RECLAIMING WOMEN'S PERSPECTIVE: FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE ANDROCENTRIC BIAS

Maja Muhić, South East European University, in Tetovo, Macedonia, m.muhić@seeu.edu.mk

10.31902/fli.26.2019.8

UDK 316.662-055.2

Abstract: The past few decades have been marked by an increasing discussion on the role of dialogue in anthropology, especially following the anthropological turn of the 80s, when the discipline was looked upon as one “writing a culture” rather than understanding it from the insider’s perspective, while the ethnographer was thought of as the epistemic dictator, incapable of establishing a dialogical relation with his subjects of inquiry. The power relationship was indeed one of the most prominent problems in creating an equal, dialogical setting between the anthropologist and the other culture. This paper aims at revisiting feminist anthropology tracing the elements which constituted it, its original inspiration, and main motifs of action mostly gathered around the strong male bias of the discipline. This bias was predominantly manifested in the monological, androcentric understanding and exploration of cultures.

In tracing these aspects, and acknowledging the more egalitarian status of this discipline since its early days versus other social sciences (Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict were among the most prominent women anthropologists), the paper will look at early women anthropologists works some of which were excluded from the canon. It will also point to the existence of strong male bias in ethnography and the discipline as a whole, thus triggering the emergence of feminist anthropology with its capacity for reflexivity and accountability in ethnographic work.

Keywords: feminist anthropology, reclaiming, dialogue, subordination, domestic power, identity, binary opposition

Introductory Notes and Aims of the Study

Cultural anthropology, albeit a discipline that very early on had women on board, has grappled with issues of androcentric bias present in one its main tools of research – ethnography. Before the 1970s, when feminist anthropology was officially recognized as a sub discipline of anthropology, there have been a number of women conducting fruitful anthropological research. Yet many of their works have either been marginalized, or have been strictly guided by male mentors. Often, some of these works came from wives of men anthropologists working on their husband’s field notes (like Turner Edith). The urge to correct

this male bias was reflected in the promotion of the so called study of “women” brought forth by feminist ethnographers in the 1960s and 70s. These works have generally diagnosed the problem of lack of women’s perspectives in the ethnographies. The 1980s brought about the shift towards what became known as the study of “gender” tackling issues such as gender identity, politics, and relations triggered by the fact that the category “woman” has been criticized as one heavily influenced by Euro-American and white bias. Hence, the main points of reaction of feminist anthropology were the reduction of male bias in ethnography, which meant inclusion of more women’s voices, and challenging the multitude of feminist theories emerging at the time in Europe and the US. The early stages of anthropology have brought on board several women, some of which remain legendary names in the field and others who became marginalized for various reasons. In the text that follows, the following points will be addressed:

1. Revisit the male bias in early ethnographies;
2. Outline the phases of feminist anthropology, which are intertwined with the feminist waves;
3. Outline the major points of reaction of feminist anthropologists;
4. Diagnose the potential of these anthropologies to reclaim the discipline, by opening a new dialogue with the subjects of their investigation.

Early Female Anthropologists and the Controversies

In the first half of the 20th century, the discipline has been predominantly androcentric. Objectivity was also highly valued, while in most ethnographies women were viewed as the lesser partners of men. Yet, the discipline was largely egalitarian in its early beginnings with eminent figures like Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict producing extensive studies of Polynesia and Native Americans.

In this section we will look at three women anthropologists of the early 20th century, the path-breaking studies they made and the controversies that revolved around them either because of their gender, colour, methodology, or ways of understanding culture. Margaret Mead is considered as one of the most prominent female figures in anthropology who has, under the strong influence of Franz Boas, conducted some controversial work dealing with attitudes towards sexuality while juxtaposing the South Pacific and Southeast Asian traditions and culture with the Western one. Among some of the earlier works on women Margaret Mead’s *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), stands out as one her most influential studies, discussing the lives of teenage girls – a phenomenon that was mostly ignored by previous anthropological works. Mead was one of those anthropologists who introduced a different form of research and data

gathering based on detailed observation and life among the local community. She also introduced the concept that will later become one of the most powerful points of departure for second wave feminism in diagnosing the source of female subordination. Namely, the idea that the human behavior (in Mead's case the behavior of adolescents) can largely be influenced by culture and not only by biology as previously believed.

Mead's starting premise was that in the American civilization, with, as she says "its many immigrant strains, its dozens of conflicting standards of conduct, its hundreds of religious sects, its shifting economic conditions, this unsettled, disturbed status of youth was more apparent than in the older, more settled civilization of Europe" (2). Based on interviews with adolescents in Samoa over a 9-month period, Mead concluded that the cultural patterns and upbringing instead of the biological factors can play a pivotal role in one's behavior. The cultural stability of the Samoan society free of conflicting values, and shameful taboos was, according to Mead, the backbone of the carefree behavior of sexually active Samoan girls. Her work came under severe scrutiny by Derek Freeman who conducted research in Samoa in 1966-67 arguing that Mead was hoaxed by her native informants and that the Samoan adolescents suffer from the same problems as the Western ones. In his works published in 1986 and 1998, Freeman was critical of Mead's cultural determinism claiming that it blinded Mead in perceiving the violent and troublesome aspect of the sexuality of adolescents in Samoa.

An interesting novelty regarding this controversy came forth with the publication of Shankman's *The "Fateful Hoaxing" of Margaret Mead: A Cautionary Tale* (2013). He argues that Freeman has wrongfully accused Mead of relying on data by a female informant named Ea'apua'a Fa'amû, who as Shankman claims, was not Mead's informant on adolescent sex. Trying to get to the bottom of Freeman's desire to accuse Mead of wrong data, Shankman points out "he argued that while Mead was not a deliberate cheat, she was a foolish young woman who never realized the nature of her error" (61). The notion of the "foolish young woman" gathered with Freeman likely unacceptance of cultural versus biological determinism might shed some light on this controversy. Shankman's concluding words do resonate with the injustice done to Mead. As he points out, "he could have criticized Mead's work, revised it, and improved our knowledge of Samoa without diminishing her abilities as an ethnographer, without the allegation of hoaxing, and without the attribution of self-deception" (62).

Unlike Mead who is a pivotal figure in anthropology albeit her reputation was radically shaken by the Freeman's comments, Zora Neale Hurston is another largely overlooked anthropologist analyzed through this text for several reasons. Hurston was not given proper credit for her innovative work and

research methods implemented during her fieldwork in Florida, Jamaica, and Haiti. If Mead was ridiculed hypothetically for being a woman and an innovative one at the time with theories of cultural determinism, Hurston was a woman of colour and has not earned her PhD. She was trained under Franz Boas, but she never completed her PhD. Being a woman of colour was clearly one of the major reasons that her important studies and avant-garde research methods have been ignored. Excluding women of colour or women who have done extensive anthropological research, but have not earned a PhD degree from the overall anthropological canon is an important focal point of feminist anthropology. Hurston's work *Tell my Horse* (1938) is an incredibly intense journey through the Caribbean culture and the power of voodoo. Hurston deeply believed in fully immersing in one's culture in order to understand it to its fullest.

Entering into the minds of the participants and viewing things with their eyes was one of the key principles she believed in. Coming from a rural area in Florida, her historical roots made her believe that she is qualified to immerse herself into the Caribbean culture. This approach of a "native" among the "natives" has been problematized by Rodriguez (1998) who argues that the native remains the knowable, while the knower is always the objective observer. As she puts it,

the single status of ethnographer as objective knower not only comers the Native as the knowable, static, simple object but upholds the researcher as superior, civilized, and complex. Conversely, the criterion for being the objective knower is to be not-Native. (17)

Yet interestingly enough, Mikell (1982) notes that it was through anthropology that Hurston, "was able to distance herself from black culture of the Caribbean and of Florida and to stand back as an 'outsider' subjecting the behavior of the blacks there to close scrutiny" (219). Mikell also notices a lack of interest regarding Hurston's methods, although the 1950s and 1960s were euphoric regarding the new emphasis on the emic (the insider's view), versus the etic (the view of the outsider). Possibly again, the reason behind this could be the sheer fact that Hurston was a woman of color and thus got dropped out of the anthropological canon, which is one of the points of critique of later feminist anthropology. And yet, Hurston's contribution to anthropology should not be boiled down to her ability to immerse herself into the cultures of the Caribbean and Jamaica, but rather in her pioneering efforts toward theorizing the African diaspora, and her methodological innovations (McClaurin, 2001).

Hurston achieved an extremely honest approach to things, something that Malinowski might have failed at and yet he is irrevocably part of the anthropological canon. His dilemmas regarding his work with natives were ex-

posed through the posthumous publication of the *Diary in the Strict Sense of the Word* covering the period of his fieldwork in 1914-1915 and 1917-1918 in New Guinea and the Trobriand Islands. This diary was brutally honest, and according to his words was made as “a means of self-analysis.” Hurston has likewise carried honestly this unresolved conflict of the emic and the etic that is, the value judgement of the outsider, the knower, and the insider, the knower with less fame and recognition. As Mikell points out, “she becomes what the people are, experiencing what they experience, then stands back and says, ‘The Haitian people are gentle and lovable, except for their enormous and unconscious cruelty’” (220). Hurston was to some extent influenced by Ruth Benedict, who was also trained under Boas, but she managed to move past Benedict’s insistence on the paramount presence of psychological configurations that she believed all culture possess. Perhaps, it was her own understanding of slavery and racial discrimination that made her understand that colonialism has been a major defining factor in shaping the cultural forces in Haiti, rather than some given psychological traits. Her understanding of these factors, her outrage with male chauvinism, colour segregation and class oppression, made her in the eyes of what I refer to as “male biased anthropology,” a non-objective anthropologist. The angry outsider resonates in her writings yet she somehow balances it nicely with the calm insider perspective.

Phyllis Mary Kaberry is also known for her work exclusively dedicated to the important role that women play in the societal structure. This was clearly a controversial topic at the time (first half of the 20th century) as women were either neglected in ethnographic research or their roles were mainly located within the reproductive/nurturing/private sphere. Instead, Kaberry focused much of research on the sacred life and significant role of Aboriginal women in the society. Her advisor Elkin has encouraged her to do research among the aboriginal communities of West Australia. During her 3 years of fieldwork, she mainly focused on genealogies, religion, the social and economic organization of women, and similarly to Hurston who did not overlook the paramount effect of colonization on the Haitian community, she took into account the effects of the European contact. Her work, *Aboriginal Women: Sacred and Profane* (1939) was subject to fervent criticism for arguing that women had their own level of sacredness and that they were equal to men. In a largely male dominated anthropology at the time, women were nothing more than nurturing or erotic creatures that did not have much say in the social development. Due to these perspectives, even Kaberry’s advisor Elkin, confirmed his view on female inferiority. And yet, Kaberry rejects these views, stating:

Until recently, aboriginal woman has occupied rather an obscure place in Australian anthropology; and in popular imagination, at least, she has

too often been lost to view beneath the burdens imposed upon her by her menfolk [...] It was with the object of making a more specific study of the position of women in an aboriginal community [...] that I carried out research in North-West Australia, both in 1934 and in 1935 to 1936. (ix)

This work went against the more male centered assumptions of Malinowski, Roheim, and Warner that women were excluded from religious life in most societies. She also opposed the identification of women solely with the profane aspect of society. Thus she argues, “like the men they have their spiritual affiliations, their totems, their beliefs, their links with the Time Long Past” (x). Warner insisted on the prohibition placed on women for places that had their own emblems, but for Kaberry, this was not the criterion of defining the role of women in a society. Instead, she argued “If totem and totemite possess some sacred quality in common because of their relation to the totemic ancestors [...] then women as well as men have their share in this sacred heritage” (197).

These anthropologists and their works have been marginalized and omitted from the anthropological canon for various reasons. As Silverstein and Lewis (2016) lucidly conclude, “[t]he marginalization of these figures reflected both the colonial and racist temperament of the anthropology of their time; they were seen more as ‘informants’ than as full-fledged anthropologists, receiving minimal opportunities to move ahead in their careers—or even to complete their PhDs” (12).

Feminist Anthropology – Developmental Phases

Feminist anthropology had in general, two major points on its agenda: reduction of male bias in ethnography and research findings with inclusion of women’s voices in ethnographic research, and reacting against essentialist feminist theories developed predominantly in Europe and the USA. An important issue to be brought into perspective is that in its initial phase in the 60s when this anthropology aimed at being a study of women, thus correcting anthropology’s error of hardly including women’s voices in ethnography, it still produced a rather limited number of studies about women. Some of the more known studies of the period written by women about women are Phyllis Kaberry’s, *Women of the Grassfield* (1952), Denise Paulme’s *Women of Tropical Africa* (1963) and Audrey Richard’s *Chisungu* (1956). As previously noted Hurston’s much earlier ethnography of Voodoo in Jamaica and Haiti from 1937s remained largely unknown and unpopular as it came from both a woman of colour and one that has not gained her PhD thus never fully entering the canonical works of anthropology. Yet, what followed after the 60s, as Ardener (2015) points out was some kind of revivalism of anthropology of women. Ardener traces this revivalism to multiple factors

amongst which the upsurge of the feminist movement, the strengthened self-consciousness of female anthropologists about their womanhood, as well as the increased numbers of women readers and trained scholars (25).

Pine (2002) traces the strengthening of feminist anthropology of the 1970s in the general theoretical reappraisal in the social sciences, itself an aftermath of the widespread political unrest of the late 1960s. As she points out, "the Social scientists mainly found their inspiration in Marxist theory in their quest to understand the political and economic inequality, and to reassess issues of development and underdevelopment" (387). She also argues that there was a similar search for the roots of women's position as "the second sex" which led Western feminists to look to anthropology for ways of understanding women's situation in different social, political and economic orders. It is noteworthy then that the position of women in different society, the potential of egalitarian social order, and the roots of women's subordination were some of the main questions for feminists of this period when turning towards anthropology to find the answers.

This feminist anthropology started off by criticising the double male bias present in traditional anthropology. The first was that most anthropologists were male and that even regardless of whether they were male or female they operated within male dominated models of social organization. The second bias had to do with the reliance on predominantly male informants therefore bringing to the reader only the male view of the indigenous people. This anthropology then, at the time known as the anthropology of women, focused on what women said and did and on women's domains of action as well as the symbolic representation of female and male. Interestingly, one group of anthropologists building upon the Marxists premises (Leacock), thought of women's oppression as historical, while others (Ortner) argued that it is a universally given state of affairs. Regardless of their difference, they both ended arguing that much of women's subordination lies in their biology.

The contemporary stream of feminist anthropology can be located in the period from the 1980s onwards with its focus being not so much on the difference between male and female but rather on the differences between women through categories of class, race, gender and so forth. New themes of power, reproduction, sexuality, and work take an importance place here. One of the most prominent figures of this movement is Gayle Rubin, an American cultural anthropologist, widely known for her works on sexuality, sex, sadomasochism, pedophilia, prostitution, pornography, etc.

Anthropological Debates on the Subordination of Women – a Universal or a Historical Phenomenon?

Anthropology contributed to the critical reworking of the category of “woman” (Moore 1994, 10). Feminism in the 1970s was using inspiration from the cross-cultural research provided by anthropology to question the fixed notion of gender and gender roles. These data showing the variability in gender and gender roles, were to serve as a backbone for the feminist mission of the 1970s in showing that gender was a socially constructed rather than a naturally given category. However, as Moore puts it, these cross-cultural variables did not account for the universality of women’s subordination, which is why “anthropology developed two very important comparative theories” (10). Both theories build upon the same presumption of women being associated with nature, while men with culture (Ortner, 1974), that is, that women are linked to the domestic sphere as opposed to men linked with the public sphere (Rosaldo). In both instances, women’s reproductive functions and child care are the foundation for this particular connection. What Ortner uses to prove the universal second-class status of women in societies are three sets of cross-cultural anthropological data. These are cultural ideologies and informant’s statements that devalue women or give them a lesser role in society, social devices, and social structural arrangements that exclude women from participating in power-producing realms of the society.

Using an example to show the superficial power of women in societies, she moves on to discuss Lowie’s (1956) case study of the matrilineal tribe Crow, where

Women [...] had highly honorific offices in the Sun Dance; they could become directors of the Tobacco Ceremony and played, if anything, a more conspicuous part in it than the men; they sometimes played the hostess in the Cooked Meat Festival; they were not debarred from sweating or doctoring or from seeking a vision” (61).

However, “[w]omen [during menstruation] formerly rode inferior horses and evidently this loomed as a source of contamination, for they were not allowed to approach either a wounded man or men starting on a war party. A taboo still lingers against their coming near sacred objects at these times” (44).

This leads Ortner to conclude that the most frequent means of subordination across cultures, even in situations where women seemingly have power, manifest themselves in menstruation being a threat and sacred objects being taboo to the sight and touch of women. Her main point of departure is that every culture recognizes a distinction between the operation of nature and the

operation of culture where the latter is human consciousness trying to control and turn to its purposes the former. Herein lies the center of Ortner's argument, that in most cultures, women are identified with nature while men with culture, or putting it milder, that women are often recognized as part of culture yet have a deeper affinity with nature. Men on the contrary "are the "natural" proprietors of religion, ritual, politics, and other realms of cultural thought and action in which universalistic statements of spiritual and social synthesis are made" (Ortner 79). This very 70s argumentation of Ortner has been brought into question and critical reinterpretation by anthropologists (Moore, 1988; MacCormack and Strathern, 1980; Rosaldo, 1980) and feminists alike, the former criticising the universality of the categories of nature, culture, public and private. The latter critiques came from feminists of colour, lesbian feminists and feminists from the developed world, challenging the universal category of "woman."

Reevaluating/Reclaiming Women's Perspective

The previous sections have discussed the non-existent or passive role of women in many previous ethnographies, the omission from the anthropological canon of ethnographies done by women, especially if they were of colour, and the developmental phases of feminist anthropology. This exclusion has often been executed by lack of citations becoming effectively erased from the anthropological intellectual genealogy (Lutz 1990 cited in Silverstein & Lewis, 2016, 9). As Silverstein and Lewis point out:

Despite the looming presence of figures such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead in the English-speaking canon, "women" had no more than an incidental place in the history of the discipline. They seemed to have only supporting (or cameo) roles in many ethnographies, mentioned when reproduction or childrearing was discussed and appearing in (typically) non-speaking parts when marriage exchanges were transacted. Women were assumed to passively cooperate with men's desires and to have little independent social existence or agency of their own. (9)

They also emphasize the overall lack of women in the 60s as senior faculty or junior colleagues which was a discouraging moment for women regarding their prospect on the job market. Marriage and faculty were also considered as inevitable phenomena that would make women give up their anthropological careers. Additionally, the overall neglecting of women's voice as less valuable, more personal and subjective, has led some women anthropologists to revisit certain ethnographies, that is, return to sites of previous research. As Silverstein and Lewis point out, there were a number of instances of such revisiting

among which Jane Goodale's *Tiwi Wives* (1971), documenting the ways in which Tiwi women understood their marriage system and showing that there was a drastic discrepancy with an earlier (male) account (Hart and Pilling 1960). Her study has shown that, "rather than being mere pawns in a manipulative system that exchanged women even before they were born, women understood themselves as powerful arbiters, able also to pursue romantic bonds." (10). The list of other studies that followed among which Marilyn Strathern's *Women In Between* (1972), Annette Weiner's *Women of Value, Men of Renown* (1976), and Yolanda and Robert Murphy's, *Women of the Forest* (1974), reexamining work done earlier (under Robert Murphy's name) among the Mundurucu of the Amazonian rain forest (Murphy 1960) clearly bring into question the previous assumptions of the universal subordination of women that were earlier advocated by Ortner and Rosaldo through different interpretive lenses.

Concluding Remarks

This paper has looked into the evolution of feminist anthropology, its points of reaction to the male dominated anthropological canon, and the several women anthropologists whose works were neglected either because they were written by women or were about women and their active role in the social organization. We have discussed the works and controversies revolving around Mead's, Hurston's, and Kaberry's ethnographies driven by different motives. Mead was attacked for being hoaxed by her informants most probably because of her revolutionary ideas of cultural determinism, Hurston was largely ignored with her innovative methodology for being a woman of colour and for not having earned her degree, while Kaberry was fervently attacked for an ethnography on Aboriginal women in which she argued that they had their own level of sacredness and that they were equal to men.

We have also traced the developmental phases of feminist anthropology from being a study of women, to being that of gender, to finally molding itself into a recognized sub-discipline of anthropology. As such, this subfield has produced more than just studies that revisited previous ethnographies, which have either ignored women's role in the society or have boiled them down to being an inferior subject in the social organization. In its later stages feminist anthropology came forward with radical critiques of previously undisputed works, like the prominent collection of Clifford and Marcus (1996) *Writing Culture*.

In the introduction to this collection of essays, Clifford gives some credit to the feminist theorizing having great potential for rethinking ethnographic writing, and in debating historical, and political construction of identities. Yet, only a few sentences later, he explains why essays by feminist anthropologists have been excluded from the collection. As he points out, "we decided to in-

vite people doing ‘advanced’ work on our topic” (20), clearly extracting women from this group of anthropologists. He goes on to say:

feminism had not contributed much to the theoretical analysis of ethnographies as texts [...] we could not draw on any developed debates generated by feminism [...] Feminist ethnography has focused either on setting the record straight about women or on revising anthropological categories [...] It has not produced either unconventional forms of writing or developed reflection on ethnographic textuality as such. (20)

Ruth Behar and Deborah Gordon came out with their reactionary collection of essays, *Women Writing Culture* (1995). In her opening essay, Behar stresses her frustration with Clifford’s explanation for the exclusion of women. She ironically says: “to be a woman writing culture became a contradiction in terms: women who write exceptionally are not feminists enough, while women who write as feminists write in ignorance of the textual theory that underpins their own texts” (5). The collection of essays attests to the manifold ethnographic innovations of women anthropologists, such as storytelling, drama, and use of fiction. Behar also mentions Hurston, Deloria, Benedict, and Mead who were for various reasons excluded from the canon or a recognized place in the academy, most likely because they shared “the impatience with that flat impersonal voice that was becoming the norm in the ethnographies of their time” (18).

The few studies we mentioned through this text and the recent proliferation of feminist anthropologists dealing with issues of human rights, domestic abuse, environmental issues, etc. point to the fact that these feminist ethnographies have pioneered “the centrality of reflexivity, sought out and acknowledged collaboration with interlocutors, including participatory action research” (Olesen 2011 cited in Silverstein & Lewis, 2016, 13). They have also emphasized “personal narratives and storytelling both to highlight women’s voices and to mount a vigorous challenge to “top-down” knowledge production” (Silverstein & Lewis, 13). This proves the fact of the immense innovative strength of feminist anthropology and ethnography, of its capacity to break away with that ‘flat impersonal voice’ of male objectivity and to break away from the modes of canonical ethnographic writing, bringing in new freshness and putting the emic before the etic. There is no doubt then, that as Silverstein and Lewis point out “feminist anthropologists clarify the stakes in particular ethnographic situations, paving the way for possible interventions that may contribute to meaningful change” (27).

The history of women’s ethnographic writing proves that women have experimented extensively and creatively in their efforts to surpass the flatness of ‘the impersonal voice’ and to translate and give meaning to foreign cultural

experiences. The few works we revisited are a proof of women's bravery and capacity to experiment with diverse writing styles, including personal narratives, oral history, memoir, fictional forms, feminist critique, and meditations on the fieldwork process. The complexity of these works shows their capacity for a more reflexive, polyphonic ethnography that is more capable of understanding and hearing the emic (native) perspectives and voices.

Works Cited:

- Ardener, Shirley. "The Social Anthropology of Women and Feminist Anthropology." *Anthropology Today*. 1. 5 (1985): 24-26.
- Behar, Ruth, and Deborah A. Gordon, Eds. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- Clifford, James. "Introduction: Partial Truths." *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. James Clifford & George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 1-26.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, Eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- Freeman, D. "Fa'apua'a and Margaret Mead." *American Anthropologist*. 91 (1989): 1017-22.
- Goodale, Jane. C. *Tiwi Wives: A Study of Women of Melville Island, North Australia*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1971.
- Hurston, Zora Neale. *Tell My Horse: Voodoo and Life in Haiti and Jamaica*. New York: J.B.Lippincott.com, 1938.
- Kaberry, Phillis, M. *Aboriginal Women: Sacred and Profane*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939.
- Kaberry, Phillis, M. *Women of the Grassfields: A Study of the Economic Position of Women in Barmenda, British Cameroons*. UK: Taylor & Francis, 1952.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1989.
- Mead, Margaret. *Coming of Age in Samoa*. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1928.
- MacCormack, Carol and Strathern, Marilyn (eds). *Nature, Culture and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- McClaurin, Irma. *Black Feminist Anthropology: Theory, Politics, Praxis, and Poetics*. New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 2001.
- Mikell, Gwendolyn. "When Horses Talk: Reflections on Zora Neale Hurston's Haitian Anthropology." 43.3 (1982): 218-230.
- Moore, Henrietta, L. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity P, 1988.
- Moore, Henrietta, L. *A Passion for Difference: Essays in Anthropology and Gender*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1994.

- Murphy, Robert. *Headhunter's Revenge*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1960.
- Murphy, Yolanda, and Robert F. Murphy. *Women of the Forest*. New York: Columbia UP, 1974.
- Ortner, Sherry. "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" *Woman, Culture, Society*. Ed. Michelle Rosaldo and Lousie Lamphere. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1974. 67-88.
- Paulme, Denise. *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1963.
- Richards, Audrey. *Chisungu: a girl's initiation ceremony among the Bemba of Northern Rhodesia*. London: Faber, 1956.
- Rosaldo, Michelle. "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on feminism and Cross-Cultural Understanding." *Signs*. 5.3 (1980): 389-417.
- Rodriguez, Monica Russel, "Confronting Anthropology's Silencing Praxis: Speaking Of/From a Chicana Consciousness." *Qualitative Inquiry*. 4.1 (1998): 15-40.
- Silverstein, Leni, M. & Ellen, Lewis. "Introduction: Anthropologies and Feminisms. Mapping Our Intellectual Journey." *Mapping Feminist Anthropology in the Twenty First Century*. Ed. Ellen Lewin and Leni M. Silverstein. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2016. 6-41.
- Shankman, Paul. "The "Fateful Hoaxing" of Margaret Mead: A Cautionary Tale." *Current Anthropology* (54).1 (2013): 51-70.
- Strathern, Marilyn. *Women In Between: Female Roles in a Male World: Mount Hagen, New Guinea*. London: Seminar P, 1972.
- Weiner, Annette B. *Women of Value, Men of Renown: New Perspectives in Trobriand Exchange*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1976.

PRISVOJITI ŽENSKE TAČKE GLEDIŠTA: FEMINISTIČKA ANTROPOLOGIJA I ANDROCENTRIČNA PRISTRANOST

U posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća sve se više vodi diskusija o ulozi dijaloga u antropologiji, naročito nakon antropološkog okreta osamdesetih kada se počelo na tu disciplinu gledati ne kao razumijevanje kulture iznutra, sa tačke gledišta njenog pripadnika, već kao "ispisivanje kulture," dok se etnograf smatrao epistemološkim diktatorom, osobom koja nije sposobna uspostaviti dijaloški odnos sa svojim predmetima istraživanja. I zaista jedan od naistaknutijih problema koji je onemogućavao stvaranje dijaloškog ozračja jednakosti između antropologa i kulture drugoga je bio odnos moći. Ovaj rad nastoji ponovno razmotriti feminističku antropologiju, iscrtavajući njene sastavne dijelove, izvorno nadahnuće i glavne poticaje na djelovanje, uglavnom u vezi sa naglašenom pristranošću discipline prema muškarcima. Ta se pristranost uglavnom ogledala u monološkom, androcentričnom poimanju i istraživanju kultura.

Kako bi iscrtao ove aspekte i obznanio veću jednakost unutar discipline od njenih najranijih dana za razliku od ostalih društvenih nauka (npr. Margaret Mead i Ruth Benedict su bile među najistaknutijim antropološkinjama), ovaj rad izučava djela ranijih antropološkinja koja su često isključivana iz kanona. On takođe podvlači postojanje naglašene pristranosti prema muškarcima u etnografiji i antropologiji uopšte, koja je podstaknula rađanje feminističke antropologije sposobne da promišlja vlastitu ulogu i preuzme odgovornost za etnografski rad.

Ključne riječi: feministička antropologija, prisvajanje, dijalog, podređenost, moć u domaćinstvu, identitet, dvojne opreke.