

SESSION V

FRED L. CHIU

I am Chiu from Hongkong. I am honoured to come here and I benefited greatly in these past two days, but I have to admit that I did not have enough time to do my homework for my talk to you.

In this topic, I will talk more at the level of syntax rather than vocabulary in doing research. So it is not just method or methodology, it is to do with the kind of interaction that could be achieved and the kind of social relationship that can be formulated in doing intellectual work, which to me is activism.

On the first word 'alternative', I have been involved with all kinds of movements since I was a teenager when I decided to be a walk-out. I do not have any degree, I'm not even a high school graduate but what I'm concerned about is a German system which wants to calm everybody and which I have to resist. So 'alternative' means a little bit of escapism for me in my drop-out or as I would like to call it a march-out.

Very soon I found out that after march-out either I would have to choose to be some kind of alternative and could very easily be dismissed or I would have to buy the bullet to sneak in. So finally, after few years I have some experience in the university, in the society, and in the political prison. That is the best education I had for three and a half years as a political prisoner of conscience in Taiwan.

So alternative is important, but on the other hand we are living in an environment constantly bombarded by old establishment. You may not bother them, but they bother you. Waqla Hava said the post of the return regime, the state pretends, it is cheating you. They do not even do their homework. All they want to say is, I am cheating you, suppressing you and that the power and the violence is so obvious in their abuse of whatever language but the knife shows in the back to you. So this hegemony is basically based on very true power, violence, political economy. The dilemma is that between and after the walk-out or march-out and sneak-in, you still have to fight and fight in a way you can. So alternative in other words as I found out in English, is outer return. You have to inject something into the system. And just like my mentor, Professor Marsha Sawlin said about me when I went to Hongkong to study about the industry conflict, they said I invented a lot of virus to subvert the theoretical problem. I think we need this kind of hacker and we need to constantly invent the virus. That's a part of my job. So when I talk about myself, I subvert and I try to experiment with some of my virus.

Why Afro-Asian and Latin American scholars? I'm not an expert about Latin America and I don't know much about Africa and Asia but I will definitely not identify biologically and intellectually with a Sinic world discourse. So it just means that I do not represent and am not interested as a Chinaman from a Chinaman's perspective to look at the alternative and the alternative way of thinking.

Having said that, I think a lot of people may have met me when I went to Taiwan for a conference talking about the categorization of the aborigines, the naming and the process of naming and that the repertoire of errorizing your identity especially by the peripheral tribe people and that they actually have a lot of ways to clean the centre. In their myth they are being cheated and being sold out but they are the original Han Chinese people. So I invented the term that is anything but China, Sinic or what, and I call all this kind of thinking 'Han'-related and in a 'Han'-related setting. So I think everybody scorned at me at the conference. Who are you, what are you, are you Han-related or what?

Somebody's poison is somebody's joke. So I just adopted an attitude of really working hard on the documents and looked at the history of anthropology in China and to write a serious paper. The reason for writing a serious paper is because I want to make a joke. So I got the hint that one part of the game is to ridicule, to play with what they seemed to be so seriously doing.

One of the major social theories in China is invented by Fei so Thong. He said the social relation of Chinese is just like a pool of water, then you drop a stone into the water and the waves from the centre spread out very nicely. So there is the person-, family- or self-centred relation expanding out so smoothly, so nicely and actually I think it is a myth.

If you look at Chinese literature and if you go to Beijing it is very clear. There's a fortified city with walls. In the middle is the Ching-chao, in the outside another square, outside it another square. It is not a homogenous surface, it is highly hierarchical. It is very interesting if you look at the classics. The centre is we. The middle is something between we and they and the outer space is the other. In China, the centre is Han, i.e us human beings. Han also means the male person. And in the outside, that's the minority, the aborigines or the name of the aborigines with a part, either animal or some kind of insect. Outside you have, just like in Hong Kong, a people called Kwai Kwailo. Kwai Kwailo is a ghost. So you have a three-layer concept of the world in any make-up of yourself, the centre is I, human being Han and that's the animal, and the outside is the ghost. That's what makes it very interesting. Why animal? In animal you have the wild beasts and the domestic pets. The domestic pet is the Han-ised aborigine. And the wild-beast is almost close to the ghost so it is wild. The wild is not knowing and antagonized. But what is ghost? Well, one thing is very interesting.

The China-Japan relations used to be very bad. Japan is off the coast of China. During the Ming dynasty, when China used to be an imperial power, it had conflicts with the seaward interests of Japan - a lot of coastal conflicts with the Japanese. The Japanese were called the Bandit, the Short Bandit from the East Sea. The Bandit seemed to be half-Sinicised but not any more. But interestingly, in the 19th Century, you have all the imperial (powers) invading China and all the white people were naturally ghosts. Japan doesn't qualify to be a ghost. But when the Japanese imperialists defeated China, the Japanese become Epan Gey, the Japanese ghost. The enemy turned Ghost because the Ghost can defeat the human, cannot be subjugated or domesticated, but can be your real enemy.

So we are living in a Sinic world which is basically fortified by the China box – square, square, square. The humanness decreases when you have this hierarchy, some kind of real shape, a pyramid.

Using this metaphor we will talk about my discipline and we find it actually also has three layers at least. In the centre is anthropology, which we consider ‘we’. If you look at the tribal names of the aborigines in Taiwan, in at least half of them the name of their tribe actually means “human being” and the neighbour is also human being. Because Han means “Human being”. Very naturally, outside of the Han some elements deal with the human shaped animal, sometimes friendly, sometimes fearful. It is graded from the domestic household pet to the wild animal and of course the other is the ghost.

A look at anthropology therefore means three different movements, three different phases, which is anthropology, zoology and demonology. Anybody other than I can be rendered an animal, and anybody who defeats me can be rendered a ghost. (The demonisation exercise is not invented by Bush. He is just a Master of Demonology.)

As a Han-related person, I have had some experience by going to Europe. Anthropology is good for nothing, just for telling stories, sometimes not even stories, anecdotes. They try to tell an anecdote in a way that is synodological, to use a part, use an example to know something which is not. We call it representation. So, how is a self-proclaimed anthropological field worker not consciously actually doing zoology or practicing demonology? That’s my experience in Europe, my field work when I have a trip in Europe.

One thing is that with all my training in fine arts, music, or whatever, I go to that big, wonderful, gigantic cathedral of Europe and not before long, I am fed up. When we go into the cathedral, we are not talking about it’s so dark, there is no light, it is ghostly, there’s a bomb under that, there are nationalist symbols everywhere and piled on top of everything is the absolutely a-historical presentation of a human existence. Three hundred years of totally different genres of art, piled on each other and every cathedral is competing to do the same thing. The only purpose is to overwhelm you and every effect is just to make you diminish your own self and existence. And I invariably revolt.

And what do you do as a tourist? You go to tour the city and all the big, imperial buildings. All the big, imperial buildings are familiar to me because I was brought up in Taiwan where there are a lot of ‘second-hand’ imperial buildings built by the Japanese. I realize that the Japanese housing is from the British the hay houses. The dome is made more elaborate by the Japanese. So I just had a kind of funny feeling. Who’s who? What is what? And my teacher, Barney Colmes told me, “All the British imperial ceremonies are imported from the Moghuls.” So, when I read what is imperiability, disproportionate grand(eur), then you see it is just built up, piled up in the same fashion by something irrelevant, something not there, from England to who knows where, and the magnificence of it is in proportion to their imperial power.

Then there is the marvellous thing called the Museum. You go to the museum. You get a feeling if the European country did not have colonies, did not appropriate those things, what is left of all this spectacular display of art and culture? For example when you go to the Metropolitan Museum in New York or to Paris, it is impossible for any human being to appreciate it within one day and not get exhausted. You get tired like a dog and bored like crazy looking at one white Greek statue after another and all this spectacular display, then suddenly you go into the African section and you get back your life. It's a totally different world. You get a real sense, a real feeling, of a real human being, not just this white marble standing there in pretence.

I also had this experience before the Berlin Wall when I drove from Eastern Europe to East Berlin. By mistake, with all this bright light on, I drove into the back of the Bundestat. I thought I was in hell. How can such a horrible building, inhuman, disproportionate be built and still exist in this world?

In Barcelona, there are these funny churches. Not until you go to see all these things, do you understand why there is a Picasso, why there is a Dali, why there are these funny things. It is because they are totally fed up of the demonized control, suffocated with this Judaical Christian complex of hegemony for hundreds of years. For me it is a funny revolt and doesn't really make too much sense but for them it is a constant cultural revolution, and a constant failure, a sign of their unfinished cultural revolution. The only salvation was looting – materially, spiritually, intellectually - from the colonies which made the European civilisations reclaim their vitality and their existence.

I don't know whether it is anthropology, or zoology, or demonology and since I claim it is my field work, I think it is an anthropologist's trick to challenge other people to do their alternative ethnography. We need more than one ethnography to know what we are interested in studying.

I have a problem with the concept of decolonization. It just so happens that Frederick Maughlin is thinking the way I am thinking. It's not any more about chasing away the colonizers because the colonizer now, is now first and foremost, and most importantly, in our minds. Maughlin talks about exorcising, I want to talk about ghost-busting. This ghost-busting has to come from oneself.

There are four or five different images of anthropology. One of the famous stories is that after independence, you go to N'Kruma's office and you have a big, big picture of the people rising up from Africa and four kinds of people grabbing their things and running away - priests, colonial officers, mercenary armies and anthropologists. The second image is later. Something like this picture, which I find interesting - a cartoon painting of a native, sitting on the beach, having a drink, reading a book. What's he reading – Levi Strauss, Raw and Coke. The third image is a group of university students in Samoa, who are interviewed after this me? Meat? incident. Everybody has their own version, their own story, their opinion about meat.

The fourth one is about anthropologist Judith Macdonald. She wanted to go to Tikopia but the boat had some problem and she was stranded on a small island. On the small island only a few people knew about Tikopia so she went to a pharmacy since the owner was an expert and would know. "What do you want to study?" "I want to study the native Tikopia's Child Rearing Culture." So she had a whole day's interview with this informed person and finally got a lot of information and very detailed description. So in the evening the interview was done and before packing, the dentist (pharmacist) told her, "Ah, the interview is finished at least, but I didn't tell you what Raymond said." Raymond is the first foremost Tikopian expert. This sort of thing happens quite often. You have this import-export inversion, you have the appropriation-reappropriation things to create the nativeness.

The fifth scenario, I don't know how to make all of it, is fractured in Pinan. Talk about anthropology. I think we leave it to

End of one tape – break – then continues on next tape

I think not much but also not very little. At least anthropology has a double or schizophrenic convolute in the systems. It is an understatement to say that anthropology or the anthropologist is the handmaid of imperialism. We have evidence that even Molinovsky, in his last writings really urged anthropologists to get involved and to be socially concerned. But on the other hand you have a lot of people who don't have to be anthropologists to serve the purpose, maybe even better. For the old colonialism, for the new colonialism and for that matter, we are very clear about, for the so-called decolonised nationalism or in the globalised trend, try-to-connect-the-rail nationalism, like what happened in China.

There's a kind of people, the actors, whom to borrow my friend's term I call 'muchacho' or 'muchacha'. Muchacho-muchacha is written about by Michael Towsic. Talking about the end of the 19th century in the Amazon area, the connection period, you have this 'civilised' cult natives, who serve as the mediating forces, the intermediate personnel, do all the possible impossible torture to the uncivilized native, who gave us a labour-punctual tool, the magnum. They invent all the images, the myths, by the white super-imposed upon the non-white. They materialized it, all the cruelty and the atrocity just to show that it is possible to have a without-reason, ritualized meaning, kind of cannibalism, to extract power. So we use the term 'comprador' which is too weak a term because they are not only by themselves. They are killing. Were it not for this muchacho or muchacha, there would not have been imperialism or successful colonialism even after the colonizers left. The job was taken over by the national elite through internal colonization, through genocide, through economic development. It seems to be two sides of the same coin: de-colonisation and re-colonisation. It is just what was happening in Hong Kong before and after 1997. The people in Hong Kong are very keen to understand what is re-colonisation by a nation state. The state reclaimed the status as a nation and wants to homogenize and wants to colonise an ex-colony.

Those people who are really concerned by the situation have a patch of a reflection. For instance the notorious, indologist Louis du Mont – I kind of like him because he said something very funny and interesting in a book “From to Marx” – ‘the triumph of economy’ - how economy becomes a category, a learning discipline and the people become ‘economic man’. It is a heavy struggle within even the western tradition to make economy a viable category. His famous and notorious remark is about ‘homo hierarchical’. It depends on how you read it. If you read it from the teutonian it becomes very controversial. But you should read him more carefully because he is very sophisticated. He said if you think about egalitarianism and authoritarian practice, you will find a very interesting situation. In all the modern western society, they talk about democracy and about egalitarianism. If you go to a tribal society, they have a chief, they have a hierarchy. But if you live in these societies you find it is total opposite that is practised. The modern society talks about egalitarianism, but they practise hierarchy and authoritarianism. But in the tribal society, they have a hierarchy but they are really living in egalitarianism and they respect every body as much as the social position allows as an equal.

We turn to Han who criticizes especially the dogmatic Left when studying labour movements. The study of labour movements finally becomes the study of capitalism. The study of capitalism finally becomes the trumpeter of capitalism because it is so formidable. They have all these things and then the unbeatable system.

Then you have this funny person called Johannes Fabian who said don’t take colonialism so seriously. He made some very nice case studies. There is one case at least in Central Africa – it is colonialism within the velvet curtain (that’s my term) ‘velvet’. He tells a story. The white man comes in, it’s so nice, they sit together, they make peace. They finally get together – how - with drugs. Every body is stoned! That’s this peace pipe you have. So he talked about the whole cynical or ironical part about colonialism. A lot of historical conclusion, a lot of unexpectedness, a lot of local interest co-opt, volunteer itself with the external power to enhance it. In a sense, every politics has its dimension of local politics. Colonialism, the white people, the fire cannot be so powerful without its collaborators. It cannot be maintained, cannot be reproduced, cannot be sustained even after the State system claimed to go against colonialism and took over the power.

I would like to see or call this a moment of reflection. Some interesting work was done and turned the term of reference differently. My mentor Barney Colmes is one very good example. His colleagues in Chicago and other places turn to economic anthropology. You have to totally overhaul the discipline of economics. Some will call it anthropological economics. It is still a livelihood issue and a livelihood is how to survive and reproduce yourself in labour power at a very concrete level.

Even the historian Proeder – if you read it from the Polonian perspective, he distinguished 3 totally different things, which are material life, market and capitalism. It is not one thing, they are 3 different things. So don’t think anything automatically becomes accumulation oriented capitalism. It will not. Not even the real market. If you believe the Marshallian theory is right, the market is anti-capitalism. Capitalism is a

social system enhanced and produced by the nation state through judicio-legal means to protect special interests. Basically it is the barbarian theme. The two cornerstones of capitalism are the double-entry accounting system, that is the basically ideological apparatus of how to conceal profit, and the second is the liability limited company. That is a totally social set-up to make it possible. All these things have to be reflected upon and try to re-read and shed light on a different neo-political economy.

The other thing is about the political organization. There is quite a bit of reflection on it. Basically anthropology is good to look at the human relations, the political organisation aspect of power from the everyday perspectives. If we take the discipline of political science, there is something different called anthropological politics or political anthropology and some interesting work being done in various places in Latin America, in Africa and S.E. Asia even now. Basically they are talking about the non-State system. A French anthropologist, who died very young, 40 years ago, talked about Society against the State, about the French autonomy case. All the way you can end up not to be a State. If you look at the thickness of the anthropological perspective and the history perspective, this economic and political system has occupied a very, very short span of time in human history. Already we have run straight into that alley. This is reflexive anthropology. Look at the non-systemic process because the State system is systemization. That has caused all the trouble like genocide, homogenized population, population as a sociological invention category. Everybody becomes a statistical number not a real person. We see a non-systemised person.

University education castrates a lot of our sensory organs. We have to re-acquire our inner ear, eye to be perceptible to things. We were blind or we were made deaf. That is also what we could do and should do.

I think political organizations have a lot of things in the stage of reflection and anthropology can be supplementary or complementary to our purpose. Here is also the new critique of nowadays managerialism. .. talks about mine workers. What do they mean? They have managed their lives for the past 200 years, they have built a community. All this management, negotiations, managerial process, the technocrat, the entire system is too academicised but if you try to explain the concept of decolonisation.. I found something interesting. You call a place, a colonized 'colony', but you call the whole thing, the ghost of colonizing people as 'colonialism'. So I suggest the word for ghostbusting colonization should be 'de-colonialisation' not decolonisation. I don't know whether he is English or not. You are dealing with colonialism, the whole ideology, not the physicality of the thing. Maybe the better word is still 'ghostbusting'.

I just want to say that in addition you have the evidences of everyday practices, you have the rediscovery of life experiences and you learn it beginning from Barney to the subaltern groups. Try to make the subaltern voice heard.

The other one is more technical, mythological with an epistemological twist. In the west the whole sociological, social scientific discourse ran into big trouble, even early in the 1670s. There is a lot of .. a lot of .. Suddenly the vulgar socialist discovered something I

would call the UFO. There is the UFO theory of culture. The UFO later becomes the Black Box. Finally it ends up with the Black Hole. Everything that is inexplicable, Confucianism and capitalism becomes a Black Hole, which sucks everything in. So we become champions of the Black Hole. We journey to Singapore capitalism to find out the culture, the Black Hole that sucks everything in and gives us such comfort.

Then you have a mythological turn. I joke with my students, “Do you drive? Be careful because there are a lot of turns in sociology.” There is the I-turn i.e. the Interpretive Turn, the C-turn or Culture Turn, there is the L-turn or the Linguist Turn, there is also the U-turn. All these turns become a jerk. It is not turning, it is bouncing. With all these turns, I am finally positive about one thing the N-turn. It has something to do with Latin America. In practice, all these turns end out to be productive because it get us to understand what would like to term as N-turn or Narrative Turn. It begins to understand that there is a story and there are life experiences from the real subjects. They tell their story, which is the only way for us to communicate, to understand.

We have a volition of turns, a volition of say. Social science is not study anything but language. If human beings don't talk, there is no social science, no human history. So if we don't talk about ideology, there is nothing we can talk about.

Also the whole educational system is basically mixed up with two things: One, Recognition and the other, Understanding. Recognition can only apply to signal. The signal is Pavlov's Dog Act II. Signal cannot be understood, it can only be recognized. That's precisely what our educational system wants to do, to reduce every thinking subject into Pavlov's Dog. Train them to recognize things. If they cannot be trained, they cannot respond.

The second thing is Understanding. There is no signal, it is signs. Signs have to be decoded, to be deconstructed if you cannot understand, you have to guess or make sense of. Here is also from the epistemological, a mythical point of view and anthropology which in the past has gone through and which I see can be complementary and supplementary to the things we want to do in this conference.

Then I want to .. myself. You have to have dialects and inversion. We also see a lot of inversion and here I would like to mention that Inversion is the non-foundational analysis of social events, not based on any fixed category, turns and grounds. Be sensitive to naming and classification. The colonial's game is the classifier's game which is superimposed upon us and makes us internalize it. In other words, from a socio-linguistic point of view, I just mentioned, the level of analysis is vocabulary, or syntax. Actually our research, design and understanding ranges from philosophy to linguistic or socio-linguistic, which is we are not only talked about when we venture into the system but it is the real practice of communication and dialogue. Dialogue is the power, the whole situation of our discourse. It has also to do with signal and signs.

One more thing I learned to appreciate is when we talk about Reflection. Then you have people like .. who talk about reflection, which fills you with revolt and disgust. That kind

of reflection is self-enlarging kind of affirmation, of ethnocentric perspective. They call it reflection. But it really is a kind of empathy which is needed for us to communicate and understand. Alatas has written a new book about the advantages of backwardness and nihilism. There is an advantage about backwardness and there is an advantage in nihilism. I have a very serious nihilist background which is we can and we dare to think things we knew radically and analyse to re-understand, make sense of a thing, from a non-foundation perspective.

Anthropology zoology and demonology begins with the study of others and takes others for granted. Consequently I asked myself whether there is another possibility of doing anthropology and how to do it. Like in Linda Smith's new book talks about our history, about narrative, about other things we did not know about. Also my own experience of during the women workers' 13-day strike. I get 3 sets of different stories – they are the same stories 3 times told. But if we are not anthropocentric, whether there is a possibility in .. 's novel "Father and Son" he talks about what we as intellectuals, as intelligentsia are capable of learning, listening, transforming ourselves to be able to listen, to be able to respect whoever we come across a thinking subject. Respect, listen, learn – whether this is possible. I think only when this is clear, can anthropology belong to the people, can belong to us, which I would like to call as a people's narrotology. There's a Russian word 'narro', which means writing about people, from people's perspective, with their voice. I would not call it ethno. We have to do away with the concept ethno – ethnology.

DISCUSSION

Claude – Considering its past, what is the need for anthropology today? The tendency of anthropologists going around looking at other societies had a specific imperial purpose. In our societies you don't go around studying somebody else. For eg. in my village, I don't go to study somebody else and my neighbour doesn't come to study me and make a book out of it. Who has given you the right to come and study me and what is the purpose of this exercise? It cannot be anything else but to eventually put me in a lower level because ultimately it is I who am being studied, just as one studies an insect under the microscope. When are we going to give up this attitude of incessantly wanting to study somebody else. Is it merely because you have the time to study him and he doesn't have that time and that makes you feel superior to him? And eventually by studying his movements and culture and practices you can have a theory about him which you can then use to confuse him and eventually maintain overall control of him. I want to get to the root of this need for anthropology. According to me this is an illness or a disease.

Gloria: I suggest that we make a theoretical distinction between the military and non military based political decolonization and the psychological and intellectual decolonization processes. As far as Africa is concerned, in the annals of African political history, in the 20th century we have had a lot of active liberation movements but the text books don't mention them or they just gloss over them with one or two sentences and that brief reference is supposed to cover the millions of people who were killed in the process of trying to liberate themselves from Portuguese, British, French, German, Italian and

Spanish domination. We have people like Amilcar Cabral, Augustino Neto, Samora Machel who have given their lives to bring a measure of political independence and many others who still go unrecognized. I don't know how many people even know this history. Apart from Mandela and the ANC, hardly any of the other liberations have been covered. Flag independence we have achieved through the valiant efforts of the African liberators who fought against the colonizer countries. But ghost busting is linked with psychological and intellectual colonization and we have not really done a good job in these particular fields. The battle to achieve the second phase is a difficult one and it still awaits completion.

Firdos: What difference do you see between anthropology and sociology?

Shau Lung: I am very uncomfortable with the idea and practice of anthropology. It feels like a very vulgar process and it is profoundly narcissistic, particularly for the anthropologists, since they have to go out and dig into other peoples lives and use it as fodder for writing a wonderful monograph which they can put their name to and which would enable them to swirl around the academic circuit. There seems to be something profoundly wrong about that. If you want to make political use of that kind of stuff then you should become a journalist or better still a novelist. You don't need to go to the trouble of wearing the trappings and the intellectual armour of anthropology. So what is the role of anthropology really?

Farid: The criticisms of anthropology are old. They have been made over 20 years ago and anthropologists have already acknowledged many of the ideas that we are discussing here. I don't think it is fair to knock anthropology to that extent. There has been a lot of convergence between anthropology and sociology. The difference now is more in terms of methodology rather than perspective. A lot of anthropologists in America are studying their own societies and not just other societies. Anthropologists in our part of the world are starting to go out and study other societies in the region e.g Singaporeans going to Thailand, Filipinos studying Indonesians and so on. Anthropologists also, more than any other discipline, have become self conscious about the colonial origins of their disciplines. So we should bear all this in mind when we criticize anthropology.

This idea of studying the other is not the problem in itself. It is when you study the other by imposing concepts from one particular setting to another, that the problem arises. Simply studying the other in itself is not a problem and it is by no means a colonial thing either. I only have to refer to you to the example of Al-Biruni, the 11th century scholar who studied the religions of India. The difference between Al-Biruni and the others who came after him is that Al-Biruni tried to understand the religions of India from their point of view. He allowed his subjects to speak for themselves. Here you have a prototype of early anthropology which is very different from the kind of anthropology that emerged in Europe the 19th century. So we really ought to make these distinctions when critiquing anthropology

Wasif : I want to reflect on the two references that Chiu insinuated: one, the conditioning like a Pavlov dog and two, the ability of intelligentsia to respect and to recognize their

subjects. I don't think it is inherently possible in modern academia or within its institutional framework to recognize any form of knowledge, understanding, discourse, spirituality, beyond its permissible borders and those borders are shrouded in fanciful terms like methodology, epistemology and the right kind of qualitative research, quantitative numbers, etc. The conditioning to the symbols is enshrined in the subtle institutional mechanisms that universities around the world are now very deeply conditioned to and within that, this inability to respect anyone who is beyond those permissible borders. That starts at a very early age and in any classroom. First of all there is no relationship of respect between the teacher and the pupils. There is awe of the teacher but whatever respect exists is a one way process only - from the student to the teacher and not vice versa. It extrapolates into the university and its disciplines and therefore its ability to go out and do research. I don't see the institutional connection that Farid was referring to. There may be an intellectual connection if one stretches the imagination, but I don't see any institutional connection between what people like Al-Biruni were doing as a course of serious scholarship or reflection for their own cause, and actual institutional academia which have either colluded with state or corporates or one interest or the other. There is not even a declared intention of academia to connect with people in any constructive meaningful and just way. I agree with Claude that it is a pathology and I don't think there is a cure for that except to remove the very form of this institution.

Next speaker (name not clear): I want to agree with Alvares and the others about my discomfort with anthropology and what it is doing. May be it is more to do with the actual practice and the central role of participatory observation which is the key method in anthropology. Farid said they are doing participatory observation within the UK, Europe and America but they only do it in terms of rebellious movements or ethnic minorities within America or rap cultures or the inner city or the ghettos but not in terms of main stream U.K. or European culture. Whereas when they did anthropology in Africa or India they would start with tribal structure and then proceed to explain the whole country – the elites, the masses, the religions, the economic and political structures etc. I know a student who proposed something close to studying mainstream European society and he was told that it could not be done because you can't understand European culture by doing anthropology. That probably has to do with the power relationship between the observer and the observed. It is about observing people who do not understand why you are observing them. You are not allowed to observe European or American mainstream culture because it is supposedly much more complex. So I don't agree with Farid. I think that anthropology needs a lot more kicking.

Edju: I agree that anthropology is a weapon to dominate others. When I presented my doctoral thesis I gave my critique that all the studies of anthropology, ethnology and ethnography which Europeans have done in Africa don't serve Africa. They have not helped Africa to develop. The studies enable the Europeans to know how people in Africa think, how they function and that information is used by others. European society is very complicated. One category of persons goes to study the people but that category does not eventually make use of the material. It is used by category of persons who wish to dominate. This results in a captive mentality. You cannot captivate the mind of another

society if you don't know how they think in the first place. Anthropology will continue to keep ourselves in captivity. We have therefore to study our societies and only after that make our curricula. In Africa there is no curriculum drawn up by Africans. It is done by persons from outside. Outside thinking cannot build up Africa. We have to do that ourselves. The way we are carrying on is not the way of development. If we want to develop ourselves and to preserve our children we have to redesign the curriculum. And to redesign we have to know who our ancestors are, how their minds thought and how they behaved.

Vimbai: I don't have any respect for anthropology. I have read a lot about our people written by outsiders and the conclusions are always dangerous for our people. Those studies are not beneficial for our people. They are not written for us, they are not fed back into the community for us to examine whether what they say about us is true or not. We have instead been called all sorts of names by the people who have studied us. Nigger, khaffir, bushmen, infidels, hottentots etc. Do you know that the word denigrate means to bring down to the level of a nigger. Everybody, including Africans, use it without even understanding its origins. Similarly, Africa does not mean heart of darkness but instead it means home of all mankind. If we are serious and do not want other people to create us in their image but we want to create ourselves in our own image, we must reject anthropology because nothing has come out of anthropology that has been of any use to us in Africa. In Zimbabwe, a decision has been taken at Government level to chronicle the heritage of the liberation struggles in Africa, ourselves. There are many books written about the liberation struggle, some of them by renowned scholars by western standards. But if you look very closely at them there is always something very dangerous in them. They want to fetishize anthropology. If we decide to study ourselves we are doing so for our own good and to perpetuate our own interests. There is a difference between being studied and actually embarking on cultural exchanges which is on the basis of equality and respect so we can learn about our connectedness with other similarly situated people.

Gloria: I think we have to make a distinction between large scale popular text books used in colleges and monographs i.e the more specialised text. We must bear this in mind in terms of framing of curricular. There is a divide between mass produced text books and the specialized texts. In the specialized text we have a fair amount of in depth study but at the level of the secondary and university level this does not happen. We also have to make a distinction between colonial anthropology of the missionaries and other justifiers of imperialism and the anthropology which is trying to find itself and which we could probably transform for our own good. Unless, of course, we want to throw the baby and the bath water out together. We have to decide on that.

Chiu: I have absolutely no intention to defend anthropology as a discipline but we are here to do something about strategy. We are not going to march on the streets because we are doing intellectual work. My strategy of dealing with ... is to invent a virus. So my answer to the question what is the role of anthropology is it is to be the academic virus. That is a good site. There are lots of resources. We can develop new viruses from the existing discourse. I fully agree with the distinction between political decolonizing and psychological decolonizing. That's a good beginning. We now have the perspective that

there is not simply one decolonization. We know that the second decolonization may be even more difficult. Although a lot remains to be done, it is possible to do this and it is also a worthwhile exercise. We have to nurture each other, encourage each other and dialogue with each other. That itself has emancipative potential. Finally it is my teaching experience that this is a pedagogical problem. It is only when you respect that you can communicate with the student as a thinking subject.

END