Ethics as Embodied Practice: Reflexivity, Dialogue and Collaboration

Castillo, Rosa Cordillera A.; Dilger, Hansjörg

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Sonstiges / other

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Castillo, R. C. A., & Dilger, H. (2022). Ethics as Embodied Practice: Reflexivity, Dialogue and Collaboration. *International Quarterly for Asian Studies (IQAS)*, *53*(4), 505-518. https://doi.org/10.11588/iqas.2022.4.20796

IQAS Vol. 53 / 2022 iv, pp. 505–518

Ethics as Embodied Practice: Reflexivity, Dialogue and Collaboration

Rosa Cordillera A. Castillo in conversation with Hansjörg Dilger

Hansjörg Dilger is Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at Freie Universität Berlin with a specialisation in critical medical anthropology and the anthropology of religious diversity. His research has a regional focus on Tanzania and South Africa and migratory contexts in Germany. He was a visiting professor at the University of Vienna and visiting fellow at the University of Witwatersrand (both in 2014) and Assistant Professor of Anthropology and African Studies at the University of Florida (2005–2007). Between 2015 and 2019, he was President of the German Anthropological Association (GAA): in this capacity, he and the GAA board pushed toward the firm integration of ethical reflexivity in Social and Cultural Anthropology in Germany.

Keywords: Anthropology, methodology, research ethics, institutional review boards, interview

Rosa Castillo: *Our conversation will focus on practical ways in which researchers can conduct ethical research that remains compatible with anthropology's epistemology and methodology. We will delve into how these ways of doing anthropological research relate to inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, to broader social science discussions on research ethics and to the role of professional organisations and academic institutions. Our point of engagement is your article "Ethics, Epistemology and Ethnography: The Need for an An-*

Rosa Cordillera A. Castillo, Institute for Asian and African Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany; rosa.castillo@hu-berlin.de. Hansjörg Dilger, Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany; hansjoerg.dilger@berlin.de.

The interview was conducted on 26 May 2020 in Berlin and transcribed by Marie Wuscher, Bonn International Centre for Conflict Studies (BICC), Germany. We would like to thank Marie Wuscher for the meticulous transcription efforts and support. The interview transcript has been edited for readability purposes. The interview is part of a podcast series organised by the Research Ethics Initiative at the Institute for Asian and African Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, coordinated by Rosa Castillo, Andrea Fleschenberg and Sarah Holz since early 2020 (https://www.iaaw.hu-berlin.de/en/region/southeastasia/research/groups/negotiating-research-ethics).

DOI 10.11588/iqas.2022.4.20796

thropological Debate on Ethical Review Processes in Germany" [Dilger 2017], your research experiences and your work with the German Anthropological Association (GAA). To begin, please tell us about yourself and how you define and position yourself as a researcher. What are your research interests and what are you currently working on?

Hansjörg Dilger: My career in anthropology started out in the field of medical anthropology from the mid-1990s onwards when I first did my master's at Freie Universität Berlin and then also my PhD. For my PhD I worked on the dynamics of social relations in rural and urban areas of Tanzania and how they changed and became transformed in relation to HIV/AIDS-related illness and death. Thus I focused on systems of solidarity and support, both within families and religious, especially neo-Pentecostal, communities, but also in the context of HIV/AIDS-related activism, for instance in NGOs in urban centres. This focus on the micro-politics of care, death, burials and healing in the context of HIV/AIDS increasingly led me to the field of religion. Over the last fifteen years, I have been doing research on processes of institutionalisation – and their individual and collective embodiment – in religiously diverse settings. I have recently completed a book manuscript on the learning of morality, inequalities and faith in Christian and Muslim schools in Dar es Salaam, where I look at the teaching and internalisation of values in postcolonial and global settings [Dilger 2022]. So all of these topics, both in medical anthropology and the anthropology of religion, were related to different aspects of value formation, both with regard to my interlocutors' pursuits of a good life and to how their struggles for moral orientation are embedded in, and configured by, larger political-economic circumstances. But this interest in the processes and politics of value formation also became important for me, myself as a researcher, where I also had to question my own ways of doing "good research".

Rosa Castillo: *We will discuss your previous research in Tanzania in more detail later when we delve into the ethical issues that you dealt with. You have written on research ethics in anthropology, and more specifically in German anthropology. What for you is research ethics?*

Hansjörg Dilger: Research ethics is obviously a huge topic, but for me, it is mostly a professional orientation of doing research in a good and appropriate way. There are obviously very different understandings of what constitutes "good research" in relation to many different topics and contexts. So, this can challenge us in relation to establishing trustful and reciprocal relations in our field sites, but also in how we deal with issues of confidentiality. The responses we give to these challenges and the questions they imply can vary among indi-

vidual researchers, as well as also within our field sites among our interlocutors, or even in the institution within which we work. Ethics has to do with finding suitable answers to all these questions, but then also applying them – and, if necessary, challenging them again – in our practice as researchers and scholars. And what is especially relevant in relation to anthropology and the qualitative sciences is that all these questions and challenges become relevant in *all* phases of research. Research ethics in anthropology is often narrowly considered with regard to fieldwork, for instance. However, it is important that we think about ethical orientations and how to act ethically even *before* we enter our field sites, as well as *afterwards* when it comes to the interpretation of research materials or the writing up. So, all these questions will play a role in all these different phases and contexts of our work. And what we also need to do, I think, as anthropologists, is always to discuss these questions and challenges in close interaction with our various interlocutors in our research sites. Thus there should be a priority for us to establish conversations on all these ethical challenges together with our interlocutors, and not just to talk with them about our research questions and methods in the narrow sense.

Rosa Castillo: *The discussion and debates on research ethics and anthropology are extensive and span several decades. The American Anthropological Association website, for instance, has a vast resource on research ethics and statements dating back to 1948. But, as you wrote in your article, German anthropology was a rather late comer to this discussion. It was only in 2009 that the German Anthropological Association adopted a declaration of ethics, notwithstanding the efforts in 2001 and 2005 from subcommittees to draft ethics principles. Despite these ongoing discussions on research ethics in German anthropology, you referred to the response and reflections to ethical dilemmas in research and teaching as "muddling through" (2017: 192). That is, these responses and reflections on the ethical implications of our work are based on individual rather than institutional or disciplinary criteria. Professional organisations play a major role in advancing ethical research. Within German anthropology, how prominent are these ideas on research ethics that you shared with us? Why do you think it took so long for the German Anthropological Association to draw up an ethics declaration? And what are the advantages and disadvantages of "muddling through"?*

Hansjörg Dilger: The discussion on ethics in the German Anthropological Association goes back quite a long time, actually. A working group on ethics was established already in 1989, but it received very little support from the members of the association in its efforts to establish a commitment to ethical standards within the discipline. I think there was a concern among colleagues

that they would "lose" their freedom in doing ethnographic fieldwork, and that the research process might become over-regulated and overly bureaucratic due to any ethics code or statement. And there were good reasons for such concerns: there were these negative examples from Anglophone countries – the bureaucratic machineries of the institutional review boards in the US and the rise of an audit culture in the context of neoliberal academia in the UK in the 1990s – and so on. Anthropologists in Germany saw that institutional (in the sense of standardized) responses to ethical challenges could have a negative impact on research practice: that these institutional frameworks might restrict the openness of ethnographic fieldwork and limit the flexibility necessary for conducting qualitative research successfully. However, the proponents for establishing a debate on ethics and for coming up with a declaration on ethical principles also had good reasons for their initiatives. Some working groups in the German Anthropological Association formulated their own collective statements on ethics earlier. For instance, the working group on Anthropology and Development adopted its own guidelines on ethics in 1999, the working group on Medical Anthropology did the same in 2005, and then the German Anthropological Association actually followed in 2009. These two working groups saw the problematic consequences that the absence of clear ethical commitments might have for their research – both for individual anthropologists and for the communities or organisations they worked with.

So, in a way, all this created the context of having to "muddle through", as I called it in the article you mentioned. There is a clear disadvantage to having to establish your own ethical standards if you have no clear, professional or institutional guidance in relation to the ethicality of your research; and I think not having such an institutional response is especially problematic for early career researchers who are looking for such an orientation. I, personally, missed this as a PhD student in the late 1990s and early 2000s [cf. Dilger 2011]. There is a lot of uncertainty, and even anxiety, that you have in such a situation. It can become very challenging when you are facing certain ethical dilemmas and are not really sure how to respond to them – even if at the end, of course, you have to take the individual decisions yourself. Thus, the advantage of "muddling through" – in terms of having more flexibility for your research – is really an advantage for more experienced scholars. The critics of institutionalised ethics are right that the idea of a "quick fix" for ethical dilemmas can be very harmful: that you need only tick your ethics boxes according to an ethics code or an ethics review board and can then proceed with your research; that you do not have to think about ethical dilemmas afterwards because you have in a way already "fulfilled your obligation" in an ethical sense. Thus, it is important to think about how to maintain both this freedom and this reflexivity while at the same time having an institutional and more formal response to it.

Rosa Castillo: *In your article you point out that, in the absence of an ethical review process in German anthropology for your research on HIV/AIDS in Tanzania, the ethical aspects of your doctoral research were first addressed by the ethics review process of the Tanzania National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR), which you had to go through to conduct your research. However, their process followed the biomedical model, whereas your research was social and cultural. You therefore encountered problems with their informed consent process, which they asked you to implement using a written form. That is, your interlocutors were supposed to sign an informed consent form, in which you had to mention that you were conducting research on HIV/AIDS. This was particularly problematic for your interlocutors in a neo-Pentecostal church in Dar es Salaam and in the rural Musoma region, where people understood their illness predominantly in moral and social categories, for instance through notions of evil spirits and witchcraft, and where HIV/AIDS was strongly stigmatised. You thus could not speak directly about HIV/AIDS to your interlocutors, rendering the NIMR's approved informed consent form problematic.You provided a practical and epistemological critique of the NIMR informed consent process. However, were there any insights that you gained from the NIMR ethics review process that you would not have been made aware of if you hadn't gone through it? That is, were there blind spots that their review process alerted you to?*

Hansjörg Dilger: This is an important question, and I think the problematic aspects of an ethics review process based on the standards of the health sciences become very obvious the way you have summarised them – at least from an anthropological perspective. Talking or speaking about a certain illness can be highly problematic in contexts where this illness is stigmatised, but that is exactly what you are expected to do according to biomedical or public health standards. Addressing suffering by its name is what these settings take, in a way, for granted – that you discuss the phenomenon in question in the "correct" biomedical terms. But how do you do this in a context of strong stigma and discrimination? To give an example: I was introduced to potential interviewees in a rural area of Tanzania by an AIDS counsellor in one of the local hospitals. In one instance, he introduced me to a couple by letter and told them that I was interested in doing research on "the issue" they had. Thus, he did not even mention HIV/AIDS, because he was aware that this might put them off, but said instead that he wanted to talk about "this issue". However, because the letter came from the AIDS counsellor, the couple knew immediately that I was interested in knowing more about the wife's infection with HIV. His letter would have had the same effect if the word "HIV" had been mentioned explicitly.

The couple were very reluctant to talk to me and also refused to do an interview with me. I felt really bad about this situation, because I knew it had caused pain for the couple. I therefore started to follow the advice of my local interlocutors outside of the hospital, and of my research assistant, not to address HIV/AIDS directly but to frame it in more metaphorical terms. I had to "sense" my way into and through the field with the help of my interlocutors; they gave me orientation on how to engage in meaningful conversations by employing morally acceptable and non-offensive language.

However, the ethics review process by the NIMR as such was also helpful. At the time it alerted me to the fact that there were important ethical issues at stake in my research. Neither my home institute in Berlin nor my funding organisation, the German Research Foundation, nor my supervisor – none of them had asked me any substantial questions about research ethics at that time. In the context of drafting my ethics proposal for the NIMR, I was also alerted to the fact that the American Anthropological Association had its own code of ethics; I had not been aware of this because we did not discuss this in our doctoral training or in teaching. During my master studies this was never in any way an issue that was mentioned. It was therefore a fortunate coincidence that I could access this code of ethics by the American Anthropological Association through an internet café in Dar es Salaam, and their code of ethics showed me actually what the informed consent was that the NIMR was asking for. It also stated that I could also ask for this consent orally and not only through a written statement, which was the kind of documentation that the NIMR was looking for. For me, this was a very reassuring moment: to know that there was an ethics code by an anthropological association that established this possibility. It provided me with an authoritative source that I could rely on and refer to in my application for ethical approval. It gave my approach legitimacy and was then also accepted by the NIMR.

Rosa Castillo: *The importance of closely listening to our interlocutors, of consulting them regarding the ethical implications of our research and the validity of our analyses, as well as involving them in the research design and process and adjusting our approach accordingly – these are crucial to our praxis and ethics. Can you give us another example of an ethical dilemma that you encountered in your past or ongoing research and how you dealt with it in concrete terms?*

Hansjörg Dilger: Another example I can think of was from my ethnographic fieldwork on faith-oriented schools in Dar es Salaam. I had access to two of the Christian schools of my study through the pastor of one of the largest neo-Pentecostal churches in the city. She owned a network of schools, and in these

schools there were certain problematic and partly also semi-legal practices. For instance, they brought teachers from Kenya and from Uganda to Tanzania with a missionary visa – although the schools themselves were not explicitly religious. The pastor owned the schools as a private person, but she operated them more like a business than, for instance, a charitable organisation. So, the teachers did not actually work there as missionaries. Furthermore, the teachers were not allowed to join unions; they did not get contracts and could easily be fired. All of these things were problematic (though legal), but I wondered whether it was ethical to write about them, to reveal these aspects, as I had this ethical obligation not to do harm to the schools or to their owner. The pastor had very kindly granted me permission to enter her schools, so I did not want to abuse this trust. Moreover, what made it an ethically particularly challenging situation was that it was impossible for me to hide the identity of the schools because there was only one faith-oriented school network of this kind in Tanzania. At the same time, there were also the teachers who complained about these practices and suffered from their negative consequences.

Ultimately, I decided to write about these issues. I found it important to talk about these practices in order to explain how religious entrepreneurs from the neo-Pentecostal field established themselves within the neoliberal educational market. These details were not just interesting ethnographic anecdotes, but were crucial for making my conceptual argument. What helped me to make this decision of addressing these issues in my writing was that most of these problems were also discussed in local social media and in Kiswahili print media. I often advise students and early career researchers who are concerned about revealing ethically sensitive information, especially on institutions or organisations that can easily be recognised later by the reader, to check social media or print media for such information and refer to these sources – not necessarily to your informants, who are worried about exposure, and rightly so. Ethnography rarely detects something completely new when it comes to certain problematic details. If you search carefully, you will find that often these things are addressed in some kind of local outlets. So it is important to look for these other sources so that you do not expose your interlocutors with this information.

Rosa Castillo: *In the article "Ethics, Epistemology and Engagement: Encountering Values in Medical Anthropology," [Dilger et al. 2015] you and colleagues pushed for "the active formation of an academic environment that supports young scholars throughout the research process and encourages them to find (and potentially redefine) their own ethical and moral positions, and to provide platforms for critical and constructive engagements with our own and our colleagues' work" (p. 5). Is there anything else you would like to add as to how this can be achieved in pragmatic terms?*

Hansjörg Dilger: It is particularly important, actually, to promote this discussion on research ethics in groups of students and among early career scholars. We did this with a summer school in 2013 where we focused on the issue of research ethics with the outcome of the special journal issue on *Ethics, Epistemology, and Engagement: Encountering Values in Medical Anthropology* [2015, *Medical Anthropology* 34(1)]. But you can also initiate this discussion in other settings, for instance in colloquia of doctoral students or in research seminars for BA and MA students. And I found it always very helpful to read the texts of other scholars, or to discuss students' own research proposals, to make the potential for ethical dilemmas very concrete. It is important to have concrete examples as starting points for such conversations.

From my experience, it is crucial that early career scholars get the opportunity to ask questions about all parts of the research process, and not to take research relations or the way you apply your methods for granted, as something you can just learn and apply directly from the textbook. "The field" is a highly dynamic situation. It is important that students learn to be flexible when it comes to research ethics; there is no "blueprint" for them out there that they can directly apply in their own research settings. Furthermore, while it is important to have these conversations between students and supervisors, ethics should also become a topic among peers themselves as well as in the field with interlocutors. All these conversations should be conducted in various constellations in order to get different types of responses to your questions. Talking about your positionality, the ethical challenges that you potentially face in a field situation, all this will help students to make ethical choice an embodied research practice. This is not just an individual matter but a collective and professional responsibility of being and becoming an anthropologist – thinking about all these questions and ethical challenges *together*.

Rosa Castillo: *You have raised the importance of engaging in sustained research ethics discussions, whether peer to peer, student-teacher or between collaborators and research interlocutors in which I strongly concur with [Castillo 2018]. To your knowledge, to what extent is this kind of pedagogy undertaken by various anthropological institutions in Germany?*

Hansjörg Dilger: It is hard to tell on what scale this is already happening. My impression from individual feedback is that the awareness of thinking and teaching about ethics or integrating this as a topic in doctoral training is growing, especially among the younger generation of university professors and lecturers, but also among students themselves. I have also received very positive feedback from colleagues who found it important that we pursue this topic at the level of the German Anthropological Association. Some of them have faced

challenges with regard to the absence of institutional ethics review processes in Germany, for instance when they submit a proposal for European funding, when they are planning fieldwork with students in countries where an ethics vote is required, or when they get requests by publishers and journals to provide evidence of ethical approval. For them it is important to have a formalised framework on which they can draw, which they can use in thinking about including ethics in teaching or doctoral training. At the same time, they still emphasise the importance of adjusting ethical review processes to the specific conditions of ethnographic fieldwork.

In this regard, I want to emphasise that we pushed these discussions after my colleagues and I were elected into the board of the German Anthropological Association in 2015. Advancing the agenda of formalising ethics reviews in a way that was still congruent with the discipline's epistemological and methodological standards was only possible because we tried to involve scholars and colleagues *broadly*, i.e. not only the "usual suspects", so to speak, those who were already concerned with or interested in research ethics in any case, but by establishing a broad discussion on these themes. Nevertheless, some colleagues remained highly reluctant in this regard and were explicitly critical towards this push towards a more formalised framework on research ethics and the adoption of a collective disciplinary stance on research ethics reviews.

Rosa Castillo: *Given your criticisms of the dominant ethics governance regime, you advocate ethical assessments that are based on individual academic disciplines and are optional. Can you elaborate on how this can be done? Are there German anthropological institutions that are using such a process and how is their experience with it? What are the challenges and/or pitfalls of making this ethical assessment optional for the researcher?*

Hansjörg Dilger: Let me give the example of my own home institution, Freie Universität Berlin, because I know it best. A Central Ethics Committee was established here in 2019. It is important to emphasise that such ethics committees differ across universities. In the FUB committee there are representatives from each faculty. When a request for ethical approval is submitted, it is always reviewed by two members of the committee. One reviewer is the representative from the faculty from which the request was submitted, for instance the social sciences, and one comes from a different faculty. What I have learned from my tenure on this board between 2019 and 2021, and what I think is quite positive, is, first, requests for approval are only submitted when needed; so there is usually a certain reason for submitting such a request: it is voluntary, it is not mandatory. Second, the standards of the academic discipline remain intact, which was also very important for us in the German Anthropological Association

because we, as scholars in these fields, know best about these standards. The committee members are referred to the relevant ethics documents which have been formulated by a group of colleagues of our discipline [DGSKA 2022]. In addition, however, there is always someone from a different discipline looking at the proposal – which is a good combination, I think. Involving an outsider's critical gaze is important.

The disadvantage of this process is of course that not *every* research project is checked for its ethicality at the level of the Central Ethics Committee. But as I said before, in my view it is not that important to have an institutionally mandatory framework that everyone has to go through, as in the review process of Anglophone countries. The institutionalised ethics review at FUB is reserved for those cases where a funding organisation, publisher or host country of the anthropological research requires ethical approval. Beyond such situations, however, I find it equally important to cultivate an ethical attitude among students and researchers that they incorporate into their research practice, without giving it too much explicit thought. The discussion on ethics should not be a separate aspect of teaching, nor should there be the idea that all ethical dilemmas can be fixed by obtaining the ethical approval of review boards or ethics committee. The emphasis should be rather on strengthening reflexivity and self-responsibility in all aspects of our professional practice.

Rosa Castillo: *Bringing our conversation beyond anthropology, can you elaborate on inequalities that affect research, particularly in relation to the power dynamics between Global North academics conducting research on the Global South and on Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour communities in the Global North? That is, how is research ethics entangled with structural issues of racism and coloniality?*

Hansjörg Dilger: This question is not just an ethical issue, but I think it requires a broader discussion on the state and conditions of anthropological research as such. This discussion should address all aspects of our research: the way we define and practice our methodology, the epistemologies we build on in our analysis and our writing, and the collaborative formats that we want to establish. How can we collaborate in more symmetrical ways with our interlocutors from different communities? How can we involve students in our research? An example from my own experience at Freie Universität Berlin concerns a student-initiated research project on and with refugee women in Berlin. Students came up with the idea for such a project in 2015 when many refugees arrived in the city. Together with an activist organisation, the International Women Space, they wanted to do research on, and potentially improve, the living conditions in collective accommodation centres, especially with regard to the situation of

women. Together with a colleague from our institute, Kristina Mashimi, we guided this project. What we especially tried to do in this collaboration with students and activists was to involve the women from the accommodation centres in the formulation of the research questions, methodologies, and so on – to do this in a participatory way. However, what we realised in the collaboration was that the women often had very different priorities: the living conditions at the accommodation centres mattered to them, but they had to secure their and their families' and children's legal status; they wanted to establish a longer-term perspective of being able to stay in Germany; they wanted to learn German. Others had to move quickly to new places and it was difficult for them to stay in touch with the students or with us as researchers. It was very difficult and challenging under these circumstances to enter into a reciprocal or symmetrical relationship. To enter into such a reciprocal relationship is a very important condition, obviously, for collaboration.

In the end, we were able to complete the project and published the research findings in a book [Dilger / Dohrn 2016], but we were not satisfied with its collaborative character. In a way, the collaboration remained one-sided and so we decided to engage in a second project in which refugee women were to adopt a more active role. The women in this second collaboration were different women, with whom we established contact through a neighbourhood organisation, again in Berlin. The idea that was developed together with the women was that they told their own stories of coming to Germany, how they established themselves in the city (if they were able to do so) and their perspectives of being able to stay. We published a multilingual book out of this project, in which the women told their stories to each other [Kollektiv Polylog 2019].

This collaboration worked better than the first one because we were able to involve women with refugee backgrounds actively in the formulation of the goals of the project and in the way we published their conversations as a book. It taught us a lot about how we can engage in more symmetrical collaboration in the context of vulnerability and inequality. At the same time, it was a challenging collaboration because it required a great deal of resources and commitment that went way beyond the usual context of a seminar. We still have to learn how to do these collaborations more systematically, and I think the multi-linguality is just one aspect of such a challenge – how to do translations in joint seminar settings where people have different linguistic backgrounds, speak Arabic, Farsi, Turkish, German or English. This concerns also the editing and translation of texts when it comes to a joint book project, and so on. It was a very interesting process and we actually need to have a broader discussion on collaboration in postcolonial settings. And this is definitively about ethical issues, I fully agree, but at the same time there are many more things at stake here.

Rosa Castillo: *In relation to collaboration, which features in much of our research work, you have drawn attention to a research and teaching ethics where the needs and expectations of our interlocutors and collaborators are foregrounded. The history of anthropology is rampant with unethical research against many communities in the Global South. And, unfortunately, this continues to be the case. Another issue is the asymmetrical relationship between Global South and Global North knowledge makers, seen, for instance, in how knowledge by Global South scholars is devalued, ignored, appropriated, extracted or erased, and also in terms of how research partnerships are unequally conducted [see also Castillo / Rubis / Pattathu in this issue, part two]. How do we conduct ethical collaborative research given the North-South asymmetries in knowledge production?*

Hansjörg Dilger: The whole issue of knowledge production in postcolonial contexts needs to involve consideration about how multiple knowledge traditions can become part of collaborative research endeavours. The ethicality of collaborations in the global North-South context goes beyond changing our citation practices: this is important, but ultimately what matters is comprehensive epistemological and methodological reorientation of our research practices. It is also about challenging structural hierarchies and the distribution of resources in postcolonial research settings, starting with the very mundane bureaucratic process of funding allocation. To give an example, I was involved in a collaboration with colleagues from the University of Cape Town, the University of Dar es Salaam, Freie Universität Berlin and also from SOAS University of London, in which we worked on Christian and Muslim faith-oriented organisations in the urban public spheres in Dar es Salaam, Cape Town and Lagos. The collaboration also included PhD positions in Cape Town and Dar es Salaam, which were funded and supervised there. Ultimately, however, the money came from the German Research Foundation and was channelled through Berlin. So, in a way, I remained responsible for reporting to the German Research Foundation and for accounting for the spending of funds. Of course, we can do this accounting in collaboration with our partners abroad, and identify and define the priorities of how to spend these funds. But there is still a hierarchy involved, because I am ultimately the one who is responsible to, and thus officially recognised as "funding-worthy" by, the German Research Foundation.

Such issues – as well as the epistemological and organisational agenda we wanted to pursue – were central themes at one of our first project workshops: What texts and concepts did we identify as relevant for our joint research? Where would we hold the workshops and conferences of our collaborative project? The answers to such questions could never be taken for granted. It was very important to address them openly and to see where we ended up. Obviously, there was a lot of potential and room for failure. While we could all do our

best to resolve these issues *together*, there was always the lurking challenge of postcolonial dependencies, which required a particular sensitivity in coming to terms with these challenges. This is not an easy process, and I think that this is something that anthropologists need to address much more systematically than they have done so far: finding adequate modes of collaboration in postcolonial research settings, which challenge existing power relations openly, and finding ways to transform them into more equitable ways of working together.

We do not need to establish an illusion here: the structural context of postcolonial inequalities does not go away just by being identified or discussed. There are always very concrete material challenges: Who can travel where and under what circumstances? For instance, in our research collaboration I was able to travel easily to Cape Town or Dar es Salaam, but my colleagues needed visas – and they could be denied visas for particular reasons or for no reason at all. This is a challenge that constantly reminds us that we need to push for broader discussions on these issues beyond specific ethical aspects, and beyond concrete practices of who to quote or how to resolve a certain money issue. This is about an all-pervasive structural configuration that shapes how we do research in the postcolonial context. It is very important that we address these conditions much more systematically, on various disciplinary levels, and also on the level of professional societies. There is a start being made, but much more needs to be done here.

Rosa Castillo: *These are systemic and structural issues that shape so many aspects of our work, issues that go beyond academia and that would necessitate structural and systemic changes and responses. I turn now to the last question. What valuable insights can we derive from research ethics discussions within the discipline of anthropology for other disciplines or inter- and transdisciplinary approaches such as Area Studies, Global Studies or Gender Studies, to name a few?*

Hansjörg Dilger: I think this question touches on all aspects that we have addressed in our conversation until now: how to do ethically appropriate research in postcolonial settings; how to establish more symmetrical research relations in a Global North – Global South context; how to do fieldwork as such. All of the disciplines you mentioned are doing fieldwork in one way or another, and they face very similar ethical challenges. It is therefore important to connect across disciplines and to share what we have in common with regard to the challenges we face. Furthermore, it is crucial to keep in mind that this is not a conversation that we can have only in a national context, but that we are moving and doing research in an interconnected world. It is very important to engage in conversations on these issues in the settings and countries where

we do research, with the partners and universities with whom we collaborate. It is crucial to give a much more permanent presence to these discussions in all our conversations

Rosa Castillo: *Thank you very much for this conversation. Is there anything else you would like to add?*

Hansjörg Dilger: Maybe just one thing: all of these processes need to start with teaching, because long-term change happens only with the training of the next generation of scholars. So, it will be important to think about how to integrate the topics of research ethics and the postcolonial conditions of anthropological research in our teaching. It is important that students and early career researchers start thinking systematically about these issues, that this critical engagement with the problematic foundations of our research becomes part of their habitus and practice in the years and decades to come.

References

Castillo, Rosa Cordillera A. (2018): Subverting "Formalised" Ethics through Mainstreaming Critical Research Ethics and a Responsive Review Process. *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale* 26(3), pp. 406–407. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12526

DGSKA – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie (2022): Ethics. German Anthropological Association, https://www.dgska.de/en/ethics/ (accessed 24 May 2022).

Dilger, Hansjörg (2022): *Learning Morality. Inequalities, and Faith: Christian and Muslim Schools in Tanzania*. Cambridge University Press: The International African Library.

Dilger, Hansjörg (2017): Ethics, Epistemology, and Ethnography: The Need for an Anthropological Debate on Ethical Review Processes in Germany. *Sociologus* 67(2), pp. 191–208.

Dilger, Hansjörg (2011): Contextualising Ethics: Or, the Morality of Knowledge Production in Ethnographic Fieldwork on "the Unspeakable". In: Wenzel Geissler / Sassy Molyneux (eds): *Evidence, Ethos and Experiment: The Anthropology and History of Medical Research in Africa*. Oxford / New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 99–124.

Dilger, Hansjörg / Dohrn, Kristina (eds) (2016): *Living in Refugee Camps in Berlin: Women's Perspectives and Experiences*. In Collaboration with International Women Space. Berlin: Weißensee Verlag.

Dilger, Hansjörg / Huschke, Susann / Mattes, Dominik (2015): Ethics, Epistemology, and Engagement: Encountering Values in Medical Anthropology. *Medical Anthropology* 34(1), pp. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/01459740.2014.960565

Kollektiv Polylog (2019): *Das ist meine Geschichte: Frauen im Gespräch über Flucht und Ankommen*. Münster: Unrast.