



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Editorial

Bracke, S.; Davidson, R.J.; Geschiere, P.; Guadeloupe, F.

DOI

[10.1177/1466138120964654](https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138120964654)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Ethnography

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bracke, S., Davidson, R. J., Geschiere, P., & Guadeloupe, F. (2020). Editorial. *Ethnography*, 21(4), 415-416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138120964654>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Editorial

Ethnography

2020, Vol. 21(4) 415–416

© The Author(s) 2020

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/1466138120964654

journals.sagepub.com/home/eth



In this last issue of the year, we look back at what for many people has been a challenging time. In the editorial of our June issue we paused on what one of this year's challenges, the Covid-19 pandemic, meant for both our field of ethnographic research methods and the practices of academic journal publishing. As 2020 is coming to a close, we want to pause on another event that has marked this year: the Black Lives Matter mobilizations and their global reverberations, including the sense of urgency, yet again, for the need to attending to institutional racism. As Anthropologists and Sociologists, we follow Stokley Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton's cue in recognizing institutional racism *as* an expression of the continuing legacy of western imperialism. Given this understanding, what could a renewed commitment to dismantle institutional racism look like for our publishing practices?

Like any other social practice, the practice of doing ethnography does not stand outside of the power relations that shape the social formations that we study. Doing ethnography is imbricated, often in complex and multilayered ways, within social relations usually premised on the guiding fictions of racial difference, gender inequality, and class-based distinctions. These are exacerbated by the hierarchies of linguistic practices (majority/minoritarian languages) and geopolitical locations (centers and peripheries and the intricate articulations in between). These are dynamics we all know. Some of them have been documented and studied further. Notably, the discipline of Anthropology – and regrettably the discipline of Sociology much less – has sustained elaborate reflections on how such social relations of power have shaped the relationship between ethnographers and their fieldwork sites, and the relationship between 'empirical material' and theory, and has sought to develop better practices. The seminal works of Faye Harrison on "Decolonizing Anthropology" (1991) and Ruth Behar's and Deborah Gordon's "Women Writing Culture" (1996) continue to be relevant. As editors of *Ethnography*, we want to renew our commitment to hold the manuscripts that we receive and review to higher standards in this respect. It is not always easy to assess how such power relations 'in the field' find their ways into a manuscript when we don't know the fieldwork sites ourselves – which is the case with the majority of manuscripts that we receive – and it is equally not easy to give a clear account of the reflexivity that we strive for. We strive for a reflectivity and reflexivity, following Harrison and Behar, that is about reckoning with power differences between researchers located in the overdeveloped world and those inhabiting developmentally arrested locations.

One place in which such reflexivity materializes, is the question of citational practices. The enduring presence of racial and other colonial logics that manifest themselves in citational practices privileging *primarily the unproblematized male scholars in the North* has to be confronted. This ought to be a continuation of reflexive accountings of fieldwork practices. It is well documented that social relations of race, like those of gender, play out in citational practices: scholars of colour and female scholars are significantly less cited than white male scholars (for recent studies tracing such citation gaps, see Chakravartty et al., 2018; Dion et al., 2018). Also in this respect we are committed to hold the manuscripts we receive to higher standards, insisting upon appropriate and generous citational conduct, notably in regard to the work of colleagues who have more direct links to the researched group.

In the world in which we live, a world where the colour and class complexion of the victims of Covid-19 reminds one of colonialism, and where Black lives still are struggling to matter, we cannot but be committed to request more diligence from our own publishing and review practices as well as from the manuscripts we receive.

Sarah Bracke, Robert J Davidson, Peter Geschiere and Francio Guadeloupe

Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

References

- Behar R and Gordon DA (eds.) (1996) *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chakravartty P, Kuo R, Grubbs V, et al. (2018) #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication* 68(2): 254–266.
- Dion ML, Sumner JL and Mitchell SM (2018) Gendered citation patterns across political science and social science methodology fields. *Political Analysis* 26(3): 312–327.
- Harrison FV (ed.) (1991) *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation*. Washington: American Anthropological Association.