

institutions. On the one hand, people with disabilities have the possibility of receiving a state allowance, which raises expectations from family members and generates dependency networks around them. On the other hand, however, they continue to depend on others, especially their loved ones, for much of their everyday life needs. Schnitzler's contribution thus highlights the web of social tensions within which specific regimes of responsibility are played out in the everyday practices of people whose lives are marked by severe economic and physical vulnerability.

Importantly, these practices are also influenced by religious and moral principles, a dimension which forms the object of analysis of the following three contributions. Katrien Pype's chapter focuses on the conflicting regimes of responsibility within which people find themselves in the predominantly Pentecostal city of Kinshasa. Discussing ethnographic examples that come both from her fieldwork research and the content of the Pentecostal television serials that she observed in Kinshasa, Pype highlights the way in which the politics of allocation of responsibility intervene in the subjectivation processes of Born-again Christians. In particular, she analyses the role of confessions, soul healing and deliverance rituals in the construction of responsible, Christian subjects, and she explores the depiction of responsibility in one of the evangelizing television serials that are produced by the company with which she worked during her research. This allows her to demonstrate how crucial the process of the 'moral movement' one makes in order to become a Christian subject is in 'becoming responsible', a movement that implies the creation of a distance from the web of social relations one used to live in before one's conversion, and the taking up of one's own responsibilities in the definition of a specific life itinerary.

Peter Geschiere's contribution moves away from Pentecostal Christianity to bring to the fore the equally complex and constantly-transforming regimes of responsibility that are conveyed by witchcraft image-ries and discourses among the Maka of the south-eastern forest region of Cameroon. Geschiere guides us with a detailed, historical analysis of the transformations of local definitions of the 'witch' among the Maka in order to highlight the ambivalence of the concept of '*djambe*' (or witchcraft) itself. At first sight *djambe* seems to be a concept positioned at the antipodes of traditional, morally grounded conceptions of responsibility, as it implies a betrayal from within the group, which unsettles the safety of the house. However, as Geschiere demonstrates through a number of examples, the *djindjamb* (a person who has developed his/her *djambe*) can also turn out to be a sort of a martyr, who refuses to give up a relative to his/her fellow witches and sacrifices him/herself instead. The ambivalent moral dimension of witchcraft among the Maka and the 'inherent capacities of

these imaginaries to graft themselves unto other discourses, drawing their resilience from their diffuseness and elasticity, can be enlightening for the understanding of present-day confusions about the intertwinement of different regimes of responsibility in a neo-liberal context' (Geschiere, in this volume). Indeed, as Geschiere demonstrates, the discourses and practices of responsibility make the object of the constant processes of renegotiation and reinvention similar to those that characterize the historical evolution of the discourse on witchcraft itself, a discourse that, as Geschiere has shown elsewhere, constantly incorporates elements of its social and cultural surroundings to reinvent and adapt itself in accordance to the changing scenarios of post-colonial 'modernity'.

Witchcraft discourses not only travel across time, they also move across space and along the complex networks of contemporary migration fluxes to Europe and other destinations. Roberto Beneduce's concluding chapter analyses the disruptive epistemological force of witchcraft discourses when they enter the territorial commissions and tribunals in charge of evaluating asylum seekers' demands for refugee status in Italy. Anthropologists and Africanist scholars are regularly consulted for expertise in these cases, an experience that directly puts into question their responsibility and the knowledge about African epistemologies and realities that they produce. What, then, Beneduce asks, is the role of anthropological knowledge when asylum seekers speak of mystical weapons, mysterious deaths and spiritual enemies? When the reason for escaping from their country is the fear of witchcraft or 'voodoo' rituals? In such cases, the anthropologist faces a twofold question. On the one hand, s/he is asked to 'translate' and to give sense to 'strange' experiences, this time not in his/her field notes, but in front of judges and lawyers, who are loyal to a specific bureaucratic rationality. On the other hand, s/he is faced with the task of distinguishing between true and false narratives in a context in which the truth about migration has become almost unspeakable because of an institutional framework that confers the right to mobility only to those who are able to demonstrate their condition of victimhood (and are thus entitled to the refugee status). In this context, trickeries and lies are adopted as a tactic of survival, and the anthropological knowledge is pushed into the murky field of politics. In this epistemological and ethical conundrum, specific dynamics of 'ethnographic complicity' between the anthropologist and the asylum seekers can emerge, which Beneduce makes an attempt to analyse in relation to wider debates about the issue of responsibility in anthropological theory and practice.

By focusing on the responsibility of the anthropologist, Beneduce's chapter acts as a conclusion to the volume, producing a meta-commentary

on the other chapters included in the collection, and offering a number of final thoughts about the role of anthropology in contemporary social and political contexts. In particular, Beneduce identifies those he considers as fundamental priorities for anthropologists to 'make good use of their knowledge' in a contemporary world 'vitiating by innumerable contradictions'. His focus of attention are the practices and discourses connected to immigrants and asylum-seekers, but his analysis offers the elements to outline the contours of a critical self-reflexive anthropology; one that takes the issue of responsibility seriously and makes it a central concern of the discipline.

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the generous support of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions of the European Commission and the University of Liege which made the organization of our meetings possible. Dinah Rajak's and Katrien Pype's contributions have been published previously in slightly different formats, and we thank Wiley and Berghahn Books for granting reprinting rights. This introduction expands some of the theoretical directions behind the WORKINMINING research project 'Reinventing paternalism: The micropolitics of work in the mining companies of central Africa'. Led by Benjamin Rubbers, this project received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 646802). The ideas developed in this chapter reflect only the authors' view. The ERC is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Benjamin Rubbers obtained his Ph.D. degree from the Université Libre de Bruxelles and the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales. He is now full Professor in Social Anthropology at the University of Liège, Belgium. He participated in the preparation of this edited volume when he was awarded a Research chair from the Francqui Foundation and a Consolidator grant from the European Research Council. Benjamin is the author of three monographs and more than twenty journal articles and book chapters on the Congolese copperbelt, where he has undertaken frequent fieldtrips since 1999.

Alessandro Jedlowski is Postdoctoral Fellow in Anthropology of Media at the Free University of Brussels Belgium and a former Marie Curie and FRS-FNRS grantee. His has been conducting fieldwork on Sub-Saharan

African media industries and South–South cultural interactions since 2009. He is the author of several essays and book chapters on these topics, and is the co-editor of *Mobility between Africa, Asia and Latin America: Economic Networks and Cultural Interactions* (Zed Books, 2017) and *Cine-Ethiopia: The History and Politics of Film in the Horn of Africa* (Michigan State University Press, 2018).

Notes

1. The principal reference to the notion of responsibility in the reviews of the anthropological literature on ethics and morality (Zigon 2008; Fassin 2012; Massé 2015) is the distinction between the outcome-oriented ‘ethics of responsibility’ and the value-oriented ‘ethics of conviction’ found in Max Weber’s lecture on Politics as vocation. Probably made for the sake of clarity and simplicity, this ideal–typical distinction is of limited interest for the kind of approach to the study of responsibility that is developed in this book. Although to varying degrees, responsibility always involves a concern for both moral considerations values and a concern for actions’ outcomes.
2. Take the example of the corporate social responsibility agenda in the extractive industry. Depending on the circumstances and the actors, responsibility is sometimes enacted as a moral commitment (in the context of meetings with state representatives or focus groups with local communities), sometimes as a formal mandate involving procedures and controls (during impact studies, annual reports or external audits), and sometimes as a dialectic of prosecution and defence, in relation to the damage caused by extractive companies in the past (in advocacy groups’ reports, during protest marches, in court cases).
3. This interpretation has been given nuance by Francis Chateauraynaud (1991), who shows that the development of the welfare state did not lead to the pure and simple evacuation of the problems of fault and individual responsibility in debates about workplace injuries. Nikolas Rose and Filippa Lentzos (2017: 31–32) also note that the welfare state did not imply the withdrawal of all responsibilities from individuals. Even in the most developed welfare states, various measures were taken to push them to take charge of their own future.
4. This analysis is currently being developed in the WORKINMINING research project (www.workinmining.ulg.ac.be).

References

- Balandier, G. 1971. *Sens et puissance. Les dynamiques sociales*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bayart, J.-F. 1993 (1989). *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*, London and New York: Longman.
- Berry, S. 1989. ‘Social Institutions and Access to Resources’, *Africa* 59(1): 41–55.

- Blundo, G. 2011. 'Une administration à deux vitesses: Projets de développement et construction de l'Etat au Sahel', *Cahiers d'études africaines* 202–203: 427–452.
- Chateauraynaud, F. 1991. *La faute professionnelle: Une sociologie des conflits de responsabilité*. Paris: Métaillé.
- Daloz, J.-P., and P. Chabal. 1999. *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*. Oxford: James Curaray.
- Douglas, M. 1992. *Risk and Blame: Essays in Cultural Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ewald, F. 1996 (1986). *Histoire de l'Etat providence*. Paris: Grasset et Fasquelle.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fassin, D. (ed.) 2012. *A Companion to Moral Anthropology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Faubion, J.D. 2001. 'Towards an Anthropology of Ethics: Foucault and the Pedagogies of Autopoiesis', *Representations* 74: 83–104.
- . 2011. *An Anthropology of Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnet, P. 1928. *La responsabilité: Etude de sociologie*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- Ferguson, J. 2015. *Give a Man a Fish: Reflections on the New Politics of Distribution*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Gluckman, M. (ed.) 1972. *The Allocation of Responsibility*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Guyer, J. 2014 'Durational Ethics: Search, Finding, and Translation of Fauconnet's "Essay on Responsibility and Liberty"', *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(1): 397–409.
- Laidlaw, J. 2002. 'For an Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom', *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute* 8(2): 311–332.
- . 2013. *The Subject of Virtue: An Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambek, M. 2000. 'The Anthropology of Religion and the Quarrel between Poetry and Philosophy', *Current Anthropology* 41(3): 309–320.
- . (ed.) 2010. *Ordinary Ethics: Anthropology, Language, and Action*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Levinas, E. 1981 [1974]. *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Lévy-Bruhl, L. 1884. *L'idée de responsabilité*. Paris: Hachette.
- Lonsdale, J. 1986. 'Political Accountability in African History', in P. Chabal (ed.), *Political Domination in Africa: Reflections on the Limits of Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 126–157.
- Massé, R. 2015. *Anthropologie de la morale et de l'éthique*, Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Laval.
- Mbembe, A. 2002. 'African Modes of Self-Writing', *Public Culture* 14(1): 239–273.
- McKeon, R. 1957. 'The Development and the Significance of the Concept of Responsibility', *Revue internationale de philosophie* 11(39,1): 3–32.
- Médard, J.-F. 1992. 'L'État postcolonial en Afrique noire: l'interprétation néo-patrimoniale de l'État.' *Studia africana* 3: 125–133.
- Rajak, D. 2011. *In Good Company: An Anatomy of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Ricoeur, P. 1994. 'Le concept de responsabilité: essai d'analyse sémantique', *Esprit* 206: 28–48.
- . 2003. 'Responsabilité et fragilité', *Autres Temps: Cahiers d'éthique sociale et politique* 76(1): 127–141.
- Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2001. 'The Politics of Life Itself', *Theory, Culture and Society* 18(6): 1–30.
- Rose, N., and F. Lentzos. 2017. 'Making us Resilient: Responsible Citizens for Uncertain Times', in S. Trnka and C. Trundle (eds), *Competing Responsibilities: The Politics and Ethics of Contemporary Life*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, pp. 27–48.
- Rubbers, B. 2013. *Le paternalisme en question. Les anciens ouvriers de la Gécamines face à la libéralisation du secteur minier katangais (R.D. Congo)*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Shamir, R. 2008. 'The Age of Responsibilization: On Market-embedded Morality', *Economy and Society* 37(1): 1–19.
- Shore, C. 2008. 'Audit Culture and Illiberal Governance: Universities and the Politics of Accountability', *Anthropological Theory* 8(3): 278–299.
- . 2017. 'Audit Culture and the Politics of Responsibility: Beyond Neoliberal Responsibilization', in S. Trnka and C. Trundle (eds), *Competing Responsibilities: The Politics and Ethics of Contemporary Life*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 96–117.
- Taylor, C. 1976. 'Responsibility for Self', in A.O. Rorty (ed.), *The Identities of Persons*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 281–299.
- Trnka, S., and C. Trundle. (eds) 2017. *Competing Responsibilities: The Politics and Ethics of Contemporary Life*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Williams, B. 2008 [1993]. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zigon, J. 2008. *Morality: An Anthropological Perspective*. Oxford: Berg.