated to a capitalist logic. Degele and Winker (2007, 4–10) suggest to organize an intersectional approach by analysing three levels while stressing the need to study all three levels in their interdependences and co-productions: 1) structure – the capitalist economy that outsources unpaid care and family work in a gendered way and is characterized by unequal distribution of / access to resources based on the categories race, gender, class, body; 2) symbolic representations – the norms, ideologies and representations that confirm the hegemonic status quo by mobilizing various categories of difference, and 3) identities – the creation of difference and belonging through mobilizing various categories in order to find community in an insecure context.

The third level put forth by Degele and Winker resonates with Hirschauer's conception of *un / doing differences*: While intersectionality focuses on structural differentiation and hierarchization as a given, Hirschauer (2014) asks which axes of difference are in force where and when (181), and which ones are glossed over, ignored, or made irrelevant – by individuals, in interpersonal relations, but also by groups, societies or in certain temporal phases. He is interested in "ephemeral moment[s] of undecidedness and non-differentiation between the relevance and irrelevance of social differentiations" (170), on moments of actualization, neutralization, biographic and / or historic cycles or trends (182). He takes on a praxeological stance on difference, highlighting the importance of *doing* difference and consequently introducing the possibility of an *undoing* – that is a situational dissolving, ignoring, irrelevant-making – of difference in historical, biographical, or interactional moments. Strongly postulating the necessity of approaching the question of difference empirically, Hirschauer proposes to imagine multiple differences not as being simultaneously co-produced (as West and Fenstermaker argued), but as competing. The interesting question resulting from this approach is, then, whether (and how) people at a particular moment in time tie in with these differences in / through micro-interactions, discourses, biographies, techniques etc. (Hirschauer 2014, 183).

I propose to combine these two perspectives because both seem relevant in the analysis of different aspects of difference in this paper and, more broadly, in my work: Intersectionality theory is putting power structures centre stage and therefore presents as indispensable in the analysis of a research configuration like my own, whereby I as a White researcher sent by a White academic institution from the Global North is academically benefitting from the knowledge of Black interlocutors living in a structurally peripherized country in the Global

South. Global power structures heavily inform this relation in many aspects. Further, doing fieldwork as a White anthropologist in an African context carries a loaded history: Anthropology was, in its formative period, tightly entwined with the imperial project of colonialism, and – despite ongoing discourses and practices that aim at its decolonization – the discipline has not yet fully stripped itself from researching preliminarily poor, indigenous, and marginalized communities – the "others" –, leading critiques to see it as a way of having "the knowledge of people living there disbursed on one's own pay slip" (Arndt 2020, translation my own). Irrespective of my own intentionality or political aim, this macrostructure remains at the same time underlying and dominant in the context of my research endeavour. While acknowledging these macrostructural power imbalances, Hirschauer's perspective of un / doing differences gives theoretical fodder to many an experience I had with the women I worked with – namely that of my interlocutors glancing over, condoning, ignoring, or openly resisting the expression of differences between us. The shared aspects of mothering were referenced often in everyday interactions that I propose to theoretically frame as moments of *undoing differences.*

Amira and I: Expressing Difference
and Belonging between Mothers

While researching Qur'anic schooling in 2013 for my MA thesis, I worked with youth-aged Qur'anic teachers, accompanying them through town and to the football court while sharing their youth status as a single-travelling student. Returning to Benin as a married PhD student with my first child and pregnant with my second, I was considered a fully adult woman and mother, now being addressed by strangers as *tata*, aunty. Reflecting upon my experience with child(ren) in my research field, my own motherhood obviously played a role in my relationships, also in those with adult women in the Qur'anic learning groups. After-lesson conversations among women who shared experiences of childbearing and –raising would quickly slip to topics related to mothering: How are the children doing? What impacts their health? How does one get them to take their malaria medicine? Many times, I was asked more questions than I asked. A lot of my interlocutor-mothers found it exciting to hear about childbirth practices in Europe – something they had heard a lot of or watched documentaries about. Highly intimate aspects of life swiftly became object of casual talk and joking in the safe space of a shared experience of being woman and mother. I want to illustrate the implications of a shared positioning as a mother using the example of my relationship with Amira – a woman whose race, age group, religious and political affiliation, class / socio-economic situation, and educational background I do not share.

Amira is an elderly woman in her seventies living in the bustling city centre of Parakou in Northern Benin. Having been a market woman for the past decades, she attends the market mosque's women's group every day. Due to her high age and religious proficiency, Amira is respected by her fellow attendees and is consulted on all kinds of questions concerning the lecture of the Qur'an. The male teacher at the school (who is a generation younger than Amira) regularly draws on her expertise during classes or asks her to speak to the group about

"women's issues," such as menstruation, that he considers shameful to verbalise himself. Amira birthed seven children, all of whom are now grown up. During my research, one of her daughters, Maïmouna, gave birth. In the following weeks, Amira took me to her room on several occasions, knowing I was a mother myself. There, we would sit together, Maïmouna with her baby boy curled up on her chest, discussing what to do against sore nipples from breastfeeding, and how to find the newest fabric to wear as a uniform to an outdooring. During these conversations, our communication developed a dialogic dynamic of mutual exchange. Drawing on a shared experience of mothering, the women allowed me into the private space of the bedroom, Maïmouna being at ease with me seeing her topless, all giving in to her new role as supplier-on-demand of breastmilk for her new-born baby, just as I was when coming around with my baby. Momentarily, Amira and her daughter implied my belonging to the in-group of mothers whom sweet and traumatic aspects of birthing and mothering could be shared with. Difference was implied (or *done*, with West, Fenstermaker and Hirschauer) when they asked me questions about how giving birth works where I came from. They had heard that all babies came via caesarean "over there" and were keen on hearing my stance on this, thereby mobilizing (or *doing*) difference based on race and / or origin / nationality.

I vividly remember how Amira got to know I was a mother. We attended an outdooring together and as I held the new-born baby and congratulated his mother, I engaged in what in the research area are common patterns of joking[12] – claiming to get married to someone's child or offering one's own child for marriage to someone's child. So, I said: "one day this sweet boy here will marry my daughter." Amira, standing right beside me, was quick to reply: "Ah, he is Black! Can your daughter marry a Black [person]?", to which I responded: "Why not? Apart from that, she is Black herself." From there, the conversation evolved around the question of her father's origin, and, getting to know that he was Ghanaian, Amira exclaimed, excitedly: "Waouh! Then you are one of us!" I was quite surprised about her reaction. Later, I came to interpret Amira's statement as an act of *undoing difference:* Highlighting my mothering a Black child, and kinship alliance with a Black Ghanaian family, Amira chose to momentarily ignore my White European positioning while constructing me as "one of them." In this particular instance, Amira mobilized mothering and kinship at the expense of race, religion, nationality, and socioeconomics, in order to *undo the many differences* that inform our relationship. Meanwhile, looking at the intersection of mothering and class, my own mothering differed in many ways from that of Amira and many other women in Parakou: I didn't have to worry about being able to provide food for my kids; I was able to buy a stack of diapers in a maxi pack instead of buying them piece by piece (or not buying them at all because they are too much of a luxurious product to afford); My children had health insurance from the day they were born; I took them to the poolside in some of Parakou's hotels once in a while to treat them. My mothering is privileged. There are many aspects in mothering that could have been mobilized in order to *do difference* between me and many of my interlocutors. Interestingly enough – apart from the frequent questions about birthing prac-

---

[12] *Joking* relationships are well documented in social scientific African studies. For an analysis of joking relationships in the research region see Schottmann (1998).

tices in Europe – they were never actually mobilized in this way. Mothering, at all times during my research in Benin, played out as a complex of shared practices, worries, vulnerabilities, and imaginations that created belonging between me and the women I worked with. It was always used to *undo differences*. Along with Canosa I argue that assuming the role of a mother alongside that of a researcher may render a person more accessible to research participants and others in the field (Canosa 2018, 85), and even contribute to the "dismantling [of] differential power relations," as Farrelly, Stewart-Withers and Dombrowski (2014, 2) frame it. It is crucial to note, however, that my mothering and family configuration largely corresponds to what Julia Pauli calls the "family normativity" (Pauli 2020, 50) of the field: it matches the idealized type of family in Benin with children being born into heterosexual wedlock. Some irritations to the dominant family and gender normativity in Benin, such as the fact that I had been perceived as the one who travelled for professional reasons, while my male partner was mainly taking care of the kids, were mostly glanced over.

No Official Trips with Family: Institutional Constraints on Accompanied Researching

While empirically and methodically, my research benefitted largely from the presence of my children in the field, the organizational, respectively bureaucratic, context of taking them along posed a number of challenges. I will exemplify these challenges in the following passage by singling out two aspects – that of funding the travel and medical costs of my child(ren) and that of financing childcare in the field. These are just two out of many challenges that long-term accompanied fieldwork poses for a researcher which Stolz et al. (2020) in their introductory chapter provide a comprehensive overview of them all. Some of them are difficulties that require organizational creativity and out-of-the-box-thinking while others are existential. Often, they result in a temporal and/or financial disadvantage that can pose a career impediment – especially for women, as I have outlined above. (Unresolved) questions concerning accompanied fieldwork therefore directly touch on broader issues of gender equality and policies aiming at supporting families within academia.

First, the financing of travel and medical costs for my children was unclear over long stretches of time – a fact that generated considerable financial insecurity on my side. Generally speaking, the reimbursement of field trip costs, including costs for accompanying travellers, depends on the funding scheme that the overall project financing is subjected to. In my case – as I was then employed directly by the university (and not, e. g., holding a scholarship or being financed through third-party funds) – the financing of my field trips was subjugated to *Bayerisches Reisekostengesetz* (BayRKG), the Bavarian state law governing official trips of, among others, university members. BayRKG applies to the following groups of people:

This law regulates the reimbursement of expenses for official trips and official errands (travel expense reimbursement) of civil servants and judges of the Free State of Bavaria, civil servants of the municipalities, municipal associations and other public corporations, institutions and foundations of public law and those officials delegated to these employers.
(BayRKG Art. 1 § 1, translation my own)

In consequence, BayRKG is not applicable to people who (have to) travel with the official traveller, but do not qualify as members of the groups mentioned in the wording of the law – such as partners, children or childcaring persons travelling with the researcher. Further, the wording of the law shows that is has been drafted with short-term business trips in mind, leaving some aspects difficult to apply in the context of long-term anthropological fieldwork. Therefore, BayRKG is *doing difference* in relation to a) official travellers who are compelled to travel with care-receivers, and b) anthropologists for whom long-term official travelling to far-away places presents as the norm. Consequently, whereas researchers who obtain funding by a different organisation, such as e. g. the German Research Association (DFG),[13] may bring the costs for accompanying travellers directly and easily to account, BayRKG doesn't offer any such flexibility. I found myself obliged to cover the travelling and medical costs of one, respectively two, child(ren) travelling with me. With the obviously relatively small salary of an early career researcher, this posed a substantial financial challenge to me. Clearly, a law that would provide for the covering of like costs would have to carefully define the boundary between necessary and unthrifty company of the researcher by family members. This is mainly a question of the children's age as well as the care arrangement in place back home and would have to take the situation of single parents into account – a complex field to draft an equitable legal framework for. It touches on normative and morally charged questions such as: When is a child able to be without their parent for, let's say, six months? Will the answer to this question be different if we speak about a duration of three months, or one year? Can a breastfeeding parent be expected to wean their child in order to leave for fieldwork? Can a partner who would take over the full childcare during the supposed absence of the researching parent be expected to reduce their hours at their job? Would the law provide for a substitution of the then temporally reduced salary of this partner? Important to mention here is that travelling costs for co-travelling children vary immensely depending on their age. While a child below age 2 travels to Benin for less than 50 Euros, children above age 2 pay a full (adult) ticket of about 800 Euros. Relating this to the large variety in salary between a PhD student with a research assistant position and a full professor, one starts to imagine how differently the financial load of travelling with one's kids impacts families in such different configurations – and how detailed and carefully one would have to draft a law that *undoes differences* towards all of them. Bringing intersectionality back in, things become even more complicated (and political), if one reflects about other categories of difference apart from gender and parenting on the part of the PhD student: How does, e. g., class play

---

[13] While my graduate school, as mentioned above, has been integrated in a DFG-funded scheme of excellence, I remained subordinated to BayRKG due to my working contract at the Chair of Social Anthropology.

out in this particular case, equipping one PhD student with savings and institutional knowledge to seek assistance, while leaving the other alone in a situation of existential insecurity?

Secondly, organizing childcare during anthropological field research can be an equally tricky and nuanced field to think through. Using my case to exemplify, my funding scheme had defined that a caretaker would receive the minimum wage of the research country, that is, Benin. The logic behind this is clear: Researchers are expected to find a suitable person or institution in their location of research and employ them for childcare, just as they do back home. Practically, things can be more complex, with language barriers or divergences in pedagogical practice in place. In my case, the children travelling with me are raised speaking German and Twi while not mastering any language of the area of my research. Consequently, I recruited a Twi speaking family member from Ghana for childcare who, for this task, paused their paid work that had to be substituted, and was in need of travel coverage from Ghana to northern Benin. My partner was, as the co-parent, legally excluded from receiving funding for carrying out childcare – the boundary between kin-care and state care stood firm. Nevertheless, he was oftentimes around to care for the children, travelling at his own costs while half pausing, half juggling aside his personal career. I personally know several colleagues who lived the same situation – their partners being there, literally "between the lines" of the forms we have to fill in order to get our expenses covered, without being able to receive compensation for the pausing of their occupation for the benefit of their partner's research projects. In the question of childcare, similar to the aspect of funding of travel costs, a variety of factors are decisive: again, the age of the children, also their language proficiency, the availability of a suitable caretaker, among others. I want to expand on the aspect of normativity here: As Cassell (1987) as well as Pauli (2020) mention, being in the field accompanied by one's children leads to a shift of the role normativity plays in the fieldwork endeavour. While the ideal-type researcher of the anthropological imagination is fully detached from their normative baggage, being in the field with one's children means being in the field with one's normative stances (Haug 2020) – with a position towards e. g. what the role and place of children in a family / community / society is, what boundaries children should experience, if a parent should set them at all, how and in which activities children should be in- or excluded.[14] In field contexts where parenting common sense is perceived to be differing (in some cases radically) from one's own stances, it can be difficult to find a person that one confidently entrusts their children to. In any case, finding a suitable person to care for one's children in a fully unknown place can be a time-consuming endeavour – in a situation where (research) time is tendentially short and precious. With this aspect in mind, it appears even more necessary that co-parents ready to take over childcare during their partner's research time become legally eligible to receive financial compensation. Else, their situation remains just one out of many examples of "how the everyday structure of academia promotes the invisibility of researcher's care obligations" (Dannenberg 2019, 174). Some authors even per-

---

[14] Think of the famous descriptions by Liedloff (1989 [1975]) being astonished about babies in a Venezuelan Yequana community playing with sharp knives and at the edge of abysses without any concern, let alone fear, on their parents' side. Liedloff portrayed Yequana parenting – in a not unproblematic, romanticising manner – as an alternative to a perceived Western parenting style characterized by overprotectiveness, a timely discourse that is being led under the buzzword of "helicopter parenting" in Germany.

ceive it "as somewhat taboo to acknowledge the presence of our families, in other words to blur and even violate the boundaries of our field sites with visible traces of our personal lives and relationships, however important these relationships and biographies are in enabling us to understand the phenomenon we are studying" (Frohlick 2002, 52).

Outlook: Which Place for Researching Parents?

Being perceived as a mother during fieldwork informed my positionality positively as my family model corresponds largely to a hegemonic image of family, sexuality, and reproduction in my research context – to what Julia Pauli calls the "family normativity" of the field. It mobilized generalized images of a parent being a serious and responsible person. It facilitated access, opened a shared space of belonging between mothers, thus directly supporting the approach of my project that explicitly focuses on women's life worlds. In many situations during participant observation, casual conversations or interviews, mothering was the ground for my interlocutors to *undo difference* and thereby dismantling macro-structural power relations that differentiate us. Reconnecting my empiric examples to the theorizing on difference, power and privilege discussed above, it has become clear that categories of difference may produce ambivalent, changing, or even opposite positionings, depending on the context. Categories of difference do not necessarily produce definite positionings in terms of exclusion or inclusion. Rather, positioning is *done* in many small interactions. A shift in positioning (such as becoming a mother) may reinforce or disrupt difference or belonging, allowing people to draw on or withdraw from it. Within the institutional structure that my work is embedded in, I was quite clearly deferring from the ideal image of a single-travelling PhD student, with legal regulations *doing difference* towards parents who seek to conduct long-term fieldwork accompanied by their children. With access to resources that could cover medical and travel costs of my children as well as adequate childcare being (legally) limited, I encountered a situation that produced insecurity and left me with hours of correspondence that I would have preferred to dedicate to my project. In the end, part of my expenses could be covered due to interpersonal networks of people at the top of academic hierarchies – due to *Herrschaftswissen*. A structural solution that would provide security for researching parents in precarized parts of academia is up to now not in sight. The institutional normativity rewarding independence from care responsibilities and the field normativity rewarding parenting status produced diametrically opposed outcomes with regard to my positioning as a mother.

Supporting researcher-parents is a way to actively overcome gendered inequality in academia as well as disadvantaging of young scientists in precarized contracts. Regulations with a possibly high flexibility that will work for a variety of family models, travel plans and researching / parenting configurations are needed in order to live up to the much-stated pretension of promoting gender equity and family friendliness in academia. Some researchers do brilliant interviews with their kids playing around, others prefer their kids to stay with a care person while they do interviews. Many variables from the child(ren)'s age to their language proficiency, rural or urban research setting, research duration, to mobility play a role.

Consequently, a one-fits-all-solution cannot be a feasible goal for efficient support structures. Researchers with experience in accompanied fieldwork are experts on these questions and should be consulted and included in the reworking of regulations. Needless to add that, as any expert, they should be paid for sharing their expertise.

Doing research together with one's children enriches anthropologic fieldwork in manifold ways. Returning to Joan Cassell, who called fieldwork a "risk of self", she expands her argument unto parenting and concludes:

> *In parenting, we also risk ourselves. […] Children are fragile links between our past and future, fears and hopes. We are doubly at risk, then, when our children are in the field. In attempting to learn and grow, we risk failure and sorrow, our own and theirs. In exposing ourselves, we expose them.* (1987, 257 f.)

In taking our children along, we are exposing them to the field reality, whether they want it or not. Speaking with Cassell, it means "risking them" alongside risking ourselves – a situation requiring ethical reflection at its very least. Yet the "risk of self" in both fieldwork and parenting presents an opportunity, an epistemic tool to open one's perspective towards people we seek to closely connect to – our children and our research participants alike. But while "the field" may reward the multifaceted risking of selves involved in fieldwork, academic structures oftentimes put extra-risk on researcher-parents, and researcher-mothers especially.

References

Adjirakor, Nikitta, Oladapo Ajayi, Hanza Diman, and Mingqing Yuan, eds. 2021. *Fieldwork Experiences and Practices in Africa.* Bayreuth: BIGSASworks! 10. https://doi.org/10.15495/EPub_UBT_00005680

Alber, Erdmute. 2005. "Drahtseilakt? Plädoyer für ein Leben auf vielen Füssen." In: *Karriere und Kind. Erfahrungsberichte von Wissenschaftlerinnen*, edited by Nikola Biller-Andorno, Anna-Karina Jakovljević, Katharina Landfester, and Min Ae Lee-Kirsch, 41–50. Frankfurt / Main: Campus.

Allmendinger, Jutta. 2020. "Zurück in alte Rollen. Corona bedroht die Geschlechtergerechtigkeit." *WZB Mitteilungen* 168. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.

Arndt, Susan. 2020. "Das Ende der Überlegenheitsarie." *taz* 21.04.2020. Accessed November 4, 2020. https://taz.de/Privilegien-in-Corona-Krise/!5677150/

Bayerische Staatskanzlei. "Bayerisches Gesetz über die Reisekostenvergütung der Beamten und Richter (Bayerisches Reisekostengesetz – BayRKG) vom 24. April 2001". Accessed April 15, 2022. https://www.gesetze-bayern.de/Content/Document/BayRKG/true?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1

Braukmann, Fabienne, Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, eds. 2020. *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork.* Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

Canosa, Antonia. 2018. "'Mummy When Are We Getting to the Fields?' Doing Fieldwork with Three Children." In *Femininities in the Field. Tourism and Transdisciplinary Research*, edited by Brooke A. Porter,

and Heike A. Schänzel, 84–95. Bristol: Channel View Publications. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845416515

Cassell, Joan. 1987. *Children in the Field*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Chiseri-Strater, Elisabeth. 1996. "Turning In upon Ourselves: Positionality, Subjectivity, and Reflexivity in Case Study and Ethnographic Research." In: *Ethics and Representation in Qualitative Studies of Literacy*, edited by Peter Mortensen, and Gesa E. Kirsch, 115–131. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989(8): 139–167.

Dannenberg, Janina. 2019. "'Normality' Revisited: Fieldwork and Family." In *Affective Dimensions of Fieldwork and Ethnography*, edited by Thomas Stodulka, Samia Dinkelaker, and Ferdiansyah Thajib, 167–179. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20831-8

Degele, Nina, and Gabriele Winker. 2007. "Intersektionalität als Mehrebenenanalyse." Accessed February 15, 2021. https://www.soziologie.uni-freiburg.de/personen/degele/dokumente-publikationen/intersektionalitaet-mehrebenen.pdf

Farrelly, Trisia, Rochelle Stewart-Withers, and Kelly Dombrowski. 2014. "'Being There': Mothering and Absence/Presence in the Field." *Sites* 11(2): 1–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.11157/sites-vol11iss2id281

Flinn, Juliana. 1998. "Introduction: The Family Dimension in Anthropological Fieldwork." In *Fieldwork and Families: Constructing New Models for Ethnographic Fieldwork*, edited by Juliana Flinn, Leslie B. Marshall, Jocelyn Armstrong, 1–21. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1999.101.1.207

Frohlick, Susan E. 2002. "You Brought Your Baby to Base Camp? Families and Field Sites." *The Great Lakes Geographer* 9, 49–58.

Funk, Leberecht. 2020. "Bringing my Wife and Children to the Field. Methodological, Epistemological and Ethical Reflections." In *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork*, edited by Fabienne Braukmann, Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, 185–208. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

Haug, Michaela. 2020. "Returning to the Field as Mother. Reflections on Closeness and Difference in Long-Term Fieldwork." In *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork*, edited by Fabienne Braukmann, Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, 101–126. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

Hirschauer, Stefan. 2014. "Un/doing Differences. Zur Kontingenz sozialer Zugehörigkeiten." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 43(3): 170–191. https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-2014-030.2

Kitchener, Caroline. 2020. "Women Academics Seem to Be Submitting Fewer Papers during Coronavirus." *Washington Post "The Lily"*. Accessed November 13, 2020. https://bit.ly/37X0eRJ

Krämer, Mario. 2020. "On Being a Father in the Field. Mobility, Distance and Closeness." In *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork*, edited by Fabienne Braukmann,

Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, 209–222. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

Liedloff, Jean. 1989 [1975]. *The Continuum Concept. In Search of Happiness Lost.* London: Penguin.

Pauli, Julia. 2020. "Rethinking the Ethnographer. Reflections on Fieldwork with and without Family in Mexico and Namibia." In *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork*, edited by Fabienne Braukmann, Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, 39–59. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

Schottmann, Wendy. 1998. "The Joking Relationship as Practiced by the Baatombu of Benin." In *Regards sur le Borgou. Pouvoir et altérité dans une r*égion *ouest-africaine*, edited by Elisabeth Boesen, Christine Hardung, and Richard Kuba, 155–174. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Stolz, Rosalie, Katja Metzmacher, Michaela Haug, and Fabienne Braukmann. 2020. "On Being a Parent in the Field. Practical, Epistemological, Methodological and Ethical Implications of Accompanied Fieldwork." In *Being a Parent in the Field. Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork*, edited by Fabienne Braukmann, Michaela Haug, Katja Metzmacher, and Rosalie Stolz, 9–36. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839448311

West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society* 9(1): 8–37.

Acknowledgements

Author

Anna Madeleine Ayeh is a Research Associate and PhD Candidate at the Chair of Social Anthropology, University of Bayreuth. She is intrigued by stratified ways of knowing, working, and caring. She is working on women's practices of religious knowing in Muslim Benin as well as researching the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on work and care arrangements of differently situated members of University of Bayreuth.

anna-madeleine.ayeh@uni-bayreuth.de
University of Bayreuth

COUNTERING ABLEISM IN KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

Empowerment of Subaltern People and Reproduction of Epistemic Hierarchies

Karen Mogendorff

Abstract

Participatory action research (PAR) employs co-researchers to further epistemic justice for and empowerment of subaltern people. This methodological reflection discusses how user-led PAR with disabled people challenges ableism – hegemonic notions about normate bodyminds – in knowledge production. I draw on my experiences as a disabled anthropologist and as a facilitator of Zeg het ons! PAR projects – the Dutch version of Ask me!, Zeg het ons! seeks scientific recognition and counters ableism by empowering co-researchers to deploy their experiential disability expertise in quality-of-life research. PAR may contribute to de-ableization while partly reproducing epistemic hierarchies. PAR requires experiential and theoretical knowledge on how to deploy positionalities, institutional and interactional arrangements to be successful. More attention for experiential and practical knowledge in academic outlets could help.

Introduction

This methodological paper discusses how inclusive research – participatory action research (PAR) with disabled people (Bigby, Frawley, and Ramcharan 2013) – seeks to challenge ableism – hegemonic notions and practices with regard to normate bodyminds [1],[2] – in anthropological knowledge production (Durban 2021, 2).

---

[1] The term normate was first coined by feminist disability sociologist Garland-Thomson in 1997 (p. 32). The normate is the cultural ideal image of the white able-bodied and able-minded male in his prime who serves as the standard almost everyone tries to live up to.

[2] The origins of the concept bodymind are unclear / contested, but the concept rejects the Cartesian dualistic notion that the body is not affected by the mind and vice versa. Physical conditions tend to affect specific mental or cognitive processes in a way that creates difference but not necessarily impairment. For instance, the physicality of people with Down Syndrome tends to be affected alongside their cognitive capacities. Moreover, whenever people in encounters ascribe intellectual disability to people with physical disabilities,

PAR seeks to challenge existing power and knowledge hierarchies by employing subaltern such as disabled people as co-researchers who are empowered to use their experiential knowledge in research (Knevel, Wilken, and Schippers 2022). Ableism is not only of interest to disabled people. Non-disabled people also suffer from ableism, they also struggle and fail to live up to the ideal of the normate bodymind – the icon of the able-bodied and able-minded white male in his prime (cf. Campbell 2009).

This paper is informed by my experiences as a disabled anthropologist and as a facilitator of Zeg het ons! PAR projects – the Dutch version of Ask me!, Zeg het ons! prides itself at being the first validated inclusive research project in the Netherlands. It was introduced in 2000 by social workers and scholars as a promising method to promote inclusion and better quality of life of people with intellectual disabilities (Zomerplaag 2003).

I will deploy disability as an analytical lens in a similar fashion as gender may be used as an analytical tool (Ginsburg and Rapp 2020). Feminist standpoint epistemology explains the value of disability as an analytical lens as follows (Harding 1992; Mogendorff 2021): what one may know and understand partly depends on one's standpoint – the positionalities one has vis-à-vis others. Positionalities may be ascribed or claimed depending on how one is perceived to relate to the normate bodymind around which everything in society – including academic knowledge production – is organized. What one may experience and know may differ with age, gender, ethnicity, and ability (Harding 1992). Through their differently-abled bodyminds disabled people experience and relate to people, places, and circumstances in ways their non-disabled peers do not readily, enabling them to produce new insights and approaches to problems and methodology (Burke and Byrne 2021). This is also true for people with intellectual disabilities who are perceived in academia as the least likely to contribute to academic knowledge production (Knox, Mok, and Parmenter 2000, 50).

Deploying (dis)ability as an analytical lens means taking disabled people seriously as knowers and knowledge producers who do not only voice their knowledge and concerns (testimonial epistemic justice) but also get the opportunity to incorporate disability knowledge and expertise in knowledge production (hermeneutic epistemic justice) (Baillergeau and Duyvendak 2016, 407 f.; Fricker 2017; Kuper, Chin-Yee, and Park 2020). Inclusive research tries to bring about both forms of epistemic justice.

Before I get into how Zeg het ons! seeks to challenge ableism, I will discuss (1) the relationship between PAR, anthropology, and disability, and (2) ableism in anthropology.

PAR, anthropology, and disability

Participatory action research (PAR) is a form of research that: (1) challenges hegemonic knowledge and power relationships by employing subaltern people with experiential expertise as co-researchers (Baum, MacDougall, and Smith 2006); (2) may be classified as advisory, leading and controlling collaborative group depending to what extent PAR projects actually share power with subaltern people (Bigby, Frawley, and Ramcharan 2013, 3); (3)

---

the bodymind is treated as a monolithic whole. Thus, there is also an empirical basis for the concept.

seeks to address through concrete action issues that really matter to subaltern people (Baum, MacDougall, and Smith 2006); and (4) is informed by the Foucauldian understanding that power / knowledge results from institutional arrangements and is exercised through interaction (Baum, MacDougall, and Smith 2006; Foucault 1980 [1972]). PAR with disabled people or inclusive research seeks to counter ableism through empowerment, increase disabled people's quality of life, and promote inclusion of disabled people and their ways of knowing in society. Inclusive research has become popular in the subfield of intellectual disability studies since 2005 (Bigby, Frawley, and Ramcharan 2013).

Although PAR is compatible with anthropology's core business of representing and enabling a diversity of subaltern voices, disabled voices have been underrepresented in both action anthropology – a form of PAR that dates back to the 1950s – and in mainstream anthropology (Ginsburg and Rapp 2020; Shuttleworth 2004). The human rights "nothing about us, without us" movement and disability studies are the most important drivers of inclusive research from the 1990s onwards (Hartblay 2020; Oliver 1992). Within anthropological academic boundaries, the study *of* disability is still largely confined to medical anthropology (Durban 2021; Hartblay 2020; Shuttleworth 2004). But since the 2000s, there is increased recognition in (medical) anthropology that disabled people are not only good informants, but may also be excellent co-researchers who as experiential experts bring a perspective and insight to research, policies, and practices that non-disabled researchers and professionals lack (Oliver 1992; Van der Geest 2007, 11). Van der Geest (2007) argues that a strength of reflexive ethnography and participatory research is that anthropologists may more fully engage in participant observation in their own lived experience than they possibly can in informants' experiences.

PAR is also driven by efficacy arguments: science funded with public money should benefit society (Knevel, Wilken, and Schippers 2022). However, studies found that most non-participatory research has not structurally improved subaltern peoples' life conditions, health, or societal position (Bennett 2004, 19). PAR is believed to be able to help decrease the science-society gap (Bigby, Frawley, and Ramcharan 2013). But that is questionable given that many insights from PAR do not reach academia. Particularly, user-led PAR such as Zeg het ons! that is conducted outside of academia is not published in scientific journals (Bennett 2004; Rubinstein 2018; Stapp 2012). This may in part be because co-researchers and academics do not easily find common ground (Bennett 2004). Van der Geest (2010, 105–108) who encouraged Dutch medical anthropology students to engage in research with representatives of disability organizations as co-researchers in the Netherlands, found that students' master thesis interests did not match the practical research questions provided by 15 patient organizations. Answering questions such as: Is the training for experiential experts effective? does not necessitate anthropological inquiry. Van der Geest's (2010, 105–108) matching-attempt resulted in only one collaborative research project.

To summarize, PAR is increasingly popular in the human rights movement and across the social sciences, including anthropology. It may, however, be unrealistic to expect that advocacy organizations formulate research questions of immediate anthropological relevance. Conversely, anthropologists-in-training may not be optimally situated to direct participatory research projects that address both practical research questions and anthropological

concerns. Perhaps experienced researchers in close collaboration with advocacy organizations may be more successful in combining different questions and concerns. Depending on the study's purpose, setup, and population a specific epistemic tradition of PAR may be more relevant than another.

Ableism in (anthropological) knowledge production

This contribution focuses on how PAR may challenge ableism in knowledge production. But what is ableism and how does it manifest itself in anthropology? Durban (2021, 2) citing a conversation between Talila Lewis – an influential community lawyer and educator on intersectional social justice – with negatively racialized people defines ableism as follows:

> *A system that places value on people's bodies and minds based on socially constructed ideas of normalcy, intelligence, excellence, and productivity. These constructed ideas are deeply rooted in anti-Blackness, eugenics, colonialism, and capitalism. This form of systemic oppression leads to people and society determining who is valuable and worthy based on a person's appearance and / or their ability to satisfactorily (re)produce, excel, and "behave."*

Thus, countering ableism in anthropology is much about the deconstruction of beliefs, systems, and practices regarding normate bodyminds and, as such, can be understood as a specific form of intellectual decolonization. Intellectual decolonization is understood by Moosavi citing Mbembe as: "dismantling the global Apartheid in higher education" (2020, 333). Moosavi (in Mbembe 2020, 333) mentions disability only in passing, but he discusses mechanisms, e. g. tokenism – the semblance of inclusion is created without real inclusively – that perpetuate marginalization of both Southern and global disability scholarship (Meekosha 2011, 667). People are marginalized or subjugated through a valuation system that negatively judges people who deviate in ability or appearance from the white, abled-bodied and able-minded male norm promoted by a combination of systemic ableism, sexism, ageism, capitalism, and colonialism. The focus is here on an -ism that recently attracted attention in anthropological discussions – ableism in knowledge production (Durban 2021; Hartblay 2020; Mogendorff 2021).

Ableism does not affect all disabled people to the same extent. Disability hierarchies in academia mirror hegemonic societal ableist rankings, e. g. physical disability ranks higher as a presumed less severe disability than intellectual disability (Deal 2003). The latter may translate in increased stigmatization and ableism of people with intellectual disabilities. Disabled people may also internalize ableism; they hold ableist attitudes towards people with other disability types or may consider themselves as less capable than their non-disabled peers (Campbell 2009). Ableism also tends to be systemic and omnipresent: it plays a role across the life course and in every sphere of life. For instance, over-protectiveness – a form of ableism in particular disabled children encounter – may lead to lack of development of skills and capacities that present-day society asks of its citizens (Mogendorff 2011, 67–69).

Addressing ableism in all its guises is key to rapport building, empowerment, better quality of life, and the effective use of experiential disability expertise in research. Failure to sufficiently address ableism results in alienation of disabled people, the reproduction of ableist views and practices regarding bodyminds, and to a reduced quality of life for disabled people (Oliver 1992). Ableism also perpetuates the marginalization of both disabled anthropologists and disability anthropology as a field of inquiry on its own (Durban 2021; Hartblay 2020). To accomplish what I coin de-ableization[3] of knowledge – changing ability norms in a way that fosters diversity and inclusion – it is necessary to address forms of ableism on the interactional and institutional level in knowledge production.

Experiential disability expertise is rarely acknowledged outside disability and care research. Perhaps partly because, as Durban (2021, 4) notes, disabled scholars may be advised to not disclose their disability; to disclose one's disability is considered a career killer (Durban 2021; Mogendorff 2021). Hiding or downplaying disability and impairment either as an expression of internalized ableism, or for strategic reasons, comes with considerable costs to individual disabled scholars and helps to perpetuate ableism and the ideal of the normate bodymind which is most harmful to disabled scholars, but may also negatively affect non-disabled scholars.

Ableism in anthropology Durban (2021) blames largely on the still hegemonic Malinowskian model of total immersion in a field abroad for an extended time period[4]. This classic model of fieldwork is an ideal to live up to and is more likely to booster a career in anthropology than other valued but less influential research paradigms such as anthropology at home, action anthropology and reflexive ethnography (Durban 2021; Mogendorff 2021). Disabled anthropologists are not readily seen as able to manage the hardships associated with Malinowskian fieldwork, and have been advised to engage in presumably less challenging forms of fieldwork despite examples to the contrary (Durban 2021; Colligan 1994).

Part of ableism in knowledge production is also that disability still gets treated as a master identity – an identity that overshadows everything else including disabled peoples' ability to compete with non-disabled peers in the labour market. In my experience, when colleagues tell you that "your disability is not as bad as we thought", chances are that you have sufficiently "proven" that your disability does not interfere overly much with your work. Studiously ignoring disability and impairment or withholding asked for reasonable accommodations are also expressions of ableism found in academia (Campbell 2009; 2019).

---

[3] Ableization was first coined by Bednarska (2011) to describe how ability norms can inform conceptions of aesthetics, gender, and sexuality. I prefer the term de-ableization over reablement as used by Campbell (2019). De-ableization and reablement have in common that they call for a critical examination and adaptation of society's narrow understanding of ability, and, with that, disability. However, the *re* in reablement suggests that we need to return to a prior understanding of ability (re is Latin for return to a prior state), whereas *de* signifies moving away from old and current understandings of ability (de is Latin for moving away from). Moreover, reablement may be understood as restoring ability, which may reproduce dominant conceptualizations of ability.

[4] In the Malinowskian fieldwork model, I was educated myself when I pursued a master degree in sociocultural anthropology between 1999–2002. In the curriculum no attention was paid to disability and action anthropology.

Ableism is generally countered by accepting instead of merely tolerating disability as a form of difference. To accomplish this, it is in practice still necessary to demonstrate that ableist assumptions are untrue and that disability may generate novel insights (Mogendorff 2021). Inclusive research seeks to counter the disempowerment caused by ableism by employing co-researchers. By acting as capable co-researchers, disabled people highlight that ability is a part of disability – although this different ability, or diffability as I call it, is often misunderstood, and as such, calls for a critical examination of the concept of ability. Examining and redefining ability Campbell (2019) calls reabledment, but as explained earlier in this paper, I prefer the term de-ableization and diffability – to enable the development of novel conceptualizations of ability instead of returning to old ability conceptualizations.

Zeg het ons! concepts: Quality of life and empowerment

The inclusive research Zeg het ons! counters ableism – a major cause of diminished quality of life – with empowerment of disabled people. Ableism is already discussed, which leaves the concepts quality of life and empowerment as they inform the Zeg het ons! method to be discussed.

Ask me! is originally user-led PAR developed in Maryland, United States by ARC – a care provider – and People on the Go – an advocacy organization for people with intellectual disabilities. ARC and People on the Go developed a questionnaire with easy-to-read text and visuals informed by the quality-of-life questionnaire of Schalock and Keith (1993) and on Signs of Quality provided by People on the Go (Zomerplaag 2003). The concept of quality of life used in Ask me! and Zeg het ons! is: "quality of life is enjoying 'the good things of life' – security, belonginess and self-actualization" (Schalock, and Siperstein 1997, 246). Moreover:

> *quality of life is experienced when a person's basic needs are met and when he or she has the same opportunities as anyone else to pursue and achieve goals in the major life settings of home, community, school, and work.* (Schalock, and Siperstein 1997, 246)

This definition implies that disabled people do not experience full quality of life as they do not yet have "the same opportunities as anyone else" (Schalock, and Siperstein 1997, 246). Ableism is why disabled people do not have the same opportunities as everyone else. Realizing full quality of life requires changes in multiple life domains: housing, social life, employment, self-determination, education, leisure activities. The provided definition of quality of life tells *what* should be accomplished. The concept of empowerment explains *how* full quality of life may be accomplished.

Empowerment in Zeg het ons! Projects

Schalock's and Siperstein's (1997, 246) definition of quality of life that informs Zeg het ons! projects is closely linked to the definition of empowerment by Maton and Salem (1995, 631):

The active, participatory process of gaining resources or competencies needed to increase control over one's life and accomplish important life goals.

Participation, control, and self-determination are essential elements in Maton and Salem's definition of empowerment (1995, 631). These elements are accommodated in the structure and execution of Zeg het ons!: by ensuring that the research is controlled by the advocacy organization *LFB-OS,* by employing disabled people as co-researchers, and by implementing research outcomes together with disabled people guided by an action plan.

Foucault's view on power / knowledge as embodied by PAR, implies that successful co-researchership requires active management of power relationships (Baum, MacDougall, and Smith 2006). According to Foucault (1980 [1972]), knowledge and power are exercised through interaction and result from institutional arrangements and practices (Tremain 2015). The latter means that in order to avoid tokenism – the appearance of influence without real influence (Romsland, Milosavljevic, and Andreassen 2019) – in PAR both interactional practices and institutional arrangements need to be adapted. In Zeg het ons! projects and interactional arrangements are purposely designed to empower co-researchers.

Before I discuss how Zeg het ons! co-researchers are empowered by design and in practice, I will introduce Zeg het ons! further and my involvement in it as a facilitator and as an anthropologist.

My role as a disabled anthropologist and Zeg het ons! facilitator, the Zeg het ons! team, co-researchers, and study participants

I was a Zeg het ons! facilitator from 2005 to 2007. Zeg het ons! projects are still conducted today under the name Zeg het zelf! [Tell it to us! in English].[5] In 2005, I applied for the position of Zeg het ons! facilitator at the Dutch advocacy organization for people with intellectual disabilities called LFB-OS. At that point in time, I had done anthropological research with young adults with physical disabilities, engaged in reflexive ethnography, had conducted research with disabled people as a university researcher and had served as an experiential expert on different advisory boards. It appealed to me that as a Zeg het ons! facilitator, I could employ both my scientific knowledge and my experiential disability knowledge to enable other disabled people to do research.

Soon after I was employed as a Zeg het ons! facilitator, I was asked to present insights and findings of Zeg het ons! projects through academic outlets. For the later purpose, I was given

---

[5] Zeg het ons! projects protocols and questionnaires were adapted in 2007 in keeping with changes in legislation for service-provision for vulnerable citizens, hence the name change.

access to reports and anonymized data from when Ask me! was first introduced in the Netherlands in 2000 up to 2007. I wrote fieldnotes and memos during my employment as a facilitator. Co-researchers and I spend training and Zeg het ons! research days together. We would have lunch together and hangout in between Zeg het ons! training, interview, and focus group rounds. In-between time allowed for informal talks. I did not formally interview co-researchers as an anthropologist. But as a facilitator, I did conduct evaluative interviews with co-researchers after every single Zeg het ons! interview co-researchers conducted.

Zeg het ons! team and co-researchers

The Zeg het ons! team consisted of a handful of facilitators who mostly had a background in social work. Half of the team in 2005–2007 had also been involved in the adaptation of the Zeg het ons! method in 2000–2003. The facilitator role is a paid 10-hour-a-week job; all facilitators did hold other jobs in advocacy, care, teaching, or consultancy. I was the only facilitator with a visible physical disability and the only one who had been employed by a university and had published in peer-refereed journals. Most facilitators were involved in 3–4 projects per year.

By 2007, 143 co-researchers had worked for Zeg het ons! on 24 projects; 54 co-researchers worked regularly for Zeg het ons!. On average eight co-researchers participated in a Zeg het ons! project. One of the experienced co-researchers had become vice-president of LFB-OS by the time I joined the Zeg het ons! team. Another co-researcher participated in Zeg het ons! team meetings.

Co-researchers aged 20–60 were all recruited by the Zeg het ons! team through local branches of the advocacy organization LFB-OS. Co-researchers lived on their own with support from a service-provider, most of them had been institutionalized earlier in their lives. In the Netherlands up until the 1990s most congenital disabled people were institutionalized or lived with family.

Study participants of Zeg het ons!

Study participants are service-users of care organizations aged 18–60. Most study participants were institutionalized, but in later projects study participants were increasingly living in local communities with support from a service-provider. Per Zeg het ons! project, 30 people were interviewed and two focus groups were conducted with 8–10 people. Study participants are recruited through purposive sampling of the records provided by the service-provider that always participates in Zeg het ons! research. The 30 interviews and focus groups divided over 4–5 days did take place at a service-provider facility. A Zeg het ons! project cycle from acquisition to signing an implementation agreement with the service-provider typically takes close to a year, two years if one includes the site visit a year after the implementation agreement with the participating service-provider is signed.

I will now discuss the adaptation and validation of the Zeg het ons! method. Scientific recognition is important if one wants to influence academic knowledge production.

The Zeg het ons! adaptation of the Maryland Ask me! method: Greater participation but failed attempt to gain scientific respectability?

Between 2000 and 2003 the Ask me! method was adapted to fit the Dutch context by NIZW – the former Dutch institute of Care & Wellbeing in close partnership with LFB-OS – the Dutch advocacy organization for people with intellectual disabilities. The aim was to make it more participatory in nature than the original Ask me! project and ensure validity and reliability of the Dutch adaptation of the Ask me! method (Zomerplaag 2003).

In the Ask me! project disabled people were involved as peer interviewers. In Zeg het ons! disabled people's participation was expanded to include (1) member-check and prioritization of interview outcomes, and (2) construction and implementation of action plans to improve quality of life of disabled service-users (Zomerplaag 2003).

As a first step of validation the Dutch translation of the Ask me! questionnaire was assessed with disabled interviewers in different care organizations. Questions with regard to quality-of-life domains such as housing, employment, self-determination, and self-actualization did not optimally fit the Dutch context. Subsequently, assessment findings were used to construct the first version of what was from then on called the Zeg het ons! questionnaire. Multiple cycles of testing, evaluation, and adaptation with co-researchers followed until good validity and reliability was reached. Also, a comprehensive procedural handbook and video was produced for facilitators and co-researchers. Finally, complete control over the Zeg het ons! method was transferred from NIZW to the advocacy organization LFB-OS in 2003.

To sum up, in terms of power/knowledge concrete actions were taken to increase the chance that the research would be taken seriously academically; by validating the method and develop protocols over a three-year period. Additionally, the traditional power-knowledge dynamic in research was modified by enlarging the role of disabled co-researchers and by transferring control of the Zeg het ons! method to the advocacy organization LFB-OS.

In actual practice, careful validation of the Zeg het ons! method was not always enough to ensure that Zeg het ons! was taken seriously academically, as my experience with a university researcher indicates:

When I was a Zeg het ons! facilitator, a senior university researcher contacted me. This researcher was in the process of writing a report and grant application for inclusive research. I thought it was a good initiative and agreed to share my experiences with Zeg het ons! with her. After the interview, I never heard back from her although she had promised she would send me the report. Later, I did find out that she had claimed in her successful grant application and in her public communication about it, that she was the first to do participatory research with people with intellectual disabilities in the Netherlands. Zeg het ons! was not acknowledged as a source of inspiration.

The described incident made me wonder: When does PAR get ignored and when acknowledged? The Zeg het ons! method was carefully developed to meet scientific standards, so lack of compliance with scientific norms is unlikely to be the reason. A factor may be that user-led research by disability organizations without a university partner cannot capitalize on the reputation of the university. Perhaps a collaborative partnership in which academic and advocacy actors collaborate as equal partners would be better at gaining scientific recognition? The answer to that question depends on many factors, but my experience shows that user-led PAR may not always be the best arrangement if one seeks to influence academic knowledge production.

Lack of scientific recognition, however, does not mean that user-led PAR cannot increase insight in how ableism may be countered through empowerment.

The Zeg het ons! method: Empowerment and quality control by design and in practice

In the Zeg het ons! method empowerment and quality control are built in different phases of the research cycle. In the recruitment and training phase, co-researchers are empowered by that they are taken seriously as experiential experts: they have to meet job requirements and receive training, coaching and support tailored to their capabilities and needs. They get paid per interview. Taking experiential experts seriously seems self-evident, but professionals may experience action-shyness [*handelingsverlegenheid* in Dutch] when they need to correct people who do not follow pre-established rules or norms. Ensuring that co-researchers conform to scientific norms did empower and helped to guarantee the research quality. In the data gathering phase, co-researchers and the facilitator welcome the study participants who are interviewed during multiple rounds at the research location. The facilitator introduces Zeg het ons! to the study participants at the beginning of every interview round. This introduction serves to double check understanding and consent and to match interviewer duos with study participants. Co-researchers interview in duos because that way one interviewer may ask the facilitator for help if needed, while the other stays with the interviewee. Also, working in dyads ensures that not all individual co-researchers need to have all required research skills, making the research more inclusive. In this phase, if needed, extra accommodations can be provided for individual study participants.

Subsequently, study participants are interviewed by the duos with the Zeg het ons! questionnaire. During the interview, the facilitator visits with refreshments. The latter is an informal way to check interview progress and to offer assistance if needed. Additionally, the role reversal – the facilitator brings refreshments; the co-researchers are in charge of the interviews – is meant to empower in a subtle way. Shortly after conclusion of an interview, the facilitator evaluates each interview with the interviewer duos. These interview evaluations are a quality control step, but also a moment to collect co-researchers' insights and thoughts on the interview, and to provide coaching when needed.

Co-researchers add value in the data-gathering phase; they are generally best at calming study participants who are often nervous. In some cases, interviewees were asked their opin-

ion for the first time in their lives. The added value of co-researchers during peer interviews, is illustrated by the following episode with a study participant with elevator phobia:

> *At one research location the Zeg het ons! interviews were conducted in meeting rooms on the first floor, on the ground level was a swimming pool. The first floor could only be reached with an elevator, the stairs were closed off with chains. One of the study participants who arrived at the interview location did not want to take the elevator, he did not like cramped spaces that moved up and down. I will call him John [pseudonym]. Confronted with this unexpected situation, I was thinking about moving the interview with John to the swimming pool; it is important that participants feel safe and at ease during an interview. One of the co-researchers that day – Peter [pseudonym] – could not write or read but had excellent social skills. Peter formed an interview duo with his wife who could read and write, but was not as socially gifted as Peter. Peter did go downstairs to keep John company, while I introduced Zeg het ons! to the other study participants and matched them with an interview duo. When I wanted to go downstairs, the elevator doors opened and Peter and John stepped out chatting amiably with one another. I welcomed them and offered refreshments. John seemed at ease and wanted to progress with the interview so I introduced Zeg het ons! to him and John was interviewed by Peter and his wife. Afterwards, Peter accompanied John on his elevator ride down. When he was back, Peter, his wife, and I evaluated their interview with John. Peter and his wife: "John liked to be interviewed by us. By another person with an intellectual disability". Peter: "He liked that I did understand his fears. It calmed him down. I am really good at calming down people".*

The experience of being better at something because of one's skill-set and one's specific positionally made Peter and other co-researchers feel accomplished. Co-researchers liked that sometimes they were better at putting at ease study participants than the facilitators. Or at least that is what they told a social work student who evaluated the 24 Zeg het ons! projects in 2007. Co-researchers also told me: "we learn from their [study participants] experiences". It helped co-researchers to expand their (experiential) knowledge.

Study participants were empowered in that they were encouraged to think about their lives and what they would want from it. If you are not used to decide for yourself on many everyday matters, which is true for many institutionalized disabled citizens, you may not think about what you want to begin with (Atkinson 2004). Study participants mentioned during chats after interviews that they liked to be interviewed by peers without a proxy – a family member or personal assistant – being present. Or as one study participant put it: "You can be more honest if they are not there [proxy]".

In the analytical phase of a Zeg het ons! project, the preliminary analysis is conducted by a facilitator. Subsequently, results are presented, member-checked and discussed during a focus group with co-researchers and study participants. In a second focus group, co-researchers, study participants, and members of the clients' board that represents the interest of service-users of the participating service-provider brainstorm about solutions for the identified and prioritized quality-of-life problems. The brainstorm and the action plan that results

from it are guided by questions that represent the individual, organizational, and societal level of empowerment: What can disabled people themselves do to solve identified problems?

What the service-provider? And what should be addressed by society or by LFB-OS? In this last phase co-researchers and study participants exercise and increase their experiential knowledge by thinking together of ways to improve service-users' quality of life. The project is concluded with a festive presentation of the results and action plan by co-researchers, after which an implementation agreement is signed with the service-provider. Subsequently, the implementation is monitored by the provider's client council and the Zeg het ons! team.

To sum up, the Zeg het ons! method affects epistemic hierarchies to the extent that experiential disability knowledge is valued. During the data-gathering phase scientism was dominant with the nuance that disability expertise was with co-researchers firmly inserted in it. In contrast, in the validation, sense-making, and implementation phase disability expertise was valued over scientific expertise. Overall, Zeg het ons! shows that scientific knowledge and experiential disability knowledge may complement one another.

De-ableization in the disabled facilitator-co-researcher relationship: questioning disability hierarchies

When I became a Zeg het ons! facilitator, I did not know how my status as a disabled researcher would affect the facilitator-co-researcher relationship. I do have a common highly stigmatized neuromotor developmental disorder that results in physical impairments, but may also go together with intellectual disability. In early childhood, I was initially misdiagnosed mentally retarded after insufficient diagnostic research. Based on these and other ableist childhood experiences, I suspected that I would have more in common with co-researchers than in this paper discussed disability hierarchies suggest.

As it turned out, my visible physical impairments initially confused some co-researchers at the start of Zeg het ons! projects: my impairments indicated I was one of them, but my role as a facilitator signalled to them that I was a non-disabled professional. Having a visibly disabled facilitator communicated effectively that disabled people can be researchers. Some co-researchers would characterize my membership of the disability category and of the professional facilitator / anthropologist category as: "you are an in-between person" [*een tussenpersoon* in Dutch.] someone who has stakes in multiple worlds. In my case, the world of disability and the world of academia.

The shared experience of impairment-disability seemed in part to equalize and enhance the facilitator-co-researcher relationship. This is illustrated by co-researchers' consideration of and reflection upon the lived experience we shared of being labelled too slow:

> *Walking together as a form of reciprocity and empowerment:*
> *A thing that puzzled but pleased me was that co-researchers would almost always walk with*
> *me from the bus stop to the research location and vice versa. Due to my physical impairments,*
> *I walk significantly slower than non-disabled people. Non-disabled people almost never*

match their walking speed to mine all the way to a destination; they sometimes try, but at some point, speed up and wait for me farther along the route, or they will at some point say "I need to be elsewhere". We then separate ways. As a child, I was constantly urged by family to walk more prettily and faster, at a more "normal" speed. No matter how hard I tried, I never walked fast enough. As a result, I had unwittingly internalized an unhealthy walking speed characterized by occasional anaerobic respiration. People generally do not notice, if I walk on top speed, it still takes me 1,5 times longer to get somewhere than non-disabled people. Given my prior experiences, I did not expect co-researchers to walk with me to the research location. I was puzzled: Perhaps they walked with me because they thought that they could not access the research location without me? When I told co-researchers that they did not need to walk with me because I did not have the key [the door was always opened and closed by an employee of the host organization], co-researchers responded with: "We want to walk with you. You are slow with your legs; we are slow in our heads" (see also Mogendorff, 2013). And: "You do not mind we are slow in our heads you take the time to explain things".

Co-researchers response in words and actions demonstrate empathy and reciprocity informed by the shared experience of disablement. They do know what it means to be constantly judged as too slow and have experienced first-hand the impact of these type of ableist judgments. Co-researchers it seemed, given their own experiences with ableism, made an effort to avoid adopting ableist attitudes themselves. I felt empowered by the co-researchers who walked with me, my low ambulation speed was not merely tolerated but accepted. The fieldnote also shows that experiential experts may help each other to overcome internalized ableism. While walking with co-researchers, I did not have to live up to the normate walking speed I had internalized.

When I did get to know co-researchers better – particularly those I worked with on different Zeg het ons! projects – I noticed how much more we had in common in terms of disablement in addition to the shared experience of being treated as too slow. In the following, I will discuss three related forms of ableism I had in common with co-researchers.

Disabled people are given less opportunity to try, fail or succeed, and learn[6]

It is assumed that you cannot do it anyway, no need to try. For instance, the doctor in charge of the early intervention team that treated me in early childhood told my mother: "you do not want the best for your child" when she refused to follow doctor's advice to enrol me in special elementary school. Instead, my mother with some difficulty, arranged for me to attend the same regular primary school as my non-disabled siblings.

It struck me in co-researchers' stories that they have been given less opportunities to pursue an education or learn new things than their non-disabled counterparts given their limited education. Their stories made me wonder whether some of them could not read or write due

---

[6] This phenomenon is related to the social barrier learned helplessness in the socio-political model of disability.

their disability or due to their lack of learning opportunities.[7] Moreover, it was a consistent finding across Zeg het ons! projects that study participants craved more opportunities to learn new things.

Being able to do it, is not good enough[8]

The normate does not only prescribes that you need to be able to do something, you also need to do that something at a certain speed or in a certain way. My parents "punished" me for walking too slowly and putting my feet incorrectly one before the other by requesting that a sibling to walk behind me and tell me to "put my feet straight". I was also put into a stroller by my parents until age 9–11[9] because I was too slow. If I refused to get into the stroller – which was increasingly awkward when I grew, at some point I sat in the stroller with my knees up to my chin – I was not allowed to come along with an outing. As a result, parents of former class mates act surprised when they learn my sister and I are twins: "I thought you were her [my twin sister] younger sister, you were always in a stroller".

Co-researchers were not put into a stroller, but shared the experience of being seen as "thinking too slowly" as discussed previously. Slowness is not only met with judgment; in practice it means that care professionals as proxies took over tasks that co-researchers could and wanted to do themselves. Co-researchers liked that living on their own meant that they could do things their way in their own time. Or as some of them would say: "I am free to do it my way now [I live by myself]"; "Now I can do it myself"; "I want to do it myself"; "I want to learn to do it myself".

Help is generally forced upon disabled people such as me and co-researchers for efficiency reasons, but help is also normative. It signals that the disabled person is doing things in a non-normative way. Moreover, the provided well-intentioned help may disempower disabled people in that it hampers them in developing skills and self-confidence resulting in learned-helplessness and feelings of "never being good enough". And as my stroller experience shows, it may also affect how bystanders view the disabled people concerned.

Being over-protected / monitored[10]

My parents did not allow me to travel to secondary school by bike. I had to go by bus accompanied by my non-disabled twin sister until I was 15, although I did not require and did not

---

[7] Segregation of disabled students still exists today in the Dutch educational system. But since 2016 we have in the Netherlands a law that promotes inclusive education of disabled children [*wet op passend onderwijs* in Dutch].

[8] This phenomenon is related to the social barrier "receiving unwanted help" in the socio-political model of disability.

[9] I am not sure about the exact age. There are photos of me sitting in the stroller with my knees up to my chin at least until the age of 9. Granny claims that I was put in a stroller by my parents up to the age of 11.

[10] Over-protection is a social barrier in the sociopolitical model of disability. However, monitoring and surveillance does not get much attention in this model.

get any actual assistance to get on and off the bus. My twin sister accompanied me reluctantly, she wanted to go by bike. When I left home at 18 to study and live by myself and from then on did do everything basically by myself without anybody watching over me, it was quite a transition for me.

Being over-protected / monitored turned out to be a shared experience with co-researchers. Not being constantly monitored is something co-researchers liked and valued: "you are your own man / woman when you live on your own"; "I can decide for myself now what I eat / when I get out of bed / whether I have a pet / how I do things". And: "I am not constantly watched" when talking about the benefits of (assisted) living on their own compared to former institutional life.

Over-protection / monitoring may negatively affect development of skills and self-confidence of disabled people considered normal in current-day society. Additionally, over-protection / monitoring may also be a burden emotionally and financially to those who over-protect and monitor. Moreover, as Foucault has taught us, constant surveillance exemplified by the panopticon may also affect behaviour of the monitored when actual surveillance is absent (Tremain 2015).

These three related forms of disablement co-researchers and I experienced, helped to make intelligible how different ableist practices may reinforce each other and may negatively affect disabled people's development regardless of disability type by fostering inability and marginalization. Sharing experiences highlighted the importance what Zeg het ons! tried to accomplish: creating a safe space to empower disabled people who have been disempowerment through ableism, including myself. Safe space is something that needs to be created because experiences of ableism tend to be non-normate; they cannot be shared with everyone everywhere without risking censure or misapprehension, or, as a child, bullying by non-disabled children (Mogendorff 2007).

Naturally, there were also differences between co-researchers and me particularly with regard to knowledge and academic skills. Or as co-researchers would put it: "you find words for everything"; And: "you are slow, but if you are there everything runs on time"; "You keep things calm" [these last two things were mostly said as the facilitator with ADHD was present] and; "You are an academic but not cold". Academics in general some co-researchers considered cold and distant, as not really caring about their lives.

Finally, my experiences with co-researchers indicate that adopting non-ableist attitudes and practices may help to negate disability hierarchies and may also soften academic hierarchies at least on the interactional level. The circumstance, that I share experiences of disablement with co-researchers made it, I think, easier to gain a deeper understanding of the myriad ways in which ableism affects people's lives. This was accomplished in co-production in informal conversations between disabled anthropologist and co-researchers. That we do not have the same disability type appeared to matter little. The latter highlights that disability hierarchies are ableist constructions and it suggest that disability hierarchies may become more fluid in PAR such as Zeg het ons!

Concluding remarks

This methodological reflection focused on how PAR with disabled people may contribute to countering ableism in (anthropological) knowledge production. I discussed the Zeg het ons! method to explore how PAR seeks to affect ableism in knowledge production through empowerment by design and in practice. The focus on empowerment in Zeg het ons! contrasts with the disempowering ableist practices co-researchers and I experience in everyday life.

A factor to consider when engaging in PAR is that experiential experts and community workers in general have other stakes and interest than academics. At the end of the day, community workers and co-researchers find the difference they made in the lives of subaltern people the most important. It is great if empowering people also contributes to theory development but that is generally not the main goal for them. For academic researchers the opposite is true, career wise contributing to theory comes first, changing concrete life conditions of subaltern people second. This is not to say that, anthropological insights cannot contribute to the quality of life of disabled people, as we have seen, they may create safe spaces to share experiences of disability and ableism. However, anthropology is not going to change the majority of disabled peoples' lives for the better. Particularly not as long as disability anthropology as a field of inquiry faces relative marginalization within mainstream anthropology and answering practical (research) questions is not considered relevant to anthropological inquiry.

Employing co-researchers is an effective strategy to demonstrate that subaltern people can be competent knowledge producers and may add something to the research non-disabled people cannot readily. At the same time, the circumstance that the ability of disabled co-researchers to add to research is still not fully treated as self-evident, signals that there is a long road ahead to ensure that experiential disability knowledge significantly impacts on epistemic hierarchies and mainstream academic knowledge production.

PAR may, however, inspire anthropologists who look for ways to involve subaltern people in their research in a manner that does not only benefit the researcher but also the subaltern people (Bennett 2004, 19). As we have seen in this paper, for the latter experiential experts are essential. PAR can help to gain a better understanding of the emic point of view through co-production: you make sense of experiences, events, and data together. Not only the anthropologist but also to some extent the co-researchers engage in participant observation contributing to novel insights.

What type of PAR is most effective in knowledge production is not answered by this paper. As noted earlier, collaborative PAR may be taken more seriously in academia than non-academic user-led PAR, and as such, may potentially have a greater impact on power / knowledge hierarchies. However, collaborative PAR comes with the risk of "cherry picking": only insights are used that fit into narrowly defined academic norms and practices of knowledge production and, in doing so, partly reproduce the status quo. Non-academic PAR is less confined to academic modes of knowledge production. Although, too eager adherence of non-academic user-led PAR to scientific norms of the neopositivist variety may hamper inclusiveness and methodological innovation in the long run. Also, people involved

in non-academic PAR may lack experience in academic publishing to affect academic knowledge production significantly.

Last but not least, I learned that the role of community worker / facilitator can be combined with the role of anthropologist and that in fact these two may enrich one another. This contrasts with the stance in anthropology and my education as an anthropologist that anthropologists cannot or should not be simultaneously researchers and community workers (Goldring 2010). To me one role seemed to flow quite naturally into the other; partly because anthropological techniques may be used to empower subaltern people. Knowledge / power is affected in the facilitator / anthropologist-co-researcher relationship in that empowerment is not a one-way street. The specific added value of PAR is that all involved may learn from each other: in the case of Zeg het ons! about de-ableization, marginalization, and the value of slowing down to question the normate.

References

Atkinson, Dorothy. 2004. "Research and Empowerment: Involving People with Learning Difficulties in Oral and Life History Research." *Disability & Society* 19(7): 691–702. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/0968759042000284187

Baillergeau, Evelyne, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2016. "Experiential Knowledge as a Resource for Coping with Uncertainty: Evidence and Examples from the Netherlands." *Health, Risk & Society* 18(7–8): 407–426. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/13698575.2016.1269878

Baum, Fran, Colin MacDougall, and Danielle Smith. 2006. "Participatory Action Research." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 60(10): 854–857. http://dx.doi.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1136/jech.2004.028662

Bednarska, Dominika. 2011. "Abilities Underneath: Bodies in the Literary Imagination". PhD diss., University College Berkeley. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8793j2j5

Bennett, Marlyn. 2004. "A Review of the Literature on the Benefits and Drawbacks of Participatory Action Research." *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 1(1): 19–32.

Bigby, Christine, Patsie Frawley, and Paul Ramcharan. 2013. "Conceptualizing Inclusive Research with People with Intellectual Disability."*Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* 27(1): 3–12.

Burke, Ciaran, and Byrne Bronagh Byrne, eds. 2021. *Social Research and Disability: Developing Inclusive Research Spaces for Disabled Researchers.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge & CRC Press.

Campbell, Fiona Kumari. 2019. "Precision Ableism: A Studies in Ableism Approach to Developing Histories of Disability and Abledment". *Rethinking History*, 23(2): 138–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2019.1607475

Campbell, Fiona Kumari. 2009. *Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Colligan, Sumi. 1994. "The Ethnographer's Body as Text: When Disability Becomes Other-abling", *Anthropology of Work Review* 15(2–3): 5–9.

Deal, Mark. 2003. "Disabled people's attitudes toward other impairment groups: A hierarchy of impairments." *Disability & Society* 18(7): 897–910. https://doi.org/10.1080/0968759032000127317

Durban, Erin. L. 2021. "Anthropology and Ableism". *Anthropologist 1*24(4): 1–14.

Foucault, Michel. 1980 [1972]. *Power/Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*, edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. New York: Random House/Vintage Books.

Fricker, Miranda. 2017. "Evolving Concepts of Epistemic Injustice". In *Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*, edited by Ian James Kidd, José Medina, J., and Gaile Pohlhaus junior. Routledge Handbooks in Philosophy, 53–60, London: Routledge.

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. 1997. *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Disability in American Literature and Culture.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Ginsburg, Faye, and Rayna Rapp. 2020. "Disability/Anthropology: Rethinking the parameters of the human." *Current Anthropology* 16: Supplement 21: S4–S15.

Goldring, John E. 2010. "Between Partisan and Fake, Walking the Path of the Insider" In *Empowerment and Voice in Ethnography. Ethnography in Social SciencePractice*, edited by Julie Scott-Jones, and Sal Watt, 126–140. London: Routledge.

Harding, Sandra. 1992. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is Strong Objectivity?" *Centennial Review* 36(3): 437–470.

Hartblay, Cassandra. 2020. "Disability Expertise: Claiming Disability Anthropology". *Current Anthropology* 61(21): 26–36.

Knevel, Jeroen, Jean Pierre Wilken, and Alice Schippers. 2022. "Experiences of Inclusive Action and Social Design Research with Social Workers and People with Intellectual Disabilities". *Social Sciences* 11(3): 121. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11030121

Knox, Marie, Magdalena Mok, and Trevor R. Parmenter. 2000. "Working with the Experts: Collaborative Research with People with an Intellectual Disability." *Disability & Society* 15(1): 49–61.

Maton, Kenneth I. and Deborah A. Salem. 1995. "Organizational Characteristics of Empowering Community Settings." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 23(5): 631–656.

Meekosha, Helen. 2011. "Decolonising Disability: Thinking and Acting Globally." *Disability & Society* 26(6): 667–682.

Mogendorff, Karen. 2021. "A Closer Look at 'Wheelchair' Ethnography: Ableism and the Insights Disabled Scholars Generate with – not despite – their Impairments and Disabilities". In *Social Research and Disability: Developing Inclusive Research Spaces for Disabled Researchers*, edited by Ciaran Burke, and Bronagh Byrne, 50–63. Abingdon, UK: Routledge & CRC Press.

Mogendorff, Karen. 2013. "The Blurring of Boundaries between Research and Everyday Life: Dilemmas of Employing one's own Experiential Knowledge in Disability Research" *Disability Studies Quarterly* 33(2), Special Topic: Self-reflection as Scholarly Praxis. http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3713/3231 [online journal]

Mogendorff, Karen. 2011. "De invloed van opvoeding op de arbeidsmarktpositie van jongeren met een beperking: Implicaties voor beleid". In *Het wassende weten: Opvattingen over de toekomstige arbeidspartici-patie van jongeren met een beperking in een veranderde arbeidsmarkt vanuit verschillende disciplines,* geredigeerd door Nico Blok, 66–72. Utrecht: Kenniscentrum Crossover. [The impact of parenting styles on the employment position of young disabled adults: Implications for policy.]

Mogendorff, Karen. 2007. "Looking in a Mirror: Creating Space to Explore Identities as Persons with Impairments". *Medische Antropologie* 19(2): 269–288.

Moosavi, Leon. 2020. "The Decolonial Bandwagon and the Dangers of Intellectual Decolonisation." *International Review of Sociology* 30(2): 332–354. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/03906701.2020.1776919

Oliver, Mike. 1992. "Changing the Social Relations of Research Production?" *Disability, Handicap & Society* 7(2): 101–114.

Romsland, Grace I., Kate L. Milosavljevic, and Tone A. Andreassen. 2019. "Facilitating Non-tokenistic user Involvement in Research". *Research Involvement and Engagement* 5, 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0153-3

Rubinstein, Robert A. 2018. The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology, 1–7. Edited by Hilary Callan. © 2018 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Published 2018 by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2230

Schalock, Robert L., and Kenneth S. Keith. 1993. *Quality of Life Questionnaire*. Worthington, OH: IDS.

Schalock, Robert L., and Gary N. Siperstein, eds. 1997. *Quality of life: Application to Persons with Disabilities, Volume 2*. Washington DC: American Association of Mental Retardation.

Shuttleworth, Russel. 2004. "Stigma, Community, Ethnography: Joan Ablon's Contribution to the Anthropology of Impairment-Disability". *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 18(2): 139–161. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1525/maq.2004.18.2.139

Stapp, Darby C., ed. 2012. "Action Anthropology and Sol Tax in 2012: The final word?" *Journal of Northwest Anthropology, Memoir 8*.

Thomas, Aliki, Ayelet Kuper, Benjamin Chin-Yee, and Melissa Park. 2020. "What is 'Shared' in Shared Decision-making? Philosophical Perspectives, Epistemic Justice, and Implications for Health Professions Education." *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 26(2): 409–418. https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13370

Tremain, Shelley H., ed. 2015. *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Second edition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Van der Geest, Sjaak. 2010. "Patients as Co-researchers: Views and Experiences in Dutch Medical Anthropology". In *The Taste for Knowledge: Medical Anthropology Facing Medical Realities*, edited by Sylvie Fainzang, Hans Einar Hem, and Mette Bech Risør, 97–110. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Van der Geest, Sjaak. 2007. "Is It Possible to Understand Illness and Suffering?" *Medische Antropologie* 19(1): 9–21.

Zomerplaag, Jeroen. 2003. *Eindrapportage Zeg het ons! Mensen met een verstandelijke beperking over de kwaliteit van bestaan*. Utrecht: NIZW & LFB. [Final report Ask me! People with intellectual disabilities about quality of life].

Acknowledgments

Declaration of no conflict of interest

Author

Dr. Karen Mogendorff ⓘ is a disabled anthropologist and communication scientist with an interest in the uses of experiential expertise alongside other forms of expertise. Currently, she works at the Erasmus Medical Centre in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Her work there focuses on building an infrastructure for participation of disabled people in medical research.
kmogendorff@hotmail.com
Erasmus Medical Centre

ANTHROPOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN OCEANIA

And How to Decolonise Anthropology in (Swiss) Academia

Juliane Neuhaus

Abstract

In Oceania, as elsewhere, power relations in knowledge production have been highly debated for many decades. Oceanian anthropologists have developed challenging proposals to decolonise anthropology and academia in Oceania at large. Nevertheless, insights from this region do not figure prominently in recent theoretical discussions about coloniality and decolonisation "about the subaltern" (Grosfoguel 2007, 211). By focusing on the long-lasting Oceanian discourse in a Swiss peer-reviewed journal, this article aims to contribute to the decolonisation of Swiss academia by proposing an anthropology "with and from a subaltern perspective" (Grosfoguel 2007, 211). Drawing on recent online research, and experiences with teaching the anthropology of Oceania, this article familiarises a European readership with Indigenous anthropologists from Oceania, and their struggles with our discipline. It looks at Indigenous scholars' reflections about and propositions for different ways of knowledge production and Indigenous research methods. The article concludes with suggestions to further the decolonisation process within (Swiss) academia.

Keywords: *anthropological knowledge, Indigenous anthropology, Oceania, decolonising academia*

Introduction

> *It is obvious that non-Western anthropologists, such as me for example, have received their training mostly in metropolitan countries under Western mentors, or in their own lands under Western-trained teachers. Any special "feel" for or subjective insight they may have into their own communities and people could have been effectively suppressed by their rigorous training in the uncompromising empiricist traditions in outside settings.*
>
> (Hau'ofa 1975, 283)

Nearly 50 years ago, Hau'ofa addressed the power relations between Western and Indigenous scholars involved in knowledge production about Indigenous peoples in Oceania from the point of view of an Indigenous student. Reading and discussing Hau'ofa's criticism of his own anthropological training, and, more generally, his and other Oceanian anthropologists' criticism of anthropology as a discipline was eye-opening for students participating

in a course called "Research from Oceania" that I taught in spring 2020. I'm training students of anthropology in a metropolitan European country (in Zurich, Switzerland) since the 2010s, and as a North-European I've been trained in another such place (in Hamburg, Germany) in the 1990s. My students in Switzerland had not yet been confronted with criticism of our discipline emanating from Oceania, and neither had I, during my studies. Oceania has already been a regional focus during my studies of social anthropology and law. I've twice conducted fieldwork about legal pluralism and village courts in the eastern lowlands of Papua New Guinea in the first decade of 2000. Trotting paths well-established by colonialism, proselytization, and a classical long-term anthropological endeavour including several generations of western scholars, my research was situated in the midst of a "colonial matrix of power" (Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019, 6; see also Quijano 2000a and b, and Mignolo 2007). My own fieldwork and writing were largely untouched by debates about the decolonisation of anthropological knowledge production and my interaction with Indigenous scholars remained limited to a few visits before and after fieldwork, when I was able to meet anthropologist Linus Digim'rina and late lawyer Lawrence Kalinoe in the capital Port Moresby. Our exchanges were extremely fruitful thanks to their advice and guidance. Important local publications about my topic had been largely inaccessible in Europe, and it was only through my presence in Papua New Guinea that I was able to access local university libraries and their impressive collections of both Indigenous and western scholars' publications (Kalinoe and Leach 2001).

More recent material has mainly remained unattainable for me and other researchers living in far-away places such as Europe or the US. Digitalisation facilitates access to Indigenous scholars' publications, and we need to consciously enhance our attention to virtual spaces with their subaltern knowledge, networks, and activities. My plans for travelling back to research sites in Oceania in 2020 had to get cancelled because of the outbreak of Sars-COV-2, and I re-embarked on such a research in virtual spaces in Oceania about anthropological institutions, publications, and researchers / lecturers based in Oceania. A focus on Indigenous scholars was furthered by debates about a de-canonization of teaching at the ISEK in Zurich in 2019 (Kukuczka and Fitzpatrick 2020), and intensive discussions with my students, especially in two courses about anthropological research in Oceania. While one course was oriented along the lines of canonical ethnographic literature about Oceania, the second exclusively focused on Indigenous anthropologists from Oceania and their publications since the year 2000. Preparing and teaching this latter course in Zurich in spring 2020 showed how non-fieldwork periods can be productively used for a closer virtual engagement with Indigenous scholars.

Taking up Hau'ofa's dichotomy between Western and non-Western anthropologists is not unproblematic since we all have several identities, mixed origins, and self-attributions as well as attributions by others vary. Nonetheless, such a distinction is imminent in the critique of anthropology as a colonial discipline, as it differentiates between privileged and marginalised or excluded scholars and epistemologies (Moosavi 2020, 345). Over time, scholars employed different dichotomies such as insider / outsider and national/foreign (Morauta 1979, 562), native/regular or non-native (Narayan 1993), white/non-white; Global North/ Global South; at the centre/ in the periphery (see Moosavi 2020, 345–347, for a discussion

of these terms), or western/subaltern (Grosfoguel 2007) – and these axes do not always correspond. In using such dichotomies, scholars point out differences in the reception of contributions of metropolitan academics and those scholars in places outside North America and Europe (Henare 2007, 93). Our joint effort to foster processes of decolonisation will hopefully lead to ultimately overcome such differences and distinctions. For the time being, I employ the dichotomy of Western and Indigenous academics because Indigenous researchers seem to find it a useful one until today.

In contemporary Oceania, Indigenous anthropologists are gradually replacing Western scholars such as the ones initially criticized by Hau'ofa. Western scholars, who had initiated, built, and filled university positions in Oceania for decades, were first replaced by another generation of Western scholars. As the numbers of Indigenous students increased, some became young Indigenous academics who then went on to replace their academic mentors. Some gradually gained power to influence our anthropological discipline, although it continues to represent "colonial forms of domination" (Grosfoguel 2007, 219–220). Even if the mere existence of Indigenous academics in powerful positions could be understood as a welcome outcome of decolonising processes within academia, unequal power relations remain when it comes to working conditions, publishing and academic success and visibility.[1] A way out of this dilemma was the creation of a new interdisciplinary discipline in Oceania around the turn of the century: a discipline decolonial in its approach called *Pacific (Islands) Studies*[2] or *Cultural Studies*[3] (Henare 2007; Winduo 2004; Wood 2003; Firth 2003; White and Tengan 2001), emphasizing and validating Pacific Islanders epistemologies (Wood 2003, 341). Today, *Pacific Island Studies / Cultural Studies for Oceania* sometimes include the discipline of social anthropology, and sometimes both exist as different departments or study programs side-by-side. In some circumstances, one merely finds any Indigenous scholar employed in social anthropology, since these have rather joined the explicitly de-colonial counter-discipline (Henare 2007, 93).

My aim in this article is to add to recent decolonising processes in (Swiss) academia, by writing about the decolonisation of anthropological knowledge as called for by Indigenous scholars in Oceania. In doing so, I contribute to a broadening of our horizons by better including Indigenous anthropologists from Oceania into an academic "we" (Chua and

---

[1] That students and young Oceanian academics still need special support, be it within the region or abroad, is acknowledged through special support programs, such as, for example, *Pasifika Hub* in New Zealand; *Pasifika Australia* in Australia; PICA-WA and YPL, both in the US.

[2] Departments of Pacific (Islands) Studies in Oceania: *Center for Pacific Islands Studies* (CPIS); *Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies* (MBC); *Pacific Research and Policy Centre; School of Pacific Studies;* Melanesian and Pacific Studies Centre (MAPS) at the University of Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea (see Winduo 2004). For a recent summary about Pacific Island Studies in the US see Schliemann (2021). The label of "Pacific Studies" has gained institutional prominence in Europe, too (see the digital platform Pacific-Studies. Net).

[3] Departments and research units of Cultural Studies in Oceania: Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATS); Hawai'inuiakea – School of Hawai'an Knowledge (HSHK); Nga Pae o te Maramatanga (NPM); Ngai Tahu Research Centre (NTRC); Stout Research Centre for New Zealand Studies and Te Kawa a Maui – School of Maori Studies; Te pua wananga tit e Ao – Faculty of Maori and Indigenous Studies (FMIS); School of Maori Studies; Maori Studies, Centre for Samoan Studies.

Mathur 2018). As an anthropologist Indigenous to Oceania, Ty Tengan contributed to that volume by elaborating on the pronoun "we", and he pointed out that it has divergent meanings, either including different audiences or excluding them (Tengan 2018, 158). As a scholar working at a Swiss university, I wish to include Indigenous anthropologists from Oceania and to give space to their voices into the academic discourse. Since, if we want to "normalize" anthropology, to rid it of its hegemony, we need to better include subaltern voices (Escobar and Restrepo 2009). In the same vein, Moosavi urges Northern academics to look at decolonial theory from the Global South to tackle "enduring structures of inequality" (2020, 333). In this article, I thus put an emphasis on an important Oceanian discourse, which results in omitting references to many Northern / Western anthropologists of Oceania who have also been committed to the process of decolonising our discipline.[4]

   This article is structured as follows: I first introduce Indigenous scholars' struggles with identity, the reception of their work and anthropology as a discipline. After recalling the initial years of academic institutions in Oceania, and digging for the roots of intellectual decolonisation, I focus on two prominent Indigenous anthropologists. This is followed by a discussion of points of critique raised in the discourse, and a presentation of an emergent pan-Oceanian research paradigm. I finish my article with suggestions to further the decolonisation process within academia in Switzerland.

Intellectual decolonisation in Oceania: struggling with identity, reception, and anthropology

In Oceania, as elsewhere, knowledge production and its relations to power have been highly debated issues for many decades. Discussions have been initiated, *inter alia*, by Hau'ofa, cited at the beginning. Oceania is the term used to describe "a sea of islands" (Hau'ofa 1994), covering the vast region of the Pacific Ocean, situated between the American continent to the East, and the Asian continent and its archipelagos to the West. The emic term of *Moana Nui* (Pacific Ocean) also has come to be widely used to refer to Oceania. Oceanians or Pacific Islanders are "anyone who has lived in our region and is committed to Oceania" (Hau'ofa 2008, 51). The term allows for broad identification, and also takes into account migration, thus embracing those living abroad in various parts of the world. Yet an alternative term is Indigenous peoples of Oceania. In some circumstances, the term Pacific Islanders only includes people from Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia, excluding Indigenous people from New Zealand, Australia, New Caledonia, Guam, and Hawai'i – probably because in these latter countries, Indigenous inhabitants face a different political situation, being minorities in settler nations (Gagné and Salaün 2012). But again, the terms used may vary, depending on self-ascription and ascription by others. Pacific Islanders living abroad also

---

[4] Take, for example, anthropologists working about Oceania Martha Macintyre (see Bainton et al 2021; Macintyre and Foale 2013; Macintyre and Golub 2021) and Paige West (see West 2018a, b and c), as well as scholars from other disciplines, for example historians focusing on Indigenous agency in processes of decolonisation, such as Banivanua Mar (2016), Rawlings (2015), Hanlon (2014), Gardner and Waters (2013), Chappell (2013), Diaz (2010), Waddell (2008).

employ the term *Pasifika* to display their on-going connection to the region.[5] Oceanian scholars have discussed which term to employ for themselves (native, local, insider or indigenous), reaching agreement by capitalizing "I" in *Indigenous scholar/anthropologist* to point to particular ways in which Oceanian scholars "have taken up anthropology for their own purposes" (Tengan 2018, 154) and for stressing their shared experiences of coloniality with colleagues in other postcolonial states.

Debates about anthropology as a colonial discipline and related criticism, starting in the 1970s, form part of a large and interdisciplinary intellectual discourse about decolonisation within Oceania. One example of this intellectual debate is Linda Tuhiwai Te Rina Smith's bestselling book *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999) that has just recently been published in its third edition (2021). In it, Smith, an internationally accomplished Indigenous scholar/researcher from Aotearoa/New Zealand, advocates a specifically Indigenous research agenda and Indigenous methodologies. Although *Decolonizing Methodologies* is often referenced in international publications about the decolonisation of knowledge, a regional contextualisation – placing it within the Oceanian discourse or just naming the Oceanian discourse – is often missing (Bilge 2020, 328; Moosavi 2020, 344–346; Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019, 6; Last 2018, 211). Moreover, with the exception of Smith's book, findings from Oceania do not seem to figure prominently in recent theoretical discussions about coloniality and decolonisation (see e. g. Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nisancioglu 2018; Allen and Jobson 2016; Escobar and Restrepo 2009; Grosfoguel 2007; Rey 2008). One example is Moosavi (2020) who offers an "alternative genealogy of intellectual decolonisation" by discussing decolonial theories from the Global South that are often neglected by Northern Scholars (Moosavi 2020, 333). He mentions Malaysian scholars (Moosavi 2020, 335–336), African scholars (Moosavi 2020, 336–337), the Subaltern School in India and beyond (Moosavi 2020, 337–338), scholars from Latin America (Moosavi 2020, 338–339), and from Asia (Moosavi 2020, 339–341), but at the same time, he neglects the discourse in Oceania. Along with Smith, many other authors from many different disciplines, including anthropology, are participating in the discourse about decolonisation within Oceania (e. g. Tebrakunna country, Lee, and Evans, 2022). Without even being trying to be exhaustive, I name a few contemporary anthropologists from Oceania that have received little international attention: Ruth Faleolo, Arapata Hakiwai, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Maia Nuku, Michelle Nayahamui Rooney, Marata Taimara, Fa'anofo Lisaclaire (Lisa) Uperesa.

During the 1960s, in the wake of independence of Oceanian island nations from imperial powers such as Germany, the United Kingdom, France, the US and Australia – as successor with mandates for former British and German colonies – colonial administrations have sent many Indigenous individuals abroad to get educated as radio journalists, policemen, health workers, or to study academic disciplines. The idea behind this endeavour was to enable locals to run the state, businesses, radio stations and education once a colony would become independent. Additionally, many universities in Oceania have been founded just before and after independence, in the spirit of encouraging higher education in former colonies. Univer-

---

[5] See Franklin (2003) for a fascinating study about questions of identity in internet discussion forums for Pasifika living in the US, Australia and New Zealand.

sities received financial and logistical support by former colonial powers, and they are financed until today by these same powers, via development agencies or direct partnerships. For example, the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) was founded in 1965 by the colonial Australian administration, and the University of the South Pacific (USP) was founded in Fiji in 1967 by Australia and the United Kingdom. Western academics researching the region initially helped to found specific academic departments and trained first generations of Indigenous students in various disciplines, reproducing western canons and their classical disciplinary conceptualisations and paradigms. This led Western anthropologists of Oceania to consider the decolonisation of their discipline. In 1979, British anthropologist Louise Morauta published an article about "Indigenous Anthropology in Papua New Guinea" in *Current Anthropology*. Morauta considered inequalities between local objects of study and foreign scholars, applied the term of "indigenous anthropology" – distinguishing between "outsiders" (foreign anthropologists) and "insiders" (national social scientists) – and hoped for "possibilities of intellectual discourse between foreigners and nationals" (1979, 561–562). Some anthropologists held to the idea that "the ultimate 'decolonization' of anthropology in Papua New Guinea will come when the profession has produced a group of local anthropologists who will both conduct research in their own nation and go forth to study the natives of the so-called developed world" (Ogan 1975, 334, cited in Morauta 1979, 561). Several students from UPNG addressed other aspects concerning the decolonization of anthropology, and these were published as a comment to Morauta (1979, 567):

› Who decides research priorities?
› Who funds research projects?
› For what purposes are these research projects being carried out?
› Who benefits from the results of these research projects?

These questions seem surprisingly fresh today. But it took more than "a generation" (Allen and Jobson 2016), to produce a group of Indigenous anthropologists, and to make important steps towards the decolonisation of anthropology in Oceania. Only during the last decade or two, more and more Indigenous anthropologists are climbing the academic ladder in Oceania and elsewhere and are thus gaining academic influence within their postcolonial states, and within the region.

Postcolonial states come in many guises: some are settler nations with a minority of Indigenous peoples and a majority of former settlers, such as the US and Canada, and countries in Latin and South America. A comparable situation exists in Oceania, for example in Australia, New Zealand, and Hawai'i, the latter being a state of US. Other regions in Oceania also continue to have close ties to a former imperial power – although with reversed majority-minority relations. Namely, those regions collectively called *la France d'outre-mer*, former French colonies such as New Caledonia, Wallis et Futuna and French Polynesia. Yet, other countries of Oceania have gained independence from former imperial powers such as Germany or the United Kingdom. Today, these countries are inhabited and governed by a majority of Indigenous peoples, e. g., Papua New Guinea, Tonga, the Solomon Islands, Nauru or Vanuatu. Different kinds of postcolonial states in Oceania have produced different ways of

academic involvement in the decolonising project, both over time and in substance.[6] They also pose different limitations to and offer different possibilities for academic decolonisation. Epeli Hau'ofa and Ty Tengan are two examples Indigenous anthropologists, widely recognised in Oceania. Spanning the time between the early postcolonial period and today, they represent two generations of Indigenous scholars, with specific academic genealogies. I ask how these scholars struggle with anthropology as a discipline.

Epeli Hau'ofa (1939–2009) was among the first Indigenous scholars to postulate discomfort with the products of western anthropology: ethnographies. He also formulated region-specific criticism of the anthropological enterprise, claiming for Indigenous knowledge production. He continuously encouraged his colleagues and co-Oceanians to free themselves from an ongoing intellectual coloniality (Hau'ofa 1994). I take Epeli Hau'ofa as an example of a Pacific Islander of the first generation to study anthropology at a western university. By the time he wrote his dissertation at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra in 1975, he called himself the second "native professional anthropologist" from the Pacific (Hau'ofa 1975, 287)[7]. And he was to become one of the most influential social scientists within Oceania in the 1980s until his death in 2009 (see Tengan 2018; Wesley-Smith 2010). Epeli Hau'ofa was an Oceanian anthropologist, writer, and philosopher. His life displays some of the possible connections between islands in the Ocean, as he was born to Tongan missionaries in Papua New Guinea, attended school in Tonga, Fiji, Australia, and Canada, before studying anthropology in Canada and Australia, doing his PhD based on fieldwork in Papua New Guinea (Tengan 2018, 151). Hau'ofa described how it felt to study anthropology as an Indigenous student with a Western teacher: "It is a painful experience for people to sit and listen to someone talking about himself" (Hau'ofa 1975, 283). He described problems with regards to knowledge production and representation, arising when trained "in the West", as indicated in the citation at the beginning of this article. He also problematised the presence of outsider anthropologists in relation to the local acceptance of the discipline, when he stated:

> [T]he longer that [Western anthropologists], as outsiders, monopolize the research in the region, the stronger will be the feelings against us [non-Western anthropologists], and the more difficult will be our task of extricating our discipline from taint of imperialism and exploitation. (Hau'ofa 1975, 288)

Hau'ofa wanted to reconcile those studied (Pacific Islanders) with those who studied them (anthropologists), reminding us that "it will be on the basis of what we have written, what we are writing, and what we will write that we improve our relationships with Pacific peoples" (Hau'ofa 1975, 286–87). Another point of criticism was directed at unequal research relations: "most [Western] anthropologists involve Pacific peoples in our research projects only in the capacity of field assistants, which is paternalism in the extreme" (Hau'ofa 1975,

---

[6] See, e.g. Banivanua Mar (2016); Gagné and Salaün (2013); concerning New Caledonia see Trépied (2013); for New Zealand see Metge (2013), Reilly (2011) and Henare (2007); for Hawai'i see White and Tengan (2001).

[7] The "first native professional anthropologist" (Hau'ofa 1975, 287) was Rusiate Nayacakalou (1927–1972) from Fiji, a lecturer at the University of Sydney, Australia (Tomlinson 2006).

288). As a result, Hau'ofa urged for the "rise of fully trained local colleagues in each pacific country" (Hau'ofa 1975, 288.). Later in his life, Hau'ofa participated in meetings of the *Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania* (ASAO), predominantly populated by anthropologists from the US (Rensel 2021, 16; Mawyer and Howard 2021), a few participants from Australia, New Zealand, or Europe, and – at least at that time – very few Indigenous ones. In 1993, after having participated in one of these meetings, Hau'ofa sketched his famous talk "Our sea of Islands" (Hau'ofa 1994), where he reflected about the still ongoing colonial discourses belittling Pacific Islanders. For long, Pacific Islanders' identity was gravely undermined by colonialism, and they felt second or third class in their countries and worldwide, as well as in academia. Hau'ofa wrote his essay to counter the dominant discourse with his more optimistic view about the region, calling for a pan-Oceanian identity, reinforcing local knowledges and oral traditions. His call has contributed to an internal process, first strengthening Indigenous voices, by exclusion of non-Indigenous scholars for about a decade or two, followed by opening-up for collaboration more recently. And this leads me to the generation of Indigenous anthropologists that both Morauta and Hau'ofa had urged for.

Since roughly the year 2000, different scholars working in Oceania, of Western as well as of Indigenous origins, have developed challenging proposals to decolonise anthropology, research methodologies, and academia at large (Smith 1999, Tengan 2005 and 2018; Golub 2018). Their aim is to add to an anthropology "with and from subaltern perspectives" (Grosfoguel 2007, 211), and to "create a more inclusive Pacific anthropology" (Golub 2018, 32). I take Ty Tengan (born 1975) as an example of an Oceanian scholar of this later generation. Today, Tengan is employed at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (UHM) as Department Chair and Associate Professor in Ethnic Studies, and he is Associate Professor in Anthropology. Both departments have a mixed faculty, with a male and "white" predominance. On the one hand, Tengan is thus a "diversity scholar" in a department of ethnic studies taught in a historically predominant white institution belonging to the United States, comparable to the ones discussed in Bilge (2020). On the other hand, Tengan is an Indigenous scholar, employed at a Hawai'ian department of anthropology. Tengan was born in 1975 in Hawai'i and has spent most of his life there, feeling at home in Maui, as he states on his webpage (University of Hawai'i 2022a). He is – as far as I can see from his writings – as powerful an anthropologist fighting for academic decolonisation as Hau'ofa was. Tengan states on his website that he is "involved in the exploration and development of new models for Indigenous research in anthropology and the social sciences more generally, as well as the ways in which such research agendas articulate with other modes of critical scholarship" (University of Hawai'i 2022a). As student of anthropology, he reflected about his discipline, as Hau'ofa had done 30 years earlier. Tengan experienced a deep discomfort with anthropology among Indigenous students and scholars of other disciplines:

> *In Hawai'i, as in other parts of the Pacific and the world where former objects of ethnography were now speaking back, Native scholars had identified anthropology as the single most colonialist field in the academy. Those I met were shocked that I was in anthropology and told me that it was "an evil white discipline" that was "racist towards Hawaiians".*
> (Tengan 2005, 247)

As a graduate student, Tengan inquired into his department, not uncovering any racist discourses or ideologies (Tengan 2005, 248). However, he found "that the disciplinary models and practices carried out in the department [...] have historically worked to erect and maintain boundaries between outsider-anthropologist and insider-native" (Tengan 2005, 48). When he and a few others received their PhD in the early 2000s, they were the first Hawai'ians to be awarded such honour at UHM (Tengan 2005, 249). As Hau'ofa had been the "second native anthropologist" in Australia in 1975, Tengan was the first Hawai'ian with a faculty position in anthropology when he became assistant professor at the University of Hawai'i in 2005 (Tengan 2005).[8] After a timespan of a generational 30 years, the project of having Indigenous anthropologists in powerful positions was thus launched. As such, Tengan became a member of the ASAO, and has co-organized meetings for younger Indigenous scholars in Oceania.[9] Spanning over four years, their meetings led to a publication in *Pacific Studies* (Tengan et al. 2010), in which participants reflect about further steps to decolonise anthropology in Oceania. Recently, Tengan (2018) has discussed more generally how to "generate a more just and decolonial future" for anthropology in an edited volume questioning the state of inclusion of subaltern academics globally (Chua and Mathur 2018). Critical reflections about the decolonisation of anthropology from Oceania thus start to reach a broader audience outside Oceania. What are the central points of critique that have hindered a decolonisation of anthropological knowledge production in Oceania for decades?

Anthropological knowledge production in Oceania: points of critique and an emergent Indigenous research paradigm

I juxtapose aspects initially criticised with more recent reflections, before turning to Indigenous scholars' propositions for the future. Again, I'm focusing on reflections by Indigenous scholars – omitting Western anthropologists whose approaches, research ethics and styles of representation have of course changed in comparison to the canonical authors criticised.

---

[8] Tengan here refers to faculty positions in anthropology at the University of Hawai'i. There have been earlier incidents of positions in other faculties for Indigenous scholars, e. g., Bruce Biggs (1921–2000) and Haunani-Kay Trask (1949–2021) (see University of Hawai'i 2021). Biggs was a Maori anthropology professor at the Linguistics Department at the University of Hawai'i in 1967–68, before returning to New Zealand in 1969 (see Pawley 2019).

[9] A first explicit invitation to Pacific Islanders to participate in ASAO's annual conference was formulated in 1993 (Rensel 2021, 4). Being part of an emergent group of Indigenous scholars between 1990 and 2000, Teresia Teaiwa (2001) vividly recalls how it felt to participate at ASAO (and related associations') meetings.

Understanding (Mis)Representations

A major issue raised early on by Hau'ofa that is still discussed until today is that of misrepresentation and language. Hau'ofa addressed it just after Geertz's publication of "The Interpretation of Culture" (1973), making way for the Writing Culture debate in the mid-1980s. Speaking about Sahlins' (1963) well-known piece of writing about political types in Melanesia and Polynesia, Hau'ofa stated that this article is "clever, thoughtless and insulting. [...] The whole article is an invidious pseudo-evolutionary comparison, in Sahlins' terminology, between the 'developed' Polynesian polities and the 'underdeveloped' Melanesian ones. It belongs to a pedigree of literature on Oceania" (Hau'ofa 1975, 285). Hau'ofa also tackled the misrepresentation of Pacific Islanders in anthropological literature (published before 1975) more generally:

> *There is hardly anything in our literature to indicate whether these people [we study] have any sentiments of love, kindness, consideration, altruism and so on. We cannot tell from our ethnographic writings whether they have a sense of humour. We know little about their systems of morality, specifically their ideas about good and the bad, and their philosophies [...] We have ignored their physical gestures, their deportment, and their patterns of non-verbal communication. By presenting incomplete and distorted representations of Melanesians we have bastardised our discipline, denied people important aspects of their humanity in our literature, and we have thereby unwittingly contributed to the perpetuation of the outrageous stereotypes of them made by ignorant outsiders who lived in their midst.* (Hau'ofa 1975, 286)

In their recent publications, Indigenous scholars continue to address their discomfort with canonical anthropological literature.[10] To give just one example, Samoan anthropologist Uperesa (2010, 284) spells out her discomfort when reading about Samoan sexuality (Mead 1928). The same may hold true for a Trobriand Islander like anthropologist Linus Digim'Rina, when reading Malinowski or his diaries (Malinowski 1967) in a seminar about the history of anthropology.

Researching Topics that Matter Locally

Indigenous researchers today try to choose topics that matter to the communities and people studied. This problématique is very much in the vein of an on-going discussion about possibilities of collaboration between anthropologists and communities, and of collaboration between Western and Indigenous researchers (e. g. Larsen et al. 2022; Boyer and Marcus 2020; Field and Fox 2020; Gómez-Barris and Joseph 2019; Low and Merry 2010; Choy et al. 2009; Lassiter 2005; Lamphere 2004). Oceanian scholars, too, ask questions such as "what

---

[10] Anthropologist around the world currently discuss and criticize the anthropological canon, see, e. g., Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nisancioglu (2018), Mogstad and Tse (2018), Buell et al. (2019), Durrani (2019), Kukuczka and Fitzpatrick (2020).

do Indigenous perspectives and politics bring to anthropological practice, and what can anthropology offer Indigenous peoples?" (Tengan et al. 2010, 148). Such topics relevant to Pacific Islanders may be found in a publication series compiled by Oceanian scholars, offering online teaching materials about Oceania (University of Hawai'i 2022b). Topics covered in this series include, for example: "Militarism and nuclear testing in the Pacific"; "Gender", "Oceanic Arts" and "Health and the Environment". The series offers access to appropriate literature and various starting points for further readings, it perfectly fits the design of *Pacific Island Studies* proposed earlier on by Wood (2003).

Strengthening Pacific identities

As suggested by Hau'ofa (1994), Indigenous scholars strengthen their Pacific identities when they suggest paying special attention to 'genealogies' in their "search for, production, and transformation of connections across time and space" (Tengan et al. 2010, 140). Seeking far into their past they learn to better know "who we are, where we belong and where we are going" (Tengan et al. 2010, 141). They situate themselves within time and space as Indigenous anthropologists (opposed to non-Indigenous ones) by talking, debating, and enacting their genealogies – and by including these reflections in their presentations and publications. Indigenous anthropologists aim at "connecting people, gods, lands and seas as an effort to reclaim knowledge and contest imperialism in the Pacific" (Tengan et al. 2010, 144). The aims of doing genealogical work are manifold, an important one being to "create a genealogy for the next generation of Indigenous Oceanian anthropologists, provide them with a point of reference, a connection, and a set of relations" (Tengan et al. 2010, 161). Individual scholars' pages at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, for example, display how they position themselves, and how they reveal their genealogy to anthropology as well as to specific places (e. g., University of Hawai'i 2022a). Such genealogies are also pronounced by many other scholars and activists from Oceania, including New Zealand and Australia, weaving nets of belonging to the region and leading to a pan-Oceanian identity and to a pan-Oceanian community of scholars.

An emergent pan-Pacific research paradigm

Oceanian scholars propose specific methods for research. In 2010, a publication explained how to search for these "Pacific research models and methodologies" (McFall-McCaffery 2010). More recently, and two decades after Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), different initiatives have been summarized under the heading of *The Pacific Research Paradigm* (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019). This paradigm is applied to the fields of education, mental health and health, social work, literature, and anthropology (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019, 190). It covers contemporary approaches, encompassing metaphors, models, frameworks, methods, and methodologies (Tualaulelei and McFall-Mc-Caffery 2019, 191). Although the authors excluded work by Indigenous scholars from New

Zealand and Hawai'i (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019), they compiled an impressive list of qualitative approaches covering four pages (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019, 192–195). The authors looked at both context-specific approaches as well as at pan-Pacific concepts (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019, 191).[11]

Just one example for such a pan-Pacific research method is *Talanoa*, or "story telling". It literally means "talking about nothing in particular" but also encompasses "the ancient practice of multi-level and multi-layered critical discussions" (Vaioleti 2006, 23–24). The use of this method in ethnography, and in other academic data gathering, has recurrently been discussed (Fa'avae, Tecun, and Siu'ulua 2021; Tecun et al. 2018; Farrelly and Nabobo-Baba 2014; Vaioleti 2006). "Story telling" as Indigenous research method had already been proposed by Smith (1999, 144). In her work, she describes 25 approaches to Indigenous research (chapter 8, "Indigenous projects"). Smith explains, that "story telling is a focus on dialogue and conversations amongst ourselves as indigenous peoples, to ourselves and for ourselves" (1999, 145). In the context of anthropological research, *Talanoa* is employed as "an Indigenous method of learning and enquiry, it creates and requires closeness rather than distance within an assumed objectivity that is common-place in dominant Western research practices" (Tecun, et al. 2018, 158). Recently, *Talanoa* has been employed in a collaborative research project about medical trust in the Pacific (ASAO 2022a). The concept is also employed in attempts to strengthen a pan-Pacific identity outside academia (Talanoa 2019), or as a way of indigenous knowledge transmission (Cidro 2012). And *Talanoa* has gained broader prominence, and experiences wider use in political discourses inside and outside Oceania, for example in the context of initiatives against climate change (Robie 2018; United Nations Climate Change 2018). *Talanoa* as well as many other local epistemologies enter the international floor outside academia, for example within the framework of UNESCO's initiative for International Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP 2014; Nemani 2012).

Opening up for Collaboration with non-Indigenous scholars

There are several future goals selled out by Indigenous scholars: they plan to challenge, for example, the primacy of English terminology and concepts; to humanize research by making it more authentic, respectful and meaningful to Pacific communities; to include multiple perspectives of knowledge, at the same time not rejecting everything from abroad; to develop more sophisticated and complex terminologies; and to position these within the communities they should serve (Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019, 197). Today, after having developed their own, Oceanian epistemology, Oceanian scholars are ready to bridge the divide between them and us, explicitly inviting both novice and non-Pacific scholars to make use of their approaches in our research, and to further theorize about them (*Tualaulelei and McFall-McCaffery 2019, 197*). Two decades earlier, Smith discussed several possibilities for

---

[11] There are many other authors offering reflections about Indigenous epistemology and research not mentioned in that summary, e. g., Koya-Vaka'uta (2017) and Koya-Vaka'uta, Vaka'uta, and Lagi (2018).

"bicultural" research (1999, 177–178). She favoured "partnership research" as it "involves both indigenous and non-indigenous researchers working on a research project and shaping that project together" (Smith 1999, 178), with indigenous scholars taking key and senior roles in that kind of partnership. Around the same time, other Oceanian scholars such as Vilsoni Hereniko (2000, 90) also voted for more collaboration between members of the two groups in the future embracing the different ways of knowledge production of white/foreign/outsider and Pacific/native persons. Two examples of fruitful collaboration projects between European researchers and Indigenous communities took place around the same time and are brilliantly discussed by Pigliasco and Lipp (2011). Guido Carlo Pigliasco is an Italian anthropologist who has studied and taught at the University of Hawai'i (University of Hawai'i 2022c), and Thorolf Lipp is a German visual anthropologist (see http://www.thoroLf-lipp. de/). Their projects were based on performance practices, and were designed "to be collaborative, empowering, and somewhat experimental multimedia projects" (Pigliasco and Lipp 2011, 373). The projects were carried out in Fiji (*Sawau* project, Beqa Island) and in Vanuatu (*UrSprung in der Südsee* project, Pentecost Island) with additional places in Germany. The authors understand their projects as "initiatives to leave the academic ivory tower and to try to insert some of the findings of our discipline into the contemporary stream of living culture as a service to the societies we had the privilege to visit" (Pigliasco and Lipp 2011, 376). Even though both projects were close collaborations between outside anthropologists and Indigenous partners, and they both followed Indigenous goals, the academic output was published without Indigenous participation. What remains to be done?

Towards a Decolonisation of (Swiss) Academia

In the last section of this article, I propose steps of decolonisation within (Swiss) academia, including steps already taken, and I discuss how to broaden the distribution of knowledge produced in Oceania. Moosavi (2020, 333) lists six dangers of intellectual decolonisation by Northern academics, the most important being to overlook decolonial theory from the Global South. I hope to have added to his alternative genealogy of intellectual decolonisation by focusing on Oceanian scholars and their reflections. Five additional dangers remain, these are to "simplify intellectual decolonisation; essentialise and appropriate the Global South; overlook some forms of colonial exclusion; produce nativism; and be tokenistic" (Moosavi 2020, 334 and 341–350). The decolonisation process has entered European universities as institutions of coloniality. European Universities had been sites of colonial thinking, and the "fall of formal empires did little to change the logic of Western universities" (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nisancioglu 2018, 5; see also Mogstad and Tse 2018). Taking a closer look at possibilities and dangers when it comes to *Decolonising the University*, the editors conclude that there remains "more work to be done" (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nisancioglu 2018, 6). A main question in this context is "how to use the resources and position of the institution, while recognising, accounting for, and undoing its inherent exclusivity?" (Gebrial 2018, 29).

A broader discourse about academic decolonisation is also emerging in Switzerland, a country that only slowly realizes that it is a postcolonial state, too (Purtschert 2019;

Purtschert and Fischer-Tiné 2015; Purtschert, Lüthi, and Falk 2012). Switzerland "has never been a colonial power" (Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019, 4), and the country, its institutions and researchers have rather belated come to engage with decolonisation and coloniality. Coloniality – the colonial matrix of power – emerged as result of colonialism and works beyond geopolitical borders worldwide until today (Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019, 6). Coloniality is to be understood the heir of colonialism and colonial thinking, in that it perpetuates former patterns of power (Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019). A decolonial approach to Swiss academia means to both reconsider and undo this colonial power matrix in divergent "historic global connections, markets, and power networks", in academia and beyond, unveiling "their colonial roots, and bring[ing] to light the contemporary participation of Swiss institutions" (Siegenthaler and Allain Bonilla 2019, 5). Many researchers in Switzerland are now urging for a decolonisation of academia by broadening knowledge production, and a diversification of anthropological research methodologies from different points of view (Tsantsa Special Issues 2022 and 2019; SAA 2022). Some initiatives already make use of institutional resources to enhance reception and visibility of Indigenous anthropologists and their publications at our workplace in Switzerland: ethnographic museums opt for virtual exhibitions and archives to invite exchange with communities in Oceania and beyond (Ethnographic Museum Zurich 2022; MEG 2022), and region-specific academic associations explicitly invite Oceanian and Pasifika scholars to join, strengthening their networks and including them into our networks (ESfO 2022; ASAO 2022b). In addition to these already existent initiatives, I propose to make a better use of the virtual space to enhance the connectivity between all of us interested in Oceania, and our respective students. This may be realised, on the one hand, by reading Indigenous scholars, and on the other hand, by providing better access to Indigenous scholars via the virtual spaces of our Swiss institutions.

Furthering the reception of Indigenous scholars

I think we (Swiss/Western scholars) need to continue our (anthropological) education by exploring new methods and methodologies, not being content with our classical anthropology toolkit for fieldwork, as well as by studying and employing theories "from the South". To further educate ourselves we may discover blogs and university websites, and other useful sources of online publications by Indigenous scholars such as

› *MAI:* A New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Research. *MAI* articles critically analyze and address Indigenous and Pacific issues in the context of Aotearoa / New Zealand.
› *AlterNatives: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, published by SAGE since 2005, presenting "research on Indigenous worldviews and experiences of decolonisation from Indigenous perspectives from around the world [,] showcase themes of Indigenous knowledge and epistemologies [, and] document the emergence of different Indigenous methodologies and value systems within an academic environment" (AlterNatives 2021).

› *Collaborative Anthropologies*, edited by Charles Menzies and published by the University of Nebraska Press since 2008. The journal "is a forum for dialogue with a special focus on the complex collaborations between and among researchers and research participants/interlocutors. It features essays that are descriptive as well as analytical, from all subfields of anthropology and closely related disciplines, and that present a diversity of perspectives on collaborative research." (Collaborative Anthropologies 2022).

Within a familiar framework of peer reviewed journals, we, as academics at Western institutions, may easily access Indigenous scholarship, and one may no longer overlook decolonial theory from the Global South (Moosavi 2020, 333). To start with, we may further the reception of Indigenous scholarship through our own and our students' readings. This will lead to a better integration of Indigenous scholars' methods and findings in future research and publication, and academic knowledge production will become more inclusive. Additionally, translations of publications in lesser accessible languages could be fostered, as already done, for example, by *Anthropological Quarterly / Polyglot Perspectives*; and *Current Anthropology*, financing translations into English and offering to publish the final version of an accepted manuscript in the original language if requested by the author, as online supplement. We may also directly exchange with our Indigenous colleagues making use of digitalisation, e. g., through interviews about the ideas presented in this special issue, and further online exchange about our common project to decolonise knowledge production. We may want to expand our dialogue by discussing topics such as the translation of key terms, or the dangers of cultural appropriation by non-Indigenous scholars through the use of Indigenous methodologies, terms and epistemologies.

Furthering the access to Indigenous anthropologists

As part of an intellectual decolonisation, I propose to use our (Swiss/Western) institutional resources to enhance visibility of and access to Indigenous scholarship. I herewith refer to what is (in)visible or less accessible in our institutional virtual spaces. We, as scholars working in Swiss/Western institutions, may not only want to extend our individual regional expertise about regional-specific online platforms, materials, and publication organs. We may also want to exchange about initiatives across the globe with "each other" (meant inclusively: with Indigenous and non-Indigenous) scholars, and with our respective students. Insights from the South are useful in cross-regional comparison, and in non-region-specific theoretical discussions. Besides reading Indigenous scholars and including references to their publications in our texts, we may, for example, grant better visibility for them on our institutional and / or personal websites. At the ISEK in Zurich, we have so far provided access to canonical anthropological journals – compiled to inform students what to read (University of Zurich 2022). By adding journals as those mentioned above, we would enhance access to Indigenous scholars' perspectives, and to knowledge produced besides canonical publication organs. We may also provide alternative points of access to the many networks, institutions and scholars in

Oceania, and to their publications. This idea – developed in collaboration with ISEK librarian Jörg Schlatter a couple of years ago – wants to enhance the visibility of and access to academic institutions and scholars per world region beyond the well-known research centres and universities in Europe already easily accessible (see e. g. Pacific-Studies.Net 2022). It could be realised at individual Swiss/Western scholars' websites, at research sections of institutional libraries' websites or even at the level of academic institutions such as SAA, ESfO and ASAO.

There are, of course, many other ways for our mutual quest to decolonise anthropology, for example through teaching. Some of these have long-standing traditions in anthropological departments, some may still need to be developed:

› co-teaching with Indigenous anthropologists or streaming them into a specific session (and vice versa).
› teaching Indigenous research methods with online consultations of Indigenous researchers.
› summer schools taking place in our research regions, enhancing Western and Indigenous students' and scholars' exchange.

My article is a contribution to an emergent process of decolonising academia in Switzerland, and in Europe. I've followed a decolonial approach to Swiss academia by bringing to light an Indigenous discourse I feel has been neglected within the field of decolonisation. In the same vein, I've proposed some ideas to enhance reception of, access and visibility to (Oceanian) Indigenous scholars, mainly in virtual spaces. As cited above (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nisancioglu 2018, 6), there is still a lot of work to be done. Taken together with insights from other regions addressed in this latest Tsantsa Special Issue, my contribution will hopefully advance the inclusion of many more subaltern voices and different ways of knowledge production in Swiss academia, and beyond.

Acknowledgments

References

all online sources were last accessed on August 31ˢᵗ, 2022.

Allen, Jafari Sinclaire, and Ryan Cecil Jobson. 2016. "The Decolonizing Generation: (Race and) Theory in Anthropology since the Eighties." *Current Anthropology* 57(2): 129–148. https://doi.org/10.1086/685502

AlterNatives: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples. Sage Journals. https://journals.sagepub.com/home/aln

ASAO (Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania). 2022a. "ASAO Annual Meeting Program, 26–29 January, 2022, Portland Oregon. Working session: 'Trust and Care in Pacific Health and Research'.", convened by Mike Poltrak: https://docs.google.com/document/d/12L0_K-_hC2805D-6doo7nEE8VgAqQFk3td2vt4BYCT0Y/edit

ASAO (Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania). 2022b. https://www.asao.org/

Bainton, Nicholas, Debra Macdougall, Kalissa Alexeyeff and John Cox (eds.). 2021. *Unequal Lives. Gender, Race and Class in the Western Pacific.* Canberra: ANU Press. http://doi.org/10.22459/UE.2020

Banivanua-mar, Tracey. 2016. *Decolonisation and the Pacific: Indigenous Globalisation and the Ends of Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bhambra, Gurminder K., Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nisancioglu. 2018. "Introduction: Decolonising the University?" In *Decolonising the University*, edited by Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nisancioglu, 1–18. London: Pluto Press.

Bilge, Sirma. 2020. "We've Joined the Table but We're Still on the Menu. Clickbaiting Diversity in Today's University." In *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms*, edited by John Solomos, 317–331. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351047326

Buell, Rebecca Renee, Samuel Raymond Burns, Zhuo Chen, Lisa Grabinsky, Moreno Argenis Hurtado, Katherine Stanton, Froggi VanRiper, and Loren White. 2019. "Reworking the History of Social Theory for 21ˢᵗ Century Anthropology: A Syllabus Project." *Footnotes blog*, February 15. https://footnotesblog.com/2019/02/15/decanonizing-anthropology/

Chappell, David. 2013. *The Kanak Awakening: The Rise of Nationalism in New Caledonia.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Choy, Timothy K., Lieba Faier, Michael J. Hathaway, Miyako Inoue, Shiho Satsuka, and Anna Tsing (Matsutake Worlds Research Group). 2009. "A New Form of Collaboration in Cultural Anthropology: Matsutake worlds." *American Anthropologist* 36(2): 380–403. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2009.01141.x

Chua, Liana, and Nayanika Mathur (eds.). 2018. *Who Are "We"? Reimagining Alterity and Affinity in Anthropology.* New York: Berghahn Books. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvw049n2

Cidro, Jaime. 2012. "Storytelling as Indigenous Konwledge Transmission." In *Proceedings of the International Indigenous Development Research Conference 2012*, edited by Ngä Pae o te Märamatanga, 26–31. Auckland: Ngä Pae o te Märamatanga.

Collaborative Anthropologies. 2022. University of Nebraska Press. https://nebraskapressjournals.unl.edu/journal/collaborative-anthropologies/

Diaz, Vicente M. 2010. *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Durrani, Mariam. 2019. "Upsetting the Canon." *Anthropology News* website, April 8. https://www.anthropology-news.org/articles/upsetting-the-canon/

Escobar, Arturo, and Eduardo Restrepo. 2009. "Anthropologies hégémoniques et colonialité." Translated by Amandine Delord. *Cahiers des Amériques Latines* 62: 83–95. https://doi.org/10.4000/cal.1550

ESfO (European Society for Oceanists). 2022. http://esfo-org.eu/

Ethnographic Museum Zurich. 2022. "360° – The Extended Museum Space": https://www.musethno.uzh.ch/en/Exhibitions/360°-exhibitions.html

Fa'avae, David Taufui Mikato, Arcia Tecun, and Sione Siu'ulua. 2021. "Talanoa va: Indigenous Masculinities and the Intersections of Indigeneity, Race, and Gender within Higher Education." *Higher Education Research and Development* 40. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1882402

Farrelly, Trisia, and Unaisi Nabobo-Baba. 2014. "Talanoa as Empathetic Apprenticeship." *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 55(3): 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12060

Field, Les W., and Richard G. Fox. 2020 (2007). "Introduction: How Does Anthropology Work Today?" In *Anthropology Put to Work*, edited by Les W. Field and Richard G. Fox, 1–20. NY and Oxford: Routledge.

Firth, Stewart. 2003. "Future Directions for Pacific Studies." *Contemporary Pacific* 15(1): 139–148. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23722032

Franklin, Marianne I. 2003. "I Define my Own Identity. Pacific Articulations of 'Race' and 'Culture' on the Internet." *Ethnicities* 3(4): 465–490. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796803003004002

Gagné, Natacha, and Marie Salaün. 2013. "Les chemins de la décolonisation aujourd'hui : Perspectives du pacifique insulaire" *Revue critique internationale* 2013(3): 111–132. https://doi.org/10.3917/crii.060.0111

Gagné, Natacha, and Marie Salaün. 2012. "Appeals to Indigeneity: Insights from Oceania." *Social Identities* 18(4): 381–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2012.673868

Gardner, Helen, and Christopher Waters. 2013. "Decolonisation in Melanesia: Introduction." *Journal of Pacific History* 48(2): 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223344.2013.774766

Gebrial, Delia. 2018. "Rhodes Must Fall: Oxford and Movements for Change." In *Decolonising the University*, edited by Gurminder K. Bhambra; Gebrial, Dalia and Kerem Nisancioglu, 19–36. London: Pluto Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books.

Golub, Alex. 2018. "Welcoming the New Amateurs. A Future (and Past) for Non-Academic Anthropologists." *Commoning Ethnography* 1(1): 32–44. https://doi.org/10.26686/ce.v1i1.5204

Gómez-Barris, Macarena, and May Joseph. 2019. "Coloniality and Islands." *Shima. The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures* 13(2). https://doi.org/10.21463/shima.13.2.03.

Grosfoguel, Ramon. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn. Beyond Political-Economy Paradigms." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162514

Hanlon, David. 2014. *Making Micronesia: A Political Biography of Tosiwo Nakayama.* Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press.

Hau'ofa, Epeli. 2008. *We are the Ocean: Selected Works.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hau'ofa, Epeli. 1994. "Our Sea of Islands." *The Contemporary Pacific* 6: 147–161. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23701593. Also published in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, edited by Eric Wadell, Vijay Naidu, and Epeli Hau'ofa, 1993, 2–16. Suva: The University of the South Pacific, School of Social

and Economic Development.Hauʻofa, Epeli. 1975. "Anthropology and Pacific Islanders." *Oceania* 45(4): 283–289. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40330205?seq=1

Henare, Amiria. 2007. "Nga rakau a te pakeha: Reconsidering Maori Anthropology." In *Anthropology and Science: Epistemologies in Practice*, edited by Jeanette Edwards, Penny Harvey, and Peter Wade, 93–113. New York: Berg.

Hereniko, Vilsoni. 2000. "Indigenous Knowledge and Academic Imperialism." In *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts. An Invitation to Remake History*, edited by Robert Borofsky, 78–91. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

ICHCAP. 2014. *Traditional Knowledge and Wisdom. Themes from the Pacific Islands.* Jeonju: UNESCO International Cultural Heritage Centre in the Asia-Pacific Region.

Kalinoe, Lawrence, and James Leach (eds.). 2001. *Rationales of Ownership. Ethnographic Studies of Transactions and Claims to Ownership in Contemporary Papua New Guinea.* New Delhi et al.: UBSPD.

Koya-Vakaʻuta, Cresantia Frances. 2017. "Rethinking Research as Relational Space in the Pacific: Pedagogy and Praxis." In *Relational Hermenteutics: Decolonisation and the Pacific Itulagi*, edited by Upolu Luma Vaai and Aisake Casimira, 65–84. Suva: University of the South Pacific, Pacific Theological College.

Koya-Vakaʻuta, Cresantia Frances, Lingikoni Vakaʻuta, and Rosiana Lagi. 2018. "Reflections from Oceania on Indigenous Epistemology, the Ocean and Sustainability." In *Tidalectics: Imagining an Oceanic Worldview through Art and Science*, edited by Stephanie Hessler, 127–132. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: TBA21-Academie and the MIT Press.

Kukuczka, Anne, and Molly Fitzpatrick. 2020. "Canon-Making within Social and Cultural Anthropology in Zurich and Beyond." *Zanthro Comment 2.* Zürich: ISEK–Social Anthropology. https://www.isek.uzh.ch/de/ethnologie/publikationen/ZANTHRO-Comments/ZANTHRO-Comment-2.html

Lamphere, Louise. 2004. The Convergence of Applied, Practicing, and Public Anthropology in the 21st Century." *Human Organization* 63(4): 431–443. https://doi.org/10.17730humo.63.4.y14pe24v7ekyklyp

Lassiter, Luke E. 2005. "Collaborative Ethnography and Public Anthropology". *Current Anthropology* 46(1): 83–106. https://doi.org/10.1086/425658

Last, Angela. 2018. "Internationalisation and Interdisciplinarity: Sharing across Boundaries?" In *Decolonising the University*, edited by Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nisancioglu, 208–230. London: Pluto Press.

Larsen, Peter Bille, Doris Bacalzo, Patrick Naef, Eda Elif Tibet, Leïla Baracchini, and Susie Riva. 2022. "Repositioning Engaged Anthropology. Critical Reflexivity and Overcoming Dichotomies." *Tsantsa* 27: 1–15. https://doi.org/10.36950/tsantsa.2022.27.7994

Low, Setha M. and Sally Engle Merry. 2010. "Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas. An Introduction to Supplement 2." *Current Anthropology*, Supplement 2: S. 203–226. https://doi.org/10.1086/653837

Macintyre, Martha and Simon Foale. 2013. "Science, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, and Anthropology." *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6: 399–418. https://doi.org/10.1353/cla.2013.0024

Macintyre, Martha, and Alex Golub. 2021. "Encountering Anthropology: An Interview with Martha Macintyre." In *Unequal Lives. Gender, Race and Class in the Western Pacific*, edited by Nicholas Bainton, Debra McDougall, Kalissa Alexeyeff, and John Cox, 471–501. Canberra: ANU Press. http://doi.org/10.22459/UE.2020

MAI: a New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Scholarship. Nga Pae O Te Maramatanga. New Zealand Maori Centre of Research Excellence. http://www.journal.mai.ac.nz/

Mawyer, Alexander, and Alan Howard. 2021. "A History of ASAO Sessions: Formats and Topics." *ASAO Histories*: Paper 2, Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania. http://hdl.handle.net/10524/63971

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

McFall-McCaffery, Judy. 2010. "Getting Started with Pacific Research: Finding Resources and Information on Pacific Research Models and Methodologies." *MAI Review* 1: 1–5.

Mead, Margaret. 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa. A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. New York: William Morrow and Company.

MEG (Musée d'ethnographie de Genève). 2022. "Research & Collections": https://www.meg.ch/en/research-collections.

Metge, Joan. 2013. "Whakapapa – New Zealand Anthropology: Beginnings." *Sites: New Series* 10(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.11157/sites-vol10iss1id228

Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "Introduction: Coloniality of Power and De-Colonial Thinking." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 155.167. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162498

Mogstad, Heidi, and Lee-Shan Tse. 2018. "Decolonizing Anthropology. Reflections from Cambridge." *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 36(2): 53–72. https://doi.org/10.3167/cja.2018.360206

Moosavi, Leon. 2020. "The Decolonial Bandwagon and the Dangers of Intellectual Decolonisation." *International Review of Sociology* 30(2): 332–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2020.1776919

Morauta, Louise. 1979. "Indigenous Anthropology in Papua New Guinea." *Current Anthropology* 20(3): 561–576. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2742112

Neuhaus, Juliane. 2023 (forthcoming). "Following up: Propositions to De-canonise Teaching Anthropology." *Zanthro Comment*. Zurich: ISEK – Social Anthropology.

Nemani, Sipiriano. 2012. *Pacific Intangible Cultural Heritage Mapping Toolkit*. Suva: Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

Pacific-Studies.Net. 2022. https://www.pacific-studies.net/index.php

Pawley, Andrew. 2019. "Biggs, Bruce Grandison." In *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Te Ara– the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/6b7/biggs-bruce-grandison

Pigliasco, Guido Carlo, and Thorolf Lipp. 2011. "The Islands Have Memory: Reflections on Two Collaborative Projects in Contemporary Oceania." *The Contemporary Pacific* 23(2): 371–410. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2011.0045

Purtschert, Patricia. 2019. "Prolog: Mehr als ein Schlagwort. Dekolonisieren (in) der postkolonialen Schweiz." *Tsantsa* 24, Special Issue "Decolonial Processes in Swiss Academia and Cultural Institutions: Empirical and Theoretical Approaches": 14–23. https://doi.org/10.36950/tsantsa.2019.24.6887

Purtschert, Patricia, and Harald Fischer-Tiné (eds.). 2015. *Colonial Switzerland. Rethinking Colonialism form the Margins*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Purtschert, Patricia, Barbara Lüthi, and Francesca Falk (eds.). 2012. *Postkoloniale Schweiz. Formen und Folgen eines Kolonialismus ohne Kolonien*. Bielefeld: Transcript. https://www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-1799-3/postkoloniale-schweiz/

Quijano, Anibal. 2000a. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1(3): 533–580. https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/23906

Quijano, Anibal. 2000b. "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America." (Abridged version of Quijano 2000a.) *International Sociology* 15(2): 21–232. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/0268580900015002005

Rawlings, Gregory. 2015. "Lost Files, Forgotten Papers and Colonial Disclosures: the "Migrated Archives" and the Pacific, 1963–2013." *Journal of Pacific History*, 50(2): 189-212. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223344.2015.1048585

Reilly, Michael P. J. 2011. "Maori Studies, Past and Present: A Review." *The Contemporary Pacific* 23(2): 340–369. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2011.0039

Rensel, Jan. 2021. "The Origins and Development of the Pacific Islands Scholars Fund." *ASAO Histories*: *Paper 8*. Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania. http://hdl.handle.net/10524/63965

Rey, Severine. 2008. "Machtverhältnisse. Einführung in eine anthropologische Perspektive." *Tsantsa* 13, Special Issue "Rapports de pouvoir – Machtverhätlnisse": 25–33.

Robie, David. 2018. "Bearing Witness 2017. Year 2 of a Pacific Climate Change Storytelling Project Case Study." *Pacific Journalism Review* 24(1): 155–177. https://doi.org/10.24135/pjr.v24i1.415

SAA (Swiss Anthropological Association). 2022. "Call for Panels." Published 12 March 2022: https://www.sagw.ch/fr/seg/actualites/news/details/news/annual-meetings-of-the-swiss-anthropological-association-saa-call-for-panels

Sahlins, Marshall. 1963. "Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5(3): 285–303, https://www.jstor.org/stable/177650.

Schliemann, Lily. 2021. "Universities see Increase in Pacific Island Studies Programs." *Asia Matters for America*, blog entry 11 October 2021: https://asiamattersforamerica.org/articles/universities-see-increase-in-pacific-island-studies-programs

Siegenthaler, Fiona, and Marie-laure Allain Bonilla. 2019. "Introduction: Decolonial Processes in Swiss Academia and Cultural Institutions." *Tsantsa* 24, Special Issue "Decolonial Processes in Swiss Academia and Cultural Institutions: Empirical and Theoretical Approaches": 4–13. https://doi.org/10.36950/tsantsa.2019.24.6833

Smith, Linda Tuhiwei. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London & New York: Zed Books.

Talanoa. 2019. https://talanoa.com.au/.

Teaiwa, Teresia K. 2001. "L(o)osing the Edge." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13(2): 343–357. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2001.0071

Tebrakunna country, Emma Lee, and Jennifer Evans (eds.). 2022. *Indigenous Women's Voices. 20Years on from Linda Thiwai Smith's* Decolonizing Methodologies. London, New York, Dublin: Zed books.

Tecun, Arcia (Daniel Hernandez), "Inoke Hafoka, Lavinia 'Ulu'ave, and Moana 'Ulu'ave-Hafoka". 2018. "Talanoa: Tongan epistemology and Indigenous Research Method." *AlterNative* 14(2): 156–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180118767436

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika. 2005. "Unsettling Ethnography: Tales of an 'Ōiwi in the Anthropology Slot." *Anthropological Forum* 15(3): 247–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/00664670500282030

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika. 2018. "Shifting the 'We' in Oceania: Anthropology and Pacific Islanders Revisited." In *Who Are 'We'? Reimagining Alterity and Affinity in Anthropology*, edited by L. Chua and N. Mathur, 151–176. New York: Berghahn Books.

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika, Tevita O. Ka'ili, and Rochelle T. Fonoti. 2010. "Genealogies: Articulating Indigenous Anthropology in/of Oceania." *Pacific Studies* 33(2/3): 139–167. http://ojs-dev.byuh.edu/index.php/pacific/article/view/1163/1114

Tomlinson, Matt. 2006. "Reflexivity, Tradition, and Power: The Work of R.R. Nayacakalou." *Ethnos* 71(4): 489–506. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141840601050684

Trépied, Benoît. 2013. "La décolonisation sans l'indépendance? Sortir du colonial en Nouvelle-Calédonie (1946–1975)." *Revue critique internationale* 2013(2): 7–27. https://www.cairn.info/revue-geneses-2013-2-page-7.htm

Tsantsa. Journal of the Swiss Anthropological Association SAA. 2022. Special Issue 27 "Engaged Anthropology in and beyond Switzerland." https://tsantsa.ch/issue/view/1107

Tsantsa. Journal of the Swiss Anthropological Association SAA. 2019. Special Issee 24 "Dekoloniale Prozesse an Schweizer Hochschulen und Kulturinstitutionen: Empirische und theoretische Ansätze / Processus décoloniaux dans le monde universitaire et les institutions culturelles Suisse: Approches empiriques et théoriques." https://tsantsa.ch/issue/view/1057

Tualaulelei, Eseta, and Judy McFall-McCaffery. 2019. "The Pacific Research Paradigm. Opportunities and Challenges." In *MAI* 8(2): 188–204. https://doi.org/10.20507/MAIJournal.2019.8.2.7

United Nations Climate Change. 2018. "UNFCCC Processes and meetings / The Paris Agreement / 2018 Talanoa Dialogue Platform." https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement/2018-talanoa-dialogue-platform

University of Hawai'i at Manoa. 2022a. "Department of Anthropology / Ty Kāwika P. Tengan." College of Social Sciences. https://anthropology.manoa.hawaii.edu/ty-tengan/

University of Hawai'i at Manoa. 2022b. "Scholar Space / Teaching Oceania Series." https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/42426

University of Hawai'i at Manoa. 2022c. "Guido Carlo Pigliasco CV Spring 2020." https://manoa-hawaii.academia.edu/GuidoCarloPigliasco/CurriculumVitae

University of Hawai'i at Manoa. 2021. "In Memoriam: Haunani-Kay Trask, Exemplary Native Hawaiian Scholar." Published 3rd July 2021: https://www.hawaii.edu/news/2021/07/03/in-memoriam-haunani-kay-trask/

University of Zurich. 2022. "Subject Journals." Library: https://www.ub.uzh.ch/en/unterstuetzung-erhalten/fachliche-unterstuetzung/ethnologie/fachzeitschriften.html

Uperesa, Fa'anofa Lisaclaire. 2010. "A Different Weight: Tension and Promise in 'Indigenous Anthropology'." *Pacific Studies* 33(2/3): 280–300. http://ojs-dev.byuh.edu/index.php/pacific/issue/view/131

Vaioleti, Timote M. 2006. "Talanoa Research Methodology: A Developing Position on Pacific Research." *Waikato Journal of Education* 12: 21–34. https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v12i1

Waddell, Eric. 2008. *Jean-Marie Tjibaou, Kanak Witness to the World: An Intellectual Biography*. Pacific Islands Monograph Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

West, Paige. 2018a. "Decolonizing Conservation." *Blog entry*, 28 July 2018. https://paige-west.com/2018/07/28/decolonizing-conservation/

West, Paige. 2018b. "From Reciprocity to Relationality: Anthropological Possibilities." *Blog entry*, 29 September 2018. https://paige-west.com/2018/09/29/from-reciprocity-to-relationality-anthropological-possibilities/#more-5382

West, Paige. 2018c. "From Reciprocity to Relationality: Anthropological Possibilities." *Cultural Anthropology Editors' Forum / Hot Spots*. 26 September 2018. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/series/from-reciprocity-to-relationality-anthropological-possibilities.

Wesley-Smith, Terence. 2010. "Epeli's Quest: Essays in Honor of Epeli Hau'ofa." *The Contemporary Pacific* 22(1): 101–123. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.0.0102

White, Goeffrey M., and Ty P. Kāwika Tengan. 2001. "Disappearing worlds: Anthropology and Cultural Studies in Hawai'i and the Pacific." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13(2): 381–416. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2001.0072

Winduo, Steven Edmund. 2004. "Melanesian and Pacific Studies (MAPS): Mapping Research, Education, and Publication Culture at UPNG." *South Pacific Journal of Philosophy* 8: 121–122.

Wood, Houston. 2003. "Cultural Studies for Oceania." *The Contemporary Pacific* 15(2): 340–374. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2003.0062

Author

Juliane Neuhaus is a social anthropologist of Oceania who has conducted ethnographic research in Papua New Guinea in 2002 and 2009. Her research has focused on dispute resolution in a legally plural situation in Morobe Province, with an approach combining the anthropologies of law and of religion, looking at Christian morality, gender relations, and legal consciousness. She is currently working as a senior researcher and lecturer at the ISEK (Department of Social Anthropology) at the University of Zurich. Her regional foci today are Oceania and Switzerland. She teaches reading and writing ethnography, ethnographic methods, the anthropology of law, migration, Christianity, and racism. Together with many colleagues, she is very much interested in decolonising anthropology, and she has put efforts into de-canonising teaching.

juliane.neuhaus@uzh.ch
University of Zurich
ISEK-Social Anthropology

NO PUBLICATION, NO DEGREE

Of knowledge production as Doctoral Candidates in Anthropology / Sociology in India

Cheshta Arora and Debarun Sarkar

Abstract

The paper rekindles a three-decade-old debate in the annals of Indian anthropology / sociology which became dormant after no significant headway was made. The debate which goes by the name of "crisis in sociology" in India provides the backdrop against which the paper makes sense of current regimes of knowledge production that a doctoral candidate in India must navigate. By doing so, the paper reflects on the limitations of epistemological critiques wherein an epistemic critique stops at the corridors of an academic workplace. The paper argues that doctoral candidates in India today are cognitive workers engaged in exploitative relations of knowledge production. However, these exploitative relations are obfuscated by the postcolonial epistemological critiques that indulge in foregrounding the hegemony of the North / West. The paper proposes an infrastructural critique of knowledge that does not respond with despair to perceived transformations and crises.

> *The spectacle of publication presents itself as a vast inaccessible reality that can never be questioned. Its sole message is:*
> *What is published is good; what is good gets published.*
> *The passive intellectual acceptance it demands is already effectively imposed by its monopoly of appearances, its manner of appearing without allowing any reply.*
> Yoann Bazin, Gazi Islam, Martin Parker, Yiannis Gabriel (2018)

Introduction

In 1993, Veena Das initiated a decade-long debate which is referred to in the annals of sociology[1] in India as "Crisis in Sociology."[2] Her announcement of the crisis was supported by

---

[1] The disciplines of sociology and anthropology have had a shared affinity (Srinivas 1952; Srinivas and Panini 1973; Breman 2002; Beteille 2006). The paper uses the word anthropology / sociology to refer to this shared affinity. The particular signifiers of "anthropology" and "sociology" are used only when referring or evoking the discipline as someone else does.

[2] This terminology is not just used by the papers themselves but is the title under which these debates have

Seismo

noting problems of sub-standard research, plagiarism, academic integrity etc. while locating the crisis in three institutional structures – the universities, the University Grants Committee (UGC)[3], and professional bodies like the Indian Sociological Society. To address the crisis, Das advocated centralization of research in "five-to six departments in the country … with proven competence" (1993, 1161) and called for drawing "up a list of accredited journals to which young scholars are encouraged to submit their work" (Das 1993, 1161).

We invoke this debate for a very precise reason. The existing debates concerning precarity, academic labour, and the changes in the nature of academic work frame the concerns amidst the problematic of "neoliberalism" and ongoing austerity measures[4] in the recent decades. This particular "Crisis in Sociology" debate in India sheds light on certain foreclosures within the earlier liberal paradigm which prefigures the ongoing transformations of the university system. By tracing this debate and its foreclosure, we aim to find the adequate vocabulary for this experience of academic labour in the present.

The concern of academic labour has become exigent for Indian scholars as global debates concerning academic precarity, labour conditions in the university, or changing nature of academic work have not found adequate place within Indian academic debates baring minor exceptions. Rather, it is to highlight the trajectory of postcolonial experience wherein a social welfare state never materialized and whatever existed in its place was deeply inegalitarian. The debate prefigured the changes which were to come two decades later wherein concerns of quality and competence were discursively installed over and above the inegalitarian and exclusionary relations in and outside the university. The aforementioned debate is an important site to intervene and reflect on the continuities between the past and the ongoing transformations and their effect on knowledge production in anthropology / sociology in India.

The debate was a discussion among a closed group of established scholars and renowned faculty where the figure of passive students was manufactured to ground the pedagogue's pastoral power (Martin and Waring 2018; Bairy TS 2004). Consequently, the central problematic revolved around merit, commitment, pedagogy, role of the discipline, teaching, institutional integrity, etc. without highlighting the hierarchies that constitute these concepts, practices, and institutions. It was as late as 2019 that a group of doctoral candidates from a sociology department of a central university in India highlighted their position in the "knowledge food chain." (Reddy et al. 2015) Backed by their quantitative data and in the backdrop of the UGC Regulations 2009 and 2016, the authors noted structural exclusions produced via mandates of mandatory publishing, lack of funding, and lack of training. They argued that the neoliberal constructs informing the UGC regulations manufacture underachievers rather than a discipline in crisis plagued by under-committed, under achieving students.

While this paper complements Reddy et al. (2015), we disagree with their call to relegate the debate "to the dustbin of history". (Reddy et al. 2015, 41) We believe that rekindling this

---

been archived in the online archive maintained by the Savitribai Phule Pune University known as Documents on History of Sociology. http://www.unipune.ac.in/snc/cssh/HistorySociology/index.html, 16th April 2022.

[3] UGC is a statuary body under the Ministry of Education which regulates the standard of higher education in India.

[4] See the Special Issue on "Politics of precarity: Neoliberal academia under austerity measures and authoritarian threat" published in *Social Anthropology* 27(2), Sundar (2018), and Chattarji (2016).

debate is necessary as it reflects an effect of power on existing knowledge-making practices most succinctly. As mentioned earlier, we are interested in giving meaning to the emerging hierarchical experiences in the academic industry that get lost in enunciations and performance of being a scholar. While acknowledging doctoral candidates as producers of knowledge, Reddy et al. do not dwell on the labour of doctoral candidates. Their articulation is limited to demanding infrastructures that recognize doctoral candidates as dignified scholars. Acknowledging the university as a site of labour shifts the concern away from scholarly interests such as pedagogy, teaching, and research. These scholarly concerns tame the debate and at times take inegalitarian turns, as witnessed in Das' articulation or, as Thorkelson argues, limits the identification of "scholars" with notions such as "precarity" that "can lead into a split discourse, in which a liberal subject gets to take pity on the abject, precarious, or unemployed Other within its ranks" (2016, 485) without identifying as one. To situate this experience is to move away from relations of "empathy" to "the embodied outcome of proximity... that leads people to share perspectives and passions." (2016, 486)

Academic labour as cognitive labour

An emerging literature today marks out the specificities of academic labour as a "specific historical form of academic work". (Allmer 2018, 56) It interrogates the one-sided focus on content, values, and pedagogy (Winn 2015) and opens up academic work to questions of political economy with increasing proletarianization of academic labour (McCarthy, Song, and Jayasuriya 2017). Reddy et al. (2015) remains a rare articulation on the conditions of doctoral research work in the discipline of anthropology / sociology in India. Gupta and Nair (2019) broach similar concerns vis-à-vis conditions of doctoral research workers in management schools highlighting the "neoliberal aspirations" of global recognition. While there are parallels to be drawn with this literature such as corporatization of higher education sausage factory (Smith 2000), intensification, contractualization of academic workforce (Hey 2001), segmentation of faculty into tenured and flexible tenures, etc. (Bauder 2005) that introduce the problematic of labour to academic work, practice, and values (Winn 2015); we extend this literature by analysing the experience of doctoral students as cognitive workers juggling corporatization of academia as well as postcolonial anxiety vis-à-vis a "competent scholar".

By situating the experience of academic labour within the discipline of anthropology / sociology, as doctoral candidates in India specifically, our intent is to mark out the specific transformations perceptible from such a situation. We insist on marking out the contours of academic labour in India for two reasons. First, this kind of articulation doesn't find meaningful place in Indian academia except for scattered reflections on the nature of academic work. Second, certain notions such as "precarity" that predominate the discussion globally cannot address the specificity of the postcolonial position and its dreams of a welfare state that never materialized (Arora 2020). Thus, it is not the experience of precarity and its nostalgia for Fordist or social-welfarists configurations (Winn 2015, 4) that interests us. Rather, we want to name and articulate extractive labour relations within academia that are otherwise obfuscated from Indian academia but govern the doctoral students, teaching them the

rules of the game, prior to joining the academic workforce. For us, it is not just the context of neoliberalization and precarity but also the postcolonial condition that sheds light on our current predicaments which allows us to extend a notion of academic labour upon doctoral students. To that extent the paper differs from literature steeped in Marxist analysis of academic labour while borrowing certain conceptual apparatuses.

By using "cognitive worker" to mark the figure of an anthropologist / sociologist, we do not wish to mark the despair and anxiety vis-à-vis the changing nature of university systems and knowledge production in general, a common tone deployed by academicians talking of decreasing academic freedom and the changing conditions of work in the university (Sundar 2018). Making meaning of oneself through the concept of the cognitive worker allows the research-workers in the university to locate their shared experiences with cognitive workers outside the university. To put it differently, this identification brings to light the landscape as well as the horizon of existing academic practices that are not able to locate their own anxiety, despair, experience of crises, and their possible solutions within the political and social transformations that they all too often promise to study.

Following Rabinow (1986) and echoing Sangren (2007), Hey notes the hesitancy of anthropologist / sociologist "in addressing the significance of 'corridor talks'." (2001, 67) Similarly, Sarkar (2022, 115), noting the ability of science and technology studies "to document and ask questions surrounding the practice of scientific knowledge-making in the lab and outside." calls for interrogating "knowledge-making practices in the fields of social science." In interrogating the infrastructures of knowledge-production, we find an affinity with the figure of the cognitive worker in explaining our experience as research workers. The notion of a cognitive worker evokes both the immateriality of the labour and the managerial anxiety vis-à-vis quantifying it. Moreover, the notion of living knowledge built into the concept of cognitive labour evokes the dual nature of creative production wherein the extraction of value from the commodity is evident to the worker at the same time an inalienable quality of the work is also perceptible (Pasquinelli 2019; Smith 2013).

The paper contends that an infrastructural critique of knowledge is exigent over the epistemic critiques of western knowledge hegemony that have become the norm in postcolonial articulations. Though valid, such postcolonial articulations create a hyperopic view of the world. The above formulation and Das' figure of an incompetent student, as we argue later in the paper, are inadequate in explaining the infrastructural shifts that have already been underway. By invoking infrastructures of knowledge, we want to stress the material side of epistemological processes to accent infrastructures "are things and also the relation between things." (Larkin 2013, 329) To emphasize infrastructure is to highlight the relations that populate academic spaces and what make knowledge production possible.

Methodological note

The paper is autoethnographic in nature borrowing from years of our experience in higher education while also borrowing from fellow doctoral candidates we have encountered over the years. The style of the paper isn't evocative but analytical. As an exercise in co-writing and co-authorship, the paper follows works that have attempted to build co-constructed narratives (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner 2011) while doing collaborative auto ethnography (Chang, Ngunjiri, and Hernandez 2013). Autoethnography has emerged as an important method in interrogating the field of education (Pithouse-Morgan, Pillay, and Naicker 2021; Pilay, Naicker, and Pithouse-Morgan 2016). The method of autoethnography has resonated significantly with actors involved in education in disparate roles (Cortes Santiago, Karimi, and Arvelo Alicea 2017; Peters et al. 2020; Chang, Longman, and Franco 2014; Trahar 2009). Despite the lack of research on Indian higher education system and the labour that goes into it, one can point to rich autoethnographic work such as that of Jagannathan and Packirisamy (2019) and their evocative co-constructed narrative (Lives in Search of Love 2019). Though the paper does not match the scale and scope of such auto-ethnographic accounts, it attempts to lay the ground for situating the experience of doctoral research-workers in India, in the disciplines of anthropology / sociology in particular.

The paper builds on our experience as doctoral candidates in two different locations. One of us enrolled in 2016 in a state university[5] while the other enrolled in 2017 in a non-profit private research institute affiliated to a private, deemed-to-be-university.[6] We build on our experience of doctoral supervision, fieldwork, writing, and publication in order to theorize the reconfigured relations between the supervisor, the student, and the university. These experiences were noted down as "notes" that inform the auto ethnographic account recounted here while the anecdotal evidence is recounted from memory as remembered narratives (Keightley 2010).

Outline of the paper

Following this section, the paper is divided into six sections. The first section situates the paper amidst the consumer / producer problematic of doctoral candidates in India. The second section provides a brief overview of doctoral trajectories, particularly noting our encounter with higher education institutions in India. The third section highlights the transformation of doctoral candidates into cognitive workers while noting the exploitative relationships in universities and extractive relationship of the publishing industry. The fourth section provides an overview of a writing workshop to highlight the ad hoc and inegalitarian responses to the above problems. The fifth section notes the limitation of epistemic critiques central to

---

[5] Public universities in India are primarily of two types, central universities are funded by and hence fall under the jurisdiction of the Union of India while state universities are funded and hence fall under the jurisdiction of the state.

[6] Deemed-to-be-university is an accreditation granted to certain institutes, public and private, by the Union at the advice of UGC which allows them to function like a university.

postcolonial articulations and its inability to address the current predicaments vis-à-vis knowledge production. The concluding section sketches a brief outline of an infrastructural critique of knowledge.

Situating the Debate: Consumers / producers of knowledge

Das's account of the crisis coincided with the rise of a new middle class in India in the late 80s and early 90s, through the process of liberalization of markets (Fernandes 2006; Deshpande 2003), and a slow but steady expansion of higher education, through measures of affirmative actions, to groups that were earlier excluded from the university system (Jaffrelot 2006). Amidst this context that transformed the class composition of sociology classrooms (Rege 1994), Das built a dichotomy between "brilliance" and "competence" to announce the crisis in sociology. In an attempt to "curtail the rhetoric of brilliant individuals" (Das 1993, 1161) and put forth an infrastructure built around fostering competence, Das continued to fall back on the notion of a "competent few" who were to benefit from sound infrastructures rather than an infrastructure that could serve all and sustain varying degrees and standards of competence, desires, interests, and ambitions. Despite interrogating the notion of brilliance, she hesitated to interrogate the notion of "competence" that values, standardizes, hierarchizes, and perpetuates distinctions in anthropological / sociological knowledge-production.

Das' (1993) announcement of the crisis and ensuing solutions were later complicated by raising questions around canonization and its entanglement with the colonial and the metropolitan (Giri 1993), caste / class location of students (Bairy TS 2004), challenge of women's studies departments to the discipline of sociology (Rege 1994), limitations of certain sub-fields (Uberoi 1994), and "widespread lack of commitment to the discipline." (Deshpande 1994)

Despite these differences, a common thread that ran throughout the texts participating in the debate was the division between the consumers / producers of knowledge wherein undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral candidates were implicitly considered as consumers of knowledge. A decade later, Bairy TS pointed out the "politics of exclusion" that informed the debate indicating that: a research community did not refer to the undergraduate or postgraduate students of sociology, while imagining sociology "as being a craft" that solely worked within the academia without evoking a "sociological imagination to be at work and of use outside the academia" (Bairy TS 2004, 2). The consumer / producer dichotomy which Bairy TS located at the heart of the debate highlighted the deeply inegalitarian imaginations that informed the crisis debate in sociology wherein students were framed as incompetent and passive consumers rather than producers of knowledge. Though recently, changes in the education policies have explicitly transformed doctoral candidates in the Indian university system as producers of knowledge, involved in practices of knowledge production for the global publication industry.

The UGC guidelines of 2009 and 2016, while not a direct consequence of these earlier debates amongst sociologists / anthropologists in India, responds to the same problematic of producers / consumers by redesigning the doctoral programme. The 2009 guidelines man-

dated one peer-reviewed, journal publication to be eligible for a doctoral degree. This led to an emergence of predatory journals which was then curbed by announcing a UGC Consortium for Academic and Research Ethics (UGC CARE) list of Indian journals of where students and researchers were encouraged to submit their work. This was incentivized by assigning higher points during job-recruitment and promotions to accredited publications. A doctoral candidate today has to prove their status of knowledge producer before they are considered eligible for the doctoral degree. Additionally, a few private universities in India took the liberty to mandate two Scopus indexed publications as an eligibility criterion for a doctoral degree. Both Das and UGC arrived at a similar solution to above anxiety: a whitelist of journals.

It can be argued that these mandates emerged from a deep-rooted anxiety about the quality of higher education in India which passes on the burden and anxiety of quality of knowledge production to the doctoral candidate. This transfer of anxiety becomes a disciplinary mechanism to integrate and inculcate the "rules of the game," (Reddy et al. 2015, 41) to legitimize unpaid labour in the knowledge economy, and maintain the (feudal) hierarchy of client-patron relationship (Reddy et al. 2015) between the student and the supervisor. These characteristics make the position of a doctoral student akin to a cognitive worker, managed and disciplined for the purpose of immaterial commodity-production for the knowledge-economy rather than of an anthropologist / sociologist as an altruistic scholar, civil society member "engaged in high vocation." (Gulli 2009)

Doctoral research in India: A view from two institutes in Mumbai and Bengaluru

One of us enrolled in 2016 in a state university, University of Mumbai, while the other enrolled in 2017 in a non-profit research institute, National Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS), in Bengaluru, affiliated to a private deemed-to-be-university called Manipal Academy of Higher Education (MAHE).

As doctoral candidates in India, we were able to secure funding for our doctoral work. One of the authors worked under the UGC-Junior and Senior Research Fellowship (JRF and SRF) – a research fellowship scheme funded by the Union government which arrives at the eligible list through a national testing two times a year. A UGC-Junior Research Fellow is paid 31 000 INR, roughly 354 EUR, plus a house rent allowance, per month. After two years of satisfactory performance, the fellow is upgraded as a Senior Research Fellow who is paid 35 000 INR roughly 399 EUR, plus a house rent allowance, per month. The other author was able to secure equivalent monthly stipend through a project-PhD which was funded by a subsidiary of one of the largest conglomerates in India, the Tata Group.

Such funding arrangements account for a very small minority of doctorates done in India. For each exam, only a small percentile of candidates taking the national level test for UGC-National Eligibility Test-Junior Research Fellowship for each subject are accorded an option to avail the fellowship following which the candidate must register for a PhD in under two years or the fellowship expires.

Most doctoral candidates in India live off the measly non-NET fellowships[7] which provide 8000 INR, roughly 91 EUR a month. Another fellowship for doctoral candidates in anthropology / sociology is provided through the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) whose value, 20 000 INR i. e., roughly 229 Euros per month, is offered only for two years. There also exists a range of other fellowships, as part of state's affirmative action, for students from minority and marginalized communities provided by the Union and state governments some of which match the UGC JRF and SRF stipends. No extra funds exist for fieldwork or translation expenses and the students must either self-fund their fieldwork or use the fellowship funds. Such funding constraints affect anthropological / sociological knowledge-production wherein anthropologists / sociologists in India end up doing fieldwork primarily in India with rare exceptions (Arif 2004).

University of Mumbai, one of the earliest modern universities, was founded in mid-nineteenth century during colonial British India. The university's sociology department is the first sociology department in the country with its own peculiar historical trajectory. To suggest that the university is now going through a crisis of its own wouldn't be an exaggeration with grave financial problems which have, for example, resulted in the withdrawal of interest-bearing financial instruments such as fixed term deposits owned by the university (Chhapia 2017).

The university, like most public universities in India, doesn't have any pool of internal funding for its doctoral candidates beyond the measly non-NET fellowship. That is, admission to a university's doctoral programme doesn't guarantee any funding and funding is secured independently by the doctoral candidates through various national and state-level avenues. Thus, as a doctoral candidate at the University of Mumbai, receiving funding from the Union or state government, one is in a direct financial relationship with the state while the university functions as an institution which grants the doctoral degree and attests to the candidate being enrolled and working at the university. At the same time, the funding agency, the Union or state government, does not directly stipulate how the money is to be utilized, for what kind of projects, and by whom allowing a degree of academic freedom to decide the nature of one's work if one is able to find a wiling supervisor.

On the other hand, the doctoral programme at NIAS promises four years of fellowship to every doctoral candidate. NIAS, established in 1988, is relatively new compared to some of the older universities such as University of Mumbai. It was established by JRD Tata as an avenue for exchange amongst administrators, managers, and social leaders and insists upon the interdisciplinary characteristics of its four schools. While NIAS has an internal pool to fund independent doctoral proposals, most doctoral candidates at NIAS are admitted and funded as part of project-PhDs funded by various private and state actors. The funding agency, in this case, is directly involved in deciding the kind of projects they fund and regularly intercept the progress and allocation of budgets. This means that for a significant number of doctoral candidates enrolled in project-PhDs there is a small margin of academic freedom in terms of challenging the methodological and theoretical concerns that the project has

---

[7] It is important to note that there have been attempts to withdraw and scrap even this measly non-NET fellowship in recent times.

already fixed. NIAS, affiliated to MAHE, belongs to an emerging model of privately funded higher education that is slowly gaining ground and legitimacy in India given the deteriorating conditions of funding in public institutions and an overall political climate which supports deregulation and privatization of education (Hegde 2016; Deshpande 2001). This suggests an intricate relationship between conditions of knowledge production and how it is intrinsically tied with reconfigured relations between the state and capital.

Both the institutes are at the margins of existing "centres of excellence." (Das 1993) While sociology department at University of Mumbai was one of the former "centres of excellence" until 1960s (Deshpande 1994) which has since lost its glory, NIAS as a non-profit research institute affiliated to a private deemed-to-be university still exists in the shadow of few publicly funded "centres of excellence" housed in central and state universities and institutes such as Jawahar Lal Nehru University, University of Delhi, University of Hyderabad, etc. that attract most aspiring candidates.

Thus, these two institutes allowed us to experience transformations from deteriorating public education to new forms of knowledge production that coagulate around project-PhDs. With this, we avoid two most commons responses to the problems of higher education in India: 1) despair at deteriorating conditions of existing centre of excellence or, 2) bemoan the increasing deregulation and privatization of higher education. Coming from a former "centre of excellence", at University of Mumbai, as well as a non-profit research institute, NIAS, affiliated to a private deemed-to-be-university, these events, for us, are in the past giving way to a position that is interested in thinking of a future which is other than "what already is" or "what was" which could generate new dispositions towards research and learning (Gulli 2009).

The doctoral candidate as an underpaid and unpaid cognitive worker

As mentioned before, barring few exceptions, most doctoral candidates in India remain grossly underpaid, bordering on minimum wage, which barely covers housing and living expenses. The publication mandate exposes the doctoral candidates to the publication industry: to craft an unpaid commodity to prove one's credentials as a researcher. Thus, while only few candidates are paid through either Union or state avenues or are funded by private universities, the mandate of publication and its corollary values such as quality, rigour, commitment, etc. is applied to all candidates equally, producing starkly different conditions of production for different candidates. While a notion of precariousness helps explain the global trend towards uncertainty, flexibilization of working conditions and ongoing austerity measures, the publication mandate governing the doctoral candidates in India takes an interesting turn that's not replicated elsewhere. It's not just precarity that governs a doctoral candidate's working conditions in India but a differential, exclusionary system of payment wherein a small minority gets paid for its commodity, i. e., a mandatory publication, while others are expected to craft a commodity while being underpaid or unpaid.

Opening up the labour of the rest of the underpaid, unpaid, and overworked bodies of the doctoral candidates, who are unable to secure decent funding, to the publishing industry makes the nature of the doctoral work evidently exploitative. Das's and Deshpande's formulation of a lack of quality and lack of commitment takes on a different meaning in the context of these exploitative conditions of research work. Lack of quality and commitment to knowledge-production is a subtle resistance against productivity and the exploitative social relations that encompass research work in India. The problem of predatory journals in India then appears not as a problem but a symptom of something else, of social relations that are extractive.

Marking this allows interrogating the range of issues around knowledge-production and consumption which cannot be reduced to ad-hominem attack against the quality of doctoral candidates, of the discipline's parochialism, or the persistent positioning of the discipline in India within postcolonial theory or some updated variant of it such as southernism which shifts the blame elsewhere to the global north. We discuss the last point in detail in a later section.

The mandate for publication and its consequences

Predatory journals[8] (Seethapathy, Kumar, and Hareesha 2016) emerged swiftly in numbers following the 2009 mandate for publication. This resulted in the UGC cracking down on predatory journals by creating a blacklist of journals. This process was eventually conceived as flawed which resulted in the creation of a whitelist named, UGC CARE list. This list, by default, accepts all journals which are Scopus and Web of Science indexed.[9] For other journals a bureaucratic mechanism was set up which allows for whitelisting in the UGC CARE list for journals not listed on Scopus or Web of Science. Publication in an indexed journal accrues higher points during recruitment and promotions in universities.

Though one can publish in non-indexed journals and still receive the doctoral degree in certain universities, these incentive structures determine the value of a publication (Szadkowski 2019). This has generated a new hierarchy among researchers as it produces an opaque system wherein the value of the work is filtered through the repute of a journal.

This has three direct consequences. By incentivizing publication in private indexes, UGC and in turn the state outsources quality control of research output to international and private entities while devaluing the work of its researchers. Secondly, it exposes the labour of the doctoral candidates to the extractive relationship of academic publication industry for

---

[8] Predatory journals have adopted various forms over the past decade to circumvent publication mandates. These journals often demand a publication fee from the authors. While claiming to be peer-reviewed, they are not. Many predatory journals, a few years ago, remained offline or with paywalls. Although today, a lot of them have adopted open access means to appear legitimate (Krawczyk and Kulczycki 2021) which led to authors like Beall (2013b; 2013a) misattributing the problem to the open access movement. The authors who publish in predatory journals tend to be "young, inexperienced, and often located in developing countries." (Xia et al. 2015, 1414) This points toward increased demand for publication placed on authors who either are unable to or perceive themselves to be ill-equipped to publish in legitimate journals.

[9] Scopus is a database owned by Elsevier and Web of Science is a database owned by Clarivate Analytics.

which they are to craft a commodity at public expense. Third, it standardizes research output, its form and content, by limiting the publications to traditional peer-reviewed journals restricting any scope of experimentation. Indexed journals largely represent established fields, concerns, and styles. Limiting doctoral candidates and professors to indexed publications acts as a scaffolding for one's thought and writing as one cannot opt for new or experimental journals which usually are or remain non-indexed.

Moreover, outsourcing quality control misunderstands the nature of anthropological / sociological knowledge which unlike natural science doesn't insist on replicability or universality. Rather, it flourishes when a singularity of each context is maintained along with its own singular explanation (which at a later stage can be brought in conversation with other contexts). The fact that infrastructures in the north are given the authority to judge starkly different contexts puts another burden on researchers elsewhere to forever explain and translate one's problem into the language, theoretical concerns, or problems comprehensible by the north. Existing postcolonial critiques have already pointed out these limitations, however, the knowledge emerging from the global south is today expected to repeat these epistemic postcolonial critiques which have themselves become hegemonic knowledge articulations. Only those articulations from the south that either use hegemonic concepts from the global north or critique the global north and its epistemic hegemony are deemed worthy of being included in the western knowledge infrastructures.

The consequent problems have not gone unnoticed. In 2018, a committee led by Prof. P. Balaram was set up which submitted a report in 2019 to the UGC arguing to do away with mandatory publication for a doctoral degree. The committee's recommendations are yet to take effect. The committee which comprised of natural scientists could make this demand because of rapid transformations in peer-review process have resulted in the pre-print becoming a norm with the rise of arXiv (Larivière et al. 2014) and the experimental peer-review policies devised by the likes of PLOS One.[10] Though SocArXiv exists, the uptake of pre-print has still not happened in the social sciences for reasons that cannot be explored here. It would suffice to say that Das' (1993) suggestion to identify an exclusive list journals stands in contradiction to the ethos of openness and knowledge as commons (Szadkowski 2019) that open access, pre-print publications today represent.

This is not the place to recap the problems of the academic publishing industry at large (Bazin et al. 2018). However, the peculiar trajectory of anthropological / sociological knowledge production in India and the aforementioned debates around it make it clear that the experience of extractive relationship of the publication industry doesn't inform Indian anthropologist / sociologists' theoretical construction of knowledge even though the problems are widely rampant.

As argued previously, this lack of thinking concerning the infrastructures of knowledge production are overshadowed by a superfluous concern for quality, rigor, commitment, competence, etc. It is hence not surprising that despite the changes in the UGC regulations, no journals are run for doctoral candidates, or no journal devotes a section to publications by

---

[10] One of the most interesting choices among others that PLOS One made was allowing the authors to attach peer-review and editorial history of the document to situate the publication in greater detail.

doctoral candidates while opinion pieces by established academicians are published without rigorous peer-review.

Most "reputable" journals in India, that are part of the UGC-CARE list and are represented by leading sociologists, suffer from a serious lack of transparency, slow peer-review process with no portals in place to track the progress of submissions. Without adequate networks or mentors, one is left with no channel of communication or a word on an expected timeframe. The doctoral degree's temporality then follows the Indian academic journal standard time. This lack of accountability feeds into the client-patron relationship, where maintaining right networks can ensure one's paper enters peer-review, or at times co-authoring with the supervisor fast-tracks the process. This is particularly important because even the most "prestigious" journals in India have a rather non-transparent and lethargic peer-review process. The relationship with the supervisor is complicated on other grounds as well because the supervisors belong to a generation which didn't need to publish consistently. With recent changes in the points system for recruitment and promotions which privileges publications, the professors too find themselves in the same boat as the doctoral candidates but this sudden shift in productivity regime means that a large swathe of supervisors themselves remain untrained to guide the doctoral candidates toward a publication.

Writing a doctoral dissertation and articles for publication become two parallel tasks that the doctoral candidates have to navigate themselves as the faculty remains incognizant of different writing styles needed for both the dissertation as well as publication. For instance, one of the co-authors was reprimanded for having too many chapters in the dissertation and not following a traditional chapterization of: Introduction, Methodology, Literature Review, Data, Data Analysis, Conclusion. A dissertation written in such a form can never find an adequate avenue of publication or at best it would produce one research paper. The author's rationalization was that by increasing the number of chapters, they could maximize the number of papers that could be submitted at the same time to different publications in the hope that at least one would pass peer-review on time. Such remarks display the faculty's lack of awareness of the changing contours of knowledge production and its effects on the form and style of knowledge that the doctoral candidates must produce.

These features, if at all, should have been introduced along with the mandate of publication, or should have been one of the criteria for the journals to be considered for UGC CARE list. If not, the established figures invested in the discipline should have taken up the challenge to respond to the needs of the doctoral candidates. Both the bureaucracy as well as the invested, established pedagogues have been unable to respond to the changing nature of research work. This becomes clear with an account of a writing workshop in the next section.

Of emerging responses: An academic writing workshop

One of us recently had a chance to take part in an academic writing fellowship loosely structured as a workshop housed at one of the leading policy think-tanks in New Delhi and funded by the Urban Studies Foundation which included some leading academic figures from the field of urban studies in India.

The workshop was conducted virtually, due to the pandemic, over a span of four months. The fellowship provided a modest honorarium amounting to Rs. 20 000, roughly 229 Euros, in total covering four months. This was to encourage writing a text for either academic journals or mass media. To that end, various sessions were hosted which taught basic research skills: using tools like Zotero, reading of academic texts, writing an elevator pitch, developing what they called a "hook" for the opening paragraph of the article, providing comments to one's fellow peers and platitudes on anti-plagiarism. There was an explicit focus on sharing narratives by the mentors on how they managed to get well-cited publication either by intervening in a "hot topic" issue or by providing a catchy title which would allow for transnational appeal of the article.

The cohort included roughly twenty participants at various stages of academic life, from the post-graduate, doctoral candidates, doctorates, and practitioners. The very structure of the fellowship, being an ad hoc program with limited number of fellows, and the participation of senior academics in the workshops from public universities, private institutions, and think-tanks demonstrates vividly the repetition of the exclusionary and ad hoc responses à la Veena Das. The imparting of these skills or teaching academic writing ought to have been introduced in all programmes at the post-graduate level, which holds significant relevance in India due to the vast number of students in India facing linguistic difficulties of various kinds. Such ad hoc responses amount to the continuation of existing inegalitarian arrangements in academia.

This rather cynical approach to writing fit in with the overall tone of the workshop which began with a tacit acceptance of the different styles of academic writing prevalent in the anglophone and francophone spheres. With this acceptance, the possibility of writing beyond these accepted styles was quickly cordoned off. At the same time, writing polemical pieces was discouraged by one of the instructors early on in the workshop, devaluing a whole genre of writing.

Eventually a "mentor" was assigned to each fellow who provided close comments on the students' writing. The overall structure of the workshop worked under the assumption that writing is important for one's career, and its formulaic tone, style, and structure bereft of complexity or jargons ought to be learnt in order to succeed as a professional academic. At the same time a vague notion of creativity was stressed. This vague stress on creativity, while teaching young researchers the "rules of the game," helped distinguish research work as cognitive labour while codifying the performance of research work for the young researchers without addressing the extractive nature of research work. The concrete creative practices, such as publishing pre-prints, seeking open access journals even if not indexed, or discussing possibilities of starting new student journals were foreclosed by this emphasis on writing for the extractive arrangements that already exist.

At the heart of the writing workshop was a tension between acknowledging the necessity of publication in the current academic industry and the supposed demonstration of creativity that these works must necessarily perform and be imbued with i. e., the making visible of sufficient cognitive labour in the work to accord it value. The inability of the workshop to address the limitations of publishing mandates is grounded on a more pervasive problem of thinking which remains unwilling to look at knowledge production as labour (Hey 2001), obfuscating it through either persistent epistemic critiques or passing the buck to the students. The injunction to publish and the injunction to be creative points towards the very nature of cognitive labour. What remains surprising is that despite using conceptual apparatuses such as knowledge economy worker, cognitive labour, immaterial labour, etc. to make sense of the world in the field, the anthropologists / sociologists in India seem unwilling to apply it to their own lives and the lives of their fellows and peers.

Postcoloniality and its discontents

The colonial underpinnings of anthropology / sociology's origins have over the years necessitated a crucial call for decolonization of the discipline by positing a situated understanding of knowledge articulations and their entanglement with power structures (Grosfoguel 2007). These approaches point towards a certain inegalitarianism in global knowledge production, consumption, and circulation (Çelik et al. 2016). However, these calls to be decolonial reify the possibilities of articulations from the decolonized world or the global south where knowledge from the global south is ghettoized as one is expected to perpetuate these similar lines of reasoning (Arif 2015; 2012).

Decolonial theory's variant in India which emerged as subaltern studies[11] which was later repackaged as postcolonial theory in the west has been one of the dominant schools of thinking in the social sciences in India (Chibber 2013). Despite its emergence, primarily in the discipline of History, the theoretical consequences of subaltern studies cannot be exaggerated. Subaltern studies and the authors inspired from it form the bedrock of social science theory in India across various disciplines. Accompanying this has been the widespread dissemination of postcolonial studies / theory across the west which today informs a vast variety of scholarship on and of India. We are not suggesting that the initial character of subaltern studies in any way resembles what passes for postcolonial theory today but it would not be misplaced to suggest that various rhetorical structures have gone on to influence later articulations of postcolonial theory (Ludden 2003). Recently, postcolonial studies has coalesced around another signifier, "southernism," by certain authors in a bid to adapt to the changing signifiers mobilized in favour of dichotomous thinking of the world to levy an epistemic critique (Roy 2016; Chattopadhyay 2012). Though southernists celebrate this newfound trope of dissecting the world, it points towards a failure of postcolonial epistemic critique and its

---

[11] Some of the leading figures of subaltern studies included Ranajit Guha, Partha Chatterjee, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Gyan Prakash, Shahid Amin, etc.

inability to even envision alternative routes to knowledge production that do not depend on or replicate the hierarchies inbuilt in existing knowledge infrastructures.

At the risk of being reductionist, at the heart of postcolonial theory is a critique of the European enlightenment episteme (Spivak 1990), interrogation of its various dichotomies and categorizations, and the positing of multiple modernities (Chakrabarty 2009). Though this interrogation of the European enlightenment episteme unpacked various underpinnings of knowledge in the academy and outside, it has resulted in perpetual epistemic critique (Savransky 2017) of eurocentrism whose contemporary variants reduce the world to a north and a south (Arif 2015).

The postcolonial condition or postcoloniality is not necessarily a territorially bounded space-time which only the colonized territories are going through but also refers to a series of consequences affecting the colonizing nations. As Majumdar writes, "They remain profoundly marked by the lasting impact of their imperialist adventures, as do those whose lands were brought under imperial control, though to varying degrees and in different ways." (2007, ix) By framing postcoloniality in such manner one is not surprised to witness the resonance and receptibility of postcolonial theory in the west across the Atlantic, across languages.

This persistent gaze towards the colonizer, or the global north in the new variety, frames a *dispositif* which is hyperopic while ignoring the material relationalities of knowledge production, consumption, and circulation around oneself. This lack of self-reflexivity is not particularly unique, as Hey (2001) argues following Rabinow (1986), there has been a general lack of self-reflexivity among academicians to think through the conditions of knowledge production, the process of hiring, grant-making, research-funding, tenure-track hiring, etc. This is even more glaring in the Indian context because self-reflexivity is a persistent demand made in writings in anthropology / sociology and social sciences in India (Patel 2006). It appears that self-reflexivity somehow ends at the corridors of one's own workplace.

To locate the limitation in the postcolonial rhetorical strategy of looking elsewhere is important because the range of problems noted by authors responding to Das (1993) evoked standard problems of postcoloniality; that of language (Giri 1993), lack of diversity of textbooks (Giri 1993), and alien ness of theoretical discussions (Rege 1994). These problems it must be noted arise from a persistent lack of journals, multilingual journals, avenues for writings and translations among different languages in India for which the blame can neither be passed onto the students or the global north. Rather it highlights a space and time of our knowledge production, the lack of engaged praxis around it.

Postcolonial epistemic critiques have not been able to address the conditions of knowledge production explicitly. This is particularly reflected in the lack of transparent journals, of an academic culture that can sustain pre-prints, open access publishing or publishing in small presses. This suggests that even while critiquing the global north, the south and its infrastructures do not automatically become fertile grounds for thought and praxis. A postcolonial critique should have been accompanied by for example, creative publishing practices that could have made the discourse redundant rather than proliferating in different avatars. However, these practices are evidently considered secondary to the primary epistemological critique of the west or the global north just like the doctoral candidates' compulsion to publish.

Conclusion

The paper began with a discussion of the crises in sociology debate and pointed out how it prefigured the current ongoing transformations of the conditions of knowledge production. The debates' focus on quality and competence of doctoral students obfuscated the material conditions of knowledge production. Through an auto ethnographic account, the paper then highlighted the challenges faced by doctoral candidates and the consequences of the publishing mandate as a necessary condition to be eligible for a doctoral degree. This allows us to mark doctoral candidates as paid, underpaid, and unpaid cognitive workers engaged in crafting commodities for the academic publication industry. This autoethnographic account points out the foreclosures in the crises of sociology debate as well as postcolonial epistemic critiques. We point out that Das' concerns vis-à-vis quality and competence, and postcolonial epistemological critiques of the west foreclose an interrogation of conditions of knowledge production in the post colony.

Given this, we are interested in moving towards an infrastructural critique of knowledge production. An infrastructure is a temporal order – it works, repeats, and becomes obsolete (Vishmidt 2017). While it works, it obfuscates the relations of production that make it effective. However, in its obsolescence, in the moment when it is showing signs of malfunctioning, these relations of production become more visible. An epistemological critique that isolates knowledge from its infrastructures can misidentify these moments of obsolescence, these moments of crises – as is obvious from the debate that Veena Das initiated in India – as crisis of quality, commitment, rigour, and pedagogy.

An infrastructural critique of knowledge, as opposed to an epistemological critique, constantly looks at conditions of one's own production and does not despair when faced with moments of crises while constantly envisioning infrastructures that are not yet. The initial moment of crisis in the discipline of sociology and anthropology in India has deepened, and it also foreshadows the changing social relations that might come to dominate the extractive research work for most researchers in future with its deep lines of stratifications. These lines of stratification might make existing infrastructures, the few existing centres of excellence that the pedagogue's want to protect as well as their corresponding values, obsolete. For an infrastructural critique of knowledge, these won't be moments of despair but would be rife with possibilities.

References

Allmer, Thomas. 2018. "Theorising and Analysing Academic Labour." *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society* 16(1): 49–77. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v16i1.868

Arif, Yasmeen. 2015. "The Audacity of Method." *Economic and Political Weekly* 50(1): 53–61. https://www.epw.in/journal/2015/1/special-articles/audacity-method.html-0

Arif, Yasmeen. 2012. "Emergent Encounters: Towards a Politics of Epistemology." *Journal of the World Anthropologies Network* 6: 23–42.

Arif, Yasmeen. 2004. "Passages out of India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 39(3): 301–3. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4414530

Arora, Cheshta. 2020. "Dreaming the Welfare-State: Indian Women-Studies-Movement, Neoliberalism and Feminist Future." *Ex Aequo - Revista Da Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Sobre as Mulheres.* https://doi.org/10.22355/exaequo.2020.42.03

Bairy TS, Ramesh. 2004. "Rethinking the Debate on the 'Crisis' in Sociology." http://www.unipune.ac.in/snc/cssh/historysociology/A%20DOCUMENTS%20ON%20HISTORY%20OF%20SOCIOLOGY%20IN%20INDIA/A%202%20Crisis%20in%20sociology/A%202%2010.pdf

Bauder, Harald. 2005. "The Segmentation of Academic Labour: A Canadian Example." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 4(2): 228–39. https://acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/735

Bazin, Yoann, Gazi Islam, Martin Parker, and Yiannis Gabriel. 2018. "The (Academic) Society of the Spectacle (of Publication)." *M@n@gement* 21(3): 1118–34. https://www.cairn.info/revue-management-2018-3-page-1118.htm

Beall, Jeffrey. 2013a. "Predatory Publishing Is Just One of the Consequences of Gold Open Access." *Learned Publishing* 26(2): 79–83. https://doi.org/10.1087/20130203

Beall, Jeffrey. 2013b. "The Open-Access Movement Is Not Really about Open Access." *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society* 11(2): 589–97. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v11i2.525

Beteille, Andre. 2006. "An Anthropologist in His Own Country." http://www.unipune.ac.in/snc/cssh/historysociology/A%20DOCUMENTS%20ON%20HISTORY%20OF%20SOCIOLOGY%20IN%20INDIA/A%201%20Debates%20on%20sociology%20and%20anthrpology%20of%20India/A%201%2035.pdf

Breman, Jan. 2002. "The Sociology of Non-Western Societies at the University of Amsterdam." http://www.unipune.ac.in/snc/cssh/historysociology/A%20DOCUMENTS%20ON%20HISTORY%20OF%20SOCIOLOGY%20IN%20INDIA/A%201%20Debates%20on%20sociology%20and%20anthrpology%20of%20India/A%201%2028.pdf

Çelik, Ercüment, Ersche Christian, Wiebke Keim, and Veronika Wöhrer. 2016. "Introduction." In *Global Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences: Made in Circulation*, edited by Wiebke Keim, Ercüment Çelik, and Veronika Wöhrer, 1–20. New York: Routledge.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2009. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chang, Heewon, Karen A. Longman, and Marla A. Franco. 2014. "Leadership Development through Mentoring in Higher Education: A Collaborative Autoethnography of Leaders of Color." *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 22(4): 373–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945734

Chang, Heewon, Faith Wambura Ngunjiri, and Kathy-Ann C. Hernandez. 2013. *Collaborative Autoethnography. Developing Qualitative Inquiry.* Walnut Creek, Calif: Left Coast Press.

Chattarji, Subarno. 2016. "Labor, Precarity, and the University: Thinking about Indian Higher Education." *English Language Notes* 54(2): 167–74. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/711451

Chattopadhyay, Swati. 2012. *Unlearning the City: Infrastructure in a New Optical Field.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Chhapia, Hemali. 2017. "Broke Mumbai University Breaks Rs 111cr FDs in 17 Months to Pay Staff Salary." *The Times of India*, July 7, 2017. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/mumbai/broke-mumbai-university-breaks-rs-111cr-fds-in-17-months-to-pay-staff-salary/articleshow/59482198.cms

Chibber, Vivek. 2013. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London: Verso.

Cortes Santiago, Ileana, Nastaran Karimi, and Zaira R. Arvelo Alicea. 2017. "Neoliberalism and Higher Education: A Collective Autoethnography of Brown Women Teaching Assistants." *Gender and Education* 29(1): 48–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1197383

Das, Veena. 1993. "Sociological Research in India: The State of Crisis." *Economic and Political Weekly* 28(23): 1159–61. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4399815

Deshpande, Satish. 2003. *Contemporary India: A Sociological View*. Viking.

Ellis, Carolyn, Tony E. Adams, and Arthur P. Bochner. 2011. "Autoethnography: An Overview." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12(1). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-12.1.1589

Deshpande, Satish. 2001. "Disciplinary Predicaments: Sociology and Anthropology in Postcolonial India." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 2(2): 247–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649370120068540

Deshpande, Satish. 1994. "Crisis in Sociology: A Tired Discipline?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 29(10): 575–76. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4400900

Fernandes, Leela. 2006. *India's New Middle Class: Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giri, Ananta. 1993. "Creating a Community of Discourse in Sociology in India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 28(29/30): 1538–39. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4399967

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 211–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162514

Gulli, Bruno. 2009. "Knowledge Production and the Superexploitation of Contingent Academic Labor." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* 16. https://doi.org/10.14288/workplace.v0i16.182232

Gupta, Priyanshu, and Vivek G. Nair. 2019. "From 'Research in Management' to 'Management of Research': Changing Nature of Doctoral Programme at Indian Management Schools." *DECISION* 46(2): 169–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40622-019-00210-z

Hegde, Ganesh Anant. 2016. "9 – Privatization in Higher Education in India: A Reflection of Issues." In *A Global Perspective on Private Higher Education*, edited by Mahsood Shah, and Chenicheri Sid Nair, 157–68. Cambridge, MA: Elsevier/Chandos Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100872-0.00009-4

Hey, Valerie. 2001. "The Construction of Academic Time: Sub/Contracting Academic Labour in Research." *Journal of Education Policy* 16(1): 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930010009831

Jaffrelot, Christophe. 2006. "The Impact of Affirmative Action in India: More Political than Socioeconomic." *India Review* 5(2): 173–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/14736480600824516

Jagannathan, Srinath, and Premalatha Packirisamy. 2019. "Love in the Midst of Precariousness: Lamenting the Trappings of Labour in de-Intellectualized Worlds." *DECISION* 46(2): 139–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40622-019-00215-8

Keightley, Emily. 2010. "Remembering Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 13(1): 55–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570802605440

Krawczyk, Franciszek, and Emanuel Kulczycki. 2021. "How Is Open Access Accused of Being Predatory? The Impact of Beall's Lists of Predatory Journals on Academic Publishing." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 47(2): 102271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102271

Larivière, Vincent, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Benoit Macaluso, Staša Milojević, Blaise Cronin, and Mike Thelwall. 2014. "ArXiv E-Prints and the Journal of Record: An Analysis of Roles and Relationships." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65(6): 1157–69. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23044

Larkin, Brian. 2013. "The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42(1): 327–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092412-155522

Lives in Search of Love. 2019. "Narrating the Griefs of Academic Labour in Neoliberal Times." https://sites.google.com/view/precarious-academic-labour/home

Ludden, David E. 2003. "Introduction: A Brief History of Subalternity." In *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning, and the Globalisation of South Asia*, edited by David E. Ludden, 1–40. Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Majumdar, Margaret A. 2007. *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Martin, Graham P., and Justin Waring. 2018. "Realising Governmentality: Pastoral Power, Governmental Discourse and the (Re)Constitution of Subjectivities." *The Sociological Review* 66(6): 1292–1308. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118755616

McCarthy, Greg, Xianlin Song, and Kanishka Jayasuriya. 2017. "The Proletarianisation of Academic Labour in Australia." *Higher Education Research & Development* 36(5): 1017–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1263936

Pasquinelli, Matteo. 2019. "On the Origins of Marx's General Intellect." *Radical Philosophy* 206: 43–56. https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/on-the-origins-of-marxs-general-intellect

Patel, Sujata. 2006. "Beyond Binaries: A Case for Self-Reflexive Sociologies." *Current Sociology* 54(3): 381–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392106063187

Peters, Michael A., Hejia Wang, Moses Oladele Ogunniran, Yingying Huang, Benjamin Green, Jasmin Omary Chunga, Eric Atta Quainoo. 2020. "China's Internationalized Higher Education During Covid-19: Collective Student Autoethnography." *Postdigital Science and Education* 2(3): 968–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00128-1

Pilay, Daisy, Inbanathan Naicker, and Kathlen Pithouse-Morgan. 2016. "Writing Academic Autoethnographies." In *Academic Autoethnographies: Inside Teaching in Higher Education*, edited by Daisy Pillay, Inbanathan Naicker, and Kathleen Pithouse-Morgan, 1–17. Rotterdam: SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-399-5_1

Pithouse-Morgan, Kathleen, Daisy Pillay, and Inbanathan Naicker. 2021. "Autoethnography as/in Higher Education." In *Handbook of Autoethnography*, edited by Tony E. Adams, Stacy Holman Jones, and Carolyn Ellis. 215–227 New York and London: Routledge.

Rabinow, Paul. 1986. "Representations Are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology." In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford, and George E. Marcus, 234–61. Oakland: University of California Press. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1525/9780520946286-012/html.

Reddy, A Chandrasekhar, Gitanjali Joshua, Ipsita Pradhan, Jangkhosei Touthang, Lalatendu Keshari Das, Mitaja Chakraborty, Priyam Sharma, Satheesh Perumalla, and Shilpa Krishna. 2015. "Research Scholars' Epistemological Predicament." *Economic and Political Weekly*

54(23): 7–8. https://www.epw.in/journal/2019/23/special-articles/research-scholars%E2%80%99-episte-mological-predicament.html

Rege, Sharmila. 1994. "'If This Is Tuesday … It Must Be Social Roles': Sociology and Challenge of Gender Studies." *Economic and Political Weekly* 29(19): 1155–56. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4401172

Roy, Ananya. 2016. "Who's Afraid of Postcolonial Theory?" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(1): 200–209. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12274

Sangren, P. Steven. 2007. "Anthropology of Anthropology?" *Anthropology Today* 23(4): 13–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00523.x

Sarkar, Debarun. 2022. "Toward a Feminism Without Scaffoldings: Mapping a Research Project, a Narrative from the Field, and a Draft Bill." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 23(2): 103–118. https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol23/iss2/8

Savransky, Martin. 2017. "A Decolonial Imagination: Sociology, Anthropology and the Politics of Reality." *Sociology* 51(1): 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038516656983

Seethapathy, G. S., J. U. Santhosh Kumar, and A. S. Hareesha. 2016. "India's Scientific Publication in Predatory Journals: Need for Regulating Quality of Indian Science and Education." *Current Science* 111(11): 1759–64. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24911535

Smith, Neil. 2000. "Afterword: Who Rules This Sausage Factory?" *Antipode* 32(3): 330–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00138

Smith, Tony. 2013. "The 'General Intellect' in the Grundrisse and Beyond." *Historical Materialism* 21(4): 235–55. https://doi.org/10.1163/1569206X-12341321

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1990. *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues.* Edited by Sarah Harasym. New York: Routledge.

Srinivas, Mysore Narasimhachar. 1952. "Social Anthropology And Sociology." *Sociological Bulletin* 1(1): 28–37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42864473

Srinivas, Mysore Narasimhachar, and M. N. Panini. 1973. "The Development of Sociology and Social Anthropology in India." *Sociological Bulletin* 22(2): 179–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022919730201

Sundar, Nandini. 2018. "Academic Freedom and Indian Universities." *Economic and Political Weekly* 53(24): 7–8. https://www.epw.in/journal/2018/24/special-articles/academic-freedom-and-indian-universities.html

Szadkowski, Krystian. 2019. "An Autonomist Marxist Perspective on Productive and Un-Productive Academic Labour." *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society* 17(1): 111–31. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v17i1.1076

Thorkelson, Eli. 2016. "Precarity Outside: The Political Unconscious of French Academic Labor." *American Ethnologist* 43(3): 475–87. https://www.academia.edu/27986488/Precarity_Outside_The_po-litical_unconscious_of_French_academic_labor

Trahar, Sheila. 2009. "Beyond the Story Itself: Narrative Inquiry and Autoethnography in Intercultural Research in Higher Education." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 10(1). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-10.1.1218

Uberoi, Patricia. 1994. "Sociology, Gender, Family Studies: Regressive Incorporations." *Economic and Political Weekly* 29(27): 1686–1687. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4401428

Vishmidt, Marina. 2017. "Between Not Everything and Not Nothing: Cuts Towards Infrastructural Critique." In *Former West: Art and the Contemporary After*, edited by Maria Hlavajova, and Simon Sheikh, 265–69. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/former-west

Winn, Joss. 2015. "Writing About Academic Labour." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* 25. https://doi.org/10.14288/workplace.v0i25.185095

Xia, Jingfeng, Jennifer L. Harmon, Kevin G. Connolly, Ryan M. Donnelly, Mary R. Anderson, and Heather A. Howard. 2015. "Who Publishes in 'Predatory' Journals?" *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 66(7): 1406–1417. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23265

Acknowledgement

Authors

Cheshta Arora ⓘ is a researcher at the Centre for Internet and Society, Bengaluru, and a member of Kibitz Research Organisation. Cheshta's PhD work offered an illustrative critique of situated knowledge while interrogating relations of work / labour in the contemporary (National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bangalore; Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, 2022).

cheshtaarora@outlook.in

Kibitz Research Organisation

Debarun Sarkar ⓘ is a doctoral candidate at the Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai and a member of Kibitz Research Organisation. His dissertation intervenes in the scalar debate while empirically studying New Town, West Bengal. He is currently working as a researcher at Vidyashilp Research Center, Vidyashilp University, Bengaluru.

debarun@outlook.com

Kibitz Research Organisation

INJUSTICE ÉPISTÉMIQUE ET RECONNAISSANCE DES SAVOIRS

S'auteuriser dans une démarche de recherche-action-participative

Benoît Eyraud, Arnaud Béal, Chantal Bruno, Valérie Lemard, Jacques Lequien, Isabel Miranda[1]

Résumé

La recherche-action-participative Capdroits vise à réduire les inégalités de pouvoir inhérentes aux injustices épistémiques en proposant des modalités de recherche symétrisant les savoirs des personnes concernées par des situations de handicap, de maladie ou de dépendances, des acteur·e·s de la relation d'aide et de soin (proches ou professionnel·le·s), et des professionnel·le·s de la recherche en sciences sociales et juridiques. Elle repose sur des principes de réciprocité, d'empowerment, et d'identification de gains. Nous nous centrons dans cet article sur l'une des étapes centrales des pratiques de recherche, à savoir celles de leurs publications et des enjeux d'auteurisation qui soulèvent des questions de reconnaissance scientifique et politique. Nos analyses reposent sur une forme d'auto-ethnographie collective.

Mots-clés: *recherche-action-participative, CIDPH, handicaps, autorat, autorité, auctorialité*

EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE AND RECOGNITION OF KNOWLEDGE: AUTORSHIP IN PARTICIPATIVE ACTION RESEARCH

Abstract

Capdroits participatory action-research aims to reduce the inequalities of power inherent in epistemic injustices by proposing research methods that symmetrize the knowledge of people affected by situations of disability, illness or addiction, actors in the helping relationship and care (relatives or professionals), and research professionals in the social and legal sciences. It is based on principles of reciprocity, empowerment, and identification of gains. In this article, we focus on one of the central stages of research practices, namely autorship, which raise questions of scientific and political recognition. Our analyzes are based on a form of collective auto-ethnography.

Keywords: *disabilities, CRPD, authorship, participative action research*

---

[1] Benoît Eyraud a assuré le fil rédactionnel de l'article ainsi que l'animation collective. Arnaud Béal a rédigé certains paragraphes de l'article. Chantal Bruno, Valérie Lemard, Isabel Miranda ont fait plusieurs relectures et retours écrits, et ont participé à différents échanges oraux. Jacques Lequien a donné son accord à toutes les étapes de production. Des membres de la coordination Capdroits se sont impliqué·e·s dans l'article en refusant finalement de le signer ; d'autres membres de la coordination ne se sont pas impliqué·e·s du tout. Les extraits utilisés ont fait l'objet d'une autorisation de leurs auteur·e·s.

Seismo

Introduction

La Convention internationale des droits des personnes handicapées entend faire mieux reconnaître la place des personnes en situation de handicap dans la vie sociale. Influencée par des Organisations de personne handicapées, le mouvement des *disability studies* et le slogan *"nothing about us without us",* elle a été négociée à travers une valorisation des savoirs issus de l'expérience des personnes handicapées. La démarche scientifique et citoyenne[2] Capdroits s'inscrit dans la dynamique de cette convention, à la fois à travers son objet et sa *méthode de recherche*. Elle vise en effet à questionner l'exercice des droits des personnes dont la capacité juridique[3] est remise en cause *à partir de l'expérience qu'elles en ont* (Béal et al. 2018, Capdroits 2019, Capdroits 2022) ; elle entend s'appuyer sur une mise en problème public des expériences d'exercice des droits. La démarche vise à réduire les inégalités de pouvoir inhérentes aux injustices épistémiques[4] (Fricker 2007) en proposant des modalités de recherche symétrisant les savoirs des personnes concernées par des situations de handicap, de maladie ou de dépendances, des acteurs de la relation d'aide et de soin (proches ou professionnel·le·s), et des professionnel·le·s de la recherche en sciences sociales et juridiques. Elle s'ancre se faisant dans un questionnement autour des savoirs et de leur hiérarchisation sociale et rejoint la proposition conceptuelle de « justice cognitive » de Shiv Visvanathan (2016) de reconnaître des savoirs différents, qui sont traditionnellement hiérarchisés, dans des rapports d'égalité afin de favoriser un processus démocratique de construction des connaissances.

La mise en œuvre pratique d'une telle recherche action participative soulève aussi bien des questions relatives aux rapports de pouvoir que des modalités concrètes de production et de reconnaissance des savoirs d'expérience. Les pratiques majoritaires des recherche en sciences sociales, qui peuvent être qualifiées d'hégémoniques, au sens qu'elles s'opèrent « au fil du temps à partir du sens commun disciplinaire et qui se tient en dehors de tout examen » (Escobar et Restrepo 2010) se réalisent à travers des relations sociales qui reproduisent des formes de domination véhiculées dans la vie sociale, tendant de fait à marginaliser (Oliver 1992) ou à exploiter, par extractivisme, l'expérience des personnes en situation de handicap (Godrie 2021). Dans le cadre de la démarche Capdroits, nous cherchons, à la suite de différents travaux, à développer une pratique de recherche-émancipatoire, reposant sur des principes de réciprocité, de pouvoir d'agir, et d'identification de gains (Oliver 1992, Zarb 1992, Jeanne, Fournier et Couture 2019, d'Arripe et al. 2015, Ollerton et al. 2013, Eyraud et al. 2018). Nous proposons dans cet article

---

[2] Les dimensions « scientifique » et « citoyenne » de la démarche sont indissociables et ne font pas l'objet d'une frontière stable. Leur articulation se fait à géométrie variable à travers les interactions entre les producteurs et les récepteurs de cette démarche.

[3] La capacité juridique désigne la reconnaissance par le droit qu'une personne peut agir par elle-même dans tous les actes de sa vie. Elle est ordinairement reconnue de manière pleine pour toutes les personnes ayant passé l'âge de la majorité civile. Elle peut être « défaite » à travers la mise en place de mesures légales de prise de décision substitutive (tutelle, curatelle, soins forcés) dont l'existence est dénoncée par le comité des droits assuré du suivi de cette convention (Eyraud et al. 2018).

[4] À la suite de Fricker et de Frega, on désigne les injustices épistémiques comme l'inégale reconnaissance des savoirs des êtres humains. L'injustice épistémique « consiste dans le fait de nier la crédibilité d'un sujet en raison de certains attributs sociaux qui, en principe, ne devraient pas affecter son autorité cognitive, comme le genre ou l'identité ethnique » (Frega 2013).

de nous centrer sur l'une des étapes centrales des pratiques de recherche, à savoir celles de leurs publications et des enjeux d'autorat proposée par le protocole de la démarche Capdroits. À la suite de nombreux travaux sur l'autorat (Leclerc 1996, Love 2002, Pontille 2008), nous appelons « auteurisation » le processus par lequel une personne se reconnaît et est reconnue comme auteur·e d'un énoncé, reconnaissance se traduisant aussi bien par l'attribution d'une auctorialité, c'est-à-dire la reconnaissance de la source nominative d'un énoncé, et d'une autorité, c'est-à-dire la reconnaissance de la crédibilité et du pouvoir afférent à cet énoncé. Cette question de l'auteurisation s'est progressivement imposée comme centrale dans la méthodologie de mise en problème public de l'expérience du programme. Elle imbrique des enjeux de connaissance et de reconnaissance et constitue un révélateur des rapports de pouvoirs existant dans cette démarche de recherche-action-participative.

Un premier axe de questionnement porte sur les conditions d'accès des personnes participant à la recherche-action aux scènes de publication et à l'autorat. Toutes les personnes participantes sont-elles invitées à participer en tant qu'auteur·e à des scènes publiques les reconnaissant à ce titre ? Tous les participant·e·s de la démarche accèdent-ils de manière équitable aux espaces de reconnaissance et aux gains liés aux publications ?

Un second axe de questionnement porte sur les difficultés relatives à la personnalisation ou à la collectivisation de l'autorat. Comment se met-on d'accord sur un énoncé, un texte dans lequel chacun·e contribue et se reconnaît ? Comment s'attribuent et se distribuent les pouvoirs dans la fabrication de ces accords (ou désaccords), et *in fine,* de leur matérialisation dans des signatures (ou non) ?

Enfin, un troisième axe de questionnement porte sur les frontières et les imbrications entre les dimensions « scientifiques » et « citoyennes » des connaissances, sur notre appréhension de ce qui est scientifique, et sur le rapport ambivalent à l'élitisme présent dans les recherches-actions-participatives. Est-ce que celles-ci relèvent d'une forme de « néo-colonisation » des savoirs à travers le développement par une forme d'envahissement de la sphère de l'expérience par les formats abstraits et structuraux des protocoles et énonciations académiques (Straughan 2009) ? Ou est-ce que la participation de non-professionnel·le·s aux recherches académiques parvient à transformer celle-ci, notamment en participant à révéler les rapports de pouvoirs qui la structurent ?

Pour traiter ces questions, nous présenterons dans une première partie la place centrale prise progressivement dans la démarche Capdroits par le processus d'auteurisation en l'inscrivant dans la genèse et le développement de cette démarche.

Nous développerons dans une seconde partie une mise en abîme des difficultés posées par les opérations de publicisation de savoirs analysant une tentative d'écriture d'un article scientifique cherchant à tenir ensemble de manière symétrique les différents types de savoirs apportés par des membres de la coordination de la démarche.

Ces analyses prennent comme matériau les comptes rendus de nombreuses réunions et les courriels échangés entre membres de la coordination Capdroits, les analyses collectives menées pour préparer différentes présentations orales des résultats du programme, ainsi que les échanges liés à la rédaction d'un projet d'article qui n'a pas abouti. Ces échanges comprennent des entretiens informels entre membres de la coordination, ainsi que des comptes-rendus de temps de travail consacrés à l'écriture de cet article. Il s'agit d'une forme d'auto-ethnographie collective (Callier et al. 2017).

Six membres de la coordination de la démarche Capdroits sont co-signataires de cet article, en l'occurrence un enseignant-chercheur en sociologie et un autre en psychologie sociale, un expert d'expérience du handicap psycho-social, et un expert d'expérience du handicap intellectuel; deux spécialistes de la relation d'aide, l'une qui l'est au double titre de l'expérience personnelle de mère d'un enfant handicapé et psychologue social, l'autre qui est mandataire à la protection des majeurs et diplômée en sociologie[5]. L'un de nous, sociologue a assuré le fil rédactionnel ainsi que l'animation du travail collectif; les autres ont participé à travers l'apport de nombreux commentaires et la rédaction de certains passages, par l'apport d'articles scientifiques ainsi que par des commentaires oraux, pour l'un d'entre nous qui ne peut ni lire ni écrire.

L'auteurisation dans la démarche capdroits

Nous proposons dans cette première partie de présenter comment l'auteurisation est devenue un enjeu central de la démarche de recherche citoyenne Capdroits[6], accompagnant l'objectif d'une meilleure reconnaissance des savoirs et des pouvoirs des personnes directement concernées par des empêchements à exercer leurs droits, mais aussi des modalités de distribution des places conduisant à des accès différenciés à la production et aux publications effectives de la démarche. Nous revenons pour cela sur la genèse et la mise en œuvre de cette démarche, sur l'intégration de personnes en situation de handicap dans une dynamique de recherche, sur la mise en place d'un protocole de «mise en problème public de l'expérience», et sur la place des publications et de l'auteurisation dans cette méthode.

---

[5] Les désignations des positions d'expérience et d'expertise des participant·e·s de la démarche sont multiples.

[6] La démarche de recherche citoyenne Capdroits a mené deux vagues de recherche-action, d'abord en 2016/2018, puis en 2020/2021. Dans chaque phase, une dizaine de groupes locaux dans 5 régions françaises ont été mis en place comprenant au total plus d'une centaine de participant·e·s. Les groupes se sont constitués à partir d'un appel à participation centré sur les questions des empêchements à l'exercice des droits. Chaque groupe a été animé par trois facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s, le trinôme réunissant un expert académique, un expert d'expérience, et un expert de la relation d'aide; 31 facilitateur·e·s-chercheur·e·s et 59 participant·e·s se sont impliqués dans des groupes locaux de la première vague. L'engagement des personnes dans la démarche ne se fait pas à partir de catégories administratives de handicap, mais au regard d'un sentiment vécu d'empêchement dans l'exercice de leurs droits. Pour une majorité de participant·e·s des groupes, ces empêchements sont en lien avec un vécu de handicap psycho-social; pour une minorité de participant·e·s, il s'agit d'une expérience de poly-handicaps, de handicaps cognitifs, ou de handicaps intellectuels. La coordination de la démarche était assurée lors de la première vague (2016–2018), principalement par un chercheur académique et une chargée de mission salariée par un laboratoire de recherche; entre 2019 et 2021, cette coordination a été assurée par 14 personnes, dont 6 se reconnaissent dans la démarche par leur situation de handicap, 3 se reconnaissent comme spécialistes de la relation d'aide, 4 se reconnaissent comme chercheur·e·s académiques, et 1 comme représentant une fédération de personnes handicapées.

À l'origine de la démarche : une revendication de reconnaissance des savoirs expérientiels

La démarche Capdroits trouve son origine dans les revendications portées par des personnes en situation de handicap dans l'organisation d'une conférence scientifique internationale initiée par un collectif de chercheur·e·s académiques en sciences sociales et juridiques portant sur les questions de recueil de consentement et de recours à la contrainte dans le domaine de la santé mentale. La découverte d'une observation générale du comité des droits de la convention internationale pour les droits des personnes handicapées portant sur la « capacité juridique » (Comité des droits, ONU, 2014) et de la place tenue par les organisations de personnes handicapées dans l'adoption de cette observation, a conduit les animateur·ice·s du collectif à intégrer le Conseil français des personnes handicapées pour les questions européennes ainsi que des personnes en situation de handicap connaissant et intéressées par cette convention dans l'organisation de cette conférence[7]. Celles-ci ont apporté des objectifs nouveaux, à savoir celui de prendre en compte de manière significative les savoirs des personnes directement concernées par les mesures de contrainte légale, et de symétriser les positions des intervenant·e·s, quels que soient leur titre d'expertise. Le programme s'est alors donné comme but de favoriser la transformation de savoirs d'expériences en expertise et de faire reconnaître cette expertise sur l'espace public et scientifique (Borkman 1976), à travers un dispositif de « mise en forums ». Permettre aux personnes d'être en position d'expertise, c'est reconnaître des savoirs sur « l'ajustement aux besoins sociaux des acteurs concernés » (Bérard et Crespin 2010). Concrètement, une méthodologie a été développée consistant à faire animer des groupes locaux composés par des personnes « empêchées », « handicapées » dans l'exercice de leurs droits, par un trinôme d'animateur·ice·s nommés « facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s »[8], doté de savoirs pluriels, et de favoriser l'accès des personnes concernées par ces empêchements sur des scènes de forums. Au moment de l'élaboration du programme, une méthode de mise en forums, ou de mise en problème public de l'expérience est développée dans laquelle la question de l'auteurisation ne fait d'abord pas l'objet d'une réflexion approfondie, la notion n'étant alors même pas utilisée. Le programme prévoit simplement que des publications seront réalisées sans qu'il ne soit précisé par qui.

---

[7] Lors du premier comité d'organisation, quatre personnes se sentant directement concernées par la question de la capacité à consentir étaient présentes, toutes quatre ayant une connaissance de la convention par l'intermédiaire d'une certaine proximité avec une association représentant des personnes se sentant concernées par le handicap psycho-social.

[8] La mise en place de ces trinômes d'animateur·ice·s, la reconnaissance de leur activité, et la participation de personnes handicapées dans l'exercice de leurs droits à ces groupes locaux puis à des « scènes de forums » ont soulevé des enjeux de pouvoirs en même temps qu'elles ont révélé la portée et les limites de l'articulation entre des savoirs différents. La revendication des facilitateur·e·s-chercheur·e·s a contribué à transformer le programme d'action innovante en démarche scientifique et citoyenne (Co-chercheur·e·s Capdroits 2019).

L'émergence de l'enjeu de l'auteurisation :
signature personnelle et nom collectif

Une première réflexion relative au processus d'auteurisation s'est faite au début de la mise en œuvre de la méthode de «mise en problème public de l'expérience». Cette méthode, développée sur le postulat que l'expérience est la première source de connaissance, que cette source de connaissance doit être mise en récit et partagée collectivement pour être intelligible, prise en considération socialement et reconnue en situation comme experte, prévoyait comme première étape le partage de récits en groupes locaux⁹, puis leur analyse collective par ces groupes, avant une présentation des résultats de ces analyses devant des tiers. La mise en œuvre de cette méthode a conduit à préciser le protocole et les opérations techniques afférentes, notamment celle de la retranscription des récits et de la collectivisation des analyses. Les personnes en charge du protocole ont prévu qu'à la suite du premier partage de récits, chaque personne ayant partagé un récit était invitée lors d'un second atelier à relire, reprendre, compléter ou modifier le récit retranscrit et à confirmer l'autorisation donnée d'utiliser le récit partagé comme élément d'un corpus collectif qui peut être analysé par les différent·e·s participant·e·s des groupes, par les facilitateur·e·s -chercheur·e·s, voire par la coordination de la démarche. Dit autrement, chaque personne ayant raconté oralement une situation vécue confirme qu'elle se reconnaît dans sa transcription écrite, devenant non seulement «auteure» du récit oral mais aussi de sa version écrite. Il était proposé que cet accord soit matérialisé par une signature de la retranscription écrite (si besoin modifiée).

Parallèlement à la constitution de ce corpus de récits personnels, un travail d'analyse collective a lieu et la distanciation vis-à-vis de l'expérience personnelle se fait en la mettant en discussion, mais aussi à travers la transcription écrite, puis la réappropriation d'une parole partagée en récit auteurisé. Pour marquer ces analyses collectives, le protocole prévoit que les membres du groupe puissent donner un nom collectif à leur groupe. Plusieurs groupes ont choisi de se donner un nom d'auteur: les «Feydeliens» ; «Handicap Liberté 33» ; «Cap / pas cap» ... Le protocole ne précisait en revanche pas si les animateur·ice·s «faciliateur·e·s-chercheur·e·s» des groupes en font partie ou non. Dans la plupart des groupes, l'expertise collective s'est traduite à travers la réalisation d'un texte et/ou d'un diaporama en vue de la présentation des résultats de l'analyse sur des espaces de forums avec le nom des différents auteurs.

Ces opérations ont été identifiées comme relevant d'un double processus d'auteurisation et d'autorisation, ces termes étant alors proposés au comité partenarial et au comité scientifique de la démarche qui les ont validés.

---

⁹ La consigne commune, proposée à l'ensemble des groupes locaux, était formulée ainsi: «Pouvez-vous nous raconter une situation de vie au cours de laquelle vous avez été en difficulté dans l'exercice de vos droits, et au cours de laquelle l'intervention apportée a été insuffisante ou excessive?».

Être auteur·e … de quoi ? La diversité éditoriale proposée

Pour favoriser l'accès des récits et analyses collectives à l'espace public en même temps que pour une meilleure prise en compte des modalités d'expression des savoirs d'expérience, la recherche-action-participative a cherché à développer différents formats de publication, certains oraux, d'autres rédactionnels, d'autres se basant sur l'audio-visuel. Il a été proposé de participer à des conférences, organisées par différentes institutions (fédération de professionnel·le·s du soin, colloque scientifique …). La publicisation de ces productions visait à faire reconnaître l'autorité des personnes empêchées dans leurs droits sur ce qu'elles vivent, c'est-à-dire à en prendre en compte la véracité. La reconnaissance de l'autorat n'est pas le même dans les espaces scientifiques, dans lesquels une confirmation par des pairs est nécessaire, et dans l'espace citoyen.

Les coordinateu·e·s de la recherche-action-participative ont organisé des conférences scientifiques et citoyennes. La conférence Confcap qui s'est tenue fin 2017 a développé une pratique éditoriale à l'articulation des habitudes « scientifiques » (sélectionner les contributions) et d'une vocation citoyenne (être ouvert au public). Pour cela, un appel à communication reposant sur une consigne commune de mise en récits, quelles que soient les positions sociale et scientifique des contributeur·ice·s, a été diffusée. Au total, 78 récits ont été proposés dont 17 provenant des participant·e·s des groupes locaux.

À partir du corpus des récits constitués pour une conférence scientifique et citoyenne, une publication sur le site internet a été soumise de manière générique à tous les participant·e·s de la démarche ayant proposé de communiquer lors d'une conférence scientifique et citoyenne. Sur les 78 récits partagés par des personnes professionnelles de la relation d'aide, des personnes vulnérabilisées par un handicap, ou encore par des chercheures et des chercheurs issus du monde académique qui ont été réunis dans un corpus mis en ligne, seuls 18 ont été publiés à travers un post autonome sous nom d'auteur identifié, six ayant été produits et attribués à des personnes rencontrant des empêchements dans l'exercice de leurs droits, 6 se reconnaissant comme professionnel·le·s de la relation d'aide, et 6 se reconnaissant comme relevant de la sphère académique.

Pour les publications à vocation « citoyenne » (le manifeste « Toutes et tous capables ! Toutes et tous vulnérables ») et le livret de plaidoyer « Capacités civiles et contraintes légales », qui ont été produits au cours de la première phase de la démarche (Capdroits 2021), il a été proposé de signer le manifeste en faisant apparaître des titres « d'expérience » et des titres « d'expertise » pour tous. Pour les publications à vocation scientifique, l'ouverture à des co-auteur·e·s a pris des formes beaucoup plus restreintes (cf. infra).

Pour favoriser l'accessibilité des débats, d'autres modes d'expression que l'analyse rédactionnelle ont été présentés. Il a été proposé aux contributeur·ice·s de construire, dans le cadre du dispositif « représentations civiles » des « mises en image » (photos) et des « mises en son » (enregistrements des extraits de récits) dans le prolongement des récits de situations partagés en groupes.

L'accès à l'espace éditorial scientifique comme
forme de rétribution spécifique

Dans le cadre du programme d'action innovant Capdroits, il était indiqué que des articles scientifiques pourraient être produits sans qu'il ne soit précisé les modalités de cette production. À la fin de la première phase Capdroits, il a été décidé qu'il serait proposé à l'ensemble des facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s de la démarche de pouvoir être auteur·e d'un article scientifique. Ce choix établit une frontière forte entre les «facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s» et les «participant·e·s» des groupes locaux à qui il n'a pas été proposé cette auteurisation dans des publications scientifiques. Ce choix n'a pas été véritablement discuté: il a reposé sur des implicites pratiques, mais aussi symboliques. Il semblait déjà ambitieux d'ouvrir à une trentaine de personnes l'accès à la pratique de production de l'article scientifique; surtout, ce choix traduit la rétribution spécifique reconnue aux facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s du programme, rétribution symbolique parallèle à la rétribution matérielle proposée aux facilitateur·e·s-chercheur·e·s[10]. Il est possible que la revendication initiale des animateur·ice·s d'être considérés comme des «facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s» ait eu un effet sur l'accès proposé à des publications éditées par des revues scientifiques. Lors de la valorisation de la première phase de la recherche-action-participative Capdroits, il n'a pas été proposé aux participant·e·s lambda des groupes d'être co-auteur·e·s d'un article.

Un second déterminant de la constitution du collectif signataire est celui des modalités temporelles de sollicitation d'auteur·e·s potentiels. Dans le cadre d'un article portant sur la présentation de la première phase capdroits, non seulement il a été proposé à tous les facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s de participer à la rédaction et d'être co-auteur·e·s, mais l'autorat est resté accessible jusqu'à la dernière opération de production de la revue, les facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s ayant été relancés à plusieurs reprises pour savoir s'ils souhaitaient être co-signataires (Capdroits 2021); dans d'autres articles, la temporalité d'attribution et de distribution de l'autorat a été plus réduite; par exemple, dans le cadre d'un article sur «l'engagement», la proposition de participer a été faite à tous les facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s, mais seuls ceux qui ont signifié leur intérêt au début du processus seront régulièrement relancés (Capdroits 2019).

Pour d'autres articles, la proposition de participer a été faite en cercle plus restreint. Ainsi, pour l'article faisant suite à la remise d'un «prix de la recherche participative» (non publié), la coordination de la démarche capdroits a limité l'ouverture du processus d'auteurisation à ses membres.

La méthode d'écriture de ces articles à vocation scientifique n'a pas été protocolisée mais elle s'est répétée de manière similaire en plusieurs occasions.

---

[10] Seize facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s se sont engagés par la forme d'un conventionnement avec un partenaire institutionnel; dix se sont engagés en étant directement rétribués; sept se sont engagés sous une forme bénévole et militante. Les modalités d'engagement diffèrent de manière significative selon les groupes d'habitude. Six facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s provenant des groupes d'habitude experts d'usage ont été rétribués, et cinq provenant du groupe d'habitude «professionnel des sciences sociales et juridiques».

Rendre accessible l'autorat

L'enjeu de la publicisation de l'expérience des personnes directement concernées par des mesures de contrainte légale est au cœur de la démarche de recherche citoyenne Capdroits. Celle-ci s'est développée par la revendication d'un meilleur accès à l'espace public et scientifique porté par des personnes se reconnaissant en situation de handicap. La méthodologie de mise en problème public de l'expérience développée suite à la coopération entre chercheur·e·s académiques, personnes concernées par le handicap et professionnel·e·s de la relation d'aide a cherché à rendre accessible l'espace public et scientifique (Fougeyrollas et al. 2014) à travers un dispositif d'accompagnement et de réception invitant à la rencontre entre les savoirs. La mise en œuvre de la méthode a fait surgir l'enjeu central de l'auteurisation, aussi bien pour permettre aux personnes de se reconnaître et d'être reconnues pour leurs savoirs en leur nom propre, ou à travers une identité collective choisie. Elle a aussi fait ressortir que de nombreux et nombreuses participant·e·s ne se sentaient pas très concernés par la dimension institutionnelle de l'autorat. La reconnaissance d'une autorité vécue semble s'être faite davantage dans des temps de forum en co-présence qu'à travers des publications éditées dans l'espace public ou scientifique. L'intérêt différencié pour l'auteurisation fait ressortir une complexité des rapports de pouvoirs qui ne sont pas seulement structurés par l'opposition entre personnes concernées directement par l'objet de recherche («l'empêchement à exercer ses droits») et celles s'intéressant pour des raisons professionnelles à cet objet (les chercheur·e·s académiques). Le positionnement par rapport aux reconnaissances des savoirs («scientifiques»/versus «profane»), aux différences origine d'un environnement handicapant (psycho-social, intellectuel, cognitif…) mais aussi par rapport aux modalités de participation (militantes versus non militantes) explique des modalités de participation, des intérêts, et un accès différencié à la reconnaissance d'un statut d'auteur. Enfin, on a pu fait ressortir le pouvoir central des responsables de la recherche-action-participative qui organisent de fait l'accès à l'espace public, participant ainsi d'une fonction d'éditeur incluant de fait ou non les participant·e·s aux pratiques éditoriales.

L'auteurisation collective à l'épreuve d'un article scientifique

Nous voudrions dans cette seconde partie approfondir la portée et les limites de l'enjeu d'auteurisation en prenant l'exemple de la réalisation et de la soumission d'un article qui n'a finalement pas été retenu par éditeurs et éditrices. À travers la question éditoriale, c'est l'articulation entre deux dimensions du processus d'auteurisation que nous souhaitons éclairer : d'une part la reconnaissance d'une forme d'authenticité énonciative, à savoir que ce qui est formulé dans un énoncé, dans un texte, est bien le fait d'une ou de personnes qui en reconnaissent l'origine; d'autre part celle d'une légitimité institutionnelle. Si les revues académiques sont loin d'être le seul vecteur de reconnaissance et de dissémination des données scientifiques, elles constituent un support central de ce qui est reconnu professionnellement comme scientifique. L'attribution et la distribution de l'autorat dans des revues académiques constituent un révélateur de la reconnaissance des savoirs et de la distribution des pouvoirs dans une recherche-action. Nous

évoquons d'abord le cadre et l'objet d'un projet d'article que nous avons soumis, portant sur une analyse de l'articulation radicale des savoirs à partir du concept de « polyphasie cognitive » ; nous analysons ensuite les enjeux soulevés par la signature de cet article avant de rendre compte de sa réception par la revue à laquelle il était soumis.

L'influence du contexte éditorial et de la temporalité collective

Le projet de cet article collectif a été initié à la suite d'une opportunité qui s'est présentée en 2019 d'écrire et soumettre un article pour une revue scientifique en sciences sociales préparant un numéro sur le thème « épistémologies radicales et recherches participatives ». Cette opportunité provenait de l'obtention par la démarche capdroits du « prix de la recherche participative », décerné conjointement par un organisme d'intérêt général, la Fondation de France, et celui d'un réseau scientifique, en l'occurrence le Groupement d'intérêt scientifique « Démocratie participative » du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS). En plus d'une récompense financière, le prix prévoyait une publication dans une revue de sciences sociales consacrée aux questions de participation. Co-lauréat de ce prix, nous avons donc été sollicités pour répondre à un appel à participation de cette revue sur la thématique « épistémologies radicales et recherches participatives »[11]. L'équipe de coordination de la recherche-action-participative a collectivement répondu favorablement, considérant qu'il s'agissait d'une opportunité intéressante pour elle de se saisir d'une compréhension commune de la démarche et de sa pratique. Il n'est pas proposé aux ancien·ne·s participant·e·s de la démarche (qui n'ont pas continué lors de la seconde phase d'être co-auteur·e·s), l'idée étant d'avoir une réflexion collective sur le travail mené par l'équipe de coordination. Pour certain·e·s membres, cet article était ainsi l'occasion d'avoir une réflexion collective permettant à cette coordination ayant travaillé pendant 2 ans ensemble de mieux se représenter la pratique qu'elle mettait en œuvre. Un résumé du projet d'article a été envoyé aux coordinateur·e·s de la revue, qui l'ont accepté. La planification du travail collectif est assurée par deux des co-auteur·e·s, qui sont par ailleurs chercheur·e·s académiques. Différentes séquences de travail sont prévues, tour à tour collectives au moment où nous élaborons ensemble les orientations du texte, et individuelles pour le travail de rédaction et de relecture. Un dossier spécifique est créé sur la boîte collective de partage numérique de la coordination, dans lequel un certain nombre de matériaux produits par la démarche sont rassemblés pour faire « corpus » et permettre à chacun d'en prendre connaissance et l'analyser. Après des échanges entre les deux chercheurs académiques, un temps de travail ouvert à tous

---

[11] Voici un extrait de la présentation du dossier dans l'appel à participation : « Ce dossier vise à faire état des recherches participatives contemporaines reposant sur ces épistémologies radicales, dont le positionnement politique, voire subversif, interroge les conceptions hégémoniques et les protocoles conventionnels de production de la science [...]. En mettant l'accent sur des démarches de coopération entre chercheur·e·s de carrière et chercheur·e·s non professionnel·le·s s'inscrivant dans une double perspective de pluralisme épistémologique et de lutte contre les oppressions, ce dossier contribuera à dresser un bilan des retombées de ces travaux au regard de leurs prétentions épistémologiques et politiques. » https://riuess.org/appel-a-contributions-pour-le-numero-epistemologies-radicales-et-recherches-participatives-de-la-revue-participations-pour-le-21-fevrier-2019/.

les autres membres de la coordination est organisé, portant sur la construction de l'orientation principale de l'article, de son argumentation et de son plan. L'idée d'ordonner des idées en « faisant un plan » n'est pas évidente pour ceux et celles d'entre nous peu habitué·e·s à cette pratique académique. Nous essayons de rendre accessible cette idée de plan comme succession logique d'idées, sans chercher à vérifier précisément l'appropriation de cet enjeu et de la compétence afférente par tous les co-auteur·e·s. D'autres temps de travail collectif sont proposés et jalonnés pour prendre en compte les points de vue permettant d'intègrer dans l'écrit des mots et des choses dites à l'oral et ainsi de favoriser la participation de toutes et tous à la production des idées et à l'écriture. Un corpus de matériaux déjà constitué est rassemblé par un chercheur académique et mis à disposition des autres co-auteur·e·s. Les co-auteur·e·s qui n'ont pas l'habitude de ce travail d'analyse ne l'utilisent toutefois pas. De nouveaux matériaux sont créés, l'une d'entre nous proposant de faire des entretiens avec d'autres co-auteur·e·s. Certains d'entre eux racontent l'article à celui des co-auteur·e·s qui ne sait pas lire ni écrire. Cette méthodologie pratique fait ressortir les différences d'habitude et d'apprentissage entre des chercheur·e·s académiques qui ont eu une formation très longue sur les pratiques d'écriture et d'articulation des idées, d'autres participants, spécialistes de la relation d'aide ou participant au titre de leur handicap, ayant eu des formations « intermédiaires » ; d'autres encore n'ayant pas été formés à l'écriture et à la publication écrite.

L'appropriation collective d'un concept : l'exemple de la « polyphasie cognitive »

Au regard de la problématique du numéro de revue, l'orientation est proposée par deux chercheurs académiques d'analyser la démarche au prisme du concept de « polyphasie cognitive ». Le concept est amené par celui qui est issu du champ de la psychologie sociale pour nommer la manière dont, dans notre travail collectif, plusieurs savoirs cohabitent, s'articulent, s'utilisent à différents moments du travail de la recherche. Ce chercheur évoque puis intègrera différentes références sur ce concept : issu de la théorie des représentations sociales (Moscovici 1976), il explique la co-existence de la logique de sens commun inscrite dans les expériences sensibles et situées des sujets et des groupes, et ceux de la rationalité scientifique (Jodelet 2015) il permet de rendre compte de l'alternance des courants de pensée que nous utilisons de manière alternative, comme un courant électrique polyphasé ; les différentes « longueur d'ondes » à travers lesquelles nous pensons et communiquons se situent à l'intérieur du groupe, mais également potentiellement à l'intérieur de chaque individu pouvant être détenteur du multitudes de savoirs.

Lors d'un temps de travail oral, on demande à chacune et chacun comment ce concept « résonne ». Un autre membre de la coordination, sociologue, initiateur de la démarche et de plusieurs recherches de financement pour celle-ci, en tâche dans la coordination de l'animer, concerné familialement par les mesures de contrainte légale, est séduit ; il comprend ce concept pour décrire la pluralité des savoirs « internes » à chaque membre de la coordination, mais aussi l'alternance entre des phases de compréhension et des phases d'opacité pour chacun·e dans les discussions collectives ; un autre membre de la coordination, âgé de 75 ans, diplômé d'éthique, vivant en hébergement d'urgence, amateur de la phénoménologie de Merleau-Ponty, contri-

buteur au rapport alternatif présenté au comité des droits de la CIDPH, militant pour la garantie des droits dans toute privation de liberté (conviction qui y était oubliée) et ayant publié un article très lu sur le site internet de l'espace éthique (Meile 2020), amène l'importance de «l'attention conjointe» pour signifier la coexistence des savoirs et le processus dialogique de pensée commune. Une autre participante qui se présente comme très touchée par les expériences du handicap psychique évoque la psychologie humaniste et les théoriciens de l'écoute (Rogers 2001) pour signifier que dans la démarche, ce qui est important, c'est le fait d'être écouté et pris en compte dans un processus de pensée collective. Un autre, en situation de handicap intellectuel insiste sur l'importance du dialogue. Une usagère-chercheure propose de faire des entretiens avec les différents membres de la coordination pour l'illustrer. Ce travail d'appropriation collective se fait parallèlement à l'avancée de l'écriture, continuité rédactionnelle assurée principalement par deux chercheur·e·s; une spécialiste de la relation d'aide s'impliquera également fortement dans la ré-écriture et le raccourcissement de l'article.

Plusieurs autres temps de travail collectifs autour de l'article sont proposés; le texte en cours d'écriture est dans la boîte partagée avec des envois réguliers au membre du groupe de travail qui ne se sentent pas à l'aise avec l'usage de cette boîte.

L'appropriation du projet d'article et de son propos sur la polyphasie cognitive présente dans la démarche Capdroits s'est ainsi faite par la mise en place d'un dispositif de travail articulant des temps où un «savoir de la pratique Capdroits» s'échange oralement et spontanément, des outils rendant accessible la production commune, et une explicitation des références de chacune et chacun.

Le refus d'autorat comme existence d'un pouvoir

À la suite de ce travail d'appropriation collective s'est posée la question de la signature de l'article. Au-delà du processus d'auteurisation personnelle, conduisant à reconnaître un produit comme étant le sien, l'auteurisation collective implique de se reconnaître dans un produit ayant été en grande partie produit par d'autres et avec d'autres, et soulève le problème d'un partage colectif d'un pouvoir, des rétributions possibles et de responsabilités. Différents usages existent dans la littérature scientifique conduisant par exemple à plus ou moins ouvrir la signature de l'article à celles et ceux qui ont permis directement ou indirectement sa production (Pontille 2008). Dans le cadre de ce projet d'article, il avait été convenu qu'il serait ouvert aux membres de la coordination de la démarche. Puis, quelques jours avant la date butoir, la question de la signature est posée à l'ensemble des membres de la coordination[12].

Sur les 14 membres de la coordination, 8 ont réagi à la proposition de signature collective dans la semaine qui a suivi. Les courriels révèlent le sentiment de non-reconnaissance «interne» de membres de la coordination avec la rédaction de l'article.

---

[12] Voici la formulation de la question par courriel : «Voici comme convenu l'article ‹radicalité épistémologique et polyphasie cognitive› dont nous avons assuré la rédaction avec Ad, à partir des analyses en groupe de travail et des matériaux partagés par les uns et les autres. [...]Merci de nous indiquer d'ici lundi soir si vous êtes d'accord pour co-signer[...]. Nous proposons que la signature fasse apparaître un double registre de savoirs, comme nous l'avions fait au moment du manifeste. Nous pouvons reprendre les titres qui avaient été alors mobilisés par les uns et les autres ou indiquer une autre manière de se présenter.[...].»

Une membre de la coordination, qui a une formation en sociologie et en gérontologie, qui est aujourd'hui mandataire à la protection des majeurs, explique dans un courriel : *« Je dois avouer que la lecture m'a été difficile car il y a beaucoup de notions qui ne me sont pas familières. »*

Une «usagère-chercheuse» membre de la coordination, marquée dans sa formation il y a une vingtaine d'année par la psychothérapie institutionnelle, exprime de fortes critiques vis-à-vis de l'article :

> *En réponse au mail de Bt de ce matin, je ne suis pas d'accord pour être co-auteure de l'article : «Radicalité épistémologique et polyphasie cognitive» parce que comme le dit très justement Bd «on est dans la novlangue» et je ne me reconnais pas du tout dans ce qui est dit : Ça ne me parle pas, je n'y trouve pas l'engagement dans la démarche Capdroits qui est la mienne ni la nature de mon investissement et de mon implication en tant qu'usagère-chercheure et il y a des asymétries dans le rapport au savoir que je ne suis pas en capacité de m'approprier ; pourtant, j'ai des velléités élitistes mais là, cela dépasse l'entendement !![…]» Cela ne répond pas à mes questions légitimes à mon sens entre symétrisation des savoirs entre chercheurs, travailleurs sociaux et usagers, la voix des usagers n'est pas dépeinte dans la particularité et la singularité de son engagement et au nom d'une objectivation scientiste, on est dans la déperdition de sens, les usagers sont noyés dans une terminologie peu accessible et obscure et dans laquelle et je ne pense pas me tromper, ils ne peuvent se reconnaître ni les uns, ni les autres. Je me pose en outre la question : «quelle est la nature de l'objectivation des savoirs ? En quoi est-elle plus légitime ou plus légitimable que le savoir expérientiel qui sous-tend cette analyse ? Où sont passés les usagers et la revendication de leurs droits à la parole ? Et leurs intérêts pour la démarche qui est à la source de ce travail ? Il devrait en fait y avoir premièrement l'appréhension des usagers-chercheurs sur la teneur de la démarche, deuxièmement l'approche des travailleurs sociaux et dans un troisième temps seulement, une analyse des chercheurs qui reprendraient le discours des uns et des autres pour qu'il y ait une réelle symétrisation des savoirs et un fonctionnement à 3 voix selon une démarche qui serait alors celle d'une réelle «polyphasie cognitive» au lieu de quoi il y a une sur-représentation du discours des chercheurs académiques dans un magma indigeste et peu recevable. Il n'y a pas selon moi dans les faits de «radicalités épistémologiques» à l'œuvre dans ce travail mais juste l'unisson du discours des chercheurs et leurs interprétations de la démarche Capdroits.*
>
> *Voilà, c'est «mon coup de gueule» mais j'imagine qu'il est partagé par les usagers qui ne se reconnaîtraient pas dans le texte proposé pour le peu d'importance qu'on fait de leur histoire et cas particulier.*
>
> *Donc, pas d'apposition de mon nom à cet article.*

Certains ne souhaitaient pas se considérer comme auteur·e·s du fait de leur impossibilité à pouvoir intervenir directement dans l'écriture, notamment à cause de leurs contraintes professionnelles. Le temps disponible pour pouvoir travailler à la rédaction d'un article n'est pas le même entre les différents groupes d'habitude, ce qui a pu générer des frustrations et des sentiments d'exclusion et d'injustice forts qui nécessitent des temps de régulation collective. Cela s'est exprimé

par des sentiments d'être en dehors du processus d'élaboration des connaissances. Une membre de la coordination, spécialiste de la relation d'aide et diplômée d'un master en sociologie, écrit :

> *Qui écrit l'article ? Comment rendre compte des mots, des codes, des schèmes de pensées de l'ensemble des groupes d'habitude afin de retraduire cette polyphonie ? Comment traduire et ainsi passer de l'oral à l'écrit ou autrement dit : comment passer de la polyphonie à la polygraphie ? Voilà une belle limite de la radicalité dont nous parlons.*

> *Il y a des disparités réelles dans les possibilités d'écrire, de rendre compte entre les individus. Quels moyens pouvons-nous développer pour le prendre en compte ?*

> *Cette radicalité est d'autant plus saillante que probablement elle est accrue par les injonctions de publication des revues dites scientifiques ? Qu'est ce qui est acceptable ? Faut-il retraduire les savoirs non académiques dans un langage académique pour être admissible dans le monde de la recherche ? [...]*

> *Suis-je auteure de cet article ?*

> *Je suis actrice de la polyphonie qui l'a rendu possible.*

> *Je suis à l'origine d'un certain nombre d'idées ou de réflexions qui sont mises en avant dans l'article.*

> *Je suis auteure de quelques phrases qui sont reprises.*

> *Mais suis-je auteure de cet article ? Je ne me suis pas impliquée dans cette polygraphie… Alors, je n'en ai pas le sentiment.*

La place du savoir universitaire dans la pratique de l'écriture de cet article et la difficulté à rendre compte de la diversité des savoirs a été évoqué par une autre membre de la coordination, professionnelle de la relation d'aide :

> *En effet, comment transmettre des savoirs de divers horizons au prisme d'une écriture relevant plutôt de la forme, des concepts, du vocabulaire… émanant du champ de la recherche académique ?*

Une autre membre psychosociologue de notre coordination va aussi dans ce sens :

> *Pour moi, cet article est tout ce que vous en dites : pas assez accessible sans aucun doute, donc excluant c'est vrai, mais aussi intéressant, peut-être pas tout à fait sorti du magma issu de notre polyphasie, même si je trouve qu'il a bien progressé en clarté (ou alors c'est à force de le relire ?). Et même s'il est vrai qu'en (re)lisant j'ai été tentée, moi aussi, par une version en écriture simplifiée.*

À voir les réactions et discussions autour de cet article, si j'osais…, en fait j'ose : je dirais en termes de «polyphonie» pour le coup, que nous n'avons pas tous la même partition ; autrement dit, je suis d'accord avec S. : comment traduire et passer de l'oral à l'écrit compte tenu de la disparité de nos savoirs et de l'exigence éditoriale des revues ?

Comment faire pour que chacun trouve sa trace/place dans un écrit (y compris les professionnels qui ont certainement beaucoup à dire) ? Une composition ? Le faut-il toujours ?

Les échanges autour de la question de la signature de l'article révèlent une complexité des rapports de pouvoir à l'œuvre. Il est possible d'interpréter les non-signatures comme une forme d'exclusion suscitée par un texte trop peu accessible. Il est aussi possible de voir dans ces refus de signature une forme de prise de pouvoir sur la nature de la démarche collective, mais aussi dans les rapports internes à l'activité de coordination, et plus largement sur l'intérêt du champ des publications scientifiques pour des personnes qui ne sont pas directement intéressées par ce type de rétribution symbolique.

À la suite de ces discussions, il est proposé d'ajourner la question des signatures à des modifications qui pourront être faites à la suite de l'examen par les pairs externes de la revue. La question de la signature du projet d'article ne sera plus posée, du moins, pour l'article se centrant sur la question des «radicalités épistémologiques» : les coordinateurs du numéro nous ont finalement indiqué un refus de publication du texte par la revue, les différents contributeur·ice·s n'étant dès lors de fait pas reconnus institutionnellement comme co-auteur·e·s d'un texte ayant une valeur scientifique.

Le refus de publication comme révélateur du pouvoir académique et éditorial

Ce refus par une revue de sciences sociales ayant pour objet «les participations» nous permet d'approfondir l'enjeu de la reconnaissance institutionnelle de participant·e·s à des recherche-action-participative comme auteur·e·s. Cette revue est organisée autour d'un comité éditorial qui confie la coordination de numéros à des chercheur·e·s qu'il reconnaît comme crédible sur une thématique donnée. Conformément aux pratiques du champ académique, les articles proposés sont soumis à la relecture d'examinateur·rice·s anonymes. Un·e des examinateur·rice·s du projet d'article soulignait la nécessité de modifications majeures, l'autre indiquait un refus. L'analyse des évaluations réalisées par les examinateur·rice·s sont éclairantes.

L'examinateur·rice qui propose un refus insiste sur le fait que la «recension de la littérature» serait «très faible», notamment à propos des «épistémologies radicales» et du concept de «polyphasie cognitive». Cette personne évoque également une «problématisation moyenne/faible», «l'article présentant des analyses importantes de cette démarche, mais la problématisation de l'article est insuffisante» ; il ou elle considère également que le «point principal, à savoir que la «démarche mettrait en scène une polyphasie des savoirs n'est pas établie, faute d'argumentation». Ces appréciations soulignent l'insuffisance scientifique de l'article. L'examinateur·rice propose une piste d'explication de la difficulté :

Une piste que je soumets aux auteur·e·s est que la méthodologie de Capdroits pourrait être pertinente pour produire des travaux de l'ordre du forum, mais trouverait ses limites dans l'exercice de l'écriture d'un article académique (d'où les incompréhensions et les départs de certaines personnes à cette occasion) ; il conviendrait alors d'en analyser finement les raisons.

Au-delà des qualités reconnues insuffisantes du projet d'article, le refus du comité éditorial et les commentaires des examinateur·e·s est éclairant des difficultés du monde académique à reconnaître le format de production de connaissance proposé par les rédacteur·e·s.

Cet article est très perturbant. S'il n'est clairement pas publiable en l'état, on ne peut s'empêcher de se balancer entre deux idées :

1) il n'est pas publiable du tout, du fait de sa problématique centrale (l'impossibilité des auteur·e·s à… l'écrire!)

2) Il mériterait une nouvelle chance, car il soulève un problème important dans le cadre des débats sur les «épistémologies radicales».

Il est intéressant de noter que la pluralité des points de vue présentés dans l'article est reçu comme une «impossibilité des auteur·e·s à écrire l'article». L'analyse théorique proposée, à partir du concept de «polyphasie cognitive» pour rendre compte du processus de production plurielle n'est pas discutée par le reviewer, qui disqualifie l'article en considérant qu'il «n'est pas écrit». Il reconnaît toutefois la pertinence du problème soulevé et justifie de manière alambiquée la nouvelle chance qui pourrait être donnée à cette contribution (ce qui ne sera pas retenue par les coordinateur·ice·s du numéro) :

[Il faudrait] «exposer le sens de ‹l'épistémologie radicale› dans le papier : il s'agit clairement de rompre avec une production scientifique «par les pairs pour les pairs». Et d'ailleurs, pourquoi continuer à communiquer ? On pourrait imaginer qu'un acte de «radicalité épistémologique» se conclue par le refus des arènes classiques de la science normale, privilégiant la force transformatrice et émancipatrice des savoirs produits (peu importe leur publication formelle, ces savoirs jouent leur épistème ailleurs, dans leur capacité à émanciper). S'agit-il d'une condition d'existence du projet (notamment vis-à-vis des financeurs) ? S'agit-il d'une volonté des chercheur·e·s en rupture d'aller faire la démonstration de la force de leur choix épistémologiques ?

Imaginant que la «radicalité épistémologique» consisterait à refuser «les arènes classiques de la science normale», il disqualifie l'invitation qui nous a été faite de réfléchir en mobilisant des outils de la «science normale». Il n'est pas question ici de rediscuter cette question de la «radicalité épistémologique» de la démarche mais d'éclairer les enjeux de pouvoirs inhérents au processus d'auteurisation. Ce refus soulève la question des frontières entre le domaine dit scientifique et le domaine public et citoyen. L'examinateur·e·s laisse entendre que tous les

contributeur·ice·s de l'article soumis ne sont pas des pairs au sens académique du terme. Il/elle dessine une frontière entre la pairitude scientifique et la pairitude citoyenne. Il/elle nous rappelle que la pairitude scientifique se construit par des formes de co-habilitation reposant sur des critères institutionnels.

Le partage de l'autorat comme co-habilitation scientifique et citoyenne

Ces réserves qui ont justifié un refus de publication par les coordinateur·ice·s du numéro de revue nous ont obligé à reprendre collectivement notre réflexion sur le processus d'auteurisation avant de nous lancer dans une nouvelle tentative d'écriture collective, en approfondissant l'enjeu de l'articulation entre autorité énonciative et autorité institutionnelle, et en éclairant ainsi le lien entre les dimensions scientifique et citoyenne de l'auteurisation. L'un des co-auteur·e·s, chercheur académique, initiateur de la démarche, a partagé sous une forme écrite ses réponses aux questions posées par les examinateur·e·s :

> *Pourquoi écrire des articles scientifiques dans la recherche Capdroits ? Ces questions me semblent importantes, mais je suis gêné par les réponses induites par les examinateurs. Certes, il est utile de pouvoir montrer que des articles ont été publiés dans le cadre de la recherche de financements ; la démarche ne manque cependant pas d'article dans différentes revues ou livres collectifs. Certes, les publications scientifiques sont plus utiles dans le CV d'un chercheur académique que dans le CV d'un travailleur social ou d'un expert d'expérience ; elles constituent une attente pour les carrières professionnelles académiques ; l'apport d'un article collectif n'est cependant pas déterminant. Plus largement, je ne me sens pas en rupture dans le champ académique. Pour moi, l'écriture et la publication d'un article dans une revue académique n'est pas seulement un exercice académique. À mes yeux, le travail d'écriture participe d'une plus grande intelligibilité de ce que nous faisons collectivement. Cette intelligibilité est d'abord interne. Les règles académiques apportent une exigence de questionnement qui est utile à tous les participants de la démarche. Je considère également que cette intelligibilité mérite d'être partagée avec d'autres, d'être rendue publique.*

Un autre des co-auteur·e·s, qui ne peut ni lire ni écrire évoque « sa fierté » de participer à un « faire » collectif et que son expérience puisse être utile pour les autres. Il conditionne sa signature au fait que ses propos ne soient pas trahis dans leur transcription écrite. Il insiste sur le fait qu'il ne se sent pas « auteur » de l'article mais bien « co-auteur » :

> *Moi, je ne peux pas écrire, mais ce sont mes mots à moi que tu écris aussi… c'est pour cela, je préfère co-auteur.*

Dans cette mise au travail, une autre d'entre nous, se reconnaissant en handicap psycho-social, soulève une nouvelle fois les difficultés d'appropriation du texte pour des personnes en situation de handicap :

Quelles sont les intérêts des personnes en situation de handicap à se mobiliser pour des publications qui parlent d'elles ? et j'aurai cette forme de réponse qui consiste à dire qu'elles vivent dans l'urgence de résoudre leurs problèmes au quotidien, qu'ils n'ont pas le loisir de « penser leurs problèmes », à défaut de les « panser » ils sont dans l'urgence de trouver des alternatives ou solutions concrètes, dans une forme de survie existentielle, sautillant de démarche en démarche, cahin-caha.

Mais elle reconnaît aussi l'importance pour elle de signer un texte dont elle ne tirera pas un « intérêt académique », mais qui donne sens à son engagement :

Parce que j'y crois. C'est le prix à payer pour sortir de notre ghetto et de notre ghettoisation. Pour que le nivellement se fasse par le haut, et non par le bas.

Un accord existe sur le fait que les publications académiques peuvent être utiles aux chercheur·e·s académiques présents dans la démarche, mais aussi à l'ensemble de la démarche. S'il ne s'agit pas d'une condition d'existence directe du projet, ces publications académiques peuvent avoir un intérêt économique indirect ; elles constituent surtout de fait une réception par les pairs, qui peut aussi être signifiante par d'autres pairs, non pas ceux du monde académique, mais celles et ceux se reconnaissant dans l'importance d'une pratique commune de recherche, à visée inclusive et citoyenne.

Autrement dit, la revendication de la reconnaissance d'une autorité énonciative passe non pas seulement par l'accès à un espace de débat, mais bien à la reconnaissance institutionnelle, en l'occurrence académique, d'un apport substantiel de la démarche de recherche action participative aux savoirs sur l'exercice des droits.

Conclusions

À travers l'analyse de l'auteurisation dans la recherche-action-participative Capdroits, cet article a soulevé trois questionnements principaux, à savoir celui des modalités publiques et scientifiques de reconnaissance des savoirs expérientiels de personnes, celui des rapports de pouvoirs entre les productrices et producteurs de savoirs, ainsi que celui des redéfinitions des frontières entre pratique scientifique et citoyenne.

L'analyse des modalités concrètes d'accès à l'espace public et scientifique des différents participant·e·s de la recherche-action nous a permis de montrer la portée et les limites de la reconnaissance des différents savoirs partagés. Certes, l'émergence de la démarche Capdroits comme cadrage spécifique des difficultés à exercer et faire valoir ses droits existant à travers des participations à des scènes de forums et des publications constitue en elle-même une preuve des effets de la reconnaissance de l'expérience de personnes empêchées dans l'exercice de leurs droits. Mais l'analyse de la dynamique d'auteurisation en a aussi souligné les limites. Beaucoup de participant·e·s n'ont pas vu l'intérêt d'auteuriser leur expérience et se sont retirés à bas bruit. Au regard de cette difficulté, l'enjeu n'est pas seulement de rendre accessible l'espace public mais de rendre suffisamment intéressant le fait d'y participer. En ce sens, nous avons montré

combien l'auteurisation collective pouvait aussi donner du sens à une reconnaissance d'autorat qui pour plusieurs d'entre nous n'a pas d'intérêt en elle-même.

L'analyse nous a permis d'éclairer les intérêts disparates dans la pratique d'auteurisation et la complexité des rapports de pouvoirs engagés. L'autorat constitue une forme de reconnaissance et de rétribution centrale dans les publications scientifiques dont la signification et l'intérêt est très différenciée selon que les contributeur·rice·s ont ou aspirent à une carrière académique professionnelle (Sarna-Wojcicki et al. 2018). Toutefois, les rapports de pouvoir ne sont pas seulement structurés par l'opposition entre personnes concernées directement par l'objet de recherche («l'empêchement à exercer ses droits») et celles s'intéressant pour des raisons professionnelles à cet objet. Le positionnement par rapport aux reconnaissances différenciées des savoirs («scientifiques»/versus «profane»), aux types de handicap (psycho-social, intellectuel, cognitif ...) mais aussi par rapport aux modalités de participation (militantes versus non militantes) explique des modalités de participation, des intérêts, et un accès différencié à la reconnaissance d'un statut d'auteur·e. L'analyse a souligné l'importance du refus de signer comme prise de pouvoir dans le sens où ce type de refus explicite que la rétribution constituée par une signature a des significations très différenciées selon la position sociale des potentiel·le·s signataires. La possibilité véritable de refuser de signer donne inversement sens à une co-auteurisation qui ne soit pas seulement formelle mais qui dit la diversité des contributions nécessaires à la production d'un énoncé porteur d'autorité.

L'analyse d'une tentative de publication scientifique a permis de faire ressortir l'enjeu central de la dimension collective de l'auteurisation. En effet, nous avons vu combien l'usage de concepts issus du savoir scientifique a été producteur d'incompréhension, de sentiment d'étrangéité. S'approprier des concepts scientifiques, comme «épistémologie» ou «polyphasie cognitive», a été difficile, jugés étranges et hermétiques ou participant·e·s à la «novlangue». La question de l'écriture, et plus précisément le rapport entre les savoirs oraux et la pratique de l'écriture a permis d'éclairer les rapports de pouvoir à partir des tensions suscitées dans notre travail collectif et participatif. La rédaction scientifique fait ressortir comment l'écriture peut renvoyer à une forme de «domestication de la pensée; ou de réification de la pensée rompant «[...] avec la pensée et le langage habituels auxquels nous avons affaire et que nous employons» dans la vie quotidienne (Moscovici 1976). Cette pratique de l'écriture a sensiblement réactualisé des rapports de pouvoir.

Cette analyse de l'auteurisation collective a aussi fait ressortir l'importance de l'accès à des publications comme légitimation à prendre position (Ebersold 2019) quant à sa participation ou non à l'espace public et scientifique de discussion. Elle a également souligné l'ambivalence de la participation à une pratique considérée comme «élitiste» qui peut avoir des effets émancipatoires en tant que reconnaissance «par le haut» des expériences mais peut aussi susciter un rapport d'étrangeté et d'opacité actualisant des sentiments de non-reconnaissance.

Références

Albrecht, Gary, Jean-François Ravaud, et Jacques-Henri Stiker. 2001. «L'émergence des disability studies : état des lieux et perspectives.» *Sciences sociales et santé 19*(4) : 43–73. http:doi. org/10.3406/sosan.2001.1535

d'Arripe, Agnès, Cédric Routier, Jean-Philippe Cobbaut, Mireille Tremblay, et Lydie Lenne. 2015. «Faire de la recherche ‹avec› les personnes déficientes intellectuelles : changement de paradigme ou utopie ?» *Sciences & Actions Sociales* 1 : 73–91.

Beresford Peter. 2013. «From ‹Other› to Involved: User Involvement in Research: An Emerging Paradigm.» *Nordic Social Work Research 3*(2): 139–148. http :doi.org/10.1080/2156857X.2013.835138

Béal Arnaud, Florie Vuattoux, Nacerdine Bezghiche, et Benoît Eyraud. 2018. «Le projet ‹Capdroits› ou comment la recherche en sciences sociales peut-elle participer à l'amélioration de l'exercice des droits de personnes en situation de handicap.» *Cliniques Juridiques* 2. https://www.cliniques-ju-ridiques.org/?p=404

Bérard Yan, Renaud Crespin. 2010, «Objet flou, frontières vives. L'expertise entre savoirs et pouvoirs.» In *Aux frontières de l'expertise, Dialogues entre savoirs et pouvoirs,* dirigé par Yan Bérard et Renaud Crespin, 15–31. Rennes : Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Callier, Durrell, Dominique Hill, and Hill Waters. 2017. «Critical Collaborative Performance Autoethnography: Reflecting on Collective Practice, Black Girlhood, Black Love and Accountability». In *Doing Autoethnography,* dirigé par Sandra Pensoneau-Conway, Tony Adams et Terek Bolen, 37–44. Amsterdam: SensePublishers.

Borkman, Thomasina. 1976. «Experiential Knowledge: A New Concept for the Analysis of Self-Help Groups.» *Social Service Review 50*(3): 445–456.

Facilitateurs-chercheur·e·s de la démarche Capdroits. 2022 (à paraître). «D'une démarche de recherche citoyenne portant sur l'exercice des droits comme sociothérapie instituante ?» In *Sociologie des pratiques coopératives et participatives en santé*, dirigé par Marie Santos et Denise Thomas.

Co-chercheur·e·s Capdroits. 2021. «Une recherche citoyenne sur l'article 12 de la convention de l'ONU sur les droits des personnes handicapées.» *Alter,* Revue européenne de recherche sur le handicap.

Co-chercheur·e·s de la démarche Capdroits. 2019. «Du partage d'expérience à la signature d'un manifeste sur l'exercice des droits : Les formes d'engagement dans la recherche citoyenne Capdroits». Vie sociale 27(3) : 135–151. https://doi-org.bibelec.univ-lyon2.fr/10.3917/vsoc.193.0135

Comité des droits des personnes handicapées, ONU. 2014. «Observation générale n° 1».

Ebersold, Serge. 2019. «La grammaire de l'accessibilité.», *Education et société 2*(44) : 29–47. https:// doi-org.bibelec.univ-lyon2.fr/10.3917/es.044.0029

Escobar, Arturo, et Eduardo Restrepo. 2010. «Anthropologies hégémoniques et colonialite.» *Cahiers des Amériques latines* 62 : 83–95. https://doi-org.bibelec.univ-lyon2.fr/10.4000/cal.1550

Eyraud, Benoît, Julie Minoc, et Cécile Hanon. 2018. *Choisir et agir pour autrui ? Controverse autour de la Convention de l'ONU relative aux droits des personnes handicapées,* Paris : Doin.

Eyraud, Benoît, Sébastien Saetta, Iuliia Taran, et Jean-Philippe Cobbaut. 2018. «La participation des personnes en situation de handicap au débat démocratique : retours sur une démarche collaborative autour de la CDPH.» *Participations 22*(3) : 109–138. https://doi-org.bibelec.univ-lyon2. fr/10.3917/parti.022.0109

Fougeyrollas, Patrick, Norman Boucher, David Fiset, Yan Grenier, Luc Noreau, Mathieu Philibert, Hubert Gascon, Ernesto Morales, et Francis Charrier. 2015. «Handicap, environnement, participation sociale et droits humains : du concept d'accès à sa mesure.» Développement Humain, Handicap et Changement Social / Human Development, Disability, and Social Change, 5–28. https://doi.org/10.7202/1086792ar

Frega, Roberto. 2013. «L'épistémologie des dominés.» *Critique 12*(799) : 978–991.

Fricker, Miranda. 2007, Epistemic Injustice, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Godrie, Baptiste. 2021. «Intégration des usagers et usagères et extractivisme des savoirs expérientiels : Une critique ancrée dans le modèle écologique des savoirs dans le champ de la santé mentale.» *Participations 30 :* 249–273.

Jeanne, Yves, Jennifer Fournier Jennifer, et Germain Couture. 2019. «Faire de la recherche avec et pour des personnes ayant une déficience intellectuelle : Construction d'un programme de formation visant à faciliter leur accès à la sexualité et à la vie amoureuse.» La nouvelle revue – Éducation et société inclusives 87 : 223–239.

Jodelet, Denise. 2015. Représentations sociales et mondes de vie. Paris : Éditions des Archives contemporaines.

Leclerc, Gérard. 1996. *Histoire de l'autorité : L'assignation des énoncés culturels et la généalogie de la croyance.* Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

Love, Harold. 2002. Attributing Autorship: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meile, Bernard. 2020. «Plaidoyer ... après la pandémie.» Espace éthique/Ile-de-France. https://www.espace-ethique.org/ressources/article/plaidoyer-apres-la-pandemie-cohesion-sociale-et-fichiers-psychiatriques

Moscovici, Serge. 1976. *La psychanalyse, son image et son public.* Paris : PUF.

Oliver, Mike. 1992. «Changing the social relations of research production?» *Disability, Handicap & Society 7*(2): 101–114.

Ollerton, Janice, and Dabie Horsfall. 2013. «Rights to research: Utilising the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities as an inclusive participatory action research tool.» *Disability and Society 28*(5), 616–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.717881

Pontille, Denis. 2008. «Écologies de la signature en France». *Sociétés et représentations 1*(25): 137–156.

Rogers, Carl. 2001. *L'approche centrée sur la personne*. Lausanne: Randin.

Sarna-Wojcicki, Daniel, Margaret Perret, Melissa Eitzel, Melissa, et Louise Fortmann. 2018. «Où sont passée·s les coauteurs·trices : Les pratiques d'autorat dans la recherche participative.» *Revue d'anthropologie des connaissances 12*(2), 323–360. https://doi-org.bibelec.univ-lyon2.fr/10.3917/rac.039.0323

Straughan, Heather. 2009. «Influencing Change: User or Researcher? Elitism in Research.» In *This is Survivor Research*, edited by Angela Sweeney, Peter Beresford, Alison Faulkner, Mary Nettle, and Diana Rose Diana, 148-162. Ross-on-Wye: PCSS Books.

Visvanathan, Shiv. 2016. «La quête de justice cognitive.» In Justice cognitive, libre accès et savoirs locaux. Pour une science ouverte juste, au service du développement local durable, dirigé par Florence Piron, Samuel Regulus, et Marie Sophie Dibounje Madiba. Québec: Science et bien commun. En ligne: https://scienceetbiencommun.pressbooks.pub/justicecognitive1

Zarb, Gerry. 1992. «On the Road to Damascus: First Steps Towards Changing the Relations of Disability Research Production». *Disability, Handicap & Society* 7(2), 125–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/02674649 266780161

Auteur·e·s

Benoît Eyraud 🆔 est maître de conférences habilité à diriger des recherches à l'UFR d'anthropologie, sociologie et sciences politiques de l'Université Lyon 2, et chercheur au Centre Max Weber (UMR 5283).

benoit.h.eyraud@gmail.com

ACS Capdroits

Université Lyon 2 et Centre Max Weber

Arnaud Béal 🆔 est psychologue et maître de conférences en psychologie à l'École de psychologues praticiens de l'Institut catholique de Paris. Il participe à la démarche Capdroits depuis 2017. Il étudie les représentations associées aux situations de vulnérabilité et s'intéresse tout particulièrement à la manière dont sont pensés et vécus les droits dans la vie quotidienne.

abeal@psycho-prat.fr

ACS Capdroits

Institut Catholique de Paris

Chantal Bruno a travaillé comme infirmière, psychologue social, formatrice dans le domaine du handicap ; elle est mère d'un enfant en situation de handicap et a publié *Mère d'un enfant handicapé, pourquoi moi?* en 2014 (Eres). Elle est co-présidente du réseau Coface Disability, administratrice à l'Unaf, membre du comité de pilotage de repairaidants, membre du CNCPH. Elle participe à la démarche Capdroits depuis 2016 et est membre de sa coordination.

confcap.capdroits@gmail.com

ACS Capdroits

Valérie Lemard est présidente de l'association Esqui, rassemblant des personnes ayant l'expérience de troubles psychiques ; formée en sociologie et en sciences de l'éducation, elle a été assistante de vie scolaire. Elle participe à la démarche Capdroits depuis 2016

lemardvalerie63@gmail.com

ACS Capdroits

Jacques Lequien est retraité d'ESAT où il a travaillé pendant 40 ans. Membre de la section des usagers d'Hénin-Beaumont, il est facilitateur-chercheur et membre de la coordination Capdroits depuis 2016.

jacques62110@gmail.com

ACS Capdroits

Isabel Miranda est armée de deux devises «Sapere Aude» et «savoir, c'est pouvoir». Elle fait de la formation, de l'accès à l'information le fil rouge de sa carrière professionnelle. Professeure des écoles puis assistante sociale et enfin curatrice, elle mêle depuis près de 25 ans pratiques professionnelles, activités associatives et démarches de réflexion et de recherche.

amae.mjpm@gmail.com

ACS Capdroits

«WO IST DEINE EIFERSUCHT? WO IST DEINE RELIGION?»

Emotionsmanagement in polygynen salafitischen Partnerschaften

Mira Menzfeld

Zusammenfassung

Glauben, religiös-moralische Imperative und religiöse Handlungsintuitionen können Glaubenden Distanzierungen und Neubewertungen von Gefühlen und Impulsen eröffnen und nahelegen. Religiöse Normen und Prinzipien dienen dann unter Umständen zugleich als Leitlinien und als Mittel, um Gefühle einzuschätzen, umzudeuten, zu verändern oder zu dämpfen. Indem ich Begriffe, Einordnungen und Modifikationen von «protektiver» und «destruktiver» Eifersucht unter polygyn lebenden deutschschweizer Salafis darlege, werde ich im Folgenden skizzieren, wie solche religiös-moralischen Normen das intrapersonelle und das nahbeziehungsbezogene Emotionsmanagement beeinflussen können. Ich begreife das salafitische Angebot an Strategien zur Affektevaluation als einen ebenso unterschätzten wie wichtigen Attraktionsfaktor, der Salafis an ihrem Glauben anzieht und in ihm verwurzelt. Emotionsregulationsstrategien sind eine wichtige Facette jener vielfältigen Mittelbarkeiten und Nähe-Distanz-Auslotungen, die salafitische Religiositäten wesentlich ausmachen.

"WHERE IS YOUR JEALOUSY? WHERE IS YOUR RELIGION?" EMOTION MANAGEMENT IN POLYGYNOUS SALAFI RELATIONSHIPS

Abstract

Faith, ethical-religious imperatives, and religious intuitions evoke intense feelings. They may also enable various ways of distancing from and re-evaluating individual opinions and impulses. Believers may resort to internalized religious norms and principles of faith to evaluate strong feelings, modify them, and/or filter them. In this article, I examine understandings, evaluations and modifications of potentially "protective" or "poisonous" jealousy that I witnessed among Swiss-German Salafis who live in polygynous relationships. I show how religious-moral norms can guide intrapersonal as well as relationship-related emotional management. I thus identify Salafism's capacity to offer evaluative tools for emotional balancing as one of the important yet underestimated motivations for becoming a Salafi Muslim. Strategies for emotional regulation are an important facet of the several negotiations between distance and closeness that are characteristic of Salafism at large.

Seismo

Einleitung

Ein wesentlicher Aspekt menschlichen Handelns ist es, Emotionen hervorzurufen, abzurufen und zu kanalisieren. Das gilt auch und gerade für religiöse Kontexte: Zum Beispiel im Fall der kontemporären mitteleuropäischen Salafiyya, mit der sich der vorliegende Text näher befassen wird. Viele Salafis[1] realisieren religiös konnotierte Gefühlsregulationsangebote in Form einer bewussten Zwischenschaltung religiös-moralischer Evaluationen von Affekten und Stimmungen, der sie sich regelmässig im Alltag widmen, die aber besonders konzentriert vollzogen wird, wenn sich intensive Gefühle jedweder Art ankündigen. Diese Zwischenschaltung kann inter- und/oder intrapersonell ablaufen, im Austausch mit anderen oder im Stillen erfolgen. Sie referiert aber auch im Fall eines vornehmlich intrapersonellen Vollzugs stets auf einen als gottgewollt interpretierten Normenkanon, und erstrebt das Wohlwollen einer göttlichen Instanz.

Eine solche religiös inspirierte Emotionsevaluation ist darum grundsätzlich triangulativ: Sie bezieht sich zumindest vorübergehend explizit auf etwas Extrinsisches, und mindestens die angenommene Gottesgegenwart ist das Gegenüber. In diesem Artikel möchte ich anhand eines Fallbeispiels aus einer polygynen salafitischen Ehe aufzeigen, wie solche Emotionstriangulationen im Falle protektiver und destruktiver Eifersucht stattfinden können.

Es ist zunächst keine originale Einsicht, dass Glauben, Gefühle[2] und Moral eng zusammenhängen. So zeigte beispielsweise Julia Cassaniti (2014) die enge Verwobenheit religiös-moralischer Bewertungen, Emotionsbewertungen, gezeigter Emotionen und Gefühlsintensitäten in Thailand auf. Cassaniti charakterisiert dabei Gefühle als wesentlich für das Verstehen von religiösem Erleben und von Alltagsmoral; Emotionen betrachtet sie in ihrer Analyse erwähnenswerterweise "less as the underpinning of moral judgments and more as objects of moral assessments" (Cassaniti 2014, 280). Hierbei klingt an, was anderswo zum Beispiel (Röttger-Rössler et al. 2015; Röttger-Rössler und Markowitsch 2009) als *feeling rules* (Röttger-Rössler et al. 2015, 187) adressiert wird: Bestimmte Normen oder Leitlinien, die besagen, welche Gefühle in welcher Intensität erwünscht oder unerwünscht beziehungsweise allgemein moralisch vertretbar sind. Solche *feeling rules* können sich unter anderem in *display rules* (Röttger-Rössler et al. 2015, 189) – also: wie, wann und warum zeige ich idealerweise wem welche Gefühle

---

[1] Als salafitisch bezeichnete Gruppierungen und Personen im deutschsprachigen Raum umfassen ein weites Spektrum islamischer Ausrichtungen. Die allen gemeinsame enge Orientierung an den *salaf salih,* d. h. den ersten Generationen der Muslime, und ihr Bestreben, zu einem «reinen» Islam zurückzukehren, führen zu von Gruppe zu Gruppe unterschiedlichen Glaubens- und Lebensvorstellungen sowie zu verschiedenen religiösen und politischen Praktiken (Meijer 2009). Diese Unterschiede rühren u. a. daher, dass die jeweiligen Vorstellungen von einem authentischen und reinen Islam der Frühzeit divergieren (Wagemakers 2012). Dezidiert salafitische Themen und Motive sind die intensive Beschäftigung mit Loyalität und Lossagung im Alltag, die intensive (und verschiedentlich ausgestaltete) Suche nach authentischen Handlungen im Sinne der religiösen Gründergenerationen, die Betonung literalistischer Auslegungen von qur'anischen und hadithbezogenen Grundlagen, sowie die jeweils strömungsspezifischen Verständnisse von Glauben und Unglauben (Wagemakers 2018; Damir-Geilsdorf, Hedider und Menzfeld 2019).

[2] Siehe bspw. Skoggard und Waterston (2015) zu Möglichkeiten und Grenzen von Feinunterscheidungen der Begriffe Emotionen, Empfindungen, Stimmungen, Gefühle, etc. Im Rahmen des vorliegenden Artikels verwende ich Termini wie «Gefühl» und «Emotion» austauschbar, da dies einerseits dem Sprachgebrauch meiner salafitischen GesprächspartnerInnen entspricht, und da andererseits eine analytische Differenzierung in diesem Kontext nur einen überschaubaren Mehrwert verspräche.

(nicht)? – äussern, aber auch in einem subjektiv intensiveren beziehungsweise weniger intensiven Wahrnehmen von bestimmten Gefühlen niederschlagen.

Genau solche religiös begründeten *feeling rules* unter SalafitInnen werden Thema des folgenden Artikels sein, der damit einen Beitrag zu ethnologischen Auslotungen des Nexus von Glauben, Gefühlen und Moral leistet.[3] Im Laufe einer Feldforschung mit Salafis in der Schweiz begegnete ich Personen, die religiös grundierte Emotionsregulationsstrategien als eine wesentliche Quelle von Selbstberuhigung, Selbstentwicklung und Seelenfrieden bezeichneten. Auch wenn ihnen nicht jede konkrete, in ihrer Glaubensinterpretation religiös gebotene Emotionsregulation grundsätzlich leichtfiel, hielten sie sich doch für religiös und zugleich zugunsten ihres eigenen Wohlbefindens verpflichtet, Gefühle auf ihre moralische Adäquatheit und Erwünschtheit zu prüfen, bevor sie sie umfänglich zur Kenntnis nahmen oder ausdrückten. Diese Qualität salafitischer Glaubensalltage geht über die bereits präzise beschriebenen Bemühungen vieler Salafis um ein religiös-moralisch richtiges Leben (de Koning 2013a; 2013b; Mahmood 2005) hinaus – wenngleich beide Selbstregulationsweisen mitunter eng miteinander zusammenhängen und religiös ähnlich begründet werden.

Ich halte Emotionsregulationsstrategien für einen wesentlichen konversionstreibenden wie auch glaubensstabilisierenden Faktor, der bislang in der Forschung zu SalafitInnen[4] zu wenig Beachtung erhält. Es ist aber essentiell, Gefühlsregulationsstrategien zu bemerken und ihre Wichtigkeit anzuerkennen, um Salafis in Europa umfassend zu verstehen.

Akteur:innen in Deradikalisierungs- und Präventionsprogrammen und Wissenschaftler:innen erwägen als wichtige Gründe für salafitische Personen, Salafi geworden zu sein, häufig etwa: Einen mutmasslichen Strukturbedarf der Glaubenden, eine Fokussierung auf vermeintlich letzte Wahrheiten, attraktive Gemeinschaftlichkeit in den puristischen Moscheegemeinden, maskulin-kriegerische Rollenangebote bei den Jihadis, vermeintlich stets klare Genderrollen, und vieles mehr (vgl. Dantschke 2014; Dziri und Kiefer 2018; Eser Davolio 2017; Nuraniyah 2018; Olsson 2020; Poljarevic 2016; Vidino 2013). Damit haben sie oft auch recht. Aber verblüffend selten wird die intensive Zufriedenheit und das Sicherheitsgefühl thematisiert, die auf die Dämpfung und Readjustierung von Affekten zurückzuführen sind, wobei Letztere in salafitischen Kontexten durchaus klar gefordert werden. Genau diese Regulationen und ihre Effekte machten allerdings in den Begegnungen, die ich in den vergangenen Jahren mit Salafis hatte, einen nicht unwesentlichen Teil privater salafitischer

---

[3] Ich befasse mich an dieser Stelle nicht mit sog. "sacred emotions" (Emmons 2005, 239), also Gefühlen, die durch Religiosität erst erfahrbar werden oder die überwältigend intensiv aufkommen, wenn an die zugeschriebenen Eigenschaften eines transzendenten Wesens oder seine vermeintliche Nähe unmittelbar gedacht wird – obwohl auch solche Emotionen für Salafis eine Rolle spielen können (vgl. Abu Abdallah 2010 für ein Beispiel).

[4] Gendersensible Formulierungen folgen in diesem Text der kontextuellen Angemessenheit. Salafis gehen von genau zwei klar definierten sozialen Geschlechtern aus, die sich an den primären physischen Geschlechtsmerkmalen orientieren. Wer sich in dieses Raster nicht einzuordnen versuchte, würde einem wesentlichen Element salafitischer Weltbilder widersprechen und einem salafitischen Glaubenspfad nur noch bedingt folgen. Umgekehrt: Wer an solch einem Geschlechtermodell zweifelt, wird sich kaum als Salafi betrachten wollen. Entsprechend werden sie mit Rücksicht auf ihre emischen Geschlechterannahmen binär gegendert.

Glaubenserfahrungen aus. In diesem Text soll darum das salafitische Alltags-Gefühlsmanagement im Mittelpunkt stehen.

Der folgende Abschnitt widmet sich methodischen Fragen. Anschliessend führe ich kurz in den Themenbereich Emotionsaushandlungen und Eifersuchtsbegriffe unter Salafis ein. Ein weiterer einordnender Abschnitt kontextualisiert knapp die rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen, die religiös begründeten Eheverständnisse und die salafitischen Gendernormen, innerhalb derer sich polygyn lebende deutschschweizer Salafis bewegen. Danach präsentiere ich im Hauptteil ein Fallbeispiel, das sich auf konkrete Eifersuchtsbewertungen unter polygyn lebenden Salafis konzentriert. Am Schluss werden die gewonnenen Einblicke zusammengeführt und emotionale Mittelbarkeiten als ein wesentliches Attraktionsmoment der kontemporären europäischen Salafiyya identifiziert.

Methodisches

Die hier präsentierten Ergebnisse erarbeitete ich im Rahmen des Projekts «Deutschsprachige SalafistInnen in der Schweiz: Skizze der gegenwärtig präsenten Spektren und Analyse ihrer moralischen Aushandlungsprozesse»[5]. Der Forschung gingen mehrjährige Arbeiten zu und mit Salafis in Deutschland voraus.

Die illustrierenden Originalzitate habe ich aus lokaler Mundart ins Hochdeutsche übertragen. Alle Namen wurden anonymisiert und, wenn es notwendig schien, auch biographische Besonderheiten verändert. Dies geschah hinblicklich der Wünsche meiner Feldkontakte, aber ebenso als ethisch gebotene Massnahme: Denn auch Salafis, die ihren Glauben vor allem privat leben möchten und weder politisch noch gar gewalttätig aktiv werden, haben bei Klarnennung oder Identifizierbarkeit möglicherweise mit behördlicher Ansprache und Beobachtung sowie sozialer Ächtung zu rechnen.

Auswahl der ForschungspartnerInnen und Kontaktaufbau

In der Schweiz kann von einer niedrigen bis mittleren vierstelligen Zahl an Salafis ausgegangen werden (Einschätzungsgrundlage: eigene Forschung 2019–2021), die verschiedensten Substörmungen angehören oder keinem Spektrum eindeutig zuzuordnen sind, und die meistenteils nicht fremdgefährdend agieren und dies auch nicht anstreben. Verlässliche Statistiken gibt es nicht, da Salafis sich nirgends als solche registrieren und gerade islamische Strömungen vonseiten staatlicher Stellen vorrangig unter dem Blickwinkel ihrer angenommenen Gefährlichkeit erfasst und kategorisiert werden. Offizielle Zahlen geben damit zwar recht präzise an, wie viele Menschen die zuständigen Behörden als (potentielle) Jihadis oder als demokratiefeindliche Muslime kategorisieren; aber sie sagen nichts darüber aus, wie viele Menschen welchen salafitischen Glaubensvorstellungen folgen. Hinzu kommt, dass viele Salafis sogenannte Jihadis oder

takfiris gar nicht als Salafis betrachten (und umgekehrt). Dies wird meist mit theologischen Unvereinbarkeiten begründet, je nach Untergruppe können solche trennenden Punkte sein: das Strafen mit Feuer, die *tazkiya* (hier etwa: Referenz/Empfehlung, von einem anerkannten Experten in Glaubensfragen und bezogen auf theologische Kompetenzen) auch für und durch militärische Befehlshaber, Übertreibung und damit religiöse Neuerung, etc. Jihadis und Salafis können also keinesfalls als Synonyme betrachtet werden.

Im Rahmen meiner Forschung konzentrierte ich mich auf die übergrosse Mehrheit an Salafis, die nicht gewalttätig sind oder werden wollen. Ich führte Teilnehmende Beobachtungen in verschiedenen Glaubensgruppen und religiösen Zirkeln durch und nahm an salafitischen Workshops teil. Ausserdem fanden Interviews mit Einzelpersonen, Paaren, Kleingruppen und Familien statt. Wichtigste Einschlusskriterien waren, dass potentielle ForschungspartnerInnen a) volljährig waren; b) nach ihrem eigenen Verständnis in besonderer Weise an den ersten drei Generationen von MuslimInnen orientiert lebten; c) eine besonders literalistische Auslegung von Qur'an und Hadith vertraten; d) eine bestimmte Glaubensmethodik bzw. Glaubensausübung *(manhaj)* verfolgten, die eng mit spezifischen religiösen Konzepten und Prioritäten zusammenhängt, welche als salafitypisch gelten können. Beispiele für solche Konzepte sind Loyalität und Lossagung, oder auch ein besonderes Verständnis der Einheit Gottes (s. weiterführend Wagemakers 2018, zum Problem der eindeutigen Eingrenzung salafitischer Beforschtengruppen s. Damir-Geilsdorf und Menzfeld 2020).

Salafitische ForschungspartnerInnen gewann ich teils über Kontakte aus früheren Forschungen, teils durch persönliche Empfehlungen nach Art eines Schneeballsystems. Die in diesem Text vorgestellten ForschungspartnerInnen vermittelte mir eine Frau, die ich an einer halbprivaten Veranstaltung kennengelernt hatte, an der Partnersuchende und junge Eheleute unter anderem einen Auffrischungs-Workshop zu salafitischen Eheidealen besuchen konnten – dort war auch Polygynie ein intensiv debattiertes Thema. Die unten beschriebenen Einblicke gewann ich durch langandauernde informelle Kontaktpflege, halbstrukturierte Einzelinterviews, Interviews in wechselnden Konstellationen mit zwei und mit allen drei Mitgliedern der Ehegemeinschaft, sowie (in shutdown-Phasen während der Coronapandemie) durch Videochats und schriftliche Messenger-Unterhaltungen.

Ich habe mich entschieden, im Artikel auf ein Fallbeispiel zu fokussieren, weil ich überzeugt bin, dass sich die besonderen Formen salafitischer Gefühlsregulationen und ihre Binnenlogiken anhand eines einzelnen und dafür dicht beschriebenen Beispiels besonders gut nachvollziehen lassen. Deutschschweizer polygyne Salafi-KonvertitInnen wie das weiter unten vorgestellte Trio sind dabei ein Spezialfall unter polygyn lebenden Muslim:innen weltweit, der nicht ohne Weiteres dazu dienen kann, Rückschlüsse auf die Realitäten und Dynamiken polygyner Konstrukte im Allgemeinen zu ziehen. Im Rahmen genau dieses lokalen salafitischen Kontexts aber sind Erfahrungen und Annahmen, wie sie im Fallbeispiel vorgestellt werden, durchaus breit nachvollziehbar sowohl für selbst polygyn lebende Salafis als auch für nicht polygyn

lebende Salafis. Darum halte ich es für sinnvoll und vertretbar, den geschilderten Fall als *pars pro toto*-Beispiel für salafitische Gefühlsregulationsstrategien anzuführen.

Anmerkung zu genderbedingten Potenzialen und Einschränkungen

Während es mir als nichtmuslimischer Forscherin in diesem Feld relativ umstandslos gelang, offene und vertrauliche Gesprächsebenen mit salafitischen Frauen zu etablieren, dauerte es deutlich länger, vergleichbare Austauschqualitäten mit salafitischen Männern zu entwickeln. Das ist nicht typisch für die Arbeit einer weiblichen Forschungsperson mit Salafis. Im Gegenteil: In vorherigen Projekten beispielsweise in Deutschland konnte ich einfacher Kontakte zu salafitischen Männern herstellen und halten, und auch private Themen besprachen Salafi-Männer durchaus – Salafitinnen hingegen weniger oft und weniger bereitwillig. Das war der Fall, obwohl es nach salafitischer Auffassung weitaus problematischer ist, wenn ein Mann mit einer unbedeckten fremden Frau persönliche Gedanken austauscht, als wenn stattdessen zwei Frauen beteiligt sind.

Ich gehe davon aus, dass die unerwartet erfolgreichen Zugänge zu salafitischen Frauen im Gegensatz zu salafitischen Männern in der Deutschschweiz schlicht damit zusammenhingen, dass ich häufiger durch Frauen anderen Frauen vorgestellt wurde, als es in Deutschland der Fall war. In Deutschland hingegen bauten sich meine Kontaktnetzwerke häufiger über einen Erstkontakt zu einem Mann mit gewisser gruppeninterner Autorität auf.

Vor diesem Erfahrungshintergrund vermute ich, dass für weibliche Forschende in salafitischen Umgebungen nicht so sehr das eigene Gender zu bestimmen scheint, mit wem sie tiefgehende Kontakte etablieren können – sondern vielmehr die Geschlechtszuordnung der Anfangskontakte sowie, daraus folgend, der bevorzugte Zugang zu den je entsprechenden geschlechtsspezifischen sozialen Netzwerken. Für männliche Kollegen verhält sich das anders: Sie erhalten oft nur oder vor allem Zugang zu salafitischen Männern und haben Mühe, mit Frauen in Kontakt zu kommen (de Koning 2018, persönliche Unterhaltung). Zumindest bei mitteleuropäischen salafitischen (Re-)KonvertitInnen scheinen weibliche Forschende also weniger gender-bezogene Restriktionen ihrer Forschungsfelder zu erleben.

Zu salafitischen Gefühlsaushandlungen und Eifersuchtsbegriffen

Die Bedeutung freiwilliger moralischer Selbstregulierung für Salafis stellten bereits Arbeiten wie jene von Mahmood (2005) mit einem Fokus auf islamische Frömmigkeit in Ägypten, Schielke (2009) zu den Grenzen von Selbstregulationen und Idealentsprechungen salafitischer Ägypter, Inge (2017) zu salafitischen Frauen in Grossbritannien und de Koning (2013a; 2013b) über Salafis in den Niederlanden fest. Sie alle zeigen, dass intersubjektive und lebensbereichsübergreifende Dynamiken die Bewertung von Handlungen, Beziehungen und Alltagsroutinen nach den Massstäben religiös-moralischer Normen wesentlich beeinflussen. Sie machen ausserdem deutlich, dass selbst die vermeintlich klarsten religiös-moralischen Regeln und Bewertungskriterien stets einer kontextspezifischen Auslegung bedürfen, wobei diese Auslegung bisweilen hochgra-

dig interaktiv und dialogisch erfolgen kann (Chaplin 2018). Ausserdem zeigen bisherige Forschungen zu moralischen Selbstmodifikationen unter Salafis, dass die Aneignung salafitischer Normen nicht ohne ein Mitdenken der Normen und Lebensrealitäten der jeweiligen umgebenden (und nichtsalafitischen) Mehrheitsgesellschaft verstehbar ist (Schielke 2009; 2010).

Auch in den Feldforschungsausschnitten, die ich weiter unten thematisieren möchte, sind religiös-moralische Evaluationen und Disziplinierungen nichts gebrauchsfertig Übernehmbares oder gar Oktroyiertes, sondern etwas, das kontextspezifisch je neu erschlossen werden muss. Allerdings ist im Fallbeispiel das Moment zwischenmenschlicher Dialogizität stark heruntergeregelt: Evaluationen erfolgen selten in der Auseinandersetzung mit anderen Salafis etwa in einer Gemeinde, und selten unter expliziter Rückbezugnahme auf Normen der Mehrheitsgesellschaft, was sich etwa in Form einer verbalisierten Abgrenzung gegenüber nichtsalafitischen Emotionsnormen ausdrücken könnte. Im Gegenteil eignen sich viele meiner deutschschweizer ForschungspartnerInnen religiös-moralische Gefühlsregulationsstrategien für sich, aber in intensiver Auseinandersetzung mit ihren religiösen Leitschriften und einem vermuteten Willen Gottes an. Das dialogische Moment findet also auch bei ihnen statt, allerdings mit einem angenommenen göttlichen Gegenüber.

Aus diesem Grund erschien es mir übrigens nicht völlig überzeugend, die beschriebenen Emotionsregulationen vorrangig als Techniken des Selbst zu deuten. Die emisch enorm dialogisch gedachte Bezogenheit auf ein göttliches Gegenüber, die den Selbstregulationen zugrundeliegt, könnte durch eine foucaultianische Lesart zu stark in den Hintergrund treten. Damit möchte ich aber nicht andeuten, dass ein solcher Ansatz allgemein wenig nützlich wäre: Eine einleuchtende Möglichkeit, transgressive Potentiale muslimischer (Nicht-)Praxen in nichtmuslimischen Mehrheitsgesellschaften auszuloten und sie als Selbsttechniken zu analysieren, bietet beispielsweise Fadil (2009) an.

Dass deutschschweizer Salafis sich Emotionsregulationsprozesse seltener im zwischenmenschlichen Austausch aneignen, liegt auch an der Verstreutheit von Salafis in der Schweiz. Nicht wenige deutschschweizer Salafis stehen darum allenfalls in losem Kontakt zu ähnlich Glaubenden, zum Beispiel nur dann, wenn sie religiöse Workshops oder unregelmässig stattfindende Gesprächskreise in etwas entfernteren Orten besuchen. Im Alltag befassen sie sich eher allein oder im Rahmen ihrer jeweiligen Partnerschaften mit religiösen Normen und deren Umsetzung. Da im Falle der weiter unten vorgestellten drei SchlüsselinformantInnen ausserdem persönliche Vorbehalte gegenüber den zwei halbwegs wohnortnahen Salafi-Gemeinden eine Rolle spielen, finden ihre emotionsregulativen Anstrengungen sogar fast ganz im Privaten statt.

Ein Gefühl, zwei Bewertungen: Gute und schlechte Eifersucht

Ein Emotionsspektrum, das Salafis insbesondere in Partnerschaftskontexten intensiv bewerten und modifizieren, ist die Eifersucht. Eifersucht tritt für Salafis als protektive oder selbstbezogene Eifersucht in Erscheinung – oder als «gute» und «schlechte» Eifersucht, wie es meine ForschungspartnerInnen manchmal ausdrücken – und ist entsprechend unterschiedlich zu handhaben. Die schützende Eifersucht lässt sich als gottgefälliges Gefühl und zugleich als

Vorsichtsmassnahme zur Vermeidung von Versuchungen, besonders von deplatzierter sexueller Attraktion, beschreiben. Sie dient einerseits dem Schutz des Partners oder der Partnerin, der oder die nicht in als sündhaft oder versuchend interpretierte Begegnungen oder Blicke hineingeraten soll; andererseits aber auch dem Schutz des Seelenheils anderer, die sich vom Anblick der unbedeckten oder aufreizend bekleideten Partnerin oder des Partners mit dem engen Shirt und den knappen Badeshorts angezogen fühlen könnten.

Im Feld wird die Formulierung «gute Eifersucht» oft austauschbar verwendet mit dem Terminus *ghira*. Letzterer besitzt auch Begriffsnuancen wie Ehrempfinden, Ehre, und bezeichnet ausserdem das Gefühl des Widerstrebens, wenn sich Unbefugte etwas aneignen, das ihnen nicht zusteht (sondern der empfindenden Person). *Ghira* kann nicht nur als Gefühl, sondern zusätzlich als religiös-moralisches Ideal und auch als einforderbarer Schutzmechanismus innerhalb einer Beziehung verstanden werden. Salafis sind sich allerdings nicht einig darüber, ob eine maximale Steigerung und Förderung der *ghira* als maximal positiv zu bewerten sei, oder ob eine übermässig gesteigerte *ghira* auch zu negativen Konsequenzen und Übertreibungen führen könne.

«Gute» Eifersucht kann, muss aber nicht verflochten sein mit anderen Gefühlen, die ebenfalls religiös-moralischen Bewertungsnormen unterliegen oder gar als religiös eingebetteter Wert an sich gelten. Ein Beispiel für einen wichtigen, mit protektiver Eifersucht eng verknüpften religiösen Wert, der zugleich eine nah verbundene Emotion und manchmal zudem eine *display rule* darstellt, ist die Schamhaftigkeit (*ḥaya*; dazu später mehr).

Eifersucht gegenüber anderen, die beispielsweise von Selbstunsicherheit oder Verlustängsten herrührt und nicht als protektive Eifersucht eingeordnet werden kann, gilt es hingegen zu bekämpfen. Diese Form der Eifersucht erkennen Salafis zwar als gewöhnliche emotionale Regung beider Geschlechter an, aber nicht als wünschenswert oder gar gottgefällig. Man soll «schlechte» Eifersucht nicht fördern, sondern im Zaum halten. Unter Umständen wird das Ankämpfen gegen diese als nicht religiös begründbar oder erwünscht verstandene Eifersucht sogar als Teil des persönlichen *jihad an-nafs*, also eines Kampfs gegen Selbstbezogenheit und destruktive innere Impulse (siehe auch Gauvain 2013 zum Thema Seelenläuterung in der *salafiyya*) und als Weg zur schrittweisen Vervollkommnung der eigenen Glaubenspersönlichkeit betrachtet, die wiederum maximale Gottgefälligkeit und einen Platz im Paradies zur Folge hat.

Die konkrete Interpretation und Erwünschtheit eines jeweiligen Eifersuchtsgefühls ist stets kontextabhängig. Sowohl protektive, gute als auch destruktive, schlechte Eifersucht werden prinzipiell für alltägliche menschliche Regungen gehalten. Der Umgang mit ihnen unterscheidet sich aber je nachdem, inwieweit sie in einer konkreten Situation als im Einklang mit religiösen Emotionsempfehlungen und -werten übereinstimmen.

Ein Kontext, innerhalb dessen besonders scharfe Grenzen zwischen protektiver und destruktiver Eifersucht gezogen werden, ist der Kontext polygyner Ehen (vgl. Illi 2018 für ein Beispiel)[6]. Medienwirksam durch den «Islamischen Zentralrat Schweiz» (IZRS)[7] und hier ins-

---

[6] Nora Illi war eine der prominentesten salafitischen Aktivistinnen der Schweiz und über die Landesgrenzen hinaus bekannt. Sie verstarb im Laufe der Feldforschung für diesen Artikel im März 2020 mit 35 Jahren an Brustkrebs.

[7] Islamischer Zentralrat Schweiz; Verband, der als von verschiedenen salafitischen Gruppen mitbeeinflusst gelten kann. Er repräsentiert allerdings keineswegs die Mehrheit der Schweizer SalafitInnen. Die meisten

besondere durch Frauen in leitenden Positionen in den letzten Jahren wiederkehrend auf-bereitet, war das Thema Polygynie im Laufe der Forschung immer wieder Gegenstand von Gesprächen mit verschiedenen GesprächspartnerInnen. Insbesondere Salafis, die bereits in polygynen Beziehungen leben, möchte ich im Folgenden in den Blick nehmen: Anhand ihrer Aussagen und emotionalen Handhabungsleistungen lässt sich der Umgang mit als protektiv respektive destruktiv verstandener Eifersucht gut veranschaulichen.[8]

Einordnendes zur Rechtssituation, zu Polygynie als selten realisiertem Ideal und zu salafitischen gender-Normen

Im nächsten Kapitel werden drei polygyn lebende Menschen vorgestellt. Eine solche Ehe-konstellation ist in der Schweiz nicht nur aussergewöhnlich selten: Polygynie und Polygamie allgemein sind sogar verboten (vgl. Artikel 215 StGB). Jede nach der Erstehe durch eine:n Schweizer:in oder in der Schweiz geschlossene Ehe gilt als strafbar.[9] Es ist also zunächst einmal zivilrechtlich gar nicht möglich, dass ein bereits verheirateter Mann auf Schweizer Boden eine weitere Frau rechtsverbindlich heiratet. Eine rein religiöse Trauzeremonie wiede-rum hat keinerlei rechtliche Bedeutung, solange ihr nicht eine zivilrechtliche Trauung voran-geht (vgl. Stellungnahme Bundesrat 2012). Zwar gab es in den vergangenen Jahren Vorstösse zu Familienrechtsreformen (vgl. Schwenzer 2013), die u. a. die Straftatbestände der Mehrehe neu bewerten sollten. Allerdings liefen diese bislang ins Leere.

Dass die weiter unten vorgestellten Salafis Ursula, Martina und Marco sich als polygyne Ehegemeinschaft betrachten, kann aus juristischer Perspektive in ihrem Heimatland also schlicht nicht sein. Die Ehe Ursulas, der Zweitfrau, mit Marco ist nur in ihren eigenen Augen und nach Meinung ihrer salafitischen Bekannten religiös gültig. Dieses Konstrukt beinhaltet eine signifikante juristische Benachteiligung für Ursula, da sie keinerlei Möglichkeiten hat, zum Beispiel im Scheidungsfall ähnliche Rechtsansprüche anzumelden wie eine zivilrechtlich angetraute Ehefrau. Sie selbst rechnet aber nicht damit, dass ihr salafitischer jetziger Ehemann sich je von ihr scheiden lassen könnte, und geht davon aus, dass im Falle des Falles eine solche Scheidung nach islamischem Recht vorgenommen würde – sie also keine zivilrechtliche Absi-cherung benötige, da das islamische Recht sie ausreichend schützen werde.

Nicht nur in der Schweiz allgemein, sondern auch unter Schweizer SalafitInnen ist eine tat-sächlich realisierte polygyne Ehe eher selten. Zwar gestatten religiöse Beziehungsnormen sala-

---

meiner salafitischen GesprächspartnerInnen standen dem IZRS kritisch bis themenabhängig kritisch gegen-über. Dennoch setzt der IZRS in der Schweiz durch starke social-media-Präsenz Themen auch in den salafi-tischen communities, die ihn ablehnen. Zum Zeitpunkt der hier ausgewerteten Feldforschungen war infolge von kontroversen medialen Positionierungen des IZRS gegenüber Sexualität, Polygynie und Ehe dieser Themenbereich einmal mehr aktuell (IZRS 2020).

[8] Eifersuchtsdiskurse gibt es auch in und zu postmodern-säkularen polyamoren Beziehungskonstrukten. Diese weichen jedoch in Ausgangsmotivation und Ausgestaltung stark von salafitischen Mehrfachbeziehungsmodel-len ab. Zu Deutungen von Eifersucht im polyamoren Kontext siehe bspw. Riedl (2018).

[9] Artikel 215 StGB CH: «Wer eine Ehe schliesst oder eine Partnerschaft eintragen lässt, obwohl er verheiratet ist oder in eingetragener Partnerschaft lebt (…) wird mit Freiheitsstrafe bis zu drei Jahren oder Geldstrafe bestraft.»

fitischen Männern prinzipiell, bis zu vier Frauen zugleich zu ehelichen, aber nur unter strengen Bedingungen. Der Mann muss angemessene und gleiche Lebens- und Versorgungsbedingungen in emotionaler und finanzieller Hinsicht für alle Ehefrauen bieten können und sie alle genau gleich behandeln – eine Aufgabe, die nahezu unerfüllbar ist (vgl. Sure 4, 129; Sure 4, 3; s. auch abukhadeejah.com 2019). Entsprechend wenige Salafis trauen sich eine Mehrehe zu.

Andere wiederum glauben, dass sie die vielfältigen Herausforderungen einer Mehrehe schultern können. Gründe, warum sie einer Mehrehe zuneigen, können vielfältig sein: Beispielsweise, dass sie sich dadurch dem Vorbild Muhammads in seiner Sorge um Alleinstehende näher sehen.[10] Ebenfalls wird oft angeführt, dass die Mehrehe Männer und ansonsten unverheiratet bleibende Frauen vom (religiös verbotenen) Konsum von Pornografie oder nichtehelichen sexuellen Beziehungen abhalten könne. Polygynie sei ausserdem eine religiös erlaubte Lösung für den Fall, dass ein Mann sexuelle Abwechslung wolle, aber nicht gegen das Gebot innerehelicher Sexualexklusivität verstossen wolle; und sie mache es unwahrscheinlicher, dass eine Frau zum sexuellen Vergnügen benutzt werde, ohne dass sie eine entsprechende eheliche Absicherung erhalte (s. bspw. salafimanhaj.com 2014; vgl. auch abukhadeejah.com 2014, 2019).

Als in einer Ehe religiös wünschenswert und förderlich für die persönliche Zufriedenheit betrachten die meisten Salafis ausserdem, wenn alle Beteiligten in vielerlei Hinsicht komplementär gedachten Gender-Rollen entsprechen (vgl. bspw. Al-Fawzan 2017; 1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com 2016; abukhadeejah.com 2014). Die individuelle Geschlechterrolle wird dabei binär an den primären Geschlechtsmerkmalen des jeweiligen Menschen orientiert zu- und festgeschrieben.

Religiös begründete geschlechterspezifische Normen und Ideale wirken für alle Salafis in zahlreiche Lebensbereiche hinein, auch wenn diese Normen teils unterschiedlich interpretiert werden. Solche Normen regeln beispielsweise Kleidungsaspekte wie das Verhüllen des männlichen und weiblichen Schambereichs oder Vorschriften zu Materialien, die einem Geschlecht vorbehalten sind (beispielsweise Gold und Seide den Frauen). Besonders sichtbar werden Gender-Normen in der normativen Verknüpfung von Mannsein bzw. Frausein mit sehr verschiedenen Verantwortungsbereichen im alltäglichen Zusammenleben. Innerhäusige Erledigungen und Kindererziehung obliegen normgemäss beispielsweise den Ehefrauen; Ehemännern hingegen der finanzielle Unterhalt von Frau(en) und Kindern, manchmal auch alle ausserhäusigen Besorgungen wie Einkäufe, ausserdem die moralisch-religiöse Anleitung ihrer Familie.[11]

In der Realität salafitischer Alltage zeigen sich jedoch ungleich differenziertere Aneignungen von religiös begründeten Geschlechterrollen.[12] Auch genderspezifisches Handeln, das sich leicht bis moderat gegenläufig zu religiösen Idealen darstellt, kommt vor: Beispielsweise wenn eine Frau erwerbstätig ist, um das Familieneinkommen zu steigern, obwohl sie dem Ideal nach

---

[10] Muhammad hat bis auf eine seiner Frauen ausschliesslich Geschiedene und Verwitwete geheiratet. Salafis begründen das unter anderem damit, dass er Verwitwete und Geschiedene nicht unversorgt und schutzlos sich selbst überlassen mochte.

[11] Vgl. für tiefergehende Einblicke in salafitische Geschlechternormen innerhalb ehelicher Gemeinschaften beispielsweise al-Fawzan 2017; quranundhadith.com o. A.; 1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com 2016; abukhadeejah.com 2014.

[12] Siehe Schielke (2009) für ein Beispiel dafür, dass die Vereinbarkeit von religiösen Idealen und alltäglichem Tun und Sein auch in muslimischen Mehrheitsgesellschaften nicht unbedingt selbstverständlicher gelingt.

ganz auf den häuslichen Bereich konzentriert bliebe. Solche Abweichungen werden aber nicht einfach kommentarlos gelebt, sondern sorgfältig als von bestimmten qur'anischen Versen und Hadithen einigermassen gedeckt gerechtfertigt und interpretiert. Beispielsweise sagt Marco, dessen Zweitfrau erwerbstätig ist: «Es heisst, der Islam soll leicht sein. Allah will nicht, dass wir es uns schwer machen. Es wäre gerade halt sehr schwer, wenn beide Frauen zum Beispiel gar nicht mitverdienen». Solange die Absicht stimme, dass irgendwann alle seine Frauen zuhause bleiben könnten, dann wäre es nicht so schlimm, wenn dieses Ideal gerade noch nicht umgesetzt werde.

Zumindest nominell klare Geschlechterverhältnisse und ihre konkreten Konsequenzen sind für KonvertitInnen wie die in diesem Text vorgestellten Personen Teil der Attraktion ihres salafitischen Glaubens. Betonungen vermeintlich grundsätzlicher Geschlechterungleichheiten nivellieren sich allerdings vor der stets übergeordneten Wichtigkeit des individuellen Verhältnisses zu Gott – auch und gerade, wenn es um Emotionsregulationen geht. Frauen wie Männer haben im Rahmen ihrer Möglichkeiten nach einem religiös idealen Leben zu streben; und Frauen wie Männer sind aufgefordert, Menschen zu korrigieren, die vom rechten Weg abkommen. Es ist keinesfalls unüblich, dass gerade salafitische Männer schon in der Eheanbahnungsphase klar beschreiben, inwiefern in Glaubensfragen die Autorität des Ehemannes zugunsten einer Machthierarchie, die sich ausschliesslich am besseren religiösen Beleg orientiert, zurückzustehen hat:

> *Sie soll mir gehorchen aber wenn ich fehlgehe, muss, sie mich korrigieren (…) Was zählt ist das bessere [Glaubens-] argument aber wenn es nicht um argumente geht, soll sie sanftmütig und gehorsam sein.* (Originalschreibweise. Auszug aus einem Inseratstext einer Partnerbörse für Salafis, abgerufen via WhatsApp, 11.02.2020)

Fallbeispiel: Martina, Ursula und Marco

Martina, Ursula und Marco sind Salafis, konvertiert, Mitte 30 und leben polygyn in der Schweiz. Beide Frauen betrachten sich als religiös mit Marco verheiratet. Zivilrechtlich gültig ist allerdings nur die Ehe von Marco und Martina, die auch im Standesamt geschlossen wurde. Das ist für die drei allerdings kein grosses Thema, sagen sie: Vor Gott seien sie eine durchaus legitime Ehegemeinschaft, und nur das bedeute ihnen etwas. Martina hat mit Marco ein gemeinsames Kind. Ursula ist erst vor einigen Monaten in Martinas und Marcos Leben getreten; sie ist geschieden, ihr Kind aus erster Ehe lebt bei ihr. Nach einer Zeit des Alleinlebens ist sie eine Ehe mit Marco eingegangen.

Ursula und Martina haben jeweils eigene Wohnungen in einer Schweizer Mittelstadt, wobei Ursula erst vor Kurzem in Martinas und Marcos Heimatort gezogen ist. Martinas Eltern sind bereits verstorben und haben ihr eine Eigentumswohnung hinterlassen, die sie mit ihrem und Marcos Kind bewohnt. Ursulas Wohnung bezahlt zu ungefähr zwei Dritteln Marco. Zusätzlich arbeitet Ursula («noch», wie sie sagt, «wir wollen natürlich, dass ich mich hier auf die Familie konzentrieren kann [und keiner Erwerbstätigkeit mehr nachgehe]») und steuert damit eben-

falls einen Teil zu Miet- und Alltagsausgaben bei. Martina ist nicht erwerbstätig, weil – wie sie sagt – «das Ziel ist, dass die Frau machen kann, was ihre Aufgabe ist, Haus und Kinder erziehen und ein schönes Heim machen». Marco lebt wechselweise bei Martina und seinem Kind, sowie bei Ursula und seinem Stiefkind. Er sagt, es sei nicht leicht für ihn, für alle finanziell und emotional angemessen aufzukommen, «aber wenn ich hart arbeite, kann ich ja auch allen immer mehr bieten».

Marco und Martina sagen, dass ihnen schon lange klar gewesen sei, dass eine polygyne Ehe ein «schönes Ziel» (Martina) sei. Religiös-moralisch begründen sie diese Einstellung so, wie es Salafis aus vielen unterschiedlichen Strömungen auch tun (vgl. EZE CH 2020; Ulucay und Vogel 2020a, 2020b; Illi 2018): Wenn das Geld, die persönliche Eignung und die Fähigkeit zur emotionalen Gleichbehandlung mehrerer Frauen beim Mann vorhanden seien, dann sei es ihm geboten, mehr als einer Frau die Ehe zu ermöglichen. Täten dazu fähige Männer das nicht, hätten sie zu verantworten, dass unverheiratet bleibende Frauen mit Ehelosigkeit, Einsamkeit, finanzieller Prekarität, emotionaler Vernachlässigung und sexuellen Versuchungen zu kämpfen hätten. Ausserdem sei in Gemeinschaft alles leichter (Martina), Aufgaben des Alltags wie die Kinderbetreuung könnten in einer polygynen Beziehung aufgeteilt werden und «man hat ja dann auch immer wen zum Reden, eine Schwester, eine neue» (Martina).

Martina und Ursula kannten einander aus einer kleinen privaten Frauengruppe, die sich unregelmässig zwecks Austauschs über religiöse Fragen trifft, bevor Ursula Marco zum ersten Mal begegnete. Ursula empfand es damals als sehr schwierig, einen Mann zu finden, der «wie schon erwiesenermassen gut ist als Mann, für gerade eine islamische Ehe». Dieser Beweis der partnerschaftlichen Eignung eines potentiellen Gatten war ihr äusserst wichtig, da ihr Exmann offenbar weder ihre Religiosität unterstützte noch seine bisweilen aggressive Impulsivität kontrollieren konnte. In ihrer nächsten Verbindung wollte sie darum einen Mann, der sich bereits als Ehemann und Vater bewährte. Ursulas Familie unterstützt die Konversion ihrer Tochter nicht; Ursula konnte also nicht auf familiäre Vermittlung bei der Suche nach einem Ehemann hoffen, und «meine Scham[13] verbietet es natürlich, dass ich einfach auf Männer losgehe [und sie anspreche]», wie sie sagt. Darum war Ursula froh, als Martina sie fragte, ob sie sich vorstellen könne, die zweite Ehefrau ihres Mannes zu werden – denn «bei Martina wusste ich, dass sie

---

[13] Die angesprochene Schamhaftigkeit (ḥaya) ist im salafitischen Kontext deutlich positiv konnotiert und wird als Gefühl, aber auch als Handlungsideal konzeptualisiert. Schamhaftigkeit zeigt sich u. a. durch Vorsicht und maximale Distanz im Umgang von Frauen mit Männern, die nicht miteinander verheiratet sind und füreinander nicht in die Kategorie maḥram fallen (d. h. in einem Verwandtschaftsverhältnis zueinander stehen, das Heirat und Sex miteinander ausschliesst, bzw. vor denen Frauen ihre als intim verstandenen Körperbereiche – die ʿaawrat – nicht üblicherweise bedecken). Schamhaftigkeit bedeutete für die meisten meiner Feldkontakte beispielsweise, die Blicke zu senken vor fremden Frauen oder Männern, sich nicht alleine mit Männern oder Frauen zu treffen ohne Heiratsabsicht, fremden Frauen oder Männern nicht die Hände zu schütteln und ihnen nicht in die Augen zu sehen.

gut behandelt wird, und dass ihr Mann Religion hat und weiss, was eine Mehrehe bedeutet … auch an Pflichten für ihn» (Ursula).

Martina wiederum hatte mit Marco die Absprache gefasst, dass eine Zweitfrau zwar gemeinsames Beziehungsziel sei, aber niemals eine Annäherung Marcos an eine andere Frau ohne Martinas Zustimmung stattfinden könne:

> *Da hatte ich schon eine gesunde Eifersucht (…) es ist ja ḥaram [tabubelegt, religiös verboten], dass ein Mann einfach dahergeht und Frauen durchsieht wie Kleidung, die man mal anzieht und dann wegwirft oder einfach nur mal hervorzieht und anschaut so zum Spass.* (Martina)

Was Martina hier als «gesunde Eifersucht» kennzeichnet, bedeutet für sie: Eine Eifersucht, die religiös-moralisch zu rechtfertigen ist. Diese spezifische Eifersucht, die ihren Mann davor bewahrt, fremde Frauen visuell zu konsumieren und sich damit unter religiösen Gesichtspunkten schuldig zu machen an ihnen und ihren eventuellen (späteren) Partnern[14], bedarf also aus Martinas Sicht keines Verschweigens und keiner Korrektur. Im Gegenteil, diese Eifersucht beinhaltet protektive Elemente und sie ist religiös geboten. Wenn also Martina diese spezifische Gefühlsherleitung betont und «dann auch schau[t], dass ich das wirklich auch so meine und nicht nur so tue, weil ich neidisch bin auf andere Frauen oder so» (Martina), haben wir es mit einer zunächst impulsiv empfundenen, daraufhin intrapersonell überprüften und schliesslich für religiös-moralisch gut befundenen Gefühlsregung zu tun. Solcherart geprüft und für gut befunden, wird das Gefühl in der Konsequenz nicht nur bewusst wahrgenommen, sondern auch mitgeteilt und dem beteiligten Mann explizit als religiös gerahmt dargelegt. Durch das Fühlen, Bewerten und Zulassen dieser Form von Eifersucht praktiziert Martina eine Eifersucht, die religiösen Norm- und Idealwert besitzt.

Marco sah seinerzeit zudem wenige Möglichkeiten, selbst potentielle Zweitfrauen kennenzulernen. Ein Mann könne zwar über bestimmte dating-Seiten wie etwa secondwife.com suchen, aber dann wisse er immer noch nichts über die soziale Reputation einer Person:

> *Und es ist auch nicht gut, da rumzusuchen und vielleicht auch begehrlich jemanden anzusehen. Islamisch ist es da richtig, dass man sich davon fernhält. Und da war es gut, dass Martina darum auch gesagt hat: Sowas geht nicht. Also islamisch ist das allweg nicht, und es ist auch nicht richtig, weil man soll seine Frau so angucken und nicht andere Frauen. Das konnte die Martina natürlich verlangen, dass ich da nicht mal in die Nähe von zina [Ehebruch] komme. Da passen wir schon aufeinander auf.* (Marco)

Er interpretiert Martinas damalige Eifersucht also ebenfalls als religiös-moralisch gerechtfertigt und damit als protektiv. Für ihn ist diese Form der Eifersucht ein wünschenswertes Gefühl,

---

[14] An (eventuellen) späteren Partnern, weil es – so bekam ich es einmal erklärt – eine unnötige Beleidigung und Herausforderung beispielsweise des künftigen Ehemanns einer Frau wäre, seine Gattin schon vor ihrer Heirat je entehrend angeschaut zu haben. Man habe sich durch diesen Blick ein inneres sexualisierendes Bild von ihr sozusagen angeeignet, obwohl man hätte wissen können, dass es einen späteren Ehemann geben würde, der wollen würde, dass sich vor ihm möglichst niemand seine Frau auf diese Weise angeeignet hätte.

ein religiöser Wert und zudem eine Fürsorgegeste unter Ehepartnern, die nicht nur gerechtfertigt, sondern sogar erwünscht und hilfreich ist.

Dass Martina Ursula letztlich mit Marco zusammenbrachte, war einerseits dem Umstand geschuldet, dass die Frauen sich gut verstanden – und andererseits Martinas religiös begründeter Überzeugung, dass es Marcos Recht und ihre Aufgabe sei, eine weitere Ehegattin in die Familie aufzunehmen, wie sie sagt. Jeder Part einer sich anbahnenden polygynen Ehe führe dabei ihrer Ansicht nach einen «eigenen Kampf, um ein besserer Mensch zu werden»: Die Frauen fochten eher gegen die «einfach giftige» Eifersucht, der Mann ringe eher mit der Pflicht, allen gleichmässig eine gute Ehe zu bieten. Sowohl Ursula als auch Marco und Martina war immer wieder wichtig zu betonen, dass es «extrem zentral [ist], dass vor allem die Frauen sich mögen und miteinander gut auskommen» (Martina), da sie eine möglichst harmonische Lebensgemeinschaft zusammen aufbauen wollten und beide mit demselben Mann verheiratet seien.

«Giftige» Eifersucht bewältigen

Eines Abends beim Essen, es gibt Lamm, sitzt Ursula nah bei Marco und erzählt von einem Buch, das sie lesen möchte. Plötzlich ein Schrillen, rund um den Tisch schrecken alle auf: Ich selbst brauche einen Moment und drei rhythmische Wiederholungen des Schrillens, um zu verstehen, dass nicht etwa ein Feueralarm, sondern Marcos Handy die Quelle des Geräuschs ist. Marco zieht es umständlich aus seiner Hosentasche und wendet sich ab, während er das Gespräch annimmt; wenige Sekunden später verlässt er telefonierend das Zimmer. Ursula sieht stumm und zusammengesunken auf ihren Teller. Auf einmal hebt sie ruckartig den Kopf: «Ja, so ist das.» Was sie meine, frage ich leise. «Da ist jetzt sicher irgendwas bei Martina und dem Kleinen. Also, wir rufen Marco nur bei der anderen an, wenn was ist. Kann niemand etwas dafür. Aber eben, gerade waren *wir* ja hier zusammen.» Sie nimmt mir das Geschirr aus der Hand und verschwindet in der Küche. Als sie wiederkommt – Marco ist noch am Telefon – ist sie etwas entspannter und sagt: «Ich will nicht so neidisch sein, weil jeder macht ja [für das Gelingen der Ehegemeinschaft], was er kann hier [...] ich sollte nicht eifersüchtig sein.» Ich frage, ob ich gehen solle, damit sie Zeit für sich habe. Sie antwortet, alles sei in Ordnung; später wolle sie beten und sich vor Augen rufen, dass sie Geduld haben müsse und ihre «giftige Eifersucht loswerden» wolle, «weil ohne fühle ich mich freier.» Immerhin gehe ihr Mann ja, wenn er von ihr weggehe, nicht zu irgendeiner Frau, sondern allenfalls in einem Notfall zu seiner eigenen Frau, nämlich Martina. «Und ich habe dadurch ja auch Vorteile. Ich muss ihn nicht alleine glücklich machen.»

Marco kommt ein wenig später herein und berichtet, sein Kind habe Fieber und Martina sei unsicher, ob ärztliche Behandlung nötig sei. Martina habe sich entschuldigt, in seine und Ursulas Zeit hineingeplatzt zu sein. Als er das sagt, lächelt Ursula ihn an und sagt: «Das macht gar nichts. Und der Kleine geht vor.» Marco ist in Gedanken offensichtlich bereits bei seinem

fiebernden Sohn und kündigt an, vielleicht nachts zurückzukommen, falls das Fieber sinke. Ursula verabschiedet ihn und auch mich kurze Zeit später, um sich zurückzuziehen.

Ursula erlebt hier zunächst, was sie als «giftige» Eifersucht kategorisiert: Ein empfundenes Zurückgesetztsein und eine persönliche Betroffenheit, dass ihr Mann zu seiner Erstfrau geht und nicht bei ihr bleibt. Aber im Gegensatz zur protektiven Eifersucht gegenüber Nichtehefrauen ihres Mannes, die von ihr mitgeteilt und gehegt würde, reagiert sie auf diesen unerwünschten Eifersuchtsimpuls mit einordnenden und dämpfenden Selbstregulationen – die Eifersucht, die sie empfindet, erscheint ihr «giftig», weil sie nicht die Qualität eines religiösen Werts besitzt. Der Eifersucht auf eine nach ihrem Verständnis rechtmässige Ehefrau ihres Mannes begegnet sie, indem sie versucht, ihre unmittelbare Betroffenheit durch zeitnahe religiöse Kontemplation und Selbstmahnungen auszugleichen. In anderen vergleichbaren Momenten sagte sie, dass ein zentrales Ziel in puncto Emotionsregulation stets das subjektive Wohlergehen sei,

> [weil] mich das ruhiger macht als alles andere, wenn ich mich von so einem giftigen Gefühl wegbringe [...] Klar fange ich mich sozusagen auch darum [emotional] ein, weil das islamisch ist, aber eben auch, weil es mir dann einfach gut geht. (Ursula)

Auch Martina verwies in einer ähnlichen Situation mit umgekehrten Vorzeichen explizit darauf, dass ihr Glauben ihr nicht nur die Forderung stelle, selbstsüchtige Eifersucht zu drosseln, sondern ihr zugleich die Mittel dazu an die Hand gebe und damit effektiv auch ihre subjektive Entspanntheit fördere:

> Wenn es mich überkommt [Eifersucht], dann konzentriere ich mich auf das, was schöne Eigenschaften für eine Ehefrau sind. Also wie ich sein will. Und ich bete und lese dazu [zu dem Thema], das macht mich ruhiger [...] Ich merke ja selbst, wenn ich so Zickerei nicht zulasse, dann komme ich viel besser zuwege von meiner Stimmung her. (Martina)

Protektive Eifersucht hegen

Genauso kann die emotionale Selbstregulation gemäss religiös-moralischen Empfehlungen auch das Steigern einer als zu gering empfundenen «guten» Eifersucht betreffen. Dies ist eine Forderung, die beispielsweise Ursula gegenüber Marco hinblicklich ihrer Erwerbstätigkeit, die Kontakte mit fremden Männern beinhaltet, öfter und durchaus klar artikulierte. Marco wird von ihr ab und an freundlich ermahnt, mehr protektive Eifersucht zu zeigen, und erlebt diese Mahnungen als «gegenseitige Hilfe für ein islamisches Leben».

Wenn Ursula von der Arbeit kommt und Marco bereits in ihrer Wohnung auf sie wartet, kann es vorkommen, dass er kurz verstimmt ist. Er sagt dann beispielsweise halb scherzhaft, halb ernsthaft, dass sie sich besser um die Kunden ihres Arbeitgebers kümmere als um ihren Ehemann. Ursula kontert das meist auf zwei Ebenen. Einerseits betont sie, er müsse nicht daran zweifeln, dass ihr andere Männer egal seien; wenn sie gereizt ist, murmelt sie vielleicht zudem,

er solle ihre Ehre nicht beleidigen. Andererseits stichelt sie halb witzelnd zudem oft, dass er besser schnell beruflich aufsteige, damit sie eine «richtige Frau» sein könne in dem Sinne, dass sie nicht länger zum Einkommen beitragen und beruflich bedingt fremde Männer treffen müsse; wenn er das nicht vorantreibe, werde er irgendwann noch als *dayyuth* betrachtet. Das wiederum ist die Bezeichnung für einen Mann, der beispielsweise Unzucht unter Angehörigen wissentlich duldet, der also religiösen Schutz- und Anleitungspflichten nicht nachkommt. *Dayyuth* bezeichnet ausserdem einen Mann, der nicht willens bzw. in der Lage ist, besonders weibliche Familienmitglieder daran zu hindern, aufreizend und somit Versuchung verursachend aus dem Haus zu gehen. Der Begriff wird je nach Kontext zudem in Verbindung gebracht mit Ehrlosigkeit, einem Verlust an Schamhaftigkeit des Mannes und dadurch auch seiner Angehörigen, mangelnder Erfüllung der Haushaltsvorstandsrolle des Mannes, Gehörntwerden, oder sogar Unmännlichkeit im Allgemeinen.

Einmal erklärte sie mir den ernsthaften Hintergrund ihrer scherzhaften Mahnungen: Die protektive Eifersucht, die sie von ihrem Gatten einfordere, sei eine gute Charaktereigenschaft eines Mannes; sie beweise seine ehrliche Sorge um ihre Seele – denn seine Eifersucht würde seine Frauen ja vor Versuchungen und Belästigungen bewahren – sowie für eine Wertschätzung ihrer Gattinnenrolle in einer Weise, die religiösen Idealen entspreche.[15] Das könne sie religiös und persönlich von ihm verlangen – nicht aber, dass er «einfach nur stumpf mir dumm kommt, weil ich im Job eben Männer sehen muss», was sie klar als «giftige» und moralisch verwerfliche selbstbezogene Eifersucht wertet. Vor allem sei eine Kultivierung seiner protektiven Eifersucht jedoch «wichtig für seinen Glauben und schlussendlich auch dafür, dass er ein ganzer Mann ist und sich so auch fühlt.» Ursula führt also individuelle Wohlbefindensvorteile für alle Beteiligten, daraus resultierende wünschenswerte Lebensverhältnisse, einen zu erwartenden Reputations- und Männlichkeitsgewinn für ihren Mann mit einem dadurch gesteigerten Weiblichkeitsgewinn für sie, und die religiös-moralische Werthaftigkeit protektiver Eifersucht per se ins Feld, um für eine gezielte Steigerung positiver Eifersucht bei ihrem Mann zu werben. Ursula grenzt diese wünschenswerte Eifersucht klar ab von einer nichterwünschten Eifersucht, die bloss zum Gegenstand hat, dass ihr Mann es persönlich ärgerlich findet, wenn sie eng mit anderen Männern kommuniziert.

Marco sagt dazu bei anderer Gelegenheit, dass es in einer mehrheitlich nichtsalafitisch geprägten Gesellschaft schwer für ihn als Mann sei, wünschenswerte protektive Eifersucht zu entwickeln:

> *Da schwimmst du ja auch gegen den Strom, nicht wahr [...] Für mich ist noch schwierig, nicht zu schmollen, wenn Ursula eben so viel rausgeht und auch alle ihre Stimme*[16] *hören zum Beispiel. Aber ich muss da eben nicht schmollen, sondern was dafür tun, dass das nicht mehr so ist und sie geschützter ist. Darum geht es ja eigentlich.* (Marco)

---

[15] Dies resoniert u. a. mit einem Text, der in verschiedenen englisch- und deutschsprachigen Salafiforen kursierte und kursiert, und der vielen ForschungspartnerInnen bekannt war sowie von ihnen geschätzt wurde. Darin heisst es beispielsweise: «Seid dankbar dafür, dass euer Ehemann so ein schönes Mass an Ghirah für euch hat und dass er euch schätzt und euer Jenseits fürchtet.» (s. bspw. ahlu-sunnah.net o. A.).

[16] Für einige Salafis ist die weibliche Stimme Teil der *ʿawra*, also der Körperteile und -eigenschaften, die eine Frau nicht öffentlich entblössen sollte.

Er sei aber in einem Prozess, eine solche protektive Eifersucht zu kultivieren, dass er möglichst im Einklang mit den Vorbildern der ersten muslimischen Generationen stehe – auch wenn er damit in der Schweiz «gegen den Strom» schwimme, was sein Verständnis dessen betreffe, was er von seinen Frauen an Einschränkungen des öffentlichen Umgangs mit anderen Personen verlange: «Aber das wollen sie [Martina und Ursula] ja auch so.» Er hält eine zunehmende protektive Eifersucht auch für ein Motivationselement, was sein eigenes berufliches Vorankommen betrifft: Wenn er mehr Geld verdiene, sei Ursula immerhin nicht länger gezwungen, noch arbeiten zu gehen. Er könne dadurch die Grundbedingungen dafür schaffen, dass protektive Eifersucht im konkreten Sinne eines Einschränkens ihrer Kontakte zu Männern überhaupt lebbar sei. Das wiederum würde «so eher alberne Eifersucht und Schmollerei», wie er es nennt, dämpfen – weil einerseits die Gelegenheiten abnähmen, in denen sie mit fremden Männern sprechen müsse, und weil andererseits sein Selbstbild als Mann gestärkt sei, was ihn souveräner machen würde.

> *Denn dann erfülle ich ja auch, was ich sollte, nämlich dass ich für sie aufkommen kann [...] Dann geht es ja mehr darum, so wie vorausschauend eifersüchtig zu sein und bestimmten Situationen vorzubeugen, und nicht nur rumzumeckern. Damit geht es mir dann besser, das weiss ich.* (Marco)

Bis er komplett für Ursula aufkommen kann, will er im Rahmen seiner Möglichkeiten seine Gefühle adjustieren: Wenn er «schmolle» und damit auf selbstbezogene Art eifersüchtig sei, wolle er sich emotional zunehmend auf seine Sorge um ihr Seelenheil konzentrieren, das gefährdet sein könnte – und weniger auf den ursprünglichen Wutauslöser, der zurzeit offenbar oft in Phantasien besteht, wie sie mit anderen Männern lachen oder ihnen verheissungsvoll über den Arm streichen könnte. Das Händeschütteln, ebenfalls Teil ihres Berufs in einem deutschschweizerisch geprägten Umfeld, stört ihn weniger – er glaubt aber, es sollte ihn als frommen Ehemann mehr stören. Das Thema wird auch in Foren und Blogs des Öfteren aufgegriffen. Ein digitaler Beitrag, der Marco einige Tage lang nachging, wie er sagt, war der folgende:

> *Solcher kommt und gibt deiner Frau die Hand, während du ihn, wie eine stumme Ziege ansiehst. Nein, Ziegen sind besser als du! Er gibt ihr die Hand so, er bewegt ihre Hand und sieht sie dabei an. Maa schaa Alllah, er genießt es sie anzufassen und betrachtet sie, wie ein Bulle. Wo ist deine Männlichkeit? Wo ist deine Eifersucht? Wo ist deine Religion?* (1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com 2015)

Marco beabsichtigt also nicht etwa, eifersüchtige Impulse ersatzlos zu entschärfen und abzubauen, so wie es seine Frauen bisweilen dann versuchen, wenn sie aufeinander eifersüchtig sind. Stattdessen möchte er ein impulshaftes Gefühl der selbstbezogenen Eifersucht religiös-moralisch umdeuten, indem er die angenommene kausale Grundlage der Empfindung modifiziert: Von Selbstunsicherheit hin zu Sorge um seine Frauen und ihr Seelenheil. Dies würde eine Umwandlung in «gute» Eifersucht und letztlich die Erfüllung eines religiös erwünschten Wertes bedeuten, was zudem seinem Rollenideal als frommem Ehemann besser entspräche.

Fazit

Die am Beispiel vom Umgang mit Eifersucht beschriebene Form der Gefühlsregulation – einerseits als religiös-moralischer Imperativ, andererseits als alltägliche Praxis – bedeutet für viele SalafitInnen im deutschsprachigen Raum einen zugleich religiös unverzichtbaren und subjektiv bereichernden Aspekt ihres Lebens. Das Evaluieren und Abdämpfen eigener Impulse und Gefühle ist dabei sowohl vorausgesetztes Gebot eines religiösen Erwünschtheitskanons als auch handlungsanleitendes Mittel sowie anzustrebendes Ziel. Das Zwischenschalten religiös inspirierter Werte- und Selbstevaluationsstrategien führt dem Verständnis und dem Empfinden vieler Salafis nach nicht nur zu einem gottgefälligen Leben, sondern auch zu gelungenerem partnerschaftlichem Miteinander, zu gesteigerter Männlichkeit bzw. Weiblichkeit, und zu mehr individueller Ausgeglichenheit.

Die distanzierende, abwägende Forderung der beschriebenen *feeling rules* (Röttger-Rössler et al. 2015) ist dabei in einem weitgespannten Netz von Regulationsimperativen betreffend Nähe und Distanz zu verorten, das typisch für salafitische Religiosität ist. Weitere Nähe-Distanz-regulierende Normen betreffen beispielsweise Berührungs- und Blickkontaktregeln,[17] Gender-Sphären und damit verbundene Kleidungspräferenzen[18] oder auch Regeln über die Beziehungsqualitäten, die zwischen Salafis und Nichtsalafis als wünschenswert beziehungsweise unerwünscht gelten.[19]

Ich halte Distanzierungs- und Mittelbarkeitselemente, auch und besonders emotionsbezogene, für ein wesentliches Charakteristikum salafitischen Glaubens, Erlebens, Handelns und Denkens. *Mittelbarkeit* wird hier nicht in erster Linie verstanden als Element von Religiosität, das Mittelspraxen zwischen Göttlichem und Nichtgöttlichem beinhaltet (siehe Robbins 2017 für eine Übersicht über ethnologische Verständnisse von Religion in dieser Hinsicht), sondern als Form des regelbezogenen Umgangs einer (salafitischen) Person mit der Welt, mit den eigenen Gefühlen und mit den Mitmenschen, der sich wie eine Schutzschicht zwischen den Glaubenden und alles potentiell Bedrohliche, weil als gottesfern Erlebte, legt. Eigene spontane Gefühle fallen dabei in die Kategorie des potentiell Bedrohlichen und sind darum prinzipiell religiös zu evaluieren, sowie gegebenenfalls entsprechend zu modifizieren.

Nähe-Distanz-Austarierungen unter Rückgriff auf religiöse Mittelbarkeitskonzepte bestimmen bei meinen ForschungspartnerInnen also nicht nur die Beziehung zwischen Individuum und sozialer Umgebung, was Robbins (2017; s. auch Robbins 2019) anderswo zurecht als eine wichtige Wirkung von Religionskonzepten identifizierte. Nähe-Distanz-Auslotungen bestimmen ausserdem die Beziehung zwischen einer Person und ihren eigenen Emotionen, Erlebnissen und Bewertungen – also zwischen einer Person und ihr selbst. Gefühle, die zu "objects of moral assessments" (Cassaniti 2014, 280) werden, können dabei bereits im Zuge dieser morali-

---

[17] Vgl. bspw. Inge (2017); besonders zwischen Männern und Frauen, die weder verheiratet sind noch aus der Gruppe derjenigen Personen stammen, mit denen ein Eheverbot besteht.

[18] Vgl. hierzu auch Olsson (2020), Piela (2019); es geht dabei um Ideen zu angemessenen Bewegungsräumen für Frauen, auch um das Bedecken bestimmter Körperteile in der Öffentlichkeit.

[19] Vgl. auch de Koning (2013a), Damir-Geilsdorf et al. (2019). Solche Reglements betreffen zum Beispiel Freundschaften zu Nichtmuslimen oder das Beten neben salafitischen Personen einer abweichenden Glaubenspraxis als der eigenen.

schen Bewertung umgedeutet oder aber durch eine mit ihnen verknüpfte Handlung respektive eine aufwändigere, veränderte Gefühlsbewertungsanstrengung modifiziert werden.

Im Gegensatz zu anderen ebenfalls dezentralen, basisgetragenen und literalistischen religiösen Gruppen wie Pfingstkirchen (Meyer 2010) scheinen auch in Moscheengemeinschaften tief verwurzelte deutschschweizer Salafis sich seltener offensichtlich und relativ spontan erfüllt zu fühlen von als religiös induziert verstandenen Emotionen und sinnlichen Erlebnissen. Stattdessen müssen sie sich durch «korrekte» und intensive Religiosität erst den Weg zu religiös richtigem Fühlen bahnen.[20] Gefühle sind somit spürbarer Gradmesser des rechten Glaubens, Optimierungsfeld des Glaubenden, und – mit zunehmender Selbstregulation – spontaner Erfahrungsraum des eigenen vermuteten Rechtglaubens, der nämlich dann angenommen wird, wenn das eigene Empfinden irgendwann akkurat mit religiösen Idealen zusammenfällt. All diese Dimensionen und die zu ihnen gehörigen Evaluations- und Regulationsprozesse wiederum werden als erdend, stabilisierend, ausgleichend erlebt. Kurz: Das moralisch-religiös Gute und das Sich-gut-Anfühlende fallen für viele Salafis in der Dimension des religionsspezifischen Emotionsmanagements zusammen, und das verwurzelt sie in ihrer Glaubensweise. Dieses Emotionsmanagement ist wiederum eine wichtige Facette jener vielfältigen Mittelbarkeiten und Nähe-Distanz-Auslotungen, die salafitische Religiosität wesentlich ausmachen.

Literaturverzeichnis

Ich verweise bei online-Referenzen oft auf die Namen von Websites, nicht auf AutorInnen. Das hat den Grund, dass in diesem Forschungsbereich 1. die AutorInnennamen auf Websites nicht unbedingt aussagekräftig bzw. eindeutig sein müssen und 2. einzelne Gruppierungen oft mehrere Websites/Kanäle betreiben, die nicht unbedingt inhaltlich deckungsgleich sind. Eine Website zu benennen erscheint darum klarer als die Angabe eines eventuell vermerkten AutorInnennamens oder AutorInnenkollektivs.

1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com. 2016. *Fundamentale Regel der Ehe*. 14. August. Abgerufen am 2. Juli 2020.

https://1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com/2016/08/14/fundamentale-regel-der-ehe/1wissen-2taten3dawah.wordpress.com 2015. *Habt Ghira' (Eifersucht) für eure Frauen!* 18. Juni. Abgerufen am 2. Juli 2020.

https://1wissen2taten3dawah.wordpress.com/2015/06/18/habt-ghira-eifersucht-fur-eure-frauen/.

Al-Fawzan. 2017. «Advice to the Muslim woman.» Übersetzter Auszug aus: Shaykh Salih ibn Fawzan ibn Abdullah al-Fawzan, *Nasiha wa fatawa lil mar'ah al-muslima*. Abgerufen am 9. Juni 2021.

http://salafimanhaj.com/advice-to-the-muslim-woman bzw. http://download.salafimanhaj. com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_AdviceToWomen.pdf.

Abu Abdallah. 2010. «Die Hölle [Sehr Emotional].» Eingestellt am 18. Oktober. Abgerufen am 13. September 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4CmIB-83B6M

---

[20] Obwohl beispielsweise auch Weinen vor religiöser Ergriffenheit nicht selten vorkommt, erfolgt dies meist forciert und entspricht der Erfüllung einer erlernten *display rule;* vgl. bspw. Abu Abdallah (2010) für ein Beispiel sorgsam kultivierten Trauerns und Weinens vor grossem Publikum. Es spielt hierbei aber eine Rolle, dass das Weinen aus den «richtigen» religiösen Gründen heraus geschieht.

abukhadeejah.com 2019. «Polygamy (Polygyny): Would it Better [sic] to be One of a Few Wives Instead of Being on your Own?» 20. Januar. Abgerufen am 9. Juni 2021.
https://www.abukhadeejah.com/polygamy-in-islam-better-than-being-alone/

abukhadeejah.com 2014. «Introduction to Marriage: Bulūgh Al-Marām.» 19. März. Abgerufen am 9. Juni 2021. https://www.abukhadeejah.com/the-book-of-marriage-ibn-hajrs-buloogh-al-maraam-explanation-of-al-fawzaan/

ahlu-sunnah.net (o. A.). «Die schützende Eifersucht – al ghira.» Abgerufen am 2. Juli 2020. https://ahlu-sunnah.net/die-schutzende-eifersucht-al-ghira/

Cassaniti, Julia L. 2014. «Moralizing Emotion: A Breakdown in Thailand.» *Anthropological Theory* 14(3): 280–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499614534551

Chaplin, Chris. 2018. «Communal Salafi Learning and Islamic Selfhood: Examining Religious Boundaries Through Ethnographic Encounters in Indonesia.» *Ethnography* 21(1): 113–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138118795988

Dantschke, Claudia. 2014. «‹Da habe ich etwas gesehen, was mir einen Sinn gibt.› Was macht Salafismus attraktiv und wie kann man diesem entgegenwirken.» In *Salafismus, Auf der Suche nach dem wahren Islam*, herausgegeben von Behnam Said und Hazim Fouad, 474–502. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Damir-Geilsdorf, Sabine, und Mira Menzfeld. 2020. «Methodological and Ethical Challenges in Empirical Approaches to Salafism: Introduction.» *Journal of Muslims in Europe* 9(2): 135–149. https://doi.org/10.1163/22117954-BJA10004

Damir-Geilsdorf, Sabine, Mira Menzfeld und Yasmina Hedider. 2019. «Interpretations of *al-wala' wa-l-bara'* in Everyday Lives of Salafis in Germany.» *Religions* 10(2): 124. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10020124

de Koning, Martijn. 2013a. «How should I live as a ‹true› Muslim? Regimes of living among Dutch Muslims in the Salafi Movement.» *Etnofoor* 25(2): 53–72. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43264020

de Koning, Martijn. 2013b. «The moral maze: Dutch Salafis and the construction of a moral community of the faithful.» *Contemporary Islam* 7(1): 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11562-013-0247-x

Dziri, Bacem und Michael Kiefer. 2018. «‹Baqiyya im Lego-Islam› – Anmerkungen zu den Whatsapp-Protokollen der ‹Ansaar Al Khilafat Al Islamiyya› aus einer islamwissenschaftlichen Perspektive.» In *«Lasset uns in sha'a allah ein Plan machen»: Fallgestützte Analyse der Radikalisierung einer WhatsApp-Gruppe*, herausgegeben von Michael Kiefer, Jörg Hüttermann, Bacem Dziri, Rauf Ceylan, Viktoria Roth, Fabian Srowig und Andreas Zick, 23–58. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Emmons, Robert. 2005. «Emotion and Religion». In *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, herausgegeben von Raymond Paloutzian und Crystal Park, 235–252. New York, London: Guilford Press.

Eser Davolio, Miryam. 2017. «Hintergründe jihadistischer Radikalisierung in der Schweiz – eine Fallstudie.» In *Radikalisierung und extremistische Gewalt: Perspektiven aus dem Fall- und Bedrohungsmanagement*, herausgegeben von Jens Hoffmann und Nils Böckler, 155–168. Frankfurt a. M.: Verlag für Polizei und Wissenschaft.

EZE CH – Einladung zum Erfolg. 2020. *Geschiedene Frauen heutzutage!* Dip. Ing. Marcel Krass. Eingestellt am 30. Juli. Abgerufen am 30. Juli 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GWSEWwkGytY

Fadil, Nadia. 2009. «Managing Affects and Sensibilities: The Case of Not-handshaking and Not-fasting.» *Social Anthropology* 17(4): 430–454. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8676.2009.00080.x

Gauvain, Richard. 2013. *Salafi Ritual Purity: In the Presence of God.* London, New York: Routledge.

Illi, Nora. 2018. «‹Polygamie hat viele Vorteile›: Die Schweizerin Nora Illi (30) erklärt, warum ihr Mann gerne zwei oder mehr Frauen haben darf.» [Interview mit Nora Illi] *Blick*, 9. September. Abgerufen am 1. Juli 2020. https://www.blick.ch/news/schweiz/die-schweizerin-nora-illi-30-erklaert-warum-ihr-mann-gerne-zwei-oder-mehr-frauen-haben-darf-polygamie-hat-viele-vorteile-id2830572.html

Inge, Anabel. 2017. *The Making of a Salafi Muslim Woman.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

IZRS. 2020. *Tabus, langweilige Ehebeziehung & unbefriedigte Sexualität– Haben wir ein Sex-Problem im Islam?* Video einer Diskussion von Nicolas Blancho, Ferah Ulucay, Abdel Azziz Qaasim Illi und Maymounah Ah. Eingestellt am 2. Juni 2020. Abgerufen am 1. Juli 2020. https://www.facebook.com/islamrat/videos/280591609993766

Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject.* Princeton: University Press.

Meijer, Roel. 2009. «Introduction.» In *Global Salafism. Islam's New Religious Movement,* herausgegeben von Roel Meijer, 1–32. London: Hurst & Co.

Meyer, Birgit. 2010. «Aesthetics of Persuasion: Global Christianity and Pentecostalism's Sensational Forms.» *South Atlantic Quarterly* 109(4): 741–763. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-2010-015

Nuraniyah, Nava. 2018. «Not Just Brainwashed: Understanding the Radicalization of Indonesian Female Supporters of the Islamic State.» *Terrorism and Political Violence* 30(6): 890-910. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2018.1481269

Olsson, Susanne. 2020. «‹True, Masculine Men Are Not Like Women!›: Salafism Between Extremism and Democracy.» *Religions* 11(3): 118. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11030118

Piela, Anna. 2019. «Wearing the niqab in the UK: Exploring the Embodied ‹Shape a Moral Action can Take›.» *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 87(2): 512–542. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfz002

Poljarevic, Emin. 2016. "The Power of Elective Affinities in Contemporary Salafism." *The Muslim World* 106, Nr. 3: 474–500. https://doi.org/10.1111/muwo.12159

Quranundhadith.wordpress.com (o. A.). *Von den Rechten der Ehegatten gegenüber einander.* Abgerufen am 2. Juli 2020. https://quranundhadith.wordpress.com/2013/11/25/von-den-rechten-der-ehegatten-gegenuber-einander-schaykh-abdullaah-abdu-r-rahiim-al-bukhaariyy/

Riedl, Katrin. 2018. «Mehrfachliebe als Affekt. Ein Moment von Subversion im Neoliberalismus?» *Tsantsa* 23: 73–81. https://doi.org/10.36950/tsantsa.2018.18.7293

Robbins, Joel. 2019. "On Knowing Faith: Theology, Everyday Religion, and Anthropological Theory." *Religion and Society* 10(1): 14–29. https://doi.org/10.3167/arrs.2019.100103

Robbins, Joel. 2017. «Keeping God's distance: Sacrifice, Possession, and the Problem of Religious Mediation.» *American Ethnologist* 44(3): 464–475. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12522

Röttger-Rössler, Birgitt, Gabriel Scheidecker, Leberecht Funk und Manfred Holodynski. 2015. «Learning (by) Feeling: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Socialization and Development of Emotions.» *Ethos* 43(2): 187–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/etho.12080

Röttger-Rössler, Birgitt und Hans J. Markowitsch (Hg.). 2009. *Emotions as Bio-Cultural Processes.* New York: Springer.

salafimanhaj.com. 2014. *Responsible Polygamy vs Irresponsible Polygamy.* Eingestellt 2011–2014. Abgerufen am 9. Juni 2021. http://download.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Polygamy2014.pdf

Schielke, Samuli. 2010. *Second Thoughts About the Anthropology of Islam, or How to Make Sense of Grand Schemes in Everyday Life.* Working Paper No. 2. Berlin: Zentrum Moderner Orient.

Schielke, Samuli. 2009. «Ambivalent Commitments: Troubles of Morality, Religiosity and Aspiration among Young Egyptians.» *Journal of Religion in Africa* 39(2): 158–185. https://www.degruyter.com/database/IBZ/entry/ibz.ID1762674847/html

Skoggard, Ian und Alisse Waterston. 2015. «Introduction: Toward an Anthropology of Affect and Evocative Ethnography.» *Anthropology of Consiousness* 26(2): 109–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/anoc.12041

Schwenzer, Ingeborg. 2013. *Familienrecht und gesellschaftliche Veränderungen. Gutachten von Prof. Dr.Ingeborg Schwenzer vom August 2013 zum Postulat Fehr (12.3607)* Dauerhaft abzurufen unter: https://www.bj.admin.ch/bj/de/home/publiservice/publikationen/externe/2013-08-01.html

Stellungnahme Bundesrat. 2012: *Interpellation 12.3170: Polygamie in der Schweiz.* Eingereicht am 14.3.2012 im Nationalrat der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Beantwortet durch eine Stellungnahme des Bundesrats am 9.5.2012. Dauerhaft abzurufen unter: https://www.parlament.ch/de/ratsbetrieb/suche-curia-vista/geschaeft?AffairId=20123170

Ulucay, Ferah und Pierre Vogel. 2020a: *Streitthema Mehrehe: Teil 1.* Youtube-Video. Eingestellt am 1. Juni 2020. Abgerufen am 1. Juli 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=phuaG2BInDQ

Ulucay, Ferah und Pierre Vogel. 2020b: *Nora Illi und die Aussage, die Gelehrte zum staunen brachte.* Youtube-Video. Eingestellt am 3. Juni 2020. Abgerufen am 1. Juli 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XMuMqatrOiA

Vidino, Lorenzo. 2013. *Jihadist Radicalisation in Switzerland*. Zürich: CSS Studies. www.css.ethz.ch/publications/pdfs/CH_radicalization_report.pdf

Wagemakers, Joas. 2018. «Salafism or the Quest for Purity.» *Oasis*, 26. Juli 2018. Abgerufen am 1. Juli 2020. https://www.oasiscenter.eu/en/what-is-salafism-quest-for-purity

Wagemakers, Joas. 2012. ««Seceders› and ‹Postponers›? An Analysis of the ‹Khawarij› and ‹Murji'a› labels in Polemic Debates between Quietists and Jihadi-Salafis.» In *Contextualising Jihadi Thought*, herausgegeben von Jeevan Deol und Zaheer Kazmi, 145–164. London: Hurst.

Autorin

Mira Menzfeld 🆔 ist Ethnologin und arbeitet im Rahmen des UFSP «Digital Religion(s)» der Universität Zürich am Religionswissenschaftlichen Seminar zu «Digital Relations and Local Religious Communities» (Projekt 5). Bevor sie in die Schweiz kam, forschte und lehrte sie in Köln, Turku und Guangzhou. Sie beschäftigt sich mit den Digitabilitäten religiöser Rituale in Transmigrationskontexten, mit Salafis in Mitteleuropa sowie mit Sterbensprozessen in Südchina, Finnland und Deutschland. Ihre Promotionsschrift «What it means to die» wurde mit dem Dissertationspreis der DGSKA ausgezeichnet. Kürzlich gab sie zum Thema Salafiyya die Special Issue «Salafism in Europe. Empirical Approaches» des *Journal of Muslims in Europe* heraus (mit Sabine Damir-Geilsdorf, 2020).

mira.menzfeld@uzh.ch
Universität Zürich

Dank

PERCEPTION OF REFUGEES IN LITHUANIA

Rūta Dapkūnaitė

Abstract

This article offers a partial answer to the question, "why are the vast majority of Lithuanians opposed to refugees immigrating to Lithuania?" I use cultural model theory (CMT) to find the salient characteristics Lithuanians attribute to refugees. Using methods associated with CMT, I shed light on some of the underlying conditions from which a negative perception of refugees emerges. Surprisingly, the negative image of refugees is not just reproduced from social media and news platforms that overwhelmingly depict refugees negatively but stems from Lithuanians' precarious feelings about their own lives. I thus propose that Lithuanians cultural models of refugees do not simply mirror political or social media portrayals of them as folk devils, but that Lithuanians construct their own cultural models from their life experiences and use these to substantiate their cultural model of refugees.

Keywords: *perception, refugees, integration, resistance, media, cultural model*

Introduction

While researching the portrayals of refugees by Lithuanian media and its government and citizens, it became apparent that while there were similarities, there were also significant differences between the views of citizens and those of both the government and the media. Therefore, in this paper, I seek to describe the generally negative view the Lithuanian public has of refugees and explain why this view is not just a simplified reflection or passive mirroring of the media or the government. I argue that these perceptions by Lithuanians reflect the value orientation and perspectives of their local community.

I want to add that there are many Lithuanians in favour of helping refugees, but my focus is on those who are, for the most part, adamantly opposed to any refugees entering and staying in Lithuania. In this paper, I aim to show through people's personal experiences how they develop their prejudices towards refugees. I seek to illuminate some of the reasons why a large body of Lithuanians, if not most, are staunchly resistant to refugees immigrating to the country and, in particular why they consider government assistance for refugees "unfair" (lit. *neteisinga*). The answer to the question regarding Lithuanians' widespread prejudices against refugees is multifaceted, but there are essential aspects of the root causes of local resistance that are surprising and complexify the nature of Lithuanian resistance to refugees in particular and immigrants in general.

I use cultural model theory to describe and analyse a cultural configuration of resistance to refugees. The individually constructed opinions are similar and converge on a few collectively shared negative images of refugees. When shared, such individual schemas are usually referred to as cultural models (Bennardo and De Munck 2014). Holland and Quinn defined cultural models as:

> [...] presupposed, taken-for-granted models of the world that are widely shared (although not necessarily to the exclusion of other, alternative models) by the members of a society and that play an enormous role in their understanding of that world and their behaviour in it. (1987, 4)

There is more than one cultural model of refugees in Lithuania; however, the one I developed sheds light on the underlying conditions that shape critical features of the Lithuanian cultural model of intolerance.

This article will start with a brief explanation of the cultural model theory, followed by a concise literature review on immigration and the concept of integration, and a subsequent discussion about methods of analysis and types of collected data in the methodology section. The last section summarises the results from gathered data and introduces the concept of the precariat (Standing 2012; 2014).

Literature review and issues of the concept of integration

To begin with, I will clarify the refugee definition within this text and will shortly present the Lithuanian context. This paper defines refugees as persons who hold asylum status in a host country, in this case – Lithuania. Lithuania opened its borders to refugees in 1997, but between 1997–2015, it has received a little more than 200 asylum seekers who were granted refugee status (MIPAS, 2017) and has never become a major destination country (EWSI 2019). According to Lindberg and Borrelli (2021), Lithuania is among the least popular destinations for asylum-seekers arriving in Europe. In 2015, Lithuania received 291 asylum applications (EMN Lithuania 2018). Only a few Lithuanians ever come into direct contact with refugees; however, the public shares common cultural models or political narratives not necessarily constructed or implied by the media.

Vermeulen and Penninx (2000, 263) asserted that integration is a multi-dimensional concept with strongly related structural and cultural dimensions. The social integration approach is one of the main processes used by the host country to integrate refugees or immigrants (Bornschier and Trezzini 1997). Robila (2018) emphasised multiple factors that contribute to successfully integrating refugees in the host nation. Her "smooth" (2018, 10) integration formulation includes their experiences, physical and mental health, and social support factors. Robila argues that, in general, there is a lack of understanding of the cultural diversity and the range of experiences refugees bring in. She mentioned the key resilience characteristics: personal agency, beliefs that life has meaning, goal direction, a sense of purpose, and motivation.

A problem with this notion of integration is that it is all one-sided – the immigrants are expected to adapt to the local social and cultural system. Thus, as Rytter (2019) defined, the concept of integration reflects and promotes an asymmetrical relationship between majorities and minorities. Further, he mentioned that integration often invokes the idea of society as a whole, where someone (refugees) needs to be integrated into something (the Lithuanian society).

This research focuses on revealing how members of the public in the host countries create obstacles not just to immigration and integration but to the act of tolerance and being sympathetic to the marginal status of refugees. Thus, the question arises whether there are particular features in the Lithuanian ethos (or character). I will argue against the tendency to characterise intolerance as part of a people's cultural configuration reflecting racism or extreme nationalism. Instead, I will show that intolerance is, in part, an outcome of a widespread feeling of socio-economic and cultural insecurity.

Methods

One year of fieldwork and participant observation has been conducted for this research (before the war in the Ukraine and the resulting Ukrainian refugee crisis in 2022). During this research, a number of other methods were used: 60 informal conversations with locals and refugees, 33 online surveys, 40 interviews with locals and 20 interviews with refugees and immigrants, two freelists with a total of 79 participants, and a media content analysis in which I reviewed 12 national media articles. This article presents data elicited using the freelist method. This emic method is simple to use, where people are asked to "list all the things they associate with X." Each informant should give you a list of at least five or more terms. Dengah II et al. (2021) describe freelisting as follows:

> Freelists allow social scientists to uncover the components that contribute to an individual and collective understanding of a given cultural domain. Once replicated, with more informants and data, we can begin to see a cultural domain take shapes – some items are recurrent and frequently cited, while others are more idiosyncratic, uncommon, and thus personal rather than cultural. By looking for patterns across multiple informants, we can ascertain how members of a cultural group understand a specific domain. (2021, 15–16)

According to Dengah IIet al. (2021) and Handwerkeret al. (1997), a sample of 30 respondents should be adequate to obtain culturally reliable responses to a freelist question on a specific domain. The first freelist (N = 33) question was to list "what and why you think other people do not like about refugees and their situation?" Results are presented in Table 1 below. A second freelist (N = 46) was somewhat similarly phrased but focused on concerns (which could also be positive concerns); it asked informants to "list all the concerns Lithuanians have for refugees immigrating to Lithuania" (see Table 2). Interviews and participant observation data are also used to interpret the implications of the freelist results.

All participants were born in Lithuania. Different informants were recruited for each sample, so there was no overlap. The median age of participants for the first freelist was 31 years with an age range between 17–45, while for the second, the median age was 54.5 with an age range between 27–82. Women constituted 70 % of the two samples and men 30 %. All research instructions were in Lithuanian and translated for publication by the author.

Freelist results and analysis: depiction of refugees

Table 1 presents the frequencies and saliency indices of the top terms listed for "what do Lithuanians dislike about refugees?" The reason was to minimise answering in politically correct terms if the question concerned their own opinions. It also allowed the portrayal of the collective rather than individual perception. The main term mentioned was *fear* of others (here, others refers explicitly to refugees), followed by *comes for social and monetary benefits*, *negative media news* and *terrorism / criminality*. Concepts of racism and nationalism appeared at the bottom of the list, only mentioned once each. More than half the respondents listed that other people do not like refugees because they are afraid of different cultures, different people, Muslims, and others.

Table 1   Total frequencies for the top terms (please list what and why you think other people do not like about refugees and their situation)

Cited Items	Frequency of Mention	Relative frequency of Mention	Smith Index
Afraid (fear) of different culture, people, unknown, muslims, others	19	0.576	0.5758
Comes for social, money benefit	9	0.273	0.1591
Negative media (construct the negative opinion)	9	0.273	0.1768
Terrorism, criminals, dangerous, aggresive – feeling unsafe	8	0.242	0.1591
Personal characteristics (unpatient, lazyness, unrealiable, emtionality)	3	0.091	0.0808
They take the jobs	3	0.091	0.0758
Islamophobia	2	0.061	0.0455
Negative politicians (construct the negative opinion)	2	0.061	0.0455
Stereotypes	1	0.030	0.0303
Nationalism	1	0.030	0.0303
Racism	1	0.030	0.0152

Note: Table created by the author with the own data set from the unpublished manuscript "Thinking behind the numbers: A test case for identifying and understanding factors of national cultural resistance that hinder integration of refugees" (2018–2019, Center for Social Anthropology, Vytautas Magnus University).

Some assumptions can be drawn that the high frequency of the answer *fear of others* implies a kind of nationalistic defence mechanism concerned with how Lithuanian culture may be viewed as under attack by foreigners. This interpretation appears to be validated by a wave of extreme anti-immigrant protests throughout Lithuania in the last few years. These occur across the country but are intentionally located where refugees reside when they first enter the country. Another presumption rose from the freelist and interview materials that Lithuanians identify refugees by external features: skin colour, clothes, and language.

The results of the second freelist (Table 2) are similar to the first one but present rational rather than emotional terms. As in the first freelist, the second freelist also listed *fear of others* as the primary concern. After that, there were some significant differences. *Job loss and unemployment* were significantly more prominent responses than in the first freelist. People are also worried about the crimes, and they view refugees with suspicion and ambivalence as refugees are thought to be reluctant to adapt to Lithuanian society. Another interesting choice with a high frequency was *disrespect*, which is, in fact, a fear of losing Lithuanian culture, language, culture, religion, and identity.

Table 2   Total frequencies for the top terms (please list all the concerns Lithuanians have for refugees immigrating to Lithuania)

Cited Items	Frequency of Mention	Relative frequency of Mention	Smith Index
Fear of others	14	0.311	0.2894
Crime	9	0.200	0.1677
Integration	9	0.200	0.1370
Job loss, unemployment	8	0.178	0.1354
Reluctant to adapt	8	0.178	0.1312
Cheap labour	7	0.156	0.0550
Disrespect to LT	7	0.156	0.0934
Security	6	0.133	0.0833
Social benefits	5	0.111	0.0722
Terrorism	4	0.089	0.0722
Fear of Islam, agitation	4	0.089	0.0722
Negative opinion, rumours	4	0.089	0.0444
Resistance to Muslims	4	0.089	0.0722

Note: Table created by the author with the own data set from the unpublished manuscript "Thinking behind the numbers: A test case for identifying and understanding factors of national cultural resistance that hinder integration of refugees" (2018–2019, Center for Social Anthropology, Vytautas Magnus University).

Thus, the high frequency of answers regarding crime and integration was the leading theme of the second freelist. Answers uncovered that people think rather rationally than emotionally, and their concerns are related to the integrational process, including the language barrier, educational differences, accommodation, their ability to adapt to a working environment, etc.

Material benefits combined with terms referring to a potential reduction of material benefits for Lithuanians were also a prominent theme of the second freelist with a quite high frequency of such answers. Possibly, Lithuanians feel that they are the victims of social injustice because of their inadequate salaries, low socio-economic unemployment support, and fear that emigrants will take their or their children's future jobs. Social service benefits for *pensininkai* (the retired) and the unemployed are too insufficient to provide anything but minimal subsistence. Some typical comments from the interviews were: "The elite force us to feed refugees when we are starving;" "refugees never worked and will not work in Lithuania;" "their social benefits will be higher than our minimal salary;" "refugees are being shoved to us, and then we have to support them financially."

Locals perceive refugees as benefitting from unfairly given privileges by the government. Interview and freelist data indicate that intolerance for refugees partially is a product of their sense of belonging to what Standing (2012; 2014) refers to as the *precariat*. Standing explicitly considers the precariat a "dangerous class" because it rejects normative democratic political ideology and practices. He defined the *precariat* as consisting of three main qualities: insecure jobs with no occupational identity; their educational levels are higher than the labour they are expected to fulfil, and that leads to the status of intense frustration (2012, 10); they rely on wages and insufficient pensions, paid holidays, and other external benefits, their relation with the state is volatile because the state continues to reduce infrastructural and general benefits to communities and groups suffering unemployment. It feeds into their feelings of rage, nostalgia for a better past, and a strongly felt sense of precariousness in their lives and families.

As Standing (2012) depicts, the precariat is portrayed as a cultural model or an outlook on the self and society that emerges and is shaped mainly by the material instabilities of contemporary life. I do not fully agree with a theoretical model of Standing because it remains vague though vivid. However, it captures the felt anger, even rage expressed by many Lithuanians about their lives and the immigration of refugees. Another theoretical perspective that fits the data is Foster's concept of the "Image of the Limited Good" lens based on a zero-sum distribution of finite resources – "the more party x receives, the less I receive" (1965, 296). Both theories pose a material basis for the emergence of psychological dispositions which pit the self against some "feared" others. Foster provides the generative concept of refugees taking from the pool of finite resources that would otherwise go to Lithuanians, and Standing offers a view of a modern world where individuals have uncertain job situations and lack financial or social security due to the failings of the state and modern political-economic systems that reduce their ability to find suitable stable work. Consequently, many post-truth characteristics can be attributed to refugees.

The contribution of this study is that, rather than looking at Lithuanian's negative perceptions of refugees being a product of inherent psychological dispositions, they can be seen stemming from the tenuousness felt in their lives. Perhaps one counter-intuitive means to reduce intolerance is to lessen the precariousness of middle and lower class lives. Another instrument could be to emphasise how refugees can work in Lithuanian businesses or farms to improve the well-being of both groups.

Conclusions

Many studies have shown that media shapes people's beliefs, values, and behaviours (Dubow, Huesmann, and Greenwood 2007). However, the views of Lithuanian citizens, who rarely come into direct contact with refugees, are not simply a reflection or passive mirroring of the media or government.

They individually craft their own schema or script similar thoughts about refugees and create a shared image and response to the immigration. Thus, Lithuanians are not just passive receivers of media input but active agents viewing refugees as a threat to their well-be-

ing. Therefore, they adopt media narratives that characterise refugees as folk devils (Cohen 1972) that will negatively impact Lithuanian culture and threaten lives. However, while this may be interpreted as the media causing Lithuanians to hold intolerant views of refugees, my brief analysis points to another interpretation, one where Lithuania's insecurities lead them to have negative feelings towards perceived threats to their well-being, and therefore they use media-constructed narratives to justify their intolerance. Underlying this ready acceptance of negative profiles is the failure of the country to provide Lithuanians with reasonable wages, secure employment, and minimal social services. However, it is important not to see Lithuanians who have negative attitudes towards refugees not as automatons following negative caricatures of refugees without thinking, but rather to understand their existential situation as unstable and under pressure.

Refugees' situation and public resistance are considered negative not because of ethnicity but influenced by life's material and economic conditions. Therefore, because the media and all the news are primarily contradictory, it has influenced and formulated Lithuanians' view of refugees negatively, relating them with terrorism, violence, or hate. Furthermore, an opinion prevails that unfamiliar people who happened to be the *others* possibly will take away material things like jobs, cultural heritage and symbols that Lithuanians perceive as part of their national identity. Thus, refugees are perceived to represent an economic, cultural, criminal, and psychological threat to the citizens of Lithuania. Consequently, the hindrance is being created due to a widespread feeling of socio-economic and cultural insecurity.

References

Bennardo, Giovanni, and Victor C. De Munck. 2014. *Cultural Models: Genesis, Methods, and Experiences.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bornschier, Volker, and Bruno Trezzini. 1997. "Social Stratification and Mobility in the World System: Different Approaches and Recent Research." *International Sociology* 12(4): 429–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/026858097012004004

Cohen, Stanley. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panic: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers.* London: Routledge Classics.

Dengah II, H. J. François, Jeffrey G. Snodgrass, Evan R. Polzer, and William Cody Nixon. 2021. *Systematic Methods for Analysing Culture.* London: Taylor and Francis. Kindle Edition.

European Migration Network (EMN) Lithuania. 2018. "Migration Trends." Accessed June 27, 2020. https://123.emn.lt/en/#asylum

European Website for Integration (EWSI). 2019. "Migrant Integration Governance in Lithuania." Accessed June 27, 2020. https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/country-governance/governance-migrant-integration-lithuania_en

Foster, George M. 1965. "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good." *American Anthropologist* 67(2): 293–315. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1965.67.2.02a00010

Dubow, Eric F., L. Rowell Huesmann, and Dara Greenwood. 2007. "Media and Youth Socialisation: Underlying Processes and Moderators of Effects." In *Handbook of Socialisation: Theory and Research*, edited by J. E. Grusec, and P. D. Hastings, 404–430. New York: The Guilford Press.

Handwerker, W. Penn, J. Harris, and J. Hutcherson. 1997. "Sampling Guidelines for Cultural Data." *Cultural Anthropology Methods* 8: 7–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X970090010501

Holland, Dorothy, and Naomi Quinn. 1987. *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindberg, Annika, and Lisa Marie Borrelli. 2021. "All Quiet on the 'Eastern Front? Controlling Transit Migration in Latvia and Lithuania." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47(1): 307–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1575719

Platform for Migration Information and Cooperation (MIPAS). 2017. "Receipt of Asylum Seekers and Asylum System." Accessed July 7, 2020. https://mipas.lt/en/2017/11/24/receipt-of-asylum-seekers-and-asylum-system/#_ftnref1

Robila, Mihaela. 2018. "Refugees and Social Integration in Europe. Division for Social Policy and Development." United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). https://www.un.org/development/desa/family/wp-content/uploads/sites/23/2018/05/Robila_EGM_2018.pdf

Rytter, Mikkel. 2019. "Writing Against Integration: Danish Imaginaries of Culture, Race and Belonging." *Ethnos* 84(4): 678–697. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2018.1458745

Standing, Guy. 2012. "The Precariat: From Denizens to Citizens?" Polity 44(4): 588–608. https://doi.org/10.1057/pol.2012.15

Standing, Guy. 2014. "The Precariat." *Contexts* 13(4): 10–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504214558209

Vermeulen, Hans, and M. J. A. Penninx. 2000. *Immigrant Integration: The Dutch Case*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Acknowledgements

Author

Rūta Dapkūnaitė ⓘ is an anthropologist, research fellow at BICEPS and a visiting academic at University of Oxford, COMPAS. She has completed MA in Social Anthropology at Vytautas Magnus University, attained the Southern Illinois University Certificate in Intercultural Understanding and is currently pursuing her PhD on the topic of displacement of people through the anthropological perspective.

rutadapkunaite@gmail.com

University of Fribourg

BOOK REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS/ REZENSIONEN

JUDAISM IN MOTION
The Making of Same-Sex Parenthood in Israel
Sybille Lustenberger. 2021. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 267pp.

In *Judaism in Motion,* Sybille Lustenberger examines the making of same-sex parenthood in Israel. The monograph builds on an anthropology of kinship, which recognizes the processual character of becoming a kin, and an anthropology of reproduction, which understands the deep socio-political character of human reproduction. On a theoretical level, it applies a transgenerational approach.

Discussing the particular context of Israel, Lustenberger notes that Jewish law shapes the possibilities for same-sex couples to become parents. Conversely, she also questions how and to what extent those bringing children up in same-sex relationships are simultaneously changing Judaism and the nation. Her monograph explores this puzzle and shows how new forms of Jewish continuity are being imagined and made in private homes, the parliament, courts, and even in Orthodox synagogues. This compelling ethnography thus relates the making of same-sex couples' kinship and families to contemporary political, religious, legal, and cultural dynamics in Israel.

The monograph follows a structure that discusses the formation of same-sex parenthood as an intrinsic part of the processes through which societies negotiate the norms that guarantee their reproduction, overcoming a rigid division between the religious and the secular to demonstrate how divergent principles and norms move between different societal contexts and institutions and are thereby transformed.

Following this interplay, *Judaism in Motion* builds on a rich body of ethnographic research data collected during Lustenberger's long-term stays in Israel (2010–2012 for her PhD, and 2016–2018 as a postdoctoral research fellow) as well as other places, including a two-month period following an Israeli gay couple to India for the birth of their surrogate child. Her PhD data material consists of interviews with same-sex couples from varying socioeconomic and family backgrounds, all but four of whom already had children. During her postdoctoral studies, she focused on the lives of lesbians and gay men from Orthodoxy homes with children, most of whom identify as religious, to ascertain if, and how much, they are impacting on Judaism. In addition, she carried out numerous conversations and interviews with Jewish scholars, rabbis, LGBT activists, local fertility specialists, and other involved actors. This material is supplemented by countless field research encounters, such as participation in a *brit milah* (ritual circumcision), Shabbat dinners, birthday parties, etc., as well as participant observation in everyday activities. Moreover, the author collected and analysed hundreds of political, legal, and judicial documents to gain a better understanding of the legal and bureaucratic framework in this context.

Seismo

In Israel the rabbinate has significant influence on definitions of marriage and parenthood. National family law is largely shaped by Orthodox kinship principles, and the interconnectedness between kinship, rabbinate, and state is also reflected in the fact that the only way Jews can get married is through the (Orthodox) rabbinate. Furthermore, great importance is attached to having children, and most of Lustenberger's interlocutors made it clear that they wanted more than one child, or that the rabbinate would find various ways to permit all reproductive technologies that would enable them to become parents. Lustenberger argues that norms and logics in Israel derive from two ontologies – analogism and naturalism (Descola 2013) – which are at times in tension with each other. While rabbinic kinship rules stem from a biblical ontology that is analogical, i.e. states that everything and everyone has a predetermined place, current ethnological research shows that the rabbinate knows how to weave in biogenetics and reproductive technologies through very concrete rules that are meant to maintain the order of creation (naturalism). However, as *Judaism in Motion* facets, when same-sex couples request access to and use reproductive technologies, new questions arise about both the definition of kinship and what kind of Jews their children are, and what this all means for the generational fabric that is the Jewish people. Important in this regard are also complementary roles that women and men have in maintaining this fabric, as it is mothers who pass on membership of the Jewish people to their children. This means that, depending on the constellation of a same-sex couple as well as their offsprings' genders, different affiliations of belonging to Judaism have to be negotiated.

Lustenberger demonstrates these different negotiations as she focuses on lesbian couples in chapter 2 and gay couples on their way to parenthood in chapter 3. In these chapters, she examines the theme of becoming a parent with reference to reproductive technologies. It is striking how Lustenberger succeeds here – and in the entire work – in explaining current dilemmas and frictions in Israeli society by depicting specific circumstances and disparate viewpoints. This includes the author's observation that sperm donation may be highly problematic from a halakhic perspective (i. e. the body of Jewish religious laws), for which rabbis attempt to find kosher solutions. Lustenberger argues convincingly that, despite existing restrictions, rabbis themselves have paved the way for understanding parenthood as a universal right that does not depend on marital status or sexual orientation, because of the enormous value they place on procreation and a discourse on the longing and suffering of childless women. Although this does not mean that same-sex partnerships and parenthood are considered morally correct in the Orthodox context, it does mean that, in practice, lesbian couples (as well as single women) have the option of artificial insemination through sperm donation, which is largely paid for by the mandatory Israeli basic health insurance. Lustenberger places this opportunity in the context of an understanding that motherhood is a national mission which is superior to the importance of marriage.

With regard to parenthood among gay couples, the author sketches a different picture. At the time of Lustenberger's research, surrogacy was prohibited for gay couples in Israel, but it was possible to carry a child to term via a surrogate mother in, for example, India, and subsequently establish a legal relationship between father and child via a DNA procedure informed by rabbinic kinship principles. Lustenberger thus identifies transnational surrogacy as a way for both gay couples and the state itself to circumvent national law and conso-

lidate the power of the rabbinate via bureaucratic procedures to define what constitutes a Jewish family.

The question of recognition is addressed in depth in the fourth chapter, for example in the case of second-parent adoption proceedings. Here Lustenberger takes a close look at legal discourses and jurisprudence in connection with religious components, and argues that ambiguities and inconsistencies are not a failure of the legal system, but are necessary to maintain a fragile balance between civil and Jewish law.

This leads to chapter 5, on belonging and the making of Jewish children in the context of same-sex parents. One way in which belonging can be created for boys is through circumcision *(brit milah)* on their 8th day of life. Lustenberger describes her participation in one such occasion and addresses the various feelings and considerations that preoccupy those involved. She does not attempt to standardize same-sex parents' negotiation processes, but presents a multi-faceted picture that also addresses possible disagreements within the couple (e. g. whether circumcision should take place). The chapter illustrates the continuing importance of religious rituals in forming Jewish children and reproducing Jewish collective identity. In doing so, Lustenberger demonstrates the flexibility but also the limitations that exist for including children of same-sex couples in communities and extended families.

A final chapter, fittingly titled "Transformations from Within", offers in-depth explorations of lesbian and gay stories of religious affiliation, including the context of extended families. Through these the author demonstrates that same-sex parenting can only be recognized as another way to build Orthodox continuity if it is acknowledged within Orthodox Judaism. At the same time, however, Lustenberger argues that such recognition also entails the everyday religious encounters that same-sex couples and their children have in the community, such as attending religious school or sharing the birth of a child born to same-sex parents.

Drawing on her rich ethnographic material, the author sketches a picture that resists the temptation to romanticize. In addition to describing heart-warming scenes like a child shouting the wedding of his two fathers from the roof of his Orthodox public school, she also names all the unfulfilled desires, hopes, and disappointments that same-sex parents experience in their Jewishness and their families of origin.

Judaism in Motion impressively demonstrates that being Jewish can be understood as deeply relational. The book does absolute justice to its holistic claim and paints a comprehensive and multi-faceted picture of same-sex parenthood in the context of producing Jewish continuity and change. Because of its broad scope, it will appeal to a wide audience, ranging from academic and religious experts to laypersons, as well as those personally affected by the topic. As a monograph about reproduction and kinship, *Judaism in Motion* makes a crucial contribution to understanding reproductive negotiation processes that are both temporal in scope, well beyond the generations of the same-sex couple and their children, and spatially impactful well beyond the same-sex nuclear family in a context of a Judaism in motion.

Reference

Descola, Philippe. 2013. *Beyond Nature and Culture.* Translated by Janet Lloyd. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anina Meier, University of Zurich, Switzerland

RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION AND AGRO-TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE IN POST-REFORM CHINA

Lena Kaufmann. 2021. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 306 pp.

The initial encounter that kindled Lena Kaufmann's interest in everyday life of migrating rice farmers in southern China did not take place in a paddy field, but in a noodle soup shop in Shanghai. While living there in 2006, she came to know the owner of the lunch spot, Mr. Wu. He and his family – originally from rural Anhui Province – stand as an exemplar of massive rural-urban migration in China. Since the 1980s, a third of Chinese farmers, about 280 million individuals, have left their homes to work in cities. They leave behind not only their paddy fields, but frequently also their children and parents, returning home only once a year. Kaufmann's research centres around the predicament that each of these households has to face: How to deal with the enormous pressures of migrating into metropoles as well as staying at home to preserve the familial fields? The book aims at showing that the critical factor in the decision-making process was in most cases the family's "major asset": their paddy fields. The material the author builds her argument on, is multifaceted: Kaufmann conducted field research in China over nineteen months in 2007–2008 and 2010–2011. She collected data from rural Hunan Province and additionally draws on data from Anhui migrants working in Shanghai as well as farmers living in rural Anhui Province. Additionally, she draws on historical resources such as Chinese oral vernacular literature and local gazetteers.

Contrary to Kaufmann's previous research that focused on the *urban* part of migrating farmers (Kaufmann 2011), this monograph not only depicts the *rural* side of migration, but offers an in-depth perspective of migrants' everyday lives, framed with a theoretical approach that reaches beyond a simplistic rural-urban spatial dichotomy. Through conceptualizing these farming households as "communities of practice" (p. 28 ff.), the author shows how both staying and migrating household members together actively deal with their immovable assets, the rice fields. She points out that the Chinese term for people who "stay back" nicely reflects this: the expression *liushou* (lit. *liu* = stay, remain / *shou* = guard, take care, conserve, protect) strongly expresses the care aspect and denotes that those migrating might return.

The strength of the book unfolded for me the moment I realized that it is a meticulously researched account on rural-urban migration in contemporary China, but also a stunning ethnographic account of smallholder wet rice farming. Kaufmann demonstrates that two aspects of this particular cultivation technique – that stands in sharp contrast to (non-irrigated) swidden rice cultivation as practised by most of Chinese minorities populating the highlands – particularly influence household decision strategies. Firstly, working on wet rice fields remains extremely labour-intensive, even in times of mechanization, and secondly, the fields need continuous cultivation to maintain their soil quality. Both aspects have direct implications regarding migration: They make it seemingly impossible.

In the first chapter, the reader is introduced to the above-mentioned predicament and the main field site of the study – a rice farming village of around 1,400 inhabitants living in 370 households. The choice of research area was deliberate: Hunan Province has one of the longest histories of wet rice cultivation in the world, maintains a rice-based local economy, and is today the "national centre of hybrid rice development and, along with the Philippines, the global centre" (p. 65). The chapter outlines a dazzling trajectory of Chinese agriculture

Seismo
verlag

from 1949 to the present, recalling the simple fact that, "For most of China's history, most of its people have worked as farmers" (p. 63).

In chapter two Kaufmann explains what rice knowledge (transmission) systems entail, how such knowledge is transmitted, and how both *content* as well as *media of transmission* have changed during the radical transformations that have shaped rural China since 1949. She thereby distinguishes three time periods. The multifaceted knowledge of "pre-collectivization" (before 1949) rice knowledge systems, characterized as "embodied" and "contextualized", were rooted in households structured along patrilineal groups. Gendered norms were strong and local officials' influence decisive; hence farmers' bodies were the primary media of knowledge formation and transmission. During the "collective" phase (1950s to early 1980s), when households were merged into communes, knowledge was scientized and subsequently turned into one-sided rice farming knowledge. Individual farmer's bodies as locus for skilled-informed agricultural practices were replaced by technical institutions: state-owned experimentation farms and model fields – Green Revolution technologies being at the heart of this period. During the third "post-Reform period" (mid-1980s to today) Kaufmann describes a return to individual bodies. In this, farmers' households and individuals encompass ways of knowing that span beyond pure rice knowledge: conventional and scientific knowledge go hand and hand, and farmers have extensive knowledge about wider economic issues including – notably – migration. While the first two phases were typified by a continuous will to enlarge and refine agrarian (rice) knowledge, the third, current phase entails a general agricultural deskilling of young migrants.

The third chapter focuses on one specific form of "media" of knowledge acquisition and transmission: farming proverbs. Kaufmann has selected and translated 150 proverbs that contain encoded knowledge about rice farming – stressing that this is only a tiny percentage (less than 0.4 percent!) of all the sayings collected in the 1980s for a local anthology that served as her main source. Evidently, sayings such as "Don't transplant late rice seedlings after the autumn, if the grain encounters frost, the milk stage [fruit development] will be difficult" (p. 247) are condensed forms of (rice) farming technology and ways of knowing. Kaufmann demonstrates that such strictly rhyming and therefore seemingly unchangeable proverbs are in fact very flexible "platforms of knowledge" (p. 145) which act as key media in which knowledge is negotiated between farmers and the state: Proverbs not only served the state (who assumingly crafted some of the proverbs) as means of propaganda and education; the farmers themselves used the rhymes also as a subtle means of resistance by reciting them "in a sarcastic or joking manner" (p. 163).

Chapter 4 analyses the agro-technological choices households take in order to deal with the above-mentioned predicament. Drawing on ethnographic data, the analysis focuses on rice harvesting techniques and lists the broad repertoire of tools and techniques applied. Kaufmann shows how families simultaneously rely on old and new technologies and resources, far from embodying a linear, historical process in which sickles are replaced by combine harvesters.

The fifth chapter brings together all the book's strands by looking at which social and technical land-use strategies rural households follow today. To illustrate how complex, continuously adapting, and – surprisingly – in many cases counter to state expectations these

are, Kaufmann identifies twelve land use strategies. This final chapter pinpoints the strength of the study. Where existing research on Chinese wet rice farming and migration provides data on how family members remaining in villages and those who migrate to cities maintain their fields, mostly only investigating particular strategies at a very general level – the two main ones being risk reduction and income generation – Kaufmann's approach is more nuanced. She does not focus on migration strategies or push factors for migration, but instead examines "the strategies used to protect land resources *despite* migration. These involve the land-use and land-arrangement strategies of both migrants and those left behind" (p. 27).

Overall, the book argues against a linear perspective of technological development by showing "why it makes sense for farmers to simultaneously draw on a repertoire of old and new technologies, rather than simply opting for mechanization in order to compensate for the migrated labour" (p. 167). Such an understanding of Chinese agro-technological change contrasts not only with Chinese traditional narratives in local gazetteers and common-sense models of progress (p. 169) but has serious implications reaching beyond the discipline of social anthropology. As Graeber and Wengrow assert in *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity* (2021), in-depth accounts of communities of practice such as the migrating and staying-behind individuals portrayed by Kaufmann are urgently needed, because they refreshingly complicate our view on processes of rural-urban migration, the differentiation between skilled and unskilled migrants, and the role of paddy fields in China. In this book, Kaufmann has definitely achieved her stated goal: "to challenge prevailing narratives about backwardness and progress. I wish to contribute to a better understanding of the particularities of Chinese modernity, disputing the notion of linear technological progress. Challenging public discourse which portrays Chinese peasants as passive and backward [...], I want to show that farmers are, in fact, forward-looking decision-making agents who are actively shaping China's modernity" (p. 24).

In sum, I consider this book as an immensely crucial contribution in the field of anthropology of Chinese agriculture as well in the field of migration studies since it decentres the classical depiction of Chinese smallholders: Instead of picturing these families as passive victims of the unparalleled economic development that has been shaping China for the last decades, Lena Kaufmann shows that these rural communities actively make choices built on a repertoire of skilled practices that are rooted in the socio-technical ground of wet rice cultivation. Even though densely written theoretical and historical backgrounds form substantial parts of the book, it is very accessible and the abstracts at the beginning of each chapter even allow for a non-linear reading of the book.

References

Graeber, David, and David Wengrow. 2021. *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. London: Allen Lane.

Kaufmann, Lena. 2011. *Mala tang – Alltagsstrategien ländlicher Migranten in Shanghai*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rebekka Sutter ⓘ, *Ethnographic Museum at the University of Zurich, Switzerland*

COEUR D'ALENE
Ethnohistoire d'une communauté indienne
en Amérique du Nord
Matthieu Charle. 2019. La Roche-sur-Yon : Dépaysage. 313 p.

L'ouvrage *Coeur d'Alene* est issu d'une thèse d'anthropologie soutenue par Matthieu Charle, en 2013, à l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales (Paris). L'anthropologie des sociétés autochtones nord-américaines étant largement désertée en Europe francophone, cette monographie mérite qu'on lui accorde un intérêt particulier. Ce livre trouve ses fondements dans une ethnographie menée entre 2005 et 2006 au sein la réserve du même nom, dans l'Idaho, au nord-ouest des États-Unis. Néanmoins, il ne se limite pas à une étude synchronique et s'inscrit pleinement dans une perspective ethnohistorique, au sens où l'auteur a recours à une grille de lecture anthropologique pour écrire l'histoire d'une société qui n'a pas elle-même produit d'archives. Charle se propose ainsi «d'identifier puis d'analyser les moyens par lesquels la communauté coeur d'alene a négocié la pérennité d'éléments sociaux fondamentaux à sa reproduction avec un environnement changeant, depuis le milieu du xixᵉ siècle jusqu'à nos jours» (p. 40). Les Coeur d'Alene connaissent en effet, comme nombre de populations autochtones des États-Unis, de violents bouleversements à la suite de leur rencontre avec les Euro-Américains. Alors qu'ils ont longtemps été considérés comme précocement et profondément acculturés, Charle montre au contraire que les Coeur d'Alene n'ont cessé de s'approprier des pratiques culturelles étrangères en les intégrant à leur propre manière d'appréhender le monde. Maîtrisant ces multiples changements, ils ont su redéfinir en permanence leur organisation sociale, non sans tensions néanmoins.

Le livre est implicitement divisé en deux : une première moitié narrative et une seconde plus analytique. La première moitié est composée des parties une à trois. Après la partie une, où l'organisation sociale des Coeur d'Alene est présentée à grands traits, les parties deux et trois du livre sont le lieu d'une histoire relativement événementielle des relations entre les Coeur d'Alene et les Euro-Américains. On apprend qu'au début du xixᵉ siècle les Coeur d'Alene sont environ 3000 à 4000, au centre de la région dite du «Plateau», qui traverse principalement les États américains de Washington, d'Idaho, du Montana, de l'Oregon ainsi que le sud de la Colombie-Britannique (Canada). Les premiers contacts avec les Euro-Américains entrainent une vague d'épidémies en 1831, 1832 et 1850. Le premier soulèvement coeur d'alene face à l'occupation américaine est réprimé en 1858 et la communauté est contrainte de rejoindre une réserve créée par le gouvernement fédéral. Les Coeur d'Alene perdent bientôt la majorité des terres qui leur appartenaient, ce qui les plonge dans une profonde précarité au début du xxᵉ siècle. Ce récit clôt la première moitié du livre, suivant une lecture historique assez commune de l'Ouest américain. C'est plutôt la seconde moitié (parties quatre et cinq) qui confère en effet son intérêt anthropologique à l'ouvrage. Charle y développe une interprétation originale de l'adaptation des Coeur d'Alene au changement historique, en croisant des données issues de l'historiographie et de sa propre ethnographie. Selon l'auteur, les récits de rencontres entre Euro-Américains et populations autochtones insistent soit sur la résistance de ces derniers, soit sur leur assimilation. Charle défend une interprétation plus subtile de cette histoire en montrant la nécessité d'observer les multiples interactions qui se sont jouées à différentes échelles de la société : la nation, le conseil tribal,

la famille ou encore l'individu. De cette analyse, on retiendra notamment deux hypothèses. La première hypothèse s'appuie sur la notion de «malléabilité», proposée par Charle bien que le phénomène qu'elle désigne soit directement inspiré des travaux d'Elizabeth Furniss (2004) sur les Shuswap. Par «malléabilité», l'auteur entend la capacité d'adaptation permanente que les Coeur d'Alene ont su mettre en œuvre depuis le xixᵉ siècle. Cette malléabilité serait véritablement constitutive de leur organisation sociale et leur aurait permis de faire face à d'intenses bouleversements. Charle montre que leur ferveur catholique précoce peut s'expliquer ainsi par leur capacité à intégrer des pratiques européennes à leur propre schèmes culturels. L'auteur livre à ce titre une réflexion stimulante sur la notion de «conversion», qui n'est pas opératoire pour penser la complexité des relations au christianisme entretenues par les Coeur d'Alene. Loin de devenir chrétiens au sens où l'entendent les missionnaires, les Coeur d'Alene ont par exemple pu interpréter l'installation du premier jésuite, Nicolas Point, comme celle d'un prophète – le prophétisme étant un phénomène relativement répandu en Amérique autochtone, en particulier dans les moments de crise. La figure du Christ aurait quant à elle été intégrée à l'ensemble des esprits avec lesquels les Coeur d'Alene dialoguaient, sans pour autant devenir exclusive. Charle insiste également sur l'alternance entre différents registres de spiritualité, contestant la validité d'une opposition entre familles catholiques et familles traditionalistes. À l'inverse, l'auteur observe que des individus s'investissent dans des pratiques rituelles à la fois autochtones et chrétiennes sans y voir de contradiction particulière. À rebours des récits réducteurs de résistance et d'assimilation, Charle pense donc la malléabilité comme une singularité culturelle coeur d'alene :

> les mouvements oscillatoires entre les différents niveaux de solidarité de ces communautés ne sont pas des événements isolés et accidentels, issus de circonstances historiques uniques, mais reflètent bel et bien des phénomènes cycliques qui s'accordent éventuellement avec de nouvelles structures ou configurations, en fonction de l'expression des tensions au sein de la communauté. (p. 172)

La deuxième hypothèse se situe dans le prolongement de la première. En réussissant à s'adapter au changement historique, les Coeur d'Alene ont pu entretenir, selon Charle, une forte cohésion sociale. Cette cohésion s'est maintenue jusqu'à aujourd'hui comme l'illustre l'organisation régulière de *pow-wow*. Lors de ces rassemblements, des danses costumées et accompagnées de musiques sont pratiquées. Les *pow-wow* les plus visibles sont les rendez-vous annuels «intertribaux» qui regroupent de nombreuses nations autochtones des États-Unis et qui connaissent un grand succès dans le pays – 90 % des individus s'identifiant comme autochtones disent participer à au moins un *pow-wow* par an. Ces événements peuvent aussi être plus confidentiels. Dans ce dernier cas, le *pow-wow* est l'occasion de fêter une naissance, de mettre fin à une période de deuil ou de procéder à des distributions de biens (*Giveway*) à ses proches ou sa parentèle. C'est également un moment où l'on honore les vétérans de l'armée, suivant une éthique qui valorise la défense de la communauté par le combat, et où l'on rappelle plus généralement les valeurs partagées collectivement et que l'on souhaite transmettre aux plus jeunes. L'interprétation proposée par Charle à cela d'intéressant qu'elle opère un décentrement du regard : l'analyse ne porte pas tant sur le contenu des spectacles

que sur les formes de sociabilités qu'impliquent les différents *pow-wow*. L'auteur propose ainsi une typologie de ces événements en fonction des sociabilités qui les caractérisent. Une opposition se dessine alors entre, d'une part, les *pow-wow* organisés dans la sphère privée, où l'on retrouve des parents et où, par exemple, on entend prodiguer des soins chamaniques à un proche, et, d'autre part, les *pow-wow* organisés dans la sphère publique, comme les rassemblements «intertribaux» annuels, ouverts à tou·te·s et où l'on revendique une identité partagée. Qu'il soit privé ou public, le *pow-wow* demeure toujours, néanmoins, un «moment d'intimité indienne» (p. 201) selon les termes de Charle, où l'on actualise une diversité de relations sociales en marges des spectacles et où l'on revendique ouvertement la vivacité des cultures autochtones.

Au fil de sa réflexion, l'auteur propose des points de comparaison avec d'autres sociétés autochtones, en particulier du Plateau et des Plaines, faisant écho à la méthode du "side-streaming" définie par Daniel Richter (1992, 5). En s'appuyant notamment sur les travaux de l'historien Gilles Havard et des anthropologues Emmanuel Désveaux et Raymond DeMallie, Charle confirme ainsi l'intérêt d'un comparatisme nord-américain, désormais peu pratiqué mais qui apparaît pourtant fécond pour interroger les continuités et les singularités entre les différents groupes autochtones. On regrettera toutefois que les analyses reposant sur les données ethnographiques de l'auteur soient minoritaires dans le livre – la plupart des chapitres reposant sur une littérature de seconde main. Lorsque l'ethnographie est véritablement exploitée, elle donne pourtant lieu à des interprétations stimulantes, comme dans le cas des *pow-wow,* et l'on aurait apprécié en approfondir la lecture. Toutefois, ce regret ne change en rien l'intérêt de cet ouvrage qui permet de mieux connaître une société jusqu'alors peu étudiée et de dépasser certains raisonnements simplistes sur les communautés autochtones, notamment l'opposition entre résistance et assimilation ou encore l'association automatique entre une forme d'organisation sociale et une «aire culturelle», en l'occurrence celle du Plateau. Parce qu'il analyse attentivement le changement historique au prisme des interactions entre les groupes qui composent la société coeur d'alene, d'une écriture toujours accessible, ce livre intéressera autant les historien·ne·s que les anthropologues, spécialistes ou non de l'Amérique du Nord.

Il faut noter, pour finir, le beau travail éditorial mené par la maison Dépaysage, récemment fondée à La Roche-sur-Yon (France). Bien que l'intérêt académique pour les communautés autochtones nord-américaines décroisse en Europe francophone, l'éditeur cherche à entretenir vis-à-vis de ces sociétés le «regard éloigné» que Lévi-Strauss appelait de ses vœux, en publiant principalement des œuvres littéraires écrites par des auteur·ice·s autochtones et inuit, ainsi que des travaux anthropologiques. Outre l'effort esthétique appréciable – photographies de qualité, graphisme original –, on soulignera que les publications comprennent souvent des préfaces signées par d'éminent·e·s spécialistes de l'Amérique du Nord, dont Emmanuel Désveaux dans le cas du présent ouvrage.

Références

Furniss, Elizabeth. 2004. "Cycles of History in Plateau Sociopolitical Organization: Reflections on the Nature of Indigenous Band Societies." *Ethnohistory 51*(1): 137–170.

Richter, Daniel Karl. 1992. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Jonas Musco, École des hautes études en sciences sociales, France

LA REVANCHE DES CONTEXTES
Des mésaventures de l'ingénierie sociale
en Afrique et au-delà
Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan. 2021. Paris : Karthala. 494 p.

La revanche des contextes, curieux titre qui interpelle le lectorat et dont la pertinence apparaîtra que progressivement à la lecture de ce bel ouvrage. Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan nous présente ici un ouvrage qui couronne son œuvre consacrée au développement. Après *Anthropologie et développement* (1995), Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan a poursuivi son projet avec *La rigueur du qualitatif* (2008). Dans *La revanche des contextes,* l'auteur nous parle non seulement du développement, mais plus généralement de l'ingénierie sociale, c'est-à-dire la volonté de transformer – ou tout au moins de changer – les pratiques et les représentations des gens, le plus souvent au nom d'une meilleure rationalité supposée pouvoir construire un monde meilleur. « L'ingénierie sociale est une expression générique qui englobe [...] tous les dispositifs d'intervention planifiée, élaborés par des experts, visant à implanter ou modifier des institutions et/ou des comportements dans des contextes variés » (p. 7) : on distingue d'emblée une volonté pédagogique de l'auteur qui explicite clairement les termes employés, en souligne leur sens et leurs sous-entendus et prend le lectorat par la main pour lui expliquer clairement son propos.

Ainsi, cet ouvrage s'adresse à un large public de spécialistes du développement, d'anthropologues – pas seulement africanistes – et de tous ceux qui s'intéressent aux relations interculturelles et à l'amélioration des conditions de vie dans les Suds. Ce livre est divisé en cinq parties consacrées aux modèles voyageurs, aux normes pratiques, aux modes de gouvernance, aux logiques sociales et aux réformes possibles de l'ingénierie sociale.

L'introduction s'ouvre sur le constat que les programmes ou les modèles conçus par les tenants de l'ingénierie sociale se heurtent systématiquement à un élément imprévisible : le contexte dans lequel ils sont mis en œuvre. La *revanche des contextes* correspond aux effets imprévus induits par les logiques et les représentations des acteurs sociaux. L'auteur précise que les concepts qu'il développera sont d'une part en construction permanente et qu'il convient de les adapter à chaque contexte et, d'autre part, le fruit d'une réflexion collective au sein d'une équipe de recherche dont le cœur se trouve à Niamey, au LASDEL[1].

Les modèles voyageurs, issus du travail de Rottenburg (2009), sont au cœur de la première partie. Ils se fondent sur une « histoire édifiante », sorte de mythe fondateur, qui décrit une expérience – épurée – de changement social qui a bien fonctionné quelque part dans le monde, en général dans les Suds. L'auteur développe ensuite le concept de dispositif : « tout ensemble fonctionnel et intégré d'éléments organisationnels et d'instruments d'ingénierie sociale indispensable au fonctionnement du mécanisme d'une politique publique » (p. 35). Ces dispositifs se composent d'« instruments » constitués de « techniques particulières » : l'auteur décrit les différents concepts pour analyser des projets de changement social contextualisé et offre une boite à outils servant à décrire le fouillis de la réalité sociale. Il montre ensuite comment cette mise en récit du modèle s'accompagne d'une mise en

---

[1] « Le LASDEL » est un laboratoire nigérien et béninois de recherche en sciences sociales, menant des travaux qualitatifs à base empirique : https://www.lasdel.net/

Seismo

réseau qui permet de le diffuser au sein du monde du développement. Il revient alors sur les notions d'arènes et de groupes stratégiques qui constituent les acteurs et le contexte, qu'il soit pragmatique – centré sur l'observation des acteurs – ou structurel. Puis, il intègre ces modèles voyageurs dans la vague du *new public management,* politique fétiche du néo-libéralisme. Il applique – de façon convaincante – dans le chapitre qui suit cette architecture conceptuelle au fameux cas des *cash transfer* comme modèle voyageur de développement.

La deuxième partie aborde les normes pratiques et Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan propose de les distinguer des «normes officielles, normes professionnelles, normes bureaucratiques, normes sociales» (p. 116). Ces normes officielles distinguent trois sous-groupes : les normes légales, professionnelles et bureaucratiques, alors que les normes sociales prescrivent et interdisent ; elles proposent des rhétoriques de légitimation et sont enseignées, souvent dans la pratique. Ces dernières sont relativement explicites et s'imposent dans les familles, les Églises ou les associations. Quant aux normes pratiques, elle relève du domaine de l'implicite et «sous-tendent les pratiques des acteurs ayant un écart avec les normes explicites (normes officielles ou normes sociales)» (p. 121). C'est bien l'écart que l'on observe entre les normes officielles et sociales et les pratiques réelles des agents sociaux qui permet de parler de normes pratiques : ce sont les stratégies de résistance, de contournement, d'esquive, etc., déjà mises en évidence par de nombreuses recherches. Toutefois, il convient de ne pas considérer ces multiples normes construites par le socioanthropologue à partir d'une observation minutieuse et précise de la pratique, dont il décline une typologie wébérienne, comme des contraintes qui pèsent sur l'individu soumis au déterminisme des lois sociologiques, mais plutôt comme des répertoires d'action qui s'offrent à l'agent social et à partir desquels il laisse libre cours à son agentivité. Le quatrième chapitre applique ce cadre théorique à l'étude du service public nigérien à partir des nombreuses recherches que l'équipe du LASDEL a conduites sur cette thématique et l'on y observe la puissance interprétative de ces multiples normes, auxquelles s'ajoute la notion de «nœuds critiques» : des cas paradigmatiques où les normes et l'agentivité des membres de l'arène se cristallisent sous les yeux du socioanthropologue.

La troisième partie déplace le niveau d'analyse et porte sur les modes de gouvernance, considérés comme «[des] dispositif[s] institutionnel[s] spécifique[s] de la délivrance de biens d'intérêt général» (p. 209). L'auteur rappelle l'antienne de la «bonne gouvernance» qui revient à une «désétatisation» de la délivrance des biens d'intérêt général et affaibli l'État considéré comme corrompu et inefficace. Grâce au concept de mode de gouvernance l'auteur nous propose un véritable cadre d'analyse de l'ingénierie sociale et l'applique aux politiques publiques, véritables «stratégie[s] institutionnel[s] de délivrance [de] biens d'intérêt général au sein d'un (ou de plusieurs) mode de gouvernance» (p. 215). Il en propose huit, souvent articulés les uns aux autres pour constituer des configurations de gouvernance spécifique selon les cas étudiés : bureaucratique-étatique, développementiste, communal, associatif, chefferial, religieux, marchand et mécénal (pp. 222–235). Le sixième chapitre traite du mode de gouvernance bureaucratique-étatique et s'inspire – entre autres – des travaux de Béatrice Hibou (2012). Au moyen de l'étude du fonctionnement sur le terrain des services de la Santé et de l'Éducation par l'équipe du LASDEL, l'auteur développe une analyse détaillée des contradictions de ces politiques publiques, des pratiques des fonctionnaires

inspirées des multiples normes publiques, pratiques, sociales, etc. qu'ils observent, ainsi que des stratégies des élites nationales. Il conclut par une description féroce des états africains : « [l'État] *n'est ni souverain* (dépendance de l'aide), *ni protecteur* (répression et insécurité), *ni développementaliste* (accroissement des inégalités, des migrations, du chômage), *ni impartial* (favoritisme politique et patronage généralisés), *ni laïc* (complaisance envers les fondamentalismes religieux chrétiens et musulmans), *ni délivreur de services d'intérêt général* (dégradation de ces services), *ni à l'échelle du pays tout entier* (délaissement de zones entières et des populations vulnérables) » (pp. 284 f., souligné par l'auteur) … l'on se demande bien à quoi il sert, si ce n'est à nourrir les élites !

Le mode de gouvernance développementiste constitue le cœur du septième chapitre et analyse les projets de développement – « paradigme de l'ingénierie sociale » – qui « représente[nt] une vitrine de luxe bureaucratique » et une enclave dans la délivrance des services publics où la qualité prévaut souvent en comparaison avec l'offre étatique (pp. 293 f.). L'auteur revient sur l'aporie des projets participatifs imposés et porte la critique sur le supposé bénévolat de la participation « volontaire », sur l'empowerment des femmes, sur la société civile imaginaire constituée par des associations ad hoc et sur la lutte contre la « corruption ». Il souligne les effets pervers de la dépendance de l'aide et le miroir aux alouettes qu'elle tend aux fonctionnaires, tentés de s'associer aux projets au détriment de leurs propres tâches et qui constituent une forme de fuite des cerveaux : « courtiser les bailleurs de fonds, tenter d'être recruté par eux, pratiquer la langue de bois du développement, ces effets pervers aboutissent à une passivité générale de l'administration et des services publics » (p. 315). Il rappelle l'échec de la pérennisation des projets qui revient à institutionnaliser la dépendance à l'aide. L'auteur dresse ainsi le portrait détaillé de l'échec du développement.

La quatrième partie porte sur les logiques sociales qui proposent une analyse qui monte en généralité. Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan critique le culturalisme qui continue d'obscurcir certaines analyses du développement, tant chez les développeurs, certains politiciens locaux, l'opinion publique des Nords que dans de – trop – nombreux travaux scientifiques : supposée tradition africaine ancestrale inspirée de l'évolutionnisme du 19ème siècle ; importance des relations personnelles, de l'imaginaire communauté qui nierait l'individu, des ethnies inventées par la colonisation et réappropriées par certains big men, crainte de l'irrationnelle sorcellerie. Il déconstruit ensuite la notion de culture en sciences sociales, sans pour autant l'abandonner, car elle constitue « un ensemble de pratiques et de représentations dont des enquêtes auront montré qu'elles étaient significativement partagées par un groupe » (p. 341). Il montre enfin comment la pluralité des normes permet de comprendre plus finement ce que l'on a souvent regroupé sous la notion de néo-patrimonialisme. Le chapitre suivant traite de la pluralité des logiques sociales qui « se situe[nt …] à un niveau plus général et plus transversal, et introduit un projet plus interprétatif [...], alors que ‹ normes pratiques › reste plus proche du constat » (p. 352) : logique de la pitié, du cadeau, de la honte, de l'échange généralisé de faveurs ou de l'ostentation.

La dernière partie fait le pari – audacieux en sciences humaines – d'aborder certaines perspectives d'application du cadre conceptuel et propose une esquisse d'anthropologie appliquée à l'ingénierie sociale. Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan s'interroge avec un certain désarroi : « Comment peut-on convaincre les décideurs du monde du développement [qu'il

convient de reconnaître] quatre énoncés complémentaires : 1) toute intervention suppose des changements de comportements ; 2) on ne peut réformer les comportements sans prendre en compte leurs contextes d'occurrence et les normes pratiques en vigueur ; 3) la meilleure façon de connaître les contextes d'occurrence et les normes pratiques est de documenter les effets inattendus d'une intervention ; 4) cette connaissance des effets inattendus est une opportunité pour permettre à l'intervention de s'adapter aux contextes d'occurrence » (p. 380). Il propose dans le dernier chapitre de partir à la recherche des réformateurs de l'intérieur et illustre son propos au moyen de nombreux exemples qui montrent comment ils tentent de modifier les pratiques de leur service en jouant sur les normes pratiques des fonctionnaires. L'auteur conclut alors : « [...] l'enjeu principal des politiques publiques en Afrique devrait être le passage [...] d'une logique de la dépendance à une logique de l'initiative » (p. 417).

La conclusion propose le projet d'une anthropologie des discordances, des dissonances, des écarts, des contradictions et des diversités pour reprendre son titre. Ce projet reconnaît l'importance des clivages internes et des pratiques non-observantes, c'est-à-dire celles qui ne suivent ni les normes bureaucratiques, sociales ou autres. Il s'ancre dans l'observation des normes pratiques au sein d'une arène contextualisée et de ses groupes stratégiques luttant pour des enjeux parfois divergeant. Ce projet ambitieux s'appuie sur la longue expérience anthropologique de son auteur qui nous propose une brillante synthèse des travaux de l'anthropologie du développement. Les descriptions détaillées des pratiques non-observantes, l'analyse sans fard des projets de développement lui permet d'ouvrir de nouvelles perspectives empiriques et théoriques pour l'étude des politiques publiques et de l'ingénierie sociale en Afrique ... et au-delà.

Références

Hibou, Béatrice. 2012. *La bureaucratisation du monde à l'ère néolibérale.* Paris : La Découverte.

Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 2008. *La rigueur du qualitatif : Les contraintes empiriques de l'interprétation socio-anthropologique.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Acad. Bruylant.

Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 1995. *Anthropologie et développement : Essai en socio-anthropologie du changement social.* Marseille & Paris : APAD & Karthala.

Rottenburg, Richard. 2009. *Far-fetched Facts : A Parable of Development Aid.* Translated by Allisson Brown and Tom Lampert. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press.

Yvan Droz, Institut de hautes études internationales et du développement, Genève, Suisse

Schweizerische Ethnologische Gesellschaft
Société Suisse d'Ethnologie
Associazione Svizzera di Antropologia
Swiss Anthropological Association

SAGW
ASSH