

From Archaeological Problems to Developmental Issues and Beyond

Alain Marliac

Archaeologist, Director of Research, l'Institut de Recherches pour le Développement (IRD, formerly ORSTOM), 32 Av. Henri Varagnat, 93143 Bondy Cedex, France

Peoples in developing countries today have to cope with the various knowledge they dispose of, under different representations : 1. the scientific or western one including technological or professional ones, 2. theirs, controlled by their world vision ethnically or locally defined and 3. difficult to grasp, which is the mixture of the two. Drawing aside from this formulation which, as usually with old words and under the Modern Constitution, would strongly tend to reduce their connotation to something definitely stilted, we have tried here to ponder upon this possible moving entity which is not only under the pressure of multiple and changing situations and constraints, but also, under the threat of a scientific knowledge whose indisputability is taken for granted nowadays on the side of Nature and also, consequently, on the side of Culture and cultures analyzed and defined by social sciences. This essay - drawn from my own archaeological fieldwork experiences and transferred, from anthropological knowledge on North Cameroon populations and from other examples - will be then epistemological and political in linking knowledge to situations including many other dimensions and entities. For developing peoples, it aims at illustrating the general issues of development which are built on Science, cause and product of Western European development.

From general point of view, admittedly, Development has often failed in non-western societies, except by aping itself when in new countries or being copied by groups interested by some of its products, material as well as spiritual (Hobart 1993b : 1). But a question still lasts: is it a success, a wreck or a non-failure? Examples have been picked up from archaeological fieldworks, publications and transfer on the spot, as well as from historico-archaeological debates today scattered worldwide (as the so-called *Afrocentrism* question), which point at sociocultural problems where knowledge on identity (racial, ethnic, national) are at issue. These examples will appear - I believe - meaningful for development problems' and for development in general. Defining and selecting criteria for action and argument depend on different knowledge and of their weight, including of course the scientific ones. Any decision, any choice, relies upon the knowledge available and the ways it becomes available or not, manageable or not. "*Le transfert des techniques des sociétés industrielles vers les pays en voie de développement qu'ils échouent ou qu'ils réussissent, transforment les sociétés traditionnelles, leurs environnements et leurs bases matérielles.*" (Latour and Lemonnier in Latour and Lemonnier (eds) 1994 : 20).

Within these development situations the question of knowledge on which this choice is founded is then pivotal. This, necessarily, raises the question of this knowledge's nature, composition, its free circulation and use. I will consider here knowledge in themselves (their nature, translatability, etc...), and also with their social status, their social weight (*i.e.* the ways they are taken into account within societies' links and exchanges).

During the eighties and nineties, the concept of *indigenous knowledge* flourished as a possible and powerful resource

disdained for a long time by Science (Brokensha *et al.* 1980), but it may be useful regarding the difficulties and consequences met (Hobart 1993b). Agrawal (1995) wrote a sound short review and restatement of this domain but did not advance a solution towards its possible co-working with scientific knowledge.

If modern knowledge did not succeed to solve development issues and sometimes raised new ones like the "*demographic bomb*", because - in my opinion - the nature, definition and links of this knowledge have not been investigated enough *per se* (*op.cit.*: 433), and also because this knowledge has been imposed. If a scientific component is totally or partially integrated in it, it is an unknown mixing of knowledge which carries any decision along.

Its composition thus, should be thoroughly examined not only through the words and claims but also during the building, in the field or in the lab, or during ordinary daily life.

How is Archaeology concerned?

There is a flow of claims, mainly in the USA, for balanced history in the Universities' historical curricula, and many attacks what seems a racist opinion of Black Africa's history (histories?). These declarations, either pointing at a European misconception, prejudice (racism?) or at a 'European Africanism' (Obenga 2001), are accompanied by accusations of plunders and lootings of African past vestiges during the colonial periods. As for Archaeology *stricto sensu*, in developing countries of Africa, the debates concerning Black Africa's past have taken place since C. A. Diop's first publications (1954). Most often, two challenges are at issue:



1. Black Africa as cradle of mankind and black cultures as origins of all the other^I, vs ,
2. Black Africa as an ahistorical, wild, backward and borrowing continent, full of tribes and sorcerers (Geschiere 1999 : 212).

There are also various other positions occupying the conceptual space between these extremes. They all depend on the problem of the knowledge's value and their strength, and on the availability and translatability of knowledge on this topic. These are being tied also with their reciprocal treatments during confrontation-combination which induces the sociopolitical questions of the distribution of powers and rights in the societies concerned (free press, free opinion, free communication vs any totalitarianism and free from any *délit d'opinion*).

A lot of publications and conferences concerning West's (*i.e.* European mainly), responsibilities, insufficiencies and guilt have sprung. Within this domain of discussion upon the 'race notion' and reassessment of black Africa's history, a lot of publications have been made (*e.g.* Diop 1954 and 1979, Ki-Zerbo 1978, Lugan 1989, Bernal [1991] 1999, M'bokolo 1992, 1995, Froment 1996, Lefkowitz and Roger 1996, Fauvelle-Aymar *et al.* 2000, Marliac 2001a, Obenga 2001) and they have been followed by numerous books or articles from pros and cons. They are more or less situating themselves on the verge of the domains of history or archaeology^{II} but appear to be intertwined with these disciplines at least by their words, the content of which being vague.

Sometimes, people involved, even involuntarily, in a case, do not escape from being prosecuted in courts as for the Kennewick Man file in the USA, or the Ayodhya mosque case in India (Ganesh *et al.* 2003).^{III}

Finally, exemplifying this shaky situation, nowadays some knowledge - concerning Black Africa's past - completely out of the current scientific stream are, nevertheless, published (*e.g.* Dika Akwa 1985).

Race

The common accepted and 'correct' answer, spread all over the planet, is that 'race' is a wrong term to classify Human beings. Science has already argued (Froment 1996), that men share many common features and that 'race' has to be abandoned. 'Race' has, scientifically, no value. But the question is then how is it scientifically established or destroyed? And what is Science?^{IV} Nevertheless, this one way 'dogma' that 'Science tells the truth', is still widely dominating opinions over the world. It has taken place everywhere, from primary schools up to universities, media, films, TV shows, exhibitions, courts, etc. and lately in Durban, South Africa. It could be baptized *à la mode* and neglected, however, it is only confined to writings, private meetings and films. But it is impossible, in the view of the quarrels, claims, slaughters, riots and wars sometimes, which spring everywhere arguing from these writings and claims to. interpret any

event along the races differences⁵. Peoples still rely on 'race' as a distinguishing factor and consequently many countries have become unfriendly.

At different levels and places (universities, unions, students' associations, various clubs and parties..), constructed theories, models and "facts" founded on this apparently balancing world vision, overtly or not, wind around the 'race' notion. They are most often, used for a political discourse and sometimes political actions^V. The scientific knowledge is almost always mobilized, but if science is the touchstone claimed on both sides: Afroamerican scientists and their momentary allies^{VI} vs their opponents, there must be a contradiction somewhere. Bernal vs Lefkowitz and Rogers McLean's debate is, from this point of view, typical.^{VII}

I have tentatively showed by analyzing the notion of 'race' used during the arguments aroused by Diop's publications, that it is the use of this term as a resource and not as a problem which raises the quarrel (Marliac 2001a). In a way, C. A. Diop - justifiably motivated by its own status as a black - drew nearer to the fundamentals: how to define **race**. But he failed to solve the problem.

In fact, race is everyday and everywhere recognized by common ordinary knowledge, and consequently has its value. This one is denied any signification by some scientific analyses (Froment 1996) which are, I think, largely insufficient even from their own point of view. 'Race' still remains conspicuous anywhere and always, for passers-by as well as for forensic pathologists studying human bones (who thus contradict some other scientists; see Gill 2000), and for visitors in various Museums around the world.^{VIII} Diop's hesitation upon the notion of 'race' (Marliac 2001a) is explained by his blind trust in Science (as he conceived of), tied up with the however throbbing query: what is Truth for his every day's life as 'black' and for his black brothers, individually everywhere in the world? This short review shows how historico-archaeological knowledge is easily controversial and bound with political conflicts at once^{IX}.

Locally

Peoples in Africa are not - except the *élites* (and to which degree?) - trapped through education by the Nature/Culture constitution - that I will further explain - within which the scientific knowledge is encapsulated, even if schooling^X would catch them up in near future. (see also Field 2000, Golan 1991). They keep mingling, juxtaposing, adapting, translating units from one set to another, or flatly ignoring some of them, new as well as old. I easily believe that any other common people would do the same. The problem is to know how and to which degree it proceeds. How peoples are, slowly or rapidly, engaged in integrating pieces of this modern knowledge, while introducing ideas, theories, pictures, engines, items and commodities from the West in their lives?

Representative democracy can be conflictual with respect to cultures within which peoples want to live and which they want to promote for their children. Golan (1991)

shows how confusely Inkhata, the Zulu political association, writes a Zulu history which would turn to be also a nationalist history for any black people in South-Africa. A 'one man one vote' philosophy of democracy, by the way clearly supported by Golan, is contradictory to the respect due to any minority/majority, be it ethnic, or cultural, as in Canada (See Taylor 1994)^{XI} or, due to *horresco referens*, overtly or covertly racial, as today's South-Africa, Zimbabwe and in some other countries.

In Ivory Coast, the Eotile people revived their ethnic history, language and customs (Perrot 1988) in 1960's, by taking advantage of the collapse of their conquerors, the Sanwi. They returned back to the islands they originated from, found artefacts and then gathered at their founding village Monobaha from where they carried back many things, such as, pipes, grinding stones. The path leading them to the past was constructed from traditions, visions, dreams and material cultures, and finally materialized by recent cement-made steles.

In Diamaré (North Cameroon), the Zumaya, today assimilated as Fulani, once used sherds of their own culture, which they buried secretly at night in the fields of another people, to claim afterwards these lands as theirs! It reminds of what the Poles did at the end of WW II about Silesia within the newly established Oder-Neiss border, to prove that Slav presence antedates the Germans' arrival, not to speak of the Israelis in the Sinai and of the Chinese in Sinkiang and Tibet. Things are good evidences when they bear indisputable marks of their cultural making.^{XII}

In North Cameroon, where I have made fieldwork for years (Marliac 2003), the question remains to be explored out of the University audiences which generally followed C. A. Diop and the Afrocentrist stream (Essomba 1992). We still clearly need studies (and field works ones too) on the state of affairs, e.g. in schools curricula, villagers, public opinion, *élites* and among decision-makers and medias leaders, to define, if possible, what these audiences have done with archaeological results (*i.e.* with published general studies, mainly within the historical or today's realms). It is impossible to measure or estimate now properly, to what degree did archaeology influence national history as learned and taught, from home to school and college, and then during a lifetime. Research is still strongly needed.

Knowledge co-operations

The mixing of the two knowledge (or more), would need careful and precise fieldwork examination and record of including the *mediator* at work on the case, with the help of other sciences such as anthropology, linguistics, psycho-sociology, etc. It goes from a 'zero choice', where one of them - generally the one coming from outside and thereby, alien - is flatly rejected, misunderstood (or unpalatable) to the total assimilation of one, generally the techno-scientific one through different **reworkings** (Horton 1982 : 222), borrowings, passive assimilation and translations. Thanks to multiple treatments of the knowledge at hand!

From a general point of view, the mixing/seizing^{XIII}, begins as soon as the anthropologist studies the other cultures and as soon as the archaeologist excavates. The vestiges unearthed can not but be recognized by the model/pattern^{XIV} in place in the researcher's brain and by the ordinary 'ethnic' knowledge of the observers sitting at the top of the pit. The excavation itself changes the minds of the villagers living near it and sometimes related to it. But it remains unknown to what degree and how the people recognize such and such items of 'material culture' as theirs, or those of other groups when a transmitted tradition is named for years after such or such place. These attributions are of course debatable but not always out of reach and comprehension (Seignobos 2001). In Central Diamaré, what appears during excavations is often attributed to pagans (*haBe/kaado* or *kirdi*) with whom Muslim inhabitants do not want to have any kinship.

As an archaeologist, instead of asking, "*I have always wondered about what sense these partners*^{XV} *made of the published conclusions*" of my excavations (Marliac 2000a : 205), I should have noticed that people - becoming aware of my more or less sophisticated results or other published material - kept engaged, as elsewhere in the world, in making :

- Either new knowledge out of the two_(or more) knowledge at disposal, e.g. my archaeological published facts and explanations + their histories and myths + histories from their neighbours or past conquerors (Fulani in my region) + local ideologies or religions (mainly Islam in the case considered here). For this amalgamation thanks to different recipes including the school systems' ones, more or less replicated from the western ones, and the media systems broadcasting from inside and outside (Marliac 2000b).

- Or nothing, depending on their needs, will and situations.

Socio-political Archaeology

The first paragraph describes the archaeological public stage where peoples, experts, racists, liberals, journalists and so on, struggle over definitions, pictures, claims, etc., which are obviously related to sociopolitical questions, without straightly blaming archaeological science itself. But adaptations, *collages*, mingling, being still debatable, archaeology can not finally dodge the question of its own definition and status.

Archaeology as a science

Hall (1990: 64) broadly hinted to previous (*i.e.* white) South African archaeologists' works which were deliberately written under formalized language in such a way that prohibited understanding by white settlers, (as well as by black peoples, I would like to add), because it could have questioned their political supremacy^{XVI}. It also crosscuts Diop's contradictions between his personal feelings, need of *reconnaissance* as a black individual, and scientific 'facts' resumed and listed in so many writings (e.g. Froment 1996)^{XVII} concerning 'being black' or as said former President L. S. Senghor rightly:

I wonder how differently could S.-African archaeologists have written their records and conclusions and how could these 'facts' be translated in ordinary languages (Zulu, Xhosa, Afrikaans, English, Khoi Khoi, etc.), without losing a bit of scientificity, if not the entirety sometimes! So, the question should be asked again: what is Science?

However, I know by experience that researchers can impose their ways of comprehension, thanks to their prestige, through their technical language (or *jargon*). I lived this on the spot during excavations in Sahelo Sudanian North Cameroon and at the time when my social scientist colleagues were asked to expose and explain their job in front of non-experts, e.g.: administrative employees of my institute, technicians, villagers or laymen, even in Paris. Nobody in these audiences dared to ask anything because they do not possess the concepts and corresponding words and the way to integrate all this within a discourse...^{xviii} We can not know what happens in the minds of people who are attending; they are misunderstanding, partially comprehending or falling prey to the illusion of understanding, feeling emptiness, discovery, boredom? What we can ascertain is the only use of a technical language, the lack of exchange, and the total silence reigning in the room. Science speaks! Either people bows to **It** or ignore **It**, which signifies fear or the feeling of uselessness of critique. This rejoins also the problems of popularizing (i.e. translating, changing) sciences (McClancy and McDonough 1996), which entails the question of scientific knowledge, nature and its translatability without loss. Hall's sentence, so doing, expands the field of investigation towards this point.

In effect, his declaration would imply that scientific formulations are political means implemented to keep out the democratic discussion and that researchers are aware of it.

He, consequently, gives an 'off limits' definition of science^{xix}, which, from another vantage point, fits in my own question hereabout discussed: why is the continuous weight and domination of Science or scientific explanations (or sometimes would-be scientific), within decision-makings and opinion-buildings, still present even when they raise problems? Moreover, Hall implies - may be involuntarily - that there is Truth somewhere (Where? Hanging in the air?), to be discovered by Science (only?), and then uses and reformulates as an unquestionable standard of knowledge to guide political choices. How can a scientific analysis be reformulated or *reworked* as said Horton (1982) for this aim while remaining scientific?

A post-Marxist background relying usually on Science, is deductible from such a position^{xx}. Hall, based on this background, missed the target that Latour revealed (1991, 1999: 22, 33, 74, 361) and upon which we will return further: Science has been made to paralyze politics.³⁰

All the examples listed in the § 1, as well as the turn towards *indigenous knowledge*, are samples of

developmental problems in the ways they impinge on people's behaviour in Africa today by interfering with the representations they get of their past and of their identities. As said Latour and Lemonnier (1994 : 19): " ...ces techniques modernes ... si particulières dans leurs modes de fonctionnement et de développement ont, en bien des points du monde, attaqué, déplacé, vaincu toutes les autres... ". They illustrate - within the field of history-archaeology - difficulties of *Modern Constitution* today, which we will speak of further. These difficulties - the translation-mediation between these knowledge - are epistemological ones. Development is thus also an epistemological question as suggested also recently by Sen (2003) arguing on the topic of plundering of archaeological museums in Iraq, during the 2003 war. He claimed that the term **heritage** so frequently used by commentators, "...is the selective constructions and representations of the past by dominating powers and power structures and their relations to the others in the modern conditions of inequality" within a 'discourse space'.

Scrutinizing Archaeology

Archaeology as any knowledge, whenever necessary, is used under different ways of integration or adaptations and these ways are often hidden or badly known. The continuous condemnation of European enterprises in their so-called colonial pasts, quasi unanimously followed by researchers, schoolmasters, the medias and African *élites* is, not only anachronistic, but, through the misunderstanding of *Modern Constitution*, its birth and use, also often in contradiction with the available sources. It forgets also its similar use on European ancient cultures themselves from sixteenth-eighteenth century up to now.

These judgments are founded on the same recipes: moral, partial and iterated discourse on insufficient or ignored facts, added to anachronistic vantages and mainly a wrong analysis of what really happened. They are based on a sociological theory of socio-development which I think ill-adapted as it ignores Science's role and then turned into a moral advantage which can be used for any society anywhere. It boils down to the *liberal guilt*, efficient for western intellectuals and middle classes and then useful for political activities generally resulted in the global rejection of the West. Three techniques are generally used:

- to reexamine from a scientific vantage point what was said decades, if not centuries ago, which clearly depended on the knowledge and world visions of those times: the anachronistic method;

- reevaluate any scientific research: the usual and valuable scientific methods ;

- to refuse any opposed knowledge.

This debunking of errors does not avoid mistakes and interpretations itself, as there is no real and unique scientific reasoning (if this exists at a general level) in social sciences^{xxi} and because of this, so doing, destabilize what they try to use as a bedrock of their claims: Science. The solution is pushed towards an indefinite future where

mankind will have to build new politics. Moreover, it misses examining Science itself which their efforts contributed, however, to destabilize...

Constitutions

In different articles (e.g. Marliac 2001b, 2002b), I already raised the problem of the existence of different knowledge (and especially the difference between scientific knowledge and the other ones), and of their unavoidable confrontation and then mingling with others during the making of 'objects' for everyday life, community life, and both also for a lifetime. Perhaps, from these past arguments concerning *Modern Constitution* and its basic ontological dichotomy between Nature and Culture linked with Science, it could be said that I positioned too neatly the knowledge into two well delineated categories: the scientific ones and the other ones (ordinary, professional, ethnic, cultural and so on, if not individual), the global one versus the local one...

By criticizing the purification practice too narrowly which gave the Nature-Culture constitutional couple (N/C) and its strength, one could miss its inescapable counterpart: mediation or translation practices. Both practices can not but work together (Latour 1991: 14, 21). Researches and experiences show that these two categories of knowledge - as far as recognized - are constantly and variously mingled. It would have been a mistake while underlining the N/C dichotomy at the beginning and the purification at work, not to fully acknowledge the continuous work of mediation which is its pendant.

Science

In fact it is the *Modern Constitution* in our brains, which makes us speak of mingling the two knowledges. Empirical observations show that there is no mingling but - after the building - varied processes: separation and creation of two (or more/less in some other cultures) referential poles, which, Nature and Culture, were slowly along the centuries, considered in the West, as real. In his seminal writings, Latour (1991, 1995, 1999), shows that the current work of "*la vieille matrice anthropologique*", consisting of building knowledge by mixing, adding, using and making *collages* and *bricolages*, adapting things, instruments, ideas, dreams, gestures, etc (*i.e.* translating, which was the ways of all the so-called premodern cultures) is still at work. So why does purification still exist and reign over us?

The buildings of knowledge are identical from remote times up to now, but the use of tools and machines and the attribution of power, reality or force varied (Latour 1991: 139-147). Later in the Western knowledge - when the results of separating nature and culture appeared so successful^{xxiii} - it was consequently turned into an ontological dichotomy. This is called purification, and Nature appeared as that transcendent entity '*out there*', known only by Science. Culture was the rest. But prevailing working practice of *médiation* is hidden.

The apparent 'mistake' noted above, has emerged, not

from a misconception of the *Modern Constitution* practices, I believe. But from the ascertainment that the two branches of the N/C dichotomy (purification/mediation) are still commonly and continuously included within development situations themselves with different socio-cultural use and with different contents. Thus Purification continues today to build the dipole. Nature became the only external and unquestionable entity, represented by Science, whose denotation has changed into that of a universal judge and the solving power of which can address all problems, including faith. Significantly the word took a vast public place pushing away the various other sciences which, by the way, would not advocate for such a prominent situation.

Science as Court of Justice

From the 19th century onwards^{xxiii}, approximate, mixed, imposed solutions or bricolages of knowledge have always been made between different groups and societies. Experimented, chosen or rejected, totally or not and by using scientific knowledge, this one sometimes is hidden, insufficiently explored or stated for reasons we will show further. Researchers shift either to Nature, or to Culture (or Social) or to the mediator: Language (Latour 1991: 13), without highlighting the mediation processes that created the results and built the dipolar 'reality'. But nowadays, when used, the so-called 'scientific' results are consciously or unconsciously, attributed to one of the constitutional dipole: Nature.

Science - to keep apart from sciences - is at work within societies today clearly as a sociopolitical tool. Anybody refers to **It** as the warrant of truth. If action succeeds under its leading, thanks are expressed to **It**; even if it fails, **It** is not blamed, especially in social sciences^{xxiv}. Within their realm, the other bearers of knowledge are identified variedly (*i.e. they do not understand...^{xxv}, they are all but dopes... it is an illusion*)^{xxvi}, or cursed as *reactionary*, *passéiste*, etc. Even Malaysia Premier Mahathir, *orang melayu* himself, complained (wrongly I think) about the Malay backwardness (1970) !

The so-called *indigenous knowledge* of the 80-90's itself, evoked herein above, is nothing but an **artefact** made by a scientific examination and it has been rightly criticized, for instance by Agrawal (2002b)^{xxvii}. The same attitude appears often in the so-called *community archaeology's* works (Marshall 2002: 211-219). Cultures differ! Yes, but the one of ours remains with his analytical 'scientific' tool-kit, often unconsciously and involuntarily, as **The** measuring standard; natures, -the cultures' partners -, disappear for the profit of Nature as defined by Science.

Sciences which are the ways of working and establishing a **fact** is complicated to describe, but with the quality to be depicted and explained (Hacking 1989, Stengers 1993, Latour 1995, etc), become unquestionable under the name of Science. This attribution (choice?) is made under the threat of Nature which became undisputable. The social sciences themselves entrenched in their mode of



Pratnatattva

explanation of social behaviours by replacing them by other social factors which they, alone, discover (and by which people, unaware of this, are supposed to be *manipulated*) and they grasp the big umbrella of Science to escape critique. Facts built by scientists do not keep the status of representations but are promoted immediately to the realm of Truth (Latour 1999: 52-53).

What for Development?

Techno-scientific knowledge, is a product and the basement of the overall world vision, was born, built and strengthened in the 16th century and onwards in Europe., Then, it achieved its worldwide reigning today (and called *Modern Constitution* by Latour 1991). This constitution distinguishes and opposes, as we have seen before, ontologically Nature and Culture (N/C). The former, known by Science, is nowadays the ultimate standard of Truth and Reality (Latour 1991). And this knowledge taught and learned from school up to universities and expanded widely by the media and assimilated completely by western majorities, is functioning or not functioning, mixed with other knowledge, in a lot of activities around the planet nowadays. Thereby, it is raising innumerable developmental problems, discussions and quarrels, 'natural as well as cultural', down from the individual and local level up to the global one as we have seen before (Hobart 1993a). These problems occur ceaselessly even in these would-be modern societies as ours (Callon *et al.* 2001).

By the way, it should be stressed that it is the terms - non-scientific/non-science- which are operational in discourse, rather than those like scientific/science. Thus the explanation of: *What is Science?* - a delicate and fundamental question- can be put aside, if not covered up (See the 'debates' on Creationism , or Darwinism).

Thus, the problem which was seemingly that of definition and explanation of the varied choices people eventually made or not made, while holding these knowledge within their reach^{xxviii}, including rejection of any external knowledge, is deflated. Within this set of data, opinions, facts, and artefacts lies, errors and controversies, if not riots and wars take place. Science became a prominent tool, extolled by numerous success and loaded with all the prestige, weight and power of the social groups, carriers and distributors of a modern knowledge and most often it is encapsulated also within the language of the most powerful countries in the world. Consequently - in every case if necessary - it bears on such and such decision together with its supporters and allies: scientists (anthropologists included), oil companies, governments, local political decision-makers, neo-cons, traders, sects, bankers, NGOs, journalists, politicians, nationalists, imperialists, US liberals, terrorists, Marxists, etc. who momentarily or not aggregate. These allies, overtly or covertly, can support financially scientific research investments (labs, researchers-engineers, products, tests), dissemination, industrial development. In return, by selling scientific hardware for research and technology and products technologically mastered by these techniques and

industrially replicable, they make money^{xxix}, and plan a communicational grid that covers the society and repel any adversary argument contained in book, articles and media debates.

Science, by establishing itself (and being established) as the only inescapable method of knowing, applying, and sometimes finding answers^{xxx}, prevents peoples' from living a political democratic life. This resulted in making up their minds freely among all the available information like the Eotile did, and like all the so-called premodern people (Europeans included), did from Prehistory to History. The turn towards *indigenous knowledge*, the *Afrocentrist* claims, the 'race' debate, the Zulu history, here above exposed and added to so many other ethnic and nationalist questions all over the planet (*e.g.* Black Consciousness), are clear examples of a real problem where Science - as an entity - is unable to give any absolute solution but remains omnipresent, and sociologically heavy enough to prevail often over other choices^{xxxi}.

Media and experts in the West explain these situations by discourses or images, as remnants of old and primitive customs and creeds or mediaeval practices that we should have overcome. There are also post-Marxist sociological would-be explanations like : '*they have been manipulated*' or '*they follow illusions*' , or they obey '*les vieux démons*'^{xxxii}, which is a *Modern Constitution* interpretative consequence. It more and more resounds as anathemas betraying the flight from examining really what is science. More, it is a dismissal towards ordinary peoples from Europe and from the rest of the world as said Latour (*ibid.* note 30).

What for Archaeology?

It is usual to snigger while declaring archeology useless or, at least, out of place in the institutions devoted to research on and for development. The various examples herein already displayed, show the opposite.

Knowledge deadlocks

The controversies depicted above show that peoples are more and more discussing upon the facts they need for bettering their lives, knowledge growth, self consciousness and agency. They also show that **Development** is less and less accepted, just as it is, without any opposition. Science which backs Development is more and more recognized just as a partner more or less strong, respected and efficient in the controversies or applications. There is also continuous appeals to courts for settlements of controversies and conflicts and the necessity to control them for powers in place either by propaganda, laws or simply, sometimes military, strength. These examples are topical here in their revealing that development is a problem of knowledge, exchanges of knowledge and translation of knowledge. They parallel those existing in other fields of Development.

Michon and Bouamrane (2000: 56) clearly argued within the realm of forestry sustainability : "*Dans les politiques*

de gestion des terres forestières, la référence au naturel qui est à la base des projets de conservation a longtemps justifié l'éviction des populations locales, quel que soit leur degré d'interférence avec l'écosystème protégé ". Who, except Science, gives the definition of what is 'natural'? And who will support this opinion but sociopolitical or economical groups interested, often linked with governmental powers? Jean Boutrais shows also that centralization of sustainable resources management which implies a modern notion of this imposed and imported management, is followed by deprivation of the inhabitants' rights and customs. And he straightly concludes: "*Partout, les gestions dites modernes des ressources renouvelables ont provoqué des effets désastreux.*" (2000: 150). Who made money through these modern sustainability projects?^{xxxiii}

Similarly, the *melting-pot* projects which crown everywhere a would-be human resource policy, is showered with fulsome praise in the Maastricht West. They show continuously its daily and repeated failures, blow ups as well as its worsening political future. This is echoed all around the planet from England to Afghanistan, France, Somaliland and Canada.

The globalization projects, the 'planetary village', "*seem to imply a continued or even intensified heterogeneity in cultural terms*" (Meyer and Geschiere 1999: 1). Who will get profit from what this policy entails: huge immigration waves, Third World countries socio-economic level collapses, disintegrations of identities, riots if not civil wars, global instability?

Knowledge politics

The transfer from developed countries to developing ones is then a global political problem, global in its founding on modern knowledge and in its linking with many if not all the elements of the groups concerned. It is global also through its overflowing the whole world while brought on explorers' shoulders, dragged with all the tools, imported machines, shown by all the medias displaying its success, beauty, efficiency and the discourses of it in its own language!

Its drawbacks which more and more peoples and researchers are interested by are best described, within the social sciences domain, by Hobart's expression "*growth of ignorance*" (Hobart 1993b) that points to the enormous quantity of information lost during scientific building. For instance, what do Giziga peasants, Mofou villagers or Borno townsmen of North-Cameroon-Nigeria area today, make with my or other experts' pottery typologies, diagrams, maps, datings, cultures (Salakien in Marliac 2004, Holl 2002), for themselves sometimes daily, for their understanding or building and possible praising of their pasts? The wider the scientific explanation, the more it appears useless to situations in the field whatever they are. What was shown by M. Callon *et al.* (2001) for hard or natural sciences-the re-entry into macrocosm-is worse for social sciences which hardly succeed in finding solutions or answers to everyday development problems.

History and Hope

The problem at hand now is what to do with a general knowledge for local situations? Instead of starting from a general, 'global' knowledge which is only constructed by reducing local occurrences and then fossilized in words, the solution would be to restart from these local examples. Global/local is an inexact term of a situation where you meet only local situations which became global through a network expansion. There is neither global nor local in the old sense as universals.

A possible solution would be to take into account at last all the knowledge available on such questions and to take into full consideration the bounds, scale and target of the question. We have to claim the right to 'indetermination' (Agrawal 2002a). Dove (2002) shows how at their scale and within their reach, Indonesian smallholders succeeded in taming and profiting by heveas, a totally foreign plant imported from Brazil, in opposition to huge industrialized heveas plantations.

In fact we have just to do what Latour advised us to do - "*follow scientists and engineers through society*" (Latour 1987); so that we may see who, what and to and with whom any 'object' is devised.

Acknowledgments

My friend Claude Hartley kindly read and corrected the English language I used for this short essay . The remaining mistakes and possible nonsense being still mine.

Endnotes

ⁱ Thus creating black individuals as respectable human beings as any other white, yellow, red man.

ⁱⁱ As were firstly for Diop's publications in France, rather ignored by archaeologists and historians. Many years later, having known success in the USA within the African Americans circles, they returned back to France but still remained little discussed but by African intellectuals.

ⁱⁱⁱ In France, one court recently modified the current attitude of courts which formerly interpreted the laws. It decided to consider as 'historical truth' one version of the case 'scientifically' under debate. This recent shift of the judicial power underlines the political importance of the point here in discussed.

^{iv} Unhappily also, this conclusion knocks against the moral principle herein stated: qualifying peoples as shrewder or sillier/civilized or barbarian according to skin color or intellectual cunning is forbidden: it is **racism**. The sentence: "*Nobody can be judged better or worse than another in account of his race* ", as such, unfortunately, re-introduce the notion of race.

^v Such as the forbidding of apartheid South-Africa and Namibia's attending at the World Archaeological Congress in Southampton (1986), together with the welcoming of USSR and its satellites. Cf. the recent proposal by French M.Ps., that 'race' should be eradicated from French vocabulary. See on the opposite, the Routledge's bi-monthly Journal title : *Ethnic and Racial Studies*

- vi Some western 'intellectuals' are on the front-line of the fight but, ironically enough, their white anti-racist branch (e.g. in France : Fauvelle-Aymar *et al.* 2000) is being outflanked on its left (to use the common political standard left/right or liberals/conservatives) by black fundamentalists/essentialists using without saying, the black/white skin difference as a criterion.
- vii All this implying that knowledge is always honestly used through languages, which I would not dare to assure in any case.
- viii See the huge wall poster at the today's Musée de l'Homme (Paris), antiracist exhibition (March 2003) ! Or how scientists make Science look ridiculous.
- ix Then, suddenly relieved of any problem of incommensurability between sciences, laws, customs, creeds, opinions, interests.
- x Aping the Western pattern which still teaches the same knowledge as in any Primary School in France and then up to college.
- xi C. Taylor (1994) brilliantly shows from the constitutional point of view in Canada, how strong is for peoples their need of reconnaissance (and I would add *connaissances*) and which fundamental political problems it raises concerning the individual and community right to be protected (the Meech amendment problem).
- xii What difference is there between a flaked pebble and a broken pebble? See the *éolithes* of Mio-Pliocène strata in France (Alimen 1965: 80), which have been controversial for years at the end of the 19th century in Prehistory studies, and could reappear on the archaeological stage because of the constant backward movement of hominids traces discoveries.
- xiii Depending from which part of the *Constitution* the observer starts. If it is from the usual *anthropological matrix* of Latour, he seizes, manages and then as a modern, he purifies the product by attributing it either to Nature or Culture, deciding consequently which one is the reference.
- xiv Instead of using the cumbersome 'theory' whose content differs from French to English, I chose 'model', which is the sense 'theory' has in many Anglosaxon archaeologists' writings. (See particularly Hodder: 1991).
- xv Surrounding villagers, schoolboys and girls, students, *élites*, politicians, government agencies, etc.
- xvi "They [former S-African archaeologists] like other before them avoided many potential clashes with settler ideology by using highly technical framework for conceptualizing and reporting their results " (Hall 1980 : 64).
- xvii Hall opinion could well fit Froment's continuous 'scientific' opposition to the race notion.
- xviii It is something you are taught to do, from college up to Ph.D.
- xix "...a completely new and sensational definition of scientific work, morally condemned for the way it can not but follow for its own accomplishment." (Marliac 2000c).
- xx It could be sound to remind readers that this background denies any value to the indigenous knowledge (See also Agrawal 1995: 427 note 15 ; Hobart 1993b: 6 ; Hennion and Latour 1993: 8) which reveals its membership of Modern Constitution.
- xxi *i.e.* they, even when aping the different natural sciences methods, can not reach the same results.
- xxii Western Development from the end of the 18th up to the 21st century, which anybody can judge now.
- xxiii Installation of the Modern Constitution during the Second Enlightenment, Latour 1991 : 54.
- xxiv Which should have been the latest to claim any scientificity in its *Modern Constitution* sense.
- xxv And now we should understand why, and why some of us have been named bushmen, *sauvages*, *bourgeois*, *yokels*, *kirdi* and so on...
- xxvi And this is to note also from those intellectuals/social-scientists/artists, invited for TV would-be debates, uttering Truth for the TV audience.
- xxvii "La première exigence de cette logique est que le savoir autochtone utile soit séparé des autres connaissances, des pratiques, du milieu, du contexte et des croyances culturelles avec lesquels il se combine dans les faits " (op.cit. : 328).
- xxviii 'Reach' must also be defined in terms of communication, reciprocal comprehension and information tools, institutions and the society at large (languages, codes, medias, schooling, laws, courts, government, powers, institutions...).
- xxix And peoples, around the world, think all Euro-Americans speak English, use Science from the morning to the evening in their daily behavior. The western overall world success as a civilization, is linked to Science and Technology, its companions.
- xxx la Science lest/ "la politisation des sciences par l'épistémologie afin de rendre impossible la vie politique ordinaire en faisant peser sur elle la menace d'une nature indiscutable " (Latour 1999 : 22). Science (or La Science) is not to be confused with sciences.
- xxxi Not to speak of the numerous revisionisms at issue today concerning, e.g.: Algeria's war, Japan's war in S.-E. Asia, Aborigines history since the first British settlement, Crusades, slave trade by the Arabs, Biblical history (Finkelstein and Silberman 2002), recent Iraq Museums' lootings, European Union's constitutional atheist texts: revisionism is and has always been at the heart of History.
- xxxii Which sounds farcical from the mouths of so materialistic-oriented researchers!
- xxxiii As has been said for years: the debt of Brazil, Algeria or Argentina, for example, is in the banks of a fiscal paradise like the Bahamas or Saint-Barthélémy!

বিষয়সংক্ষেপ

সাম্প্রতিক তত্ত্বীয় তর্কবিতর্ক দ্বারা ঘনসংবদ্ধ এই গবেষণা প্রবন্ধটিতে উন্নয়নশীল দেশগুলোতে অতীত সম্পর্কিত ও আধুনিক উন্নয়ন সম্পর্কিত জ্ঞান পরস্পর সম্পর্কিতভাবে বিভিন্ন সমস্যা তৈরি করেছে বলে বলা হয়েছে এবং সেগুলো কীভাবে ঐতিহাসিকভাবে তৈরি হয়ে উঠল তা নিয়ে আলোচনা করা হয়েছে। আধুনিক সংগঠনের অধীনে অ-পশ্চিমা সমাজগুলো ও পশ্চিম ইউরোপীয় জ্ঞানের সংমিশ্রণ এমন অসম শর্তসমূহের আওতায় ঘটছে যে এই জ্ঞান প্রধানত অ-পশ্চিমের উপর চাপিয়ে দেয়া বলে লেখক চিহ্নিত করেছেন। লেখক এই পর্যালোচনায় পশ্চিমা বিজ্ঞানের সমালোচনা করেছেন এবং এই বিজ্ঞানসৃষ্টি প্রকৃতি/সংস্কৃতি দ্বিবিভাজনকে যেভাবে উন্নয়নের ও অতীতের জ্ঞানে স্বতন্ত্র বলে ধরে নেয়া হয় তাকে প্রশ্ন করেছেন কেনো লাভুখের তত্ত্বায়নকে অনুসরণ করে। এই আলোচনায় আফ্রিকার বিভিন্ন দেশের উদাহরণ ব্যবহৃত হলেও উত্তর ক্যামেরুনে লেখকের নিজের প্রত্নতাত্ত্বিক গবেষণার অভিজ্ঞতা কেন্দ্রীয় উদাহরণ হিসাবে এসেছে।

সাধারণ দৃষ্টিতে দেখলে স্বীকার করতেই হবে যে অ-পশ্চিমা দেশগুলোতে উন্নয়ন ব্যর্থ হয়েছে, যদিও এদেশগুলোর বিভিন্ন গোষ্ঠী পশ্চিমের বস্তুগত বা আধ্যাত্মিক উপাদানগুলো গ্রহণ করেছে। বিভিন্ন পরিস্থিতিতে অ-পশ্চিমা মানুষজন যে-ভাবে কোনো ধারণা নির্বাচন করে গ্রহণ করার জন্য সেখানে গ্রহণ বর্জনের বিষয়টি যে জ্ঞানের উপরে ভিত্তি করে সংঘটিত হয় সেই জ্ঞানের প্রশ্নটি খুব গুরুত্বপূর্ণ। জ্ঞানতাত্ত্বিকভাবে এই জ্ঞানের প্রকৃতি, অনুবাদযোগ্যতার পাশাপাশি রাজনৈতিকভাবে এই জ্ঞানের সমাজের বিভিন্ন সংযোগের মধ্যে আদানপ্রদান হয় তা বিবেচনা করতে হবে। এই জ্ঞানে অতীত একটি কেন্দ্রীয় বিষয় হিসাবে থাকে বলে আফ্রিকার বিভিন্ন জায়গার উদাহরণ থেকে প্রতিভাত হয়।

উপনিবেশ-উত্তর সময়ে বিকশিত আফ্রিকাকেন্দ্রিকতাবাদ কীভাবে পশ্চিমে নির্মিত নরবর্ণের জ্ঞানের প্রতিক্রিয়ায় গড়ে উঠেছে সেটি লেখক আলোচনা করেছেন। তিনি দেখিয়েছেন যে যদিও নরবর্ণের ধারণা বিভিন্নভাবেই মিথ্যা ও অসার হিসাবে প্রমাণিত হয়েছে, তবুও সেই ধারণা এখনও স্বাভাবিক হিসাবে বিবেচিত। বিভিন্ন প্রত্নতাত্ত্বিক গবেষণার মাধ্যমে উৎপাদিত জ্ঞান জাদুঘর, শিাব্যবস্থার মাধ্যমে ও উন্নয়ন নীতিমালার সঙ্গে সম্পর্কিতভাবে এমনভাবে বিস্তৃত হয়েছে যে তা মূল পশ্চিমা থিমকে অক্ষুণ্ন রেখে আফ্রিকাকেন্দ্রিকতাকে প্রতিষ্ঠিত করেছে। জুবু, জুমাইয়া, এয়েতাল ইত্যাদি জাতির উদাহরণ উল্লেখ করে লেখক দেখিয়েছেন যে প্রত্নতত্ত্ব অধীত ও নির্মিত বিভিন্ন জ্ঞান (পশ্চিমা ও স্থানীয় জ্ঞানের মিশ্রিত রূপে) আধুনিক সংগঠনে (যেমন: রাষ্ট্রীয়, জাতীয়তাবাদী, সত্তাসম্পর্কিত, ইত্যাদি) ভূমিকা রেখেছে।

আধুনিক সংগঠনে বিজ্ঞানের সঙ্গে উন্নয়নের ধারণা ও প্রত্নতত্ত্বের ঘনিষ্ঠ সম্পর্ক আলোচনা করে লেখক অ-পশ্চিমে গৃহিত ও রূপান্তরিত আধুনিক বিজ্ঞানের ধারণার অন্তর্গত সঙ্কটের দিকে আলোকপাত করেছেন। স্বাভাবিক বলে বিবেচিত ধারণার বিরোধিতা করে লেখক ব্রুনো লাভুখকে অনুসরণ করে দেখিয়েছেন যে বিজ্ঞানে সংস্কৃতি ও প্রকৃতির মধ্যে দ্বিবিভাজন অসার আর বিজ্ঞান সত্যকে প্রকাশ করে না, বরং একটি রাজনৈতিক হাতিয়ার হিসাবে ব্যবহৃত হয় গণমানুষের মুখ বন্ধ করে রাখতে এবং অজ্ঞতার বৃদ্ধি ঘটাতে। প্রত্নতত্ত্বও নিজেকে বিজ্ঞান হিসাবে প্রতিষ্ঠিত করে, নতুন নতুন প্রযুক্তি ও কৌশল ব্যবহার করে এমন একটি জ্ঞান পরিনত হয়ে উঠেছে যেখানে জ্ঞানের বিনিময়, সংযোগ, ত্রিকোলাজ একনায়কতাত্ত্বিক হয়ে উঠেছে। পেশাদার প্রত্নতাত্ত্বিকগণ যখন কথা বলেন বা জ্ঞানের বিনিময় ঘটান তখন সেই বিনিময় হয়ে ওঠে অগণতান্ত্রিক কারণ যারা জ্ঞান গ্রহণ করছেন তারা বিষয়গুলো বুঝছেন নাকি বিভ্রমে পড়ছেন নাকি স্বপ্ন দেখছেন নাকি ভুল বুঝছেন তা বিবেচনা করার পরিসর তৈরি হয় না। বিষয়টি এমন যেন যেহেতু এটা বিজ্ঞান সেহেতু সেটাকে সকলকে মাথা নুইয়ে মেনে নিতে হবে।

জ্ঞানের বিনিময় ও মিশ্রনের ক্ষেত্রে প্রত্নতত্ত্ব ও উন্নয়নের ধারণার বৈশ্বিকীকরণের বিপরীতে লেখক এই প্রবন্ধে স্থানীয়করণকেও বিবেচনায় আনতে বলেছেন। সর্বোপরি ব্রুনো লাভুখকে অনুসরণ করে তিনি বৈজ্ঞানিকদের সমাজের মাধ্যমে অনুসরণ ও পর্যালোচনা করার আহ্বান করেছেন।

References

Agrawal, A., 1995. *Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge. Development and Change*, 26 : 413-439.

Agrawal, A., 2002a *Plaidoyer pour l'indétermination. R. Internat. Sc. Sociales, UNESCO/érès*, vol. 173: 321- 323.

Agrawal A., 2002b. *Classification des savoirs autochtones : la dimension politique. R. Internat. Sc. Sociales, UNESCO/érès*, vol. 173 : 325-335.

Alimen A., 1965, *Préhistoire*. Tome I. Boubée & Cie ed., Paris.

Bernal M., 1999 [1991] - *Black Athena II* . PUF, Paris.

Boutrais J., 2000, *Gestion sociale locale. in GILLON Y., CHABOUD C., BOUTRAIS J. & MULLON C. (eds) 2000 - Du bon usage des ressources renouvelables. IRD, Latitudes 23 : 147-152.*

Brokensha D.W., Warren D.M., Werner O. (eds) 1980. *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham Md. Univ. Press of America.

Callon M., Lascoumes P. and Barthe Y., 2001, *Agir dans un monde incertain. Essai sur la démocratie technique*. Seuil, Paris.

Dika Akwa 1985, *Les descendants des pharaons à travers l'Afrique*. Osiris-Publisud, Paris.

Diop C.A., 1954, *Nations nègres et culture*. Présence Africaine, Paris. (re-edition 1979) .

Dove M.R., 2002 - *Histoires et savoirs autochtones hybrides chez les petits cultivateurs d'hévéa d'Asie*. R. Internat. Sc. Sociales, UNESCO/érès, vol. 173 : 389-400.

Essomba J.-M. (ed), 1992, *L'archéologie au Cameroun*. Karthala, Paris.

Fauvelle-Aymar F.-X., Chretien J.-P. and Perrot C.-H. (eds) 2000 - *Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des africains entre Égypte et Amérique*. Karthala, Paris.

Field J. et al ., 2000, 'Coming Back'. *Aborigines and archaeologists at Cuddie Springs*. Public Archaeology 1, n°1 : 35-48.

Finkelstein I. and Silberman N.A., 2002 - *La Bible dévoilée. Les nouvelles révélations de l'Archéologie*. Bayard, Paris.

Froment A., 1996, *Science et conscience : le combat ambigu de Cheikh Anta Diop*. in Waast R. (ed) " Les Sciences Hors d'Occident au XXè " ORSTOM-UNESCO. Vol. 2 : 321-341.

Ganesh M.S., Hazari Rabindra T. and Ratnagar S., 2003, Babri Masjid and Archaeology : Archaeological evidence as legal testimony. "Rewriting History "Seminar, Feb. 2003, N° 522 ><http://www.india-seminar.com/2003/522.htm><.

Geschiere P., 1999, Globalization and the power of indeterminate meaning : witchcraft and spirit cults in Africa and Asia. in MEYER & GESCHIERE (eds) 1999 : 211-237.

Gill, G.W., 2000, *Does race exist? A proponent's perspective*. NOVA ONLINE <http://www.kennewick-man.com/>

Gillon, Y., Chaboud C., Boutrais J. and Mullon C. (eds), 2000, *Du bon usage des ressources renouvelables*. IRD, Latitudes 23, Paris.

Golan, D., 1991, *Inkhata and its use of the Zulu past*. History in Africa, 18 : 113-126.

Hacking, I., 1989, *Concevoir et expérimenter*. Ch. Bourgois, Paris.

Hall, M., 1990 Hidden history: Iron Age archaeology in Southern Africa. In ROBERTSHAW (ed) 1990 : 59- 77.

Hennion and Latour B., 1993, *Objet d'art, objet de science. Note sur les limites de l'antiféchetisme*. Sociologie de l'Art N° 6 : 7-24.

Hobart, M., (ed) 1993a *An anthropological critique of*

- Development*. Routledge, London (re-edited 1995, 1997).
- Hobart, M., 1993b, The growth of ignorance ? In HOBART M., 1993 (ed): 1-30.
- Hodder, I. (ed) 1991, *Archaeological Theory in Europe*. Routledge, Londres.
- Holl, A., 2002, *The land of Houliouf*. Mem. of the Museum of Anthropology, Univ. of Michigan, n° 35.
- Horton, R., 1982, Tradition and Modernity revisited. In HOLLIS M., & LUKES S. (eds) *Rationality and Relativism*. Basil Blakwell, Oxford : 201-260.
- Ki-Zerbo, J., 1978, *Histoire de l'Afrique Noire*. Hatier, Paris.
- Latour B., 1991, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*. La Découverte, Paris. [1993 *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press].
- Latour, B., 1995, *La science en action*. Gallimard, Folio-Essais, Paris. [1987 *Science in Action. How to follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Harvard University Press].
- Latour, B., 1999, *Politiques de la nature. Comment faire entrer les sciences en démocratie*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Latour, B. And Lemonnier P., (eds) 1994, *De la préhistoire aux missiles balistiques. L'intelligence sociale des techniques*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Latour, B. and Lemonnier P., 1994, Genèse sociale des techniques, genèse technique des humains. In Latour B. and Lemonnier P. (eds) 1994 : 9-24.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. and Rogers G. Mclean (eds) 1996, *Black Athena revisited*. University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill & London.
- Lugan, B., 1989 - *Afrique, l'Histoire à l'endroit*. Perrin, Paris.
- McClancy, J. and Mcdonough C., (eds) 1996 *Popularizing Anthropology*. Routledge, London.
- Mahathir, M., 1970 *The Malay dilemma*. Donald Moore, Singapore.
- Marliac, A., 2000a, *Composed vs Simple Pasts : About Archaeologists and their Partners*. Inter. Jour. Hist. Archaeol. 5, N°3 : 203-218.
- Marliac, A., 2001a, *Problèmes archéologiques, problèmes humains : moi, nous et les autres*. XIV^e Congrès UISPP, Liège, 2-8 Sept. 2001. (A paraître chez British Archaeological Reports en 2005).
- Marliac, A., 2001b, *Du dialogue pédo-archéologique à un discours hybride?* Com. au Colloq. Inter. ICoTEM, MSHS, Univ. de Poitiers, 11-12 Oct. 2001. (Under press with the Proceedings).
- Marliac, A., 2002a, Du politique en anthropologie et réciproquement à propos d'identité : l'implication des sciences sociales. *La critica sociologica*, 151 : 12-32. Roma.
- Marliac, A., 2002b, *Des 'terres noires' médiévales urbaines de France aux buttes anthropiques tropicales: l'archéologue en action*. *L'Anthropologie* 106: 745-761.
- Marliac, A., [2000] 2004a *Scientific discourses plus Local Discourses : the future for Development issues ?* Comm. to Internat. Confer. "Challenges to the Social Sciences in Africa in the XXIst Century". Makerere University, Fac. of Social Sc. 25-27 October 2000. Kampala, Uganda. In *Confronting XXIst Century Challenges*. Makerere Univ. Printery, vol. 1, Part 2.
- Marliac A., 2004b *Archéologie du Diamaré au Cameroun. Milieux et peuplements entre Mandara, Logone, Bénoué et Tchad de 2 M. A. au XIX^e siècle*. Ms. 300 p. with Index, Illustr., Maps, Appendix & Tables. (submitted).
- Marshall, Y., (ed) 2002, *Community archaeology*. World Archaeology 34, n°2.
- M'bokolo, E., 1992, *Afrique Noire Histoire et Civilisations*. Tome I ; 1995 - *XIX^e et XX^e siècles*. Tome II. Hatier. AUPELF-UREF, Paris.
- Meyer, B. and Geschiere, P. (eds) 1999, *Globalization and Identity*. (eds) 2000 - *Du bon usage des ressources renouvelables*. IRD, Latitudes 23 : 53- 73.
- Obenga, Th., 2001, *Le sens de la lutte contre l'Africanisme eurocentriste*. L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Perrot, C.-H., 1988 *La renaissance de l'histoire Eotile dans les années soixante*. *History in Africa* 15 : 457-466.
- Seignobos, C. 2001 Mise en place du peuplement et répartition ethnique. in Seignobos C. & Mandjek O. (eds) 2001 - *Atlas de la Province de l'Extrême-Nord du Cameroun*. IRD-MINREST, Paris : Pl. 7.
- Sen, S. 2003, Essential dilemma in the liberal understanding of Heritage. <http://www.meghbarta.org/2003/june/ourwrld.html#sen> and <http://www.meghbarta.org/2004/january/ourwrld.html#sen2>
- Stengers, I., 1993, *L'invention des sciences modernes*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Taylor, C., 1994 - *Multiculturalisme*. Flammarion, Paris.