Introduction

Decentering Anthropology, by way of Malinowski

Chandana Mathur and Dorothy L. Zinn

Malinowski, Again?

Over a century has now passed since the publication of Bronisław Malinowski's monograph, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922), one of the most decisive in forming the modern anthropological canon. The questioning of the power relations underlying this canon began some time ago, and calls have continued for the decolonization of anthropology (Gough 1968; Asad 1973; Harrison 1991; Allen and Jobson 2016; Gupta and Stoolman 2022) and the rightful recognition of non-hegemonic anthropological traditions (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006; Bošković and Eriksen 2010; D'Agostino and Matera 2023). Our volume contributes to this conversation from within our current unsettled global context—new nodes and modes of capital have been emerging for some time now, and countries like China, India, Turkey, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia have been rising in influence. Authoritarian governments and policies are on the ascent, both in the United States and in many of these new nodes, with calamitous consequences for this age of converging crises. Universities have frequently been targeted by these regimes, anthropologists and our students often particularly so.

Starting from Kathleen Gough's (1968) and Talal Asad's (1973) early contributions regarding anthropology's colonial origins, over the last several decades critical perspectives internal to anthropology have proliferated in the discipline's dominant centers as much as elsewhere. In more

recent years, this engagement has moved in various new directions, for example, with anthropologists as leading members of the Cite Black Women Collective (Smith et al. 2021); anthropology's own #MeToo moments, with accusations of molestations of US women graduate students; and in the wake of the 2018 *HAU* journal controversy, calls for greater attention to precarity and relations of power within the discipline—not only within its academic institutions and journals, but also more broadly in the power of hegemonic locations and canons (Chakraborty 2018). In 2020, the Association of Brazilian Anthropology (ABA) passed an important motion: "Diversify Information and Education about the Global Anthropologies of Foreign Researchers and Anthropology Students" (Associação Brasileira de Antropologia 2020). The ABA motion included two key points: (1) "Avoid cognitive extractivism," and (2) "increase the diversity of knowledge about global anthropologies." Several of these developments have triggered controversy, as with, in January 2021, the striking of Alfred Kroeber's name from the hall at the University of California at Berkeley that hosted the Department of Anthropology; or Akhil Gupta's 2021 presidential address to the American Anthropological Association (AAA), which sparked a great deal of debate over the history of the discipline and its leading representatives (Lewis 2021; Gupta and Stoolman 2022). Also controversial were the 2023 adoption of a resolution by the AAA membership to boycott Israeli academic institutions in response to a call from Palestinian civil society organizations, which was passed before Israel's brutal campaign in Gaza had concentrated renewed attention upon the lethal rapaciousness of settler colonialism, as well as a similar decision taken in 2024 by the members of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) to end collaborations with Israeli academic institutions. We can connect such recent thinking and initiatives to previous writings on race in the history of anthropology—ranging from Michel-Rolph Trouillot's insight that the discipline of anthropology needs to challenge the systems of thought that assigned to it a pre-established "savage slot" within the Western human sciences (Trouillot 1991), to Lee Baker's powerful work on race and the emergence of American cultural anthropology (Baker 1998). It is this body of work as much as the current Zeitgeist that informs writings that have provoked reflection and debate such as Ryan Cecil Jobson's "case for letting anthropology burn" (Jobson 2020). And, from quite a different angle, support for the argument of decentering anthropology has come from environmentalism and the various strains within the discipline's "ontological turn," as well as a broader trend in the humanities toward posthumanism (Braidotti 2013).

As noted earlier, there has also been significant pushback from forces—not only located in the Global North—that reassert the centrality and pri-

macy of the way things were in the "good old days" of white, cis male heteronormative hegemony and, in our relationship to the environment, business as usual. The academic world is inevitably permeable to such developments: consider the Trump administration's devastating and unprecedented attacks on US universities, the destruction of affirmative action and DEI (diversity, equality and inclusion) programs, vengeful and gargantuan cuts to university budgets, imprisonment of student activists and bans on international students, removal of funding for climate change research, and so on. These measures disproportionately affect anthropology in the United States. But looking beyond the United States, already back in November 2022, an online discussion in which we participated with delegates of the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA) presented a sobering picture of the state of the discipline with respect to the local and national sociopolitical contexts in which it operates. Members in locations around the world reported funding and position cuts, backlash in the classroom from right-wing students, and other forms of pressure against a discipline that, according to some increasingly influential political entrepreneurs, promotes "suspect" (if not actually "dangerous") ideologies like Critical Race Theory and gender. Indeed, as Raminder Kaur and Victoria Louisa Klingert have put it, there appears to be "a recolonizing backlash before decolonizing can even begin to materialize" (2021: 248).

So in this context, why should we invoke Malinowski yet again? This volume presents various perspectives on decentering anthropology in a seeming paradox, through reference to such a central figure as Bronisław Kaspar Malinowski. This concept was the basis for a workshop sponsored by the Wenner–Gren Foundation and held in Bozen-Bolzano in 2022, organized by Chandana Mathur, Elisabeth Tauber, and Dorothy Zinn: the contributions here arose from the presentations and discussions that took place there. In crafting the conversation, we have taken Malinowski as a metonym for the discipline in our attempt to address some of the current debates on world anthropologies and the decolonization of anthropological knowledge, production, and careers. Despite (and because of) the tarnish on his status following the publication of his diaries (Malinowski 1967), Malinowski remains part of an equivocal global anthropological tradition that, to a large degree, is still dominated by Anglophone anthropology of the North Atlantic, and to a lesser extent, by French anthropology. As Gabriella D'Agostino and Vincenzo Matera have noted in their global anthology on anthropology's histories, "An anthropologist's work still focuses on a studied/constructed otherness, which is implicitly defined according to a tacit standard, that of Malinowski . . . , an ethnographic archetype that still has not been completely challenged" (2023: 3).

Our provocation of decentering by way of Malinowski is, in effect, a loosening of a canon without pretending that it does not exist. It is a basis for exploring ways of engaging with a long-recognized history of the discipline, while at the same time recognizing the validity of many claims and propositions on the part of anthropologists and fellow scholars who have been seeking to transform the discipline methodologically, epistemologically, ethically, and institutionally by addressing power imbalances between hegemonic anthropologies/anthropologists and their multitudinous Others. "Having our cake and eating it too?," some readers might conjecture: perhaps, but as we will see in this introductory essay, we are in good company with a number of other colleagues who have suggested that what we need is not to render anthropology's canon invisible, but to interrogate it, render transparent the processes that led to problematic aspects of its development, and work in several directions to redress them. With an eye to the past, present and future, we must inquire as to how anthropology could have been and can be otherwise, to use a popular term from the decolonial lexicon.

A prolific and globetrotting scholar, Polish-born Malinowski launched his career at the London School of Economics, one of the central anthropology departments of the period. He left a mark on anthropologies across the world, whether through a direct institutional influence (LSE, Yale, International African Institute, Rockefeller Foundation) or through that of his students in many areas of Great Britain, the United States, and Africa.[1] The Malinowskian legacy continues not only through his own ethnographic research, carried out in the Trobriand Islands and, at the time of his death, in Mexico, but also in its global dissemination as a model for research practice subsequent to the publication of *Argonauts*. Malinowski's biography also features less well-known connections to places like the Canary Islands, where he spent several months as a youth traveling with his mother (Young 2004) and subsequently two years with his wife, Elsie Masson, writing *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*; the South of France, where, during one stay, his and Elsie's second daughter was born, and where later—during a sabbatical—he penned *Coral Gardens and Their Magic*; and Oberbozen-Soprabolzano in South Tyrol (Italy), where he and Elsie created a homestead during the years of Italian Fascism (Wayne 1995; Salvucci, Tauber and Zinn 2019). Intrigued by this near omnipresence of Malinowski, we utilized the device of Malinowskian places to bring together diverse scholars located around the globe for the Wenner–Gren workshop, forging a prism for reflecting on disciplinary power configurations today, and the contributions to that event form the basis of this volume. Our intention has been neither to celebrate nor "cancel" Malinowski, but with reference to Thomas Gerholm's (1995) "world system of

anthropology," the workshop's venue in Bozen-Bolzano created an eccentric space (etymologically, "out of center"), permitting conversations that normally are not able to take place. Acknowledging anthropology's previous reckonings with capital and empire (Gough 1968; Asad 1973; Trouillot 1991; among others), we have followed Faye Harrison's (2012) vision of an alternative, post core-periphery space.

Looking carefully at Malinowski's biography (see Grażyna Kubica's and Daniela Salvucci's chapters in this volume), Malinowski's position within a hegemonic, patriarchal, racist, and imperial "center" is not entirely straightforward, and he is not really suitable to serve as a straw man to be vilified. Yet he is an iconic founder of the discipline, a white European man writing in the first half of the twentieth century, spanning both British and US traditions, centrally involved in the institutions that established the dominance of Anglophone anthropology. As such, his life and career provide a standing rebuttal to the scholarship that considers other forms of domination to be somehow equivalent to the colonialism that historically accompanied the birth and global spread of capitalism; and sees "postcolonial" societies and seeks "decolonial" forms of redress in these very different spatial contexts (Moore 2001; Sandru 2012). We find Malinowski's own contradictions and the tensions they occasion to be particularly stimulating and generative as we call upon our contributors to interrogate how we might decenter anthropology while making reference to him.

Decentering Anthropology

While our thinking draws heavily on a plethora of discussions of academic decolonization, especially—but not limited to—those within anthropology itself, our perspective cannot be reduced to the concept of decoloniality, of which there are manifold definitions, articulations, and concretizations. We also look to partially overlapping reflections coming from the arena of "world anthropologies." Indeed, we share Carolyn Rouse's perspective that "discourses of 'decolonizing anthropology' and 'world anthropologies' [are] dialogical tools that are necessary to continually decenter hegemonic knowledge production" (2023: 358). In our view, "decentering" is a productive path to follow because it enables us to gain purchase on aspects that we want to consider that are not strictly connected to the specificity and materiality of historical colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialist processes per se—although it is important to bear in mind, as Oda-Kange Midtvåge Diallo and Nico Miskow Friborg (2021) remind us, the generation and reproduction of many current oppressive

conditions and practices are certainly embedded in the structures of the "Academic Industrial Complex."

Eduardo Restrepo and Arturo Escobar (2005:119) assert that "the enablement of 'world anthropologies' involves a pluralizing, de-centering and re-historicizing of what usually appears as a single and non-problematic 'anthropology.'" The facets of pluralizing and re-historicizing have undoubtedly received a tremendous impetus in the two decades since Restrepo and Escobar's essay. In the context that they are considering, pluralization refers to the greater visibility of different anthropologies from outside the hegemon. There have also been some structural efforts in this direction, such as those of the International Union of the Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) and the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA), now unified as the World Anthropological Union (WAU), and of the Wenner–Gren Foundation,[2] all of which are committed to supporting this pluralization, and indeed, they have promoted it through various initiatives.[3] But we may also consider pluralization in a different sense, not referring to geopolitically defined representatives of the discipline, but to other axes of difference, as for example in the commitment to gender equality, anti-racism, and a broadening of inclusivity (as with, for example, the American Anthropological Association's increased attention in recent years to accessibility for people with disabilities). And of course, there has been and continues to be extensive re-historicizing of the discipline, for example in bringing to light significant contributions to anthropology's research and epistemology by lesser-known national traditions or reassessing relations among these traditions and the hegemonic ones.[4] As with pluralization, re-historicizing can also refer to other positionalities in anthropology, for example, in the rediscovery and belated recognition of major contributions by women, people of color, and scholars with disabilities or of queer and nonbinary identities (or any combination of these identifications).

Given the attention to pluralizing and re-historicizing in the first decades of the twenty-first century, we suggest that decentering anthropology analogously requires more focused attention. Our goal is a cross-fertilization of ideas across various locations, abilities, genders, and generations, regarding the decentering of anthropology and what it means in different places/times. We imagine that decentering can take many forms, and while this volume explores several of them, there will doubtless still be others that will remain untreated or underexplored. A good starting point might be Daniela Salvucci's chapter, which eloquently interprets decentering not as moving or displacing the center but as rearticulating the very notion of center itself as a node of intersections. We believe that Salvucci's rearticulation of "center" is suggestive for moving beyond overly simplis-

tic calls for jettisoning the canon: if decentering is not merely knocking a statue off its pedestal (or otherwise "killing our ancestors" [Sanchez 2023]) and erecting another one in its place, then we are forced to consider the complexity of each positionality and not attribute binary, essentializing positionalities to agents of various sorts in anthropology, be they national disciplinary traditions, individual scholars, or specific institutions. In this way, we are necessarily reminded of "the inescapability of power in any knowledge production" (Rouse 2023: 356). We might even say that *intersectionality*—as in Kimberlé Crenshaw's famous formulation (Crenshaw 1989)—is not only a matter of shedding light on compounded disadvantages, but it can simultaneously help us to understand the reproduction of privilege if we shift the context under consideration.

The binary attributions we contest include that of "native/non-native" (see Joy Owen's chapter). As Vineeta Sinha notes, the deep-rooted presence of the "native" in our discipline has the effect of "completely undermin[ing] anthropological endeavors to make larger, overarching human connections, and transcending the binaries of self/other, subject/object, native/non-native" (Sinha 2021: 268). One possible subversive tactic that Sinha mentions is that of the reversal of the gaze (Mathur 2006; Ntarangwi 2010), and indeed, we find this to be one of the potentially fruitful paths for forwarding a process of decentering. Given that anthropologists have known about the importance of the "perspectives gained from studying up" for fifty years now, the directionality of the power relationships driving anthropological knowledge production has not shifted as radically as it should have (Nader 1974). What has indeed changed over these fifty years is that the Global North has emphatically become an object of anthropological study. Yet anthropological fieldwork in the Global North has usually been undertaken by Global North scholars, and when Global South scholars conduct fieldwork in the North, it is usually among marginalized Northern populations. Ethnographic accounts of mainstream culture in the Global North by Global South scholars have been all too rare (exceptions include Mathur 1998, 2022). There are good reasons for why this path still remains relatively untrodden. Aside from institutional expectations in some local contexts—such as India, where "decoloniality" has generally meant studying one's own country in view of countering distorted colonial representations (Arif 2021)—the possibilities of effecting a reversed gaze are likely limited by funding or mobility opportunities or political constraints.

In the preparation of our workshop, for example, on several occasions the co-organizers felt the weight of such constraints, for example, with the difficulty that some participants had to obtain a visa to enter Italy—and despite our great efforts and the generous financial support of the

Wenner–Gren Foundation, these constraints were not always overcome. Indeed, for Elisabeth Tauber and Dorothy Zinn, dealing with such problems up close for the first time was a humbling decentering of their own status within the Global North, and they have subsequently learned how common and pressing these barriers are for the mobility of scholars from the Global South. Or, indeed, for scholars with passports from the Global South living and working in the Global North. We should note, too, that Yasmeen Arif's research as an Indian scholar in Lebanon provides an excellent example that breaks the bounds of the native/non-native binary indicted by Sinha: precisely this sort of South–South framing has great potential to decenter "the anthropological cartography of ethnographic work" (Arif 2021: 257). This is a courageous effort, because it goes deeply against the grain of expectations for funders and publishers, as well as institutional gatekeepers: as Arif relates in one vignette, a publisher in India told her "Who in India would want to read anything on Beirut?" (Arif 2021: 259). We can well imagine that not everyone has the wherewithal to pursue such a countercurrent endeavor. Finally, if it is beginning to sound like we are lapsing into yet another binary after having eschewed many others, it is important to acknowledge that North–South distinctions may themselves be subject to "the inconstant geography of capitalism" (Storper and Walker 1989).

Since its inception, a focus on humankind has been pivotal to the discipline, the *anthropos* inscribed in the discipline's very name. The input from recent anthropology looking to multispecies relations and the more-than-human has led to yet another variant of decentering: posthumanism and postanthropocentrism as a dethroning of human speciesism (Howard and Küpers 2022). This field of study is enormous, and this is not the place to deal with it thoroughly: we only signpost a few points that are relevant for the discussion at hand. Species, like gender, class, and ethnicity, may be invoked as a dimension of power relations, even intersectionally (Petitt 2023). A good deal of scholarship in anthropology in the last few decades that has focused on the human and the more-than-human has come to be known under the rubric of the "ontological turn," with a specific attention to decentering Western ontological perspectives (Holbraad and Peterson 2017). J. I. Fúnez-Flores (2022) has recently drawn an intriguing comparison between ontological approaches and those of Latin American decolonial thinkers. What these two very different lines of thought have in common, he observes, is precisely a decentering of the foundations of Eurocentrically conceived modernity and its attendant notions of knowledge (decoloniality) and reality (ontology), developed as they have been through capitalist–colonial exploitation to the detriment of other versions of these notions, as well as of the peoples and more-than-human environ-

ments in which they are embedded. Nonetheless, we must keep in mind that the politics of the "ontological turn" have frequently been called into question (Bessire and Bond 2014; Graeber 2015; Lossin 2020). Also, as Zoe Todd (2016) astutely observes, some ontological thinkers risk reproducing colonialist power differentials when, for example, they do not properly include Indigenous scholars' understandings of Indigenous concepts and choose not to consult or cite this work. Despite their theoretical sophistication, then, unless they attend to the dimension of practice, proponents of this literature risk creating a situation of "plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose." As has been well documented, citational practices buttress a canon (Smith et al. 2021; Davis and Mulla 2023; Tauber and Zinn 2021), reproducing global hierarchies in anthropology, but in this case, they can also undermine well-meaning theoretical innovations that are themselves critical of the canon.

Attention to citational practices, publishing and other specific institutional changes, then, contributes to the project of decentering by working to dislodge dominant configurations (see Restrepo and Escobar 2005, but consider also the caveats that Sara Ahmed [2012] provides about institutional "diversity" work). Teaching is also a location in which such changes can make a difference through the construction of a syllabus that gathers resources and citations from different positionalities, effectively "loosening the canon"; in classroom practices that foster inclusion and collaboration; and in teaching research methods that respond to critiques of anthropology as colonial (Ruth et al. 2022; Diallo and Friborg 2021; Sinha 2021). The chapter in this volume by Joy Owen offers us her own decentered, reflexive vision on the topic. For many white anthropologists, though, it may be surprising to learn that even simply creating a learning environment that is perceived to be free of racism can, paradoxically, be a momentous challenge for university anthropology departments, as ongoing research by Magnus Gielge demonstrates (2024). A sobering decentering of a self-satisfied self-perception of anthropologists as the challengers of racism invites a rethinking of our pedagogical practices and institutional environment (Das and Ivasiuc 2025).

The issue of Malinowski's canonical status in teaching anthropology goes hand in hand with research that is still the calling card of the discipline and used for the training of new generations, as his research in the Trobriands famously set the standard for the practice of ethnographic fieldwork. Currently, research methods are undergoing reconsideration, with calls for decolonization through collaboration with and empowerment of research participants (West 2016). Yasmeen Arif points out the importance of innovating method through "fashioning emerging encounters, especially hitherto untapped ones—which can provide the basis for

another epistemology" (Arif 2012). To what extent has fieldwork practice in non-hegemonic locations today departed from the Malinowskian convention and evolved alternative research paradigms (see Allen and Jobson 2016)? On the other hand, to what extent are anthropologists in such places obliged to follow hegemonic approaches in order to be more widely legitimized and considered *à la page*?

In making reference to the notion of decentering, it is important to bear in mind that we must contextualize each and every instance under examination. The same element may appear more central in one context but peripheral in another. And within a given setting, we need to recognize the complexity of center–periphery relations on various scales: do we see decentering taking place within given locations, taking into account intersectional lines of difference? For example, Malinowski established himself at the London School of Economics, becoming an iconic figure for the Department of Anthropology. But in the context of the history of the discipline in the 1920s and 1930s, according to Edmund Leach (1984), the rise of LSE anthropology was itself a decentering from the bastions of Oxford and Cambridge: LSE had a lower status in that period, but the Malinowski Seminar attracted a number of promising students away from Oxbridge. Furthermore, Leach argues, women in particular were able to find spaces of affirmation that were denied them at Oxbridge, which may also explain why the Seminar drew in several women among Malinowski's students, many of whom would later rise to prominence (e.g., Lucy Mair, Audrey Richards, Monica Wilson). Ironically, Malinowski and other "foreigners" at LSE came to be definitively associated with "British" social anthropology (see also Daniela Salvucci's chapter).

The institutional histories of how anthropology came to be implanted in diverse locations, beginning with those recounted in Talal Asad's landmark edited volume *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (1973, and within it, see Brown 1973) and going on to newer work by David Nugent and by Freddy Foks (Nugent 2002, 2021; Foks 2018) suggest a complicated and nonbinary relationship between "the Anglo-American core in the world system of anthropological production" (Ribeiro 2012) and marginalized anthropological traditions, including those on Euro-American semi-peripheries. The "infrastructures of knowledge and control" put into place, for example, by US capitalist philanthropies, created a "cultural vanguard" and played a role in training significant numbers of anthropologists in the Global South (Nugent 2002, 2021). However, despite occasional telltale continuities, these foundational relationships did not determine the subsequent histories of anthropologies in these locations, and some of our contributors address these complexities (the chapters by Ricardo Macip and Isaac Nyamongo in this volume). Our emphasis on the

material histories of anthropological knowledge production also makes it necessary to attend to the trajectories taken by nation-building as against empire-building anthropologies, to invoke the distinction drawn by Stocking. These are not always as distinct as might be expected in their approach to anthropological subjects. And here we can return to Malinowski as a device for sparking reflection: he established his career at LSE, a prominent institution in the metropole, following the extractive approach to research common in his day (Pels 2018). In some of the book's chapters, our decentered view interrogates academic anthropology in Malinowskian places: are institutional arrangements reproducing hierarchies of knowledge production or contributing to the creation of "epistemic disobedience" (Mignolo 2013), "epistemic freedom" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2018), and "theory from the South" (Comaroff and Comaroff 2012)? Moreover, is the traditional hierarchy of academic over extra-academic anthropology getting decentered (as we find in Isaac Nyamongo's chapter on Kenya)?

The volume resonates not only with ongoing discussions of decolonization, World Anthropologies, and citational politics, but also of the Lausanne Manifesto (Saillant, Kilani and Graezer-Bideau 2011) regarding the use of language in anthropology and problems associated with the international dominance of English. Scholars in settings where other languages are the working languages often feel pressured to publish in English for their work to gain international currency but also in order to pursue their career advancement locally, where English-language publications may be more highly ranked in evaluation processes. In many countries, including some from the Global North, English-language degree programs have come under fire as part of a larger perceived menace to local/national language-based scientific traditions.[5] In putting together this publication, we find ourselves enmeshed in a bind common among those who pursue disciplinary plurality and question the hegemony of the English language. Despite these goals, we have admittedly succumbed to the utility of English as a lingua franca for forwarding the discussion, while only a few of the contributors are actually native speakers.

Among the topics this volume explores are the pressing inequities within our discipline: the "subjugated knowledge" contributed by non-hegemonic anthropologies, hierarchies in publishing and citation; preferences for hegemonic scholarship over local scholarship in Global South locations. We draw on world anthropologies not as a multicultural patchwork, but—inspired by interculturalism in Latin American and French Canadian conceptions (Saillant et al. 2011; Mignolo and Walsh 2018) and Fernando Ortiz's transculturation ([1940]1995)[6]—we put them into direct relation via Malinowski. This will clarify the possible epistemological impacts of this expanded dialogue on hegemonic anthropologies: contribut-

ing not only to improving understanding (Bošković and Eriksen 2010: 16), but also to reshaping anthropological theorizing. Malinowski serves as a metonym, a red thread running through the issues highlighted here.

About the Contributions

Proposing Malinowski as a "loose can(n)on" in global anthropology, our volume brings together scholars with connections to Malinowskian places from Papua New Guinea to Mexico. Our volume is divided into two groups of contributions, both of which have taken Malinowski as a starting point. The first group, "In the Wake of Bronisław Malinowski" (Salvucci, Macip, Cacchioni, Nyamongo, Kubica) looks to Malinowski's own life and influence to focus variously on decentering his canonical status.

As noted above, Malinowski had a connection to South Tyrol, a border area that in anthropological terms bridges two semi-peripheral traditions, the Italian- and German-speaking ones. As a mid-career scholar, Daniela Salvucci has been conducting research on Malinowski and his first wife, Elsie Masson, in South Tyrol. Salvucci proposes to reconsider the very notion of decentering, not as moving a center point, but redefining the center as a node of intersecting relations, and she re-reads Malinowski in this light.

Ricardo Macip, who has conducted research in Malinowski's last field site, Oaxaca (Mexico), also considers the Malinowskian legacy, this time with regard to Mexican anthropology, offering a critical assessment of a "White Father" relationship to local scholars. Macip does not rest on a simple colonial reading but instead keeps in mind the important nuances of internal power differentials along ethnic, class, and gendered lines. In this manner, he complexifies trite binaries that would tend to ignore such dynamics within a postcolonial setting.

Davide Cacchioni, a recent PhD in Marseille, represents the period Malinowski spent in Southern France. On the one hand, Davide decenters the anthropocentric approach typical of the discipline with his mission to "follow the cannabis plant," on the other hand, he shows us how methodologically this can lead to a rich reading of multiscalar human socioeconomic relations, in the sophisticated tradition of Malinowski's *Coral Gardens*.

Malinowski's supervisory duties also connected him to Kenya, where today Isaac Nyamongo looks back on his legacy via Jomo Kenyatta, first President of Kenya, who was a student of Malinowski's at LSE. This fascinating history follows the development of the local anthropological tradition far away from the LSE center. Despite Kenyatta's prestige, the discipline of anthropology in Kenya's post-independence era has not realized its full potential. Among other things, Nyamongo shows how this

version of anthropology prioritizes applied research, decentering the precedence from wholly theoretical work.

The last contribution in the first part takes on the proverbial elephant in the room: Malinowski's controversial posthumous publication, *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term* (Malinowski 1967). From Malinowski's native Poland and his alma mater Jagiellonian University, Grażyna Kubica has worked extensively on Malinowski and brings to this volume a comprehensive knowledge of his contribution and meticulousness in relating it to the details of his biography. Here, she considers the various readings of the notorious *Diary*, which she edited and annotated in an unabridged Polish edition; she attempts to situate Malinowski's written reflections on his Trobriand experience within the context of his prolific diary-keeping at various other times in other places. Kubica insists on decentering anthropology as the primary context for reading the *Diary*.

The second group of essays, "Decentering Malinowski, Decentering Anthropology" (Strong, Pizzaro, Ogunsanya, Owen), all rotate around Malinowskian places to forward strategies of decentering. Like Kubica, Thomas Strong also begins with a focus on Malinowski's *Diary*. Strong, who has worked in Papua New Guinea, notes Clifford Geertz's use of the term "queer" in his dismissal of the Malinowskian diaries but draws out its potentially subversive ramifications. Reflecting on contemporary Melanesian scholarship, he decenters conventional ideas about the production of anthropological knowledge and its relationship to the fieldworker.

Of course, Malinowski's name has long been associated with the London School of Economics, where he held his influential Seminar. The material legacy he left behind as the Malinowski Archive has become the locus for an important pilot project the LSE Library has been implementing to "decolonize" archival materials. Emma Pizarro, an archivist at LSE, gives us some insights into what this means concretely and the various challenges that it implies. Anthropologists have also reflected on the sobering reality of how the archive can perpetrate and perpetuate colonial violence (e.g., Stoler 2022; Desjarlais and Habrih 2022). As a professional practitioner, Pizarro's perspective from outside the discipline helps decenter anthropological views and raise a number of reflections regarding what can and should be done to make archival materials accessible to a wider population of users, who may be anthropologists with various backgrounds or people from among the groups studied by anthropologists.

Metaphorically, we may consider bureaucratic limbo a Malinowskian place, if we think of his time in the Trobriand Islands during World War I (see Jacobsen, Karlsen, and Khosravi 2020) but also during World War II in North America. Comparing his own experience of limbo in Ireland's asylum-seeker reception system to Malinowski's experience of rupture

and isolation in the Trobriands, Abayomi Ogunsanya yields a rich ethnographic reverse gaze. Such reverse gazes remain few and far between in anthropology despite their great potential for decentering.

Apart from Jomo Kenyatta (above), Malinowski had numerous other students who conducted research in Africa (Audrey Richards, Hilda Beemer Kuper, E. E. Evans-Pritchard, Meyer Fortes, Isaac Schapera, Lucy Mair, Monica Hunter Wilson), and he himself spent time consulting with them in situ, with research and guest lecture stints in various parts of Africa. Moreover, he had a complex relationship with the British colonial administration in Africa (Foks 2018; Colajanni 2022). Hailing from South Africa, Joy Owen brings us a voice of a new generation from a wholly different world, post-apartheid and post-"Rhodes Must Fall." Owen dialogues with memories of Malinowski during her studies in a reflexive discussion that traces her process, as a "native" scholar, a "coloured" woman, of disciplining and "undisciplining" herself.

Finally, the Polish anthropologist Michał Buchowski, who has written about the marginal status of Central and Eastern European anthropologies (for example, Buchowski 2004), served as the discussant at the symposium. His afterword to this volume adds to and appraises the decentering perspectives offered here.

For the record, we were not able to include every Malinowskian place possible, and there were a few omissions that are particularly glaring. First, the Canary Islands were a Malinowskian place, as mentioned above. We were having difficulty in the attempt to locate anthropologists based there, and then the volcanic explosion in 2021 did the rest in convincing us to give up. Another significant Malinowskian place is New Haven, Connecticut, home to Yale University, the institution where Malinowski was working at the time of this death in 1942. For both of these places, but also Papua New Guinea, we made attempts to involve scholars who could bring decentered gazes from their exterior locations, but our efforts were not fruitful. Despite these regrettable lacunae, we were excited to have a rich and stimulatingly heterogeneous group of colleagues present. Drawing together these diverse scholars by way of Malinowksi, we have aimed to creatively "provincialize" (Chakrabarty 2000; Ribiero and Escobar 2006) the disciplinary hegemon of the North Atlantic and ignite discussion across space and generation regarding the decolonizing of anthropology vis-à-vis the production of knowledge, canon, and careers.

Chandana Mathur is Associate Professor of Anthropology at the National University of Ireland, Maynooth. Drawing on the perspectives of anthro-

pological political economy and political ecology, her research focuses principally on the contemporary United States, South Asia, and the South Asian diaspora. She is a former Chair of the World Council of Anthropological Associations (2016–18) and a former Vice President of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (2021–23). She has received a Distinguished Service Award from the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, and a Presidential Award from the American Anthropological Association.

Dorothy L. Zinn is Professor of Sociocultural Anthropology at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano (Italy), where she heads the PhD program in Education and Social Sciences. Her research has focused primarily on migration and multiculturalism in Italy, but also on issues of patronage–clientelism and corruption. She has translated three monographs into English by the noted Italian anthropologist Ernesto de Martino. Zinn is co-founder of the Malinowski Forum for Ethnography and Anthropology (https://mfea.projects.unibz.it/) and a delegate to the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). She is currently President of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe (2024–26).

Notes

1. Just to name some of the most noteworthy: E. E. Evans-Pritchard, Raymond Firth, Meyer Fortes, Jomo Kenyatta, Edmund Leach. A number of prominent women anthropologists were students of Malinowski (see Wayne 1985): for example, Lucy Mair, Hortense Powdermaker, Audrey Richards.

2. The WCAA's 2004 founding meeting in Recife, Brazil, had in fact been supported by the Wenner–Gren Foundation.

3. For example, since 2013, the WCAA's *Déjà Lu* journal has given global visibility to articles from counter-hegemonic anthropological journals around the world—WCAA. "Homepage." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://waunet.org/wcaa/dejalu/. Since 2017, the WCAA channel *En sus propios términos* has created a space where world anthropologies can be accessed in their own languages, to counter the dominance of the English language—WCAA. "In One's Own Terms." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://waunet.org/wcaa/propios-terminos/.

Additionally, the American Anthropological Association first set up its Commission on World Anthropologies as long ago as 2008, has now established a World Anthropologies Hub (AAA. "World Anthropologies Hub." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://americananthro.org/about/committees-and-task-forces/anthropology-advocacy-council/world-anthropologies-hub/), and in its flagship journal, *American Anthropologist*, maintains a section on World Anthropologies.

4. In this, EASA's History of Anthropology Network has been particularly active (EASA. "History of Anthropology." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://

easaonline.org/networks/history-of-anthropology/). See also the Histories of Anthropology Annual book series, edited by Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach and, online, the Berose International Encyclopaedia of the Histories of Anthropology (Berose. "International Encyclopaedia of the Histories of Anthropology." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://www.berose.fr/?lang=en).

5. As Francine Saillant (2015) points out, however, the dynamics of hegemony and subalternity do not simply play out between the English language and "the rest": as a French-Canadian, she describes how a pecking order of Franco-French and Franco-others exists even within the francophone world. This is a perfect example of the role that context plays in considering center–periphery relations, as described above.

6. We remind readers that Malinowski wrote a highly appreciative introduction to the first edition of Ortiz's book.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Allen, Jafari Sinclaire, and Ryan Cecil Jobson. 2016. "The Decolonizing Generation: (Race and) Theory in Anthropology since the Eighties." *Current Anthropology* 57(2): 129–48.

Arif, Yasmeen. 2012. "Emergent Encounters: Towards a Politics of Epistemology." *World Anthropologies Network (WAN)/Red de Antropologías del Mondo (RAM)* (6): 23–41.

———. 2021. "The Reluctant Native, or, Decolonial Ontologies and Epistemic Disobedience," *HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11(1): 256–63.

Asad, Talal, ed. 1973. *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. Amherst, MA: Humanity Books.

Associação Brasileira de Antropologia. 2020. "Motion of the 32nd RBA: Diversify Information and Education about the Global Anthropologies of Foreign Researchers and Anthropology Students." https://www.aba.abant.org.br/files/20210108_5ff8624aac67c.pdf.

Baker, Lee D. 1998. *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bessire, Lucas, and David Bond. 2014. "Ontological anthropology and the deferral of critique," *American Ethnologist* 41: 440–56.

Bošković, Aleksandar, and Thomas Hylland Eriksen. 2010. "Introduction: Other People's Anthropologies." In *Other People's Anthropologies*, ed. Aleksandar Bošković and Thomas Hylland Eriksen, 1–19. Oxford: Berghahn.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, Richard. 1973. "Anthropology and Colonial Rule: Godfrey Wilson and the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Northern Rhodesia." In *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, ed. Talal Asad, 173–97. Amherst, MA: Humanity Books.

Buchowski, Michał. 2004. "Hierarchies of Knowledge in Central-Eastern European Anthropology." *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 22(2): 5–14.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chakraborty, Proshant. 2018. "Ethical Dilemmas, Anthropological Practice, and Principles #HAUtalk." *AllegraLab*. Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://allegralaboratory.net/ethical-dilemmas-anthropological-practice-and-principles-hautalk/.

Colajanni, Antonino. 2022. "Bronislaw Malinowski, l'antropologia pratica, la politica e il colonialismo" [Bronislaw Malinowski, practical anthropology, politics and colonialism]. *ANUAC* 11(2): 3–66.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 2012. *Theory from the South: Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving toward Africa*. London: Routledge.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1: 139–67.

D'Agostino, Gabriella, and Vincenzo Matera. 2023. "Introduction: For a History of Anthropology in the Plural." In *Histories of Anthropology*, ed. Gabriella D'Agostino and Vincenzo Matera, 1–46. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Das, Bhargabi, and Ana Ivasiuc. 2025. "CARE: Caring, Anti-racist Education and Decolonial Pedagogies in the Neoliberal University and a Colonial-Born Discipline." *ES&C: Educação Sociedade Culturas* 70: 1–20.

Davis, Dána-Ain, and Sameena Mulla. 2023. "The Unbearable Whiteness of Citational Practice in US Medical Anthropology." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 37(3): 182–89.

Desjarlais, Robert, and Khalil Habrih. 2022. *Traces of Violence: Writings on the Disaster in Paris, France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Diallo, Oda-Kange Midtvåge, and Nico Miskow Friborg. 2021. "Subverting the White Cis Gaze: Toward a Pedagogy of Discomfort, Accountability and Care in the Anthropological Classroom." *Teaching Anthropology* 10(4): 17–35.

Foks, Freddy. 2018. "Bronislaw Malinowski, 'Indirect Rule,' and the Colonial Politics of Functionalist Anthropology, ca. 1925–1940." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 60(19): 35–57.

Fúnez-Flores, J. I. 2022. "Decolonial and Ontological Challenges in Social and Anthropological Theory." *Theory, Culture & Society* 39(6): 21–41.

Gerholm, Thomas. 1995. "Sweden: Central Ethnology, Peripheral Anthropology." In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, ed. H. F. Vermeulen and A. A. Roldán, 159–70. London: Routledge.

Gielge, Magnus. 2024. "How Could an Anthropology Department Be Racist?" *Boasblog Decolonizing Anthropology Series*, 25 January 2024. Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://boasblogs.org/decolonizinganthropology/anti-rassismus-in-der-lehre/?pdf=11523.

Gough, Kathleen. 1968. "Anthropology: Child of Imperialism." *Monthly Review* 19(11): 12–24.

Graeber, David. 2015. "Radical Alterity Is Just Another Way of Saying 'Reality.'" *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5: 1–41.

Gupta, Akhil, and Jessica Stoolman. 2022. "Decolonizing US Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 124(4): 778–99.

Harrison, Faye, ed. 1991. *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology of Liberation*. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.

———. 2012. "Dismantling Anthropology's Domestic and International Peripheries." *World Anthropologies Network (WAN)/Red de Antropologías del Mondo (RAM)* (6): 87–109.

Holbraad, Martin, and Morten Axel Peterson. 2017. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, Christopher A., and Wendelin M. Küpers. 2022. "Posthumanism and Anthropology." In *Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism*, ed. Stefan Herbrechter, Ivan Callus, Manuela Rossini, Marija Grech, Megen de Bruin-Molé, and Christopher John Müller, 725–47. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04958-3_14.

Jacobsen, Christine M., Marry-Anne Karlsen, and Shahram Khosravi, eds. 2020. *Waiting and the Temporalities of Irregular Migration*. London: Routledge.

Jobson, Cecil Ryan. 2020. "The Case for Letting Anthropology Burn: Sociocultural Anthropology in 2019." *American Anthropologist* 122(2): 259–71.

Kaur, Raminder, and Victoria Louisa Klingert. 2021. "Decolonizing Ethnographies." *HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11(19): 246–55.

Leach, Edmund. 1984. "Glimpses of the Unmentionable in the History of British Social Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13(1): 1–24.

Lewis, Herbert. 2021. "On the Counterfactual History of Anthropology." Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://www.easaonline.org/downloads/networks/hoan/HOAN_Newsletter_21j-202112_Lewis_Open_Letter_AAA.pdf.

Lossin, R. H. 2020. "Neoliberalism for Polite Company: Bruno Latour's Pseudo-Materialist Coup," *Salvage*, 1 June. Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://salvage.zone/neoliberalism-for-polite-company-bruno-latours-pseudo-materialist-coup/.

Malinowski, Bronisław. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: E.P. Dutton & Co.

———. 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mathur, Chandana. 1998. "Transformation as Usual? The Meanings of a Changing Labor Process for Indiana Aluminum Workers." *Critique of Anthropology* 18(3): 263–77.

———. 2006. "A Passage to Indiana: Reflections on Fieldwork in a Reverse Direction." *Indian Folklife* (23) August 2006. Special Issue: Post-field Positionings. Guest Editor: Susan Seizer.

———. 2022. "A Strike to Remember: Ethnographic Reflections on the Conditions of Possibility for Labor Resistance in the US Heartland." In *The Routledge Handbook of the Anthropology of Labor*, ed. Sharryn Kasmir and Lesley Gill, 335–47. Oxford: Routledge.

Mignolo, Walter. 2013. "Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (De)coloniality, Border Thinking and Epistemic Disobedience." *Confero* 1(1): 129–50.

Mignolo, Walter, and Catherine Walsh. 2018. *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Moore, David Chioni. 2001. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique." *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Lan-*

guage Association of America 116(1): 111–28. https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2001.116.1.111.

Nader, Laura. 1974. "Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes, 284–311. New York: Vintage Books.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J. 2018. *Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonization*. Oxford: Routledge.

Ntarangwi, Mwenda. 2010. *Reversed Gaze: An African Ethnography of American Anthropology*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Nugent, David. 2002. *Locating Capitalism in Time and Space: Global Restructurings, Politics and Identity*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

———. 2021. "Orientalism in War and Peace: The Politics of Academic Scholarship during the Long Twentieth Century." *Third World Quarterly* 42(11): 2,521–2,537. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2021.1913405.

Pels, Peter. 2018. "Anthropology Should Never Be Fully Decolonized." *Etnofoor* (30)2: 71–76.

Pettit, Andrea. 2023. "Conceptualizing the Multispecies Triad: Toward a Multispecies Intersectionality." *Feminist Anthropology* 4: 23–37.

Ortiz, Fernando. (1940) 1995. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Restrepo, Eduardo, and Arturo Escobar. 2005. "'Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise': Steps to a World Anthropologies Framework." *Critique of Anthropology* (25): 99–129.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 2012. "The Problem of Hegemony, Flows and Equity in World Anthropologies." *World Anthropologies Network (WAN)/Red de Antropologías del Mondo (RAM)* (6): 7–20.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.

Rouse, Carolyn. 2023. "An Anti-genealogical Take on US Anthropology and Disciplinary Reform: From Anti-racism to Decolonization." *American Ethnologist* (50) 356–67.

Ruth, Alissa, Katherine Woolard, Thurka Sangaramoorthy, Bryan Brayboy, Melissa Beresford, Alexandra Brewis, H. Russell Bernard et al. 2022. "Teaching Ethnographic Methods for Cultural Anthropology: Current Practices and Needed Innovation," *Teaching Anthropology* 11(2): 59–72.

Saillant, Francine. 2015. "World Anthropologies and Anthropology in the Francophone World: The Lausanne Manifesto and Related Initiatives." *American Anthropologist* 117(1): 146–50.

Saillant, Francine, Mondher Kilani, and Florence Graezer-Bideau. 2011. *The Lausanne Manifesto*. Montréal: Liber.

Salvucci, Daniela, Elisabeth Tauber, and Dorothy L. Zinn. 2019. "The Malinowskis in South Tyrol: A Relational Biography of People, Places and Works." In *BEROSE—International Encyclopaedia of the Histories of Anthropology*, Paris. Retrieved 3 October 2025 from https://www.berose.fr/article1754.html.

Sanchez, Andrew. 2023. "Kill Your Ancestors: The Wars of Decolonization." *American Ethnologist* 50: 439–45.

Sandru, Cristina. 2012. *Worlds Apart? A Postcolonial Reading of Post-1945 East-Central European Culture*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Sinha, Vineeta. 2021. "Annihilating the 'Savage Slot' from Anthropology: Materializing Reflexive Practices." *HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11(1): 264–72.

Smith Christen A., Erica L. Williams, Imani A. Wadud, Whitney N.L Pirtie, and the Cite Black Women Collective 2021. "Cite Black Women: A Critical Praxis (A Statement)." *Feminist Anthropology* 2(1): 10–17.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2022. *Interior Frontiers: Essays on the Entrails of Inequality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storper, Michael. and Richard Walker. 1989. *The Capitalist Imperative: Territory, Technology, and Industrial Growth*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Tauber, Elisabeth, and Dorothy L. Zinn. 2021. "The Graphy in Ethnography: Reconsidering the Gender of and in the Genre." In *Gender and Genre in Ethnographic Writing*, ed. Elisabeth Tauber and Dorothy L. Zinn, 7–44. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Todd, Zoe. 2016. "An Indigenous Feminist's Take On The Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' Is Just Another Word For Colonialism," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 9(1): 4–22.

Trouillot, Michel Rolph. 1991. "Anthropology and the savage slot. The poetics and politics of Otherness." In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the present*, ed. Richard Fox, 17–44. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Young, Michael. 2004. *Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884–1920*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.

Wayne, Helena. 1985. "Bronislaw Malinowski: The Influence of Various Women on his Life and Works," *American Ethnologist* 12(3): 529–40.

———, ed. 1995. *The Story of a Marriage: Volume II. The letters of Bronislaw Malinowski and Elsie Masson*. New York: Routledge.

West, Paige. 2016. "Teaching Decolonizing Methodologies," SavageMinds, https://savageminds.org/2016/07/25/teaching-decolonizing-methodologies/.