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Abstract
Complexities of power/knowledge relationships are widely recognized, theorized and examined in multiplicities of contexts in social sciences and humanities. In this presentation I will, however briefly, examine how and why anthropology, often referred to as the bastard child of nineteenth century Western imperialism, has transformed itself at the dawn of twenty first century, at least according to the American Anthropological Associations (AAA:2012), to become one of the “most humanistic of sciences and scientific of humanities.” A discipline with the current goals of producing and “disseminating anthropological knowledge to solve human problems”, according to the AAA, the institutional governing body of the field in the United States of America. History of the development of anthropology, like other social sciences and humanities disciplines, has been shaped by the diverse relationships of its practitioners, the anthropologists, to the fluid nature of Western imperial powers. That is, transforming from empires of commerce, and conquest to "empires by invitation or empires of trust", during the twentieth century, especially after the Second World War. Here I will focus on the following significant questions: How did the instrumental uses by Western colonial powers of anthropologists and cultural knowledge they produced about the non-Western colonized societies during the nineteenth and early twentieth century shape trajectories of the development of the discipline? How or whether the ab/uses of anthropology and anthropologists changed during the two World Wars as well as the anti-colonial wars of liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America? What were the impact of Western decolonization, onset of the Cold War, wars by proxies, and creation of neo-empires by “invitation/trust”, on anthropology, after the end of WWII? More significantly, how did the triumph of Western Capitalism over the USSR, the beginning of war on global terror (after September 11-2001) and the need for counterinsurgency (COIN) campaigns in the Middle East influence militarization/weaponization of anthropology and anthropologizing the military? Also explored will be the role of recently trained non-Western or “native” anthropologists in reassessing anthropology’s imperialist past and its extremely critical contemporary stance.
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INTRODUCTION

Anthropology as a social science discipline is an outgrowth of attempts at systematic study of human behavior during the European Age of Enlightenment. It developed into a professional field of study within European universities, like most of the other social and humanistic sciences, during later part of the 19th century. From the very beginning, two things distinguished anthropology from its other sister social science disciplines: 1) the birth of Anthropology, according to British social anthropologists, Catherine Gough (1968:12) as a bastard “child of Western imperialism”; and 2) anthropology's professional focus on the scientific study of the colonized, non-Western peoples and their so called “primitive culture” for the purposes of “scientific colonization” and control by Western powers of those they subjugated and studied1.

1 In this task the tsarist Russian Empire as well as its successor Soviet Empire were also full partners. For details see extensive critical treatment of vast materials on the subject by Slezkine 1994.
The well-known French anthropologist, Claude Levi-Strauss (1966:126) has said that during the interwar years, anthropology became “the science of culture as seen from the outside”—i.e., by the civilized Western men and women studying their non-Western “others”. However, by the end of the twentieth century, anthropology had transformed itself to what Eric Wolf (1923-1999), another well-known American anthropologist, has described as one of the “most humanistic of sciences and scientific of humanities.” That is, a field of social sciences engaged in producing and “disseminating anthropological knowledge to solve human problems” as claimed on the website of the American Anthropological Association (AAA: 2012, emphasis is added). However, as one of our own Middle Eastern native anthropologist, Lila Abu-Lughod (2013; 225), has said: “There is no escape [especially for the social sciences] from history or politics”. Similarly, another very well-known and respected anthropologist with Middle Eastern roots, Talal Asad (1973:12) has reminded us, “Anthropology does not merely apprehend the world in which it is located, but the world also determines how anthropology [and social sciences in general] will apprehend it.”

Therefore, in this presentation², my aim is to examine why and how anthropology transformed itself from a bastard child of imperialism to one of the most critical of the social sciences and the most scientific of humanities within the relatively short history of this discipline. My goal will be to narrate the dynamic nature of relationship between power and production of anthropological knowledge, its instrumental use/abuses by imperial powers during the colonial and postcolonial eras. Because of the constraints of time, however, his complex story of the coming of age of anthropology as social science will be sketchy at best.

The multifaceted relationships of power and knowledge are widely recognized, theorized and examined by practitioners of social sciences and humanities in varieties of contexts. Here, however briefly, I will examine how and why anthropology as discipline got transformed or transformed itself over the last century? More specifically, how did Western colonial powers’ instrumental deployment of anthropologists and cultural knowledge they produced about the non-Western colonized peoples during the nineteenth and early twentieth century shaped trajectories of the development of the discipline? How or whether the ab/uses of anthropology and anthropologists changed after the two World Wars because of the anti-colonial wars of liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America? What were the impact of Western decolonization, the onset of the Cold War, wars by proxies, and formation of the neo-imperial systems, on anthropology, especially after the end of WWII? More significantly, how did the triumph of Western Capitalism over the USSR, the beginning of war on global terror (after September 11-2001) and the need for counterinsurgency (COIN) campaigns in the Middle East (especially Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria among others) has influenced militarization/weaponization of anthropology and anthropologizing the military? I will also comment on the role of recently trained non-Western or “native” anthropologists in reassessing anthropology’s imperialist past and its extremely critical contemporary stance.

² Presented initially as a Keynote Address at the Second International Scientific Research Congress on Humanities and Social Sciences (IBAD) in Istanbul, Turkey, April 20-23-2017. I am grateful to IBAD and the Congress's coordinator Dr. Hayrullah Kahya for the invitation and warm hospitality in Istanbul.
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In this story of examining relationships between power and knowledge, I will argue however briefly, that the most significant factors shaping developmental trajectories of anthropology as a social science discipline, its growth/maturity and “coming of age”, has been tied to the subtle but crucial shifts in the forms and nature of Western imperial systems. That is, changes from the earlier expansion of European “empires of commerce/trade” into becoming “empires of military conquest”, and eventually and imperceptibly transforming themselves into what Geir Lundestad (1999) has called “empires by invitation”, or what a historian of the United States, Thomas Madden (2008) has described as the American “Empire of Trust”. Hence, it is to the examination of the birth, growth and transformation of anthropology within each of these systems of Western imperialisms and their transformative impacts upon the non-Western societies that I would like to now turn.

II

European Renaissance and subsequent technological advances resulted in what came to be known as the Age of Discovery of the exotic Orient, eventually leading to the “discovery” of the Americas. These earlier Western explorations resulted in the establishment of powerful extractive commercial empires fetching considerable wealth for the Europeans. They also exposed the West to peoples, civilizations, and wealth previously unknown to them. In a seminal edited volume called, Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter, Talal Asad (1973) states: “ever since the Renaissance the West has sought both to subordinate and devalue other societies, and at the same time to find in them clues to its own humanity” (Asad 1973:104, emphasis is added).

The growing commercial interests and investments of European merchants in Asia, Africa and the Americas had to be protected by their governments in the far flung parts of the world, thus leading European armies to transform their empires of commerce into deadly empires of conquest. Improved security condition for the Westerners in the colonies created the environment for initial scientific study of the colonized and subordinated societies of Africa, Asia, Oceania and the Americas. The early anthropologists helped explain behavioral differences between the West and the “Rest” through the development of the concept of “culture” and the theory of unilineal evolution of human societies. That is, to explain the question of why human societies differed, anthropologists introduced and deployed the concept of culture not only as the unique capability of human beings among all organisms as its producer, possessor and transmitter from generation to generation but also explained the differences between Europeans and the non-Europeans while providing justification for European colonization of the “primitives” and bringing them technological and cultural progress—i.e., civilizing them by subjugating them. An intellectual coup which made other social sciences such sociology, history, psychology to acknowledged anthropology’s exclusive jurisdiction over the concept culture until quite recently.

Nineteenth and early twentieth century anthropology, according to Diane Lewis (1973:583), contributed to at least three ideological frameworks of colonial racism: 1) the gulf between the cultures of colonizer and the colonized; 2) exploitation of these differences to benefit the colonialists—i.e., anthropologist did nothing for their subjects to thwart harm directed by colonial powers at them by claiming scientific objectivity (some would say indifference), and claiming their own rights to collect unlimited raw data in colonized societies along with other tangible economic resources, writing books, articles,
etc. about them for their own benefits; and 3) presenting the presumed cultural differences as “the standard and absolute facts”.

In early twentieth century anthropologist became interested also in exploring not only why human societies differed culturally from each other, but also addressing the question of how human societies worked/functioned coherently. To this end, Lewis (1973) suggests that British social anthropologists in colonial Africa developed the theory of structural-functionalism highlighting the integrity of traditional African tribal social system which they urged the colonial governments to preserve and use them for a more effective control of the continent. Their reasoning for doing so were twofold: 1) to spare the African societies what they considered Native American population had experienced in the United States as well as to avoid the devastation caused in traditional European societies by industrial revolution. An act which made the British, at least on the surface appear with greater sensitivity towards the African “natives” than were the United States government towards the native Americans. This approach, Talal Asad (1973:110) says, led the British anthropologists, Myer Fortes and Evans-Pritchard, to claim that African political systems (chieftainships and kingdoms) under the British rule were based on consent of their subjects and as such they were rational, stable and balanced political system. In contrast, Asad suggests, the British functionalist anthropology developed rather negative assessment of the “Oriental Muslim” political regimes, claiming that unlike the Africans the relationships of rulers and the ruled in Muslim polities were characterized by repression and autocracy. He argues that the two contrasting images of British Functionalist Anthropology in Africa and the Islamic Orientalism are products of Europeans’ pre-colonial relations and their pre-colonial assumptions about the Muslim Orient. That is, in their construction of the “irrationality” of Muslim societies compared to the rationality of African political systems, they highlighted their own historic fears of the Ottoman Turkish power, especially during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In these instances, they focused on what they considered to be the absences in the Muslim societies compared to Europe—i.e., the absence of Muslim gentry and subordinated position of Muslim women, reaffirming the European attributions of repression, corruption, misrule and decay to Muslim societies. Thus, modern Orientalism was born towards the end of 19th century at the apex of colonial expansion in the Middle East (Asad 1973:115).

In 1902, when American Anthropological Association (AAA) was established, majority of its 175 members were studying and reporting on the British Empire’s African subjects. The American anthropologist for the most part were studying the shattered communities of Native Americans for the Bureau of Ethnology, a US government entity. In 1919 at the conclusion of WWI, a call to separation of anthropology from colonialism as its “time servers” and “handmaidens” was made by Franz Boas, often regarded as “father of American anthropology”. Boas publicly “complained that his colleagues had ‘prostituted science’ by scouring Central America for German submarine bases under the guise of research and Boas was censured by Malinowski Malinowski, “the father of [British] social anthropology” who advocated in 1929, that “to avoid a colonial struggle European powers should follow a colonial strategy based on anthropological knowledge and planning to achieve the desired evolutionary progress cheaply and without bloodshed” (Pels 1997:164, emphasis is added). However, in 1942 when both Malinowski and Boas died, most anthropologist, including some of the most famous of them, Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict among others, were directly involved helping fight the World War II. Ruth
Benedict, for example, studied Japanese culture and developed, a popular theory of "culture and personality", at least for a time, in a book called the *Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. Other anthropologists studied physical features of the draftees and Margaret Mead prepared pamphlets for the Office of War Information (Stannard 2007).

As such, anthropology which had emerged as distinctive discipline at the beginning of the colonial era, had become a flourishing academic profession at the service of power by the end of WWII. In fact, Talal Asad (1973:14-15) claims that by the end of WWII, anthropologists' “efforts were devoted [entirely] to the description and analysis—carried out by Europeans, for a European audience—of non-European societies dominated by European power”. Stanly Diamond (1964:433) has added that, early anthropologists believed “only the colonial Westerner can paint a portrait of the idea of the primitive which they [the natives] themselves cannot ordinarily do so”. Indeed, Levi-Strauss (1966:126 cited in Lewis 1973:582) has remarked “if the natives were to do a study of themselves, they would only produce philology or history” but not anthropology. Therefore, all ethnographic fieldwork was carried out in conquered lands by white people, until the end of WWII. Not surprisingly, until after WWII, rarely had anthropologist considered studying the impact of colonial confrontation and conquest upon the lives of peoples and subjugated communities they studied. The end of WWII, ushered the onset of anti-colonial struggles, national liberation wars and the emergence of new forms of imperialism by invitation or emergence of the "Empires of Trust" drastically altering realities for ethnographic research around the globe. We will now turn to the brief examination of the impact of these change in power relations and their impact on production and uses of anthropological knowledge.

### III

The two World Wars in Europe, especially WWII accompanied considerable shifts in power relations globally. Europeans' invitation to the United States to join in their wars in Europe and the Americans’ decision, even if reluctantly, to join them in both occasions and leading their European allies to victory, made the twentieth century effectively the American Century and transformed America to a new kind of global imperial power—i.e., Empire by Invitation or Empire of Trust (see Lundestad 1999, Madden 2008). The end of WWII also triggered the onset of the Cold War between the capitalist West and the Communist Eastern blocs. Weakened Western European colonial powers confronted wars of liberation, sometimes encouraged by the Socialist camp led by the former USSR. The new bipolar world presented complicated power dynamics to many emergent postcolonial newly independent nation states. That is, the powerful Western and Eastern bloc countries were looking for “trusted allies and friends” to “invite” their aid and assistance among the post-colonial independent states while the fragile and highly vulnerable governments of newly independent countries looked for reliable and trusted patrons from one or the other of the competing ideological blocs. A reality which effected the formation of newly configured American and Soviet “empires of trust or empires by invitation” (for characteristics of these new imperial systems see, Shahrani 2016). In this brave new world of zero-sum power games, competition for friends/allies and search for patrons, necessitated the reconfigurations of old colonial ties, giving way to the formation of neo-imperial structures with clear consequences for both—i.e., for the West and for the “Rest”. And not surprisingly, in this new context, pre-war anthropology, relying on the concept of culture and theories of unilineal evolutionism and structural-functionalism to explain the
two fundamental questions of why human societies differed and how human societies worked/functioned seemed clearly inadequate.

More importantly colonial era anthropology and anthropologist faced new realities—they did not have free and easy access to places they used to doing ethnographic research. Neither could post-war anthropologists ignore the effects of radical shifts in the world system, rapid social and economic changes in postcolonial societies, or the inadequacy of structural functionalist theory of culture for explaining social change and pervasive political crises. Therefore, in the novel environment of the 1950s and 1960s, the very concept of culture itself came under systematic scrutiny. Questioning the meta analytical and explanatory role of culture as the sole factor shaping all aspects of human behavior, at the exclusion of psychological, economic and political factors in decision making, Alfred Kroeber & Talcot Parsons (1958, also see Turk 1962) issued a joint statement restricting the concept of culture to “values, ideas, and other symbolic meaningful system” (Wolf 1980). Indeed, Social sciences during the first two decades after WWII, for all intents and purposes, became “behavioral sciences” in search of multifaceted explanations focusing on the role of human agency in institutional processes and decision making on the basis of normative/social structural principles producing specific social organizational outcomes (Ortner 1984, Barth 1966, Paine 1974).

This new approach, described as “processual anthropology”, was not the only one challenging structural functionalist and unilineal evolutionary theory. Other explanatory approaches to understanding social change and continuity were also proposed. For example, Levi-Strauss’s school of French Structuralism suggested that culture was simply a product of “convolutions of human brain” common to all humans which “continuously spawns logical and analogical opposition, forever replacing binary opposites already installed with new ones, in ultimately fruitless road- fruitless because human brain cannot transcend the matrix of nature that had given rise to it.” (Wolf 1980). Others proposed multilinear evolutionary and “cultural ecological approach” which focused on how human actions and technologies were deployed to transform and reshape the natural environment. An approach which evolved into general ecological studies treating human beings not as a unique culture bearing entity but as just another organism with different intake and expenditure of energy and calories in different environments (White 1969). A development which Eric Wolf (1980) suggests led to further divisions within anthropology reflecting the broader competing political ideological struggles of the time. That is, the rise of a Marxist leaning “cultural materialist approach” advocated by Marvin Harris (1980, 1968) and his students and colleagues at Columbia University. Cultural materialist, sought to establish a science of anthropology, stood in opposition to the advocates of “symbolic anthropology” led by Clifford Geertz (197d) and his followers who viewed societies and cultures as “texts” to be interpreted and unpacked subjectively. Most members of anthropological profession opted for a more eclectic theoretical stance in explaining the complex realities of social life confronting them.

By the 1960s, anthropology's focus on studying “primitive” societies—i.e., hunters-gatherers, mobile herders/pastoralist and peasants in the colonized lands—had also expanded, becoming more inclusive of studying urban communities, their own neighborhoods, factories and boardrooms, as well as studying the impacts of Western and Eastern bloc’s foreign aid, technology transfers via international development programs upon the targeted countries and communities in the former colonies. Diane Lewis states
that a significant consequence of this trend was that, Western anthropologists studying their own societies did not de-humanize their own people, and became more sensitive to the addressing societal problems, and as a result anthropology and anthropologists became more conscious of the relevance of their own scientific or humanistic works. To illustrate her point, she says the Smithsonian Institution’s collections of the world cultures are housed in “the Museum of Natural History but cultures of the White people [are displayed] in the Museum of History and Technology” (Lewis 1973:598, emphasis is added).

The publication of Orientalism by Edward Said (1978), although in its first edition more approving of anthropological studies at the time, had a phenomenal impact not only on anthropology but upon social sciences and humanities focusing on postcolonial studies in general. One of its most lasting legacies has been the establishment of the fact that production of knowledge in all times and places is situated. That is, the broader dynamics of power, economic policies and practices of colonial, postcolonial, and neocolonial regimes affect scholarly practices at multiple levels. More specifically, as Laura Deeb and Jessica Winegar (2016:5) have put it: “The production of knowledge is political from its inception in a future academic’s social life.” More specifically, Orientalism, encouraged research on the anthropology of colonialism, post-colonialism and anthropologists as colonizers (i.e., anthropology of anthropology), which had begun to question anthropology’s role in colonial rule during the 1960s (see Pels 1997). Perhaps, Orientalism’s most critical impact on anthropological practice was a drive towards shunning collaboration with the strategies of new expansive neocolonial/imperial powers, including supporting their wars and pervasive violence in the Third World, such as the Viet Nam war and other Cold War related “low intensity conflicts” in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Indeed, during the last quarter of the 20th century, critique of colonialism, everyday resistances to power, reflexivity (or some would say navel gazing by anthropologists), balancing of domination and resistance, became significant themes of anthropological investigation (e.g. works by James Scott 1990, 1985). Two other developments effected anthropology and anthropologists to become more critical and greatly nativized—i.e., the effect of Foucauldian equation of power and production of knowledge during the 1980 and, the rise of post-structuralism/colonialism, combined with deep disillusionment with the Left by the late 1980 and early 1990s (see, Deeb Winegar 2016, Pels 1997).

IV

During the 1970 and 1980s, Third World or native anthropologists received training in anthropology and their numbers began to increase with critical impact, especially on the studies of identity politics and gender studies. Albert Memmi (1969:181) in his book, Dominated Man, says: “For the oppressed to be finally free, he must go beyond revolt, by another path, he must begin in other ways, conceive of himself and reconstruct himself independently of the master.” But how is this possible?

In an important article on “Anthropology and Colonialism”, published in Current Anthropology, Diane Lewis (1973:589) offers the following list of challenges facing the Third World anthropologist: Time or opportunity for education and self-discovery, especially in the Third World post-colonial environments where social sciences, especially anthropology is not valued. The choices for prioritizing which of the most pressing problems of his/her community and country to be addressed—especially when resources are lacking and priorities within the country radically different. Significance of outsider
studies are obvious, but natives must decide who has the right to study their culture—themselves or outsiders, and if so, how?

Sadly, however, the current president of Afghanistan, Ashraf Ghani, an “activist” native anthropologist and the co-author of a book entitled, Fixing Failed States: A Framework for Rebuilding a Fractured World, despite much hope and expectations has not been able deliver much of anything as a native anthropologist to the suffering peoples of the country he rules³ (Ghani and Lockhart 2008). Similarly, applied anthropologists have, for the most part, continued to support neocolonialism and their so called economic development projects, under the rubric of planned development and social change programs, have largely failed to deliver also. Therefore, how to maintain a balance between “pure anthropology”—i.e, doing science and contributing to theory and methods—and looking for solution to practical problems of communities and nations remains hypothetical at best. Ultimately, Lewis suggests for Third World or “native” anthropologists to be effective, understanding the terrain of ecology of global powers within the new globalized empires of trust/invitation is a critical necessity. These are indeed major challenges, fraught with considerable obstacles, but must be faced with courage and determination especially by the growing numbers of Middle Eastern and North African native anthropologists.

In a recent book on Anthropology’s Politics Disciplining the Middle East, Laura Deeb and Jessica Winegar (2016), report the doubling of trained professional anthropologists doing research on the region, largely because of the emergence of Middle East and North Africa (MENA) as the new enemy of the West. Many of the native anthropologist educated in post-Orientalist academia, trained by postcolonial and post-structuralism mentors are focusing on social justice and activism. At the dawn of 21st century, especially after the events of the September 11-2011 in New York and Washington DC, their number have doubled again according to Deeb and Weniger. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, spearheaded by the United States as an “Empire of Trust” and her NATO allies, as part of their war on global terror, have presented anthropologists in general and native anthropologists from the MENA region in particular with fresh challenges of the uses and abuses of anthropology.

That is, in the recent Counter Insurgency (COIN) warfare in the Middle East, US Department of Defense (DoD) has attempted to enlist anthropologists in the War Zones (Rohde 2007). The US army, according to an embedded journalist in the war in Afghanistan, Anne Marlow (2007), is convinced that “cultural understanding in successful counterinsurgency” is a must. Adding, “if we just understood the Iraqis/Afghans/Shiites/Sunnis better, we would have made fewer mistakes... military…, it seems to have spent much of the last few years retooling to fight small rather than large wars, and to emphasize counterinsurgency and nation-building rather than mere kinetics (aka killing)”. To accomplish the US military’s goals of gentler and kinder form of military

³ The reason for Ghani’s lack of effectiveness as a native anthropologist in position of leadership in Afghanistan is attributed, especially by his critiques in the Afghan public media, including social media, to the fact that he has behaved more like a Pashtun tribesman, than a trained professional activist anthropologist he used to present himself before becoming president in a vastly fraudulent election of 2014 which required the intervention of then US Secretary of State John Kerry. For reports about the election crisis see: https://search.yahoo.com/yhs/search?p=John+Kerry+and+Afghanistan+election+of+2014&ei=UTF-8&hspart=mozilla&heimp=yhs-002. For reports of calls for Ghani’s resignation, following a suicidal attack carried out by a tanker loaded with more than 2,500lb of explosive in a major intersection in the center of diplomatic quarter in Kabul on Wednesday May 31st, 2017, see Tolonews reports of May 31-June 5, 2017 at: http://www.tolonews.com/
interventions by war and violence in Afghanistan, Iraq and beyond, DoD has attempted to recruit anthropologist for its “The Human Terrain Project” since 2007. According another investigative journalist Ward Carroll, the DoD “always needs more aircraft, but the surveillance tech is already good enough for this needs.” So instead, the army is asking for an extremely detailed, layered map of tribes, religions, cultures, races, politics, history and languages for key areas and their interaction with the geography.... Human preparation of the environment rather than physical preparation of the environment... We need to map the human terrain in those sensitive areas as thoroughly as we mapped the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. That will allow us in the future not to go into a post-9/11 scratching our heads ‘should we go kinetic, should we go non-kinetic? Should we go after this tribe or should we go after that tribe? It allows us to have a foundation in place already to move for our government actions.” (2009, italics are added)

Therefore, at a cost of millions of dollars, Carroll reports that, “several think tanks, universities and some offices within the US Government are working on [construction of] some kind of variation of this human terrain map”.

When the aims of Human Terrain (HT) program became known, the Committee on Ethics of the American Anthropological Association (AAA 2012) took a very principled and strong stance condemning the program. Indeed, more than 1000 anthropologists signed a petition circulated by AAA, not to participate in the US Department of Defense Human Terrain program. Significantly, no professionally trained anthropologists specializing on the Muslim Middle East-- Western or native-- participated, causing the Human Terrain program to fail miserably4. More importantly, this movement also spawned the call to the boycott of Israeli academic institutions by AAA for the persistent violence incurred by the Israeli forces against the Palestinians.

To conclude, this highly sketchy narrative of anthropology’s coming of age-- from being born in the bosom of imperialism in the late 19th century, active participation in the two major European wars of twentieth century (WWI and WWII), to its principled stance against the attempted abuses of anthropological knowledge at the dawn of 21st century in support of the ongoing US Counter Insurgency (COIN) wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must once again acknowledge the intimate relationships between power and the production and (ab)use of knowledge. But also remind ourselves, and non-Western governments that, at this time of increased identity politics manifested in the slogans of “America First” or nationalism on steroids, giving rapid rise to pervasive Islamophobia in the West and politics of rage in the Rest, continued devaluation of social sciences in non-Western countries cannot be but damaging to their own self-interest and global instability in the long haul. Therefore, encouraging and supporting the younger generations to consider joining the fields of critical social sciences for professional training and research is incumbent on all and every one of us, especially in this august gathering in this beautiful city, Istanbul.

---

4 This is not to say that some anthropologist have not actively participated in promotion of the uses of anthropology for US national security and defense purposes. One of the more active voices in such a project has been a Montgomery ‘Mitzy’ McFate, the “Senior Social Scientist for the US Army’s Human Terrain System, where she helped build the program from a ‘good idea’ with no money attached to a program with over five hundred employees, 27 teams deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan, and $151 million dollar a year budget.” (Shachtman 2008, also see Stannard 2007).
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