

World Anthropologies: Anthropological Cosmopolitanisms and Cosmopolitics*

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro

Department of Anthropology, University of Brasilia, Brasilia DF 70910-900,
Brazil; email: gustavor@unb.br

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2014. 43:483–98

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at
anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev-anthro-102313-030139

Copyright © 2014 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

*This article is part of a special theme on
Knowledge. For a list of other articles in this
theme, see [http://www.annualreviews.org/
doi/full/10.1146/annurev-an-43](http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-an-43)

Keywords

geopolitics of knowledge, diversality, anthropological diversity,
nonhegemonic anthropologies

Abstract

To present the world anthropologies project (WA), this article explores the existence of three kinds of anthropological cosmopolitanisms and cosmopolitics: imperial, liberal, and radical. Imperial cosmopolitics reproduces the hegemony of the Anglo-American core in the world system of anthropological production. Liberal cosmopolitics is a step ahead but naturalizes the West's prominent place in the global production of knowledge. Radical cosmopolitics is currently epitomized by the WA. It problematizes Anglo-American centrality and criticizes Eurocentrism. The WA is a hybrid of diverse theoretical and political debates. It has important singularities: It is not located in the discipline's center, and it is a political critique of and action against the existing global anthropological hierarchy. Critical transnationalism and cosmopolitanism are sources of inspiration for the WA. The WA believes that anthropologists can take advantage of globalization's heterodox opportunities to go beyond metropolitan provincialism, to improve the conditions of conversability, and to benefit from the diversity of anthropologies and from the resulting heteroglossic cross-fertilizations.

COSMOPOLITANISMS AND COSMOPOLITICS

The ambition of anthropological thought—to think humankind in its unicity and variation—has historically placed anthropologists in the midst of cosmopolitan ideologies and utopias. It is difficult to know whether people are attracted to anthropology because they are cosmopolitans or whether abstract notions such as culture(s), society, kinship, and humankind turn them into cosmopolitans. Hannerz (1996) posits that a true interest in and engagement with alterity are at the core of cosmopolitanism.¹ Among Western academic disciplines, anthropology is defined by a wanting to understand the structures of alterity (Krotz 2002). Fabian (2012, p. 64) reaffirms this disciplinary singularity, sees alterity as a theoretical concept that was useful to criticize “ideological views of cultural differences,” and reasserts its essential epistemological role as the unifying issue of the discipline regardless of where anthropologists are located, in the West or elsewhere. In sum, cosmopolitanism, alterity, and anthropology go hand in hand.

Going to faraway lands has played a central role in the discipline’s constitution and consolidation, especially after ethnography, in the first half of the twentieth century, became one of its central tenets. In 1960, Felix Keesing (1960, p. 198), after a survey on anthropology’s international organizations in which he consulted a “considerable number of anthropologists in different countries,” found that “the science was one in which scholars traveled or communicated by correspondence to an unusual degree.” Indeed, since the nineteenth century, and more so in the past 30 years when the discipline increasingly globalized itself, anthropologists have woven innumerable transnational webs of scholarly exchange and influence. Anthropological cosmopolitanisms are sometimes set in motion, and anthropologists attempt to deploy their international agency. International conferences, for instance, are opportunities to connect with colleagues from other countries and to set international agendas. They have been organized in the nineteenth century as exemplified by the International Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology, founded in La Spezia, Italy, in 1865 (Keesing 1960) and by the International Congress of Anthropology held in Chicago in 1894 (Wake 1894). But only in 1934 was a supranational organization founded: the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES).

To explore the nature of anthropological cosmopolitanisms I need to emphasize two of their main characteristics. First, the profession is rooted in a worldview based on the respect for human diversity. Second, anthropology calls for agents and agencies that, albeit anchored in national scenarios, sometimes become politically active on a supranational level. I see the interest, academic or otherwise, in the diversity of human life and the international actions of anthropologists as cosmopolitics. For the purposes of this article, I understand cosmopolitics as (a) “discourses and modes of doing politics concerned with their global reach and impact” (Ribeiro 2006, p. 364) and (b) discourses that attempt to make sense of human diversity and of alterity (on cosmopolitics, see also Cheah & Robbins 1998, Ribeiro 2003). When discussing world anthropologies, I am particularly interested in

cosmopolitics that are embedded in conflicts regarding the role of difference and diversity in the construction of polities. I view anthropology as a cosmopolitics about the structure of alterity (Krotz 1997) that pretends to be universal but that, at the same time, is highly sensitive to its own limitations and to the efficacy of other cosmopolitics. (Ribeiro 2006, pp. 364–65)

¹ Cosmopolitanism is a Western notion that epitomizes the need to conceive of a political and cultural entity, larger than one’s homeland, “that would encompass all human beings on a global scale” (Ribeiro 2001, p. 2842). It “presupposes a positive attitude towards difference,” a wish to “construct broad allegiances and equal and peaceful global communities of citizens who should be able to communicate across cultural and social boundaries forming a universalist solidarity” (Ribeiro 2001, p. 2842). On the 1990s debate on cosmopolitanism, see Neilson (1999).

To look at anthropology as cosmopolitics is to recognize that anthropology is not the only discourse on the variability of human life. It is also to accept a distinction made by Danda (1995) between anthropology as an academic discipline and anthropological knowledge, i.e., the more or less systematized body of information/knowledge every ethnic group produces about different Others. On the one hand, anthropological knowledge is a cosmopolitics that may be found everywhere albeit in a myriad of contents and degrees of formalization. This kind of knowledge about alterity was enclosed in Western anthropological jargons as local knowledge, myths, or cosmologies. On the other hand, the discipline of anthropology is but a cluster of local knowledge about alterity that was systematized and highly elaborated in Western academia, a cosmopolitics that became a “science” and disseminated throughout the world with the expansion of Western knowledge, university, and nation-state systems. In this line of interpretation, (a) anthropology is the “academic discipline that made its first appearance in the North Atlantic region” (Danda 1995, p. 23), and (b) other cosmopolitics on human diversity have developed elsewhere in the world and have configured various anthropological knowledges “akin to what would later be known as anthropology” (Ribeiro 2006, p. 365).² Even though North Atlantic anthropologies have varied histories and interests, they are insufficient to depict the richness of anthropological knowledge in the world. In sum, whereas the quest for anthropological knowledge is universal, anthropology is not: It is the result of scholarly developments in the West that were later globalized.

Different cosmopolitics are related to different cosmopolitanisms embedded in a great variety of loci of enunciations, with their histories and contexts. The acknowledgment of this plurality of subject positions is the substance of the notion of geopolitics of knowledge (Mignolo 2001). To understand the particularities of the world anthropologies project (WA), I consider the existence of three main styles of cosmopolitics: imperial, liberal, and radical cosmopolitics. Because anthropology is a transnational reflexive discourse and cosmopolitan by nature, these cosmopolitics have become entangled over time in lesser or greater degrees and have been fertilized by other similar discourses. It is in the nature of cosmopolitanisms to be hybrids that reflect diverse cultural, geographical, sociological, political, and historical positions. Hence the three styles of cosmopolitics I present here should be seen as Weberian ideal types, thought experiments, heuristic devices useful to organize the chaotic complexity of the social world and representations.

IMPERIAL AND LIBERAL COSMOPOLITICS

Imperial cosmopolitics do not problematize the hegemony of Western canons and naturalize the universality of the existing anthropological status quo. Imperial cosmopolitics currently prevail in the pragmatics of the global academic regime (Chun 2008), in international academic life and hierarchy dominated by Anglo-American worldviews, by rankings and audit cultures derived from neoliberal and productivist projects. In the imperial style, “peripheries” export raw data while theory can be produced only in the discipline’s hegemonic centers. The “unspoken assumption” (Mathews 2008, p. 55) is that US-based centers always assemble the best minds and offer the best working conditions. Concomitantly, nonhegemonic anthropologies are seen as bound to the geographic and cultural limits of practitioners’ nation-states; local colleagues are often viewed as refined informants, whereas hegemonic anthropology is seen as international by definition and

²Danda (1995, p. 23) gives the Indian example of the *Manava Dharmashastra* (*The Sacred Science of Man*), written in 1350 BC; see also Chaabani (2012) who views Abu Rayhan al-Biruni, a Persian scholar (973–1048), and Ibn Khaldoun, a Tunisian scholar (1332–1406), as harbingers of anthropology. But note that my conception of anthropological knowledge as cosmopolitics includes the oral knowledge of lowland South American Indians, for instance, on the existence of people different from them (see Albert 1995 on the discourses of the Yanomami leader Davi Kopenawa).

AAA: American
Anthropological
Association

IUAES: International
Union of
Anthropological and
Ethnological Sciences

English is unproblematic as the global scientific language. This scenario does not involve only exotic tropical lands and natives. Spanish anthropologist Isidoro Moreno (Guarné 2012, p. 11) used the expression “anthropological colonialism” to describe the behavior and production of British anthropologists who studied and exoticized Andalusian culture (see also Narotzky 2006).

Although in the past the core of the world system of anthropological production (Kuwayama 2004) was composed of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, the current global hegemony of US academia makes the United States the key producer of imperial cosmopolitics. In a critical essay, Dominguez (2012) hypothesizes an imperial scenario of global anthropological cooperation dominated by American anthropology, a scenario in which the American Anthropological Association (AAA), by far the largest disciplinary organization in the world, would become the sole global association. For Mathews (2011, p. 48), non-American anthropologists “must sound like Americans in their theorizing and working” if they want to be heard by Americans, a point Kuwayama (2004, p. 10) had also made. Imperial anthropological cosmopolitics amounts to what De L’Estoile (2008) called the gravitational power of hegemonic internationalization and is the main target of the WA critique. Imperial cosmopolitics are basically a power effect of the centrality of American academia in the world. In its exacerbated form, it is a handmaiden of imperialism, the latest example of which is the so-called weaponization of anthropology. I do not further explore the imperial anthropological cosmopolitics because they have been consistently discussed in works such as Asad (1973), Copans (1975), González (2009), Gough (1968), Jorgensen & Wolf (1970), and Price (2011).

Liberal anthropological cosmopolitics share with imperial ones the quiet acceptance of the hegemony of Western canons and institutional power. The best way to describe liberal cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitics is to compare them with global governance agencies whose mission is to keep the global status quo while giving the impression that they endeavor to reach more democratic international decision-making processes. Hegemonic centers agree to share their international power provided their positions are left unthreatened through mechanisms that grant them a differentiated decision-making capacity or by controlling the flows of economic, political, and symbolic capitals. Although a step ahead of imperial cosmopolitics, liberal cosmopolitics do not put at risk the “rhetorical internationalism” (Dominguez 2012, p. 53) of US institutions. In the history of anthropological cosmopolitanisms, this kind of cosmopolitics reflects mostly European and US cosmopolitanisms that have, more often than not, cross-fertilized each other. The theoretical capacity and contributions of nonhegemonic anthropologies are usually ignored.

Following in this section, I explore the characteristics of social agencies and agents that illustrate the works and deeds of liberal cosmopolitics. The organizing by British anthropologists of the ICAES, in London in 1934, is perhaps the first example of an initiative inspired in European anthropological cosmopolitanism and liberal cosmopolitics. After World War II, in 1948, under the auspices of the Paris-based United Nations Educational and Scientific Council, the ICAES would become the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), even now the only global anthropological institution. Post-World War II decolonizing movements helped to reduce the prominence of former European colonial powers. In this period, the global supremacy of the United States increased on all fronts. Not surprisingly, the 1950s may be seen as the decade when American dominance in world anthropology started to consolidate. For Vidyarthi (1974, p. 21) “with the decline of colonial anthropology of the British, Dutch and French brands, the Americanizing influence in anthropology has almost enjoyed a monopoly.” Some events were indications of this growing leadership, such as the organization of the 1956 IUAES world congress in Philadelphia.

But nothing matches the importance that an institution founded in New York would have in bringing about a hybrid of American and European anthropological cosmopolitan liberal style with

a growing dominance of the first. Established in 1941 by Hungarian-born Paul Fejos, the Viking Fund would become in 1951 the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research (WGF), in honor of the Swedish industrialist who provided its endowment. This American foundation had, in its beginnings, a European accent, and from 1958 to 1980 it would hold a European Conference Center in a castle in Austria.

WGF: Wenner-Gren
Foundation for
Anthropological
Research

Vidyardhi (1974, p. 13) considers the 1952 Wenner-Gren International Symposium “Anthropology Today” as the watershed of the “emerging American model in anthropology.” It was the first of a long series of international symposia that for more than six decades have often become hallmarks in the history of the discipline. Eighty-one scholars from around the world met in New York (Stocking 2000). Furthermore, the 1952 event was also published as the influential volume *Anthropology Today*, edited by Alfred Kroeber (1953), with the ambitious subtitle of “an encyclopedic inventory,” meaning everything that anthropologists knew until that point in time. Another result of the event was the book *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today* (1953), edited by Sol Tax, Loren Eiseley, Irving Rouse, and Carl Voegelin, which is an account of the discussions that took place at the symposium. The two books were so widely acclaimed that the *American Anthropologist* invited several anthropologists to write reviews that occupied 25 pages of its 1954 third volume. The “Anthropology Today” symposium was proposed by Paul Fejos, the founder and at that point Director of Research of the WGF. He wanted the event to serve as an inspiration for the Foundation’s future policies (Silverman 2009, p. 949).

The particular blend of European-American cosmopolitanism that developed in the first decades of the WGF would have been impossible without the leadership of Paul Fejos (1897–1963). He was a “Renaissance man” (Dodds 1963, p. 405), a “cosmopolitan, multilingual, multit talented” Hungarian (Silverman 2009, p. 949) who migrated to the United States in 1922 and became a successful film director in Hollywood before establishing the Foundation, which he led with “unparalleled brilliance” (Dodds 1963, p. 405) from its inauguration in 1941 until his death in 1963. John Dodds (1973) wrote Fejos’s biography and a eulogy in which he praises Fejos’s ability, as a “product of a European culture” (Dodds 1963, p. 405) free from the “abracadabra of the social sciences as frozen in the American mold,” to shift “the center of gravity” of anthropology and reduce “the insularity of American anthropology by making it aware of its world connections.” Fejos had partners in this endeavor. Several were first-generation Americans, such as Kroeber, who was of German descent and a student of Franz Boas, the German-American anthropologist considered the father of US anthropology. But among Fejos’s partners, it was Tax who came to incarnate “the world mission of liberal democratic anthropology,” as Stocking (2000) put it, or the American liberal cosmopolitics as I submit.

Tax was a child of Russian Jewish migrants, “secular despite their descent from rabbis, socialist in their political leanings,” a student of Ralph Linton, an “institution builder” whose “forte was more organizational than theoretical” and “who moved firmly into the role of master impresario of world anthropology” (Silverman 2009, p. 949).³ He was involved in the planning and administration of several major international congresses. Tax and Fejos first cooperated in the organization of a conference in Middle American ethnology in 1949. A few years later, Tax would be an editor of one of the volumes that came out of the 1952 “Anthropology Today” International Symposium. For both men, anthropology was “the most comprehensive knowledge of humankind” and “a connected enterprise of scholars worldwide” (Silverman 2009, p. 950). Their vision was also that anthropology had to face universal issues and practical questions.

³The next three paragraphs are based on Silverman (2009). See also Stocking (2000).

It was this worldview that congealed in 1959 into a “social experiment” (Silverman 2009, p. 950), the WGF-funded “world journal,” *Current Anthropology*, intended to change international anthropology by changing the ways anthropologists communicated on a global level. Tax would later take further steps in the globalization of anthropology. He organized and chaired the ninth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in 1973 in Chicago. He wanted this meeting to be another “global overview of the state of the art in anthropology” and to become a landmark for the future of the discipline in which “scholars from outside the Western metropolitan centers would play an ever larger role” (Acciaioli 2011, p. 23).

Liberal anthropological cosmopolitics can inspire innovative initiatives such as when Tax, aiming at a “participatory democracy of scholars in exchanging information,” traveled around the globe to listen to anthropologists before drawing the final contour of the *Current Anthropology* project. He viewed the journal as a clearinghouse where associates (he dreamed to recruit 4,000 of them) would actively participate in a worldwide community in spite of the “unavoidable American dominance, given a U.S.-based editor and sponsor” (Silverman 2009, p. 953). Another important endeavor was the translation of the discussions held during the 1973 Chicago congress into English, French, German, Russian, and Spanish (Acciaioli 2011). More than 40 years later, this kind of language politics is far from being common: Quite the contrary, English speakers increasingly naturalize the hegemonic role their language plays in global academic communication (Mathews 2011). Tax would also foster the publication of almost 100 volumes issuing from the 1973 ICAES in a series entitled *World Anthropology*.

Acciaioli indicates the limits of Tax’s liberal cosmopolitics compared with the more radical pluralism of the WA (Acciaioli 2011, pp. 22, 26–27). Although surely open to cosmopolitan dialogues, Tax did not see the “gatekeeping role of Northern epistemologies” (Harrison 2012, p. 87) behind his belief in universalism and did not question the hegemonic position of Western anthropology. As Acciaioli (2011, p. 22) puts it, Tax was committed “to certain (universalizing) epistemological and political tenets of the Western tradition.” His goal was to enhance “world anthropology” not to foster “world anthropologies.” The difference between the singular and the plural is not innocuous. For Restrepo & Escobar (2005, p. 100), two of the founders of the World Anthropologies Network (WAN), “rather than assuming that there is a privileged position from which a ‘real anthropology’ (in the singular) can be produced and in relation to which all other anthropologies would define themselves,” the WA takes seriously the geopolitics of knowledge, i.e., the “multiple and contradictory historical, social, cultural and political locatedness of the different communities of anthropologists and their anthropologies.”

RADICAL COSMOPOLITICS: WORLD ANTHROPOLOGIES

Different from the imperial and liberal cosmopolitics that reflect the first 90 years of the twentieth century, the American Century, the world anthropologies’ radical cosmopolitics is a child of the post–Cold War period and of the globalization era. Buchowski (2014, p. 2) sees it as a response to “neoliberal globalization” and the “concomitant further expansion of dominant Anglo-Saxon anthropology.” The WA is a cosmopolitics that aims at (a) pluralizing the history of anthropology; (b) spreading the awareness that the discipline is made up of many different perspectives, according to its practitioners’ loci of enunciation; and (c) propitiating the emergence of cosmopolitan anthropological practices that create a less Eurocentric discipline dominated by a few hegemonic centers in the North Atlantic (Restrepo & Escobar 2005, Ribeiro 2006, Ribeiro & Escobar 2006a). Although it takes into consideration the role that different subject positions (informed by race or gender, for example) play in the construction of anthropological knowledge and the importance of international flows for the dissemination of the discipline since its early days, the WA tends to

emphasize the unequal relations between hegemonic and nonhegemonic centers of anthropological production located within and without nation-states. It is thus influenced by the notion that there is a geopolitics of knowledge (Mignolo 2001) that is historically related to the unbalanced power distribution within the world system of anthropological production (Kuwayama 2004). World anthropologies assume that (a) anthropologists value diversity as a means to improving understanding and creativity and that consequently it is possible to mobilize them to delve into the discipline's own diversity and take advantage of it; (b) it is possible to enhance cross-fertilization if anthropologists profit from the heterodox opportunities opened by globalization processes of the past 25 years, such as e-communication (Reuters 2011), which made bypassing hegemonic centers a real possibility; (c) there is a need to avoid the gravitational power of hegemonic internationalization (De L'Estoile 2008), that is, of imperial and liberal cosmopolitics, to go beyond the monotony of an academic universe dominated by Anglo-American perspectives and to build heteroglossic global exchanges; (d) universality as a notion dominated by a Eurocentric vision of epistemological achievements is to be left behind in favor of "diversality," that is, the possibility of accepting epistemic diversity as a universal project.⁴ The WA is not guided by a multiculturalist agenda; rather, it is influenced by the Latin American discussion on interculturality (see Bartolomé 2006, Rappaport 2005). The valorization of other anthropologies and anthropologies otherwise (Restrepo & Escobar 2005) needs to be done concomitant with a critique of the conditions created by modernity and the "coloniality of power" (Castro-Gómez & Grosfoguel 2007, Quijano 1993) that obliterated the production, validity, and visibility of other knowledges.

The WA's critique of Eurocentrism takes into consideration Chakrabarty's (2000) notion that it is necessary to provincialize Europe but without dispensing with its social justice metanarratives. Diversality is thus a neologism that "reflects a constructive tension between anthropology as a universal and as a multiplicity" (Ribeiro & Escobar 2006a, p. 3). In this sense, the WA is not a foundational movement, an effort to create a new discipline that disregards what was previously done. But it is highly critical of Eurocentrism and Anglo-American dominance because they are seen as an impoverishment of the discipline's diversity of styles, contents, agendas, and politics. What is at stake is the creation of "new conditions of conversability" that will allow for richer, heteroglossic cross-fertilizations within a global community of anthropologists that, differently from Tax's day, is currently much larger outside the core of the world system of anthropological production. This demographic shift and the valorization of linguistic and cultural diversity make it possible to envisage that in the present there is more anthropological imagination outside the hegemonic centers than within.

As a radical anthropological cosmopolitics, the WA is interested in critical transnationalism and cosmopolitanism as transformative political discourses and practices. Fabian (2012) clearly perceives that the project's goal cannot be reduced to giving visibility to nonhegemonic, national anthropologies, to the "anthropologies without history" (Krotz 1997, p. 240), however valuable this move may be. The idea is to give voice to critical transnational and cosmopolitan anthropologists to construct global alliances and promote cooperation. The WA is an example of a radical anthropological cosmopolitics that shares some characteristics of current social movements because it shies away from centralism and depends on networks that seek to practice global democracy and horizontality using the Internet as its main means of articulation. In its almost 15 years of existence, it has established a network of individuals, the World Anthropologies Network (<http://www.ram-wan.net>), and inspired the creation of a network of institutions, the World

⁴The most important programmatic statements of the WA may be found in World Anthropologies Collective (2003), Restrepo & Escobar (2005), Ribeiro (2006), and Ribeiro & Escobar (2006a). Acciaioli (2011) synthesizes the WA's proposals.

Council of Anthropological Associations (<http://www.wccaanet.org>), and of the Committee on World Anthropologies in the AAA. In the pragmatics of global anthropological politics, the WA often gets into alliances with critical liberal cosmopolitics, especially those that are incarnated by institutions.

The WA was granted a positive reception by the anthropological community. In Australia, Acciaioli (2011, p. 21) considered that it “does constitute a novel, more radical, and incipiently more successful endeavor to pluralize anthropology.” In Poland, Buchowski (2014, p. 2) thought that the WA “can be seen as the next step in the evolution of critical thinking in anthropology.” In Mexico, Bueno (2007, p. 238) wrote that the 2006 volume *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power* is a “work that every anthropologist should read.” In the United States, Kingsolver (2007, p. 581) found that the volume “should be translated widely” because “it provides critical transnational and intranational perspectives on universal-particular concepts and analyses.” The book was, in fact, translated into Spanish and Portuguese and published in Colombia, Mexico, and Brazil. It is greatly cited and used in classrooms worldwide. The WA is being constantly enriched by new contributions, such as the 2012 volume of *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* (see, for instance, Buchowski 2012, Hanks 2012) and other related proposals, such as the Lausanne Manifesto (Saillant et al. 2011).

The Maturation of an Idea

The larger intellectual environment within which the WA developed in the 2000s is composed of previous radical critiques of anthropology as a discipline, such as Asad (1973), Harrison (1991), and Hymes (1974). Equally important is a blend of politicized theoretical debates that include subaltern studies, cultural studies, postcolonialism, decoloniality of power, multiculturalism, interculturality, feminist critiques, postimperialism, and a strong sensibility to transnational activism, critical cosmopolitanism, and the Internet as a tool for global activism and politics (Escobar 1994; Keck & Sikkink 1998; Ribeiro 1998, 2003, 2008).

The WA is part of a genealogy of anthropological cosmopolitics that have an episodic history represented by meetings and the publication of books and articles over the past six decades, some of them already mentioned. However, only in the 2000s, in view of the characteristics of the current moment of increased globalization (global online communication and cheaper international trips, for instance), the appearance of the World Anthropologies Network (World Anthropol. Collect. 2003) made this cosmopolitics visible enough to merit ample discussion as a means of transforming the discipline’s status quo. The organization of a network on the Internet, the fact that most of its members are professionals working outside the United States, the critical approach to the disciplinary power hierarchies and dominance of “hegemonic anthropologies,” and the congealment of its programmatic narratives into new initiatives are features that distinguish this movement’s impacts.

Several initiatives related to the larger field of anthropological cosmopolitics share a common trait: They were developed by or financed with the support of the WGF (Díaz Crovetto 2008). This is true of the first and last on the list: the 1952 International Symposium “Anthropology Today” and the World Anthropologies International Symposium, organized by Arturo Escobar and Gustavo Lins Ribeiro in 2003. In between, there was another important WGF symposium, Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries, organized by Hussein Fahim in 1978. Fahim’s 1982 book anticipated ideas that others would unwittingly follow. He wanted to develop “a world discipline of anthropology” and to promote the “de-Westernization of the anthropological enterprise” (Fahim 1982a, p. 138). To preserve different perspectives on social problems, he stressed that the “need for communication among non-Western anthropologists”

should not imply the isolation of “Western fellows”; the task was to liberate “anthropology from domination by any country or group” (Fahim 1982a, p. 150). To avoid assuming the “centrality, dominance, and patronship of Western anthropology,” he concluded that the contributions of “third world anthropologies” should not be seen as responses or accessories to “Western anthropological knowledge”; rather “equality and reciprocity should be the key notions toward the development of a world anthropology” (Fahim 1982a, p. 151).

The interest that the WGF has kept in anthropological cosmopolitanisms is congruent with the Foundation’s own history. However, the WGF’s support of and participation in pioneering ventures such as the World Council of Anthropological Associations do not mean they are outcomes of the Foundation’s policy or imagination. Rather, they mean that radical anthropological cosmopolitics may find constructive alliances in the hegemonic centers and that many leaders in the discipline are open to criticism and new visions.⁵

Many relevant contributions developed without the participation of the WGF. Besides the WAN, perhaps the most outstanding one was the 1982 volume of the Swedish journal *Ethnos*, edited by Tomas Gerholm and Ulf Hannerz. In the introduction to the volume, Gerholm & Hannerz (1982) coined a metaphor about the lack of communication among “national anthropologies” seen as islands that communicated only through bridges with “international anthropologies” located in the continent. Other important essays were written by Mexican anthropologist Krotz (1997) on anthropologies of the South as well as by Brazilian anthropologist Cardoso de Oliveira (1999/2000) on peripheral and central anthropologies and the problem of mutual ignorance among them. Japanese anthropologist Kuwayama’s (2004) book on the world system of anthropological production should also be noted. Finally, over the past 20 years several volumes were published. They aimed either at portraying anthropology’s diversity (Boskovic 2008, De l’Estoile et al. 2002) or discussing regional or national anthropological traditions (Cardoso de Oliveira 1988; Das 2003; Daveluy & Dorais 2009; Grimson et al. 2004; Miceli 1999; Ntarangwi et al. 2006; Ribeiro & Trajano 2004; Skalník 2002, 2005; Uberoi et al. 2008b; Vermeulen & Rodán 1995; Visacovsky & Guber 2003; Yamashita et al. 2004; among others). These volumes epitomize other productive entries to further sophisticate the debate on world anthropologies.

People and Action

The fact that among the WA’s founders there were several Latin American anthropologists gives it a different flavor when compared with other anthropological cosmopolitics. The network started in 2000–2001 with the articulation of Latin American scholars based at the University of North Carolina [Marisol De la Cadena (Peruvian) and Arturo Escobar and Eduardo Restrepo (Colombians)] and at the University of Brasília [Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (Brazilian)].⁶ They brought, in different ways, a critical Latin American cosmopolitan style to the blend that would define the WA as a radical cosmopolitics. The very notion of Latin America supposes a cosmopolitanism with American imperialism as its main counterpoint. In spite of the continent’s variety, the Latin American field of “intellectual practices” (Mato 2002) implies a form of consciousness, a locus of

⁵Buchowski (2014, p. 2) rightly wrote that the WA was met with support from “highly self-conscious intellectual traditions, above all the Francophone one (*The Lausanne Manifesto*),” from “several allies within the dominant anthropology who opposed metropolitan provincialism” and from “the ignored and alienated traditions in new postcommunist territories, which up to that point merely impulsively resisted domination, as well as many others dispersed across the globe.”

⁶Later, De la Cadena moved to the University of California at Davis, and Eduardo Restrepo returned to Bogotá, where he teaches at the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Colleagues who were not Latin American soon joined the WA; Susana Narotsky (University of Barcelona) is one example.

enunciation composed of certain critical intellectual and political genealogies. More importantly, such intellectual practices are also performed outside the academic milieu, reflecting a preoccupation with the political usages of knowledge and involvements with different social actors and movements as well as interventions in public policies. In this field of action, Latin American scholars also articulate themselves with international organisms and with human rights, indigenous, Afro-Latin American, feminist, grassroots education, environmentalist, and other kinds of social movements and nongovernmental organizations (Mato 2002, p. 38). This is why, as Mato (2002, p. 38) puts it, the preferred Latin American self-identification is intellectual and not scholar.

Following are some of the relevant components that constituted the progressive Latin American mindset from the 1970s through the 1990s: antiauthoritarian, antiracist, and profound democratic convictions; Andean debates on *interculturalidad* and *mestizaje*; Marxism and leftist political organizations; dependency theory; the critique of development; grassroots environmentalism; Michel Foucault's discourse analysis; Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony; and portions of anti-American imperialism. There is no doubt though that the WA's founding figures are hybrids of progressive European, American, and Latin American cosmopolitanisms because they have different ties with the US academic milieu. Although educated in their home countries (De la Cadena did her undergraduate in Peru and two MA courses in Europe; Escobar and Restrepo did their BA degrees in Colombia; and Ribeiro did his BA and MA degrees in Brazil), all have doctoral degrees from American universities. Two of them, De la Cadena and Escobar, have made their professional careers in the United States. World anthropologies show, again, that cosmopolitics are hybrids by definition.⁷ But the Latin American stamp is not a minor characteristic. Although the WA keeps strong relations with critical transnational anthropologists working at the center and with some of its liberal cosmopolitics, the WA did not originate nor is it located there, nor is it led by American anthropologists.

However, the centrality of American and European anthropologies turns them into strategic loci of political action. Thus the WAN made its first public appearance in the 101st AAA meeting, held in 2001 in New Orleans. In 2003, *Social Anthropology*, the European Association of Social Anthropologists' journal, published a WA manifesto (World Anthropol. Collect. 2003). The Network's main immediate goal was to organize an international symposium to carry on consistent face-to-face debates and to develop a website to facilitate the interaction of world anthropologists. The symposium took place in Italy in 2003. Sponsored by the WGF, it gathered scholars from all continents. The website (<http://www.ram-wan.net/index.html>) and the WAN e-Journal, the first issue of which was published in 2005, were organized by voluntary collective work and are administered in Colombia. The book, *World Anthropologies* (Ribeiro & Escobar 2006b), a product of the 2003 international symposium, remains the most comprehensive statement on the WA. Over the past 10 years, several sessions in congresses in different countries were organized to discuss the subject, corroborating the notion introduced by the book that the time was ripe for world anthropologies.

Currently the most active and visible outcome of the WA political perspective is the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). In 2004, I convened, in Recife, Brazil, a meeting of 14 presidents of some of the largest national and international anthropological associations. After three day-long conversations, the WCAA was founded in the congress of the Brazilian Association of Anthropology. The presidents' meeting was sponsored by the WGF, which has continuously supported the Council's existence. Currently, the WCAA is composed of more

WCAA: World Council of Anthropological Associations

⁷ Buchowski (2014, p. 2) considers that the "history of World Anthropologies replicates a trajectory of many other emancipatory movements. It was up to intellectuals trained in the power centers to formulate emancipatory thoughts."

than 40 members and is a most influential presence on global anthropological politics. It has enabled the appearance of new global political networks, visions, and leadership.⁸ In 2009, several WCAA leaders became members of the Executive Committee of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences and started to further its reorganization by promoting a more democratic constitution and a successful world congress in 2013 in Manchester (Spiegel 2014). This new moment of the IUAES brings hope that anthropologists can further consolidate their academic global exchange in a solid institutional environment open to the participation of colleagues from all over the world.

Another WA-inspired initiative was the launching, in 2008, of the AAA Commission on World Anthropologies. In 2010, it became a Committee, a more permanent body of the association.⁹ Its objectives are to “identify significant issues that are shared among anthropologists from different nations. Develop clear objectives for drawing U.S. and international anthropologists together in ways that benefit anthropology globally. Engage a diversity of international voices and perspectives and involve both academic and applied anthropologists in this endeavor” (Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 2014). The Committee on World Anthropologies is composed of international and American scholars and has made consistent efforts to disseminate other anthropological knowledges within American academia. It has become “a forum to query how U.S. engagement with public issues can become less imperialistic and more collaborative” (Low & Merry 2011, p. 94). In 2014, in response to the Committee’s suggestions, the *American Anthropologist* started a “world anthropology” section to address “the origins and ongoing concerns of anthropology around the world” (Weil 2014, p. 160).

Following years of internal WCAA debates and three open sessions organized by the Committee on World Anthropologies in AAA meetings with tens of editors of some of the main anthropological journals to discuss how to pluralize editorial policies regarding style and language, the WCAA launched its own online journal *Déjà Lu* (*Already Read*). Starting in 2012, it republishes, in any language, articles selected by anthropological journals (<http://www.wcaanet.org/dejalu>). This kind of intervention in anthropological publishing is a particularly strategic effort because it allows for the exposure of the heterogeneity of contemporary anthropology.

FINAL COMMENTS

Some of the issues the WA has tackled are subject to theoretical debates; others are related to historiographic revisionism, to different political positionings, or to a combination of these elements. Among them, I highlight the following: anthropology as a Eurocentric or universal approach, the unequal dissemination mechanisms of the discipline on the global and national levels, hegemony in the academic world, theoretical dependency or intellectual autonomy, the usage of language in scholarly communication, different academic styles, and epistemologies. These subjects revolve around the issues of cosmopolitanism versus localism and of the power imbalance among loci of knowledge production.

The fact that the quest for anthropological knowledge is universal boosted the discipline’s dissemination worldwide. Anthropology was thus borrowed in many loci of knowledge production

⁸The founding and development of the WCAA are the result of the cooperation of many colleagues, the vast majority of which is not related to the WA. But given my role in the creation of the WAN and of the WCAA, I may say that the idea to convene the 2004 Recife meeting was motivated by the ongoing WA debates in the early 2000s. I want to acknowledge the importance of the Japanese colleagues in the consolidation of the WCAA (especially Junji Koizumi) and of the German-born Australian anthropologist Thomas Reuter.

⁹Setha Low and Virginia Dominguez were the presidents of the AAA when the Commission and the Committee were created.

and (un)wittingly disallowed local anthropological knowledges or entered into hybrid relations of varied degrees with them, creating different disciplinary styles. The Japanese and Indian cases provide useful scenarios to think about the resulting conundrums. Yamashita (2006) raises an apparently simple question: If anthropology is a Western discipline, how does one explain the existence of a Japanese anthropology since the late nineteenth century? His question points to the fact that imitation and mimesis are not always a surrender to powerful others or to colonialism. The Indian debates on Western social sciences, their interpretations and uses (Das & Randeria 2014), are particularly powerful because of their immediate relationships to postcolonial politics, highly complex processes of nation building, and the political uses of traditional knowledges. Many of the founding fathers of Indian anthropology and sociology believed that “mastering the science of the colonizer was the essential first step to qualify for self-rule and establish India as a modern nation-state” (Uberoi et al. 2008a, p. 32). The ideal was to be modern without being Western (Uberoi et al. 2008a, p. 32). Whatever the positioning about the adequacy of Western notions to interpret India, these debates epitomize how Western knowledge is a default setting that ends up creating phantoms, ambiances where desire and reality intersect, where autonomy and dependency are fought. The Japanese and Indian cases send a warning about generalizations that efface local agency, contradictions, and complicities between global and local agents and that conceal imitation’s subversive force because nothing is pure replication and thus new critical interpretations and practices may always arise (Bhabha 1994).

However, because the expansion of the West is also an expansion of power systems in which literature and science played important roles (Pratt 1992, Said 1994), there is no space for naïveté. The current zeitgeist is characterized by a huge concentration of power in a unique hegemonic center, the Anglo-American academia. This may be why the intellectual and political preoccupations underneath the WA surpass anthropology’s borders as evidenced by a book commissioned by the International Sociological Association (Patel 2010) and the *World Social Science Report, 2010: Knowledge Divides* (UNESCO/ISSC 2010).¹⁰ The WA also identifies with the valuing of nonacademic knowledge. In consequence, WA has a strong interest in a growing literature on theories from the South and in debates against epistemicide that appreciate the emergence and visibility of indigenous theories (for instance, Comaroff & Comaroff 2012, Connel 2007, Nava Morales 2013, Smith 1999, Souza Santos & Meneses 2009).

In the eyes of the WA cosmopolitics, anthropology will lose its Western biases when new conditions of conversability arise globally and symmetrical comparisons and dialogical partnerships (Cardoso de Oliveira 2008) develop among local anthropologists, local anthropological knowledges, and the expanding discipline of anthropology. Only then will metropolitan provincialism, the arrogant ignorance of the center, be surpassed by provincial cosmopolitanism, the yet-to-be-fully-considered richness of multiple global fragmented spaces of anthropological production.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I was (a) one of the founders of the World Anthropologies Network, (b) one of the founders of the World Council of Anthropological Associations and its first chair, and (c) one of the first co-chairs of the Committee on World Anthropologies of the American Anthropological Association.

¹⁰Interestingly enough, both volumes include articles with similar titles: “One Social Science or Many?” (Elster 2010) and “One Sociology or Many?” (Sztompka 2010).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I want to thank the anonymous reviewers who helped me to enhance my arguments in this article.

LITERATURE CITED

- Acciaioli G. 2011. From world anthropology to world anthropologies: continuities in the project of decolonizing and internationalizing anthropology. See Ribeiro 2011, pp. 20–44
- Albert B. 1995. *O Ouro Canibal e a Queda Do Céu: Uma Crítica Xamânica da Economia Política da Natureza*. Sér. Antropol. 174. Brasília: Univ. Bras.
- Am. Anthropol. Assoc., Comm. on World Anthropol. 2014. *Objectives*. Adopted Aug. 10, 2010. Am Anthropol. Assoc., Arlington, Va. <http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/cwa/index.cfm>
- Asad T, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities
- Bartolomé MA. 2006. *Procesos Interculturales. Antropología Política del Pluralismo Cultural en América Latina*. México: Siglo XXI Ed.
- Bhabha HK. 1994. Of mimicry and man: the ambivalence of colonial discourse. In *The Location of Culture*, pp. 85–92. London/New York: Routledge
- Boskovic A, ed. 2008. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*. New York/Oxford: Berghahn
- Buchowski M. 2012. Intricate relations between Western anthropologists and Eastern ethnologists. *Focaal – J. Glob. Hist. Anthropol.* 63:20–38
- Buchowski M. 2014. *The story of WCAA*. Presented at Jt. Meet. Int. Union Anthropol. and Ethnol. Sci. and the Jpn. Assoc. Cult. Anthropol., Chiba, Jpn.
- Bueno C. 2007. Hegemonía o alternancia: trayectorias locales de la antropología. *Desacatos* 25:238–42
- Cardoso de Oliveira LR. 2008. Dialogical and power differences in world anthropologies. *Vibrant* 5(2):268–76
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1988. O que é isso que chamamos de antropologia brasileira. In *Sobre o Pensamento Antropológico*, pp. 109–28. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1999/2000. Peripheral anthropologies “versus” central anthropologies. *J. Lat. Am. Anthropol.* 4(2)–5(1):10–30
- Castro-Gómez S, Grosfoguel R, eds. 2007. *El Giro Decolonial. Reflexiones para una Diversidad Epistémica más Allá del Capitalismo Global*. Bogotá: Siglo Hombre Ed./Univ. Cent./Pontificia Univ. Javeriana
- Chaabani H. 2012. Insights on the history of anthropology: its emergence in the wider Middle East before it existed as a discipline. *Int. J. Mod. Anthropol.* 5:80–87
- Chakrabarty D. 2000. *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ/Oxford, UK: Princeton Univ. Press
- Cheah P, Robbins B, eds. 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Chun A. 2008. The postcolonial alien in us all: identity in the global division of intellectual labor. *Positions* 16(3):689–710
- Comaroff J, Comaroff JL. 2012. *Theory from the South: Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving Toward Africa*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm
- Connel RW. 2007. *Southern Theory: Social Science and the Global Dynamics of Knowledge*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Copans J, ed. 1975. *Anthropologie et Impérialisme*. Paris: François Maspero
- Danda AK. 1995. *Foundations of Anthropology: India*. New Delhi: Inter-India
- Das V, ed. 2003. *The Oxford Indian Companion to Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press
- Das V, Randeria S. 2014. Democratic strivings, social sciences, and public debates: the case of India. *Am. Anthropol.* 116:160–65
- Daveluy M, Dorais LJ, eds. 2009. *À la Périphérie du Centre. Les Limites de l'Hégémonie en Anthropologie*. Montreal, Can.: Éd. Liber
- De L'Estoile B. 2008. Hegemonic gravity and pluralistic utopia: a comparative approach to internationalization in Anthropology. *J. World Anthropol. Netw.* 3:111–29
- De L'Estoile B, Neiburg F, Sigaud L, eds. 2002. *Antropologia, Impérios e Estados Nacionais*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará/Faperj

- Díaz Crovetto G. 2008. Antropologías mundiales en cuestión: diálogos y debates. *J. World Anthropol. Netw.* 3:131–55
- Dodds JW. 1963. Eulogy for Paul Fejos (1897–1963). *Curr. Anthropol.* 4(4):405–7
- Dodds JW. 1973. *The Several Lives of Paul Fejos: a Hungarian American Odyssey*. New York: Wenner-Gren Found. Anthropol. Res.
- Dominguez VR. 2012. Mutuality, responsibility, and reciprocity in situations of marked inequality: dilemmas of, and concerning, US anthropology in the world. *Focaal – J. Glob. Hist. Anthropol.* 63:51–61
- Elster J. 2010. One social science or many? See UNESCO/ISSC 2010, pp. 199–202
- Escobar A. 1994. Welcome to Cyberia: notes on the anthropology of cyberculture. *Curr. Anthropol.* 35:211–31
- Fabian J. 2012. Comments on “Changing global flows in anthropological knowledge.” *Focaal – J. Glob. Hist. Anthropol.* 63:62–65
- Fahim H. 1982a. Communication among anthropologists across non-Western Countries. See Fahim 1982b, pp. 138–51
- Fahim H, ed. 1982b. *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. Durham, NC: Carolina Acad.
- Gerholm T, Hannerz U. 1982. Introduction: the shaping of national anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47(1):5–35
- González RJ. 2009. *American Counterinsurgency: Human Science and the Human Terrain*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm
- Gough K. 1968. Anthropology and imperialism. *Monthly Rev.* 19(11):12–27
- Grimson A, Ribeiro GL, Semán P, eds. 2004. *La Antropología Brasileña Contemporánea: Contribuciones para un Diálogo Latinoamericano*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo
- Guarné B. 2012. The world is a room: beyond centers and peripheries in the global production of anthropological knowledge. *Focaal – J. Glob. Hist. Anthropol.* 63:8–19
- Hanks M. 2012. Introduction: the politics and ethics of collaboration among world anthropologies. *Focaal – J. Glob. Hist. Anthropol.* 63:3–7
- Hannerz U. 1996. Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*, pp. 102–11. London: Routledge
- Harrison FV, ed. 1991. *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation*. Washington, DC: Assoc. Black Anthropol., Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
- Harrison F. 2012. Dismantling anthropology’s domestic and international peripheries. *J. World Anthropol. Netw.* 6:87–110
- Hymes DH, ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage Books
- Jorgensen JG, Wolf ER. 1970. A special supplement: Anthropology on the warpath in Thailand. *New York Rev. Books* Nov. 19, pp. 26–35
- Keck ME, Sikkink K. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Keesing FM. 1960. The international organization of anthropology. *Am. Anthropol.* 62:191–201
- Kingsolver A. 2007. World anthropologies: disciplinary transformations within systems of power. Review article. *Am. Anthropol.* 109(3):580–81
- Kroeber AL, ed. 1953. *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Krotz E. 1997. Anthropologies of the South: their rise, their silencing, their characteristics. *Crit. Anthropol.* 17(3):237–51
- Krotz E. 2002. *La Otredad Cultural entre Utopía y Ciencia. Un Estudio sobre el Origen, el Desarrollo y la Reorientación de la Antropología*. México: Univ. Autón. Metrop., Unidad Iztapalapa/Fondo Cult. Econ.
- Kuwayama T. 2004. *Native Anthropology*. Melbourne: Trans Pac. Press
- Low S, Merry S. 2011. Engaged anthropology in the United States and its relevance for world anthropologies. See Ribeiro 2011, pp. 93–110
- Mathews G. 2008. Why Japanese anthropology is ignored beyond Japan. *Jpn. Rev. Cult. Anthropol.* 9:53–69
- Mathews G. 2011. On the referee system as a barrier to global anthropology. See Ribeiro 2011, pp. 45–57
- Mato D. 2002. Estudios y otras prácticas intelectuales latinoamericanas en cultura y poder. In *Estudios y Otras Prácticas Intelectuales Latinoamericanas en Cultura y Poder*, ed. D Mato, pp. 21–46. Caracas: Cons. Latinoamericano Cienc. Soc. (CLACSO)/CEAP, FACES, Univ. Cent. Venez.
- Miceli S, ed. 1999. *O Que Ler na Ciência Social Brasileira (1970–1995)*. São Paulo: Ed. Sumaré/Anpocs
- Mignolo W, ed. 2001. *Capitalismo y Geopolítica del Conocimiento: El Eurocentrismo y la Filosofía de la Liberación en el Debate Intelectual Contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Signo

- Narotzky S. 2006. The production of knowledge and the production of hegemony: anthropological theory and political struggles in Spain. See Ribeiro & Escobar 2006b, pp. 133–56
- Nava Morales E. 2013. *Totopo no Ar: Rádio e Comunalidade em Oaxaca, México*. PhD Thesis, Univ. Bras., Brasília, DF
- Neilson B. 1999. Review article: on the new cosmopolitanism. *Communal/Plural. J. Transnatl. Cross-Cult. Stud.* 7(1):111–24
- Ntarangwi M, Mills D, Babiker M, eds. 2006. *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*. London/New York: Zed Books
- Patel S, ed. 2010. *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions*. London: Sage
- Pratt ML. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge
- Price DH. 2011. *Weaponizing Anthropology: Social Science in Service of the Militarized State*. Oakland, CA: AK/CounterPunch Books
- Quijano A. 1993. Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina. In *La Colonialidad del Saber: Eurocentrismo y Ciencias Sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*, ed. E. Lander, pp. 201–46. Buenos Aires: CLACSO
- Rappaport J. 2005. *Intercultural utopias*. Durham, NC/London: Duke Univ. Press
- Restrepo E, Escobar A. 2005. Other anthropologies and anthropology otherwise: steps to a world anthropologies framework. *Crit. Anthropol.* 25(2):99–129
- Reuters T. 2011. Defining the practical tasks of a global anthropology and the role of democracy in their accomplishment. See Ribeiro 2011, pp. 58–63
- Ribeiro GL. 1998. Cybercultural politics. Political activism at a distance in a transnational world. In *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements*, ed. SE Alvarez, E Dagnino, A Escobar, pp. 325–52. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Ribeiro GL. 2001. Cosmopolitanism. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 4, ed. NJ Smelser, PB Baltes, pp. 2842–45. Elsevier: London
- Ribeiro GL. 2003. *Postimperialismo. Cultura y Política en el Mundo Contemporáneo*. Barcelona: Gedisa
- Ribeiro GL. 2006. World anthropologies. Cosmopolitics for a new global scenario in anthropology. *Crit. Anthropol.* 26(4):363–86
- Ribeiro GL. 2008. Post-imperialism. A Latin American cosmopolitics. In *Brazil and the Americas. Convergences and Perspectives*, ed. P Birlé, S Costa, H Nitschack, pp. 31–50. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert
- Ribeiro GL, ed. 2011. *Global Anthropologies*. Beijing: Intellect. Prop.
- Ribeiro GL, Escobar A. 2006a. World anthropologies: disciplinary transformations within systems of power. See Ribeiro & Escobar 2006b, pp. 1–25
- Ribeiro GL, Escobar A, eds. 2006b. *World Anthropologies. Disciplinary Transformations in Systems of Power*. Oxford, UK: Berg
- Ribeiro GL, Trajano Filho W, eds. 2004. *O Campo da Antropologia no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto
- Said EW. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf
- Saillant F, Kilani M, Bideau FG, eds. 2011. *The Lausanne Manifesto. For a Non-Hegemonic Anthropology*. Montreal: Éd. Liber
- Silverman S. 2009. The first 50 years. A social experiment. Sol Tax, Paul Fejos, and the origins of *Current Anthropology*. *Curr. Anthropol.* 50(6):949–54
- Skalník P, ed. 2002. *The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Set Out
- Skalník P, ed. 2005. *Anthropology of Europe. Teaching and Research*. Prague: Set Out
- Smith LT. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London/New York/Dunedin: Zed Books/Univ. Otago Press
- Spiegel M. 2014. *WCAA and IUAES: institutions for strengthening anthropology in a globalized world*. Presented at Jt. Meet. Int. Union Anthropol. and Ethnol. Sci. and the Jpn. Assoc. Cult. Anthropol., Chiba, Jpn.
- Stocking GW Jr. 2000. “Do good, young man”: Sol Tax and the world mission of liberal democratic anthropology. In *Excluded Ancestors: Inventible Traditions: Essays Toward a More Inclusive History of Anthropology*, ed. R Handler, pp. 171–264. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Souza Santos B, Meneses MP, eds. 2009. *Epistemologias do Sul*. Coimbra: Almedina

- Sztompka P. 2010. One sociology or many? See Patel 2010, pp. 21–28
- Tax S, Eiseley LC, Rouse I, Voegelin CF, eds. 1953. *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Uberoi P, Deshpande S, Sundar N. 2008a. Introduction: The professionalization of Indian anthropology and sociology. People, places, and institutions. See Uberoi et al. 2008b, pp. 1–63
- Uberoi P, Sundar N, Deshpande S, eds. 2008b. *Anthropology in the East: Founders of Indian Sociology and Anthropology*. Calcutta/London/New York: Seagull Books
- UNESCO/ISSC (Int. Soc. Sci. Counc.). 2010. *World Social Science Report, 2010: Knowledge Divides*. Paris: UNESCO
- Vermeulen HF, Rodán AA, eds. 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes. Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. London: Routledge
- Vidyarathi LP. 1974. The emerging American model in anthropology. In *Trends in World Anthropology*, pp. 11–21. New Delhi: Concept
- Visacovsky S, Guber R, eds. 2003. *Historia y Estilos de Trabajo de Campo en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Antropofagia
- Wake CS, ed. 1894. *Memoirs of the International Congress of Anthropology*. Chicago: Schulte
- Weil J. 2014. World anthropology. First articles in the new section. *Am. Anthropol.* 116(1):160
- World Anthropol. Collect. 2003. A conversation about a World Anthropologies Network. *Soc. Anthropol.* 11(2):265–69
- Yamashita S. 2006. Reshaping anthropology: a view from Japan. See Ribeiro & Escobar 2006b, pp. 29–48
- Yamashita S, Bosco J, Eades JS, eds. 2004. *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books