JHEA/RESA Vol. 19, No. 2, 2021, pp. 1-26

(ISSN 0851–7762)

Producing Anthropological Knowledge in and of Southern Africa: A Case Study of the *Anthropology Southern Africa* Journal

Shannon Morreira*

Abstract

This article conducts an archival examination of the *Anthropology Southern Africa* journal (formerly the *South African Journal of Ethnology*/*Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie*), in keeping with Allen and Jobson's (2016) call for anthropology to examine its own archives, as spaces of knowledge production which act as indexes of power. The article moves through three eras of the journal, between 1978 and 2020, showing how it evolved from being the home of *volkekunde* anthropology under apartheid, to a space for the production of anthropological knowledge by both established and nascent voices from the global South. Turning attention to the demographic minutiae of praxis within journals enables the start of a conversation about who was making anthropological knowledge at different moments in history, and what sort of knowledge was made.

Résumé

Cet article propose un examen des archives de la revue *Anthropology Southern Africa* (anciennement *South African Journal of Ethnology*/*Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie*), en droite ligne de l'appel d'Allen et de Jobson (2016) à l'anthropologie d'examiner ses propres archives comme des espaces de production de connaissances qui agissent comme des index de pouvoir. L'article couvre trois périodes de la revue, entre 1978 et 2020, et montre comment elle est passée du statut de foyer de l'anthropologie *volkekunde* sous l'apartheid à un espace de production de connaissances anthropologiques par des voix, établies et naissantes, du Sud global. Porter l'attention sur les détails démographiques de la praxis dans des revues, permet d'amorcer une conversation sur ceux qui, à différentes périodes de l'histoire, produisait les connaissances anthropologiques, et du type de connaissances dont il s'agissait.

* Antrhopologist, Humanities Education Development Unit, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Email: Shannon.morreira@uct.ac.za

Introduction

In their 2016 article *The Decolonizing Generation* Jafari Sinclaire Allen and Ryan Cecil Jobson stated that, even while anthropologists recognise that the archive and the canon are indexes of power and domination, 'scant efforts have been made to turn this insight back toward the archive of anthropology itself' (Allen & Jobson 2016:135). While Allen and Jobson were writing of the work done by a generation of black, Afro-American scholars and allies towards decolonising United States anthropology, similar calls have long been made from within Africa with regard to examining the politics of knowledge production in and about the region, in a context of uneven globalisation and disparities of power (Zeleza 2002; Mkandawire 1989; Mkandawire 2005). In contemporary South Africa, recent calls by students and activists to decolonise the disciplines (see Nyamnjoh 2016), as well as critiques levelled by academics against the structure of the curriculum and the university itself (Nyamnjoh 2012; Morreira 2017) have added urgency to the issue.

In this article, I heed these calls by conducting a quantitative and qualitative exploration into the archive of the peer-reviewed, South-Africa based journal *Anthropology Southern Africa*, to speak to the politics of anthropological knowledge production in the region, and its impact on wider society through regional and global flows of knowledge and resources. It is worth noting at the outset the positionality of the author: I was an editor of the journal from 2015 to 2019, and currently sit on the Editorial Board. I am also a white woman, born in South Africa, raised in Zimbabwe and currently practicing as an academic in a South African university. While my PhD was in anthropology, I am not based in an anthropology department, but rather in an inter-disciplinary education development unit. All these positionalities matter, as in many ways I am both insider – anthropologist, resident in South Africa, academic at a South African institution, ex-editor of the journal; and outsider – inter-disciplinary academic, white Zimbabwean, no longer editor. This perspective has given me access to the archive examined here, rapport with the editors interviewed, and an insider knowledge of South African universities and the contemporary workings of the journal itself. Given the histories of colonialism and apartheid, I am also deeply aware of what it means to be a white settler academic in a society which carries historical and contemporary structural racism, which as a systemic issue is variably visible or invisible in different settings, texts and contexts. The work undertaken in this paper is an attempt to surface and make

visible some of the trends within anthropological knowledge production in South Africa, which has and does occur against the backdrop of these wider societal hierarchies. The work of unsettling the hierarchies we have inherited and continue to work within has historically fallen on the shoulders of black academics, but must also be undertaken reflexively by white academics who can work within their spheres of influence to disrupt and challenge contemporary power relations, and unearth the ways in which historical power relations have underpinned knowledge production in the disciplines.

The decision to undertake this analysis was made between all the co-editors of the journal at the time it was initially written in 2018 (and updated in 2021) as one among many ways in which the journal was deliberately and reflexively thinking through its role in knowledge production in the region. The paper thus uses the journal as a case study through which to think about the 'local' production of anthropological knowledge in the region, bearing in mind the racialised history both of South and southern Africa, and of the discipline itself, and how this may have impacted upon what was written, who wrote it about whom, and where they published it. The paper draws on a quantitative examination of authors' and editors' geographical and academic positioning to speak to demographic trends over time; as well as some brief qualitative examinations of the journal's shifting aims and scope over time to speak to what was considered 'good' anthropological knowledge from this perspective (and thus what other sorts of knowledges may have been excluded). Finally, the paper draws on interview data with editors past and present to examine the socio-political history of the journal and its relation to southern and South African anthropology. Throughout, I work with an underlying historical understanding of anthropology as an academic discipline that existed and was enacted within capitalist modernity, which created particular epistemic hierarchies within which African knowledge was undervalued (Morreira 2017). This was as true in anthropology, even with its liberal tradition of cultural relativism, as it was elsewhere. Harry Garuba has argued that racialisation was a core project of modernity, which was 'embedded in a machinery of knowledge production that defined ways of knowing, ways of seeing and apprehending social reality and the world' (Garuba 2008:1642). Anthropology and other social sciences form part of this machinery; as such, this article provides a factual overview of one journal's production of knowledge over time, taking into account the impact of racialisation on knowledge production as it unfolded in South Africa.

In what follows, I compare three points in the journal's history:

- 1978–2001, when the journal was published as the *South African Journal of Ethnology/Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie*;
- 2002–2013, when *Anthropology Southern Africa* was self-published by the Anthropology Southern Africa Association;
- and 2014–2020, when *Anthropology Southern Africa* was co-published by international publishers Taylor & Francis and South African publishers NISC.

Each era shows particular trends, and each reflects the wider politics of the time. Due to space constraints the paper focuses mostly on the period up to 2014, but does also end with a brief consideration of the demographic and conceptual shifts in the contemporary era.

Inda and Rosaldo (2002:4) have noted of globalisation that it results in complex and uneven mobilities, such that 'not every person and every place participates equally in the circuits of interconnection that travel the globe'. Uneven globalisation, disparities in economies within the region, and the politics of racialisation all affect 'who produces what knowledge, about whom, and for whom' (Anyidoho 2008:25), both within Africa and beyond it; in this paper I consider one example of knowledge production in the southern African social sciences.

Background

Knowledge, as we know, is not apolitical; and academics and intellectuals, the producers of knowledge, do not stand outside of the power relations of the universities or research centres in which we work, and the broader societies – both national and global – in which we operate. In Zeleza's words: 'Politics, indeed, affects all our lives, our social relations and practices, as citizens and as academics, as creators and consumers of cultures and commodities[1], as the producers, practitioners, and prey of power, as objects and subjects of knowledge.' (Zeleza 2002:9). Zeleza's 2002 article on the politics of historical and social science research in Africa gives a thorough analysis of some of the factors at play in producing knowledge in and about Africa, particularly the ways in which research agendas have been 'tied to the vagaries of state politics and policies, the shifting missions and mandates of international donor agencies, and the unpredictable demands and dislocations of civil society' (ibid); not to mention the internal politics of universities and independent research centres themselves. In South Africa, Gordon and Spiegel (1993) have made the point that anthropological knowledge production was for a very long time subsumed within the machinery of apartheid and the struggle against that machinery, such that apartheid 'discourse perniciously

dictat(ed) what should be written both by its supporters and, significantly, its opponents' (Gordon & Spiegel 1993:86). It is worth noting at the outset that many of the key debates about and critiques of South African anthropology (such as the works of Archie Mafeje and Bernard Magubane, for example) were published elsewhere, not in the journal being examined here: an examination of the archive thus reveals important absences as well as presences. In 1998, Archie Mafeje argued that post-independence anthropology in Africa had been re-organised rather than deconstructed, such that the underlying logics of colonial anthropology – epistemological, theoretical, methodological – were reproduced in slightly altered form rather than disbanded. Despite Mafeje's call to African anthropologists to 'call it an end of an era and start experimenting with new forms of knowledge' (1998:39), anthropology has remained a strong presence within South African social science; it thus seems worth examining the historical and contemporary shape of that presence. Knowledge does not get created in a vacuum, particularly in the social sciences where academic work is deliberately positioned in response to societal challenges and inequalities. Local and global politics matter to research and therefore to the sorts of knowledges that are produced.

Connell (2014:526) has argued:

> The global economy doesn't produce a simple dichotomy. It does produce massive structures of centrality and marginality, whose main axis is a metropole/periphery, North-South relationship.

In southern Africa, South Africa at times acts as the regional metropole of knowledge production, in that South African universities are often better resourced than others; globally, however, the dynamics are still massively skewed such that most of the published work about southern Africa comes from the global North. Hassan (2008), for example, has shown that only 1 per cent of publications in international peer reviewed journals emanate from southern Africa, whereas a massive 30 per cent come from the United States alone.

The disparity in the geo-politics of publication cuts across academic disciplines, including within African Studies: Briggs and Weathers' (2016) study of two top-tier African Studies journals,[2] for example, found that the percentage of papers published by Africa-based authors has declined over time, despite an increase in the numbers of Africa-based scholars at universities and research institutes, due to increased rejection rates. Furthermore, even where papers from Africa-based authors were published, Briggs and Weathers show that Africa-based authors are systematically cited less than authors from the North.

Scholars in the global South are also not immune to the cultural capital imbued in intellectual work from the global North, and continue to rely on northern theories in their work, such that Hountondji (1997:2) refers to the phenomenon of 'theoretical extroversion' in the global South, which extroversion Zeleza defines as 'the feverish importation of paradigms, problematics, and perspectives…from the intellectual establishments of the North' (Zeleza 2002:21). Connell (2007) has argued that while most of the world does produce theory, in many genres and styles, only work from certain parts of the world is *perceived as* theoretical. Connell (2007:ix) thus notes that 'Hountondji describes a pattern in colonial science, carried forward to the postcolonial world, where data-gathering and application happen in the colony, while theorising happens in the metropole. Most social science still follows this pattern'. As such, within the academy, the North remains the space from which theory emanates, while the South is seen as a source of data (Connell 2007). Furthermore, there are certain expectations that scholars from the global South, (or scholars from underrepresented communities and nations who are based in the global North) should do research on the global South, such that the gaze of social science continues to be directed towards the developing world. As recently as 2020, then, Ron Kassimir of the Social Science Research Council could state that there is an unspoken idea within social science that 'scholars from the developing world should study their own' (quoted in Nordling 2020; cf. Morreira 2012), which unspoken idea drives whether an application for a research grant is successful or not. In producing such knowledge about 'our own', scholars from the global South also continue to publish in global languages that carry greater social capital than African languages, which, while increasing the impact of the research, runs the risk of divorcing African knowledge workers from the people among whom we live and work, and who we write about (cf. wa Thiong'o 2005).

Writing in 2002, Zeleza said 'the challenge for Africa's intellectuals, leaders and assorted friends is to map out modes of integration into the unfolding global system that will maximise, not further marginalise, the interests of the continent's peoples and polities, economies and environments, societies and cultures' (Zeleza 2002:10). Nearly twenty years later, this diagnosis still stands. Pierre (2020) has argued that more than any other discipline, anthropology has contributed to particular ways of what she terms 'apprehending African society' (Pierre 2020:223). Pierre argues that during the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, anthropology provided the intellectual drive behind colonial representations of Africa and Africans, which were shaped by a racialising logic. It is within the context

of anthropological and other knowledge production in and about the global South, as outlined above, that this paper situates itself, in order to argue that practicing reflexivity is essential for those of us who are in the business of knowledge production in and about Africa. In what follows, this paper begins such acts of reflexivity with regard to an archival examination of the *Anthropology Southern Africa* journal.

Case Study: *Anthropology Southern Africa*

The *Anthropology Southern Africa* journal is the journal of the Anthropology Southern Africa Association (ASnA), a professional association for anthropologists living and working in or on southern Africa. While its current remit is regional, for much of its history the association and journal have mostly been South African-centric. The history of the association, and of the journal, is telling of both the history of anthropological knowledge-making in South Africa, and the history of South Africa more generally. Mamdani (2001) notes that racialised ideology is institutional as well as ideological, such that it is embedded in the work of institutions like universities and their mechanisms of publication. For the purposes of analysis, I have compared three points in the journal's history: 1978–2001, when the journal was self-published by the the Association of Afrikaans Ethnologists/*die Veereniging van Afrikaanse Volkekundiges* as the *South African Journal of Ethnology/Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie*; 2002–2013, when *Anthropology Southern Africa* was self-published by ASnA and 2014–2020 when *Anthropology Southern Africa* was co-published by Taylor & Francis and NISC. I deal with each in turn as a means of exploring the power dynamics, possibilities and limitations of producing particular kinds of knowledge about southern Africa at particular points in time.

Eras of the Journal

The *South African Journal of Ethnology/ Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie (1978–2001)*

In its first incarnation, the journal that became *Anthropology Southern Africa* was the self-published journal of the Association of Afrikaans Ethnologists/ *Veereniging van Afrikaanse Volkekundiges*, and published articles in Afrikaans and English. Since early in the twentieth century, but becoming most apparent once apartheid had taken hold in the 1940s, anthropology in South Africa was ideologically divided between the two camps of 'ethnology' and 'sociocultural anthropology' (Spiegel & Becker 2015). Authors in both these camps, however, were largely white, whether settlers or sojourners,

and Mafeje and Magubane have argued that despite the differences between them, both intellectual traditions drew on a colonial epistemology in their work (Webster 2018). The sociocultural anthropology branch drew from, and contributed to, British anthropological thought following Radcliffe-Brown, who established the first anthropology department at the English-medium University of Cape Town; while the ethnology branch, locally termed *volkekunde*, drew on a pre-World War 2 German tradition of anthropology (Spiegel & Becker 2015). Despite their colonial underpinnings, the two approaches differed in their understanding of colonial society, and the role of anthropology as a discipline within that society. Where the English-speaking sociocultural anthropology camp tended to view colonial nation states as a single system, the *volkekunde* tradition gave intellectual and scientific support to the apartheid ideology of separate development.

The journal in its first iteration fell into this intellectual camp. *Volkekunde* analyses worked with the idea of 'ethnos', in which essentialised cultures were seen as neatly mapping onto the ethnic groups as identified by the apartheid state. Most of the *volkekunde* practitioners were based at Afrikaans-medium 'historically white universities' (HWUs) in South Africa, and at under-resourced historically black (often rural) universities (HBUs).[3] The sociocultural anthropologists were at English-medium HWUs in South Africa and in the wider southern African region as well (see Morreira 2016). Neither *volkekunde* nor sociocultural anthropology were apolitical. Spiegel and Becker note of the British/English speaking tradition that:

> …many social anthropologists demonstrated their rejection of segregationist policies in published work and public interventions. Due to the discipline's assigned field of expertise and particularly its concern with the concept of 'culture' (and 'cultures'), social anthropology leaned toward concepts of pluralism with which to engage the state from a liberal position (Spiegel & Becker 2015:755).

Kuper (2005) has argued that volkekunde scholarship fed directly into apartheid ideology. Moreover, both traditions were immersed in the racialised epistemologies of the time: Mafeje for example has argued that the very categories of analysis used in this era of anthropology, whether liberal or volkekunde, reflected colonial epistemology (Mafeje 1970; Nyoka 2012).

The analysis that follows is based on a quantitative and qualitative examination of 342 of the papers from this era, when the journal was entitled the Suid Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Etnologie or, in English, the South African Journal of Ethnology. The papers are drawn from 68 issues of the journal over 22 years, and are archived online, and in hard copy at the University of Cape Town African Studies Library.[4]

A qualitative reading of this archive shows that the ideological and epistemological positioning of the journal within the *volkekunde* tradition was clear from the very start. The journal was launched with a paper entitled '*Volkekunde*' by a white male author, R.D. Coertze (who was also editor of the journal for 11 years) which outlined the theory of culture as espoused by *volkekunde* ethnologists. As the journal shifted from its *Volkekunde* roots to a more liberal tradition, Coertze was later involved in many vehement debates with colleagues, in which he defended *volkekunde* as a legitimate form of knowledge-making. In its instructions to authors, however, the journal did not overtly state that it was concerned with a particular kind of knowledge-making; instead, in this period, it merely guided authors with an all-encompassing directive that 'original work in all branches of anthropology and ethnology are published in the journal' (Volume 1, 1978).

Quantitative data on language and the affiliations of authors who published in the journal are also of interest:

Table 1: Language of Publication, 1978–2001

Articles in Afrikaans	217	63%
Articles in English	125	37%

Table 2: Geographical Location of Authors, 1978–2001

South Africa	298	92.8%
Other Africa	1	0.003%
Other International (excluding Africa)	22	6.85%

At this stage in its history, the journal was a space in which mainly South African researchers publish sole-authored pieces, predominantly but not exclusively writing in Afrikaans. During the apartheid era, Afrikaans was largely associated with the ruling nationalist party and apartheid government.[5] The preponderance of articles in Afrikaans thus tells a particular story about the positioning of knowledge, and who the articles were written for: a largely local, South African audience. Despite this, 22 per cent of authors came from the wider globe beyond South Africa – although, interestingly enough, not from Africa but from further afield. Only one paper in this entire period was published by an author affiliated to an African institution outside of South Africa, a study by an academic at the University of Malawi.

A breakdown of authors' affiliations to different categories of South African universities in play at the time is also interesting:

Table 3: Affiliation of South Africa-based authors, 1978–2001

Historically 'White'[6] University (HWU), Afrikaans-medium	241	80.8%
Historically 'White' University (HWU), English-medium	6	2.01%
Historically 'Black' University (HBU)	18	6.04%
Government	33	11.07%

Under the apartheid dispensation, HWUs were limited to white students, while HBUs referred to South African universities historically designated as 'black'. HWUs were also populated by white academics. For the purposes of analysis, HWUs were split by language in terms of English and Afrikaans, and Afrikaans-speaking departments largely followed the *volkekunde* tradition. It can be seen above that only 2 per cent of the papers over this period were published by authors affiliated to English-speaking HWUs, while 80.8 per cent came from Afrikaans speaking HWUs. Anthropologists from the socio-cultural anthropology tradition in South Africa, then, did not submit their work to the journal, but published elsewhere. This reflects the ideological split between the *volkekunde* ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology traditions. A further 11 per cent of papers were published by authors affiliated with the apartheid government in some way: as staff in state museums, or in state departments, for example the Department of Plural Relations and Development (previously the Department of Bantu Affairs). A mere 6 per cent of papers emanated from Black universities.

The topics during this period were almost entirely of the *Volkekunde* school. There was a fixed idea of culture at play in most papers, such that cultural attributes were mapped onto tribal affiliation and, importantly for the policies of separate development, homeland and place. The journal up to the 1990s was thus fully immersed in the apartheid project: knowledge is not apolitical, although in the papers sampled for qualitative analysis from the journal it is largely presented as such, with political context entirely missing from most analyses. In ethnology/*volkekunde*, culture as a concept overrode the political economies of colonial capital within which people existed and enacted their ways of being. Colonialism's role in creating and maintaining racial and 'tribal' categories was largely elided, as were many of the contemporary debates occurring elsewhere about the nature of Africa and anthropological knowledge in a postcolonial world (eg. Mafeje 1970; Asad 1973). The kind of anthropological knowledge that was considered legitimate thus excluded the ways in which a racialised political economy affected daily life, and excluded African intellectuals from outside South

Africa, as well as those from within South Africa whose views did not fit with *volkekunde* understandings.

In 1994, South Africa underwent a transition from apartheid to majority rule. The move between political systems in South Africa, and the impact it had on all spheres of public life in South Africa, could obviously not fail to have an effect on the journal, but it was nonetheless a slow one. In 1993, R.D. Coertze, who had always vehemently defended the *Volkekunde* tradition, stepped down as editor, and J.D. Kriel (another white male academic) took over. While content remained mostly the same under Kriel, through 1994's new dispensation into the late 1990s, qualitatively we begin to see some alternative positions creep in from 1994 onward – some from within *Volkekunde* itself, and others from the English-speaking socio-cultural anthropology tradition. In 1995 Emile Sharp and John Boonzaier (at the time both based at UCT, a historically white university) published 'Sieners in die Suburbs' which suggested that white South Africans should be a unit of study as a means of understanding political transformation. Sharp and Boonzaier argued: 'How white people make sense – or fail to make sense – of this changing world is a subject that needs to be added to the anthropological agenda in South Africa.' (Sharp & Boonzaier 1995:64). Rather than focus on 'native life' and 'tribal culture' then, this article shifted the unit of analysis to political transition and the role of whiteness in maintaining inequality in South African society. Also in 1995, O.B. Lawuyi, from the (historically black) University of Transkei published 'Who is the African South African?', which also focused on race and an overarching pan-African identity, rather than ethnicity, as a means of thinking through citizenship. In 1997, P.X. Shilubane published an article entitled 'Towards the indigenisation of anthropology'. These few examples of titles give a sense of the qualitative shifts that occurred in the 1990s.

Beginning in the early 1990s, then, the 'English' camp of anthropologists and the 'Afrikaans' camp of ethnologists began to interact more on a professional level than they had previously done; however, it was only in 2000 that the Anthropology Southern Africa Association came into being which brought the two camps together into one professional association for the first time. In 2002, the journal was relaunched as *Anthropology Southern Africa*. This move was foreshadowed by a series of debates in the journal which pitted the two (white, at least in Mafeje's reading) intellectual traditions against one another. In 2000, John Sharp published 'One Nation: Two Anthropologies' in the journal. From the mid-1990s, articles written in English became more common and, tellingly, from 1994 onwards, there were no more articles from authors affiliated to the government. From

2000 onward, the journal shifted in focus strongly away from *Volkekunde* publications. With sociopolitical shifts in wider South Africa, then, came shifts in local anthropological knowledge production.

Anthropology Southern Africa (2002–2013)

From Volume 25 onwards, the journal was published as *Anthropology Southern Africa*. I present a quantitative analysis here of the papers from this era which were published between 2002 and 2013. I also draw on a qualitative, thematic analysis of the content of those papers; and interview data with one of the editors of the journal from this period.

The journal was in transition in the early 2000s, shifting from being the journal of the *Vereniging van Afrikaanse Volkekundiges* to that of the Anthropology Southern Africa Association. In the words of one of the editors from this era, Stephne Herselman:

> While I was editor, I felt very strongly that the journal should become a mouthpiece as it were, for all southern African anthropologists and for scholars in related disciplines. Up to that stage, scholars from different institutions published in different journals. The merger between the two associations in the early 2000s was a milestone in the development of anthropology as a discipline in South Africa and we believed that the journal constituted an additional instrument to further bridge the gap in southern African anthropology that had resulted from the existence of separate associations with different philosophies/traditions.[7]

The aim was for previously separated authors and departments to publish in the same journal and thus (presumably) to read one another's work. (The journal was distributed among members of the new Anthropology Southern Africa Association, most, but not all, of whom were based in South Africa.) It is worth noting, however, that despite the differences in the ways in which anthropological knowledge was made by *volkekunde* anthropologists and the liberal tradition, both Bernard Magubane and Archie Mafeje rejected the sharp distinction that was drawn between them by their practitioners (Webster 2018), seeing them instead as 'two complementary constituents of the same tradition of settler colonial anthropology' (Webster 2018:400). The journal failed to attract authorship from 'all' southern African anthropologists, as Herselmen was aiming for, and the black radical voice in South African anthropology continued to publish elsewhere.

The instructions to authors remained general, merely noting that 'Articles in English containing original research, review articles, short communications, and commentaries on articles already published in the journal,

from any field of anthropology, ethnology, or archaeology are published in the journal.' (Volume 25, 2002). From the beginning of this period, however, the move away from *Volkekunde* was immediate. As per the instructions to authors, a rapid language shift also occurred: aside from two articles published in the very beginning of this time frame, the move to English was almost absolute. The location of authors also shifted slightly, as seen in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Geographical Location of Authors,[8] ASnA 2002–2013

South Africa	183	83.9%
Other Africa	4	1.8%
Other International (excluding Africa)	31	14.22%

At this point in its history, the journal was still primarily a space of publication for South African authors, although there is a slight drop in the percentage of authors from South Africa as compared to the previous period when the journal was published as *South African Journal of Ethnology*. This drop is accompanied by a very slight increase to 1.8 per cent in the percentage of authors based elsewhere in Africa compared to the previous period; and a larger increase to 14.2 per cent in international authors beyond Africa.

A breakdown of the majority South African authors shows that once again the majority are from HWUs.[9] However, there are some changes in the categories which need to be used, due to shifts within the South African higher education landscape. In 2001, South Africa released a National Plan for Higher Education which saw the mergers of several institutions as a means of unifying a sector fragmented and differentially resourced under apartheid. Under the new model, public universities were divided into three categories: traditional universities, which offer theoretical degrees; technikons, which offer vocational education; and comprehensive universities, which offer both. Anthropology and degrees in related disciplines are offered only in traditional and comprehensive universities. The mergers were implemented by 2004, and in some instances the mergers brought together universities formerly designated for white students with those formerly designated for black students. The categories of HWUs and HBUs as used in the previous section for the purposes of analysis of the journal during its apartheid and early post-apartheid years, then, are less clear cut in this era. In addition, most universities became (at least partly, but at times entirely) English-medium in this era: it was thus a time of considerable change for previously *volkekunde* anthropology departments.

Given that most authors in this era were still from South Africa and given that the shape of the higher education landscape in that country had quite significantly changed, a description of where authors are situated within this new system is useful. Table 5 uses the categories of HBU and HWU where authors came from a university that did not take part in a merger (eg in the Western Cape, the University of Cape Town is a HWU, and the University of the Western Cape a HBU), and merged university to show instances where authors came from newly merged universities formed in 2004 (eg. the University of KwaZulu-Natal and the University of Johannesburg).

Table 5: Affiliation of South African-based authors, 2002–2013

Historically 'White' University (HWU)	108	59%
Historically 'Black' University (HBU)	24	13.1%
Merged University	51	27.8%
Government	0	0%

While 59 per cent of South African-based authors were based at HWUs, the percentage of publications from HBUs rose from 6 per cent to 13.1 per cent (in real numbers however this is only a shift from 18 to 24 authors, although it is over a shorter time period). There were no longer any submissions from government departments, showing anthropological knowledge-making in the post-apartheid period to be separate from the state in a way in which it was not during apartheid. Merged universities, whose merging had taken place as part of a state policy aiming to shift inequalities within the sector, contributed 27.8 per cent. This ratio of work emanating from authors based at HWUs, HBUs and merged universities is in keeping with university rankings, which consistently show HWUs as the highest ranked in the country, followed by merged universities, and with HBUs at the lower end of ranking scales. In this period of the journal's history, then, we still see that only a minority of anthropological knowledge making in and about southern Africa is being done by academics at HBUs, or by academics elsewhere in southern Africa, with HWUs and merged universities providing the bulk of published anthropological research.

Most anthropological knowledge-making thus continued to come from academics based at historically white universities or based internationally in Europe or America. In 2009, this reality led to a debate within the journal about the inequalities that existed between different South African universities. The journal published a debate section led by two academics from Nelson Mandela University, Theodore Petrus and David Bogopa,

in which the authors considered the relationship between anthropology departments and anthropological traditions in South Africa, and argued that the journal should play a supportive role in allowing for the emergence of new knowledges, particularly those that emerge from historically under-resourced universities, and in giving a space and voice to new academics by bringing their work to publication (Petrus et al. 2009). There was thus an overtly stated awareness of the geo-politics at play in anthropological knowledge making in the region.

A qualitative reading of papers in this era shows that the topics published shifted away from a *volkekunde* focus on 'culture' towards political economy and exposé anthropology, which aimed to highlight the inequities of the apartheid and post-apartheid system (see Spiegel 2005), followed by what Speigel (2005) has referred to as anthropology based on an ethics of care, which also had at heart a focus on the effects of a racialised political economy on meaning-making and daily life. A qualitative reading also shows engagement with pressing issues in the making of anthropological knowledge in southern Africa. This was the intention of the editor at the time; in Herselman's words again:

> I hoped to make the journal a forum where scholars from different/opposing theoretical perspectives could critically examine each other's work to foster meaningful anthropological debate in Southern Africa.

Despite the absence of radical black voices, such as Magubane or Mafeje, an increase in theoretical debate can clearly be seen in the work published in the journal in the later stages of this era. For instance, in 2007, Volume 30 of the journal presented a special section entitled 'Debating Southern African Anthropology' which contained papers critiquing essentialism and the existence of 'quoting cliques' within intellectual traditions in the country; on the relevance of anthropology in the region, and the rise of the citizen anthropologist; and on the racialisation and deracialisation of anthropological work, among others. All papers in this special section on southern African anthropology, however, were written by authors based at South African universities or in the global North, even where they wrote about the wider southern African region. Wider African voices were still largely absent. Many papers, however, published work *on* the wider southern African region, but by the authors who were affiliated to South African universities. As Zeleza (2002) notes, however, post-apartheid South Africa became a hub for southern Africa research. Authors thus may well have been based in South African universities, but not necessarily originally from there.

Regional and national policies of course play a part in this; knowledge production is partly driven by the internal dynamics of disciplines and associations, but it is also reliant upon external issues. Zeleza (2002), for example, notes that in much of southern Africa, the state has not supported intellectuals in their research agendas, particularly where those agendas might be in contrast to those of the state itself. Drawing on Moja, Zeleza notes that many southern African researchers and research centres are reliant upon donor funding, which comes with a particular remit such that, 'support to research in Africa has been mainly for applied research that addressed issues of concern to society. Africa has not been a significant contributor or beneficiary of the knowledge revolution' (Moja in Zeleza 2002:13). The *Anthropology Southern Africa* journal would not necessarily have been seen as a useful forum for such work by southern African authors who were based in their home countries. In contrast, the South African state funded (and still funds) research papers if they were published in journals accredited by its Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). There was thus a greater incentive for South African-based academics to publish in the journal than there was for academics from elsewhere on the continent. South African state policies thus also contribute to the geopolitics of knowledge production about southern Africa from South Africa.

This is of significance given that anthropology in South Africa during this timeframe was still very much driven by a focus on the lasting effects of apartheid's racialisation of the political economy (Speigel 2005), with a focus on exposing the effects of the historical and contemporary socio-economic exclusions of Black South Africans on the ways in which life was lived. Such a focus resulted in an anthropology that explored the lives of black South Africans far more than it did those of white South Africans (although not exclusively) and focused on the lifeworlds of those who were oppressed rather than on the lifeworlds and embedded racialised ideologies that allowed such oppression to continue into the post-apartheid world – although again, not exclusively (Nyamnjoh 2012). On taking up a post at the University of Cape Town, Professor Francis Nyamnjoh responded to the intellectual climate of South African anthropology by writing the (controversial at the time it was published in 2012) paper 'Blinded by Sight: Diving the Future of Anthropology in South Africa' – which he did not publish in *Anthropology Southern Africa*, but in *Africa Spectrum*. One of the core themes of the paper was how intellectual traditions produce particular ways of seeing and knowing, that can create blind spots. Nyamnjoh tackled this firstly with regard to how knowledge was produced, arguing that anthropological work was still often published as an individual endeavour, despite the fact that all anthropological knowledge during fieldwork is co-produced through dialogues with key local

intermediaries. I will return to this element of anthropological knowledge-making below, in my discussion of the final iteration of the journal. Secondly, however, Nyamnjoh's critique of knowledge-making in South Africa focused on what anthropologists study and what they do not study, arguing that whiteness as a category of social life was under-researched in South African anthropology, despite the fact that 'far from being determined by race, place, class, gender and/or age, whites in Africa determine race, place, class, gender and age for themselves and for others' (Nyamnjoh 2012:71).[10] This critique, coming from a black anthropologist who at the time of writing was recently arrived in South Africa, serves to show the ways in which the racialisation of anthropology remained part of the processes of knowledge production well into the post-apartheid era.

ASnA in its Present Guise: Internationalisation from 2014 to 2020

By 2011, the journal found itself in crisis. In the words of the incoming editor of the time, Heike Becker:

> At the ASnA[11] conference 2011 in Stellenbosch it became clear that the journal was in a deep crisis… the journal was close to faltering and being disaccredited by the DHET since it received hardly any submissions. By the time of the conference in mid September there was no issue published for the 2011 volume. During the conference there were very concerned discussions about the future of the journal. After I was appointed editor, in a really marvellous collaborative rescue mission we made it and saved the journal from threats of disaccreditation. The relationship between the journal and the Association was intensive in that rescue phase and afterwards.

The journal was pulled back from the brink; a new editorial board was created, drawing on established local scholars and, significantly, a much larger cohort of international scholars than ever before. At the annual ASnA conference in 2012, following an independent analysis of the journal by a publishing consultant, ASnA members voted to sign a contract with international academic publisher Taylor & Francis, which came into play from Volume 37 of the journal, in 2014. The journal's aims and scope was extended beyond a brief 'Note to Authors' to state that:

> The journal aims to promote anthropology in Southern Africa, to support ethnographic and theoretical research, and to provide voices to public debates. ASnA is committed to contemporary perspectives in social and cultural anthropology and in relevant interdisciplinary scholarship. It looks at the current conditions in Southern Africa, African, and global societies, taking into consideration varied challenges such as the politics of difference, or poverty and dignity.

The emphasis above on the politics of difference or poverty echoes back to the (post)colonial positioning of an ethics of care and exposé discussed in the previous section: however, in this iteration of the journal a move is made to extend the focus beyond south(ern) Africa to take a wider lens, allowing for the development of theorising from the South about the South and elsewhere, rather than importing theories from the North to analyse the South (cf. Connell 2007). Moves towards interdisciplinary scholarship also allow for a recognition of the key role played by interdisciplinary fields such as critical race studies and African Studies in differently unpacking the social dynamics that had once been seen as exclusively the realm of anthropology.

A quantitative breakdown of author demographics from this period, as has been done for the earlier two periods of the journal, shows the following:

Table 6: Geographical Location of Authors,[12] ASnA under Taylor & Francis 2014–2020

South Africa	137	64.9%
Other Africa	17	8%
Other International (excluding Africa)	57	27%

While most authors are still based in South Africa, the percentage of South Africa-based authors significantly dropped: from 92.8 per cent and 83.9 per cent during the previous two eras of the journal, to only 64.9 per cent in the present era. The number of authors from elsewhere in Africa rose, from 0.003 per cent and 1.8 per cent in the previous two eras, to 8 per cent in the present era. The number of international authors from elsewhere than Africa also rose, from 6.85 per cent and 14.22 per cent in the previous two eras, to 27 per cent in the present era. The present phase could thus be categorised as one of internationalisation for the journal.

South Africa-based authors do, however, still make up the bulk of the authors who publish in the journal. A breakdown of their affiliations also shows some changes, however:

Table 7: Affiliation of South African-based authors, 2014–2020

Historically 'White' University (HWU)	93	67.8%
Historically 'Black' University (HBU)	25	18.2%
Merged University	15	10.9%
Post-apartheid University	1	0.72%
Independent Researcher	3	2.18%

What is telling in the present is that authors from HWUs published 67.8 per cent of the papers in the journal, those from merged universities published 10.9 per cent, while those from HBUs published only 18.2 per cent of papers from authors based in South Africa. There is thus still a large discrepancy between differently resourced universities in terms of who makes new anthropological knowledge about the region. This speaks perhaps to a new role for the wider Anthropology Southern Africa Association to play in facilitating new conversations and new forms of knowledge making across South Africa and the region.

Unlike in previous eras, records kept by the journal since 2014[13] have also indicated the gender; stage of career; and race (in terms of South African categories) of authors, as follows:[14]

Table 8: Stage of career, race and gender of authors, 2014–2020

	Established	Early Career	White	Black	Male	Female
2014	18	16	23	11	15	19
2015	22	17	32	7	22	17
2016	28	16	37	7	25	19
2017	24	15	28	11	18	21
2018	27	23	23	27	20	30
2019	18	19	22	15	19	18
2020	19	10	20	9	20	9
Total 2014–2019	156	116	185	87	139	133
	57.3%	42.7%	68%	32%	51.1%	48.9%

This data shows that a high 42.7 per cent of the authors who publish are early career academics. This is not accidental, as the journal editors since 2014 have been clear that one role of the journal should be a developmental one, that allows for new voices to emerge in the academy. To that end, the journal editors have run workshops with aspiring authors in South Africa and Botswana; and have, together with ASnA,[15] introduced the Monica Wilson and the Elaine Salo prizes for Masters, Doctoral and Honours students, which lead younger scholars towards potential publication in the journal. The editors have also carefully and deliberately taken on a developmental role towards work that comes to the journal from new scholars, particularly from under-resourced institutions, such that submissions can be re-worked carefully with authors several times, until they are publishable. The journal has also introduced book review and photo essay sections, which allow for a different kind of ethnographic expression. Such mentorship and shifts

in content come at a moment where the more established forms of South African anthropological knowledge-making have been critiqued by students during the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall student protests.

#RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall in South Africa also focused on transformation within institutions and disciplines with regard to race and gender. The journal's demographic data shows that only 32 per cent of authors who published in this time frame are black: it is likely that this is a higher percentage than in previous eras for which we do not have data, but it is still telling of the state of the academy. The journal has also collated data on whether authors emanated from Northern institutions or institutions in the global South: this data shows that 74.9 per cent of all authors who have published in the journal in this period are from the global South, with 25.1 per cent coming from Northern institutions. The journal is thus providing a space for anthropological knowledge making from the South:[16] but the demographic data on country of origin and race shows that this southern voice is still mainly a South African one (with some growth in the inclusion of wider regional voices) and is still mainly (but by no means entirely) white. With regards to gender, authorship is fairly evenly split, with 51.1 per cent authorship by men, and 48.9 per cent by women.

Moving away from author demographics towards an examination of the work that is being produced shows that over this period, the journal has seen a move toward more co-authored papers; and guest-edited special issues have become a feature, thus removing authority somewhat from the editors themselves. As mentioned above, photo essays have also been included, and one ethnographic article in the style of a graphic novel/cartoon has also been published. Articles cover a wide range of topics, but have in common that most are ethnographic in method, relying on detailed qualitative and immersive methodology. While many continue the focus on the ways in which daily lives unfold in relation to wider political economies that characterised the previous era of the journal, there is evidence of conceptual shifts within this focus: for example, where concepts from the South are used to develop a theoretical analysis of the political economy of daily life, rather than simply using the South as a space for ethnographic data (eg. Radebe 2019). There is also work on the ethics of doing insider fieldwork as an African anthropologist (eg. Setlhabi 2019; Mutaru 2018); on local cosmologies as seen through human/plant relations (Gibson and Ellis 2018); and, as in the previous era, considerable work on the complexities of postcolonial African identities. An interesting shift that can also be seen is the rise of papers which have informants/respondents as co-authors to an academic author/professional anthropologist, (eg. Pauli & Dawids 2017) such that anthropological authority does not only lie with academics but is

also granted to the local experts from whom anthropologists gain much of their knowledge. There is thus evidence of moves towards the co-production of knowledge as advocated by Nyamnjoh (2012). A rise in papers from independent researchers or researchers affiliated to spaces outside of the university also reflects shifts within the knowledge economy. Finally, at least one paper in this era has also shifted the gaze from an anthropology of southern Africa, to an anthropology from a southern-based journal that examines life in the global North (Rapport 2020).

Editorial Demographics

Thus far we have focused on the demographics of authors writing in the journal: the makers of anthropological knowledge. But there is of course also an important role played in knowledge-making by the gate-keepers of legitimate knowledge: in this instance, the editors of the journal. Like authorial demographics, the demographics of editors have changed over time, but nonetheless reflect strong patterns of race and gender. The *South African Journal of Ethnology* was edited by four white men, from HWUs within South Africa. *Anthropology Southern Africa* in its iteration between 2002 to 2013 was edited by two white women, both based in South Africa, one at a merged university and one at a HBU. *Anthropology Southern Africa* from 2014 to 2020 has been edited by five white women, based in South Africa at HWUs and an HBU; one black man based at a South African HWU; two black women based at universities in southern Africa; and one white woman based at a university in Europe. There has thus been quite a large shift in editorial demographics in the last iteration of the journal, with editors remaining in place for a shorter tenure, and with the inclusion of black academics and academics from elsewhere in southern Africa and Europe for the first time. The journal in this iteration has also brought in multiple guest editors of special issues, in a deliberate bid to spread editorial authority and decision-making across institutions and individuals. It is also worth noting that through the journal's post-apartheid phase, editorial work has mainly been done by women, many of whom are fairly early in their careers.

Closing Comments

This paper has provided an examination of the archive of the *Anthropology Southern Africa* journal, in terms of content and in terms of authorial and editorial affiliation. The article has moved through three eras of the journal, showing how it has moved from being the home of *volkekunde* anthropology under apartheid, to a space for the production of anthropological knowledge by both established and nascent voices from the global South. Throughout

the journal's history it is clear that anthropological knowledge-making (along with other social sciences) does not just report on social categories but forms part of the machinery of knowledge production through which such categories are created, debated, maintained or overturned. Whilst there has not been room in this paper for an exhaustive analysis of the shifting discourses within South African anthropology as evidenced in the journal over time, turning our attention to the demographic minutiae of praxis within journals enables the start of a conversation about who was making anthropological knowledge at different moments in history, and what sort of knowledge was made.

Acknowledgments

With thanks to current and previous editors of *Anthropology Southern Africa*; to Caroline Jeannerat, editorial assistant of the journal; to audiences at CODESRIA's General Assembly' in Dakar in 2018 and at the ASnA Annual Conference in Botswana in 2018; and to the anonymous peer-reviewers who helped me a great deal in recognising what was implicit in the paper about the South African context, enabling me to make it explicit.

Notes

1. And, while Zeleza does not focus on this point, it is worth noting that academic knowledge is, of course, a commodity, on which the careers and livelihoods of academic practitioners rest; we are not disinterested parties in knowledge production.
2. The journals in question were *African Affairs and the Journal of Modern African Studies*.
3. Universities were racialised under colonialism and apartheid, as were other institutions, such that HWUs were populated by predominantly white staff and students. As late as the 1960s, the Mafeje Affair at the HWU University of Cape Town saw black anthropologist Archie Mafeje unable to take up an academic post he had been offered, after the university rescinded the job offer due to his race. Using HWUs and HBUs as categories of analysis thus provides something of a shorthand for recognising which categories of persons were making knowledge: in South African anthropology for much of its history, most practitioners were white. The rich intellectual traditions of black social scientists such as Mafeje, Livingstone Mqotsi, ZK Matthews, and Bernard Magubane thus were largely situated outside of South African anthropology and most certainly outside of the journal being discussed here in this era.
4. The archival work for this section of the paper was done in the African Studies Library at UCT in 2018. It is possible that the hard copies from this era were lost in the fire that burnt down much of the African Studies Library in 2021.

5. For example, the Soweto uprising of 1976 was ignited by protests against Afrikaans-medium instruction at schools.
6. The *University Education Act* in 1959 proposed to have separate universities for black students and white students in South Africa.
7. Interview with Stephne Herselman, June 2018.
8. Of original articles, excluding book reviews.
9. Unlike in the apartheid era, the post-apartheid HWUs were not entirely staffed by white academics, but, as has been noted even in contemporary critiques of South African higher education, the proportion of academics remained skewed towards a white professoriate (Nyamnjoh 2015).
10. A similar critique was made by Mafeje in 1998, when he argued that 'white South African anthropologists are at best neo-colonial liberals. This is not meant only in the political and economic sense but more fundamentally in the sense of a social and intellectual inability to transcend the problem of alterity. Are the white South Africans African? If so, what is their anthropology and who are its subjects?' (Mafeje 1998:21).
11. ASnA refers to the Anthropology Southern Africa Association
12. Of original articles, excluding book reviews.
13. With many thanks to Caroline Jeannerat for compiling this data for the journal, and to the editorial team for sharing it for use in this paper.
14. This data includes the authors of all articles in the journal, including book reviews and obituaries, whereas the previous data sets have only looked at the authors of original research articles.
15. Zeleza has argued that one route to a shifting politics of knowledge production in the region is through 'vibrant and integrated intellectual associations, groups and communities, on national, regional and continental levels' (Zeleza 2002:16). The relationship between the journal and the wider association is thus important going forward, particularly given that ASnA is in the process of renewing and strengthening its links across southern Africa, such that the 2017 ASnA conference was held at Chancellor College, Malawi; and the 2018 conference at the University of Botswana, and the 2021 Conference will be held at the University of Namibia.
16. It is also worth noting that between 2014 and 2018, the impact factor of the journal rose from 0.071 to 0.714.

Bibliography

Allen, J.S., and Jobson, C.J., 2016, 'The Decolonizing Generation: (Race and) Theory in Anthropology since the Eighties', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 57, No. 2, pp. 129–148.

Anyidoho, Nana Akua, 2008, 'Identity and Knowledge Production in the Fourth Generation', *Africa Development*, Vol XXXIII, No. 1, pp. 25–39.

Asad, Talal, (ed.), 1973, *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, London: Ithaca Press.

Briggs, Ryan C., and Weathers, Scott, 2016, 'Gender and Location in African Politics scholarship: the other white man's burden?', *African Affairs*, Vol. 115, Issue 460, pp. 466–489.

Connell, Raewyn, 2007, *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, Raewyn, 2014, 'Rethinking Gender from The South', *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 518–539.

Czerniewicz, Laura, 2016, 'Knowledge Inequalities: A Marginal View of the Digital Landscape', Keynote Address, Open Repositories Conference 2016, Dublin, Ireland.

Garuba, Harry, 2008, 'Race in Africa: four epigraphs and a commentary', PMLA, Vol. 123, No. 5, pp. 1640–1648.

Gibson, Diana, and William Ellis, 2018, 'Human and plant interfaces: relationality, knowledge and practices', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 75–79. (DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2018.1483735). 20 June 2021.

Gordon, Robert, and Spiegel, Andrew, 1993, 'Southern Africa Revisited', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 22, pp. 83–105.

Hassan, M., 2008, 'Making One World of Science', Editorial, Science, Vol. 322, Issue 5901, p. 505.

Hountondji, Paulin, 1997, *Endogenous Knowledge*: Research Trails, Dakar: CODESRIA Book Series.

Inda, Jonathan, and Renata Rosaldo, 2002, *The Anthropology of Globalisation: A Reader,* Melose, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kuper, Adam, 2005, '"Today we have naming of parts": The work of anthropologists in Southern Africa,' in B. de L'Estoile, F. Neiburg and L. Sigaued, (eds), *Empires, Nations and Natives: Anthropology and State Making*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Lawuyi, O.B., 1995, 'Identity and consciousness: who is the African South African?', *South African Journal of Ethnology,* Vol. 18, No. 3.

Mafeje, Archie, 1970, 'The Ideology of Tribalism', *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 2.

Mafeje, Archie, 1998, 'Anthropology and Independent Africans: Suicide or the end of an era?', *African Sociological Review*, Vol 2, No. 1, pp. 1–43

Mamdani, Mahmood, 2001, *When Victims become Killers: Colonialism, nativism and the genocide in Rwanda*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mkandawire, Thandika, 1989, 'Problems and Prospects of the Social Sciences in Africa', *Eastern African Social Science Review*, Vol. 5.

Mkandawire, Thandika, 2005, *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development*, CODESRIA and Zed Books: Dakar and London.

Morreira, Shannon, 2012, 'Anthropological Futures? Thoughts on Social Research and the Ethics of Engagement', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 35, Nos 3&4, pp. 100–105.

Morreira, Shannon, 2016, 'Working with our Grandparents' Illusions: On Colonial Lineage and Inheritance in Southern African Anthropology', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 279–295.

Morreira, Shannon, 2017, 'Steps towards decolonial higher education in Southern Africa? Epistemic disobedience in the humanities', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 287–301.

Mutaru, Saibu, 2018, 'Conducting anthropological fieldwork in northern Ghana: emerging ethical dilemmas', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 185–198. (DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2018.1465350). 20 June 2021.

Nordling, Linda, 2020, 'Who Gets to Study Whom?' *Sapiens*, (https://www.sapiens.org/culture/anthropology-colonial-history/). 19 June 2021.

Nyamnjoh, Francis, 2012, 'Blinded by Sight: Diving the Future of Anthropology in Africa,' *Africa Spectrum*, Vol. 47, Nos. 2–3, pp. 63–92.

Nyamnjoh, Francis, 2016, #RhodesMustFall. *Nibbling at Resilient Colonialism in South Africa*, Bamenda: Langaa Press.

Nyoka, Bongani, 2012, 'Mafeje and "Authentic Interlocutors": an appraisal of his epistemology', *African Sociological Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1.

Pauli, Julia & Francois Dawids, 2017, 'The struggle for marriage: elite and non-elite weddings in rural Namibia', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 15–28. (DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2016.1237296). 20 June 2021.

Petrus, T.S., Becker, H., Owen, J., Van der Waal, K., Bogopa, D.L., and Herselman, S., (Editor *Anthropology Southern Africa*), 2009, 'Debates Section,' *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 32, Nos 1&2, pp. 87–93.

Pierre, Jemima, 2020, 'Slavery, anthropological knowledge and the racialization of Africans', *Current Anthropology*, Vol 61, supplement 22, pp. 220–231, (https://doi.org/10.1086/709844). 21 June 2021.

Radebe, Nompumelelo Zodwa, 2019, '*Singabantu bendawo*: understanding the concept of land from the perspective of ubuntu', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 247–258. (DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2019.1670086). 20 June 2021.

Rapport, Nigel, 2020, 'Britain and Brexit: imagining an essentialist sense of "British-ness" and navigating amongst "the British"', *Anthropology Southern Afric*a, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 94–106. (DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2020.1740604). 20 June 2021.

Setlhabi, Keletso Gaone, (2019, 'Reliving secrecy and ethics in *bojale* ten years on', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 173–184. (DOI: 10.108 0/23323256.2019.1604146). 20 June 2021.

Sharp, John, 2000, 'One nation, two anthropologies?', *South African Journal of Ethnology*, Vol. 23, No. 1.

Sharp, J., and Boonzaier, E., 1995, '"Sieners in die suburbs?": exploring new directions for South African anthropology', *South African Journal of Ethnology*, Vol. 18, No. 2.

Shilubane, P.X., 1997, 'Towards the indigenisation of anthropology', *South African Journal of Ethnology*, Vol. 20, No. 4.

South African Department of Education, 2001, *National Plan for Higher Education*, Pretoria: Government Gazette.

Spiegel, A.D, and Becker, H., 2015, 'South Africa: Anthropology or Anthropologies?', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 117, No. 4, pp. 754–760.

Spiegel, A.D., 2005, 'From exposé to care: Preliminary thoughts about shifting the ethical concerns of South African social anthropology', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, Vol. 28, Nos. 3–4, pp. 133–141. (https://doi.org/10.1080/23323256.2005.11499923). 20 June 2021.

Webster, Anjuli, 2018, 'On Conquest and Anthropology in South Africa', *South African Journal on Human Rights*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 398–414. (https://doi.org/10.1080/02587203.2018.1543840). 20 June 2021.

wa Thiong'o, N., 2005, 'Europhone or African memory: the challenge of the Pan-Africanist intellectual in the era of globalization', in Mkandawire, T., (ed), *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development*, CODESRIA and Zed Books: Dakar and London.

Zeleza, P., 2002, 'The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 9–23. (https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070120116953). 20 June 2021.