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For anthropologists, participation has long been a requisite part of immersion fieldwork, whether in the form of rolling up one’s sleeves, getting stuck into or experiencing the field. The participant observer engages, interacts, lives and shares with her or his informants. In the 21st century, it would appear that such a participatory imperative has been joined by a collaborative imperative. This at least seems to be one of the subtexts of Monica Konrad’s densely edited collection *Collaborators Collaborating*. Not only do anthropologists enter into collaborations of their own, as Konrad suggests, they are also increasingly studying “emergent forms of international research collaboration at a time when knowledge intensification appears to assume explicitly collaborative forms” (p. 6). The result is a 12-chapter foray into collaboration and its forms across a diverse range of settings across, albeit with a distinctive medical slant.

While there are many thematics that one could pick up one as they arise from the empirically rich studies contained within the book, I will suffice here to examine two ways in which contributors relate collaboration to processes of recognition. For some of the authors, recognition is about bringing to light – through ethnographic study – some of the invisible relations that in fact are indispensable to projects, achievements or endeavours. In Rebecca Empson’s engrossing account of Mongolia’s first successful organ transplantation, she argues that for all the accolades that the surgeon received, “it is due to the networks of different connections with people, be those surgeons, government officials, or the patients willing to undergo the operations, that he was able to perform this operation” (pp.101-102). Similarly, in her chapter on global clinical trials...
Ann Kelly argues that “the process of translating research participants into medical information involves local drivers, data entry clerks, fieldworkers, medical experts, ethics boards and funding bodies… the success of a clinical research project depends on the connections made between them” (p.177). Collaboration, in this sense, is requisite to getting anything done, not least in increasingly complex ‘knowledge societies’ where operations like organ transplantation and clinical trials emerge out of complex assemblages of knowledge and practice which involve numerous actors, technologies, objects, etc., many of which remain “invisible” in publications, media coverage or other forms of reporting. The ethnographer must play a role in rendering these relations visible.

For another set of authors, the collaborative imperative points to an urgent intellectual task facing today’s ethnographers “to take seriously all people’s theories of how the world is” (p. 235). Barbara Bodenborn chronicles the ways in which Inupiaq whale hunters and biologists in Alaska interact, each contributing particular kinds of knowledge about whales ‘into the mix’. She reflects: “I suspect that I have been more socialized by Inupiag kinship relations: ilyagiiit; additions, than I have by intellectual encounters with Deleuzian rhizomes” (p. 236). In their chapter, Douglas Holmes and George Marcus summarise this newfound collaborative imperative: “We have no interest in collaboration as a ‘division of labor’ among the investigators who control the design of the project or as the basis for blending of academic expertise or as gestures to a canonical interdisciplinarity. The corrective is, again, to integrate fully our subjects’ analytical acumen and insights to define the issues at stake in our project, as well as the means by which we explore them” (p.131). Recognition here – alongside other proponents of the so-called ‘ontological turn’ – is aimed at the intellectual work carried out by ex-informants who are now rather interlocutors in such a way that their analytics form and inform the ethnographer’s analyses.
Collaboration, then, is both an imperative (for the ethnographer) and a precondition (for social life), while it is the task of the collaborating anthropologist to re-cognise. *Collaborating Collaborators* succeeds in catalysing what is undoubtedly one of the most salient debates within 21st century anthropology. The rich ethnographic chapters, provide readers with food for thinking through the changes – from participation to collaboration, from informants to interlocutors – that are both the object of study for contributors and the imperatives that they are confronted with. If this subtext is successfully sown into the fabric of the volume, another remains frustratingly under-conceptualised, namely the ‘global’. Each of the collaborations explored in the volume are somehow ‘global’ whether in scope, in form or in name. This raises numerous questions about whether and if so how collaboration has become a crucial component in the ongoing formation of a global anthropology.
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As bio-capital in the form of medical knowledge, skills, and investments moves with greater frequency from its origin in First World industrialized settings to resource-poor communities with weak or little infrastructure, countries with emerging economies are starting to expand new indigenous science bases of their own. The case studies here, from the UK, West Africa, Sri Lanka, Papua