

ANTHROPOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH: THEIR RISE, THEIR SILENCING, THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

Esteban Krotz*

Abstract

Traditionally, the southern part of the world has been considered largely as the privileged field for anthropological research carried out from the perspective of the North, where anthropology had its roots as a scientific discipline. There is still little awareness that in the South an increasing number of particular anthropological traditions has emerged and consolidated during the last decades. This article tries to identify the principal reasons for the silencing of these processes and to point out some important elements for the characterization of the new 'anthropologies of the South'. Their study will not only be a contribution to the knowledge of specific traditions of culture contact and anthropological sciences, but also to that of worldwide anthropology of which these specific anthropologies are a part.

The rise of anthropologies in the South

Cultural contacts are as old as cultures themselves and, as far as we know, just as ancient is human reflection on the different aspects of cultural contact and cultural diversity. Thus understood, anthropological sciences constitute only one particular (and quite recent) form of knowledge that developed within a certain civilization and during a specific period: in 19th-century Europe and its western (North America) and eastern (the Tsarist empire) 'annexes', and which was definitely consolidated as such during the last third of last century.¹

The long history of encounters between Europe and its 'others' overseas, which has always been the main source of cultural otherness faced by the then emerging anthropological discipline, has never been a uniform flow of similar situations. The rhythms and the intensity of these contacts varied during different periods. We must remember, too, that only after the early Middle Ages did something like an identifiable European subject as such start being outlined. There were situations that branded this history more than others and many anthropologists agree that one of the most fundamental ones was the arrival of Europeans in America.² The well-known debate on the human character of the inhabitants of the New World, which from the start mixes religious with reason-of-the-state motives, the thirst for knowledge with economic interests, and humanism with the obsession for conquest, already involves many elements which became manifest more strongly three centuries later, when anthropology emerged as a science.

The establishment of anthropology as a scientific discipline took place at the crossroads between two previously unseen processes. One was the expansion at a planetary scale of one single civilization, a movement among whose motives we find nationalism and militarism, Christian mission and racism, the capitalist-industrialist search for markets and raw materials and the intellectual eagerness to take an inventory of all the phenomena in the world. The other was the hegemonization of a specific, recently created type of knowledge,

characterized by a certain social organization of those who practice it and by consensus among them about certain procedures for generating and validating propositions about empirical reality and for accepting determinate results of research. Anthropology³ arose as a particular field within the social sciences, showing variations derived from the somewhat different political and academic traditions of the northern nations who divided up the world among themselves at that time. It began its existence undertaking the task of ordering the huge amount of data on other cultures —overseas, in the interior of Europe, in the past— accumulated for centuries through collections and reports, libraries and museums, which were being enlarged from the 18th century onwards with ever faster-growing amounts of new information.

The comparison of data about different cultures, and the search for an explanation of cultural diversity according to the parameters widely accepted as scientific in those days, gave birth to what we call the first - and up until now only-anthropological 'paradigm': 19th-century evolutionism. The admission of the first recognized representatives of the new science to the universities, the places most identified with scientific knowledge which since then has widely come to be considered synonymous with 'true knowledge', the beginning of the systematic professional education of the future members of the anthropological community and the publication of the first anthropology textbooks are rightly considered the culmination of the initial phase of the new discipline.

It is ironic that the establishment within the North Atlantic civilization of an ever more prosperous and successful scientific discipline, dedicated particularly to cultural diversity, has come hand in hand with a strong and sustained tendency of the same civilization to annul this diversity: religious mission and modern technique, the nation-state with its schools and administrative devices, the requirements of an 'efficient' industrial production, the scorn for anything which from a North-Atlantic-centered conception of progress could (and can) only be considered as inferior and destined to disappear - all this has come together since then to diminish and even erase cultural heterogeneity in favor of an ever growing universal homogeneity.

However, it is obvious that this goal has not been achieved. Moreover, the contradictions inherent in the North Atlantic model of civilization created new heterogeneities in the North, in the South, and at a world level. Today, the most profound of these, which was obscured for decades by the East-West conflict, is reappearing with new faces. It is now even clearer than before that we are not merely facing a passing technological, economic or informational inequality gap, but a much deeper and more encompassing one, and that its analysis must include different spheres such as the political and military, world view and knowledge, language and gender, the patterns of everyday life, feelings and corporeality, identity formation and socialization. In other words, the North-South conflict also means a *cultural* division of the world's societies. It is the division that was defined during the 18th and 19th centuries by opposing terms such as 'civilization' and 'savagery/barbarism'; later they were substituted by the binomials 'development' and 'underdevelopment', 'modernity' and 'tradition', 'domination' and 'dependency', 'metropolis' and 'periphery', 'globalism' and 'localism'. To a great degree, all these aspects are included in the metaphor of

the opposition North-South. Its geographical appearance must not let us forget that there are 'Northern'-type zones in many cities in the South, and that most of the countries in the South contain internal differences that are somewhat similar and even parallel to those which exist at a world level. On the other hand, it has been widely documented that typical 'Southern' situations of poverty and misery, margin-alization and alienation exist - and are recently extending - in countries which belong to the North..

In the second part of our century many original efforts have also been undertaken in the South, particularly in Latin America,⁴ to analyze this worldwide difference and its consequences. Undoubtedly, their main achievement was to demonstrate that the situation of the South was not one of 'delayed development' in terms of some objective parameter or in comparison to the North's situation, but that the socio-cultural conditions of the South vastly responded to the transforming pressure exerted by the North upon the South and, by the same token, that the position achieved by the North was to a large degree a result of its merciless and secular exploitation of the South. But since, during the 1960s and 1970s, most social scientists - at least, in almost all parts of the South - considered the socio-economic aspects the crucial ones for explanation and for political action, cultural aspects were usually disregarded in their analyses.⁵

This is why there still is no awareness of many layers of our socio-cultural reality and of many of the cultural changes produced by the development of worldwide and mostly capitalist industrialism. One of the changes resulting from over a century of world domination by the North Atlantic model of civilization, which has hardly been studied, is precisely this article's subject matter: the fact that anthropology rooted itself and acquired its own life in the South itself, which traditionally had been only the main habitat of the objects of study of anthropological science. Although in some countries there were earlier beginnings, it is particularly during the last three or four decades that in many parts of the South all sorts of academic institutions have been established, as well as periodic congresses and museums, specialist journals and professional associations, long-term publishing projects and research programs. Most recently, a good number of the traditional undergraduate programs have been complemented by masters and doctoral studies courses in anthropology.⁶

All this has made commonplace a previously almost non-existent situation: anthropology practitioners coming from the cultures of the North meet in 'their' traditional places of study not only informants, but also native⁷ colleagues and students. At the same time, there is in the growing anthropological communities of the South an increasing awareness that certain scientific difficulties which are ignored by the traditional bibliography of their discipline are not passing or marginal, but might have to do with the 'use' of anthropology in situations where the socio-cultural phenomena dealt with are not 'others' in the same way as they are in the anthropology originated in the North, and where researchers are in another way part of what they study.

The silencing of the anthropologies of the South

However, when one examines the discipline's histories, the most published and translated textbooks and the main journals, the anthropologies generated in the countries of the South, and their institutions and practitioners, hardly exist. This is true for the most widespread anthropology, that is, the one written in English and French, and even more for

anthropology produced in German-speaking countries and the somewhat peripheral areas of the Scandinavian, Mediterranean and Slavic countries.

When the anthropology of the South becomes present, for example, in the context of international events, a knowledge about it can never be found that is equivalent to that concerning the history and the contemporary debates of the anthropology of the North, that is, the anthropology of the countries where anthropological sciences originated. And if there is a kind of awareness of its existence, is it not true that one can generally perceive a tacit consensus that it must be something as 'underdeveloped' as the countries of the Third World, where it is taking place? More benign versions conceive it as a kind of 'echo' or diluted version of 'the' anthropology, which is and continues to be only the one generated in the countries of the North, the one documented by their journals and books and transmitted in their universities.

But things are even worse. The anthropology of the South hardly ever appears in the South. Academic courses taught at universities on 'anthropological thought', as well as the historical segments of courses on special themes, usually present the anthropology generated in the countries of the South almost exclusively as the result of a permanent and worldwide process of diffusion of ideas, methods and debates, which has had and continues to have its only origin in the heart of North Atlantic civilization; whence it seems to arrive in a South which is almost entirely lacking in any proper reflection on cultural contact, cultural otherness and cultural diversity. Even when some universities in the South add a course on 'Mexican anthropology' or 'Latin American anthropological thought' to the courses on 'anthropological theory', the former continue to privilege the images of 'extension' or 'adaptation' in a way which often makes any proper profile of the anthropologies of the South invisible.⁸ We still have to see how the frequent opposition over many years to the anthropology generated in the North as a 'bourgeois' and even 'imperialist' science contributed to this restricted vision of things in the South, for only in few cases were in-depth criticisms of anthropology produced, and, when they were, they generally did not have the concrete socio-cultural or academic situation of the South as a point of reference, but only certain currents of critical thought generated precisely in the countries of the North where the object of criticism had originated.

Another aspect of this silencing of the anthropology of the South is that the often intrinsically tense relationship between Southern and Northern members of the anthropological community is not dealt with in an explicit manner. By this I do not mean that personal contacts between them are always conflictive. I am not concerned here with possible personal problems, but rather with the contradictions caused by the development of anthropology in a world shaped, until now, by the power of the very same nations that also generated our discipline and which continue to determine almost completely its guidelines or patterns. But tensions are felt daily in many places and, insofar as they are not openly discussed and dealt with, they continue to reinforce this silencing of the anthropologies of the South. Consider, for example, a typical attitude of Northern anthropologists towards their colleagues from the South. How often is it essentially paternalistic? Don't they invariably – although sometimes more implicitly than explicitly and often in a subjectively well-meaning way – rate them as second class, condemn them to be permanent apprentices of the owners of the 'true' anthropology? How often do we find here only a new variation of the well-known international division of labor, where the 'native anthropologist' becomes a sort of 'key infor-

mant', who loans his or her services in exchange for an occasional co-authorship or invitation to one of the 'holy' places of so-called world anthropology? And something similar happens in the South. How often is the colleague from the North less a guest received in friendship than a coveted source of all sorts of resources and a possible means of access to the 'really significant' publications and events? How often is he or she treated with a mixture of incoherent mistrust (for his or her possible links with colonial inheritance or actual imperialist strategies) and aprioristic admiration (derived more from his or her physical closeness with the most recent debates in, let's say California, Paris and Manchester, than with the proven quality of his or her scientific work)?⁹

Another example of this appraisal of the anthropologies of the South on which academics from the North and the South agree in fact, and which equally contributes to hide the existence of an anthropology of the South, is the seldom analyzed attraction which the academic centers of the North have for postgraduate studies and sabbatical stays. Of course, the reasons for that are obvious and this remark does not seek to justify the lamentable provision of libraries, laboratories and electronic devices in most of the universities of the South, let alone certain Southern discourses which defend a lack of scientific rigor and low standards by means of a vague reference to a hypothetical originality, legitimated as such only by the geo-cultural situation of the place where it is produced. But the fact is that for the overwhelming majority of anthropologists from the North (including students), to pass a certain time at a university in the South is seen, in the best of cases, as a sort of fieldwork, while an extraordinary number of anthropologists from the South have only been students or visiting professors in countries of the North and never of the South. This situation may be changing now 'because of the previously mentioned increase in postgraduate studies in the South in recent years, but in most parts of the South the present leading generation of anthropologists has a better knowledge of the Northern than of Southern anthropological communities, journals, etc., even those of neighboring countries. Apart from everything else, this situation undoubtedly inhibits the awareness of the very existence of an anthropology of the South both among locals and foreigners. And it leads, in the event in case that it is noticed, to a conception of the anthropologies of the South as at best the 'poor relations' of 'the true' anthropology.

Four 'critical issues' for the characterization of the anthropologies of the South

Naturally, having recognized the North Atlantic origin of anthropological science towards the end of the last century, its presence - better, the beginning of its presence - in countries of the South must be seen as the result of a diffusion process. However, in the present situation, the anthropologies of the South can no longer be reduced to mere 'extensions' or 'replicas' (somewhat imperfect ones) of one original anthropological model. Rather, we find ourselves looking at different forms of producing and using anthropological knowledge which have particular characteristics. Some of them are shared only by the anthropologies of a certain region marked by some common historical situations and developments that differ from those of other regions. For instance, the centuries of similar colonial experience of most Latin American countries, the anticolonial struggle of many African countries during the 1950s and 1960s, and their post-independence problems with establishing nation-state institutions, the involvement of several Asiatic countries in the Vietnam War and the recent fast economic development of others in the same continent, have all marked in different ways the anthropologies created in these regions. But in spite of these diversi-

ties, some common characteristics can be recognized in the whole South. To defend this hypothesis does not mean looking for a uniform distribution of these characteristics.¹⁰ Moreover, only comparative research can produce valid information about the existence of these characteristics and their dimensions and, thus, also, about the depth and the breadth of the differences between the anthropologies of the North and of the South.

The following four ‘critical issues’ for an incipient, tentative and fragmentary characterization of the anthropology of the South are formulated principally, as already indicated, from a Latin American perspective. Regardless of the national and regional peculiarities present throughout the so-called ‘subcontinent’, it seems not too difficult to recognize a certain group of common traits that could be found also in other regions of the South. Therefore they can also be seen as part of a future agenda for anthropological research on anthropological science and, especially, on the anthropology of the South.

With regard to this, it should always be remembered that the production of scientific knowledge is a process of cultural creation similar to other processes of cultural creation. That means that, as in other cases, it cannot ‘be analyzed only as a symbolic system separate from other aspects of a more comprehensive social reality. This would mean reducing anthropology to the results of this production process and restricting its history to the development of ‘anthropological thought’.

An immediate implication of this is that the production of anthropological knowledge must not be studied as a process without a subject. Any analysis of anthropological science must include as something fundamental the study of the characteristics of the scientific communities which generate, use and distribute anthropological knowledge. It is crucial to be aware that the generators of this knowledge (which are always collectives), as well as their organizational and communicational structures and their links with more comprehensive social reality, are not something ‘external’ to anthropological knowledge, but rather, that they are elements that are as intrinsically constitutive of it as, for example, are the argumentative dynamics of the scientific debate.¹¹

Those studying and those being studied are citizens of the same country

One of the characteristics which, at first glance, distinguishes ‘classical’ anthropology from the one practiced at the present time in the South is that, in the latter, those studying and those being studied are citizens of the same country. This is obviously not a matter of geography, although often the physical closeness between the places where the empirical information is being collected and the places where these materials are being analyzed, discussed and the results of the research published, is important. It is more fundamentally important that, today, even relatively distant indigenous and peasant communities can have access to the results of anthropological studies generated about them in another part of the country, and that they can establish several types of interaction with the authors of those studies. Of course, this situation is made easier by the existence of official national languages in which the anthropological books and articles are usually written. On the other hand, the fact that those studying and those being studied are affected (although not necessarily in the same way) by the political and economic decisions which come from the public institutions in

whose configuration and legitimation they both participate, creates a significant link between the professional interests and the social and political interests of anthropologists. Here also are we dealing with a situation that is very different from the relationship that a visiting researcher may establish with a group of persons he or she studies during a certain number of months. Finally, when we assume that the socio-cultural origin (socioeconomic stratum, religion, region, ethnic group, and even gender and age group, etc.) of the authors of anthropological studies influences the study's point of departure, development and results, this influence will vary when the researchers are part of the same national (socioeconomic, religious, regional imbalance, ethnic, gender and age group, etc.) system as those they study, or when they usually live in individual and socio-cultural conditions totally different from those of the people that they are temporarily observing or even living with.¹²

Conceptualizations and valuations of science and social science

A crucial aspect which distinguishes most countries of the South from the countries where anthropology once originated is the social appraisal of scientific knowledge in general and of scientific anthropological knowledge in particular. While the economic, political and military dominance of the latter is based more and more on the creation and use of knowledge (and control over it), in the countries of the South most of the scientific and technological knowledge considered useful is imported and, accordingly, very often even the production and diffusion of traditional and locally generated knowledge is blocked. In effect, which civil servant, businessman, politician or even university professor in a country of the South *really* believes that the universities and research centers of the South will produce important scientific knowledge for the future of the nation or the region? Although this lack of appreciation for the science produced in the countries of the South is seldom expressed explicitly, the social status of scientific researchers and the fact that so few university workers in the South can dedicate themselves full time to academic activities are eloquent enough indicators. Another is the lack of effective diffusion mechanisms for the results of research. Also, observing the classrooms in most of the universities in Latin American countries, where a lot of academic programs in archaeology and linguistics lack laboratories and where postgraduate studies in ethnology continue to be introduced without any thought for the provision of books and journals, grants and organized training in the field, so that students are sometimes limited to learning from the notes they take in class, anyone who has been able to visit universities in Europe and North America may wonder if the word 'university' has the same meaning in the North and in the South.¹³ Thus, the specific academic and intellectual context of academic teachers and researchers –and, of course, of the students - is also rather different from that of their colleagues in the North.

Different alterities

As already noted, anthropological science was not born as an abstract way of thinking about cultural difference and cultural contact in general (and it is important to repeat that it couldn't have been born like that!), but originated as part of the intellectual and social effort of a specific civilization to understand, with the cognitive means available to it at that time, the relationships between different cultures and civilizations in space and time. What we usually call positivism, scientism or empiricism has made an important contribution to the avoidance of questioning the conditions of the possibility of 'using' or 'applying' anthropology everywhere and always in the same manner, obscuring the possibility of un-

derstanding other types of cultural diversity and intercultural relations and, perhaps, of understanding them from other perspectives. It should be asked to what extent anthropologies in the South are different because of the different quality of the socio-cultural otherness which anthropologists in the countries of the South are facing today (distinct from the period of the dawn of the discipline and distinct from the otherness contemporary North Atlantic civilization is confronted with). Is it possible to consider anthropological science as a 'neutral' cognitive instrument, that is, to strip it completely of the conditions that gave rise to it? Like all instruments, does it not retain traces of its source, and like every instrument does it not foreshadow or even shape the reality it works on? If this is so, how must it be transformed in order to be used in different –and new– situations of cultural otherness? How could this transformation be organized? What effects would it have upon the general idea of and practice of scientific knowledge?

Sometimes these questions are answered simply by saying that in the South anthropology has turned, at the end of the extended process of diffusion during the past decades, into a special type of 'native sociology'. But at least two facts quickly show us how inadequate these types of answers are. The first is the permanence of a more or less clear disciplinary differentiation in most universities and job markets in the South, where anthropology continues to exist as a distinctive academic tradition along with sociology, political science, and others. The second is that the anthropological treatment of socio-cultural alterity is always and necessarily done from the point of view of a certain culture (and each fieldwork experience, the central method of anthropology, reproduces this fact in a condensed and highly reflexive fashion).

Once again we must refer here to worldwide and omnipresent homogenizing forces. Here it is enough to underline the two mentioned in the previous sections. On the one hand, it is a well-known fact that the Latin American nation-states have tried to suppress cultural heterogeneity by many means, from resorting to open genocide and ethnocide to the implementation of diverse educational and social policies.¹⁴ On the other hand, precisely the existence of university-type institutions and practices has been a powerful factor in the creation of a collective consciousness that Latin America (or at least the population that considers itself in some way 'educated') is simply and clearly a part of 'Western civilization', although an 'underdeveloped' part. Either way, there is a reinforcement of the frequently expressed idea that, except for some rather insignificant relics in some distant corners of the countries, there does not exist any real socio-cultural alterity within Latin America. Moreover, as in other parts of the South, these 'premodern relics' are usually considered causes of the 'underdevelopment' of the indigenous population and of the whole country. This is why it is highly significant that it is precisely some of the so-called 'survivals' of several indigenous cultures (for example, in the areas of medicine, agriculture and housing but also in world view and organization of social relations) and the demands by certain American indigenous groups which have lately become more audible that have contributed to the recovery of a perception of the existence of a cultural alterity *within* all Latin American countries. Obviously this alterity does not restrict itself to the actually living indigenous peoples –its presence can also be observed in wide segments of the '*mestizo*' population.¹⁰ Therefore it is not surprising that the anthropological study of political processes and social movements, of urban culture and of popular religion, reveals that there are problems when conceptual molds and methodolo-

gical tools inherited from the dominant anthropological traditions are simply and plainly 'applied' instead of 'recreated'. And, of course, it is different to study cultural alterity from a position of neutrality or general respect for indigenous peoples in a faraway country and to be involved by these studies in the claims for rights of human groups of one's own country, whose legal recognition may affect the anthropologist's own social, political or even economic interests.

Rediscovering the own antecedents

The three aspects we have already mentioned are intrinsically related to the problem of the local 'antecedents' of the present anthropologies of the South. When the biographies of the first persons dedicated since the late 18th century to the study of the cognitive and practical problems of cultural diversity, are narrated, when their works are analyzed and when their efforts to create communication circuits with the other emerging specialists are described, the citizens of the powerful countries of those days and of today are usually considered 'forerunners' of the discipline, while those of the countries of the South are no more than simple 'amateurs'.

Is belonging or not belonging to the societies where anthropology was born as a scientific discipline enough to justify these classifications? Up to a certain degree it is, because anthropology initially developed in North Atlantic civilization and not in the South. The danger lies in the concealment brought about by the unreflexive use of this kind of classification. For in consequence, the very existence of the anthropologies of the South is once again ignored. And as long as the value of their own antecedents is diminished, it is harder for them to recognize themselves as traditions with a proper profile.¹⁶ On the other hand, the deep transformation which anthropology has undergone since it started is hidden. Repeating the point very schematically: during the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, anthropology only had one center. Any scientific anthropological practice was, above all, albeit to different degrees, an extension and ramification of the impulses generated in the center. But during the second half of this century, many of these transplants have started revealing themselves as roots, as forms of anthropological life which in different ways combine the influences from a long North Atlantic anthropological discussion with their own efforts, made in the past and the present, to understand the cultural diversity within different civilizations and among all of them.¹⁷

**Conclusion:
the need for an anthropology of the anthropologies of the South**

It is not difficult to formulate the conclusions from all of this. In the first place it is obvious that every time we speak of 'the anthropology of the South', we are talking, in fact, in the plural: the anthropologies of the South are as manifold as the different 'schools' or 'currents' which are acknowledged within the anthropology of the North, or even more so. However, just like the latter, they share certain characteristics. These are not very clear yet, but naturally they have to do with the situation of having been traditionally the place of the 'object' of the original anthropology and with the principal worldwide inter-civilizational conflict that in our day divides the planet into two different and in a certain sense opposing spheres: the North and the South.

The systematic study of the anthropologies of the South has hardly begun. Its best-known incipient expression is an interesting and growing variety of articles and symposia that appear now and again in almost all countries of the South and which aim to establish an 'assessment of progress' or 'state of the art' account of the discipline, of some subfield or of some specific question, or to trace its development within its own national anthropological community.¹⁸ It seems that this is a task for more specialized anthropologists and for other experts dedicated to the study of science. But it is also important to try to create a more general awareness in the South of the necessity of this work, because every specific anthropological study can contribute in one way or another to the discovery of the profile and the dynamics of the anthropologies of the South and to bringing the perspectives born in the South into international anthropological debate.¹⁹ The results of these efforts will make clearer the characteristics of the anthropologies of the South, their theoretical and methodological potential will be improved, and their findings and propositions better sustained.

This does not mean, necessarily, the construction of an anti-Northern 'anthropology'. On the contrary, these efforts will, finally, contribute to eliminating the still widely accepted unilinear conception of the evolution of worldwide anthropological science, where one type of anthropology - the Northern one - is used to hide the otherness of others - the Southern ones - by measuring the latter in terms of what they lack with respect to the former. Thus, they will lead towards a truly planetary perspective on anthropological sciences.²⁰ Thus, the anthropological study of the anthropologies of the South may lead to a recognition that the discipline dedicated to the study of diversity in all the ambits of socio-cultural reality is *itself also diverse*.

Notes

* Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán and Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (México). Article published in: *Critique of Anthropology*. 17 (3): 237-251.

1. A first version of this text was presented at the symposium 'Anthropology of the South: Problems and Perspectives in the Construction of Anthropological Knowledge' (13th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethno-logocal Sciences, Mexico City, August 1993; see *Alteridades* 3(6), 1993 [published during the second part of 1995], which contains most of the revised versions of the papers of this symposium). I wish to express my gratitude to the Department of Anthropology of the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana and to Monica Mayer for their support in preparing this English version and to John Gledhill and an anonymous referee of *Critique of Anthropology* for their comments on a previous draft.

2. So, for example, the Catalan-Mexican anthropologist Angel Palerm (1974: 90) has pointed out that 'modern anthropology rises from this effort to understand and interpret the New World', agreeing up to a certain point with Claude Levi-Strauss (1975: 16 ff).

3. By 'anthropology' I mean the whole group of subdisciplines formed by eth-nology/socio-cultural anthropology (including so-called European ethnology), pre-history/archaeology, ethnohistory/anthropological history, bio-anthropology and anthropological linguistics, although the perspective of the first branch will be privileged here.

it must be enriched and/or modified.

5. Again with respect to Latin America, it is interesting to see how important and well-known writings that strongly emphasized the cultural consequences of colonialism - such as those of Franz Fanon - did not find much of an echo in anthropological research. Others, like those which introduced the term 'culture of poverty', even became an obstacle to a properly cultural perspective in anthropology.

6. A good indicator of the rapid changes in this sector is given by the comparison between the early 1970s when in Spanish-speaking Latin America there were only two places where it was possible to obtain an MA degree in anthropology (Peru and Mexico), and today, where in Mexico alone there exist more than ten of these programs (see the related sections of the new yearbook *Inventario antropológico* 1, Mexico City, 1995).

7. 'Native' means here just citizens of countries of the South; the existence of anthropologists that belong - and recognize themselves as belonging - to indigenous groups of these countries is still a very infrequent and recent development.

8. Of course, some names of famous Southern anthropologists are always known — in the North and/or in the South — but usually only by some colleagues with a specialist interest in a particular country (or with a special relationship to its anthropological community) and only very exceptionally because of his or her contribution to general anthropological debate and theory.

9. It seems important to register that something similar happens not infrequently within the almost always highly centralized countries of the South with respect to the relationships between the members of the anthropological community that live and work in the capital and those of the 'provinces' or 'interior'.

10. One important reason for this is that in the South there exist real 'transplants' from the North. Other reasons for the heterogeneity of the anthropologies of the South are: the differing influence of distinct subcenters of Northern anthropology (USA, Europe; several Marxist currents); the varied endurance of these influences; different relationships between Southern anthropological communities and the political structure of their countries (ranging from close cooperation between both to temporary suppression of the former); types and strength of intellectual traditions within a region or country; and last but not least, the relative importance and distribution of an indigenous population, which is also, in most countries of the South, an important focus of anthropological work.

11. This idea resists the well-known opposition between 'externalist' and 'internalist' approaches (see Krotz, 1987). With respect to this problem see also the considerations of David Scott (1992: 376).

12. Here it may be convenient to remember some of the well-known features of the traditional relationships between Latin American intellectuals and the state that also influence the anthropological communities: the scant importance that governmental officials are accustomed to give to the results of academic research (a fact that is sometimes hidden by their interest in social sciences as a device for elementary data collection, conflict manage-

ment or legitimation of political decisions); the frequent suspicion that social research and training centers are over-politicized; the not infrequent appointments of once independent social scientists to important administrative or political positions; the difficulties of surviving as a critical social scientist in the face of different types of censorship and even personal menace.

13. It may be remarked here that this situation goes hand in hand with the widespread conviction that any kind of 'education' is a major means of general progress and individual socio-economic improvement. One consequence of this apparent paradox is the lack of systemic criticism of modern sciences as hegemonic forms of knowledge, another the general idea of universities as institutions for the transmission, but not for the creation, of knowledge.

14. The manifold 'indigenist politics' (official acculturation strategies with regard to die indigenous population) in Latin America constitute a very interesting difference in comparison with the history of many African and Asian countries, which must be considered in a general analysis of the anthropologies of 'the South'.

15. This aspect has been emphasized especially by the Mexican anthropologist Guillermo Bonfil, most of whose work was dedicated to demonstrating the contemporary vitality of models of civilization rooted in the indigenous traditions of Latin America (see Bonfil, 1987, 1993).

16. Here it also would be important to remember the somewhat different distinctions between social research, political essay, philosophy and novel in Europe and in Latin America or the varying relationships between socio-cultural studies and philosophical and religious traditions in East and West.

17. This means that we are not using the term 'transplant' here in the sense given to it by Brazilian anthropologist Darcy Ribeiro in his important analysis of worldwide European expansion. Rather, we would have to apply a category similar to that of the 'new peoples' which are composed of 'ethnic entities which are distinct in their constitutive matrices' (Ribeiro, 1972: 35).

18. There have also been some initial efforts to produce comparative pictures of anthropology in Latin America: see the collective volumes *Anthropology in Latin America* (Leite, 1990), *Balance of the Anthropology in Latin America and the Caribbean* (Arizpe and Serrano, 1993) and *Styles of Anthropology* (Cardoso de Oliveira and Ruben, 1995). For several years, *Current Anthropology* has also been an importance place to obtain information about the anthropologies of the South.

19. During the Congress mentioned earlier (see note 1), it was decided to launch the bulletin *Antropologias del Sur/Anthropologies of the South*, although so far it has only been possible to publish two issues.

20. In this sense, these efforts will match two important contemporary currents in Northern anthropology. One is the fast-growing interest in the history of the discipline. The other is

the different attempts made by Northern anthropologists to study their own societies from an anthropological perspective (e.g. 'anthropology at home') and to re-establish the connection between the study of European popular culture and folklore with the 'overseas' ethnology/anthropology (e.g. 'European ethnology').

References cited

- Arizpe, Lourdes and Carlos Serrano, eds (1993) *Balance de la antropología en América Latina y el Caribe*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Bonfil, Guillermo, ed. (1987) *México profundo: una civilización negada*. Mexico City: CIESAS-SEP.
- Bonfil, Guillermo, ed. (1993) *Hacia nuevos modelos de relaciones interculturales*. Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes.
- Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto and Guilherme Raul Ruben, eds (1995) *Estilos de antropología*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
- Krotz, Esteban (1987) 'Historia e historiografía de las ciencias antropológicas: una problemática teórica', in Carlos García Mora (ed.) *La antropología en México: panorama histórico*, vol. 1, pp. 113—38. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Leite Z., George de C, ed. (1990) *A antropologia na América Latina*. Mexico City: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude (1975) 'Las tres fuentes de la reflexión etnológica', in J. R. Llobera (ed.) *La antropología como ciencia*, pp. 15—23. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Palerm, Angel (1974) *Historia de la etnología: los precursores*. Mexico City: SEP-INAH.
- Ribeiro, Darcy (1972) *Configuraciones*. Mexico City: SepSetentas.
- Scott, David (1992) 'Criticism and Culture: Theory and Post-colonial Claims on Anthropological Disciplinarity', *Critique of Anthropology* 12(4): 371-94.