

World Anthropologies Network (WAN) Red de Antropologías del Mundo (RAM) electronic journal

No 3 April/Abril 2008

Introduction

Susana Narotzky y Gustavo Lins Ribeiro

Articles

Traditions of Knowledge in Colonial Management of Inequality:
Reflections on an Indigenist Administration Perspective in Brazil

Antonio Carlos de Souza Lima

Social Science Knowledge and Military Intelligence:
Global Conflict, Territorial Control and the Birth of Area Studies During WW II

David Nugent

Antropólogos-ciudadanos (y comprometidos) en la Argentina.

Las dos caras de la "antropología social" en 1960-70

Rosana Guber

Hegemonic Gravity and Pluralistic Utopia:
Comparative approach to internationalization in Anthropology

Benôit de L'Estoile

Antropologías mundiales en cuestión: diálogos y debates

Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto

Dossier: Report from the WCA meeting in SA

Stereotypes and the Changing Image of Anthropology in Brazil

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro

Fateful legacies and the burdens of academic excellence:

UK anthropology and the public sphere

John Gledhill

Transformation of the public image of anthropology: the case of Japan

Junji Koizumi

Anthropology!? that's interesting!

Henk Pauw



CONTENTS

Introduction <i>Susana Narotzky y Gustavo Lins Ribeiro</i>	3
PART 1. WORLD ANTHROPOLOGIES AND ANTHROPOLOGY'S POLITICS	
Traditions of Knowledge in Colonial Management of Inequality: Reflections on an Indigenist Administration Perspective in Brazil <i>Antonio Carlos de Souza Lima</i>	7
Social Science Knowledge and Military Intelligence: Global Conflict, Territorial Control and the Birth of Area Studies During WW II <i>David Nugent</i>	33
Antropólogos-ciudadanos (y comprometidos) en la Argentina. Las dos caras de la "antropología social" en 1960-70 <i>Rosana Guber</i>	67
Hegemonic Gravity and Pluralistic Utopia: a Comparative approach to internationalization in Anthropology <i>Benoît de L'Estoile</i>	111
Antropologías mundiales en cuestión: diálogos y debates <i>Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto</i>	131
PART 2. REPORT FROM THE WCAA MEETING IN SA	
Stereotypes and the Changing Image of Anthropology in Brazil <i>Gustavo Lins Ribeiro</i>	159

Fateful legacies and the burdens of academic excellence: UK anthropology and the public sphere <i>John Gledhill</i>	169
Transformation of the public image of anthropology: the case of Japan <i>Junji Koizumi</i>	181
Anthropology!? that's interesting! <i>Henk Pauw</i>	193

INTRODUCCIÓN

Susana Narotzky and Gustavo Lins Ribeiro

The World Anthropologies Network project has several years of life already. It has brought together into a fruitful conversation an active and increasing number of worldwide anthropologists. This issue of the WAN Journal is a clear expression of the theme that has been at the forefront in our debates: the history and politics of anthropological knowledge flows. The present moment sets us at a juncture, however, in which we should enhance collaboration between academic and non-academic thinkers and activists, in different locations, through sustained South-South and South-North interaction, through the dissemination of written production, and also through the actual involvement in collaborative teaching and research projects. The question to address at this juncture is: where is the present dynamics of our practice of a World Anthropologies Network leading us in the foreseeable future and how could we contrive its growth?

One of the WAN goals is to enable the development of an active network that through its interactive dynamics produces new forms of knowledge. New complexities of interaction would generate new forms of knowledge. In this sense we envisage a truly creative horizon: the opening of spaces beyond the hegemonic ways of anthropological scholarship would produce the possibilities for asking new questions and imagining other possible ways of understanding processes of human life. The metaphor of the web or net is appropriate in its connective sense of linking separate points (people, sites, questions, knowledge locations and histories), thus opening the avenues of intellectual creativity. This metaphor is also particularly interesting since it indicates an inability to form an enclosed space: the spaces between the links remind us permanently that there is a lot that we always let go, through holes in the web.

One initial idea of the WAN was to problematize the hegemony of US and more generally Anglo-American academia in anthropological knowledge production and dissemination, freeing non-Anglophone anthropologists from compulsory and dependent consumption of Anglo-American theory. This has been on the agenda of some anthropologists for a while. The preoccupation with the political implications of knowledge production is a result of the engagement with radical politics and feminism in the 1960s and 1970s and with postcolonial, identity politics and political ecology issues emerging in the next decades.

The existence of the internet provided a technical instrument that seemed ideal to the development of the connective aspect of the WAN project: to put in touch and enhance interaction with anthropologists worldwide working within different histories and traditions of anthropological knowledge, immersed in diverse political realities and often also working in different geographical areas (many working in their home countries). The internet notwithstanding, the original seed idea for the project was a product of face to face intense interaction among a handful of Latin American anthropologists. A first extension of the network was a result of direct interaction with other scholars in the context of teaching international graduate courses, or of other forms of personal interaction with particular colleagues through other collaborative projects. There was also an attempt to bring together colleagues who had been previously thinking about the issues of power and knowledge production in anthropology. Many of these ideas were discussed in a 2003 International Symposium of the Wenner-Gren Foundation that produced a lively debate. Once again, face to face intense interaction was crucial. Other panels happened at International Conferences such as the 2002 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, the 2004 meeting of the Brazilian Association of Anthropology (ABA), the first Latin American Congress of Anthropology of the Latin American Association (ALA), in Rosario – Argentina (2005), the 2006 EASA meeting in England and a session organized by the World Council of Anthropological Associations in the joint congress of the Anthropology Southern Africa, Pan-African Anthropological Association and the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), in Cape Town (2006), as well as in the 2007 AAA meeting. These gatherings were extremely fruitful and some of the issues raised by the attendants became papers we reproduce in this issue of the journal.

At the same time, several WAN participants have maintained a lively e-conversation raising questions that have been proposed for debate at more public venues. A website has been developed and is now fully in operation relying on the voluntary work of a small but hardworking group of anthropologists. An electronic journal has been launched and is in its third issue. On the whole three modes of communication have been significant to the WAN project: 1) intense face to face interaction at different venues, 2) continued interaction through e-mail and 3) the website which has been an excellent media of dissemination of our project.

It seems unquestionable that face to face interaction plays an important role in the unfolding of the project, stimulating long term active involvement. The fact that the WAN project has not developed a formal organization structure makes it dependent on the informal self-assumed responsibility of its participants. In the end, the internet's ability to connect and generate growth is dependent on sustained face to face interaction, which is the element that produces a particular form of collective responsibility leading to collective reflexivity. In this connection, the multiplication of venues of face to face interaction is an essential constitutive element of the WAN project. But there is a fourth element that needs to be underscored: the collaborative aspect. In order for the WAN project to pursue we need to produce collaborative engagements with substantive social, political, economic, cultural issues that will enable the production of anthropological knowledge in a different way. Some of this is underway through the creation of graduate programs of anthropology that engage scholars and institutions in different locations. Some collaborative research projects exist that include activist positions. The publication of the present issue, which is being expected by readers in different parts of the world, is another indication of the power of collective collaboration. We want to thank all authors for their cooperation. Eduardo Restrepo deserves special thanks for all the energy he dedicated to this issue. The collective aspect of the WAN project is its main asset and makes it a different attempt of practicing anthropology; it should remain our compass.

TRADITIONS OF KNOWLEDGE IN COLONIAL MANAGEMENT OF INEQUALITY: REFLECTIONS ON AN INDIGENIST ADMINISTRATION PERSPECTIVE IN BRAZIL¹

Antonio Carlos de Souza Lima²

This text addresses issues related to anthropological studies on public administration in Brazil from a historical perspective. It is based on a series of research studies dealing with public policies focused on managing minority populations in need of special protection and care for their integration into “Brazilian” society as a whole, i.e. as a “civic mass” that is able to exercise citizenship. Potentially dangerous, due to the incomplete character of their development, some of these segments are sometimes described by social thinkers, lawyers, physicians or any other specialists appointed for their management, as in need of State caring and monitoring, a kind of power exercise which may be called *tutulary* (Souza Lima, 1995)³.

1 First published in Portuguese in Bastos, Cristiana; Almeida, Miguel Valle de; Feldman-Bianco, Bela, eds. 2002 – *Trânsitos coloniais: diálogos críticos luso-brasileiros*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp.151-172.

2 Associate Professor of Ethnology at Museu Nacional/Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (see www.ppgasmuseu.etc.br). IC Research Productivity Grant-Holder at Conselho Nacional de Pesquisa e Cientistas do Nosso Estado FAPERJ Grantee (2004-2006). Technical Co-Coordinator of the Ethnicity, Culture and Development Research Laboratory (LACED – www.laced.etc.br).

3 My studies on the exercise of power by the State, which I have called *tutulary*, arose from my study of Brazilian Native peoples policies, initiated in 1985 with an M.A. dissertation and resulting in a doctoral thesis in 1992, published with revisions in 1995 (Souza Lima, 1995). See also Souza Lima, 2003 for further developments. Similarly there are studies by Adriana de Resende Barreto Vianna (1999; 2003); Claudio Costa Pinheiro (1998); João Paulo Macedo

I examined many documents such as staff instructions for direct State management of native issues. Data was collected through observation, participation and interviews. This study questions how administrative officials, direct agents of tutelary power, were instructed at a given time. It also focuses on what kind of accumulated knowledge these instructions were based on how this knowledge was transmitted. Thus, a more comprehensive reflection was required – placing them as members of a Nation-State administration, derived from a peculiar colonial system – on how differently the ways of perpetuating and re-establishing social inequality are expressed at an institutionally political level. In light of this, the notion of tutelary power underlies this article.

Colonial Traditions: Knowledge for Managing and Maintaining Social Inequality

With a view to creating tools to transcend certain impasses brought about by post-colonial studies and by some of their critics, I will consider the types of knowledge generated in colonial enterprises, in their transmission, distribution, reproduction and re-significance.⁴ Before trying to define a **single and unique** “culture of Portuguese colonialism”, placing Brazil as the supposed heir to this legacy – present in Brazilian society through the broader scale of personal relations, reflected in certain aspects of a particular “informality” and “legal concision” etc. – one must grasp how certain specific social categories responsible for managing distinct aspects of imperial enterprise in different periods of time and in interaction with pre-existing local realities, have produced, handled and transmitted their knowledge. Given the plurality and complexity of imperial *specialists’* knowledge and power, it is possible to pose a number of questions, an interpretative step to be associated with others. Without trying to subsume the same order and the continuity of a single period of time from an “exemplary centre” – that of the mother country and the Portuguese court – it is interesting to maintain a view of the complexity and variation between times and distinct spatial scales for the world that arose from Portuguese conquests since the fifteenth-century, without defining great chronological references *a priori*. A possible way to do this would be the descriptive and

& Castro (1998; 2003), Jair de Souza Ramos (2003); José Gabriel Silveira Corrêa (2003).

4 See. Nicholas Thomas (1994).

formal use of proposals presented by Fredrik Barth (1975: 15-27; 1982:80-86; 1993: 339-354; 1995; 2000:107-166) to approach cultural phenomena. This would mean weighing the utility of the *tradition of knowledge* concept to consider links between the imperial Portuguese enterprise and the States that were created in the regions in which it operated.

A colonial management tradition of knowledge could be in this case thought of as a set of knowledge, whether embodied and reproduced in customary interaction standards, into etiquette, corporal positions and stereotyped gestures, or targeted at power devices such as organizations, codifications, culturally material elements (architecture, clothing etc.). Finding and disseminating information, submitting and defining, classifying and organising hierarchically, agglutinating and locating conquered peoples and the spaces inhabited by them are operations carried out by what I term management knowledge and by the power through which it is exercised and generated. Further, these forms of knowledge also affect peoples and organisations that conquer and colonize new geographic spaces and their inhabitants: the colonizers' visions of both natural and social worlds are changed by means of an essential and transforming feedback from the colonizing experience.

Knowledge generated reorders representations of both colonized and colonizers and their administrative organisations as regards nature and human societies, imprinting new trends on their worldviews. Hence, I suggest that the power of population management in colonial contexts outlines simultaneously both social and geographical spaces, as real territories are often created enmeshed in social hierarchies. Even when there is an intent of building integration between conqueror and conquered peoples, the work of colonial management sustains the inequality of achievement and commandment capabilities and fulfillment of command, thus guaranteeing colonizers' dominance. In protecting cultural differences and preserving the continuity of former manners and life-styles prior to the conquest, as in a kind of *in vitro* state, the knowledge and powers set into play by colonizers in a colonial situation exacerbate inequalities. This establishes and demands mediation so that colonized peoples can feel the social forms that are imposed on them as the dominant ones. When differences between colonizers and colonized traditions are brought together in the quest for greater social integration, they belittle colonized peoples' streams of culture⁵, as they

5 See Barth (1982; 2000: 107-166) for the idea of streams of culture.

circumscribe it, appropriate it, thus objectifying and making exotic the everyday life of dominated peoples. In both cases, they reproduce social inequality.

In considering the Brazilian case, especially the exercise of State power on native populations, and focusing on the colonial context, one could distinguish four great traditions of knowledge for colonial management of inequalities among native peoples and transplanted-African peoples. As ideal types to be (re)considered, they can be denominated as “hinterland tradition”, “missionary tradition”, “mercantilist tradition” and “slave-holder tradition”.

“Hinterland tradition” can be thought of, as for every tradition, as knowledge evolving through time. However, it can be traced to the start of Portuguese exploration in Africa, especially in inland areas known as *sertões*, in Brazil and in Africa, since the fifteenth-century. As contours of unknown geographic spaces are explored and inserted onto the set of representations accumulated as portions of the “known world”, strategic knowledge at geopolitical and economic levels is registered, often transformed into geographic charts and maps. These “new” geographical spaces are thus classified, and their records act as hubs for commercial exploitation, since they also sketch descriptions of native human populations in these spaces. These hubs serve to maintain contact and trade with these populations and many times wage the first conquest wars against them. These hubs are only some of the characteristic actions in “hinterland tradition”. In the Brazilian case, in the context of official protection for native peoples from the early twentieth-century on, the term *sertanista* (hinterland specialist), relate to those engaged in *attraction* and *pacification* techniques (Souza Lima, 1995) directed towards native peoples removed from regular interaction with governmental apparatus, be they hostile or not.⁶

“Missionary tradition” is the term I use to designate the knowledge constituted through the Catholic Church – especially through “conversion” devices and pastoral techniques.⁷ It was essential to understand the “uses and customs of gentile peoples” to explain and impose European ways of being and behaving, with a view to creating not only allies and a labor force but also to transform heathens into catechumens. Thus, it was a case of

6 In Monteiro (1999), one finds an interesting analysis of documents that transports us to the times of hinterland tradition par excellence.

7 For the concept of pastoral power, see Foucault (1990).

making sure that more and more significant aspects of reality built up by the colonizer would acquire the automatism of truth effects. These would be assimilated and sometimes, from varied negotiations, syncretised in relation to colonized cultural streams. The conquerors' viewpoint was present in an incorporated-like state in their values, in their willingness to act, in their ways of perceiving and interacting with physical aptitude and in their ways of feeling and self-expression. All this was aimed at disseminating beliefs submitted to social control devices, institutions, codes, technologies, monuments and in narratives that begun to construct and constitute the "history" of those who recognized themselves in it. Creole elites are a specific example of "missionary tradition" triumph. The "missionary tradition" also demarcates areas (missions, native people settlements directed by missionaries, schools, seminars, faculties, universities etc.), ways of intervening in space and time through peoples with which it is faced, putting itself into effect especially as a "pedagogy of example".⁸

One can call "mercantile tradition" a set of knowledge that cares little for spanning it over spaces or peoples as a goal in itself: here we are speaking of producing and controlling interaction flows for bartering among peoples endowed with a radical cultural alterity. Therefore, the mercantile tradition is made up of the knowledge and ways of acting that allow for trading with profit; transposing social worlds with different values regarding barter; reciprocity rules; acute market interference in the social life of peoples linked through commercial relations in colonial contexts. Some of the operations mounted by the mercantile knowledge in scenarios of alterity, so typical of colonial enterprises, are: 1) seeing nature and exotic societies as purveyors and consumers of goods (from products to mental habits and representations) that are inexistent in other areas framed by commercial networks, 2) reevaluating the meaning of these goods, so that they can become the objects of a progressively greater consumerism in the social universes where they are partially unavailable, turning them into essentials, 3) conceiving and regulating relations that can achieve, transport, widely circulate and extensively sell within the market orbit perceived as privileged for these "new" products.

Perhaps the working of the slavery system is the best known of the mercantile knowledge in the Portuguese empire and Brazil. However, the prospect of approaching an aspect of slavery as a

8 In Castelnau-L'Estoile (2000) we find a particularly interesting analysis of Jesuit enterprise to convert Brazilian native peoples.

knowledge tradition for colonial management may help bring up new issues. It is the case of asking how one has built, communicated and reproduced the knowledge needed for: 1) reducing and transporting, culturally uprooting and partially inserting people into another cultural environment (especially as regards labor methods) and 2) keeping up hierarchy and inequality. How did slaveholders come to a set of techniques for immobilising and controlling human stocks; making them produce and reproduce themselves; taming and co-opting them; repressing and dividing these foreign population contingents; transforming them into a type of labor force apparently lacking other values than their very use as a labor force? How does the knowledge about managing slave teams appear; how is it elaborated and handed down? What is its genealogy, from slavery in antiquity to the dawn of the world of discoveries? How are they transformed and in what language are they conveyed and retained? Who are its *specialists* and what public is targeted?

The scope of the “slave-holder tradition” must not be confused with that of the “hinterland tradition”, which refers to exploring spaces and to the early moments of the colonizer enterprise as it conquered peoples, although it included arresting captives to work. Neither is it the same as the “mercantile tradition”, in which it is the slave-commodity – and the work and the wealth it can produce that are at stake. The status of enslaved peoples – not only those of native origins in the actual colonial space but also and, above all, those transported there – is even less so a subject of investigation similar to that of the “missionary tradition”, which supposes the potential or future freedom of the native peoples, or of the spaces like missions and native people settlements directed by missionaries. The appropriate space to generate and operate knowledge that can be called a “slave-holder tradition” is that of domestic units, and its ways of exercising power are coextensive to the management of extended families and their associated clientele. It is knowledge for everyday management; interaction patterns that are developed (and allow it to develop) in domestic spaces (such as rural estates) or based on them (such as in urban situations), which make up a “slave tradition”. At this level, state powers and their formation processes are inseparable from family and personal relations. They thus become power relations in themselves; a variety of action on actions in which physical violence is an emblematic limit: it extracts the maximum value through an extra-economic compulsion that does not belong to work.

State Formation and Internal Colonization in Brazil

If the application of this conceptual constellation can be easily imagined for past periods, its explanatory potential must not be restricted only to themes that remain in the exclusive orbit of investigation about the past. The idea of “traditions of knowledge for the colonial management of inequality” may be useful in explaining current contexts, in addition to dualist interpretations of social life aspects. This therefore restores a complex range of processes to the explanatory capacity of current social circumstances as well as frames spatial scales and temporalities from distinct aspects.⁹

To give an example, recent geographic studies on urbanization in the Western Amazon in this century and over the last two decades have revealed the extraordinary importance of the Catholic Church (and even more when it comes to its missionary side) in the process of founding cities, since parish churches often became the origin of future municipalities. “Community” is the current expression employed by many human settlements to be recognized as “political-administrative agglomerates”, by inserting themselves in the social net.¹⁰ The strategy of representing itself as a “community”, that is, of recognizing itself and making itself to be recognized as “the” “x” or “y” community, is in a sense due to the presence of those Catholic Church segments linked to Liberation Theology that organized the so-called “Grassroots Ecclesiastical Communities”. Yet, the expression also serves NGOs’ social intervention tools and their international circuits of support and action. Moreover, it is partially incorporated by the Brazilian State, dependent upon the influx of sponsoring multilateral mechanisms and international technical cooperation for development instruments associated with them. The Brazilian State has been adopting this terminology in recent decades, a distinctive one at the political level and a very powerful weapon in the struggle for resources sometimes. At least, we are facing issues related to urbanization processes quite distinct from those formulated for different parts of Brazil, even in the so-called frontier regions (Velho, 1976). It would be essential to remember how old ecclesiastical action in the Amazon region is. This was

9 For the issue of temporal scales in social analysis, see the different texts included in Revel (1996)..

10 Cf. Menezes (2002); Larvie (1998); Barreto Fº (2001) for different uses of the term community. Pacheco de Oliveira (2004:10-111) remarks the rather inappropriate use of this term to Native peoples at the present.

propelled by the severance between Church and State in the Republic, as the notion of prelacy was created – a circumscription of essentially missionary and conquering character – in the Amazon region generally speaking, in which the Salesian Order was to play a fundamental role. One of its members became governor of Mato Grosso State in the first decades of the twentieth-century, for instance.

In examining the military discourses for the occupation of the Amazon region (Souza Lima, 1991a), one comes close to interventionist representations and practices that could be easily reported to the Marquis of Pombal's Directory.¹¹ The ideals of a military-based colonization, but of an essentially agricultural nature, which would link native peoples to different spaces and transform them into agents of "regional development" – come up often. They appear together with discussions on national sovereignty over the Amazon region; they give rise to inflamed paroxysms of nationalism and xenophobia. What is more, they escape the more frequent types of "explanations" about Brazilian historic development.

Yet, to bring to an end this impressionistic exemplification on the subject of the Amazon, we could see the representation of its "agricultural" destiny (the "barn of Brazil", as it has been called) constructed with another set of rhetoric and practical patterns: those focusing on the extraction of innumerable natural resources, of which rubber latex remained as the most recent and analytically structured episode.¹² I will just mention the many varied enterprises in time, such as extraction of

11 Cf. Domingues, 2000, for an analysis of the eighteenth-century in the Amazon region, and Almeida (1997), for the Directory itself. Pombal (1699-1782) was a noble and statesman.

12 The Brazilian literature on rubber latex exploitation is vast. Ana Maria Lima Daou (1998)'s doctoral thesis on rubber latex exploitation elites addresses important aspects of Amazonian social shaping in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. Lucia Arraes Morales (2002) approaches in a specially detailed fashion migration induced by Getúlio Vargas' dictatorial regime of north-eastern workers – known as the rubber soldiers – to extract rubber during the Second World War. Both provide us with different aspects of political negotiations at stake in this part of Amazonian and Brazilian history. João Pacheco de Oliveira (1979) deals excellently with some characteristics of rubber-tree properties during the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth, which can be widely addressed as models for understanding other extractivist forms of exploitation in the region.

“hinterland drugs”, rubber latex or, since the 1970’s and 80’s, of timber, gold and other minerals, along with research studies on flora and fauna species. These enterprises are generally linked to some kind of governmental intervention that transforms labor (and social) relations, in which extra-economic coercion is taken for granted. They are best represented today by regional elites economic interests and are surprisingly enmeshed in ecological concerns. Many of the results and of the practices at stake are far from the achievements aimed at and guided by colonization process planners. Such results and practices comprise a huge and complex panorama framed by historical temporalities and spatial scales that escape them.

As far as an Indigenist administration is concerned, an essential part of the colonizing tools in the Amazon region and other Brazilian regions, the analyses that deal with tutelary power exercise, with only some differences in emphasis and concern, find references and social intuition sources in some papers by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, especially those in which he proposes to apply the notion of internal colonialism in ethnology. Originally published in *América Latina* (1966) and published again in his collection *A sociologia do Brasil indígena* (1972), Cardoso de Oliveira’s essay started from the discussions about Gunnar Myrdal and Wright Mills’s on developmental issues, and on the concepts of the strong imbalance faced by the so-called less developed (or in development) societies available at that moment – such as the notion of dual society, present in Jacques Lambert’s *Os dois Brasis*. Cardoso de Oliveira noted that the situation to be described was more complex if seen from the standpoint of a “national society” expanding over native peoples, his privileged object of analysis. He took up the idea of expansion front, proposed by Darcy Ribeiro and which was in turn based on geographer Leo Waibel’s concept of pioneer front. The notion of expansion front allowed to select different modalities through which an “enveloping society” would make contact with native peoples. The “expansion front” was worked on later by Cardoso de Oliveira himself and, with some differences, by José de Souza Martins. It was a result of ethnological fieldwork and described the conflictive interactions between native peoples and nut collectors, native peoples and cattle raisers, native peoples and rubber latex explorers. It was an attempt to conceive analytically and critically what the nationalist ideology of the time called “progress” and “modernisation”.

With a view to going beyond this regionalist perspective, so as to allow for a more theoretical and comprehensive picture,

Cardoso de Oliveira brought into play the colonial situation concept proposed by Georges Balandier (1951) in his study of the contradictory aspects of African societies. In colonial situations, it is possible to see the opposition between “enveloping society” and “tribal society” in post-colonial countries. This was the starting-point for the internal colonialism concept coined by Pablo González Casanova (1963: 25;29-30) based on the Mexican situation, which was quite distinct from that in Brazil. The concept of internal colonialism could, according to Cardoso de Oliveira, serve as a theoretical proposal for his ethnological analysis in terms of “inter-ethnic friction” in the relations between native peoples and the “enveloping society”. In his own words, “the ethnologist is interested in examining national societies seen as a whole and not in their regional manifestations anymore” (1972:80), which would turn ethnological investigation into a fundamental element for analyzing the “second Brazil”, according to Lambert’s expression.

Cardoso de Oliveira even proposed that “these inter-ethnic friction areas must be taken – in a research study inspired by the notion of internal colonialism – as particular cases in the wide process of conquering territories and subjugating their tribal occupants” (1972: 80). If, apparently, developments of Cardoso de Oliveira’s viewpoint were not extended, one can see them broadly redefined in another referential analysis in Otávio Velho’s study on what he calls “authoritarian capitalism”, starting with comparative research studies on internal colonization processes such as those that took place in the United States and Russia (Velho, 1976).¹³ The frontier concept is supposed to have many developments in Brazilian anthropology and geography. However, it seems that these ended up not fitting in with one of the demands in Cardoso de Oliveira’s proposal, that is, a decisive focus on the analysis of certain meanings of the “national society” concept. It remained limited to the study of certain types of peasantry and locally circumscribed relations with public administrative agencies. If the project had been forwarded, it would have helped to put into question this category so greatly used and scarcely defined and demonstrated: the national society.

13 For the notion of “expansion front” and its development, see the same entry in Velho’s article on the *Dicionário de Ciências Sociais*. For his use of a re-elaborated version of Fredrick Jackson Turner idea of moving frontier in North American history, see Velho (1976).

Drawbacks to the notion of “internal colonialism” are evident. Marked by its time, it was conceived based on theories developed after the Second World War, theories that were economically formulated, about and for modernization and development, the same theories that according to Escobar (1994) engendered “underdevelopment” and the “Third World”. The result was a sort of “prescription” towards internal development. This encompassed the mechanical association of phenomena such as agrarian reform, urbanization and political mobility, social mobility and marginalization, and the formulation of a typically industrial class system, seen as the way to widening political participation, as they designated “democratic” access to voting.¹⁴ This prescription for an “advanced society” had roots in the Cold War and the “struggle against communism”. This logic of grasping colonial trends, quite distinct from that proposed by Balandier, leaves out some essential elements in defining a situation as colonial: growing cultural asymmetry, the monopoly for accessing vehicles for worldviews and knowledge legalized in codes and power devices.

It is in these terms that employing the concept of tradition of knowledge, proposed by Barth for contexts of cultural pluralism, such as those existing in colonial situations, makes one look at facts that should be included in the thematic universe I approach in this paper. One may ask – and ethnographically answer – what are the worldviews, the construction of significant social realities, behavior and interaction patterns; knowledge and power devices that allow the imposition and perpetuation of a concrete scenario so that it can be defined as a colonial situation? We have to consider the re-signified reproduction of social ways of negotiation and conflict, which recreate their effects and lead to changes unforeseen by social planners, making their specialization in general a discretionary, authoritarian and many times useless exercise. Social planning developed between the 1950’s and 1970’s, furthered the proposals for “modernizing” Latin-American states, though centered on good intentions for transformation and on social justice ideas, considered “awareness” an absolute, unanimous process that, pedagogically established at a given moment, would further a break with its past and the everyday life of dominated peoples. Nevertheless, this paper’s

14 The works developed at Núcleo de Antropologia da Política (the Anthropology of Politics Nucleus), Nuap/Pronex, co-coordinated by Drs. Moacir Palmeira (PPGAS/Museu Nacional), Mariza Peirano (UnB), and César Barreira (UFC) have been delving into the electoral policy in Brazil.

focus is not to address issues that seem to hamper use of internal colonialism, at least not at this moment.¹⁵

Indigenist Administration in Brazil and Its Specialists¹⁶

In *A sociologia do Brasil indígena*, there are two other fundamental subjects in the study of indigenist policies and studies: one of them is that of indigenist administration management; the other contemplates representations on native peoples in Brazil.¹⁷ In the first case, Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira emphasized the importance of a sociological study of Indigenous posts managers, specialists at Serviço de Proteção aos Índios - SPI (the Indian Protection Service) and later at Fundação Nacional do Índio - FUNAI (the National Indian Foundation), responsible for relating directly to native peoples, managing local units of official protection and dealing on a daily basis with conflicts between worldviews and social traditions.¹⁸ The second subject points towards the ways in which native peoples have been represented in Brazil, based upon common sense and the media, teaching material and the country's official historiography etc. One could develop a long research agenda by relating all this material to a native people's studies approach based on the idea of "traditions of knowledge for the colonial management of inequality", from

15 As to the sound quality of Cardoso de Oliveira theory, as well as for some criticism and recovery, see João Pacheco de Oliveira's (1988, 1999) proposals for the study of inter-ethnic conflict.

16 For my use of indigenism and indigenist, see Souza Lima (1991b; 1995, 2005). For a similar, however, different point of view, see Ramos (1998).

17 Cf. "O papel dos postos indígenas no processo de assimilação dos Terena"; "As mentalidades sobre o índio" in: Cardoso de Oliveira (1972). In Souza Lima, 1995 (Introduction and Chapter 1), I sought to outline a long empirical and theoretical investment, which would address native peoples studies à la Said, that is, as a homologue to oriental studies, which would point above all in the second direction. There I also expressed the reasons why I opted in defining native peoples' studies and native peoples' policies, according to the original context of these ideas: the Mexican context. In Souza Lima (2005), a more in-depth discussion is given.

18 For the establishment of SPI, in 1910, see Souza Lima (1987); for a brief history of FUNAI, see Souza Lima (1998).

the perspective of a historical anthropology¹⁹. It must be emphasized that for a country whose national identity is emblematically based on native people's societies, studies of the representation of native peoples and their history have not many followers and even less specialists.²⁰ In an investigation of this nature, the relations between Anthropology and public administration should have a featured role.

However, by emphasizing the possibility of making use of the concept of "traditions of knowledge for colonial management of inequality", administrative categories can become especially meaningful, serving as a catalyst for varied socio-cultural vectors. We are speaking about those that up to very recently held the position of native people's specialists in Brazilian public administration within the scope of the first above-mentioned theme in Cardoso de Oliveira's work: the technicians in Indigenism, created for Indigenous posts chiefs (or managers),²¹ but who also perform many other roles within the scope of the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI).

Technician in Indigenism is a position within FUNAI. The term indigenist has thus become a general term for those who work "in defense" of native peoples, which allows enlarging its use for the institution's employees as a whole, whether they are within or without FUNAI today. They are (self) assigned individuals who have received some sort of training (such as the Indigenist courses); who are, or were, part of certain social networks; who shared several ideological presuppositions in their work with Native Peoples, whatever their formal education; who adhere to some values, etiquette, behavior patterns, and who transfer and reproduce them. In sum, individuals who are recognized as having a certain knowledge.

The concern for training personnel to work in direct touch with native peoples, especially in the position of Indigenous posts managers, is not something new, having existed since the beginning of the Indian Protection Service, in 1910, until its closing in 1967 (Souza Lima, 1995). In the 1940's, it was already

19 The idea of a historical anthropology is presented in Brazil by João Pacheco de Oliveira (1999), among others.

20 Cf. Ramos (1998), for an exception to this "rule".

21 I make the following considerations based on my own research studies on SPI and, more recently, on FUNAI, and in relation to Luiza Saldanha (1996)'s undergraduate research study. See also Freire (2005)..

implicit in the proposal for creating a Brazilian Indigenist Institute, which was never implemented. In the 1950's, it became one of the main objectives in the creation of a course specialized in this field, developed at the Museu do Índio (the Indian Museum) and focused on training personnel in Anthropology. The course aimed at fostering ethnological research and disseminating a "scientifically-inspired" standard for "protecting" native peoples. Elaborated by Darcy Ribeiro, it involved participation from many professors and lecturers from other educational and research institutions, among them the National Museum, represented by Professor Luis de Castro Faria (Souza Lima, 2005).

Further, it was with the establishment of FUNAI in 1968 and the official creation of the position of indigenist technician that the acute need to train staff for a series of jobs was perceived. Initial discussions on FUNAI's establishment led once more to a discussion of this issue, as the Deliberative Council endeavored briefly to develop a new State action model in relation to native people's societies. The first training course for indigenist technicians was proposed in 1969 and run in 1970 – there were eight more, the last being in 1985. They came up during the military dictatorship, which was highly concerned with the country's development and keenly interested in expansion towards the Amazon region (Davis, 1978). The course's early purpose was not only to train new staff but also to qualify existing personnel acting directly with the native population, many of whom had not even finished secondary school, a requirement that currently must be met in filling a technician position on native peoples. These were locally hired individuals, the remainder of SPI administration, who exercised menial functions though they were in fact indigenous post managers. It was essential to provide them with the certificates required for their professional development, so as to provide FUNAI with a qualified operational body. A mix between new employees admitted through public examinations and older ones was to continue for some time in the courses, generating obvious discrepancies.

The course syllabus was also reminiscent of the military dictatorship period (1964-1985). At first, it expressed the developmentalist and expansionist character of the dictatorship. The courses would focus on agricultural techniques to be taught to native peoples; community development methods; first-aid notions; and FUNAI's bureaucratic-administrative routines. Gradually, other subjects began to be included in this syllabus: sociological and anthropological concepts and, above all, ethnological studies, besides linguistic notions and techniques. For some learners, all

this was new; for others, innocuous items - even among those admitted by public examinations and the new applicants, there were different levels of information on indigenous issues and very different life experiences. It is worth remembering that a secondary school degree was the only prerequisite for candidates applying for this position, and that secondary schools in Brazil do not include neither sociology nor anthropology in their syllabus; even references to native peoples in history and geography courses are superficial, simplistic and full of prejudices and stereotypes.²²

The course also counted on two other techniques of knowledge transfer: 1) lectures delivered by experienced indigenists, that is, FUNAI officials (some of them SPI remainders) who had lived for long periods among native peoples, as well as others that had experienced the process of attracting and pacifying withdrawn or hostile tribes - many of them holding a *sertanista* position on FUNAI's salary schedule and payroll ; 2) field training subsequent to the course's theoretical approach. In short, the applicant would go to a FUNAI indian post, where he would work under the supervision of an office manager and write a final report.

These two aspects of the course must not be overlooked. Lectures and field training generated knowledge transfers in a practical and non-systematic way. They allowed beginners to identify -especially in emotional terms of positive and negative affection, as well as deep humanitarian feelings of "doing good"- what they were supposed to do. The course therefore gave them access to traditions of knowledge, as they became used to grasping different meanings of indigenist work. In field training, they were bound to write about their working experiences. Writing was part of a native peoples' office manager's routine, before diverse factors began to justify the use of orality as the preferred type of record. Among these factors we can list the progressive dismantling of FUNAI's administrative structure; the absence of resources channeled to community development projects (or even the most basic social work assistance), besides the lack of other kinds of support, such as work groups, an administrative sector contributing effectively to its correspondent activity etc. Actually, the reports also served a function never met by FUNAI's organisational structure so far: that of collecting and systematizing information about what was happening in native areas and

22 See Pacheco de Oliveira & Rocha Freire (2006) for a radical critique of these stereotypes.

transmitting it to a central administration. It is to a certain extent a centralized type of administration, in which the negotiation game that keeps it going creates influence zones that do not coincide with administrative circumscriptions, thus allowing for maximum dispersion in the governmental network.

Reports on field training programs have not always described these experiences as exactly positive. As one reads this material or resorts to the memory of those who did the courses, one has the feeling that opinions on the training programs convey a general criticism leveled at FUNAI, made by all interviewees. According to the latter, FUNAI officials operating in native areas could count only on themselves and the good relations they could establish with the native societies they were supposed to work with, segments of the local population, other public officials, missionaries etc. In short, they felt that the organizational administrative structure as such left them to their own devices. Many times, they had to learn how to fight against segments of the very FUNAI's rival groups. Each of the indigenist technicians interviewed reported how they had to create their own personal networks in order to keep on working.

In this sense, the 1985 course was different when compared to the others. Offered at a time when officials expurgated during the dictatorial period in Brazil were resuming their positions, the course clearly aimed at a change. It intended to give learners a critical view of the state's way of acting. They were supposed to wipe away some "vices" existent in the indigenist work, endeavoring an interplay with experiences brought about by anthropologists, missionaries and FUNAI's indigenists who had developed practices other than a stricter tutelary control (or simply away from corrupting and corrupted measures).²³ The indigenist task was seen rather as consultation and partnership with native peoples than as mediation. Thus, the expectation was to vitalize common stock practices and take a step towards reformulating FUNAI's administrative machine from the inside.

Once the course was completed, the indigenist technician was sent to a native area, where he was supposed to develop some work come what may. Many times, the only thing he could do was to be an emblematic – more than effective – representative, at the local level, of federal authority, an isolated link on a chain more figurative than real, though able to send information in

23 For the ethnography of an action project directed towards native peoples, as an alternative to FUNAI's communal development, see Almeida (2001)..

search of help outside the geographic area in which he was located. As there were no available resources to develop activities in the interest of native peoples, the most common answer in the interviews carried out for this paper was that of the indigenist's lonely perplexity: no interplay or knowledge exchange with other FUNAI technicians and sometimes, when they were not seen as potential enemies or competitors, not even with anthropologists, missionaries or native peoples themselves. If, from the beginning, FUNAI would not provide them with regular resources and did not demand a corresponding plan, it soon became impossible to develop clear interventionist proposals. This situation would worsen due to the government's own budget enactment rules. These posed more obstacles than ways of control in distant inland regions. Compelled to invent, the direct managers of State indigenist policies saw themselves many times at the mercy of other officials hierarchically connected to FUNAI's "administrative area" rather than to its indigenist activities. Knowledge transmission chains with any trace of institutional quality were thus broken up. At other times, a possible solution to obtain resources to operate in a micro scale was to employ the very native peoples as FUNAI's officials and soon include them into the State's network. This was one of the strategies for developing a clientele network between native peoples and managers, which could bear the weight of their "national" existence.²⁴ At other moments, the strategy was to get retirement pensions from agencies devised to assist rural workers as a way of obtaining resources to mitigate hunger and illness among native peoples. In all these cases, through a minimal financial investment in direct action, a growing integration between native peoples and the state administrative network was achieved.

Without a qualification or upward mobility system referred to merit in his career, an indigenist technician as soon as he started to understand and establish the necessary relations to work amidst a native people, could find himself being transferred to another administrative circumscription and having to start from scratch in another region of the country. Another likely destination in these specialists' career was to move to non-local positions along FUNAI's bureaucratic structure. Not to mention those who became involved in corrupt practices. In many instances, proud of his micro-power and his exercise of tutelage, the indigenist technician or very often those who held the position of Indian posts managers turned into local petty rulers, like so many in Brazilian

24 Bezerra (1995, 1999), points towards the role of personal relations and client trends in State operations in Brazil.

public administration, managing clientele and engaging in various types of natural resource exploitation of native lands. Moreover, priestly heroism, present in many vocations and intentions to work with native peoples, led them easily to arrogance, sectarian and corporative closeness, to an antagonism against all sorts of alliances with actors outside the agency, against all manners of recording and reflecting on such a delicate job, involving the lives of human societies.

In this paper, I sought to discuss how one can hear echoes of distinct knowledge traditions in staff-training as part of the current Brazilian colonial administration, the so-called indigenist section. In fact, the *indigenist technician* as a typical protagonist in tutelary administration, a specialist in managing cultural plurality situations, presupposes a singular transversality of knowledge traditions invoked by military engineers affiliated to Brazilian orthodox positivism that led to the Indian's Protection Service in 1910. It was a mix of missionary spirit and martyrdom, heroic pioneering and nationalist "hinterland culture". In the indigenist practices, these were also combined with the experience of managing as master or foreman of crowds of workers in a semi-servile or slave-like situation. A final touch could be found on XIX/XX's evolutionary science that supposed native peoples were doomed to civilize or to disappear under the waves of the expansionist thrust. Different kinds of knowledge, whose genealogy is still to be adequately investigated, are grouped together under the banner of the Nation-State and in governmental agencies focused on the Brazilian intra-territorial dimension. This can no doubt be one of the ways in studying state formation processes in post-colonial contexts and in assessing contemporary political action in their own context. The idea of "traditions of knowledge in colonial management of inequalities" can be tested not only by focusing upon native peoples, but also by studying the administrative devices constitutive of State-controlled territorial spaces, or by looking at major segments of the population subsumed to the logic of similar domination.

References cited

- Almeida, Rita Heloisa de. 1997. *O Diretório dos Índios. Um projeto de "civilização" no Brasil do século XVIII*. Brasília: EdUnB.
- Almeida, Rubem Ferreira Thomaz de. 2001. *Do desenvolvimento comunitário à mobilização política. O projeto Kayowá-Ñandeva*

como experiência antropológica. Rio de Janeiro: LACED-Museu Nacional/Contra Capa Livraria.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined communities*. London and New York: Verso.

Balandier, George. 1951. La situation coloniale. *Cahiers Internationaux de sociologie*. (11): 44-79.

Barreto filho, Henyo T. 2001. “Da nação ao planeta através da natureza: uma tentativa de abordagem sócio-antropológica das unidades de conservação na Amazônia (etnografia comparada do Parque Nacional do UAU e da Estação Ecologia de Anavilhanas)”. PhD Dissertation (Social Anthropology). São Paulo: FFCHL/Universidade de São Paulo.

Barth, Fredrik. 1975. *Ritual and knowledge among the Baktaman of New Guinea*. Oslo; New Haven, Universitetsforlaget; Yale University Press.

_____. 1982. “Problems in conceptualizing cultural pluralism, with illustrations from Sohar, Oman”. In: David Maybury-Lewis & Stuart Plattner (eds.), *Prospects for plural societies*. Washington D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

_____. 1993. *Balinese worlds*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

_____. 1995. Other knowledge and other ways of knowing. *Journal of Anthropological Research*. 51(1): 65-68.

_____. 2000. *O guru e o iniciador e outras variações antropológicas*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa Livraria.

Bezerra, Marcos Otávio. 1995. *Corrupção*. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo: Relume-Dumará, ANPOCS.

_____. 1999. *Em nome das bases*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará; Nuap.

Oliveira, Roberto Cardoso de. 1972 (1969). *A sociologia do Brasil indígena*. 2ª. ed.. Rio de Janeiro; Brasília: Tempo Brasileiro-EdUnB.

Castelnau-L’Estoile, Charlotte. 2000. *Les ouvriers d’une vigne sterile. Les jésuites et la conversion des Indiens au Brésil, 1580-1620*.

- Lisboa/Paris: Centre Culturel Calouste Gulbenkian/Commission Nationale pour les Commémorations des Découvertes Portugaises.
- Castro, João Paulo Macedo e. 1998. “*Não tem doutores da favela, mas na favela tem doutores*. Padrões de interação em uma favela de um subúrbio carioca nos anos 90”. M.A. Dissertation (Social Anthropology). Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional/UFRJ.
- _____. 2003. “Desenvolvimento e tecnologia de controle populacional” In: SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos de Souza, ed. *Gestar & Gerir. Estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, Nuap/Museu Nacional.
- Cohn, Bernard. 1996. *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge*. The British in India. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Corrêa, José Gabriel Silveira. 2003. “A administração dos índios: as diretrizes para o funcionamento dos postos indígenas do SPI.” In: SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos de Souza, ed. *Gestar & Gerir. Estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, Nuap/Museu Nacional.
- Daou, Ana Maria Lima. 1978. “A cidade, o Teatro e o *Paiz das Seringueiras*: práticas e representações da sociedade amazonense na virada do século XIX”. Tese de doutorado em Antropologia Social. Rio de Janeiro, PPGAS/ Museu Nacional.
- Domingues, Ângela. 2000. *Quando os índios eram vassalos*. Colonização e relações de poder no norte do Brasil na segunda metade do século XVIII. Lisboa: Comissão Nacional Para Comemoração dos Descobrimentos Portugueses.
- Elias, Norbert. 1972. “Processes of State formation and nation-building”. *Transactions at the Seventh World Congress of Sociology*. Geneva: International Sociological Association.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1994. *Encountering development*. The making and unmaking of the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. “*Omnes et singulatim*: crítica da razão

política” *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*, 26, março.

_____. 1997. “*Il faut défendre la société*”. Paris: Hautes Etudes; Gallimard; Seuil.

González Casanova, Pablo. 1963. “Sociedad plural, colonialismo interno y desarrollo” *América Latina*, 5 (3).

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational connections*. Culture, people, places. London and New York: Routledge.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1990. *Nações e nacionalismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Larvie, Sean Patrick. 1998. “Managing Desire: Sexuality, citizenship and AIDS in contemporary Brazil” PhD dissertation (Department of Psychology, Committee on Human Development). Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Mandani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and subject*. Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Menezes, Maria Lucia Pires. 2002. “Atalaia da Nação: Cidades e ações imssionária na Borda da Amazônia.” PhD. Dissertation (Geography). Rio de Janeiro: IGEO-UFRJ.

Monteiro, John Manuel. 1999. “Os caminhos da memória: paulistas no Códice Costa Matoso” *Varia História*, Belo Horizonte MG, v. 21, p. 86-99.

Morales, Lucia Arrais. 2002. *Vai e vem, vira e volta: as rotas dos soldados da borracha*. São Paulo: Annablume.

Pacheco de Oliveira, João. 1979. “O caboclo e o brabo. Notas sobre duas modalidades de força-de-trabalho na expansão da fronteira amazônica no século XIX” *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*, Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 11.

_____. 1988. “*O nosso governo*”. Os ticuna e o regime tutelar. São Paulo; Brasília: Marco Zero; CNPq.

_____. 1999. *Ensaio de antropologia histórica*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ.

_____. 2004. “Uma tentativa de reversão da tutela (e não

- de sua superação)” In: Victora, C.; Oliven, R.G.; Maciel, M.E.; Oro, A. – *Antropologia e ética*. O debate atual no Brasil. Niterói: Eduff, p.105-111.
- Pacheco de Oliveira, João Pacheco de & Rocha Freire, Carlos Augusto da. 2006. *A presença indígena na história do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro; Brasília: Trilhas de Conhecimentos/LACED; MEC/SECAD; UNESCO. (Coleção *Educação para Todos* – Série *Vias dos Saberes*).
- Paine, Robert. 1977. “The nursery game: colonizers and the colonized”. In: *be White Arctic*. Anthropological essays on Tutelage and Ethnicity. Newfoundland: Memorial University of Newfoundland, University of Toronto Press. P. 77-106.
- Peirano, Mariza Gomes e Souza. 1982. “Documentos e identidade social (algumas reflexões sobre a cidadania no Brasil)”. Brasília, *Série Antropologia*, UnB, n. 30.
- Ramos, Jair de Souza. 2003. “Poder tutelar e formação do Estado Brasileiro: o Serviço de Povoamento do Solo Nacional 1907-1918”. In: SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos de Souza, ed. *Gestar & Gerir. Estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, Nuap/Museu Nacional.
- Reis, Elisa Pereira. 1998. “O Estado Nacional como ideologia: o caso brasileiro” In: *Processos e escolhas*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa Livraria, pp.67-90.
- Revel, Jacques. 1998. *Jogo de escalas*. A experiência da microanálise. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas Editora.
- Rocha Freire, Carlos Augusto da. 1990. “Indigenismo e antropologia. O Conselho Nacional de proteção aos Índios na gestão Rondon (1939-1955)”. Dissertação de mestrado em Antropologia Social. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional/ufrrj.
- _____. 2005. “Sagas Sertanistas: práticas e representações do campo indigenista no século XX”. PhD. Dissertation (Social Anthropology). Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional/UFRJ.
- Saldanha, Luiza. 1996. “Escola de Heróis. Os cursos de formação de Técnicos em Indigenismo da FUNAI, de 1974 a 1985”

Undergraduate Monograph (History). Rio de Janeiro: IFCS/CFCH/UFRJ.

Souza Lima, Antonio Carlos de. 1987. "Sobre indigenismo, autoritarismo e nacionalidade: considerações sobre o discurso e a prática da proteção fraternal no Brasil" In: Oliveira Filho, João Pacheco de, ed. *Sociedades indígenas e indigenismo no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo: EdUFRJ; Marco Zero.

_____. 1991^a. "Militares, índios e fronteiras políticas no Brasil" *Antropologia e Indigenismo*, 1.

_____. 1991b. "On indigenism and Nationality in Brazil" In: Urban, Greg & Sherzer, Joel, eds. *Nation-States and Indians in Latin-America*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 236-258.

_____. 1995. *Um grande cerco de paz*: poder tutelar, indianidade e formação de Estado no Brasil. Petrópolis: Vozes.

_____. 1998. "Fundação Nacional do Índio". *Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

_____. 2003. "Sobre gestar e gerir a desigualdade: pontos de investigação e diálogo." In: Souza Lima, Antonio Carlos de Souza, ed. *Gestar & Gerir. Estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, Nuap/Museu Nacional.

_____. 2005. "Indigenism in Brazil: the international migration of State Policies" In: L'Estoile, Benoît de; Neiburg, Frederico & Sigaud, Lygia, eds. *Empires, Nations and Natives*. Anthropology and Stat-Making. Durham & London: Duke University Press. Pp. 197-222.

Swaan, Abram de. 1988. *In care of the State*. Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in Modern Era. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1994. *Colonialism's culture*. Anthropology, travel and government. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1996. *Coerção, capital e Estados europeus I*. São Paulo: EDUSP.

Velho, Otávio. 1972. *Frente de expansão e estrutura agrária*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.

_____. 1976. *Capitalismo autoritário e campesinato*. São Paulo: DIFEL.

Vianna, Adriana de Resende Barreto. 1999. *O mal que se adivinha*. Polícia e menoridade no Rio de Janeiro, 1910-1920. Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional.

_____. 2003. “Quem deve guardar as crianças? Dimensões tutelares da gestão contemporânea da infância”. In: Souza Lima, Antonio Carlos de Souza (ed.), *Gestar & Gerir. Estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, Nuap/Museu Nacional.

SOCIAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE AND MILITARY INTELLIGENCE: GLOBAL CONFLICT, TERRITORIAL CONTROL AND THE BIRTH OF AREA STUDIES DURING WW II

David Nugent¹

This text is part of a larger project that seeks to understand the conditions of possibility of different forms of social science knowledge. The time frame is what Giovanni Arrighi (1994) has called “the long 20th century” and what Neil Smith (2003) refers to as “the American century”—the period from the late 19th to the early 21st century, during which the US first rose and then fell from the position of the world’s leading power. In the larger project, I suggest that the social sciences in the US are inextricably linked to the process of empire formation, and that they may be divided into three periods, each of which corresponds to a shift in the relationship between the US and its imperial domains. These three periods are: (1) The Formation of Empire (circa 1900-1940; in particular, the period between WW I and WW II); (2) The Consolidation of Empire (circa 1945-1975); and (3) The Reconstitution of Empire (circa 1975-the Present).

During each of these periods, I argue, the social sciences have been characterized by a distinctive “geography of enquiry.” Area studies—the geographic mode of the cold war period—is the best known of these, although the other two also have their own distinct geographic frames. Each of these geographies of knowledge, I seek to show, has been enabled by a historically contingent assemblage (Collier and Ong 2005) of institutional practices and relationships. One of my goals is to focus attention on how and why these global assemblages came into being, and in this was to better understand the powers and interests involved in authorizing different forms of social science knowledge.

The emphasis of the present paper is a little-known but important subject. I focus on the collaboration of the military and the academy during WW II to produce the first comprehensive

1 Department of Anthropology, Emory University.

version of area studies—a geography of knowledge well-suited to the military’s desire to impose control upon and stability within the extensive territories being “liberated” from Axis control. Before turning to the fruit of this military/academic collaboration, however, I review briefly the geography of knowledge that emerged prior to WW II. Such a contrast will highlight not only the degree to which war-time area studies represented a radical break with what had come before. It will also point to the distinctive institutions, powers and interests involved in producing knowledge during these two periods.

The Consolidation of Empire: the Social Sciences Between the World Wars

During the opening decades of the 20th century—and especially between the two world wars—a new kind of social science research came into being. Unlike the armchair theorizing that dominated past academic endeavors, the “new” social science was problem-oriented and observation-based. Between the world wars, for the first time literally thousands of young men and women began doing primary research—both field and archive-based. Although the range of topics upon which they focused their energies was quite broad, the research of this era had an important commonality. It was intended by its sponsors to have some bearing on understanding the pressing socio-economic and political problems of the day.

The “new” social science was brought into being largely by the great philanthropic foundations located in the United States of America. Rockefeller and Carnegie took the leading role, although Russell Sage, Rosenthal, Phelps Stokes and others also played important parts. As the foundations stated openly and explicitly, they were deeply troubled by the negative impact that the expansion of trade and industry was having on diverse peoples and societies located around the globe. The foundations sought to understand why this was occurring, and wished to ameliorate the worst of the negative impacts. In this way they hoped to promote and expand the benefits of capitalist modernity, a project to which they were deeply committed. This was considered an especially pressing matter in light of the Russian Revolution of 1917, the spread of international communism, and the emergence of numerous, powerful anti-colonial movements.

The foundations turned to the university, and secondarily to the private research institute, as the institutional site where their

goals could best be pursued. They turned to the university-based academic as the source of expertise best suited to gathering the information they sought. The foundations believed that before either was ready to perform the tasks required of them, however, extensive changes in both would have to be made. Universities were oriented predominantly toward teaching, and faculty had neither opportunity nor motivation to engage in primary research. Nor did they have the extensive blocks of uninterrupted time necessary to produce in-depth works of scholarship. Nor were they trained in the problem-oriented, observation-based methods the foundations believed to be essential to their cause.

In an effort to mold academia in the desired directions, the foundations intervened extensively in the organizations of universities and in the training and activities of academics. The philanthropies poured huge sums of money into approximately thirty select universities—the majority in the US, but some in Europe and a few beyond it—to showcase their efforts. Some of the funds were used to relieve the teaching pressure on professors, and to provide them with free time to pursue research and writing. Other monies were made available to sponsor actual research projects that dealt with the pressing social problems that were the focus of foundation concern—and that took academics directly to the contested frontiers and internal lines of fracture of capitalist modernity. Philanthropic largesse was also used to train academics in problem-oriented methodology and observation-based techniques of data collection.

The foundations also provided monies to train graduate studies along similar lines, and to allow them to do their own primary research. The philanthropies were equally committed to increasing the overall number of graduate studies, and to opening graduate study to formerly under-represented groups. These included members of the domestic middle and working classes. They included as well gifted students from beyond Western Europe and the US—from China, India, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East—who were brought to be trained at the foundations' re-made elite universities. In this way the foundations hoped to form an international academic elite trained in and committed to the problem-oriented, observation-based approach to social engineering that the foundations believed essential to their cause.

In addition to transforming the conditions of academic life within a select group of elite universities, the philanthropies also created new organizations to coordinate and guide the activities

of all universities—especially those in the US. They did so in large part by creating national institutions (especially the SSRC, the ACLS and the National Research Council) that funded the kind of research they sought to promote, the kind of researcher they sought to reward, and the kind of training they sought to provide. These institutions became the most important sources of funding for social science research and training during the entire period in question.

In addition to reorganizing academic life within universities, the foundations also focused their attention on private research institutes. In some cases, the philanthropies created entirely new institutes out of whole cloth. An example here would be the Institute of Pacific Relations, which organized and funded research and publishing about a wide range of issues in what today would be called the Pacific Rim and large sections of SE Asia (Akami 2002). The foundations also reorganized and re-oriented the activities and priorities of existing institutes so that they would promote the kinds of research and scholarship to which the foundations were committed. An example here would be the RIAA—the Royal Institute of International Affairs—whose headquarters were in London. Under philanthropic guidance, the RIAA coordinated research and writing on a wide range of topics, from the economic and political conditions of colonial Africa (Hailey 1938) to the dynamics of the world communist movement (Toynbee 1928).

All in all, during the inter-war period the foundations created an entire infrastructure of social science training, research and publishing. An assemblage that was truly global in scope, this infrastructure was made up of a **extensive** network of universities, private research institutes, training programs and publishing venues the complete dimensions of which have yet to be fully documented. For the present purposes, however, the important point about this infrastructure is the following; it underwrote virtually all social science research and publishing in the English-speaking world. It also made the US the intellectual and institutional center of the social sciences, and placed the US at the focal point of an emerging global public sphere of social science knowledge.

A review of the scholarship produced during this period as a whole (as opposed to the works of a few famous authors) reveals that the foundations were concerned about problems and processes—labor migration, capital investment, epidemic disease, poverty, colonialism, fascism, international communism—rather

than territories or boundaries. By understanding and ameliorating the worst of the period's social problems, the foundations hoped to maintain a world without borders—one that would be safe for capital and consumption, and safe from communism and international socialism. The problem-oriented, observation-based forms of knowledge they did so much to create reflected these concerns.²

A War-Time Geography of Knowledge: the Military and Area Studies during World War II

This processual, globally-oriented, field-based approach to applied, practical problems transformed in fundamental ways as a result of WW II, when a new geography of knowledge came into being. The new knowledge geography may be distinguished from the old in a number of ways. First, it emerged in radically transformed global conditions—the heat of industrial warfare (cf., Lutz 2004), waged among the contending capitalist superpowers of the era. It was also enabled by different bodies—an assemblage that was predominantly military/academic as opposed to corporate/academic. Third, in its field dimensions, the new knowledge geography was implemented by different personnel—academically trained soldiers and civilian professionals rather than field-readied academics. Finally, the new geography of knowledge was intended to serve a very different set of needs, and to address a different group of concerns. It is to a consideration of these that we now turn.

During WW II, the US Army did not seek knowledge about global processes that threatened to stir up potentially dangerous peoples living along the external frontiers and the internal lines of fracture of an expanding capitalist order. Instead, the military was in need of a single, overarching conceptual framework that would facilitate direct territorial administration of diverse peoples living in scattered, war-torn areas. As the war progressed, the Army found itself responsible for governing many of the far-flung regions of the globe that were being seized (“liberated,” in the lingo of the Allies) from the Axis powers. The military sought a form of knowledge that would assist in its efforts to govern these areas—that would allow its soldier-administrators to know the territories for which they would be responsible *before* they actually began governing them, and that would make it possible

2 See Nugent (2002) for a more detailed discussion of these processes.

for these soldier-administrators to deepen their understanding as they governed. In other words, military planners sought a form of knowledge that would equip soldiers with conceptual armature they could use to effect the day-to-day administration of occupied territories.

It was in this context that a war-time version of area studies was born—one overseen by high-ranking military officers, designed and taught by academics, and implemented around the globe by military personnel (together with civilian professionals-turned-officers). By the end of the war, this version of area studies had been employed in the armed forces' efforts to order and administer the lives of over 300 million people around the globe—more than 10% of the world's population (Holborn 1947: xi).

This iteration of area studies—the first to be institutionalized in the US—did more than simply guide the armed forces in their interim efforts to govern foreign lands. It also acted as the model for the academic version of area studies that consolidated during the Cold War.³ Indeed, the origins of peace-time area studies, and the academy's concern with cultures and areas, can be traced directly to WW II, to the same problems that generated the military's concern with these issues. The processes to be discussed here thus have relevance for understanding how the social sciences have been ordered and conceptualized for much of the period since the beginning of WW II.

Early in the war, US military planners began to envision a new global geography of power and knowledge—one that had little in common with the web of interconnected processes and prac-

3 The fact that the entire area studies framework represented a significant change of direction for the social sciences is revealed by the following; from its creation (by Rockefeller philanthropy) in 1924 until 1943, the SSRC—which organized the vast majority of all social science research in the US—showed virtually no interest in “culture areas.” The committees of the SSRC covered a wide range of topics—from “Consumption and Leisure,” to “Social and Economic Research in Agriculture,” to “Interracial Relations” (SSRC 1934; see also the annual reports of the SSRC between 1934 and 1943). During this entire twenty-year period, however, only once (from 1926 to 1928) was there a Committee on Culture Areas (SSRC 1934: 37). The SSRC, and the social science community it helped create, was focused on problems and issues rather than areas and cultures.

tical problems of such pressing concern to the corporate-based philanthropies (and to academics) just a short time before. The war-time geography of the military emerged first in the realm of the imagination, for it began to take shape well before the outcome of the war was certain. Nonetheless, Allied military planners began to imagine a globe liberated from the Axis powers. They began to plan for the possibility that they would soon find themselves in control of extensive territories in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Pacific still controlled by the enemy.⁴

The US was not prepared for such an eventuality. Unlike the European countries, which had established extensive colonial empires long before WW II, the US had only rarely imposed direct political control over foreign lands.⁵ As a result, it had no ready-made cohort of colonial administrators to whom military planners could turn for assistance. Nor had the US had any reason to establish programs of training comparable to those of the British, the French or the Dutch—who had consciously designed programs to prepare people for roles in colonial administration. As a result, US military planners were compelled to establish new schools and to design new programs of study, where soldiers could be trained for the novel task that appeared to lie ahead.

It was in this context that a new geography of knowledge came into being. Unlike that of the pre-war era, this new geography showed a highly developed concern with the administration of *territories*—no doubt because control of territory was the central point of contention in the war itself, and could only be established through violent clashes with the enemy. The new knowledge geography was equally concerned with the socio-political processes that took place within the boundaries of territories seized from the enemy—and with ensuring that these processes were a source of order rather than conflict in the context of military government. Indeed, the ability to

4 It was in England where the Allies first began to anticipate a new geography of political relations. European governments in exile, having fled to London before the advancing forces of the 3rd Reich, signed agreements with the British. According to the terms of these accords, once Germany had been expelled the British armed forces were to administer the “civil affairs” of the countries in question in an interim capacity, until the governments in exile could return to their home territories. The British signed agreements of this kind with Norway, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Denmark.

5 The main exceptions were those territories seized from Spain at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War.

control the borders of liberated territories, to understand their internal socio-cultural dynamics, and to maintain stability within these borders, were matters of strategic, military concern. The geography of knowledge that emerged during the war was thus focused on the problems of *order* and *governance* within carefully delimited territorial spaces.

The development of plans to train personnel for military government evolved as did the war itself. In early spring of 1942, the Provost Marshal General of the US Army was charged with training several hundred Army officers for military government duty in occupied territory. He was guided in his efforts by the experiences of officers who had performed this same function in Germany after WWI. These soldiers had found themselves wholly unprepared for the task of government administration in occupied lands. On the one hand, they were completely uninformed about the economic patterns, social institutions, political practices, religious beliefs and cultural mores of the people they were to administer. As a result, they had no idea how people were accustomed to living—and therefore how their attachments to familiar patterns of life might affect their responses to military government. Making matters worse, US officers had no German language skills, and thus were unable to educate themselves about these matters in the process of governing. They could not even communicate with the people under their jurisdiction (Coles and Weinberg 1964; Herge 1948).

The military concluded that it was essential to address these problems if they were to prepare soldiers adequately for military government during WW II. They were especially concerned to avoid repeating the mistakes of the last war because, in the military's estimation, WW II was more "ideological" than the Great War (Friedrich 1948; Holborn 1947). Indeed, it was as if the worst fears of the philanthropies from the 1920s and 1930s had been realized. Despite their best efforts, it had proved impossible to maintain a "world without borders." Enemy governments and their respective populations in many parts of the world had become deeply committed to communism, socialism, fascism and anti-colonial nationalism—which made them extremely hostile to the US. Military government was therefore likely to be even more difficult than it had been in the non-ideological past.

To ensure that US personnel were fully up to the task that (might!) lay before them, a School of Military Government was established at the University of Virginia, in Charlottesville, in May of 1942. Later that same year a separate Division of

Military Government was created in the office of the Provost Marshal General. In March of the following year, an entire Civil Affairs Division was established in the War Department, and under its auspices programs of study were launched at several hundred colleges and universities across the US. The purpose of this expanding network of institutions was twofold: (1) to train military personnel who could govern effectively in territories as they were seized from the Axis powers; and (2) to prepare soldiers in the numbers required to administer the vast sections of the globe where military government personnel were likely to be needed.

As envisioned by the Armed Forces, the administration of areas formerly under Axis control would be overseen by “civil affairs teams,” divided hierarchically into three groups. A cadre of specially trained officers, who would attend the School of Military Government at the University of Virginia, would be in command. They were “destined mostly for assignments at the higher military headquarters set up to govern states, zones, or large districts of occupied territory” (Grace 1947: vi).

Beneath these high-ranking, commissioned officers in the hierarchy of military government was a second group—civilian professionals and people in possession of specialized, essential skills that were likely to be in short supply in war-torn areas. This group—medical doctors, nurses, engineers, lawyers, public safety personnel, individuals with experience in public administration etc.—would attend a Civil Affairs Training School (CATS), either in Charlottesville, or at one of ten universities scattered around the US. The CATS program would prepare personnel for positions in the field, as opposed to in headquarters; CATS graduates were to be responsible for implementing military government in relatively small territorial districts (Grace 1947: vi).

Both groups of officers would be assisted by a larger group of enlisted men, who would attend the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) at one of 227 colleges and universities (Keefer 1988). This program provided soldiers with elementary training in medicine, engineering, agronomy, veterinary science, surveying, communications, psychology—which would allow them to assist the more highly-skilled, CATS-trained personnel.⁶ Together,

6 There was a basic and advanced curriculum of the ASTP. The former offered training in surveying, the internal combustion engine, communications, and acoustics & optics (Matthew 1947: 186). The advanced curriculum provided training in chemical engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, mecha-

graduates of the CATS and the ASTP would possess skills and training that would make them indispensable to effective military government in occupied territories.⁷

Graduates of the CATS and the ASTP would be assisted by a third group—a special branch of ASTP-trained personnel. These individuals were to complete the military's Foreign Area and Language Program (FALP), at one of 55 institutions of higher learning in the US. The FALP provided its graduates with intensive training in the cultures and languages of the areas they were to administer. Originally conceived of as military police, FALP personnel were to be trained in police procedure as well as in the cultural characteristics and communicative practices of subject populations (Hyneman 1945: 435-36).⁸ Unlike the graduates of

nical engineering, petroleum engineering, sanitary engineering, transportation, marine transportation, organization and supply, medicine, dentistry, veterinary science, personnel psychology, and area and culture (Ibid).

- 7 Colonel Herman Beukema, a professor of history and government at West Point, was named director of the Army Specialized Training Division, in which the ASTP was housed. He appointed Arthur L.H. Rubin, "a civilian who haad previously directed the Institute of Military Studies at the University of Chicago ... [to be] chief of the ASTP's Curricula and Standards Branch" (Keefer 1988: 40-41). "[W]ith help from the ASTD Advisory Committee, [he] was largely responsible for determining the general content of the courses comprising each branch of study" (Ibid: 41-44). "The ASTD Advisory Committee consisted of" Isaiah Bowman, president, Johns Hopkins University; Robert E. Doherty, president, Carnegie Institute of Technology; Clarence A. Dykstra, president, University of Wisconsin; Guy Stanton Ford, secretary, American Historical Association; the Very Reverend Robert I Gannon, president, Fordham University; Ralph D. Hetzel, president, Pennsylvania State College; Felix Morley, president, Haverford College; John J. Tigert, president, University of Florida; Ray Lyman Wilbur, chancellor, Stanford University; and Karl Taylor Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology" (Keefer 1988: 44, note).
- 8 In practice, relatively few of these individuals ended up being trained in police procedure (Hyneman 1945: 435). The military chose Harold W. Stoke, then professor of political science and acting dean of the graduate school at the University of Wisconsin, to lead the effort to design the FALP curriculum (Hyneman 1945: 438). He "gathered around himself a half dozen men representing a wide range of interests in the study of contemporary civilizations and the group worked out a standard curriculum for the study of foreign areas" (Ibid).

the School of Military Government, and to a lesser extent the graduates of the CATS, foreign-area-and-language-trained ASTP soldiers were to be the rank-and-file of military government—the on-the-ground personnel who would interact intimately with local populations on a day-to-day basis.

The armed forces conceived of graduates of the FALP as a kind of cultural police force, who would enforce the terms of military rule in the specific areas they had been trained to administer, informed by their background in culture and language. The occupational police, however, were not the only personnel to receive anthropological training. The Foreign Area and Language curriculum was also an integral part of the CATS program—which prepared mid-level government administrators. In this way the military sought to ensure that personnel who would have the most direct contact with subject populations had a strong grounding in the cultural characteristics of the areas they were to govern. The armed forces also sought to ensure that soldiers who would be responsible for the actual implementation of military government would be able to communicate effectively with the populations under their jurisdiction.

The architects of military government believed that it was essential to familiarize their soldier-administrators with the linguistic conventions and the cultural patterns that characterized specific peoples and areas—in the belief that this knowledge would prove invaluable in efforts to establish sound, stable, military government. If civil affairs personnel were to be effective administrators, it was of course essential that they be educated as thoroughly as possible about these matters, and that real experts provide their training.

To provide soldiers with the requisite training in language, the military looked to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). Mortimer Graves, the ACLS Administrative Secretary, had already developed what the armed forces viewed as a very effective Intensive Language Program (ILP)—one that drew on immersion techniques developed by Franz Boas and Edward Sapir. By the time the military became interested in language training (in the fall of 1942), Graves' Intensive Language Program was already in place in 18 colleges and universities around the US, and was providing instruction in 25 different languages, few of which had ever been taught before (Hyneman 1945: 436-37). To make the ILP suitable for the armed forces, the Division of Military Government made Graves its consultant and put him in charge of designing a curriculum that could be used in the ASTP and CATS programs (Hyneman 1945: 437-38).

It provide more difficult, however, to provide soldiers with training in culture areas, as the military found existing academic programs inadequate to the task at hand. As a result, the Chief of the Military Government Division gathered together a group of distinguished social scientists—anthropologists, sociologists, geographers, economists, psychologists, political scientists and historians—and asked them to formulate a curriculum to guide instructional efforts in the CATS and the ASTP (Fenton 1945: 696). In relatively short order, this group designed the curriculum in question—one to be used in preparing civil affairs personnel for the task of military government in all foreign areas. It was referred to as the Foreign Area and Language Program (FALP) curriculum.

The program of training designed by this interdisciplinary team of scholars was intended to school CATS- and ASTP-trained soldiers in the logic of what might be called “military governmentality.” Graduates learned that, as military governors, their primary responsibility was to ensure the health and well-being of the populations for which they were responsible. To do so, however, soldiers were taught that they needed to restore stability and maintain order within the war-torn areas they were to administer. It was this combination of concerns that led to the emergence of a new geography of knowledge.⁹

Civil affairs teams were trained to take a series of steps to ensure the well-being of the population. The first order of busi-

9 Unless otherwise noted, the following section of the paper is distilled from the following sources, all of which are available through the General Staff Intelligence Division of the US War Department (G-2 Division):

- “History of Training, Military Government” (1 volume; see United States War Department n.d.a).
- “A History of the Army Specialized Training Program (from its inception to 31 December 1944)” (1 volume; see United States War Department n.d.b).
- “History of Training, Army Specialized Training Program (1 January 1945 to 30 June 1945)” (1 volume; see United States War Department n.d.c)
- “The Training History of the Military Intelligence Service Language Schools” (17 volumes; see United States War Department 1949).

The standardized curriculum of the Foreign Area and Language Program can be found in, *Division Memorandum Training Circular No. 2, April 10, 1943, prepared by the Military Government Division, Office of the Provost Marshal General, Army Service Forces*; see United States Armed Forces n.d.a).

ness was to ensure that military control of the area had been fully established, and that its borders were secure. Once the territorial integrity of the area had been assured, civil affairs personnel could go about the task of establishing military government and investigating socio-cultural patterns within those borders. As soon as an area had been “liberated” they were to start their work immediately. They were to begin by announcing their presence to the local population, and by explaining that they would be acting as an interim government. Their next step was determined by the nature of their FALP training, which had been of limited duration (a maximum of nine months), and had been designed not to fill their heads with facts but to make them aware of what problems to investigate in the field. Building on what they had learned in the classroom, the soldier-administrators were to do a detailed inventory of virtually every aspect of the area assigned to them (Matthew 1947: 81-82). These investigations were to provide a comprehensive overview of the state of affairs in that region, and were also to suggest how everyday life had been organized prior to the war.

Civil affairs teams were to note, for example, the distribution and extent of the area’s natural features, including its water sources, soil types, mineral resources, zones of crop production and areas not suitable for cultivation. They were also to survey and evaluate the state of the region’s infrastructure—especially its roads, bridges, railroads, irrigation works, canals, hospitals and airfields. Civil affairs teams were also to do careful inventories of all supplies of food, water, clothing, shelter and medicine (cf., *Italian Campaigns, 1943-45*: 539). They were also to pay careful attention to features of the local population—to its size and distribution, to birth and death rates, and to all conditions, natural and social, that resulted in undue mortality. The members of the interim government were also to observe whether the population was sedentary or migratory; if the latter, they were to note the locales between which and the numbers in which the population moved.

Civil affairs teams were also to make detailed observations concerning the main social groupings of the areas assigned to them. They were to focus on linguistic, racial and religious distinctions, and on differentiation by caste and status. They were to take special care in analyzing how these distinctions affected political relations among the groups concerned, and to note whether or not there were areas of existing or potential friction or conflict.

Military government personnel were also trained to observe and record the most important features of economic life. They were to focus on such matters as the dominant industries of the area, the division of labor and the kind and extent of international trade. They were also to pay careful attention to the labor supply—to its size, skill and treatment, to its wages and organization, to the presence or absence of a labor movement. Novice administrators were also told to make note of patterns of land ownership—including size and distribution of tracts, forms of tenancy, and security of holdings. They were also to investigate the effects of government on everyday economic and social life—especially regarding forms of taxation and public utilities and services.

Civil affairs personnel were also told to pay especially careful attention to how the areas they were to administer had been governed. Regarding this problem, graduates of the CATS and ASTP were to investigate such questions as the presence or absence of colonial government, and the degree of self-government and administration. They were to note the kinds of local political positions, the numbers and authority of each, how officials were selected, how they were organized, and the relations between central and local administration. Military government personnel were also to determine the relative importance of elections, tradition and status in the selection of officials. Other important issues about which they were to collect information concerned the presence or absence of political parties or groups, their types of organization, their methods of recruitment, their racial and social foundations, their intensity of feeling and their platforms or beliefs. Military governors were also to take note of the political theories and ideologies embraced by the local population, from American and British theories of democracy, to communism, fascism and international socialism.

Finally, civil affairs teams were to record the important features of family life, the relations between the sexes and between the generations. They were to note patterns of religious belief, major religious ceremonies and the use of special places and objects of worship. They were to investigate what was taught in schools, both general and technical. The local population's degree of literacy, its reading habits and use of mass media (newspapers, radio) were also to be issues of concern to military governors.

In sum, the military's Foreign Area and Language Program (FALP) attempted to train its soldiers to "see like a state" (Scott 1998). In the process, the military sought to draw on insights

from all the social science disciplines—to provide civil affairs personnel with the skills they would need to generate a “total picture” of the area they were to administer (Matthews 1947: xii). The military sought to arm its administrators-in-training with insights and abilities that would make them sensitive to any and all conditions in a given area that might affect their ability to govern in an effective manner. In the words of anthropologist William Fenton, the Foreign Area and Language Curriculum “attempted rather uniquely to prepare soldiers for fieldwork of sorts in the civilizations (or cultures) of great areas” (Fenton 1945: 697).¹⁰

The military provided a clear rationale for providing its personnel with in-depth knowledge about the cultures and languages of strategically important areas of the globe: the maintenance of order. Invoking international law, the War Department argued that “it [was] the duty of the military commander of an occupied area to preserve, as far as military necessity [would] permit, the established institutions and customs” (US War Department n.d.a). “The ideal military government will [therefore] be one which can integrate the local laws, customs and economy of an occupied area and ...superimpose military control with a minimum of disturbance to the former and a maximum of control by the latter” (US War Department n.d.b). “Military government is, in a sense, superstructure, erected over the local set-up” (Ibid).

Once the Foreign Area and Language Program curriculum had been reviewed, revised and approved by a second group of distinguished academics, as well as by the military director of the ASTP (Fenton 1945), the Civil Affairs Division called upon the academic community as a whole to assist in training its future military governors.¹¹ The response was overwhelming. Universities and colleges from all across the country stepped up to do their part. Shortly thereafter, in the spring of 1943, the Civil Affairs Division sent the standardized FALP curriculum to these schools, and asked that they use it as the basis for all their Foreign Area and Language Program course offerings. Of the 227 US institutions of higher learning that administered the ASTP, 55 offered the Foreign Area and Language curriculum.

10 William Fenton did an assessment of the FALP toward the end of the war, while it was still in progress. His study was published just after the war (see Fenton 1945).

11 This “distinguished group of educators” had been nominated by the American Council on Education and the United States Office of Education (see Herge 1948: 30).

FALP training was provided at an additional ten universities, to officers who took part in the CATS.

As a result of these efforts to train adequate numbers of personnel for military government duty, there was something of an exodus of soldiers out of the barracks and into the classroom—so much so that high-ranking officers in charge of combat operations became truly alarmed, and complained about not having enough troops (Keefer 1995). As a result, the Army established an annual cap of 150,000 on the number of personnel who could be enrolled in the ASTP. Although aggregate figures for the entire war are not available, in mid-October of 1943 there were about 129,000 soldiers enrolled in the Army Specialized Training Program, of whom 13,000 were taking the Foreign Area and Language Program.¹² There are no comparable figures concerning the number of soldiers enrolled in the CATS at this time, but the vast majority also received FALP training. As these numbers suggest, social scientists from all disciplines participated in this effort, offering their expertise to train future military government administrators.

Just as the philanthropies had done prior to WW II, during the war the military self-consciously set out to craft a new form of knowledge—one that would contribute to its mission of re-establishing stability and normalcy in far-off lands, and of maintaining the health and well-being of their respective populations. The military did so by means of its Foreign Area and Language Program. Several features of the FALP curriculum are relevant to the present discussion. First, it emphasized the identity of area and language. Each area had a distinct language, and each language in turn implied an area with a distinctive cultural pattern. Not only did each area have its own cultural pattern or configuration, but this pattern could only be discerned by means of “integrated area study.” According to the armed forces, to get the “total picture” upon which successful military governance was based, it was necessary to draw on all the various academic disciplines that might have bearing on understanding the contemporary state of affairs in a given culture area. But simply drawing on the separate disciplines was not enough. It was necessary to integrate them—to bring them together, so that each could benefit from the insights

12 Of these 129,000 soldiers, 74,000 were studying basic engineering, 15,000 were studying advanced engineering, another 14,000 soldiers were studying medicine, an additional 5,000 were being trained in dentistry and 2,000 in veterinary science. A full 13,000 were students of culture area and language (Keefer 1988: 69-70).

of the other. It was necessary to put the separate social science disciplines in direct dialogue with one another, so that they could produce a whole far greater than the sum of its parts.¹³

Symptomatic of the fact that the military found it necessary to create an entirely new form of knowledge at this time were the challenges it faced in doing so. Although several universities offered area studies programs prior to WW II, they were ill-suited to the needs of the military. Indeed, planners in the Division of Military Government bemoaned the fact that there was no model anywhere in academia for the integrated form of knowledge they desired. Existing programs were “non-integrated.” They presented knowledge of a region in terms of competing academic disciplines, with each discipline taught separately.

The military therefore found it necessary to intervene in the production of knowledge on an extensive basis in order to train its personnel—just as the philanthropies had done during the 1920s and 1930s. Military planners felt compelled to intervene both in the organization of the disciplines and in the presentation of academic knowledge. Toward this end, the Division of Military Government assigned a coordinator to each school that offered FALP training. This individual was in charge of all aspects of the program on his campus. He was responsible for the mundane aspects of the program—the scheduling of classes and examinations. He also had more important duties. It was the coordinator who was responsible for ensuring that the otherwise disparate forms of disciplinary knowledge (anthropological, sociological, etc.) cohered into a seamless, integrated whole.

To achieve this goal, the coordinator established new organizational forms and new modes of interaction. To begin, he convened a special planning group—known as an “area committee”—for each culture/language area to be taught at his campus. This committee consisted of an academic director (chosen by the coordinator), and at least one faculty member from anthropology, sociology, economics, geography, political science and history. A representative of the language relevant to the area under consideration was considered essential to the group. Under the watchful eye of the coordinator, committee members designed courses that would address the general themes identified in the standardized, FALP curriculum (see above). They also planned the sequence of the lectures, and did the actual instruction of the culture area and language courses.

13 The army offered courses in a total of 32 languages, each with its accompanying area study program (Matthew 1947: 4).

This procedure involved an unprecedented degree of cooperation among the participating departments. In many cases, because of the deliberations of the area committee, faculty ended up delivering lectures that they would not have given prior to the war, on topics that were not strictly disciplinary in nature. In large part, this occurred because lectures were submitted for review to the director of the area committee, or to the entire committee, before being delivered. The coordinator also reviewed the lesson plans and proposed lectures, and maintained close supervision over individual instructors. In other words, the committee and the coordinator exercised ongoing, corporate supervision over the entire progress of the area studies training program.¹⁴

Coordinators followed this procedure in part to ensure that members of a single area committee did not repeat the same material in presenting lectures. At the same time, however, discussion by the entire committee about educational materials normally presented in disciplinary form exposed each participant to perspectives and insights from all the other fields of study—thus encouraging integration. The integrated nature of instruction was further reinforced by the fact that coordinators insisted that the participating faculty attend and comment upon one another's lectures. On the one hand, this meant that each faculty member was led to re-assess his own materials in light of what he learned from his colleagues. On the other hand, the collective understandings generated by this practice meant that the group as a whole could draw upon a shared base of knowledge in devising successive revisions of the entire course of study. The end result was a new set of procedures that encouraged the production of interdisciplinary knowledge.

The campus coordinator also introduced new ways of presenting and discussing educational materials that further contributed to the goal of integration. Especially important in this regard was the panel discussion, in which small groups of faculty, sometimes together with outside specialists, would draw out the implications of previous lectures, both for themselves and their students. Another novel approach that coordinators employed was what they called the interview technique, in which a "native informant" was brought to campus to be questioned by a group of faculty or students. Coordinators also employed the project technique, in which a number of students, operating as a team, were asked

14 In practice, of course, these procedures were not always followed (see Fenton 1947).

to draw upon insights from their readings and lectures to solve hypothetical problems of governance.

Implementing Areas: Civil Affairs in Action, 1942-45

Based on their training in the above-mentioned areas, and on language skills acquired as part of the same process, military personnel were expected to handle “the delicate problems of military government in occupied territories” (Matthew 1947: 5). Furthermore, they had to do so in conditions of considerable stress and danger, for they were required to take control of conquered territory immediately after the Army had landed. In many cases, military government personnel arrived together with the first wave of troops, when the bullets were still flying—or immediately thereafter.

When Allied troops wrested control of North Africa from the Axis powers, for example, civil affairs teams were included along with regular combat troops. As the Allied front advanced across the desert, these teams set up command posts along the moving frontier (cf., Vincent 1990), and in this way helped consolidate Allied control of new territories as soon as were seized from the enemy (Rennell 1948). When the Allies arrived in Sicily on July 10, 1943, and later in Corsica and southern Italy, civil affairs personnel were included in the first wave of assault (Coles and Weinberg 1964). As combat troops advanced across Italy, steadily claiming more and more territory from the enemy, teams of administrators would immediately establish themselves as the new governing body.

In planning the Allied invasion of Normandy, on June 6, 1944, US General Eisenhower decided that civil affairs troops would be at too great a risk to be included in the first direct wave of assault (Coles and Weinberg 1964). Instead, wherever possible, in the days prior to the invasion civil affairs teams were dropped by parachute behind enemy lines, in secret, so that they would be poised to begin governing the very instant circumstances allowed (Donnison 1961). On D-Day itself, civil affairs divisions were also dropped by parachute, in the second assault wave. As soon as they hit the ground these soldier-administrators raced by jeep to take control of each village, just moments after it had been liberated. In some cases they arrived ahead of regular combat troops to find German soldiers still packing up supplies in village town halls. Neither interfered with the other; the Germans would continue packing in one part of city hall (after which they would

leave), while civil affairs teams established themselves as the new government in another part of the same building (Edwards and Still 1991). Military government personnel continued to play this same crucial role as the Allies advanced across France, through the German-occupied countries of northwest Europe, and into Germany itself (Coles and Weinberg 1964; Donnison 1961).

The reason that officers like General Eisenhower were so anxious to have civil affairs teams take up their duties as soon as humanly possible—and that these personnel were considered such an integral part of all invasion efforts—was quite simple. It was abundantly clear to high-ranking military personnel that the US Army was far from being the only group vying for control of areas abandoned by the retreating Axis forces. Virtually everywhere the Allies attempted to establish themselves there were other pretenders to the throne—groups with their own ideas about what was involved in returning to normalcy. In France, the Communist Party and General de Gaulle's Free French movement had both laid careful plans to seize control over civil affairs once the Germans had retreated, and to do so prior to the Americans. In this way both groups hoped to establish themselves as the dominant power in post-war France (Edwards and Still 1991). In much of Mediterranean Europe, indeed in the whole of the continent, the military regarded communism as a grave threat—and believed that, once combat operations were over, immediate action on the part of civil affairs personnel was necessary to forestall what was otherwise sure to be the immanent expansion of communist influence (Friedrich 1948: 20).

In Southeast Asia (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Thailand), the retreat of the Japanese appeared to the Allies to have opened up a political space that they would fill. Much to their dismay, they found that space already occupied. Movements of anti-colonial nationalism, some of them quite radical, had emerged in most former colonies. Many had declared independence prior to or simultaneous with the Japanese surrender, often before the return of the Allies.¹⁵ In the former French colonies, it was the Viet Minh in Vietnam and Cambodia and the Lao Issara (Free Laos) Movement in Laos

15 The Allies being caught by surprise by the sudden nature of the Japanese surrender—because of which Allied forces were not on hand in several parts of SE Asia (especially in Thailand) to actually accept the surrender directly from the Japanese. The European powers had planned to return to their former colonial domains in September or October of 1945. The Japanese surrender came in August.

that worked actively to prevent the return of the French. In the former British colonies it was the AFPFL (Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League) in Burma and the MCP (Malayan Communist Party) in Malaya. In the Dutch East Indies, it was a broad coalition of nationalist, anti-colonial forces that sought to prevent the return of the Dutch.

These groups were determined to preserve their independence at any cost. Indeed, long before WW II many had become deeply hostile to European colonizing power. Anti-European sentiment ran sufficiently high that several (Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia) hailed the Japanese as liberators from European colonial rule when the Japanese army arrived on the scene beginning in 1940. In other colonies (Ceylon, Malaya, Laos), important social elements conspired with the Japanese in an effort to drive the Europeans from power, or failed to warn the Europeans of immanent Japanese attack.

When the Pacific War finally came to a close in August of 1945, and it became clear that the Europeans intended to re-establish colonial control, pitched battles broke out in several locales. In Saigon and Djakarta, so serious was the opposition to renewed domination by Europeans that the British army, representing the other European colonizing powers, was only able to prevail over nationalist forces by employing large numbers of soldiers captured from Japan—the recently-departed colonizing force. Elsewhere (Malaya, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Indonesia), armed conflict did not immediately break out. Instead, resistance movements crystallized or expanded to oppose the lingering presence of the Europeans. Many succeeded in bringing colonial rule to an end within a decade. Such were the stakes involved in struggles over civil affairs.

Indeed, the Allied powers realized from the outset that friendly governments would have to be *created* in most of the territories they intended to “liberate,” and that security concerns would therefore take precedence over all other considerations (Holborn 1947). Creating new security regimes that could keep a close watch over everyday life squared nicely with the short- and long-term goals of the Allies. For example, the US War Department taught its civil affairs officers that “control of a nation’s civil administration would allow the US to [determine] its policies and spread [US] influence throughout liberated and invaded nations for decades to come” (US War Department n.d.a). Officer graduates of the university-based CATS, and of the School of Military Government in Charlottesville, “were told repeatedly that their

first priorities were to further military objectives ... to establish law and order" (US War Department n.d.a). They were taught that, whenever the stability of an area was in question—whether the threat was "external" (Axis forces) or "internal" (communist or socialist groups, labor organizations, etc.), whether it stemmed from insecure food supplies or general lawlessness—they were to take a series of steps to protect the general well-being, and to guarantee continued US control.

Civil affairs personnel were told to guard against external threats by patrolling all borders with great care (especially in the early stages of the occupation), to ensure that control of territory remained intact. Thereafter, they were to limit population movement across borders and carefully monitor whatever population movement did take place.¹⁶ As complex as these tasks were, however, military government personnel were advised that guarding against internal threats was even more challenging. To do so, civil affairs teams were ordered to disband political organizations of all kinds, and to prohibit political activity in general. In the interest of stability, they were to impose martial law, and to suspend civil liberties. Such liberties as the local population would be allowed were never to interfere with the overriding need to maintain order.¹⁷

The risk of internal threat or instability could be further minimized by ensuring that the population had stable, reliable access to supplies of food, clothing, medicine, etc. Toward this end, wherever they deemed it necessary, civil affairs teams were to re-organize economic affairs. They were to seize control of all important stores of essential items, and to oversee their distribution to the general population. They were also to take command of the provision of key services (drinking water, electrical power, policing, public sanitation), administrative activities (maintenance of property registers, vital statistics offices, etc.) and banking functions. Military government personnel were also to forbid the

16 For Allied policy concerning population movement, see Report on the Tripartite Conference of Potsdam, August 2, 1945, "The Political and Economic Principles to Govern the Treatment of Germany in the Initial Control Period; Orderly Transfers of German Populations" (Holborn 1947, pp. 204-205); American Directive on the Military Government of Austria, June 27, 1945, Part I, General and Political, Section 19, "Treatment of Displaced Persons and Refugees in Austria" (Holborn 1947: 185).

17 See documents in previous note.

use of inflated, war-time currency, and were to replace it with money issued by the military.¹⁸

To ensure that key elements of infrastructure (roads, bridges, railroads, irrigation works, public water and sewage systems) were repaired and maintained, the interim military government was to organize work gangs from amongst the local population, and was to recompense the workers in military money (Rundell 1980). To protect private property and personal safety, and to maintain stability, curfews were to be established and strictly enforced. Roads were to be sealed, roadblocks established, and the movement of the population kept to a bare minimum. In those rare instances where people were allowed to be mobile, their movements were to be carefully monitored.

The instructions issued to civil affairs personnel in May, 1944, for subsequent use in France (after D-Day), are not atypical of the directives issued to military government officers in general. According to these instructions, civil affairs teams were to pursue the following, strategic objectives (Edwards and Still 1991: 25-26):

1. restoration and maintenance of law and order.
2. guarantee of a steady supply of food and other goods.
3. coordination of reconstruction projects, using local labor.
4. priority of military requirements over civil rights.
5. dissolution of all pro-enemy political parties and organizations.
6. prohibition on political activity.
7. freedom of movement and association suspended.
8. allied control of local police.
9. restoration of all prewar laws.
10. media and mail censorship.
11. providing food, clothing, medical care, fuel, etc.
12. wage and price controls.

18 Relevant documents include the following: Combined Directive on Military Government in Sicily, May 31, 1943; Revised Financial Guide for Germany, Combined Directive for Military Government in Germany Prior to Defeat or Surrender, April 18, 1944; Memorandum No. 2 Relating to France, Directives and Agreements on Civil Affairs in France, August 25, 1944; all to be found in Holborn (1947); for a general discussion of military money see Rundell (1980).

13. general control of economy, including banks [and] the issuance of occupation francs.
14. establishing a curfew.
15. set-up road blocks.
16. no civilian use of telephones or mail.

Because of the highly “ideological” commitments of the peoples who had so recently been living under the Axis yoke, the overwhelming emphasis of Allied military government was on *order*—on controlling and stabilizing living conditions within areas with carefully specified, clearly demarcated boundaries. Knowledge about language and culture was important because it helped make such control possible.

Area Studies in War and Peace

It would be a mistake to view the military version of area studies as a form of knowledge and control that is relevant only to understanding the rather specialized conditions of the Second World War, with no application to the peace that followed. As noted above, the peace-time iteration of area studies—which consolidated during the Cold War—was in fact first articulated during WWII, and had much in common with its military relative. Indeed, the preoccupation with the cultural characteristics of distinct world areas that dominated the social sciences after the war stemmed from the same concerns that focused the attention of military planners on this issue during the war itself.

The Second World War forged new institutional linkages between the US government, academics, and the organizations that sponsored the production of academic knowledge (especially the three main academic councils—the SSRC and the ACLS and the NRC [National Research Council]). William Donovan, head of the new Office of Strategic Services (OSS, the war-time equivalent of and the precursor to the CIA), played a key role in establishing these linkages. In 1941 he decided to draw on the academic community to assemble a strong team of intelligence experts to contribute to the war effort. Donovan invited representatives of the SSRC and the ACLS to help him draw up a “slate of academic advisors” for this purpose (Cumings 1997; Katz 1989). By the time he was done, Donovan had compiled a list of hundreds—leading academics and young scholars alike.¹⁹

19 This figure includes a scattering of professionals in non-academic fields.

Many of these individuals went on to play a key role in intelligence activities during the fight against fascism and communism.

The war-time bonds established between the government, social scientists and the academic councils were to prove strong and enduring. In addition to cooperating with OSS Director Donovan on intelligence in the narrow sense, the SSRC and the ACLS also began working collaboratively with the US military and intelligence communities to expand the conventional meaning of intelligence way beyond its normal bounds (Fenton 1947; Hall 1947; Matthew 1947; SSRC 1942-43; SSRC 1943-44). The Councils argued that, in light of the direct responsibilities the US was about to assume for the well being of the entire planet (sic!), knowledge about other peoples and places in every corner of the globe should be considered a matter of “intelligence.” Furthermore, the Councils asserted, the US was sorely lacking in the expertise necessary to gather this intelligence—as a result of which the country had puts its interests at great risk.

Such was the conclusion of the SSRC’s Committee on World Regions, in a June, 1943 report entitled “World Regions in the Social Sciences” (Hamilton 1943). After having shown no interest whatsoever in bounded regional cultures during the previous fifteen years, in early 1943 the SSRC formed this committee “to scrutinize the implications of the government’s training programs for service in foreign regions” (SSRC 1942-43: 49). In other words, the SSRC was intensely interested in the military’s Foreign Area and Language Program.

The influence of the armed forces’ Foreign Area and Language Program on the SSRC’s conception of the need for cultural intelligence experts is striking. In March of 1943 the military began using the FALP to train military police who could draw on knowledge of culture and language to address immediate problems of security in occupied lands. In June of that same year, the SSRC proposed a sweeping reorganization of US education intended to equip social scientists and other interested parties with the cultural and linguistic expertise required to address the long-term security concerns of the US in the post-war world.

Drawing on a conceptualization that was virtually identical to the military’s FALC, the SSRC proposed that all the peoples and cultures of the world be brought into a single ordering schema in which the constituent units were discrete, bounded cultural regions.²⁰ “World Regions” identified (in general terms) the kind

20 In addition to the slate of academic advisors to the OSS mentioned in the text, the SSRC, the ACLS, and the National

of intelligence that should be gathered about these regional units. It also provided a rationale for ranking the regions, according to their geopolitical significance. Finally, the report suggested how to train experts who could generate the much-needed intelligence about these regions.

What emerges out of the "World Regions" document is nothing less a plan for the peace-time institutionalization of the military's war-time geography of knowledge. The report begins by arguing that the rapidly changing geopolitical concerns of the US called for the production of a new kind of knowledge on an unprecedented scale:

The present war has focused attention as never before upon the entire world. Interest in foreign regions has been intensified and sharp attention drawn to areas over which we have felt little or no concern ... The immediate need for social scientists who know the different regions of the world stands second only to the demand for military and naval officers familiar with the actual and potential combat zones. Since few overseas areas have hitherto attracted research, we lack the regional knowledge now required ... The consequent scarcity of professional and scientific personnel combining linguistic and regional knowledge with technical proficiency seriously hampers every war agency. (Hamilton 1943: 1; see also Robinson 2004; Wallerstein 1997).

The SSRC report went on to argue that the need for a greatly expanded corpus of knowledge about unfolding conditions around the globe was anything but limited to the period of the war itself. Rather, once the fighting came to an end the safety and security of US interests abroad would depend critically on the continued production of such knowledge:

Our need for comprehensive knowledge of other lands will not end with the armistice or reconstruc-

Research Council (all the creations of the great philanthropies) all established area committees during the war, "when detailed knowledge and experts on virtually every area of the world were in heavy demand" (Hall 1947: iii). These committees joined with the Smithsonian Institution to form the Ethnogeographic Board, which helped coordinate the activities of academics so that they contributed as effectively as possible to the war effort (cf. Farish 2005; Fenton 1945).

tion. No matter what shape international organization may assume, the US will enjoy unparalleled opportunities and face heavy responsibilities. The ease, speed, and cheapness of communication and transportation will tend to promote economic, political and cultural relations among nations. Trade, shipping, air lines, the press, mining, the production and distribution of petroleum, banking, government service, industry and communications will require thousands of Americans who combine thorough professional or technical training with knowledge of the languages, economics, politics, history, geography, peoples, customs and religions of foreign countries. (Hamilton 1943: 2).

On this basis the SSRC called for a sweeping reorganization of education in the US to provide the expertise required to meet the new exigencies of empire. According to the "World Regions" report: "In order that we may fulfill our postwar role [in the world] our citizens must know other lands and appreciate their people, cultures, and institutions. Research, graduate teaching, undergraduate instruction, and elementary education in world regions will be desirable as far as one can see into the future." (Hamilton 1943: 2).

Although foundation planners recommended that US education as a whole be revamped to train the experts needed to manage US imperial domains, the special focus of reform efforts should be the creation of new institutes in major universities that could provide advanced training in each of the world's major areas:

In any development for the study of world regions in this country, the first step should be the establishment of university centers for research and graduate instruction. These centers will extend our knowledge of the major areas of the world: supply government and business with experts; and provide materials and teachers for lower levels of instruction ... The graduate-research centers alone, [however,] will not meet the needs of our country. The benefits of regional instruction must permeate our entire educational system. America will not be able to assume her [global] economic, political, and cultural responsibilities ... after the war without enlarged spatial concepts and a more comprehensive knowledge of the world. (Hamilton 1943: 6)

Discussions about the relation between area knowledge and the security of empire continued after the war. A combination of Cold War politics and decolonization movements in Africa and Asia seemed to threaten US interests on all sides, and reinforced the wartime conviction that knowledge about seemingly far-off people and places did indeed have a strategic dimension.

In this context, high-ranking officials at the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and at the Carnegie Endowment arranged a series of meetings to discuss what was to be done (Szanton 2004: 9). They agreed that the US had to greatly enhance its capacity to “understand and act effectively in previously unfamiliar nations and societies all across the globe” (Ibid). A new cadre of specially trained personnel with expertise in the various regions of the world was required, foundation officials agreed, “to promote capitalist development, ... to achieve social and political stability and to secure US interests” (Ibid).

In the late 1940s the foundations began to make good on this vision. In 1947 the SSRC published a new report reiterating the strategic importance of area knowledge (Hall 1947).²¹ The following year area studies got off to a modest beginning when the Carnegie Endowment helped the SSRC launch its first program of area studies research and training (Robinson 2004: 137). As the Cold War heated up during the 1950s, Joint SSRC/ACLS Committees that focused on specific world areas (Latin America, Africa, etc.) came to dominate the funding activities of both organizations, and continued to do so for decades. With generous financial support provided by the philanthropies, these Committees were instrumental in making area studies the dominant perspective in the social sciences.

It was the Ford Foundation, however, that ultimately assumed the most important role in institutionalizing the military's war-time geography of knowledge. At the dawn of the Cold War Ford embarked on a project of truly massive proportions to create a new infrastructure of training, research and publishing in the social sciences. Using the two SSRC reports on world regions/area studies as a sort of loose blueprint, Ford's Division of International Training and Research (1952) began building

21 The same year that the SSRC published its second report stressing the importance of area knowledge (1947), the US Congress passed the National Security Act. This act of Congress authorized the creation of the Central Intelligence Agency, an organization that had close ties with the major foundations (especially Ford) and with the area studies centers that the foundations helped build.

interdisciplinary, advanced-degree-granting Area Studies Institutes at major universities throughout the US (Mitchell 2004). By 1966, when Ford discontinued this program, it had succeeded in building Institutes at 34 leading universities, and had spent \$120 million dollars on the endeavor (Szanton 2004:11).²² At the cost of an additional \$150 million dollars, Ford subsidized the training, fieldwork and write-up of several thousand social science graduate students, who were steeped in the area studies framework.

As the foregoing suggests, it is not mere coincidence that there are such strong similarities between area studies in war and peace. Both were conceived of early in WW II, almost simultaneously, in anticipation of the expanded role the US would assume in world affairs at the end of the war and during the post-war era. The moment the actual fighting came to an end, the war-time version of area studies—in the context of military government—was critical in establishing US control over vast new sections of the globe. Once order had been established, the peace-time iteration of area studies—in the context of Cold War geopolitics—was intended to help maintain the position that the US had established by means of military conquest. In other words, area studies in war was designed to help address the short-term security concerns of US military government. Area studies in peace was meant to serve the long-term security interests of Cold War, global governmentality. In the words of its corporate sponsors, Cold War area studies was intended “to promote capitalist development ... to achieve social and political stability and to secure US interests” (Szanton 2004: 9).

Conclusion

Two decades ago Paul Rabinow made the interesting observation that the taboo against specifying the power relations involved in the production of anthropological texts was “much greater than the strictures against denouncing colonialism” (Rabinow 1986: 253). He went on to call for a careful exploration of the politics of the academy—of the complex constraints within which anthropological knowledge is produced and received (Bond 1990: 287). In closing, I would like to paraphrase Rabinow by suggesting that we focus not only on texts, but on the power relations involved in the production of anthropology *itself*. Anthropologists have

22 These figures do not include the considerable sums of money that Ford and the other great philanthropies spent on building institutions of higher learning in the non-Western world.

much to gain, I would argue, by extending their gaze beyond the politics of the academy to consider the multiple ways that their discipline is embedded in the power relations of the world writ large. It is not just that these power relations represent the essential conditions of possibility of anthropological research—that most anthropological fieldwork and scholarship since WW II, for example, has taken place in a global arena whose geographic limits were defined directly by the outcome of the war—and whose economic organization and socio-political dynamics were deeply affected by the institutions established to manage the post-war world (the Bretton Woods institutions, the C.I.A., a global network of US military bases, etc.). Nor is it just that these institutions have helped make (parts of) the world safe for anthropology. Equally important is the fact that these same power relations have been deeply involved in the very constitution of anthropological practice. As I have argued in this paper, it was the immediate security concerns of military government in WW II that led army officers and university professors into unprecedented relationships that reconfigured how the world was to be conceived and managed—by social scientists and military personnel alike. It was the longer-term security concerns of the Cold War era that led foundation officials (and later, the US government) to continue what the military had begun—the creation of a new social science infrastructure and a new geography of knowledge (area studies), one that had little if anything in common with pre-war approaches to social processes.

At the time that Paul Rabinow appealed to anthropologists to analyze the politics of the academy, much ink was spilt in debates concerning reflexive anthropology (Clifford and Marcus; Marcus and Fischer 1986;). I would like to suggest that, interesting and important though these discussions were, they missed entire dimensions of reflexivity. First, they failed to reflect upon why the US has been at the intellectual and institutional center of anthropology during the 20th century—why there *is* so much anthropology to reflect upon in the first place. Second, these debates showed little awareness of the distinctive assemblages of institutions and relationships that have produced different *forms* of anthropology as the 20th century has progressed. Finally, the discussions of the 1980s paid scant attention to the forces that have molded and shaped the very conceptual categories that anthropologists employ. The present paper has sought to open a discussion of these issues, and is offered as a preliminary foray into a revised, or new reflexive anthropology.

References cited

Primary Documentary Sources:

United States War Department. General Staff Intelligence Division (G-2 Division). n.d.a. "History of Training, Military Government" (1 volume).

_____. n.d.b. "A History of the Army Specialized Training Program (from its inception to 31 December 1944)" (1 volume).

_____. n.d.c. "History of Training, Army Specialized Training Program (1 January 1945 to 30 June 1945)" (1 volume)

_____. 1949. "The Training History of the Military Intelligence Service Language Schools" (17 volumes).

United States Army Service Forces. Office of the Provost Marshal General, Military Government Division. n.d.a. Division Memorandum Training Circular No. 2, April 10, 1943 [for the text of the Foreign Area and Language Program curriculum].

Published Sources:

Akami, Tomoko. 2002. *Internationalizing the Pacific: the United States, Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace, 1919-1945*. London, New York: Routledge.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1994. *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of our Times*. New York: Verso.

Bond, George C. 1990. "Fieldnotes: Research in Past Occurrences." In: Roger Sanjek (ed.), *Fieldnotes: the Makings of Anthropology*. pp. 273-289. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California.

Coles, Harry L. and Albert K. Weinberg. 1964. *Civil Affairs: Soldiers Become Governors*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.

- Collier, Stephen J., and Aihwa Ong. 2005. "Introduction." In: Aihwa Ong and Stephen Collier (eds.), *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. pp. 3-21. Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Cumings, Bruce. 1997. Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies During and After the Cold War. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 29(1): 1-32.
- Donnison, F.S.V. 1961. *Civil Affairs and Military Government. North-West Europe, 1944-1946*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Edwards, Kelly and Steven Still. 1991. "Dubious Liberators: Allied Plans to Occupy France, 1942-1944," Ted Rall Online-Full-Length Articles. www.tedrall.com/longarticle_011.htm.
- Farish, Matthew. 2005. Archiving Area: The Ethnogeographic Board and the Second World War. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(3); 663-679.
- Fenton, William Nelson. 1945. Integration of Geography and Anthropology in Army Area Study Curricula. *American Association of University Professors, Bulletin* (32): 696-706.
- _____. 1947. *Area Studies in American Universities. A Report on the Ethnogeographic Board Survey of the FAL Curricula of the ASTP and CATS Programs in 1943-44*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Friedrich, Carl J. and Associates. 1948. *American Experiences in Military Government in World War II*. NY: Rinehart & Co.
- Grace, Alonzo G. 1947. "Foreward." In *Area Studies In American Universities*, by William N. Fenton. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hailey, William M., Baron. 1938. *An African Survey: A Study of Problems Arising in Africa South of the Sahara*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Robert. 1947. *Area Studies, with Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Hamilton, Earl J. 1943. *World Regions in the Social Sciences*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

- Herge, Henry C. 1948. *Wartime College Training Programs of the Armed Services*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Holborn, Hajo. 1947. *American Military Government. Its Organization and Policies*. Washington, DC: Infantry Journal Press.
- Hyneman, Charles S. 1945. The Wartime Area and Language Courses. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* (31): 434-447.
- Italian Campaigns. 1943-45. "Chapter Fourteen. Allied Military Government." In *A Military Encyclopedia Based on the Operations in the Italian Campaigns, 1943-45* [transcribed from military documents, 2001].
- Keefer, Louis E. 1988. Scholars in Foxholes. *The Story of the Army Specialized Training Program in World War II*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Co.
- _____. 1995. Birth and Death of the Army Specialized Training Program. *Army History* 36: 1-7.
- Lutz, Catherine. 2004. "Militarization." In: David Nugent and Joan Vincent (eds.), *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*. pp. 318-331. Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Macleod, Roy M., ed. 2000. *Science and the Pacific War. Science and Survival in the Pacific, 1939-1945*. Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as cultural critique: an experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matthew, Robert John. 1947. *Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services. Their Future Significance*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2004. "The Middle East in the Past and the Future of Social Science." In David Szanton (ed.), *The Politics of Knowledge. Area Studies and the Disciplines*. pp. 74-118. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nugent, David. 2002. "Introduction." In David Nugent, (ed.), *Locating Capitalism in Time and Space: Global Restructurings, Politics and Identity*, pp. 1-59. Stanford: Stanford University

Press.

- Rabinow, Paul. 1886. "Representations Are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology." In: James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. pp. 234-262. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rundell, Walter Jr. 1980. *Military Money. A Fiscal History of the US Army Overseas in World War II*. College Station & London: Texas A&M Press.
- Rennell, Lord. 1948. *British Military Administration of Occupied Territories in Africa During the Years 1941-1947*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Robinson, Pearl T. 2004. "Area Studies in Search of Africa." In David Szanton (ed.), *The Politics of Knowledge. Area Studies and the Disciplines*. pp. 119-183. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Smith, Neil. 2003. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- SSRC. 1934. *The Social Science Research Council. Decennial Report, 1923-1933*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- _____. Annual Report. 1942-43. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- _____. Annual Report. 1943-44. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Szanton, David. 2004. "Introduction: The Origin, Nature and Challenge of Area Studies in the United States." In: David Szanton (ed.), *The Politics of Knowledge. Area Studies and the Disciplines*. pp. 1-33. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. 1928. *Survey of International Affairs, 1924*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Published under the Auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

- United States Army Chief of Staff. 1945. *Biennial Report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, 1943-1945, to the Secretary of War*. Washington, DC: United States Department of War.
- Vincent, Joan. 1990. *Anthropology and Politics. Visions, Traditions, and Trends*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1997. "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies." In: Noam Chomsky, *et al.* (eds.), *The Cold War and the University. Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. pp. 195-231. NY: Free Press.

ANTROPÓLOGOS-CIUDADANOS (Y COMPROMETIDOS) EN LA ARGENTINA. LAS DOS CARAS DE LA “ANTROPOLOGÍA SOCIAL” EN 1960-70¹

Rosana Guber²

Hace ya muchos años que nuestros colegas nos advierten acerca de las diferencias al interior del campo antropológico, entre las antropologías de construcción imperial (*empire-building*) y nacional (*nation-building*) (Stocking 1982), las antropologías centrales y periféricas (Cardoso de Oliveira 2000), y las antropologías del Sur (Krotz 1997). Estas categorías refieren un sistema de clasificación que entraña un orden jerárquico entre quienes son adjudicados o se autoadscriben a una u otra polaridad. Las desigualdades de este orden no son ajenas a la organización del sistema mundial, pero tienen sus lógicas específicas en los campos antropológicos.

Los movimientos independentistas y de liberación que afloraron en los '50 y en los '60, fueron decisivos en dos sentidos: reorganizaron las clásicas áreas de estudio antropológico y abrieron las puertas de la academia a los llamados “antropólogos nativos”, en una disciplina cuyos paradigmas provenían de Gran Bretaña,

1 Este artículo es parte de la investigación “Las ciencias sociales y las crisis” dirigida por Mariano B. Plotkin (PICT 10803, 2004-2007). Algunos de sus contenidos son una reelaboración de la ponencia presentada en el seminario “Other peoples’ anthropologies” coordinado por Aleksandar Boscovic y Thomas Hylland Eriksen en el Congreso de la Asociación Europea de Antropología Social EASA (Viena 2004), y que se publica en el volumen homónimo (Boscovic ed., Berghahn Books 2007). Agradezco los comentarios a versiones anteriores, de Sergio Visacovsky, Beatriz Heredia, Martha Rodríguez, Germán Soprano, Mauricio Boivin, Mariano Plotkin, Mirtha Bonnin, Gastón Gil y Rolando Silla, quienes en modo alguno son responsables por mis errores de descripción e interpretación.

2 Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas (CONICET) -Centro de Antropología Social, del Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social (CAS- IDES).

EE.UU. y Francia, y en medida menos visible pero muy profunda, de Alemania, Austria e Italia. ¿Cambiarían los nuevos ingresantes a la disciplina? ¿La proveerían de miradas más sensibles y humanizantes, o la viciarían con sesgos locales incompatibles con una “ciencia universal”? ¿Serían distintas las agendas de los recién llegados y las de los establecidos? ¿Y podrían aquéllas introducirse en el panorama global de la disciplina desafiando las certezas teóricas y metodológicas de las “antropologías clásicas”?

Estas cuestiones son, precisamente, las que desde los '80 vienen planteando los autores de esas “otras antropologías” (Restrepo y Escobar 2005). Dos puntos merecen aquí nuestra atención: la ciudadanía común entre investigadores y sujetos de estudio, y la dependencia teórica de los “otros antropólogos” con respecto a los desarrollos metropolitanos. Compartir la ciudadanía con nuestros nativos nos diferenciaría de los antropólogos extranjeros, quienes sólo pasan en el campo limitadas temporadas para regresar a sus universidades a escribir sus etnografías, realistas o experimentales. Esta proximidad nos permitiría elaborar nociones más comprometidas con el destino de nuestros pueblos, dejando de reproducir mecánicamente los dictados teóricos del norte.

En estas páginas revisaré ambos supuestos analizando el proceso por el cual algunos colegas en la Argentina comenzaron a delinear un campo disciplinario entre mediados de los 60 y principios de los 70, que llamaron “antropología social”. A través del análisis de las trayectorias académicas de dos antropólogos argentinos espero mostrar, primero, que la adopción de teorías dominantes en la academia del norte no garantizaba el éxito en estas latitudes, y segundo, que la pretensión de proximidad con los sujetos de estudio tuvo distintos efectos más que en los pueblos referidos en sus escritos, en la consolidación de cierto perfil del quehacer antropológico en la Argentina.

I. ¿Cuán nativos? ¿Cuán cercanos? ¿Cuán dependientes?

El par extranjería/nativismo de los antropólogos ha figurado en la agenda antropológica desde que W.H.R. Rivers y B. Malinowski empezaron a predicar la necesidad de una estadía prolongada del investigador en tierras lejanas y en aislamiento de los blancos. Desde los '60 algunos antropólogos empezaron a ponderar la productividad académica de su origen común con los informantes. Eran quienes procedían de las mismas “minorías” (Jones 1970) y de grupos migrantes (Narayan 1993); eran los estudiantes que regresaban de las metrópolis a sus países para hacer trabajo de

campo, y quienes cursaban la integridad de sus carreras en su tierra natal (Jackson 1987; Messerschmidt 1981). Quienes afirmaban la necesidad de la extranjería sostenían que la mayor distancia contribuía al conocimiento objetivo del Otro sin caer en los preconceptos locales y promovía la curiosidad sobre aspectos naturalizados, garantizando así un conocimiento neutro, válido y científico (Beattie, en Aguilar 1981:16-17). Aunque los antropólogos rara vez olvidaran sus valores (occidentales) mientras sobrevivían en el campo, el modelo el antropólogo extranjero equiparaba el trabajo etnográfico al del naturalista. Por su parte, quienes empezaron a levantar las banderas del nativismo afirmaban que sólo los intelectuales locales podían entender la vida de sus pueblos sin caer en el exotismo, ganando tiempo en la laboriosa tarea de aprender la lengua nativa. Los prejuicios locales podían corregirse, pero el acceso a los informantes era más directo, sin caer en los errores habituales del extranjero (Nukunya, Uchendu, D.Nash, en Aguilar 1981). Además, en los '60 los antropólogos europeos eran francamente rechazados en África y partes del Asia, como resabios de la era colonial (Messerschmidt 1981:9-10; J.Nash 1975). Pese a sus diferencias, ambas posturas coincidían en su concepción del conocimiento: si el éxito de los antropólogos nativos radicaba en su completa identificación con los sujetos, y el éxito de los extranjeros en su completa exterioridad, ninguna de las dos proponía reflexionar sobre la productividad específica de las relaciones entre investigador e informante en tanto que relaciones sociales, en el proceso de conocimiento (Guber 1994).

La literatura más reciente acerca de “las antropologías” retoma estas cuestiones incorporándolas a perfiles institucionales. La distinción de George Stocking entre antropologías de *empire-building* y de *nation-building* supone que en las antropologías del *nation-building* el estudioso pertenece a la misma jurisdicción nacional que sus informantes, aunque no alude a cuestiones de mayor proximidad o comprensión, sino a una funcionalidad estatal específica de la antropología. Las antropologías de *empire-building* en cambio, se ejercen en los territorios de ultramar (o detrás de las fronteras) en las otrora dependencias coloniales. Ambos tipos de antropólogos no son equivalentes sino que observan cierto orden jerárquico. Como advirtiera Eduardo Archetti (2006), el socio-antropólogo suizo Arnold Van Gennep que trabajaba en su propia Europa, ganó proyección académica mundial gracias a Victor Turner, un antropólogo británico que trabajaba en África (*un empire-builder*).

La noción de “antropologías del sur” que introdujo Esteban Krotz puso de manifiesto precisamente las desigualdades al interior del universo antropológico. Dos de sus cuatro “cuestiones críticas” nos interesan aquí. Una es que “Aquéllos que estudian y que son estudiados son ciudadanos de un mismo país” (1997:244; mi traducción). Esta común pertenencia no es sólo geográfica “aunque a menudo la proximidad física entre los lugares de donde se obtiene la información empírica y los lugares donde esos materiales se analizan, discuten y se publican los resultados de la investigación, es importante” (Ibid.). Por ejemplo: hoy los campesinos y las comunidades indígenas tienen acceso a la literatura académica, y pueden interactuar fácilmente con sus antropólogos porque comparten la misma lengua de la publicación. Además, “los que estudian y los que son estudiados están afectados, aunque no del mismo modo, por las decisiones políticas y económicas que provienen de las instituciones públicas en cuya configuración y legitimación participan (lo cual crearía) un lazo significativo entre los intereses profesionales y los intereses sociales y políticos de los antropólogos” (Ibid. Mis paréntesis). La estadía temporaria del investigador extranjero establece una relación distinta “con un grupo de personas que estudia durante un determinado número de meses” para irse después (Ibid.). Si bien Krotz advierte que los orígenes socio-culturales de investigadores e investigados pueden ser distintos, cuando comparten ciertos rasgos como la etnia se crean vínculos específicos y más duraderos.

Esta observación contradice, sin embargo, el otro fenómeno señalado por Krotz (244-5), que en los países del sur la mayor parte del conocimiento se importa, desconociendo o bloqueando el conocimiento generado localmente. Esta situación que podríamos llamar “de dependencia teórica”, obedece a varios factores: los mecanismos más aceitados del norte para difundir sus reflexiones y hallazgos, el mayor prestigio derivado de asociarse con la última moda teórica (del norte), y las discontinuas publicaciones, las bibliotecas desprovistas y el escaso debate en el sur. De la sobrevaloración que el sur hace de la producción del norte, resultaría que las condiciones de producción académica serían independientes de sus productos, y que las teorías del norte estarían operando como la lente neutra para mirar y analizar (al sur).

La mayoría de las críticas a Krotz cuestiona la división tajante—sobre todo por su metáfora territorial y geopolítica—entre unas y otras antropologías, pero no pone en duda el carácter de los vínculos entre los antropólogos del sur y las poblaciones que estudian. Carlos Uribe, por ejemplo, cree que “en países como Colombia nosotros, los antropólogos, no tenemos que ‘ir

al campo', estamos en el campo" (1997:258). Para la antropóloga colombiana Myriam Jimeno existe una relación muy cercana entre la producción teórica de los antropólogos latinoamericanos y el compromiso de los antropólogos latinoamericanos hacia aquéllos a quienes estudian (2005:46). Desarrollos teóricos y compromiso político irían de la mano evidenciando una "vocación crítica" de los antropólogos y de las ciencias sociales (2005:47). Basada en el concepto de naciocentrismo de Norbert Elias y en la advertencia de Veena Das de que el conocimiento de la antropología ha resultado de mapas de alteridad informados por teorías sobre el Otro, más que por teorías del Sí Mismo, Jimeno sostiene que la transformación de los Otros en nuevos sujetos políticos en el mismo espacio social en que vive y trabaja el investigador, colorea su práctica social y teórica. Jimeno lo denomina "ciudadano-investigador" para destacar "la cercana relación entre el ejercicio de la investigación y el ejercicio de la ciudadanía" en Latinoamérica. Prueba de ello cita a Alcida Ramos ("En Brasil como en otros países de América Latina, hacer antropología es un acto político" [2005:51]) y varios conceptos acuñados por intelectuales mexicanos y brasileños para describir, interpretar y teorizar las relaciones sociales con el Otro en América Latina. Si como dijera Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, el Otro es parte de la nación del antropólogo, "la política está *embutida* en las reflexiones de los antropólogos y en sus relaciones con la nación", se expongan o no en términos políticos (2005:52).

Propongo aquí interrogar las certezas de estas afirmaciones como lo hacemos con las nociones de nuestros nativos, con el fin de analizar los contextos en que los antropólogos producimos las realidades que estudiamos, y en que las realidades de nuestros procesos nacionales nos producen como antropólogos generadores de teorías y metodologías necesariamente diversas. Argumentaré aquí que: 1) la "co-ciudadanía" es un término demasiado impreciso que oculta no sólo desigualdades profundas de clase y diferentes orientaciones políticas y de sentido común, sino también distintas articulaciones posibles en el campo académico y entre investigador/a e investigad@; 2) estas articulaciones son vitales para entender los desarrollos diversos de nuestras "otras antropologías", sus teorías y metodologías, sus temas recurrentes y sus objetos negados; 3) el "compromiso" es una construcción que debe analizarse en cada caso, tiempo y lugar; 4) la yuxtaposición entre la común nacionalidad con los nativos, y cierto rango de inquietudes morales, políticas y sociales, no está sustentada por la evidencia, sobre todo si sólo se examina la producción textual; 5) el argumento de la mayor cercanía con

los sujetos de estudio es un recurso en los juegos de poder entre antropólogos periféricos y centrales, y quizás también entre los antropólogos periféricos y los antropólogos centrales al interior de un mismo contexto nacional y local; 6) la dependencia teórica del sur con respecto al norte no es sostenida en todo tiempo y lugar; su señalamiento encubre la existencia de varios “nortes” posibles y de varios “sures” también.

Desde 1984 la antropología social se convirtió en la orientación antropológica hegemónica de la Argentina democrática. Que así fuera, interpretaban sus practicantes no sin fundada razón, era el resultado de repetidos intentos por implantar una disciplina que fue desterrada una y otra vez de las universidades nacionales, las únicas que dictaron (y aún dictan) “antropología” en este país. En esta línea muchos antropólogos argentinos suelen presentar a la antropología social como una rama de la antropología promovida por estudiantes y jóvenes graduados de mediados de los ‘60, caracterizada por el involucramiento personal y académico con el presente, los sujetos sociales y la transformación social. Así, la definen como la orientación comprometida (Alberti 1962), militante y perseguida (Herrán 1990, Garbulsky 1991-2), democrática (Ratier & Ringuelet 1997), el patito feo de la antropología argentina (Bartolomé 1980) o su rama más débil y marginal (Hermitte 1968a). Según supone la mayoría de estos epítetos, la antropología social fue la víctima de la represión política y académica, por haber luchado contra el estado autoritario y la academia conservadora y colaboracionista.

Huelga decir que tales calificativos no fueron sostenidos siempre ni por todos los que se autoadscribieron a esta subdisciplina. Hubo quienes no se llamaron a sí mismos “antropólogos sociales” y sin embargo fueron objeto directo de la represión militar. Hubo quienes se decían antropólogos sociales pero no adherían al paradigma del intelectual comprometido. Sin embargo, la conjunción “antropología social – compromiso político” fue un rasgo que decididamente operó en el nacimiento y consolidación de esta subdisciplina antropológica. En ese proceso la antropología social no se circunscribió a los paradigmas “del norte”, aunque abrevó en ellos.

En este trabajo analizaré cómo se articularon lo que considero fueron las dos definiciones dominantes de antropología social en el principal centro académico de la Argentina, con la definición de sus cultores acerca de sus sujetos sociales/destinatarios, y cómo jugó la inspiración de las academias centrales (del norte) en este proceso. El material provendrá del ámbito académico nacido en

la Universidad de Buenos Aires entre 1940 y 1966, y girará predominante aunque no exclusivamente en torno a dos figuras que en 1970 se definían públicamente como “antropólogos sociales”. Esther Hermitte (1921-1990) y Eduardo Menéndez (n.1934), nacieron respectivamente en la ciudad de Buenos Aires y en una ciudad de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, fueron educados en la capital argentina y accedieron a la antropología en la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Los dos renunciaron a sus puestos docentes tras la violenta intervención universitaria de julio de 1966, y no participaron de la universidad argentina después de la intervención de julio de 1974, el prólogo del Proceso de Reorganización Nacional en el medio académico. Menéndez vive desde 1975 en México DF. Hermitte permaneció en Buenos Aires dictando cursos en un pequeño centro de ciencias sociales, el Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social (IDES), y se integró a la UBA con la primera gestión democrática y hasta su muerte, en julio de 1990.

Hermitte y Menéndez representan dos importantes orientaciones de la antropología social que se gestó en la Argentina a mediados de los años ‘60.³ Aunque con perspectivas diferentes, ambos intentaron crear un campo llamado “antropología social” que estuviera basado en la articulación entre teoría y práctica, aunque las características y los límites de dicha articulación pudieran exceder el estricto medio académico. Mostraré aquí cómo definieron su relación con los sujetos sociales y con las antropologías metropolitanas, y los dispares destinos de sus enseñanzas.

II. Una búsqueda hacia el norte

María Esther Alvarez, fugazmente casada con Raúl Hermitte, se graduó como Profesora de Historia en la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras cuando aún no se impartían “licenciaturas”. Su ámbito de sociabilidad era común al de otros estudiantes de Historia particularmente inclinados a la antropología y la geografía, fue el Museo Etnográfico, cuna de las actividades arqueo-antropológicas en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires y dependiente de la Universidad de Buenos Aires desde 1904, año de su inauguración. El eje de dicho ámbito era Francisco de Aparicio, profesor de arqueología

3 Cecilia Hidalgo (1997-8) añade la orientación relativa a la antropología bourdieuana de Néstor García Canclini. Este sesgo, sin embargo, ingresó a la Argentina ya en tiempos de la democracia (1985) y una vez que el mismo García Canclini, un exiliado filósofo de La Plata en México, había aplicado la teoría de Pierre Bourdieu al campo de la artesanía y las fiestas populares en ese país.

argentina y americana, arqueólogo, etnohistoriador y geógrafo autodidacta de orientación política liberal, que dirigió el Museo Etnográfico, la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología y su revista *Relaciones*, desde 1939. En 1947, tras firmar un documento público en el que varios profesores universitarios se pronunciaron en contra de la intervención del Poder Ejecutivo del presidente Juan D. Perón, fue exonerado para siempre. Aparicio murió en 1951. Hermitte, como otros de sus discípulos, se retiró del medio universitario para dedicarse a la actividad docente mientras el Museo quedaba bajo la dirección del antropólogo italiano José Imbelloni (Fígoli 1990, Guber 2006a).

Con la caída de Perón y el retiro de Imbelloni en setiembre de 1955, la intervención de la UBA designó como decano interventor de la Facultad a un discípulo dilecto de Aparicio, el arqueólogo y etnohistoriador Alberto M. Salas. Junto al otro exonerado, el arqueólogo Fernando Márquez Miranda, Hermitte volvió al Museo y presentó a Salas una propuesta que quizás imaginó en alguno de sus viajes que realizara con su esposo a los EE.UU. entre 1947 y 1950. Allí tomó algunos cursos de etnología y antropología y probablemente entonces tuvo su primer contacto con la “antropología social”. Informalmente en 1956, y formalmente en 1957 Hermitte le propuso a Salas realizar “estudios de forma de vida de las poblaciones mestizas en una comunidad minera” en el noroeste argentino (Archivo Facultad Filosofía y Letras, UBA, Cartas 9/12/1956, 14/12/1956). La mina de plomo, zinc y plata El Aguilar venía operando en la Puna argentina, a 4000 metros de altitud, desde 1926. En carácter de “Ayudante 4° de investigación rentada” por el Instituto de Antropología, Hermitte pidió fondos para viaje, un asistente de investigación y trabajo de campo en el complejo minero, adonde residió en enero y febrero de 1957 y 1958.

El trabajo de campo consistió en observar, conversar, administrar una encuesta y entrevistar a personal de la mina, a los trabajadores y a sus familias. El cuestionario de 129 preguntas cubría parentesco, redes, trabajo, vivienda, accidentes y enfermedades, esparcimiento, economía doméstica, creencias y ceremonias religiosas. Los tópicos clásicos de la antropología en busca de los “patrimonios” culturales de las comunidades, se relegaban aquí para dar prioridad a las relaciones sociales entre los grupos sociales que reunía la empresa: bolivianos, atacameños y funcionarios urbanos. Aunque no contamos con su reporte a la compañía ni a la universidad, su trabajo fue conocido por los antropólogos de Buenos Aires como “antropología social”. Sus dos asistentes de campo, Amalia Sanguinetti y Ana María Mariscotti, publicaron un

breve artículo en la revista del Museo, *Runa. Archivos del Hombre*, creada por Imbelloni en 1947. En “Notas para el estudio de la cultura de la Puna” (1958-9:195-206) se referían a Hermitte como una “experta en *Antropología Social* que ha llevado a cabo una investigación de tipo socio-antropológica en dos oportunidades, en una comunidad minera, y a quien hemos acompañado como sus asistentes” (Ibid.:195. Mi énfasis). Además, Hermitte debió cambiar de asistente en 1958 pues Sanguinetti contraía matrimonio con Bormida, profesor ya asentado en el Museo. En 1958 presentó la ponencia “Antropología aplicada y su futuro en la Argentina” en la reunión periódica “Semana Antropológica”, de la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología (Guber 2006a).

La concepción de Hermitte era ya muy afín a la que se impartía en la asignatura “antropología social” del nuevo departamento de Sociología de la misma facultad de Filosofía y Letras y a unas cuadas del Museo. Gino Germani, conocido como el padre fundador de la moderna sociología argentina, inició el programa de Licenciatura en Sociología en 1957, que ofrecía un curso bajo ese nombre, obligatorio para antropólogos y optativo para sociólogos. Ralph Beals fue el primero en impartirlo, por sólo un semestre, en 1962. Pero Hermitte, que al mismo tiempo publicaba en *Runa*, la revista del Instituto de Antropología, cinco reseñas sobre la antropología norteamericana: *Hollywood: el mundo del cine visto por una antropóloga* de Hortense Powdermaker (alumna de Malinowski) [1956-7], *The Kaska Indians. An ethnographic reconstruction*, de J.J.Honigmann [1954]; *Teoría y práctica del estudio de áreas* de Julien Steward (Unión Panamericana, 1955); *New Lives for Old* de Margaret Mead (1956) y el anuario de la principal entidad financiadora de la investigación antropológica, la Wenner-Gren Foundation [Guber 2006a]), traería una noción menos culturalista y más sociológica. En 1958 partió con una beca externa doctoral del flamante Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas CONICET, a cursar un postgrado en la Universidad de Chicago. Para ello consiguió una licencia con goce de haberes concedida por la UBA y por un año para “cursar estudios superiores en antropología social”.⁴ Sin embargo, su estadía demoró siete años, incluyendo veinticuatro meses en Pinola, Altos de Chiapas, adonde desarrolló su trabajo de campo sobre el revestimiento y el nahualismo de los Mayas modernos (Julio–Diciembre 1959, Julio 1960–Diciembre 1961 [Hermitte 2007]). Tanto su tesis

4 La licencia fue solicitada por Bormida como director del Instituto de Antropología, y concedida con la firma del rector Risieri Frondizi, por el Consejo Superior de la UBA el 13 de noviembre de 1958, hasta el 14 de setiembre de 1959.

de maestría (1962) como la de doctorado (1964) fueron premiadas como las mejores tesis de antropología de su universidad. Estas distinciones ponían de manifiesto la interiorización de Hermitte en la línea rectora de aquel departamento.

En 1931 Chicago se había convertido en una embajada de la antropología social británica en los EEUU., cuando recibió a A.R.Radcliffe-Brown tras la partida de Edward Sapir a Yale. Este arribo significó el ascenso de un método más “científico” y “estrictamente no histórico” para el estudio de la sociedad, y un abandono de las humanidades cultivadas por la escuela de Boas y de Sapir. La investigación de Radcliffe-Brown acerca de las “leyes que gobiernan el funcionamiento sincrónico de la sociedad humana” dejó profundas marcas en la escuela antropológica de Chicago: la caída de los estudios etnológicos, la subordinación de la cultura a la estructura social y la primacía de los estudios de área y el método de caso extendido. Radcliffe-Brown volvió a Oxford en 1937 (Stocking 1979:21).

Pese a que cuando Hermitte llegó a Chicago el departamento estaba recibiendo a tres jóvenes parsonianos—Lloyd Fallers, Clifford Geertz y David Schneider—, la influencia sociológica de Robert Redfield, Radcliffe-Brown y la antropología social británica estaban aún muy vivos en el proyecto interdisciplinario *Man-in-Nature* iniciado en 1956 bajo la jefatura del lingüista de maya y nahua, Norman McQuown (1910-2006, Phd Yale 1940).⁵ Los trabajadores de campo eran candidatos de maestría y doctorado coordinados por un ex alumno de E.E.Evans-Pritchard, Julian Pitt-Rivers. El proyecto contó con fondos de la National Science Foundation (NSF) y del National Institute of Mental

5 Chicago merodeaba Centro América desde que Robert Redfield trabajó en Yucatán en los años 20s y Sol Tax en Guatemala en los 40s. Redfield estudió con Robert Park, artífice de la sociología cualitativa de Chicago, y fue después su yerno. Su ascenso como antropólogo comenzó en 1928, cuando llegó al flamante departamento de antropología. Contratado por el Carnegie Institute de Washington en 1929 para realizar un análisis comparativo de cuatro comunidades mayas en Yucatán, Redfield concebía el cambio cultural en términos evolutivos, como dependiente del grado de aislamiento de cada comunidad. Tax difería en su aproximación a Guatemala, donde reparaba en que los indígenas vendían sus productos en grandes mercados por dinero. Su marcado individualismo y relaciones impersonales contrastaban con la comunidad folk de Redfield (Patterson 2001:86, Stocking 1979). Pero Tax y Redfield coincidían con Radcliffe-Brown en la integración funcional de la cultura, pese a sus diferencias internas.

Health (NIMH). El Proyecto Chicago-Chiapas investigaba el cambio social y cultural entre los indios Tzeltales y Tzotziles⁶ *Man in Nature* se desarrolló en un paraje tres fincas diez pueblos y dos secciones o barrios, en cada uno de los cuales residían un lingüista y un antropólogo social, con la ayuda de un intérprete indígena. Hermitte residió en Golouitz, la sección indígena norte de Pinola (McQuown y Pitt-Rivers 1964:5-7; Hermitte 2007).

Dado que la beca del CONICET sólo cubría dos años de su estadía en los EEUU, Hermitte recibió un subsidio del NIMH para su trabajo de campo y para redactar sus dos tesis. La de maestría (85 páginas, 1962) trataba sobre la movilidad social de los revestidos, la adopción de vestimenta ladina y del modo de vida mestizo por indígenas en busca de ascenso social. Su tesis doctoral—*Supernatural power and social control in a modern Mayan town* (234 páginas, 1964)—trataba sobre los usos indígenas de imágenes, creencias y fuerzas sobrenaturales para ejercer el control social de aquéllos que quisieran “pasar” a ladinos. El nahualismo y la brujería se revelaban, así, como aliados en la organización de los indios pinoltecos, un sistema político que había ascendido desde el mundo terrenal y operaba exclusivamente en el plano celestial, ajeno al mundo ladino. Mientras que su tesis de maestría mostraba cómo los indios cruzaban las fronteras indo-mestizas, su tesis doctoral mostraba un mecanismo interno de los Tzeltales para retener a sus miembros en el marco de sus normas, valores, costumbres y creencias. Las causas de la enfermedad, el diagnóstico de brujería y la viabilidad de la curación, se expresaban en los sueños y sus respectivas interpretaciones. La única experiencia terrenal de este orden fantasmagórico era el asesinato periódico de personas reconocidas como *ak'chameles* o brujos (Hermitte 2004, 2007).

Munida de la antropología social británica y de innumerables anécdotas de campo, Hermitte volvió a la Argentina en 1965 procurando retomar su lugar en el Museo Etnográfico. Sin embargo, muchas cosas habían cambiado desde su partida.

III. No “sociales” pero ya “comprometidos”

Quienes habían ingresado en 1959 a la primera cohorte de la licenciatura de Ciencias Antropológicas se estaban graduando en alguna de las tres orientaciones—Folklore, Etnología y Arqueología—pese a que tales distinciones no reflejaban especializaciones

6 Había otro proyecto en el área, el Harvard-Chiapas dirigido por Evon Z. Vogt (Vogt 1994).

consolidadas al nivel de los profesores ni marcaban el destino profesional de quienes las elegían. El etnólogo Enrique Palavecino, discípulo de Alfred Métraux en Tucumán, introdujo a los estudiantes en el culturalismo norteamericano y el funcionalismo británico; el folklorólogo Augusto Raúl Cortazar había aplicado el modelo folk-urbano de Redfield a los Valles Calchaquies, en el noroeste, y el arqueólogo Ciro René Lafón llevaba a su alumnos en viaje de campaña a recolectar información arqueológica y el folklore de la población rural, a la que más tarde referiría como “compatriota” más que como “comunidad folk” (1969-70). El prehistoriador austriaco Menghin merodeaba la Pampa y la Patagonia en busca de rastros de círculos culturales primigenios que permitieran integrar esta región a las sistematizaciones del mundo prehistórico como lo había hecho Wilhelm Schmidt en Viena. Y Marcelo Bormida era especialmente apreciado por sus alumnos como el más influyente y carismático. “El Tano”, como lo llamaban, había llegado a la Argentina en 1947 con un bachillerato en Antropología Física en Roma. En Buenos Aires se integró al Museo Etnográfico bajo el padrinazgo de Imbelloni. Cuando éste se alejó de su cargo, Bormida siguió en el Museo en la especialidad Antropología, que fue virando desde la Antropología Física hacia la Etnología.

La centralidad de Bormida era reconocida por sus alumnos. Según el antropólogo hoy adscripto como “social” Hugo Ratier, miembro de la primera cohorte, Bormida “era, sin lugar a dudas, la figura más importante en la antropología argentina. Menéndez (también de la primera cohorte) dijo esto alguna vez, y la gente se enojó con él. ... Él (Bormida) era joven, buen profesor, planeaba cada clase; uno buscaba el mensaje subyacente” (Gurevich 1989b; mis paréntesis). El antropólogo social Leopoldo Bartolomé lo reconoce como el “brillante pero contradictorio zar de la etnología en la Universidad de Buenos Aires hasta su muerte en 1978” (1980:7). Blas Alberti, primer graduado de la licenciatura porteña (1962) y luego autoadscripto como antropólogo social, compartía esta perspectiva: “Él (Bormida) trató de formular una teoría universalista basada en Hegel. Y de Hegel era posible saltar a una crítica de Hegel por medio de la idea de totalidad histórica y cultural”. Bormida era “el único profesor con un proyecto ideológico y político” (Gurevich 1989a). Estas consideraciones

7 Término corriente con que se designa al “italiano” en Buenos Aires, abreviado de “napoliTANO”, un origen habitual en la inmigración itálica a la Argentina en el cambio del siglo XIX al XX.

son más reveladoras a la luz de su orientación política filo-fascista, similar a la de su maestro.

Los estudiantes, muchos de ellos ya enrolados en diversas opciones de la izquierda marxista, trotskista, demócrata-cristiana y una naciente “izquierda nacional”, más que peronista, conocían los antecedentes políticos de este profesor que, se decía, había pertenecido a las filas infanto-juveniles de los *balilla*, lo cual no menguaba su brillantez teórica e intelectual. Su carrera ascendente se benefició de la platea que le ofrecía la flamante licenciatura de Ciencias Antropológicas creada en 1958 y comenzada a dictar en 1959 con un programa imbelloniano, y 20 alumnos en constante aumento (ya en 1962 el director del departamento solicitaba al decano la urgente designación de auxiliares docentes, cargo que proveerían los alumnos avanzados, dado que algunos cursos alcanzaban los 70 inscriptos).

Antropología se diferenciaba de otras carreras en varios aspectos. Si bien las materias antropológicas conservaban un perfil bastante tradicional que se remontaba a los años 30, su aparición en el panorama universitario guardaba cierto halo de novedad. La antropología no se dictaba en la escuela secundaria, de manera que era una gran desconocida para quienes ingresaban a la universidad. Además, su carácter pretérito y exótico la erradicaba de las profesiones liberales y aplicadas en un país que se preciaba de ser el más blanco y moderno de América Latina. En suma, muchos de sus alumnos llegaban a la carrera después de haber explorado otros caminos como Historia, Medicina, Derecho y hasta Física, lo cual redundaba en un cuerpo estudiantil que “elegía” la carrera en el sentido más literal del término. Además, y por tratarse a menudo de una segunda opción, los alumnos de Ciencias Antropológicas eran mayores que quienes ingresaban a otras carreras directamente desde la escuela secundaria. Así, ese cuerpo estudiantil retribuía con creatividad y entusiasmo a la nueva/vieja oferta académica en la que encontraba no sólo interesantes desarrollos filosóficos sino también, y quizás fundamentalmente, un acceso distinto a la sociedad argentina.

Hasta 1983, esto es, hasta bastante después de su muerte en 1978, Bormida fue el hombre fuerte de la antropología porteña. Esta trayectoria breve comparada con la de Menghin o incluso con la de Imbelloni, muestra una gran habilidad para sobrevivir en medio de una creciente polarización e incertidumbre académica que imponían los avatares políticos y político-universitarios. Parte de su habilidad residía en su capacidad de adaptarse a las nuevas conducciones ante cada cambio político, pero también

en su carisma, su bagaje en antropología centro-europea, y sus iluminadoras bibliografías, lo cual parecía traducirse, como vimos lo recordaban sus ex alumnos, en un programa que ellos podían aprovechar para sentar las bases de una antropología transformadora. El contexto académico nacional ofrecía el marco adecuado para esta orientación.

IV. Una rama débil

Hermitte había vuelto a la Argentina como un fantasma. Los estudiantes sabían de “una antropóloga que vive en los EEUU”⁸ por boca de sus profesores quienes, pese a la vaguedad de la información que suministraban, ya la conocían. Lafón había sido su compañero en el profesorado, sus reseñas fueron publicadas en *Runa*; varios la habían escuchado en la Semana Antropológica de 1958 y el ya graduado Menéndez era, también en 1958, estudiante de Historia y adscripto como Ayudante 5º rentado del Instituto de Antropología.⁹ Además, dos diarios porteños publicaron el arribo de esta “antropóloga social” a la vida académica de Buenos Aires.¹⁰

En el primer semestre de 1966, esto es, antes de la sangrienta intervención universitaria del General J.C. Onganía el 29 de julio, dictó en carácter de profesora interina el Seminario, esto es, no una materia obligatoria, “Etnografía sobre Mayas contemporáneos”. Sólo dos alumnos aprobaron el curso. Sus estándares de evaluación diferían de los requeridos hasta entonces en un departamento más centrado en la búsqueda de rasgos culturales que en la reconstrucción de las relaciones sociales. Simultáneamente, Hermitte

8 Los profesores se referían en términos similares a Alberto Rex González, como “un doctor que está tomando algunos cursos en los Estados Unidos ... siempre se refirieron a mí de esa manera, con desdén.”

9 Bormida, director del Instituto, fundamentaba la solicitud de tal designación en la necesidad de “contar con más personal para el mejor desarrollo de las tareas de investigación y documentación en el Instituto a mi cargo” y en que este “destacado alumno” demostraba “un especial interés por las disciplinas que aquí se cultivan”, aspirando a “especializarse” (sic) en ellas (Archivo Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, UBA).

10 La noticia en los diarios de alcance nacional *La Prensa* y *La Nación*, llevaba por título “*Llegó de EE.UU. una doctora en Antropología*” (21 de noviembre, 1965). La noticia incluía sus siete años de estadía en los EE.UU., sus estudios en Chicago y su trabajo de campo en Chiapas, junto a los dos premios recibidos por sus tesis.

comenzó a “buscar una comunidad” para reiniciar su trabajo de campo desde su nueva afiliación institucional como investigadora jefe de la nueva sección de Antropología Social del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, un centro que proponía ocupar la vanguardia en las artes y las ciencias sociales (Neiburg y Plotkin 2004). Para ello, el director del Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, el sociólogo español Juan Marsal, contrataba a expertos con doctorados en las principales universidades metropolitanas. Hermitte también obtuvo un subsidio de investigación del CONICET para estudiar “la organización política y social de una población en Catamarca” (*Actualidad Antropológica* AA 1968), pero le fue denegada su incorporación a la carrera del investigador por no identificarse su *métier* como perteneciente a las Ciencias Antropológicas. Su nueva investigación trataría sobre las relaciones de producción y distribución de tejedoras de poncho y mantas, y productores minifundistas de pimentón. En una comunidad supuestamente atávica y aferrada a la tradición, ella proponía que la reproducción de la pobreza y la desigualdad socioeconómica en poblaciones “resistentes al cambio”, procedía de los distintos recursos con que contaban algunas teleras y productores para controlar el acceso a la materia prima (la lana), la tierra, y a los circuitos de comercialización de sus productos. Esta desigualdad solía echar por tierra los sucesivos intentos de cooperativización que impulsaba el gobierno desarrollista tanto civil como militar. Hermitte contrató como auxiliar a uno de los alumnos que aprobara su seminario, Carlos Herrán, y juntos hicieron trabajo de campo y se desempeñaron como consultores del *Consejo Federal de Inversiones*, un fondo de promoción de las economías provinciales (Hermitte y Herrán 1970, 1977).

El 29 de julio de 1966, un mes después del golpe militar que destronó al radical Arturo H. Illia, la infantería policial ingresó a los edificios universitarios para desalojar a alumnos y profesores opuestos a la subordinación de la autonomía universitaria. La llamada “edad de oro” de la universidad argentina llegaba abruptamente a su fin, desprovista ahora de sus mejores cuadros que renunciaban en masa a sus cargos. En Antropología renunció la gran mayoría de los auxiliares docentes graduados y sólo una profesora de nivel superior, Hermitte (Guber 2007).

Ante el destierro de la universidad pública, la sección socio-antropológica del Di Tella aparecía como la única vía institucional para reproducir otra antropología en Buenos Aires. Además de conseguirle un subsidio a Bilbao para culminar un trabajo de campo en el Chaco, y de asumir la dirección de la beca de Menéndez en el CONICET con un estudio sobre inmigrantes

europeos en Entre Ríos, Hermitte convocó a algunos jóvenes graduados y estudiantes avanzados de Ciencias Antropológicas—Mirtha Lischetti, Ratier y Menéndez, de la primera cohorte, y María Rosa Neufeld de la segunda—para emprender un estudio sobre “El significado social de la enfermedad”. La investigación debía incluir un intensivo trabajo de campo sobre nociones de enfermedad, relación médico-paciente y clase social, en el barrio porteño de Saavedra. Tras alguna introducción teórica, comenzó el trabajo de campo con observación participante y entrevistas semi-estructuradas a médicos, enfermeras, pacientes y familiares de pacientes, trabajadores y alumnos de escuelas primarias de la zona. En 1968 el equipo estaba analizando los datos (AA 1968:14-15), pero ese análisis no se plasmó en publicación alguna. Según sus integrantes, había con Hermitte un disenso teórico-político fundado en razones político-ideológicas; según Hermitte, faltaba trabajo de campo. El equipo se desmembró cuando ella viajó a EE.UU. a dictar un curso.

La investigación en Catamarca con Herrán y con otra asistente, licenciada en Historia en Córdoba, Beatriz Alasia, fue más fructífera e introdujo en la Argentina la línea de economía política de los antropólogos norteamericanos Wolf, Mintz, June Nash y otros críticos de las perspectivas culturalistas y marginalistas (Hermitte 1972a, 1972b, Hermitte y Herrán 1970, 1977, Hermitte y Klein 1972).¹¹

La mayoría de las memorias de quienes fueron sus colegas y auxiliares, y de los demás investigadores que residían en el Di Tella, presentan a Hermitte como una entidad solitaria y académicamente intolerante de las generalizaciones de los sociólogos y científicos políticos. La anécdota cuenta que cierta vez Marsal le pidió que compilara un volumen de antropología social argentina para la *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología* que publicaba el Instituto. Hermitte rechazó prácticamente todos los trabajos que ella misma había encargado, argumentando que “eso no era antropología social” sino etnología y folklore. Desde su oficina del Di Tella, Hermitte se erigía en árbitro de la antropología social en el país, y además, la única alternativa a la antropología oficial que

11 Ver Bartolomé y Gorostiaga 1974, para las lecturas de entonces sobre cuestión agraria y antropología. Poco después, Hermitte inició otro equipo de científicos sociales y antropólogos, para analizar las condiciones de vida de los aborígenes en el Chaco. Nuevamente, la agencia financiadora era el CFI, y las conclusiones permanecieron inéditas hasta que dos de sus auxiliares decidieron publicarlas ya fallecida Hermitte (Hermitte e Iñigo Carrera 1977, Hermitte, Iñigo Carrera e Isla 1996).

Bormida dirigía en Filosofía y Letras. Recién en 1974, y cuando la universidad volvía a ser intervenida luego de un breve lapso de autonomía, Hermitte reunió a un grupo de jóvenes antropólogos pero esta vez, y salvo Herrán, todos formados en las academias centrales. Ninguno, salvo ella y Herrán, residía en Buenos Aires: Hebe M.C. Vessuri, de Oxford, en la Universidad de Tucumán; Eduardo Archetti, de París, en la Universidad del Litoral con sede en Rosario, y su ex alumno (el otro que había aprobado el Seminario de la UBA) Leopoldo Bartolomé, de Wisconsin, vivía en Misiones. Con ellos integraría el capítulo argentino del grupo de discusión sobre “Articulación Social” afiliado al Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales CLACSO.¹² En ese mismo año Hermitte creó el Centro de Antropología Social en el Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social fundado por el ministerio de economía de la Provincia de Buenos Aires en 1957 para analizar y proponer políticas económicas para el desarrollo. Su búsqueda para institucionalizar a la antropología social, continuó durante toda la dictadura del Proceso de Reorganización Nacional (1976-83).

V. Partera de la revolución

Los jóvenes graduados de Buenos Aires disponían de una autonomía que en parte decidían y en parte condicionaba la coyuntura. La garantía de reproducción socio-antropológica no radicaba sólo en Hermitte por diversas razones. Ella no tenía la llave de ningún espacio institucionalizado de investigación y docencia. La alternativa del Di Tella comenzó a angostarse en 1972 y el Centro de Antropología Social del IDES se convirtió en un espacio refugio que, por su constitución asociativa, no subsidiaba a investigadores. Además, los antropólogos sociales que llegaban a la Argentina a hacer sus trabajos de campo doctorales, contaban con su propio “capital académico” y con sus redes locales. En tercer lugar, los jóvenes licenciados de Buenos Aires podían tejer las suyas propias por fuera de, pero gracias a su previa estadía en el Museo Etnográfico.

Precisamente, en una publicación perteneciente a una institución creada directamente desde Buenos Aires, la antropología

12 El grupo CLACSO de articulación social reunió en tres ocasiones a antropólogos sociales de América Latina predominantemente interesados en la cuestión agraria. Operó entre 1974 y 1977, y varias ponencias de la primera reunión se publicaron en 1977 (Hermitte & Bartolomé 1977).

social porteña se lanzó por vez primera a la arena pública. En 1968 el segundo volumen de *Actualidad Antropológica*, una revista con novedades del ámbito antropológico nacional que publicaba el Museo Dámaso Arce fundado por Palavecino en 1963 en la ciudad bonaerense de Olavarría, dedicó su editorial a la antropología social. El artículo “Antropología social aquí y ahora” la presentaba como una rama de la antropología en demanda de debate teórico, trabajo de campo y mayor precisión en los datos. El autor anónimo sólo refería *Elements of Social Anthropology* de Siegfried Nadel, a quien probablemente leyera en el curso porteño de Sociología. La antropología social se presentaba como una ciencia comprometida con el presente y la comprensión de problemas socio-culturales “según el estadio de las transformaciones que atraviesa nuestro país” (AA 1968:1). Así, la antropología social no se limitaba al estudio de los pueblos primitivos; también alcanzaba a nuestra sociedad, siempre sosteniendo su historicidad ya que, para el editorialista, la historia era intrínseca a toda ciencia.

En el siguiente número Menéndez comentaba el editorial del anterior y atribuía el desarrollo “relativamente reciente” de la antropología social en la Argentina, a la primacía de las orientaciones teóricas “geotemporales” por sobre las “históricas” y “estructurales”. Las escuelas histórico-cultural, fenomenológica y morfocultural habían promovido el trabajo sobre ciertos objetos que desplazaron a aquéllos que sustentarían luego a la antropología social (Menéndez 1968:48). El autor identificaba las corrientes dominantes en la Argentina con la perspectiva reconstructiva y universal, y las contraponía a una perspectiva latinoamericana y nacional. Esta deficiencia debería ser revertida por la antropología social cuyos antecedentes Menéndez encontraba en dos puntos del pasado. El primero era “*circa* 1947”, aludiendo premeditadamente o no al reinado imbelloniano, cuando según él se encaraban problemas no-tradicionales “aún con grupos marginales” como los indígenas y el folk. El segundo databa “desde 1958”, con la creación de la licenciatura porteña, la antropología empezaba a aplicarse desde nuevos enfoques a otros grupos sociales y a “áreas eco-sociales no-tradicionales como las áreas urbanas” (Ibid.49). Hermitte no figuraba en estos antecedentes, sino en una paridad con otros colegas que el autor listaba como deseando encuadrarse, a veces de manera forzada o equívoca, en la antropología social. Menéndez reconocía la inexistencia de una formación socio-antropológica sistemática (Ibid.:51), por lo que hacía algunas advertencias por la falta de trabajo de campo con observación participante, la “concepción escotomizada del trabajo de campo”, el “uso mecánico de modelos y conceptos

sociológicos, no adecuados ni integrados a los marcos conceptuales disciplinarios y en consecuencia mal utilizados” (Ibid.:50), y la falta de formación sistemática en antropología social.

Para la misma época, Hermitte arribaba a las mismas conclusiones en un informe sobre “El estado de la Antropología Social en la Argentina” que presentara al Di Tella (setiembre 1969). Sin embargo, y pese al diagnóstico común, la etiología y el tratamiento del mal eran diferentes. Para Hermitte el origen radicaba en la escuela porteña dominante, la primera raíz socio-antropológica provenía de Germani y la cátedra de Sociología, no de 1947, y la solución a semejante retraso era formarse en el exterior y proceder a la investigación empírica intensiva, esto es, al trabajo de campo.

Para Menéndez su crítica debía dirigirse no sólo a las “orientaciones geotemporales” del establishment porteño, sino al corazón teórico y político de la “antropología social” en sentido estricto. Uno de sus escritos más influyentes en el medio antropológico argentino fue su diseño de un tipo teórico-metodológico que llamó MAC o *Modelo Antropológico Clásico* (1967-8).¹³ Impartido aún hoy como el eje teórico de numerosos cursos introductorios a la antropología, se trataba de un manuscrito terminado en 1968 que nunca se publicó.¹⁴ Allí su autor presentaba la “definición clásica” con que la antropología británica y la estadounidense delimitaban la realidad sociocultural a través de las variables de objetividad, autenticidad, cualidad, relativismo, totalidad y homogeneidad. En este modelo Menéndez reunía al estructuralismo levi-straussiano con las escuelas británicas funcionales y estructural-funcionales, también mechados con ejemplos provenientes del difusionismo, el evolucionismo y el historicismo boasiano. Sin embargo, la mayoría de sus ejemplos provenía de los estudios de comunidad norteamericanos y de algunos clásicos británicos acusados de erradicar a los

13 Como no pude acceder al manuscrito, me baso en las referencias que las colegas Mirtha Lischetti y María Rosa Neufeld hicieron de él en algunas publicaciones posteriores: el capítulo “*El Modelo Antropológico Clásico*” del manual *Antropología* (Lischetti 1987, 1998).

14 Las políticas de publicación merecerían un capítulo aparte, pero deseo destacar aquí que algunos textos fueron absolutamente influyentes en la antropología de la época pese a su in-edición. El MAC de Menéndez se añade a “La observación por medio de la participación” de Hermitte (escrito en 1968 y publicado en 2002), y “Ensayo para una clasificación morfológica de artefactos líticos aplicada a estudios tipológicos comparativos” de Carlos Aschero en arqueología, informe al CONICET de 1975 (Luco 2007).

pueblos de la historia y de las relaciones de dominación a través de la ficción de la “comunidad aislada”. Menéndez visualizaba al antropólogo como un agente del imperialismo que, valiéndose del trabajo de campo intensivo, accedía a la vida de los pueblos pasando largos períodos con ellos y destacando sus prácticas tradicionales como si no hubieran sido modificadas por la intrusión del capitalismo. Agregaba entonces la retórica de Franz Fanon, en boga entre los intelectuales de izquierda de Europa y América Latina, quien denunciaba el poder del colonialismo para modelar y dominar las vidas, valores y creencias de los sujetos.

La retórica de Menéndez era bastante afín a la de otros antropólogos de entonces, críticos del peso del colonialismo (Talal Asad, Katherine Gough, June Nash, Peter Worsley, Orlando Fals Borda, González Casanova, Rodolfo Stavenhagen) y de la existencia de la comunidad aislada (Mintz, Wolf; en la Argentina ver Bartolomé 1991, Bilbao 1968, Hermitte y Herrán 1970, Vessuri 1971, Archetti y Stolen 1975, etc.).

Sin embargo, las puntualizaciones de Menéndez no se pronunciaban en un contexto colonial o recientemente descolonizado, sino en un país con un siglo y medio de vida, acosado por una nueva dictadura militar inspirada en la Doctrina de Seguridad Nacional y por la privación de ciudadanía política desde 1955 de un enorme sector social mediante la proscripción del peronismo, orientación ajena e incluso contraria a las preferencias políticas de la mayoría de los primeros licenciados en antropología. En la retórica de la época en la Argentina, no sólo en el medio universitario, era frecuente hacer la analogía entre colonialismo y autoritarismo, y entre Fuerzas Armadas y fuerzas de ocupación. Esta visión no sólo era sostenida además de por la izquierda marxista y los teóricos de la dependencia, también por los viejos nacionalistas doctrinarios de derecha y de izquierda que criticaban la sujeción argentina al imperialismo británico (R. & J. Irazusta, Arturo Jauretche, Rodolfo Puiggrós, Jorge A. Ramos, R. Scalabrini Ortiz) y luego norteamericano. En esta postura convergían, pues, amplios sectores de la militancia intelectual alentados en los ‘60 por las movilizaciones antiimperialistas y anti-dictatoriales que fueron *in crescendo* desde la invasión norteamericana de Santo Domingo, y la rebelión popular conocida como *Cordobazo* en 1969 (Córdoba, Argentina) que abrió las puertas a las elecciones de 1973 (CGCA 1989).

Las reivindicaciones en clave de anti-imperialismo, anti-colonialismo y anti-capitalismo eran diversas y se articulaban con otras cuestiones. Para algunos remitían al regreso de Perón

a la Argentina y al gobierno; para otros eran la semilla de la revolución proletaria o socialista o “socialista nacional”; para los integrantes del amplio mundo académico significaba el regreso de la autonomía universitaria. Para los antropólogos renunciantes del ‘66 bien podía significar la caída de Bormida y la realización de programas alternativos que algunos llamaban “antropología social” y otros empezaban a designar como “cátedras nacionales” y “antropología del Tercer Mundo” (Barletta 2000). En suma, fue la superposición de la autodenominada *Revolución Argentina* del General Onganía, la consolidación de Bormida al frente del departamento de Ciencias Antropológicas, la muerte de Palavecino apenas antes del golpe en 1966, la renuncia de la mayoría de los flamantes auxiliares docentes—los primeros hijos de la licenciatura—tras la intervención de la “Noche de los Bastones Largos”, y el destierro de una eventual “cuarta rama” antropológica, el contexto específico en que esta antropología social se definió como una ciencia “contra-sistema” llevada a cabo por jóvenes comprometidos.

Tal era, al menos, la propuesta de Menéndez en su artículo “Ideología, ciencia y práctica profesional” aparecido, significativamente, en la compilación: *Ciencias Sociales: ideología y realidad nacional* (1970). Allí, y sin referirse a la “antropología social” sino simplemente a la “antropología”, Menéndez advertía que las ciencias sociales se habían convertido en “ideológicas” dado que las teorías en boga ignoraban los contextos históricos de la producción científica. El mejor aunque no el único ejemplo de ahistoricismo, era el estructuralismo levi-straussiano, evidencia según Menéndez de la alienación académica del trabajo intelectual que los métodos de investigación reforzaban. Mientras que los sociólogos habían caído en la división del trabajo entre patrones o analistas, y empleados o encuestadores, antropólogos y sociólogos tomaban la historia de vida como una mercancía, alienando estas historias de sus productores directos y de las condiciones de su producción (Ibid.:114-5).

Pero si bien le preocupaba la crítica teórica, a Menéndez le inquietaba más la apropiación. Como era evidente en sus cometidos, la razón del volumen era discutir la articulación entre ciencia e ideología tras una inconveniente revelación. El extraordinario impacto que había causado la puesta pública del Proyecto Camelot del Departamento de Estado de los EE.UU.¹⁵, era irrefrenable

15 Otros colaboradores del volumen eran los ya conocidos Alain Touraine, Orlando Fals Borda, Eliseo Verón, Francisco Delich y Juan Marsal.

entre los intelectuales latinoamericanos y particularmente en la comunidad antropológica latino- y norteamericana. Tras revelarse que su objetivo era obtener información acerca de la disposición insurreccional de los sectores populares en Chile, arreciaron las denuncias de los antropólogos norteamericanos ante la American Anthropological Association contra los involucrados en el papelón chileno y en actividades de inteligencia y contrainsurgencia en Tailandia y en Vietnam (Jorgensen 1973).

Pero Menéndez extendía el mal a toda la producción disciplinar, cualesquiera fueran las puras aunque vanas intenciones de sus productores. Por eso, en su artículo denunciaba la conformación de un banco de datos sobre América Latina con sede en el Di Tella y en CLACSO, para ser empleado por los EE.UU. Según Menéndez sólo el Departamento de Estado podía utilizar la información allí reunida (Ibid.:106). Recomendaba entonces que los académicos e intelectuales se apartaran del espejismo del conocimiento puro, neutro y apolítico, y se abocaran a lo que era “crucial para los requerimientos objetivos de un proyecto transformador”, “la tarea más alta a la cual debemos tender” (Ibid.). Los intelectuales argentinos debían seguir abiertos a lo que se producía en otras latitudes, pero para relacionarlo con sus propios objetivos y prioridades: ganar y ejercer el poder. Como ejemplo citaba el uso de la observación participante entre jóvenes académicos vietnamitas que aprendían los valores y pautas locales residiendo con comunidades campesinas, para contribuir en la resistencia a la invasión norteamericana (Ibid.119-120). Finalmente, Menéndez hacía votos por “una ciencia contrasistema” (Ibid.123).

Menéndez fue uno de los más influyentes antropólogos de todo este período, y quizás el más conocido dentro y fuera del campo antropológico. Se sentía con autoridad para discutir apasionadamente con sociólogos, antropólogos y psicoanalistas/ psiquiatras, ya que según él la antropología era la cuna de buena parte de la teoría social moderna. En 1971, y después de algunos años de enseñar en universidades privadas (Belgrano y El Salvador), se puso al frente de una licenciatura en antropología en la Universidad Provincial de Mar del Plata, a la que reestructuró purgándola de sus resabios etnológicos bormidianos, para instaurar una antropología social tal como él la entendía. El cuerpo docente viajaba desde Buenos Aires y estaba constituido por varios egresados de la licenciatura de Filosofía y Letras como Lischetti, Neufeld, Herrán y Bartolomé (Gil 2007). Poco después Luis M. Gatti fundó una licenciatura en antropología social en la

norteña provincia de Salta, y un par de años más tarde Bartolomé hizo lo propio en la nordestina provincia de Misiones.

La retórica de Menéndez estaba a tono con la apertura política, no tanto por su orientación partidaria, sino por el optimismo revolucionario que trasuntaba. El 25 de mayo de 1973 el peronismo volvió al gobierno tras 17 años de proscripción y las universidades nacionales fueron ocupadas por sectores radicalizados de la juventud peronista a la que él no pertenecía y a la que pronto se vería enfrentado. La antropología sociocultural se instauró como la orientación dominante de las principales escuelas de antropología como Rosario, La Plata y Buenos Aires. Mao Tse Tung, Franz Fanon y el mismo Perón se transformaron en teóricos de esta antropología del Tercer Mundo que muy poco quería tener que ver con la antropología social británica. Los líderes revolucionarios de América Latina, África y Asia se leían junto a, y casi en contra de Lévi-Strauss, Nadel y Malinowski. La antropología social debía ser la partera de la revolución. Pero ni el peronismo ni los efectos de su proscripción ni la constitución identitaria de sus seguidores fueron objeto de estudio de una subdisciplina que debía compatibilizar el entusiasmo por la revolución inminente, con la distancia analítica.¹⁶

Precisamente, la crítica anti-colonialista de la antropología, compartida con ligeros matices por los sectores progresistas, tuvo dos importantes efectos en la disciplina: su distanciamiento de la investigación empírica y el hábito de criticar a otros investigadores apelando a rótulos políticos. La inmediatez de la revolución trajo demasiadas certezas teóricas y muy pocas preguntas abiertas a la investigación empírica. Se suponía que la relación entre el antropólogo y el pueblo era clara, directa y unívoca, ya que

16 Tres excepciones deben mencionarse. En el orden de la divulgación el cuadernillo *Cabeza Negra* (1971) de Ratier describe el racismo argentino como dirigido a los migrantes provincianos a las grandes ciudades, y a los seguidores del peronismo. En el orden académico la tesis de Vessuri (1971) analizaba el gobierno peronista en Santiago del Estero del 45-55 como un nuevo patrón operando al nivel del estado nacional y provincial. También la antropóloga norteamericana con doctorado en Oxford (como Vessuri), Julie M. Taylor, analizó la figura de Eva Perón a través de la estructura de sus tres “mitos”: el mito de la esperanza, el mito negro y el revolucionario (1979). El peronismo se convirtió en objeto de investigación antropológica como parte de la “antropología de la política” de inspiración británica y brasileña recién en los años ’90 (Rosato & Balbi 2003; Frederic & Soprano 2005, etc.).

identificaba al “antropólogo comprometido” con los presuntos objetivos políticos de sus investigados. Sin embargo, no sólo soslayaban los “antropólogos sociales” explicar el peronismo desde la perspectiva de sus protagonistas; además, la creciente polarización política con tonos ya abiertamente armados, puso a los antropólogos sociales interesados en “problemas concretos” ante la disyuntiva de la acción directa o la actividad académica. Este árduo punto intermedio que casi le cuesta la vida a Bilbao en Tucumán (Vessuri y Bilbao 1976), se resolvía de plano aunque retóricamente en la pluma de Menéndez. Él entendía que el trabajo de campo etnográfico era un subproducto del colonialismo, y una estrategia inteligente para acercarse a sujetos sociales que debían ser, naturalmente, anti-imperialistas (1967-8). Admitía que la observación participante y el trabajo de campo etnográfico proveían la mejor información sobre una comunidad, un vecindario o un estrato social (1970), pero estas bondades eran también su condena ya que la marca indeleble del colonialismo en la antropología convertía al investigador en otro engranaje del aparato de opresión y dominación. Así, y cuando decidió encararlo, Menéndez prefirió la crítica epistemológica de la metodología, a la práctica etnográfica.

La prédica que fundó la búsqueda de los antropólogos luego identificados como “sociales”, se basó en la caracterización de la coyuntura argentina, hemisférica y universitaria como la de “una crisis” que era no sólo un objeto de conocimiento y de intervención sino también el fundamento de una presencia académica distintiva. Pero esta presencia estaba críticamente instalada desde varios puntos de vista. Resultaba de un golpe de estado y de una intervención universitaria, era expulsada del establishment antropológico, se pronunciaba como crítica de la academia existente y del mundo empírico al que decidía volcarse, en una discontinuidad que no necesariamente mostraba una nueva especificidad. La advertencia de que el conocimiento antropológico debía estar en función de sus posibles apropiadores, remitía a un sentido común propio de la intelectualidad de la época que introducía un poderoso aunque siempre flexible criterio discriminatorio entre “investigadores comprometidos” e “investigadores reaccionarios” o, más exactamente, de “investigadores espías”. Las acusaciones entre investigadores se convirtieron en la base de un idioma por demás plausible en un país corroído por la proscripción política y la polarización peronismo-antiperonismo, ahora reforzadas por la fantasmática Doctrina de Seguridad Nacional destinada a neutralizar a los elementos subversivos, lo que en la Argentina no se limitaba tan sólo a los militantes de la izquierda. Lejos de

ser su causa, el desenmascaramiento del Proyecto Camelot fue el argumento público que instauró la lógica acusatoria en ciertos sectores de las ciencias sociales en este país. El primer blanco nativo fue el Proyecto Marginalidad financiado por la Fundación Ford, dirigido por José Nun y coordinado por Miguel Murmis y Ernesto Laclau (Nun 1969:410-413), y estuvo a punto de aplicarse a la investigación dirigida por Hermitte sobre la situación del aborigen en el Chaco, con Alejandro Isla y Nicolás Inígo Carrera, un antropólogo platense y un historiador (Hermitte, Inígo Carrera e Isla 1996). Pero la fiebre siguió.

En 1968 la Fundación Ford propuso crear un postgrado en “antropología social” no en Buenos Aires donde reinaba Bormida, sino en La Plata, donde Alberto Rex González, un arqueólogo formado en Columbia, discípulo de Steward y en un posicionamiento contrario a los histórico-culturales del Museo Etnográfico, intentaba promover la radicación de la nueva subdisciplina. Su directora sería Hermitte, muy próxima a González y al operador académico de la agencia financiadora, el antropólogo norteamericano Richard Adams (1924-). Doctor en Yale (1951) y especializado en Centro América en los años de plomo (1950-1960), Adams transcurrió un año en la Argentina estudiando las condiciones socioculturales de los inmigrantes bolivianos en Buenos Aires, haciendo consultoría en el Di Tella, colaborando con Hermitte y Herrán en el diseño de un modelo de estudio del poder, y negociando el posible postgrado que fue decidida y ruidosamente vetado por algunos antropólogos sociales de Buenos Aires y una línea estudiantil de La Plata, con el argumento de que Adams era un agente encubierto de la CIA. El programa fue finalmente relocalizado en el Museo Nacional de la Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, gracias a la receptividad de Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira quien, en ese mismo año de 1968 y en plena dictadura militar brasileña, creó el primer postgrado con nivel de maestría en antropología social en el Brasil. En un informe a la Ford, Adams deploraba su paso por la Argentina como infausto, sujeto a los devenires políticos de las ciencias sociales y al faccionalismo de las antropologías locales.¹⁷ Este rechazo despojaba aún

17 Ciertamente, no me cabe aquí probar la inocencia o culpabilidad de Adams, pero las acusaciones que pendieron sobre su persona, que están documentadas, lo sindicaron tanto de agente del imperialismo como de agente comunista (Varela 2004). Ni el volumen de Jorgensen sobre ética en antropología, ni el grueso volumen de Huizer y Mannheim, ni el más reciente *Social History of American Anthropology*, de Patterson, ubican a Adams como agente de uno u otro bando. En vez, Huizer cita a Adams como crítico de la ideología del “laissez faire” por medio de la cual la *American Anthropological Association* promovía en su Código de Ética

más el panorama socio-antropológico rioplatense, con la exclusión de las orientaciones más innovadoras en las ciencias sociales de las universidades y de los organismos oficiales de financiamiento científico y tecnológico—CONICET, SECYT—dominados por quienes habían permanecido en el sistema universitario. Así, la interdicción principista de los fondos externos operaba en una situación de gravedad institucional y económica, a la vez que como arma en la competencia entre grupos que desconocían jerarquía y precedencia por las credenciales y la investigación.

Como resultado de la época nos quedan algunas obras de difusión de estos primeros antropólogos sociales en las colecciones *Historia Popular y Transformaciones* del Centro Editor de América Latina, con las que reflexionaban en términos actuales sobre el racismo, la cultura, los pueblos indígenas y la medicina popular, nociones caras a una disciplina hasta entonces empantanada en el exotismo. Sin embargo, la mayoría de las publicaciones de los trabajos de investigación que reunían material empírico y elaboración teórica, seguían perteneciendo a Hermitte, Herrán y los doctorandos argentinos en el exterior que publicaban poco en revistas antropológicas—*Etnia*—y mucho más en revistas de ciencias sociales—*Desarrollo Económico*, *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología*, *América Latina*, etc. La orientación más próxima al peronismo de la revista *Antropología del Tercer Mundo* bregaba por la revolución homónima; su mensaje no se encuadraba como “antropológico-social” (Barletta 2000).

VII. Co-ciudadanías y compromisos

En estas páginas he presentado sucintamente la trayectoria de dos personalidades sumamente influyentes en los orígenes de lo que hoy se reconoce como “antropología social”. Mediante estas dos trayectorias impulsoras de un mismo rótulo—antropología social—desde un mismo ámbito académico—el de la ciudad de

la autoexclusión de los antropólogos de los procesos de cambio de sus sujetos de estudio (1979:17).

Por otra parte, debe señalarse que la relocalización del programa de postgrado en Río de Janeiro demuestra que la utilización de recursos externos acompañada por los debates y recaudos propuestos por los jóvenes antropólogos del Museu (Moacir Palmeira, los hermanos Ottávio y Gilberto Velho, Lygia Sigaud, entre otros), pudieron reencauzar las sospechas de convertirse en el brazo antropológico de la Doctrina de Seguridad Nacional y la guerra fría, en beneficio de una disciplina teóricamente sólida y empíricamente fundada.

Buenos Aires, es posible revisar dos supuestos centrales de los debates actuales acerca de nuestras “otras antropologías”: que la co-ciudadanía impone o conlleva una responsabilidad político-moral de los investigadores con sus investigados, y que nuestras “otras antropologías” se han constituido de cara a y como reflejo de los desarrollos teóricos de las antropologías metropolitanas. De las premisas que traen los debates sobre las “antropologías del sur” y las “otras antropologías” (ver *supra.*), elegí estos dos supuestos porque tocan una cuerda muy sensible de la antropología argentina de fines de los años 1960: el compromiso.

En *Involvement and Detachment* (1998) Norbert Elias señalaba que la calificación de las investigaciones según su compromiso y distanciamiento con respecto a los sujetos de estudio, debe considerarse como parte de los valores en tanto juicios prácticos que los intelectuales empleamos en el desarrollo de nuestra actividad, más que como la identificación de cualidades esenciales. Compromiso y distanciamiento son “categorías nativas: abstracciones producidas y utilizadas por los investigadores en el esfuerzo de dar sentido a su mundo” y a su quehacer (d’Etoile et.al. 2002:14, mi traducción). Igual que otros conceptos de la antropología, estas categorías deben ser examinadas histórica y socialmente. Si bien, como advierte Michael Walzer, la auto-calificación de “críticos” por parte de los intelectuales es una pretensión en absoluto novedosa que data de los tiempos bíblicos (1993), también es cierto que el carácter “crítico” y su giro hacia el “compromiso” debe suscitar un análisis más profundo a la medida de las víctimas que ha generado entre nosotros. En este sentido, el riesgo de vida es un rasgo clave para la conformación de los intelectuales autoadscriptos como “críticos” (Walzer 1993). ¿Cómo modeló la noción de compromiso a la antropología argentina, y cómo ésta modeló a aquella?

Elegir a Hermitte y a Menéndez como figuras emblemáticas de dos modelos contrastantes del ejercicio de la antropología social no resulta de una elaboración propia ni de una perspectiva actual, sino de la presentación que sus protagonistas hacían en aquel entonces como una oposición que continúa vigente entre los habitantes de nuestra antropología social. Para proceder a su análisis no me limité a examinar los textos publicados e inéditos de cada uno. En esto procedí como mis colegas cuando acometen la historia de la antropología argentina atendiendo a los avatares políticos que modelaron las perspectivas teóricas antropológicas (Bartolomé 1980, Garbulsky 1991-2, 2004, Herrán 1990, Madrazo 1985, Perazzi 2003, Ratier y Ringuelet 1997, Guber 2006b). Este

giro, como veremos, también tiene sus fundamentos en el decurso de nuestra antropología social.

Para revisar los dos supuestos señalados (co-ciudadanía con los sujetos y dependencia teórica) necesito interrogar a la experiencia argentina, preguntando: a) ¿cómo y ante quiénes estos dos antropólogos significaban distintivamente la antropología que practicaban y a la que llamaban “social”? b) ¿en qué fuentes formativas teóricas e institucionales abrevaban para fundamentar esa nominación? c) ¿cómo y dónde establecieron su posicionamiento académico? d) ¿con qué conceptos y prácticas lo sustentaban? y e) ¿qué relación postulaban y practicaban con sus sujetos de estudio? Expondré estas cuestiones para las dos figuras centrales de este artículo y sugeriré luego algunas conclusiones.

Hermitte se pronunciaba como una antropóloga social de orientación británica, más que norteamericana, anclada en dos credenciales de postgrado (Master y Philosophical Doctor) y dos investigaciones empíricas, una en Latinoamérica pero no en la Argentina, y otra en su propio país, aunque en una de sus áreas más pobres, el Noroeste. Llegó de EE.UU. dispuesta a implantar la *social anthropology* que ella había aprendido y que quería practicar y enseñar en la Argentina, orientando en este sentido sus estándares de producción, evaluación, labor institucional, docencia y publicación. Dichos estándares estaban basados en la investigación empírica con trabajo de campo prolongado e intensivo, y consecuentemente en la puesta en discusión entre categorías analíticas—cambio cultural, control social, movilidad social, patronazgo/clientelismo—y categorías nativas—*nahual*, brujería, cooperativismo—aprendidas y contrastadas con nutrida evidencia. Los resultados se publicaban en revistas de ciencias sociales en un formato eminentemente académico, o de consultoría (CFI). Su desempeño institucional post-66 fue en secciones de “antropología social” en centros de ciencias sociales (CIS-Di Tella, IDES, CLACSO), cada vez más alejada de los departamentos de ciencias antropológicas (UBA; ULP). Así, la antropología social por la que bregaba Hermitte se planteaba como diametralmente opuesta a la que se ejercía en la academia oficial porteña, nominada como “etnología” y “folklore”, que deploraba por su culturalismo esencialista y por su trabajo de campo “de vacaciones”. Ambas carencias debían subsanarse con un desarrollo académico sistemático anclado en la investigación empírica, la que habría de orientar los giros teóricos de Hermitte en su traslado desde Chicago/Chiapas a Di Tella/Catamarca, desde un estructural funcionalismo más próximo a E.E.Evans-Pritchard que a Talcott Parsons, hacia una economía política

del campesinado a la Eric Wolf. Hermitte representaba, sí, la orientación metropolitana, pero esa orientación estaba lejos de ser monolítica en sus problemáticas y en la teoría. Su único denominador común era el trabajo de campo malinowskiano.

Menéndez se instauraba como antropólogo social a partir de su licenciatura en ciencias antropológicas en la Universidad de Buenos Aires, con una breve incursión en “paleoetnología” para su trabajo final. Sus lecturas en la licenciatura, la asignatura “antropología social” de Sociología, y luego con Hermitte, se pusieron en debate con los teóricos de la des-colonización, autores tercermundistas como Franz Fanon, algunos disidentes norteamericanos como Wright Mills y Jules Henry, y la cara política de dos etnólogos italianos, uno amateur y el otro académico.

La nutrida presencia de italianos en el Museo Etnográfico no era sólo un reflejo de la inmigración de Italia a la Argentina sino una orientación académica. Imbelloni y “el Tano” Bormida organizaron la agenda teórica de la antropología de Buenos Aires como una contra-corriente del funcionalismo británico y, por ende, de la antropología social que se practicaba en “el norte” metropolitano, implicando con ello el rechazo al “empirismo” y a las humanidades aplicadas. La influencia italiana en la antropología argentina no ha sido analizada aún, pero algunos de sus aportes fueron decisivos para el desarrollo de la antropología porteña, y también de la “social”. Menéndez aún hoy se proclama deudor de Ernesto de Martino (1908-1965), graduado en Letras (1932) que se dedicó a la historia de las religiones siguiendo a Raffaele Pettazzoni, un historiador y etnólogo que Bormida enseñaba. Las observaciones de De Martino giraban en torno a la “cuestión meridional” que cobrara relieve gracias a otro folklorólogo auto-didacta, Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937). Sus escritos fueron traducidos al castellano a fines de los 50s por un intelectual comunista argentino y difundidos como fundamento ideológico de una agrupación de comunistas disidentes, el “Grupo de Pasado y Presente”. De Martino y Gramsci traían a los intelectuales de izquierda un marxismo humanista. El sello de Benedetto Croce (1866-1952), maestro de ambos y figura también cara a Bormida y a Imbelloni, llegaba a los gramscianos a través de sus postulados sobre la inmanencia radical y la historicidad de la vida humana (Saunders 1993:876). Según Croce el fenómeno humano difería de otros objetos científicos en que la el objeto de la historia era “lo único, lo particular, lo irrepetible” (Ibid.:877). De Martino sostenía estos principios en su etnología aunque, a diferencia de su maestro, afirmaba la historicidad de los pueblos primitivos. Para Croce los primitivos eran “hombres que están pasivamente en

la historia ... hombres de la naturaleza,” mientras que el hombre moderno era “actor en la historia ... hombres que pertenecen a la historia” (Ibid.). De Martino dedicó gran parte de sus escritos a historizar a los Otros, “las civilizaciones más distantes de la nuestra” y a restituir la historicidad de la sociedad primitiva y de las clases subalternas italianas.

Bormida promovía a este autor entre sus alumnos, alentando no sólo su lectura sino también el intercambio directo con él. Sus principales receptores fueron Menéndez y Ratier.¹⁸ Menéndez abrazó de De Martino su causa historicista y aún hoy lo considera una de sus máximas fuentes de inspiración que, reconoce, adquirió “gracias a un fascista”. Aunque su interlocutor dominante fue inicialmente y como vimos en sus “Acotaciones” de 1968, la escuela histórico-cultural que se practicaba en la antropología oficial porteña, Menéndez comenzó a usar el término “Antropología Social” más como un rótulo diferenciador de las ciencias sociales y la antropología institucionalizada en el Di Tella y en CLACSO. Esta diferenciación la ejercía a través de la crítica teórica y metodológica al funcionalismo, el estructural-funcionalismo y el estructuralismo, imaginando una agenda política hacia el cambio social fundada en la crítica al racismo y el colonialismo. En esta línea, los sujetos de investigación que proponía Menéndez eran los pueblos coloniales, no las huestes peronistas que portaban la questione meridionale argentina, la polaridad puerto-interior. Sus estándares de evaluación, producción y publicación respondían más a la polémica y a la crítica teórica en clave epistemológica y política, que a la investigación empírica. Su estudio sobre migrantes europeos en Entre Ríos no se publicó ni ganó visibilidad, a diferencia de su tampoco publicado MAC que logró gran trascendencia. La carrera académica era, para Menéndez, el canal para una prédica transformadora desde la cual enarboló las banderas del intelectual comprometido en las arenas de la antropología. Recién en México intentaría plantear la articulación entre teoría y datos empíricos en el campo de la antropología médica.

Volviendo a aquellos dos supuestos, henos aquí dos “ciudadanos-investigadores” donde opera “la cercana relación entre el ejercicio de la investigación y el ejercicio de la ciudadanía”. Sin

18 Bormida promovió el contacto entre Ratier y De Martino e incluso lo impulsó a seguir un posgrado con él en Italia sobre el *candomblé* brasileño en comparación con el *tarantulismo* estudiado por De Martino. Sin embargo, éste falleció antes que Ratier pudiera concretar su solicitud.

embargo, la articulación entre ciudadanía e investigación era muy distinta, en primer lugar porque sus dos protagonistas la proponían así, llegando a ubicarse en posiciones no recíprocas. Ella residía en la investigación empírica y él en la polémica teórico-política. Ella discutía la producción corriente desde la investigación, y él desde su alineamiento ideológico. Ella compartía la nacionalidad con sus teleras y pimentoneros, en su rol de antropóloga social; él se dirigía a un lectorado general habitado por intelectuales. Ella no discutía las premisas políticas ni de Menéndez ni de otros antropólogos; él no discutía los datos de Hermitte ni de otros colegas. Para ella en la Argentina “faltaba trabajo de campo”; para él las instituciones donde campeaba la antropología social eran sospechosos de actividades encubiertas. Sin embargo, sus posturas no recíprocas acababan siendo las dos caras de la misma moneda, esto es, las dos expresiones de un medio académico recortado por las mismas condiciones políticas. La co-ciudadanía de Hermitte y Menéndez—que era precisamente la cualidad que él quería restarle a los antropólogos colaboracionistas del imperialismo y de la CIA—era el contexto de interpretación con el que ambos producían sus distintas formas de hacer “antropología social”. En este sentido, y desde el punto de vista de sus protagonistas, ser antropólogo-ciudadano no aparece aquí reforzando la relación investigador/a-investigad@/s sino la relación entre investigadores. Si Hermitte y Menéndez se visualizaban (o hacían lo posible para visualizarse) entre sí como “otros”, si sólo podían dialogar en planos diferentes, ¿qué los hacía interlocutores comparables? ¿Qué los hacía aparecer como perteneciendo al mismo mundo académico en torno a y por el cual contendían?

Sabemos que los rasgos diacríticos suelen emplearse como esencias absolutas. Revolucionario, estructural-funcionalista, operan en el mundo académico igual que negro, judío o indio en otros contextos. Pero si bien los antropólogos son personas tan vulnerables como otras a la esencialización, también es cierto que en la Argentina de entonces era muy difícil olvidarse de la historia. El período de fines del 60 y principios del 70 fue una nueva expresión de las tensiones que atravesaban a la sociedad argentina y que los argentinos acometían de muchas formas para hacer y cambiar su historia. En este escenario una de las categorías relevantes con que, en términos nativos, se interpretaban las diferencias a menudo expresadas como adscripción política o ideológica era el término “generación”. Empleado desde tiempo atrás para designar a quienes habían forjado la organización nacional del país (la generación del 57, la generación del 80), la generación operaba como una categoría con que los argentinos

habían historizado su pasado de cara a “otros” clasificados por su edad y su senioridad a la luz de los avatares políticos del siglo XX en la Argentina. El término también se aplicaba al mundo universitario, designando a las circunstancias políticas en las cuales cada uno había desarrollado la etapa formativa de su trayectoria académica.

Si Hermitte podía adscribirse a una postura “políticamente liberal”, análoga a la que sostenía primero la conducción universitaria del '40 cuando ella cursó el Profesorado, y luego la conducción de la intervención post-55, es claro que su experiencia de la intervención peronista en 1946 y la exoneración de su maestro Aparicio debió marcar profundamente su ponderación de la libertad de cátedra y del valor absoluto de la calidad académica por encima de otros recursos que fueron cada vez más decisivos para implantar profesores y líneas de trabajo desde la década peronista. Su renuncia ante los hechos del 29 de julio de 1966 probablemente fue una respuesta acorde a esos valores, siendo la única profesora del departamento de Ciencias Antropológicas sobreviviente de los tiempos de Aparicio. Cortazar había permanecido en la universidad peronista, Márquez Miranda y Palavecino habían muerto, y Menghin, Lafón y Bormida habían ingresado como profesores después de 1946. Menéndez, en cambio, había ingresado a la universidad con la Libertadora, cuando la política ya permeaba decididamente a la universidad, en un contexto general de proscripción, represión creciente y avance de la dominación norteamericana en América Latina y particularmente en el Cono Sur. Su recurso a la crítica teórica como una herramienta de la acción política y académica, mucho más que a la investigación básica, era ampliamente compartido por otros miembros de su primera cohorte antropológica, pues muchos de sus compañeros de entonces acabaron siendo más notorios por su militancia que por sus textos. Al mismo tiempo que el matemático Oscar Varsavsky, una de las expresiones más destacadas de esta postura y prematuramente fallecido, Menéndez proclamaba su crítica al “cientificismo” que, según acusaba, encarnaban los directivos de la renovación universitaria de 1955. La universidad no podía mantenerse aislada de un entorno marcado por la proscripción y la vigilancia.

Esta diferencia generacional fue crucial para modelar cada posición de cara a la vida académica. Hermitte podía establecerse como “antropóloga social” con créditos innegables (según estándares académicos) provistos por una universidad del “centro” (o “norte”), y contando en 1966 con 16 años de graduada universitaria. Menéndez renunciaba a sus cargos de

auxiliar docente con sólo tres de licenciado, y un breve trabajo de campo en arqueología. La “antropología social” se revelaba entonces como un nombre académicamente plausible para una generación que buscaba ingresar a las ciencias antropológicas por otra puerta y con otros horizontes, no sólo debido a la clausura de la Universidad de Buenos Aires en julio de 1966. Ese nombre tenía varias ventajas: no contaba con demasiados antecedentes en la Argentina; diferenciaba a sus propulsores de la antropología del Museo y también del departamento de Sociología; y según los contenidos con que se llenara, operaba como un dispositivo apto para argumentar en la academia, la política universitaria y la política a secas. Gracias a la creciente polarización político-académica que impregnó a la Universidad desde la “noche de los bastones largos”, la “antropología social” se convirtió en una categoría que, aunque poblada de interrogantes, se empleó para competir por la antropología del futuro en la Argentina, algo distinto de la Etnología y del Folklore, y también del estructural-funcionalismo en Sociología.

Sin embargo en algo se parecían nuestras dos figuras. Hermitte tenía, como diría Bourdieu, el capital académico para convertirse en árbitro de “la buena (social)” y “la mala (culturalista, etnológica) antropología”. Menéndez desarrollaba aceleradamente una retórica apta para, en los criterios de la época, erigirse en árbitro político de la antropología social comprometida y la del statu quo, cada vez más condicionado por la Doctrina de Seguridad Nacional y cada vez menos determinado por los sobrevivientes del Eje de la Segunda Guerra. Estos dos árbitros parecían hacer de la antropología social dos versiones irreconciliables, con sus propios criterios y normativas. Pero que esto no era así lo demostraron unos jóvenes antropólogos autoadscriptos como “sociales” desde su formación en las academias metropolitanas que aparecieron a comienzos de los 70 en el escenario argentino, aunque no porteño. Estos jóvenes doctores o por doctorarse en antropología en Oxford, París y los EE.UU. disponían de un entrenamiento teórico y práctico en “antropología social” y, salvo Leopoldo Bartolomé que venía de Wisconsin habiéndose licenciado en la UBA, ninguno había pasado por el Museo Etnográfico. Ni Vessuri, ni Archetti, ni Bartolomé buscaron insertarse en Buenos Aires, después de terminar sus intensivos trabajos de campo y de redactar sus tesis doctorales que publicaron como artículos en revistas de ciencias sociales. Estos “antropólogos sociales” generaron, cada uno a su manera, lazos específicos con sus sujetos de estudio: Bartolomé trabajaba en su Misiones natal y mantenía, igual que Archetti, una fluida relación con las Ligas

Agrarias de productores algodóneros y yerbateros, duramente reprimidas desde 1974 (Archetti 1988, Bartolomé 1991); Vessuri pasó de su provincia natal Santiago del Estero donde hizo su trabajo de campo doctoral, a Tucumán a trabajar sobre las ideologías de los trabajadores de la caña de azúcar desde una óptica que ella identificaba como “comprometida” (Vessuri 1973, 1977). Estos ciudadanos-investigadores esgrimían su “involucramiento” desde sus datos de campo obtenidos siguiendo el disciplinamiento socio-antropológico de las academias metropolitanas.

¿Puede hablarse entonces de una correlación entre ciudadanía y compromiso? ¿Y puede oponerse esta correlación a la academia metropolitana? Desde el caso que aquí presenté, entiendo que puede correlacionarse ciudadanía y compromiso pero con dos salvedades y siempre que comprendamos estos términos como construcciones sociales. La primera es que la correlación opera más en el eje investigador-investigador que en el eje investigador-investigado. Poco sabemos del involucramiento de Menéndez en tanto que investigador y ciudadano con sus sujetos de estudio, pese a su prédica por el compromiso. Su audiencia eran sus colegas y el medio intelectual. Hermitte contribuía a entender los fracasos del cooperativismo en Catamarca, eludiendo el recurso fácil al atavismo tradicionalista, tan establecido en las agencias del estado argentino. En esta línea y como segunda salvedad, el compromiso no siempre se practica y enuncia desde la antropología y sus debates, aunque suela formularse en relación a la política. Pero ser sensible a “la política” no alude necesariamente a la vinculación del investigador con los sujetos de estudio. En este sentido, la máxima de Ramos según la cual “En Brasil como en otros países de América Latina, hacer antropología es un acto político”, debiera leerse conforme a los condicionamientos que han operado desde el estado sobre toda la vida académica, comprendiendo aquí tanto a quienes se adscribían al modelo del intelectual comprometido y a quienes no. Entonces, el caso argentino sería más contundente que el brasileño. Para Hermitte, emblemática del perfil profesional-académico, la política era parte de su objeto de análisis, pero su carrera estuvo siempre afectada por los avatares de la política nacional y universitaria, que la mantuvieron fuera de la universidad pública—mediante la manipulación de concursos y de antecedentes, la negación de su ingreso al CONICET y el veto al postgrado platense—y ya en 1984 y por razones igualmente políticas, que la incorporaron a la universidad y al CONICET. Su “vocación crítica” la ejercía desde la antropología social a través de la cual pronunciaba su compromiso con la disciplina. Menéndez quiso representar el

perfil casi contrario, y aunque nunca abjuró de la investigación básica, más teórica que empírica se definía como parte de los intelectuales “comprometidos” de las humanidades y las ciencias sociales de entonces.

Por último, la correlación entre ciudadanía y compromiso, ahora reformulada como una relación entre pares, puede articularse en oposición (como pretendía Menéndez) o en concordancia (como Hermitte) con la academia metropolitana, pero a condición de examinar qué hicieron los antropólogos con sus respectivas formaciones, cómo adoptaron las teorías para analizar realidades empíricas nativas, y a condición también de pluralizar “la metrópoli”. En el caso argentino necesitamos incorporar a Italia (no sólo a Alemania y Austria), y reparar en las diversas líneas académicas, a menudo contrapuestas, que florecieron en los EE.UU., Gran Bretaña y Francia.¹⁹

En todo caso, la primera antropología social argentina pudo nutrirse de muy diversas influencias, pero sucumbió al aplanamiento arrasador de una polarización política que en el plano académico estuvo encarnada por antropólogos de la misma ciudadanía y la misma afiliación disciplinar, polarización que remataron la noche de los bastones del '66 y la noche más cruenta aún del Proceso de Reorganización Nacional.

Referecias citadas

- AA. *Actualidad Antropológica* 1968 “Investigaciones”. Olavarría, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Museo Dámaso Arce.
- AA. *Actualidad Antropológica* 1968 “Antropología Social, aquí y ahora”, 1-3. Olavarría, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Museo Dámaso Arce.
- Aguilar, John L. (1981) “Insider research: an ethnography of a debate”. In Messerschmidt (comp.) *Op.cit.*:15-26.
- Alberti, Blas. 1962. “Antropología, desarrollo y compromiso”. *Antropológica* 1:4-9.
- Archetti, Eduardo P. 1988. “Ideología y organización sindical: las Ligas Agrarias del norte de Santa Fe”. *Desarrollo Económico*

19 Que Marx no sea considerado “metropolitano” o “hegemónico”, es una cuestión de óptica; lo es en el este europeo (Skalnić 2002, Elfimov 2003).

- _____. 2006. "How many 'centers' and 'peripheries' in anthropology? A critical view on France". Gustavo Lins Ribeiro y Arturo Escobar (comps.) *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations in Systems of Power*. London, Berg.
- Archetti, Eduardo P. & Kristi-Anne Stölen 1975. *Explotación familiar y acumulación de capital en el campo argentino*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI editores.
- Aschero, Carlos. 1975. Ensayo para una clasificación morfológica de artefactos líticos aplicada a estudios tipológicos comparativos". Buenos Aires, CONICET, inédito.
- Barletta, Ana M. 2000. "Universidad y política. La "peronización" de los universitarios (1966-1973)". *Proceedings LASA*.
- Bartolomé, Leopoldo. 1968 "El pensamiento mítico en la veterinaria folklórica". *Runa* XI:71-92.
- _____. [1974] 1991 *The Colonos of Apóstoles. Adaptive strategy and ethnicity in a Polish-Ukrainian settlement in northeast Argentina*. AMS Press.
- _____. 1980. La Antropología en Argentina: Problemas y Perspectivas. *América Indígena*. XL(2):207-215.
- Bartolomé, Leopoldo & Enrique Gorostiaga (comps.) 1974 *Estudios sobre el campesinado latinoamericano. La perspectiva de la antropología social*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Periférica.
- Bilbao, Santiago Alberto 1968-1971. Migraciones estacionales, en especial para la cosecha del algodón en el norte de Santiago del Estero. *Cuadernos del Instituto Nacional de Antropología*. (7):327-365.
- Boletín de la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología*, 1958.
- Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto. 2000. Peripheral anthropologies 'versus' central anthropologies. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, 4-5(1-2):10-30.
- CGCA - Colegio de Graduados en Ciencias Antropológicas 1989. *Jornadas de Antropología: 30 años de la carrera en Buenos Aires (1958-1988)*. Universidad de Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras.

- Elfimov, Alexei 2002. *Russian Intellectual Culture in Transition. The Future in the Past*. Hamburg: Lit Verlag.
- Elias, Norbert 1998. *Envolvimento e Alienação*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.
- Fígoli, Leonardo 1990. "A ciencia sob olhar etnográfico. Estudo da Antropologia Argentina". Brasília, Tesis doctoral, Universidade de Brasília.
- _____. 2005. Origen y desarrollo de la antropología en la Argentina: de la Organización Nacional hasta mediados del siglo XXI. *Anuario de Estudios en Antropología Social*. (1):71-82. CAS-IDES.
- Frederic, Sabina y Germán F. Soprano (comps.). 2005. *Cultura y política en etnografías sobre la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Prometeo-UNQUI.
- Garbulsky, Edgardo. 1991-2 La antropología social en la Argentina. *Runa* (20):11-34.
- Gil, Gastón Julián. 2007. Ideología, represión e investigación de campo. La carrera de antropología de Mar del Plata, 1971-1977. *Anuario de Estudios en Antropología Social* n.3. En prensa.
- Gramsci, Antonio 1971. *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Hoare & Nowell.
- Guber, Rosana. 1994. Antropólogos nativos en la Argentina. Análisis reflexivo de un incidente de campo. *Publicar en Antropología y Ciencias Sociales* IV(5):25-46. Colegio de Graduados en Ciencias Antropológicas de la República Argentina.
- _____. 2002 "El Cabecita Negra o las categorías de la investigación etnográfica en la Argentina". En Sergio Visacovsky y Rosana Guber (comps.) *Historia y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina*. pp.347-374. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia
- _____. 2006a. "Linajes ocultos en los orígenes de la antropología social de Buenos Aires" en *Avá*. Revista del Postgrado en Antropología Social de la Universidad Nacional de Misiones, Argentina 8:26-56.

- _____. 2006b. "Política nacional, institucionalidad estatal y hegemonía socio-antropológica en las periodizaciones de la antropología argentina". Salta, *Congreso Argentino de Antropología Social*. Ms.
- _____. 2006c. Eduardo L. Archetti, 1943-2005. *American Anthropologist* 108 (3):631-635. AAA, Washington DC. ISSN 1548-1433.
- _____. 2007. Crisis de presencia, universidad y política en el nacimiento de la antropología social porteña. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*. Bogotá. En prensa.
- Guber, Rosana y Sergio E. Visacovsky. 2000. La antropología social en la Argentina de los '60 y '70. Nación, marginalidad crítica y el «otro» interno. *Desarrollo Económico*, 40(158): 289-316.
- Gurevich, Estela. 1989a. *Entrevista a Blas Alberti*. Ms.
- Hermitte, Esther 1956-7. Reseña de "Teoría y práctica del estudio de áreas. J. Steward". *Runa* VIII:123-124.
- _____. 1955-56. "The Kaska Indians. An ethnographic reconstruction, de J.J.Honigmann" en *Runa* VII:133-134.
- _____. 1956-57. "Yearbook of Anthropology, de Wenner-Gren Foundation" en *Runa* VIII, 1ª parte:126-127.
- _____. 1956-57. "Hollywood. El mundo del cine visto por una antropóloga, de Hortense Powdermaker" en *Runa* VIII, 2ª parte:290-292.
- _____. 1956-1957. "New Lives for old, de Margaret Mead", en *Runa* VIII, 2ª parte:297-298.
- _____. 1968a "Informe sobre el estado actual de la Antropología Social en la Argentina". *Las ciencias sociales en la Argentina*. Coord. Juan Marsal. Buenos Aires, Instituto Di Tella.
- _____. 1968b "La movilidad social en una comunidad bicultural." *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología* N°1, Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, Instituto Torcuato Di Tella.
- _____. 1969. "Antropología Social". *El estado de las Ciencias Sociales en la Argentina*, Autores Varios, Documento de Trabajo n° 67, Setiembre, Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, pp. 1-12.

- _____. 1970. "El concepto de nahual en Pinola, México". *Ensayos antropológicos en los Altos de Chiapas*. México: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano.
- _____. 1972a "Ponchos, Weaving and Patron-Client Relations in Northwest Argentina". En: Arnold Strickon & Sidney Greenfield (comps.). *Structure and Process in Latin America*. pp. 159-177. University of New Mexico Press.
- _____. 1972b *Asistencia técnica en materia de promoción y asistencia de la comunidad en la provincia de Catamarca*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Federal de Inversiones.
- _____. 2002 [1967] "La observación por medio de la participación". Visacovsky & Guber *Op.cit.*
- _____. 2004 [1970]. *Poder sobrenatural y control social*. México, Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, n° 57. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.
- _____. 2007 [1960-61]. *Chiapas en las notas de campo de Esther Hermitte*. Andrés Fábregas Puig y Rosana Guber (coords.); GTTCE-IDES (org.). San Cristóbal las Casas: Universidad Intercultural de Chiapas. En prensa.
- Hermitte, Esther & Leopoldo J. Bartolomé (comps.) 1977 *Procesos de articulación social*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu editores.
- Hermitte, Esther & Carlos A. Herrán 1970. ¿Patronazgo o cooperativismo? Obstáculos a la modificación del sistema de interacción social en una comunidad del noroeste argentino. *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología* (2): 293-317.
- Hermitte, Esther & Carlos A. Herrán 1977 "Sistema productivo, instituciones intersticiales y formas de articulación social en una comunidad del noroeste argentino". En: Esther Hermitte & Leopoldo J. Bartolomé (comps.) *Procesos de articulación social*. pp. 238-256. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.
- Hermitte, Esther & Nicolás Iñigo Carrera 1977. *Diagnóstico socio-cultural de tres comunidades de la Provincia de Chaco* Informe de Area Social del Proyecto nutricional AITG, Buenos Aires. Ms.
- Hermitte, Esther, Nicolás Iñigo Carrera & Alejandro Isla 1996. *Estudio sobre la situación de los aborígenes de la Provincia del Chaco, y*

políticas para su integración a la sociedad nacional. Posadas, Editorial Universitaria.

- Hermite, Esther & Herbert Klein. 1972 "Crecimiento y estructura de una comunidad provinciana de tejedores de ponchos. Belén 1678-1869". Buenos Aires, Documento de Trabajo, Instituto Di Tella (1979 David Browman y Ronald Schwartz (comps.) *Peasants, Primitives, and Proletariats*. The Hague, 49-73).
- Herrán, Carlos A. 1990. Antropología Social en la Argentina: apuntes y perspectivas. *Cuadernos de Antropología Social* 2(2):108-115.
- Hidalgo, Cecilia. 1997-8. Antropología del mundo contemporáneo. El surgimiento de la antropología de la ciencia. *Relaciones de la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología*. XXII-(23):71-82. Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Huizer, Gerritt & Bruce Mannheim. 1979. *The Politics of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Imbelloni, José. *Epítome de Culturología*. Buenos Aires: Humanior.
- Jackson, Anthony (comp.). 1987. *Anthropology at Home* London and New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Jimeno, Myriam 2005. ¡La vocación crítica de la Antropología en Latinoamérica. *Antípoda* (1):43-65.
- Jones, Delmos 1970. Towards a Native Anthropology. *Human Organization* 29 (4): 251-259.
- Jorgensen, Joseph G. 1973. "On Ethics and Anthropology". Weaver, Thomas (comp.) *To See Ourselves*. pp. 19-61. Glennville, Illinois: Scott Foresman.
- Krotz, Esteban. 1997. Anthropologies of the South. Their rise, their silencing, their characteristics. *Critique of Anthropology*. 17(3):237-251.
- L'Estoile, Benoit de; Federico Neiburg & Lygia Sigaud (comps.). *Antropología, Impérios e Estados Nacionais* Rio de Janeiro: Relumé Dumará.
- Lischetti, Mirtha. 1987 (comp.). *Antropología*. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.

- Luco, Susana. 2007. "Una migración teórica. Cambio de paradigma en la enseñanza y en la práctica de la arqueología de la UBA 1958/1984". Buenos Aires, informe parcial de tesis de Maestría, IDES-IDAES, UNSAM. Manuscrito.
- Madrazo, Guillermo B. 1985. Determinantes y orientaciones en la Antropología Argentina." *Boletín del Instituto Interdisciplinario de Tilcara*. (1):13-56.
- McQuown, Norman & Julian Pitt-Rivers 1964. *Man in Nature*. Chicago, University of Chicago, Ms.
- Meister, Albert, Susana Petruzzi & Elida Sonzogni. 1963. *Tradicionalismo y cambio social* Rosario, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras: Universidad Nacional del Litoral.
- Menéndez, Eduardo L. 1968. Correo antropológico. *Actualidad Antropológica* (3):48-51. Olavarría, Provincia de Buenos Aires: Museo Dámaso Arce.
- Menéndez, Eduardo L. 1967-1968. *El modelo antropológico clásico*. Buenos Aires, Ms.
- _____. 1970. "Ideología, ciencia y práctica profesional". *Ciencias sociales: ideología y realidad nacional*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Tiempo Contemporáneo:101-124.
- _____. 2002. *La parte negada de la cultura. Relativismo, diferencias y racismo*. Barcelona: Edicions Bellaterra.
- Messerschmidt, Donald A. (comp.). 1981. *Anthropologists at Home in North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narayan, Kirin 1993. How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?. *American Anthropologist* 95(3):671-686.
- Nash, June 1975. Nationalism and Fieldwork. *Annual Review of Anthropology* v.4, 225-245.
- Neiburg, Federico G. y Mariano Plotkin 2004. "Los economistas. El Instituto Torcuato Di Tella y las nuevas elites estatales en los años sesenta". Neiburg y Plotkin (comps.) *Intelectuales y expertos. La constitución del conocimiento social en la Argentina* Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós:231-264.
- Patterson, Thomas C. 2001. *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States* Oxford, Berg.

- Perazzi, Pablo 2003. *Hermenéutica de la barbarie. Una historia de la antropología en Buenos Aires, 1935-1966*. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Argentina de Antropología.
- Ratier, Hugo. 1971. *Cabecita Negra*. Buenos Aires, Centro Editor de América Latina.
- Ratier, Hugo E. y Roberto R. Ringuelet. 1997. La antropología social en la Argentina: un producto de la democracia. *Horizontes Antropológicos* 3(7):10-23. UFRGS, Porto Alegre.
- Restrepo, Eduardo y Arturo Escobar. 2005. Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise: steps to a world anthropology network. *Critique of Anthropology* 25(2): 99-128.
- Rosato, Ana y Fernando A. Balbi (comps.) 2003. *Representaciones sociales y procesos políticos. Estudios desde la antropología social*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.
- Sanguinetti, Amalia C. y Ana M. Mariscotti 1958-9. Notas para el estudio de la cultura de la Puna. *Runa* IX, (1-2):195-206.
- Saunders, George R. 1993. 'Critical Ethnocentrism' and the Ethnology of Ernesto De Martino. *American Anthropologist* 95 (4):875-893.
- Schippers, Thomas K. 1995. "A history of paradoxes. Anthropologies of Europe". Vermeulen & Alvarez Roldán, *op. cit.* 234-246.
- Skalnik, Peter (comp.). 2002. *The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology.
- Stocking, George A. (Jr.) 1979. *Anthropology at Chicago*. Chicago, The Joseph Regenstein Library.
- Stocking, George W. 1982. Afterword: A View from the Center. *Ethnos*. 47(1):173-186.
- Taylor, Julie, M. 1979 *Eva Perón. The myths of a woman*, University of Chicago Press.
- Uribe, Carlos. 1997. A Certain Feeling of Homelessness. Remarks on Esteban Krotz's 'Anthropologies of the South'. *Critique of Anthropology* 17(3): 253-261.

- Vermeulen, Han F. & Arturo Álvarez Roldán (comps.). 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes. Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Vessuri, Hebe M.C. 1971. "Land Tenure and Social Structure in Santiago del Estero, Argentina". Oxford, University of Oxford, Linacre College, Doctoral Thesis.
- _____. 1973. La observación participante en Tucumán 1972. *Revista Paraguaya de Sociología* (27):59-76, Asunción, Paraguay.
- _____. 1977 "Procesos de transición en comunidades de obreros rurales y articulación social". Esther Hermitte y Leopoldo J. Bartolomé (comps) *Procesos de articulación social*. pp.196-237. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.
- _____. 1989. "Las ciencias sociales en la Argentina: diagnóstico y perspectivas". Oteiza, Enrique (dir.). *La política de investigación científica y tecnológica argentina. Historia y Perspectivas*. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.
- Vessuri, Hebe M.C. & Santiago Bilbao. 1976. "Campo de Herrera, Tucumán. The first cooperative for agricultural work in Argentina, five years after its creation". June Nash, N. Hopkins y Jorge Dandler (comps.) *Popular participation in social change. Cooperatives, collectives, and nationalised industry*. The Hague, Mouton, 211-231.
- Visacovsky, Sergio E ; Rosana Guber y Estela Gurevich. 1997. Modernidad y tradición en el origen de la carrera de Ciencias Antropológicas de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. *Redes* 10(4):213-258. Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.
- Visacovsky, Sergio E. & Rosana Guber (comps.). 2002. *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.
- Vogt, Evon Z. 2004. *Fieldwork among the Maya. Reflections on the Harvard Chiapas Project*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Walzer, Michael. 1993. *La compañía de los críticos. Intelectuales y compromiso político en el siglo XX*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión

HEGEMONIC GRAVITY AND PLURALISTIC UTOPIA: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO INTERNATIONALIZATION IN ANTHROPOLOGY¹

Benoît de L'Estoile²

Universalism' is, according to standard accounts (e.g. Merton 1973), one of the cardinal values of science. In principle, all of us agree that "science knows no boundaries". In that sense, 'scientific internationalism' is a shared value. However, the common rhetoric of universalism and internationalism may conceal under the same clothe quite different situations in a game where all players are not equal. This begins with inequalities between languages that virtually write off the map large portions of the world's anthropological literature. The international circulation of ideas does not suppress power relations, but may itself have the effect of constructing and reinforcing hierarchies, both internationally and within national spaces.

Reflections on non-hegemonic traditions in anthropology frequently take the form of presentations of the field in one or other national context. Thus we have a series of highly interesting accounts of anthropology in... Argentina, Brazil, China, Denmark, ..., Zambia or (New) Zealand, but we are sometimes left with a feeling of embarrassment as to how to bring them together. My aim in this paper is to outline a comparative framework that might serve to place the relationships between different national anthropologies within an international space. International space is not a given, but a product of a process of construction, and there are various forms of internationalization

1 I am grateful to Susana Narotzky and Gustavo Lins Ribeiro for their invitation to contribute this article for the WAN/RAM Journal. A first version of this paper was presented at the session "Difference And (In)Equality Within World Anthropologies", sponsored by the World Council of Anthropological Associations, at the 2007 AAA meeting, Washington DC. My travel was funded by my research center, IRIS (CNRS-EHESS-Inserm), Paris.

2 Ecole Normale Supérieure, and IRIS, Paris.

and internationalism³, which offer different opportunities and constraints. The attempt to propose a comparative framework has mostly an analytical purpose, but also a practical one, as what is at stakes is also to define what kind of internationalization we want to foster.

This paper draws on a collection I edited with Federico Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud (L'Estoile, Neiburg, Sigaud, 2005), as well as on my own work on the International African Institute in the interwar period and on my personal experience within the Executive Committee of EASA, where I have been serving as elected member since 2006.⁴

In order to understand the features of the international space, we need to identify some factors that define national specificities in anthropology, not because they were historically established prior to internationalization (this is often the reverse), but because they are the primary locus for the socialization of most anthropologists. I will then propose to look at the interests at play in internationalization and some of the forms it may take, in the past and today.

The International Space of National Anthropologies

Trying to account for the emergence and specialization of distinct national traditions within the international space of anthropology was a major focus of the comparative endeavor which led to *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*⁵. The specific form taken by anthropology in each national context is closely related with 1) the interactions between anthropology and state-building, in imperial or nation-state settings; 2) its place in the academic division of labour. I will analyse successively these two aspects.

3 I will speak of *internationalization* as a process, and of *internationalism* as a political and scientific ideal, involving the active promotion of internationalization.

4 I was encouraged to take responsibility in EASA by the late Eduardo Archetti, to whose memory I dedicate this contribution.

5 I draw freely here on the comparative chapter I co-authored with Neiburg and Sigaud, which elaborates these points further (2005b).

Relations between the production of anthropological knowledge and the process of state-building break up into three main components:

(a) the nature of the political units (nation-state/ imperial state) within which a national anthropological tradition develops and towards whose construction it contributes;

(b) the position occupied by each political unit within the international space and the transformations over time in the system of interdependence between states.

(c) the interplay between the emergence, maintenance and transformation of specific national anthropological traditions, and the international circulation of scientific theories and models for governing populations.

The expression 'national anthropologies,' as used for instance in the classic volume by Gerholm & Hannerz (1983), carries two distinct meanings: the adjective 'national' may refer a) to the distinction between nation-state and empire, or b) to the opposition between the national sphere and international space. George W. Stocking gave substance to the first meaning by contrasting 'nation-building' anthropologies with 'empire-building' anthropologies (1983: 172). For example, the determinant factor in British anthropology – the paradigm of an 'empire-building' anthropology – was "experience with dark-skinned 'others' in the overseas Empire," while the dominant feature in the anthropology produced in continental European countries was, by contrast, "the relation between national identity and internal 'otherness.'" Thus *national* anthropologies were confined to the study of groups living within the national territory, while *metropolitan* anthropologies embraced a far wider area.

Taken in its second sense, the term 'national anthropology' designates a discipline defined by its *local* character in contrast to an 'international anthropology,' *cosmopolitan* in nature, practiced by researchers from diverse backgrounds, whose center is today Anglo-American anthropology. Seen from the viewpoint of this center, national anthropologies frequently add up to little more than residual forms destined to dissolve into international anthropology.

The constant (and frequently implicit) slippage in the volume edited by Gerholm & Hannerz between the first and second sense has the side-effect of reinforcing a dichotomy which equates one pair of terms, 'national, and 'international,' with another, 'peripheral' and 'central.' There is an implicit hierarchy

here, constructed from the dominant position of the 'center' (Stocking's term) which associates the scaling of the opposed terms with the supposed theoretical sophistication or rusticity of an anthropological tradition. Thus national anthropologies are held to be more 'modest' in scale and content, than metropolitan ones, while the latter are in turn assumed to 'provide the largest contribution to so-called 'international anthropology.' In other words, 'metropolitan' comes to be equated with 'cosmopolitan' (i.e. 'modern'), while 'national' is heard as 'provincial' (i.e. 'backward'). Such a schema underlies most standard 'histories of anthropology'.⁶

One of the main challenges of our book was precisely to subvert the established dichotomy between national and imperial anthropologies by bringing together case studies drawn from a range of sites within and beyond the metropolises: Mexico or Brazil provided typical cases of "national" anthropologies, France, or Britain typical "imperial anthropologies", while Portugal, the US or South Africa offered hybrid cases which escaped easy pigeon-holing. Nation-building and empire-building appear, then, not as mutually exclusive categories, but rather as two poles in relation to which social configurations specifically located in time and space move closer or further away. Linking the transformations occurring within particular anthropological traditions with the history of interdependence between states avoid the pitfalls of essentializing 'center' and 'periphery'. Such a perspective suggests a perhaps predictable but nevertheless crucial pattern: there is a broad coincidence between the field of influence of a state and the field of study of its anthropologists. This led us to formulate an hypothesis: the more a state has the capacity to project itself abroad (be it in colonial or hegemonic form), the more its anthropologists will tend to undertake fieldwork beyond national borders⁷.

In that light, one can read the history of US anthropology as a case of a shift from a 'nation-centered' anthropology, focused

6 The definition of the 'center' varies according to the perspective. Thus in a recent account by the Max-Planck Institut at Halle, the German tradition is included in the "central traditions" together with the American (i.e. U.S), British and French ones (Barth , Gingrich, Parkin and Silverman, 2005).

7 Such a model could be refined by taking into account non-state forms of hegemony, such as the missionaries or the development programmes and NGOS. See Pantaléon, 2005 on this last point.

essentially (like Mexican or Brazilian anthropologies) on nation-building to an 'imperial' or 'metropolitan' anthropology, which progressively became global⁸, while providing in other ways a striking instance of what Gustavo Lins Ribeiro calls "metropolitan provincialism" (Neiburg & Goldman, 2005).

At the risk of overstating the case, there are signs that French anthropology – for a long time active not only in its colonial/post-colonial backyard in West Africa and the Pacific, but also in South and Central America, and prominent in international debates – might today be passing through a symmetrically inverse process of 're-nationalization' (Rogers 2001, 2002; de L'Estoile & Naepels, 2004). In parallel, the ever-increasing weight (in terms of both personnel and resources) of the North American and, more generally, English-speaking academic world, has tended to push French anthropology towards the margin of debates. While many researchers from Northern European countries write directly in English for the international academic market, most French anthropologists still tend to publish in their own national language as first choice despite the fact the latter no longer occupies the pre-eminent position it once held in international intellectual exchanges. France appears in a situation of a former central anthropology that contended for hegemony, rapidly being provincialized.

The 'national' anthropologies that developed in quite different ways within an imperial framework provide a further complexification: Portugal (Ribeiro Thomaz, 2005) is a case of "peripheric empire", while India (Beteille 2007), or South Africa (Kuper, 2005), could be characterised as "central peripheries" where anthropology developed early.⁹

The close relationship between a state's zone of influence and the study field of its anthropologists tells us much about the asymmetries existing between the various 'national traditions' in anthropology. Indeed, anthropologists from the USA study Mexico, but the reverse is generally not true. The sphere of activity of Mexican anthropologists is usually confined to areas thought

8 In 1919, the chairman of the U.S. National Research Council declared that anthropology should no longer be preoccupied with Native Americans, but should follow American interests overseas. (Vincent, 1990: 153).

9 The first post-graduate department of anthropology was established in the University of Calcutta in 1920, and the first professional journal devoted to the subject, *Man in India*, was started in 1921.

to be of strategic value to the Mexican state itself. Thus, even those who have undertaken field research in the United States have focused on Mexican immigrants (Lomnitz, 2005).

The relationship between anthropology and the state develop within a national context which itself never exists in isolation. The building of (national and imperial) states must be comprehended as a process which is simultaneously internal and external – in a situation of interdependence between political units which compete for status, prestige and markets. Even today, concern for national prestige and competition with other states in the study of native populations are a driving force in the support given by the state to anthropological institutions or museums.

I will just mention here briefly the second defining factor for anthropology at a national level: the place it occupies in the various systems of teaching and research, or, in other words, its relationship to neighbouring disciplines, which account for its size, its status, and the definition of the field. (Elias, 1983; Whitley, 1984)¹⁰. Thus, in France, anthropology has for long maintained close relationships with philosophy, and a significant number of well-known anthropologists were trained as philosophers¹¹. At the same time, it was almost completely separated from archaeology (associated with classics), and with relatively little input from history. In Mexico, by contrast, anthropology is closely associated with archaeology and history, as evidenced by the INAH (National Institute of Anthropology and History) or the National School of Anthropology and History. The location of the discipline within academic institutions (universities, museums, research centers) is of course crucial.¹²

This place within the national academic field is usually internalized by scholars, first through training, and then through the nationally designed systems of evaluation and reward, and significantly defines the orientation of their research interests, or the set of theoretical and methodological tools they use.

10 The system of disciplines is itself constantly being reconfigured and redefined by the pressures of various demands, coming from the State, or, increasingly, from the market.

11 Durkheim, Mauss, Lévi-Strauss and Bourdieu are but the most famous instances of such a pattern, but at the *Ecole normale supérieure*, where I teach, it is still not uncommon for some young philosophers to experience a conversion to anthropology. For a recent appraisal, see Gaille-Nikodimov, 2004.

12 On the role of the museum in French anthropology, see L'Estoile (2003a, 2003b, 2007a).

The position of the discipline in the academic division of labour accounts for the various definitions of the field when one crosses borders, together with the already mentioned various types of relationship with state-building. Thus the international circulation of individual academics may entail disciplinary shifts: this is the case for Indian scholars who identify as sociologists in their home country but turn into anthropologists (of India) when they come to the United States (Béteille, 2007).

All these factors contribute to defining national spaces within which operates a “common language”, not only linguistically, but in the more general sense of a set of common assumptions and procedures. In that respect, the relative force of professional associations, that pursue the explicit aim to articulate at a national level potentially conflicting thematic and local interests, may be seen as both a symptom of, and a factor in, success in creating a common language.¹³

Interests in internationalization and the creation of a transnational space

The diversity of forms taken by anthropology at the national level results in the absence of any preestablished common sense in the international space. In other words, what is to be expected at the international level is not immediate mutual comprehension. Rather, misunderstandings are likely to arise between practitioners embedded in different national spaces who, moreover, usually meet on an unequal footing. So how is it possible to construct a transnational space out of these different national settings? What are the conditions of creating an understanding between anthropologists belonging to different worlds without adopting the standard language of hegemonic internationalization?

An historical approach to relations of interdependence allows us to analyze the processes involved in the international circulation of individuals, theories and political technologies, as well as the constitution of ‘national schools’ by looking both at the interests that support internationalization and those which

13 The very different role played by national associations in different countries is striking: thus the AAA or the Associação Brasileira de Antropologia (ABA) are very strong in contrast to the very weak role played by rival associations in France or Italy. In France, the two more important associations organized in December 2007 a general meeting on the state of the discipline and work towards a kind of federation. See the website www.assisesethno.org.

tend to reinforce the national frame. Internationalization may provide opportunities, opening up the possibility of creating new alliances; yet it also represents for established 'national intellectuals' a potentially disruptive factor that may encroach upon their interpretative monopoly. One needs to pay closer attention to the uses of internationalism in specific contexts.

In many cases, internationalization is a strategy allowing to redress local situations of weakness by mobilising outside networks as allies. Such a pattern is apparent in the efforts to build an international space in African studies in the interwar period (L'Estoile, 2007b). The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures was founded in 1926 to be 'a coordinating agency, a central bureau and a clearing-house for information' between all those [mostly European] interested in Africa. There was a strong utopian component in a project that aimed at bringing together, just a few years after World War I, specialists in African languages and cultures from the various European countries¹⁴. It partook of the so-called "spirit of Geneva", as was then dubbed the cosmopolitan hope to overcome nationalist tensions in pacific dialogue which was expressed in the League of Nations (and ultimately frustrated). The journal of the Institute, *Africa*, featured articles in English, French, and German, as a sign of commitment to cosmopolitanism.

The creation of the IALC was indeed symptomatic of, and contributed to, the internationalisation of colonial debate in the inter-war period. One of the driving forces behind its creation was the attempt by influential American and British missionaries to build up an international network that would reinforce their position in their increasingly complex dealings with the various colonial powers in Africa, especially in the area of education¹⁵. This transnational strategy succeeded to a large extent.

14 Its chairman was British (the colonial pundit Lord Lugard), while its two directors, the colonial administrator and anthropologist Maurice Delafosse and the linguist Dietrich Westermann, were respectively French and German, and its General Secretary Swiss (Hannes Vischer).

15 The very creation of a body dedicated to furthering knowledge of African languages and cultures was also tightly linked to a wide-spread belief that a scientific approach to African problems would allow both missionaries and colonial officials to master a shifting colonial context and to overcome conflicts between various stakeholders in African matters, especially between rival colonial powers (L'Estoile 1997a, 1997b).

Efforts to establish an international forum for discussion in the sphere of African languages and cultures were however complicated not only by national rivalries in the colonial field, but also by dissent arising from scientists' divergent research programs, which in many cases came to be framed as national oppositions. Thus at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the IALC in 1933, the Belgian Professor De Jonghe proposed that international cooperation would be better if conceived of as an addition of nationally framed schemes: "I would ask that the programmes of study for each colony be presented by the English as regards English territories, by the French regarding French territories, and so forth for Italian, Belgian and Portuguese colonies. These national propositions would then be integrated in the international frame of the Institute."¹⁶

Not surprisingly, Malinowski objected to this, urging his colleagues 'not to lose sight of the fact that we are an International Institute'. Being himself a foreigner in Britain, enjoying considerable financial support from North American Foundations, attracting to his LSE seminar students from continental Europe and the British Commonwealth, Malinowski had everything to gain by endorsing internationalisation. Conversely, the nationalistic argument can be seen as a strategy his competitors in continental Europe invoked to counter a menacing hegemony. The same individuals could be playing a complex game, using in different contexts internationalism or nationalism as strategic resources. Henri Labouret was among those involved in such a complex strategy: in France, he used his position as one of the two Directors of the Institute to enhance his status as international expert, while within the Institute he played the nationalist card and his links to the French colonial administration.

Thus while the IALC did provide a forum for international debate, the increasing divergence between national developments in anthropology made international cooperation more difficult. The existence of an international forum not only did not prevent the formation of 'national schools' along quite different lines in Britain and France, but rather contributed to the construction of differences as being 'national' in character. Science is not an *a priori* 'universal' practice, but universalisation can only be established through the connection of a series of 'local practices'

16 Minutes of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures Meeting at Bruxelles, dated 4th July, 1933 (IAI 1/18), Archives of the International African Institute, British Library of Political and Economic Sciences, London. Original in French.

constituted in different settings. The contrasting developments in both academic and colonial contexts reflected in the discussions within the Institute over procedures to be followed in order to produce a knowledge of African populations recognized as 'scientific'.

The case of the IALC sustains the hypothesis that processes of internationalization are initiated and sustained by such factors as mobilization of international competition as an argument to obtain support at the national level, the international circulation of anthropologists trying to get the best exchange rate for the academic capital accumulated in other places, the importation from abroad of new theories or methods to gain space within the local game.

Hegemonic and pluralistic forms of internationalization

Internationalization is however too loose a term, as it refers to a variety of processes. To go beyond this, I shall introduce a distinction between two ideal-typical forms of internationalization and internationalism: hegemonic and pluralistic.

Hegemonic internationalization, is basically a result of the attraction by the more powerful center on its own terms. The international idiom, linguistically and intellectually, is the one of the hegemonic center. There is no need to expand much on what I mean by hegemonic internationalization. Thus the AAA is in fact both the U.S. National Association and *de facto* international, since it attracts scholars from all over the world, provided they accept to speak the local language¹⁷. More generally, anthropologists based in the American system (but from various origins) largely define the anthropological agenda worldwide.

Hegemonic internationalization is like gravity: it naturally attracts you towards the gravitational center, without your even realizing it. The default language, not only linguistically, but also intellectually, is the one of the center. In other words, whoever gets recognition in the center, sometimes for 'local' reasons, is mechanically attracting attention elsewhere. This does not mean that the center has a monopoly over intellectual innovation, but that it tends to become the place that distributes recognition: thus

17 The very fact that at the meeting where this paper was presented, our meeting ground was, in a literal sense, the meeting of the US National Association, and our common language English is a striking illustration of this phenomenon.

a Brazilian anthropologist will get recognition in Sweden only once she is recognized centrally; Indian scholars who emigrated to the US are better known in France than their teachers who stayed "at home". Such a mechanism is at work in many ways: when we think of texts for teaching, bibliography for our research, guest-speakers we want to invite, etc.¹⁸. This gravitational attraction ultimately entails a risk of uniformizing: internationalization would mean that the same references, the same fads, the same words, the same curricula spread all over the world. Such a standardization would of course facilitate the mobility of those who fully master the language of the center, but also greatly impoverish the intellectual content of the discipline¹⁹.

What I call pluralistic internationalism, by contrast, is an endeavour with a strong utopian component: it advocates a meeting ground where in principle all can meet on their own terms. In essence, it strives at creating a kind of non-hegemonic internationalization. In Europe, the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) is a typical instance of this pluralistic utopia, as was, in different ways, the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures.

These ideal-types are not watertight categories, but rather polarities which help us to clarify intermediate situations.

In the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th century, there was not one, but several competing hegemonic internationalisms, organized respectively around France, Britain, Germany, and increasingly the United States, each with its own "area of influence". This competition for hegemony between various players in fact insured some kind of pluralism by opening up a space for local strategies. For instance, in a country like Brazil, some actors chose at a certain point to play the French influence as an alternative to the North American one (Miceli, 1990). Thus young French philosophers were invited to teach Durkheimian

18 One of the main vectors that insure the reproduction of hegemony are the text-books or readers, which, whatever the intentions of their authors, eventually produce a selection of all the available texts, by creating a canon. Readers select a limited number of works which they define as 'central', and de facto contribute to make them canonical by making them easily available and reproducible.

19 This is largely what happened to a discipline as economics. Economists share a common language (English, formalization and a set of basic assumptions), which facilitates international circulation and also contributes to legitimizing their claims to scientificity.

sociology in Brazilian universities : Claude Lévi-Strauss, succeeded by Roger Bastide, at the young University of São Paulo, which led both of them to become anthropologists, eventually changing the field both in France, Brazil, and beyond. This diversity of models and international networks up to this day is in part reflected in the creativity of Brazilian anthropology, which, at its best, displays typical features of “provincial cosmopolitanism”, to use Lins Ribeiro’s apt characterization (2006).

More recently, European anthropologies that once competed for hegemony have been forced to seriously cut their claims down to size in the face of U.S. hegemony. The recognition of this relative weakening is of course one of the factors that made possible the founding of EASA. But the utopian component has been central.

Practical utopian experiments

I will finally mention two quite different experiences I have been involved in, attempting to translate pluralistic internationalism into practice.

EASA has been set up in 1989 partly following the realization of the fact that the place where European anthropologists were meeting, apart from specialists’ meetings or conferences, was indeed the AAA. This is of course very well so, but the founding idea of EASA was that it was useful to build up a meeting ground between representatives of various European traditions, where they could meet on their *own* terms (Archetti, 2003; Kuper, 2004). This has sometimes been misread as a sure symptom of Anti-Americanism. While a desire of resisting what was felt to be Americanization was certainly present among some of the founders²⁰, I believe its deep meaning is rather a commitment to pluralism.

In my view, the purpose of an association such as EASA is to create *meeting grounds*, both in the literal and metaphorical sense. The technologies of creating meeting grounds are both social and material: in our case, these are our bi-annual conferences, as our networks, electronic, our website (<http://www.easaonline.org/>), our thematic networks (Media anthropology, Africanist,

20 Adam Kuper’s call to a cosmopolitan anthropology is thus in part a reaction against ‘post-modern’ anthropology (Kuper, 1994).

Europeanist, etc) or in print, as our journal *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie sociale*²¹, and our publication series²².

The utopian component of what I call “pluralistic internationalism” encounters a number of difficulties, the first one being “linguistic” in a wide sense. One of the central problems is of course the issue of a common language. Misunderstandings frequently arise, because of the absence of a shared common sense, which cannot be assumed, but has to be built up. In cases of encounters between speakers of unequal languages, the speakers of the “weaker” language are at a structural disadvantage, having to express themselves in a foreign medium. To use a sports metaphor, they are always “visitors”, never the “home team”. Ideally, it would suppose that everyone is able to understand the other speaking in its own language. While I sympathize with the call for a more ‘heteroglossic’ anthropology (Lins Ribeiro, 2006)²³, I am aware that this utopia of an anthropological Pentecost that would overcome the Babelian linguistic dispersion can only materialize in very specific situations²⁴.

EASA has been set up as a tool to promote diversity and dialogue between non-hegemonic traditions (Galey, 1992). However, while a number of anthropologists in Europe do speak one or more European languages in addition to their own and English, English tends to become the default common language assuring major comprehension, even if it also creates very strong asymmetries between those who master it fluently and those who struggle to express themselves with this medium.

21 Thus the various review editors take pain to look for reviewers belonging to different traditions than the authors.

22 EASA enjoys the continuing support from the Wenner-Gren Foundation.

23 In my own personal utopia, everyone should speak at international meetings in a language other than his or her ‘own’, in order to distribute handicap more equally. This is of course quite impractical!

24 The closest I came to a linguistically polyphonic conference was a conference of art historians I attended last year, where people presented their papers and discussed them in the four supposedly most important languages in Art history, English, French, German, and Italian. I was in awe in front of our colleagues, but soon discovered that a number of French students did not bother to hear the papers in German, or that students from Scotland complained that too much French was spoken.

Not all European anthropologists are involved in EASA. The striking variation in the degree of interest in internationalization (or in this specific form of internationalization) could be accounted for by looking at both the place of each country within national space and the position of individuals within their own national space.

There is a marked discrepancy in this respect between those countries, mostly in Northern Europe, where most scholars already made the decision to publish primarily in English, and those where there are still strong incentives to publish in the national language (France, Italy, Spain, to some extent Germany). Intellectual debate in France is largely set up nationally. The tendency to publish in one's national language is reinforced by the existence of international networks which exist on a linguistic basis (France/Francophone Belgium and Switzerland, Quebec; Brazil/Portugal; Spain/Latin America) and create spaces that are both international and easily compatible with a national definition.

While translation programs should be developed²⁵, they of course tend also to reinforce the role of the *lingua franca* as instrument of communication, because it makes sense to maximize the effect of translation by translating to English rather than to any other language²⁶. Ideally, translations should be fostered not only from "peripheral" languages to English, but also between peripheral languages themselves; this, however, is in practice dependent on the existence of national programmes.²⁷

The utopian drive can actually change practices, as shown by an other experiment in international cooperation I had the opportunity to develop with colleagues and friends from the Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro. The specific existing institutional framework for French-Brazilian cooperation we used had been devised to support the development of post-graduate programmes in Brazil, so was fundamentally asymmetrical: French scholars came

25 We have such a translation programme at EASA, for which we receive a fund from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and will soon publish two books in our Translation Series at Berghahn.

26 As we know as anthropologists, translation is not only a linguistic issue, but crucially involves an understanding of local contexts and situations (Malinowski, 1935).

27 Such as those maintained by the French government as part of its cultural policy to help translation of French works in various languages.

to Brazil to teach²⁸, while Brazilian academics and students came to France to learn. Starting from this, we set out to build up a symmetrical cooperation, which included not only mutual visits, but innovative forms of collective work including students and more senior scholars. Thus, when we organized in 1997 ago a joint conference in Rio de Janeiro, my Brazilian partners decided to go for a significant extra-cost to insure simultaneous translation, thus allowing everyone to express himself in French or Portuguese, as he or she chose. Such a solution cannot however work when more languages are involved.

This cooperation led to the formulation and implementation of common research programmes: we developed two sub-projects²⁹. One was comparative: by bringing together a series of reflexive/historical endeavours of various anthropologists in Brazil, France and beyond, each trying to reflect on his or her own practice as situated in a specific national space, we set out to elaborate a collective reflexivity based on comparison. It eventually culminated in the successive publication first of a special issue of an established journal in France, then a book in Brazil and finally a book in English (L'Estoile, Sigaud, Neiburg, 2000, 2003, 2005).

The second research axis was even bolder, since it involved researchers and students in a collective field research in the Nordeste. The confrontation in the field of viewpoints framed in diverse social and academic settings was highly productive, as it made apparent a number of implicit natiocentric expectations (L'Estoile & Sigaud, 2001, 2006)³⁰. This experiment resulted into publications and exhibitions in both France and Brazil³¹. This cooperation involved significant investments in trying to master

28 In the French foreign affairs jargon, they are called « missionnaires.

29 We received funds from various Brazilian and French institutions, including a significant grant by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

30 Due to the failure to find continuing funding for the French side of the research team, and the pressure of other works, most French participants, except me, have since gone into other projects. We were also unable to organize a symmetrical common fieldwork in France, as had been our initial dream.

31 *Lonas e bandeiras em terras pernambucanas*, Exhibition at the Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, 2002 (<http://www.lonasebandeiras.com.br/index.htm>). Nous sommes devenus des personnes. Nouveaux visages du Nordeste brésilien, exhibition at the Ecole normale

the language of the other and translating, but it allowed us to create mutual understanding.

Conclusion: translating utopia into practice

Ritually calling for internationalization without looking at the way it works on the ground is not very helpful. We need a comparative framework that allows us to better understand the mutually structuring relationships between national and international space in anthropology. The ideal-typical distinction between two polar configurations of internationalization, hegemonic and pluralistic, may help to clarify the way international space is configured.

The attraction of hegemonic internationalization cannot be escaped only by goodwill. The inescapable fact that today's internationalism speaks English is the result both of the legacy of the British Empire, and of US imperial hegemony today. This is not to be changed, and I write this of course in English, but concern with translation in the broad sense of the term is to be central.

Pluralistic internationalism, with its utopian component, is thus a necessary counterpart to this hegemonic gravity. Intellectual diversity has to be fostered against the risk of uniformity. In many ways, however, pluralistic internationalization is much more difficult to achieve than the juxtaposition of national differences of hegemonic internationalization, because it involves ideally both the respect for local specificities and the creation of a *common ground* where a more equal exchange may take place. To achieve this, meeting grounds and forums of discussion have to be so devised as to favour communication over barriers that are not only linguistic, but also cultural, economic and social. In fact, translating utopia into practice involves a form of intellectual activism which demands great effort, while it is much easier to follow routine procedures.

The purpose of transnational organization such as EASA or WAN/RAM is to create some basic conditions that allow for the building up of a more pluralistic form of internationalization. The ultimate aim is not the creation of a standard language, but rather of a series of *meeting grounds* and translation devices. Fostering meeting grounds and enhancing translation does not by itself insure a more pluralistic international communication, but

supérieure, Paris, 2003 (<http://www.diffusion.ens.fr/bresil/index.html>).

it opens up a space where this utopian drive of mutual understanding may find a possibility of, at least partial, realization.

References cited

- Archetti, Eduardo P. 2003. Ten years of *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*. Ambiguities and contradictions. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 11(1): 103-112.
- Barth, Fredrik. Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin and Sydel Silverman. 2005. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, University of Chicago Press.
- Béteille, André. 2007. Etre anthropologue chez soi: un point de vue indien. *Genèses* (67): 113-130.
- Elias, Norbert. 1982. «Scientific establishments». In: N. Elias (ed.), *Scientific establishments and hierarchies*. pp. 3-69. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Gaille-Nikodimov, Marie. 2004. Comment réduire l'altérité ? Anthropologie et philosophie face à l'idée de contexte culturel. *Critique* (680-681).
- Gerholm, Tomas & Hannerz, Ulf. 1983. Introduction: the shaping of national anthropologies. *Ethnos*, 47 (1): 5-35.
- Galey, J.-C. 1992. Editorial. For a journal. of social anthropology. *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale*. (1).
- Kuper, Adam. 1994. Culture, identity and the project of a cosmopolitan anthropology. *Man* (NS) 29, 3
- _____. 2004. Existe-t-il une 'école européenne' en anthropologie. *Critique* (680-681): 150-159.
- _____. 2005. "Today We Have Naming of Parts": The Work of Anthropologists in Southern Africa. In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 277-299.
- De l'Estoile, Benoît. 1997a. Au nom des "vrais Africains": les élites scolaires de l'Afrique coloniale face à l'anthropologie (1930-1950). *Terrain* (28) : 87-102. (<http://terrain.revues.org/document3173.html#txt>)

- _____. 2003a. From the colonial exhibition to the Museum of Man. An alternative genealogy of French anthropology. *Social anthropology/ Anthropologie Sociale*. pp. 341-61.
- _____. 2003b. O arquivo total da Humanidade : Utopia enciclopédica e divisão do trabalho na etnologia francesa dos anos trinta. *Horizontes Antropológicos*. (20): 265-302. (http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0104-71832003000200014&script=sci_arttext)
- _____. 2007a. *Le goût des autres. De l'exposition coloniale aux arts premiers*. Flammarion.
- _____. 2007b, "Internationalisation and 'scientific nationalism': the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures between the Wars". In : H.Tilley & R.Gordon (ed.) *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism, & Disciplinary Development*. pp. 95-116. The University of Manchester Press.
- De l'Estoile, Benoît and Lygia Sigaud (eds.). 2001. Occupations de terre et transformations sociales: Pernambuco, septembre 1997. *Cahiers du Brésil Contemporain*. (43-44).
- _____. 2006. *Ocupações de terra e transformações sociais*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Fundação Getulio Vargas.
- De l'Estoile, Benoît, Federico Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud, 2000. *Anthropologies, Etats et Populations, Revue de Synthèse* (3-4) (<http://www.ehess.fr/acta/synthese/index.htm>)
- _____. 2003. *Antropologia em imperios e estados nacionais*. Relume-Dumara: Rio de Janeiro.
- _____. 2005. (ed.) *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- _____. 2005b. "Anthropology and the Government of Natives: a Comparative Approach". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp.1-29. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lomnitz, Claudio. 2005. "Bordering on Anthropology: Dialectics of a National Tradition in Mexico". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 167-196 Durham: Duke University Press.

- Malinowski, B. 1935. "An ethnographic theory of language and some practical corollaries », *Coral Gardens and their magic*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1965, vol.2, p. 3-74.
- Merton, Robert. "The normative structure of science". In: Storer, N.W. (ed.), 1972 *The Sociology of Science. Theoretical and empirical investigations*. pp. 267-278. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mills, David. 2005. "Anthropology at the End of Empire: The Rise and Fall of the Colonial Social Sciences Research Council, 1944-1962". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 135-166. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Neiburg, Federico and Marcio Goldman. 2005. "From Nation to Empire: War and National Character Studies in the United States". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 108-134. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Pantaleón, Jorge F. 2005. "Anthropology, Development, and Nongovernmental Organizations in Latin America". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 248-262. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 2006. World Anthropologies. Cosmopolitics for a New Global Scenario in Anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology*. 26 (4): 363-386.
- Ribeiro Thomaz, Omar. 2005. "The Good-Hearted Portuguese People": Anthropology of Nation, Anthropology of Empire". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 58-87. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rogers, Susan C. 2001. Anthropology in France. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. (30): 481-504.
- _____. 2002. L'anthropologie en France. *Terrain* (39). (<http://terrain.revues.org/document1476.html>).
- Souza Lima, Antonio Carlos de, 2005, "Indigenism in Brazil: The International Migration of State Policies". In: *Empires, Nations and Natives. Anthropology and State-making*. pp. 197-222. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Stocking, George W. 1983. Afterword: a view from the center.
Ethnos 47(1): 172-186.
- Vincent, Joan. 1990. *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions and Trends*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Whitley, Richard. 1984. *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

ANTROPOLOGÍAS MUNDIALES EN CUESTIÓN: DIÁLOGOS Y DEBATES¹

Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto²

Anthropology is what anthropologists do. That is to say, the boundaries as the distinctive features of the discipline vary with time. Changes in the world at large and in academe, anthropologists response to the changes, and their individual and collective initiatives all contribute to the dynamism of the discipline

Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2003:1).

... anthropological ideas do indeed respond to the contexts in which they are generated. They are not, however, mechanically reflective of the encompassing political economy but emerge in a complex interplay among intellectual production, varied institutional settings, and the dominant value orientations of the time

Eric Wolf (2001:63).

Like other cosmopolitics anthropology reflects the historical dynamics of the world system, especially those related to the structure of alterity. This also means that theory in anthropology reflects world politics and, by extension, that theory in anthropology is always/already political

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (2004:3).

1 Una primera versión de este trabajo fue expuesta en el Grupo de Trabajo *Transferencia y Políticas de Difusión en Antropología* de la VI Reunión de Antropología del Mercosur, realizada en Noviembre del 2005, en la ciudad de Montevideo. Agradezco los comentarios, sugerencias y críticas del Profesor Gustavo Lins Ribeiro, como también de mis amig@s y colegas Adolfo Neves de Oliveira y Paloma Sanches, y, en especial, Santiago Díaz Torres..

2 Dr. (c) Antropología Social, UnB. Brasília. Email: gdiazcrovetto@unb.br

Me propongo discutir en el presente texto las diferentes dimensiones sobre la noción y el proyecto de *antropologías mundiales*, a partir de trabajos del Colectivo de Antropologías Mundiales o *Red de Antropologías en el Mundo*³ (Wan Collective 2003), de la propuesta de los organizadores del simposio *Antropologías Mundiales: Transformaciones en los Sistemas de Poder* (Ribeiro y Escobar 2002), y, de forma indirecta, de algunos textos escogidos de los participantes del evento. Para dicha tarea, pretendo reflexionar y colocar algunas cuestiones teóricas y epistemológicas referidas al proyecto de antropologías mundiales, encaminándome, en cierta medida, hacia una *antropología de la antropología* (Peirano 1991, Díaz 2005), considerando para ello los marcos reflexivos de una geopolítica del conocimiento (Mignolo 2001). Mi aproximación a los contenidos de la propuesta de *antropologías mundiales*, será a partir de una perspectiva siempre crítica, sobretudo en relación a la cuestión referida a la enseñanza y reproducción de la antropología, recordando, tal como apunta Ahmed, que la antropología también tiene su propio proceso de socialización (1973). Tampoco podría desconocer que toda disciplina, tiene diferentes formas y estrategias de inserción, que van de la mano de diferentes procesos continuos o de ruptura enraizados en diversos campos sociales, políticos, y culturales, entre otros; formando relaciones, ya sea locales, nacionales o internacionales, y que en parte, la perfilan. Para ello vale la pena mencionar que *cuestiones académicas tienen fuertes bieses locales y nacionales, y que la disciplina, es de hecho, plural – ha antropologías, no antropología* (Caldeira 2000:18). Ante todo, debemos reconocer que la antropología es también un campo de lucha, donde se conjugan y se disputan diferentes formas de producción, reproducción y difusión de conocimientos; saberes, prácticas e intereses, entre otros elementos, por parte de diferentes centros-lugares; universidades, centros de investigación, ongs, órganos públicos. Al mismo tiempo, estos se encuentran enraizados en diferentes relaciones de poder.

Cabe destacar entonces, - para ser justo a los epígrafes, e incluso, al título del presente trabajo -, mi pretensión de *localizar* esta propuesta de antropologías, que se funda, antes que nada, en la idea de redes (WAN Collective 2003). Esta pretensión, o bien, mi interpretación sobre la cuestión, requiere tanto de una problematización del *trabajo* como del *pensamiento* antropológico⁴,

3 El primero término sería una traducción literal, mientras que el segundo es la propia nominación del grupo por sus integrantes – en especial, del grupo hispano-hablante.

4 Parafraseó aquí los títulos de dos volúmenes de artículos de Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, *Sobre o pensamento antropológico* (2003)

así como de la trayectoria histórica referencial para este proyecto – trayectoria, que es, en parte, también referenciada por el propio colectivo, así como en los trabajos individuales de sus integrantes⁵. Pero esta localización requiere, o más bien, requirió *un momento*; la caracterización de éste se tornará una de las cuestiones centrales durante el desarrollo del presente texto, considerando que un *recorte* es siempre un llamado para rever el pasado, así como para pensar-imaginar el futuro. Bajo esta consideración, presento tanto los diferentes intentos y caminos de una *internalización* de la disciplina, como también traigo a luz de debate los marcos propositivos de los estudios vinculados con una crítica colonial. Sobre la preocupación de una revisión de una antropología colonial, Ben-Ari apunta que ésta está relacionada con actuales asuntos sociales, organizacionales y profesionales (1999). Tanto el proceso de internacionalización de la antropología como los revisionismos críticos de una antropología colonial se constituyen como parte fundadora de las retóricas de las antropologías mundiales, donde experiencias y reflexiones permiten la instauración de nuevos discursos narrativos.

Como propuse anteriormente (Díaz 2005), no podemos dejar de considerar que la antropología en si misma es una práctica cultural realizada por un grupo social, con ello, la noción de antropologías parece estar a la par con la de grupos sociales, en una *pluralidad* acentuada. Dentro de este universo acentuado en una propia diversidad, compartimos, no obstante, una cierta *matriz disciplinar* (Cardoso de Oliveira 2004), en relación a un cuerpo teórico y metodológico.

Una opción por considerar entonces a la antropología social como una práctica cultural realizada por diferentes grupos sociales nos lleva a agudizar y sensibilizar nuestra mirada, para, de este modo, rever instituciones y organizaciones envueltas en los posibles contextos sociales, políticos, económicos, donde nuestra disciplina, y por ende, su práctica, su pensar y su discurso se encuentran insertos – siempre en un juego dinámico. Cada antropología, es, entonces, localizada, localizada en estas redes particulares de relaciones que las distinguen unas entre otras⁶.

y *O trabalho do antropólogo* (1998).

5 Desde ahora en adelante, me referiré al *World Anthropologies Collective* como el colectivo.

6 Cardoso de Oliveira apunta para la concepción de *estilos de antropología* (2003:155-156), que remite a las formas bastante peculiares de domesticar la disciplina a través de su práctica, que no se limitaría a un ejercicio personal-individual, *sino de un*

Ante ello, me parece bastante vigente, la siguiente referencia a Boas, que dice respecto a que *cada grupo cultural tiene su historia propia y única, parcialmente dependiente del desarrollo interno peculiar al grupo social y parcialmente, de influencias exteriores a las cuales él se haya sumerso* (2004:45). De este modo, la metáfora interpretativa sobre la propia antropología, referenciada a una práctica y a un grupo social, nos trae también, consecuentemente, las dinámicas de las interligaciones entre procesos internos y externos. Esclarecer estas dinámicas, haciendo visibles las diferentes configuraciones de poder, se presenta como una de las temáticas prepositivas centrales de las *antropologías mundiales* y de sus exponentes.

Por último, como parte de esta introducción encuentro oportuno preguntarse si esta propuesta por antropologías mundiales reivindica necesariamente una definición de *su imagen, su idea, su personalidad y su experiencia* en una *contraposición* (Said 2003:20⁷) a la hegemonía de los “centros metropolitanos” – y sus respectivas configuraciones de poder –, en relación a prácticas y a saberes. Prematuramente esta respuesta podría integrar un sí, a partir de un claro antagonismo frente a “un” hegemonismo de estos centros, y a la vez un no, en la medida, que su propuesta reivindica una heteroglosia de posibilidades difícilmente encasillables en una oposición binaria, de construir por negación de algo, pues en su ontología visa no sólo distanciarse y contraponerse a algo, sino que también se propone una búsqueda de nuevas formas para reivindicar un futuro posible. En ese sentido, los posibles principios de las antropologías mundiales, siempre en diálogo, me hacen pensar en el siguiente texto: “Lo que aprendí entonces e intenté exponer fue que no existe algo dado o fácil de encontrar que pueda ser considerado como un punto de partida: los principios tienen que establecerse de acuerdo a cada proyecto, de tal manera que *posibiliten* la realización de lo que viene a continuación” (Said 2003:38).

Propongo entonces, vislumbrar, en cierta forma, una genealogía de la propuesta de antropologías mundiales, que presente, en diversas intensidades, las configuraciones que permitieron los

discurso común de un grupo localizado de profesionales: de una comunidad antropológica situada en el tiempo y espacio. Al respecto, la propia noción y consideración de redes por parte del proyecto de antropologías mundiales, le permitiría distanciarse de una localización fija en un cuadro temporal espacial.

7 Said, naturalmente, se estaba refiriendo a la idea de la construcción de oriente a partir de occidente – no obstante encuentro pertinente su observación para el presente caso.

contenidos de esta propuesta, *las condiciones posibles* de su marco epistemológico (Foucault 1969). Finalmente, y brevemente, reflexiono sobre la concepción de antropologías mundiales en diferentes aspectos, como por ejemplo, su significado en la reproducción del conocimiento y práctica antropológica.

Internacionalizando la(s) antropología(s).

Quiero, al menos brevemente, discutir y presentar reflexiones e informaciones sobre los antecedentes o los *enlaces* posibles del proyecto de antropologías mundiales con momentos anteriores. Pero, para resaltar la importancia de esto, vale la pena retomar nuevamente la consideración de la antropología como una práctica cultural de un *grupo social*, pues con ello, reaparece por su propio peso la cuestión de la organización social y sobretodo, de buscar en ella el juego dinámico de la *diferencia* y de la *identidad* (Cardoso de Oliveira 2003:157), de los *encuentros* y *desencuentros* (Díaz 2005).

Para tratar la *internacionalización* de la disciplina, me parece conveniente considerar las informaciones presentadas, tempranamente, por Vidyarthi en su *Trends in World Anthropology* (1979), donde se destaca que esta internacionalización podría apreciarse a partir de un proyecto con un claro dominio e intención norteamericana, ante un deterioro de las antropologías europeas, para lo cual destaca cuatro puntos: la creación del *Directorio Internacional de Antropología*, la Serie de Publicaciones referentes al *Simpósio Internacional de Antropología y Etnología* – realizado en Estados Unidos en el año de 1952 –, dos *Congresos Internacionales de Ciencias Antropológicas y Etnológicas* y finalmente, el flujo de profesores-investigadores. El establecimiento del *Directorio* contó con el apoyo del Consejo Nacional de Investigación de los Estados Unidos (National Research Council), siendo su primera versión de 1938 y fue editada por Alfred Vincent Kidder. Destacase que en esta primera edición no se contaban registros de antropologías y/o antropólogos/as de países del tercer mundo (idem:16). Hubo posteriores ediciones y revisiones, entre ellas la de 1940 elaborada por Melville Herskovitz, mientras que en 1967 y 1975 el volumen fue organizado por Sol Tax (Vidyarthi 1979:16). Los Directorios, no sólo pretendían sondear el número de antropólogos/as existentes en el mundo, sino también las diversas instituciones e inclusive, las diferentes áreas de investigación. El *Simpósio Internacional* de 1952 fue organizado por la Wenner-Gren Foundation en Nueva York, ciudad donde se encuentra la oficina de la fundación, la cual, como veremos, jugará un rol protagónico para la *internacionalización* o *mundialización* de la antropología. Dicho Simposio, contó con la

participación de destacados antropólogos de diversos países⁸. Sería en dicho contexto de internacionalización, que surgiría en 1959, bajo el amparo de esta misma fundación, la revista cuyo símbolo iconográfico es un mapamundi, *Current Anthropology*, que en palabras de Vidyarthi:

... was made available to its associates all over the world at a rather very concessional rate. By its policy it published review papers on theory, methods, ethnography and national anthropological styles from different parts of the world. Working with a democratic spirit, it first consolidated American Anthropology and then radiated its scholarship, skill and ideas to the rest of the world. It also published material about anthropology and anthropologists in other parts of the world. These efforts ... thus helped the *internationalization of the discipline*. It tried also to win over, though in fraction, the language barriers by publishing materials in English, originally written in their respective national languages (1979:15; énfasis agregado).

Con respecto a los *Congresos Internacionales* estos corresponderían al quinto realizado en 1956 en Filadelfia y al noveno en Chicago durante 1973. De este último congreso, sería incorporada la idea de *antropología mundial*, visando una publicación con los 2000 trabajos recibidos, en dos volúmenes, con una experiencia-cobertura de antropólogos/etnólogos de diferentes latitudes del mundo. Vidyarthi destaca que el 18% de esos trabajos serían de autoría de antropólogos/as del tercer mundo (1979:16). Por último, el autor destaca también la importancia en el proceso de internacionalización de la disciplina del flujo e intercambio de profesores, investigadores y alumnos para realizar conferencias, participar en congresos y efectuar investigaciones, posibilitado por diferentes centros de fondos y becas, concentrados en larga escala en los Estados Unidos, como por ejemplo: Fulbright Smithmundt Programme, Rockefeller, Fundación Ford, Fundación Wenner-Gren, entre otras. Muchas de estas investigaciones eran realizadas, por un largo tiempo, como apunta Vidayharti, en países coloniales o poscoloniales (*en desarrollo*) como parte de una tradición de formación etnográfica en lugares y países distantes, que se incrementó como política con el establecimiento de los

8 A modo de ejemplo, destaco que el capítulo XV del libro *Antropología Estructural* de Levi-Strauss proviene de un trabajo presentado durante el Simposio.

“estudios de áreas” por parte de diversas universidades norteamericanas, recibiendo un considerable aumento de fondos al término de la Segunda Guerra Mundial (1979:19), ante la nueva configuración geopolítica del mundo y de la inserción de Estados Unidos en ella.

Otros momentos-eventos importantes para observar la internacionalización de la disciplina son mencionados por Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, que en *Por uma Etnografia das Antropologias Periféricas*⁹, nos presenta la experiencia de tres reuniones internacionales: Austria en 1967 y México tanto en 1968 como en 1979. Las dos primeras fueron financiadas por la Wenner-Gren Foundation y trataron sobre la cuestión de la enseñanza. El encuentro de Austria de 1967 se tituló de *Reunión para la Integración de la Enseñanza en las Investigaciones Antropológicas*, mientras que el primer simposio en México, se denominó *I Reunión Técnica de Antropólogos y Arqueólogos de América Latina y el Caribe*. La relevancia de estos seminarios radica en que, en cierta forma, internacionalizaron regionalmente (latinoamericanamente) la disciplina; instaurando y motivando reflexiones de las antropologías allí realizadas. Estos encuentros contribuyeron también para generar des-localaciones y flujos, que en un primer momento tuvieron un carácter relativamente más personal que institucional, sobre todo, a partir de figuras emblemáticas representantes de las diferentes antropologías que participaron en los seminarios. Cabe destacar que el diálogo fructífero establecido originó un número especial de la Revista América Indígena, del Instituto Indigenista Interamericano (Vol. XL, México, 1980), afianzando con esto el proyecto de flujos y diálogos para una internacionalización de la disciplina¹⁰. Los diferentes artículos que integraron dicho volumen, trataban de levantar, sondear y reflexionar sobre la antropología en sus respectivos países¹¹. Podemos considerar, que el diálogo, acentúa entonces, el proceso de internacionalización, un camino para establecer, casi necesariamente una *alteridad mínima* (Peirano 1999). Esta alteridad hace referencia a una forma de auto-observación a partir de estudios que incorporen reflexiones sobre el propio

9 Perteneciente al capítulo 7 de su libro *Sobre o pensamento Antropológico* (2003).

10 No obstante, sabemos que para que un diálogo perdure, éste necesita de una continuidad.

11 Como podemos apreciar en el siguiente párrafo: *la finalidad de esta reunión de antropólogos latinoamericanos de evaluar la situación de la disciplina en la región, en el marco de los procesos sociales y de desarrollo de sus naciones, determina y limita el carácter de los informes por países* (Berdichewsky 1980:309).

pensamiento social dentro de los límites nacionales (Peirano 1991). Con esto último quiero decir, que el establecimiento de instancias de diálogo entre diferentes antropologías, así como las diversas tentativas para una internacionalización de la disciplina, requirió, y requiere, desde temprano, una propia auto-reflexión de las diferentes experiencias de las antropologías nacionales. Retomaré esta cuestión y su importancia, posteriormente.

Hay otro simposio bastante significativo, en el sentido de precedente de las propuestas de antropologías mundiales, se trata pues del *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*, organizado durante 1978 en Austria, nuevamente bajo el amparo de la Wenner-Gren Foundation¹². Este congreso internacional, -que desencadenó un libro con el mismo título, en el cual fueron seleccionados algunos de los trabajos expuestos en el encuentro (Fahim 1982) -, contó con la participación de 20 personas de 17 países. El concepto *indigenous anthropology* fue propuesto como un concepto de trabajo¹³, referido a la práctica antropológica en el país, sociedad o grupo étnico de origen del investigador (Fahim e Helmer 1982:xi), mientras que el término *no-occidental* fue escogido ante la cuestión de que si la antropología fue desarrollada en un ambiente intelectual, económico y político occidental, habría aumentado considerablemente el número de antropólogos/as formados y operando fuera de esta tradición, lo que habría levantado nuevas cuestiones para la disciplina (*op. cit.*). Creo oportuno, por la relevancia que pueden adquirir a la hora de rever las propuestas contenidas en el proyecto de antropologías mundiales, presentar los objetivos de este encuentro: (1) juntar a un grupo de antropólogos/as no occidentales para concretizar un intercambio de informaciones y perspectivas de sus propias experiencias en la práctica de la antropología en sus respectivos países; (2) buscar animadas y sistemáticas discusiones de la problemática de encarar una antropología local en países del tercer mundo; (3) explorar el potencial de las contribuciones en relación a las preocupaciones globales de la disciplina; y (4) discutir y desarrollar un medio más efectivo de comunicación entre antropólogos/as del tercer mundo, como también entre y con toda la comunidad mundial de antropólogos/as (*op. cit. p.xiii*). Fahim y Helmer destacan que los integrantes discutieron

12 Específicamente en el castillo Wartenstein, ex propiedad de la Wenner-Gren Foundation.

13 En los comentarios sumarios sobre la conferencia, Fahim y Helmer comentan que para diversos participantes, advierten que este concepto podría constituir *un peligro potencial para la unidad epistemológica de la disciplina* (Fahim y Helmer 1982:xxx).

diversas temáticas, como: la propia pertinencia de la conceptualización y uso de *indigenous anthropology*, las ventajas y desventajas de esta práctica, la cuestión sobre identidad y aspectos éticos, para finalmente llegar a una serie de nociones y propuestas. Muchas de éstas apuntan para una *internacionalización* de la disciplina. Fahim y Helmer (1982:xxviii-xxx) resumen las cuestiones levantadas por los participantes en tres propuestas, relativamente congruentes con los propios objetivos del encuentro:

- El reconocimiento de barreras para el intercambio y la cooperación entre antropologías del tercer mundo, que estimularon la formulación de estrategias para superarlas. Entre ellas se hace referencia a la posibilidad de publicar informes-reportes nacionales de las *antropologías alrededor del mundo*, a partir de un carácter crítico, que podrían circular entre los diferentes países.
- La posibilidad de participar y realizar, a partir de una base de reciprocidad y equidad, proyectos de investigación en conjunto, entre científicos sociales del occidente y del resto del mundo. Lo cual podría incluir no sólo a docentes y profesionales, sino también a estudiantes.
- Poder establecer y mantener una serie de conferencias, encuentros y/o seminarios con problemáticas específicas, y tal vez, orientadas a regiones específicas. Realizables, de preferencia, en países no occidentales.

La importancia de este encuentro radica en que hace, de una forma conjunta y crítica, un revisionismo de las posibles configuraciones de poder tanto en las prácticas como en la constitución del saber antropológico en los diferentes países, marcando y delineando las posibles diferencias entre antropólogos/as occidentales y el resto del mundo, entre lo externo y lo local, problematizando la importancia de un compromiso local por parte de profesionales extranjeros y nacionales. Pero, y al mismo tiempo, este seminario procuró ver e imaginar horizontes que combatan tales dificultades, incluso, marcando líneas para una agenda. Estas cuestiones, son retomadas claramente, como veremos, en la propuesta de antropologías mundiales.

Se puede apreciar, por lo tanto, que la internacionalización de la disciplina hace referencia a considerar que existen diversas antropologías, siendo por lo cual importante reflexionar y entablar diálogos entre ellas – una forma inicial de establecer una comunidad de dialogo-reconocimiento. Cuestión que fue colocada

y levantada, principalmente, a través de diferentes encuentros-congresos internacionales.

El pasado presente de la crítica colonial

European attitudes to the outside world in the imperial age had – and still have – a great influence on the thinking of many European scholars in various fields of knowledge... It is hard to see how a European anthropologist can escape being influenced by ideas in his own society, and to insist that he can avoid this influence would be to minimize the importance of socialization emphasized by anthropology as a discipline

Abdel Ahmed (1973: 261, 264).

La re-avaluación de la antropología no se puede separar de la re-avaluación del lugar de Occidente en la historia y en el mundo.

Gérard Leclerc (1973:172).

El estudio crítico del colonialismo trajo consigo, tal como en el caso anteriormente observado sobre la internacionalización de la disciplina, el desarrollo de seminarios y encuentros que terminaron en publicaciones consagradas. Entre estas, cabe destacar el volumen organizado por Talad Asad, *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (1973).¹⁴ Debido al largo y denso recorrido de los diferentes trabajos de dicho libro, que transitan entre la cuestión de la antropología y el colonialismo, levantaré sólo algunas referencias que me permitan ejemplificar la importancia de dicho enlace, resguardando, que aquí yace otro punto de partida para algunas de las cuestiones retomadas como centrales por el proyecto de antropologías mundiales.

Uno de los mayores aportes reflexivos para la antropología que trajo el revisionismo crítico del pasado y del presente (que suele acentuar un *pos*), por parte de los estudios sobre antropología y colonialismo, dice respecto a la posibilidad de hacer visible la inserción de la *práctica* y del *pensamiento* antropológico en un marco más amplio, referido a la sociedad que los engloba, mostrando con ello las diferentes configuraciones de poder y de intereses que pueden estar envueltos, pautando el horizonte de estas

14 Fruto de un Seminario realizado en la Universidad de Hull en 1972, universidad que también diera el apoyo para la publicación (Asad 1973:19).

prácticas y de este pensar. Fue en ese sentido que Asad apuntó que *la estructura de poder colonial tornó el objeto de estudio antropológico accesible y seguro* (1973:17)¹⁵. Hubo, entonces, una serie de debates en torno a cuestiones éticas, metodológicas, teóricas, y consecuentemente, epistemológicas en la antropología, levantando, o al menos, cimentando, cuestiones todavía más amplias, relativas a la otredad-alteridad (que llevó a preguntarse sobre la cuestión del sujeto de estudio), la localización del conocimiento, entre otros aspectos. En cierta forma, se podría pensar, que estos debates prepararon la crítica pos-moderna en la antropología. Sin duda, este marco revisionista fue nortado por los diferentes acontecimientos relativos a la experiencia colonial, principalmente de las antropologías francesas e inglesas, que tuvieron que lidiar con las independencias pos Segunda Guerra Mundial de las ex colonias esparcidas en diferentes continentes¹⁶. Al respecto Talal Asad apunta:

... since the Second World War, fundamental changes have occurred in the world which social anthropology *inhabits*, changes which have affected the object, the ideological support and the organizational base of social anthropology itself. And in noting these changes we remind ourselves that anthropology does not merely apprehend the world in which it is located, but that the world also determines how anthropology will apprehend it (1973:12; énfasis agregado).

Los estudios referidos al colonialismo (o pos-colonialismo, en su versión *actualizada*) y a la antropología, posibilitaron diferentes cuestionamientos del desarrollo de la disciplina y con ello, sobre diferentes formas de cómo esta fue realizada tanto como práctica y pensamiento. Este amplio y diversificado marco revisionista se posibilitó en parte, gracias a la propia ampliación de voces en el horizonte discursivo de la antropología, fue entonces el *otro* que comenzó a *hablar*, posicionándose críticamente frente a experien-

15 Al respecto L'Estoile, Neiburg y Sigaud apuntaron que *el trabajo de los antropólogos sólo fue posible porque tales grupos ya se encontraban en un proceso de submisión a los estados nacionales o imperios modernos, siendo objetos de políticas* (2002:9). Mientras que Ben-Ari distingue las oportunidades que el colonialismo le dio a la antropología, como lugar para hacer trabajo de campo, salarios, etc. (1999:384).

16 Sobre los procesos de independencia, encuentro pertinente la siguiente afirmación de Leclerc: *“las guerras de liberación nacional materializaron y materializan esta voluntad de dejar de ser objetos de historia para ser los sujetos de esa misma historia”* (Leclerc 1973:150).

cias, supuestos y totalizaciones, que no le decían respecto, o al menos, no de la forma en que se le eran planteadas las problemáticas. La insurgente *voz* del *otro* hizo visible también las diferentes inequidades y asimetrías existentes tanto entre antropólogos/as, antropologías de occidentes y de países del tercer mundo, como también frente a los propios grupos y sociedades estudiadas. Las *nuevas voces* ayudaran a ampliar el marco idílico de la diversidad cultural dentro de la propia disciplina. Este revisionismo trajo consigo un *espíritu* crítico de negarse a simplemente tomar como dadas las cosas, en razón *que la hegemonía de ciertos universalismos no es algo naturalmente dado* (Ribeiro 2004). Este espíritu se reveló también en la idea de transmisión y reproducción de conocimientos en la antropología. Vale la pena resaltar lo que escribió Ahmed:

... it is also true that the institutes that give the anthropologist his training are influenced by ideas current in the society to which they belong. It is these training institutes which are responsible for planting in the minds of their students a number of questionable Euro-centric assumptions as if they were accepted facts... (Ahmed 1973: 263).

Frente a este marco, además de las referencias a Europa, vis-à-vis sus relaciones con las ex-colonias, debemos incluir también los *imperialismos*, en sus diferentes momentos, donde Estados Unidos jugó y juega un rol importante al respecto de las mismas consideraciones acusadas sobre la producción del conocimiento. No deberíamos dejar de considerar también una aguda atención a la propia geopolítica de la configuración de las antropologías así llamadas de hegemónicas (Inglaterra, Francia y EEUU), pues estas se encuentran y se han encontrado, en diferentes formas, en luchas de legitimación entre sí. Asimismo cabe notar grandes diferencias de contextos de vivenciar tanto esta crítica, como esta *colonialidad*, a lo largo y ancho de los continentes, pues lo que parecía como un discurso crítico levemente localizado por experiencias históricas particulares, se tradujo y convirtió en el pie de guerra discursiva, o al menos, de crítica, para otras voces de otras antropologías, inclusive, desde países como EEUU, Inglaterra y Francia.

Los contenidos que aquí presenté sobre colonialismo y antropología reaparecen en los planteamientos de las antropologías mundiales, que rescatan también el pluralismo y diversidad explícitas en el proyecto de descolonización (Leclerc 1973). Con lo cual, claramente, los embates del colonialismo aparecen como

una cuestión no superada – y que ha de ser superada. Pero antes que nada, se trata de que frente al colonialismo resta descolonizar, y esto contemplado en su más amplia envergadura (discursiva, simbólica, práctica, etc.). Al respecto Leclerc apunta:

(La descolonización)... adquiere todo su sentido si situamos la descolonización más allá de las apariencias inmediatas y limitadas a que estaríamos tentados a asimilar (la independencia política y económica)... La descolonización marca, por lo menos para África, y también para el tercer mundo, el acceso a la soberanía del lenguaje, en una historia a partir de entonces mundial, la substitución por un diálogo del secular monólogo narcisista de Occidente... La colonización clásica era, en muchos aspectos, la forma privilegiada de este monólogo (1973:149).

Por otro lado, Chakrabarty nos recuerda que: "... certain version of "Europe", reified and celebrated in the phenomenal world of everyday relationships of power as the scene of the birth of the modern, continues to dominate the discourse of the history. Analysis does not make it go away" (2000:28).

Considerando el juego dinámico existente en la creación, el uso y la adscripción de narrativas, en este caso, los posibles revisionismos de una crítica colonial bajo una adjetivización *pos* puede traer, a veces, en sus inserciones locales, ciertas incongruencias. Al respecto Ribeiro propone que *en América Latina el postcolonialismo sería igual a lo que él mismo condena, un discurso externo sobre el Otro que llega a través de un poder metropolitano* (2003:43). Por otro lado, De la Cadena nos recuerda que *universales en apariencia, formas occidentales de conocimiento y sus prácticas no son confinadas a Europa o a Estados Unidos – han excedido estos territorios por casi seis siglos* (De la Cadena 2004). Con esta salvaguarda hecha, la contribución de la crítica colonial, puede trascender sus orígenes locales, para a partir de nuevas lecturas, re-localizarse.

Antropologías Mundiales

Like all academic disciplines, it (anthropology) inherited a field of significance that preceded its formalization. Like many of the human sciences, it now faces dramatically new historical conditions of performance. Like any discourse, it can find new directions only if it modifies the boundaries within which it operates

Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2003:9).

Las antropologías mundiales, como proyecto, implícito en la concepción de la red de antropologías del mundo, están inmersas, de una u otra forma en *nuevas condiciones históricas* para su desempeño (op. cit. Trouillot), por los nuevos contextos sociales, económicos y políticos (Wolf 2001), enraizados por la globalización – en sus diversas condiciones (Ribeiro y Escobar 2005). En otras palabras, ha una conjunción entre las posibles narrativas discursivas, - al poder incorporar, imbuirse y relacionarse -, con los nuevos marcos contextuales en la producción de conocimiento. Pero dicha propuesta, quiere hacer visible estos marcos, a partir de una geopolítica del conocimiento (Mignolo 2001) que agudice y entrevea las diferentes configuraciones de poder. Creo, que las distintas formulaciones presentadas en el grueso de las proposiciones de las antropologías mundiales (WAN 2003, Ribeiro y Escobar 2002, Escobar y Restrepo 2004, Ribeiro y Escobar 2005) se nutren de los diferentes momentos claves, referidos tanto al continuo y largo proceso de internacionalización de la disciplina como también por el revisionismo crítico que trajo consigo los estudios coloniales. Sin duda, no se trata de una simple línea de ensamble, menos todavía, de un carácter evolutivo, pues en muchos casos, las antropologías mundiales podrían estar en discordancias con variadas cuestiones levantadas por estos *movimientos* de antecendencia. Sino que se trata más bien, de buscar ciertos *emergentes* que marcaron en parte el horizonte epistémico, en concordancia, o a la par, con el propio contexto mundial actual. A esto se le debe agregar una cuestión fundamental, hoy en día se presentan diferencias sustanciales con los contextos de la *época* de los Simposios-Encuentros Internacionales referenciados anteriormente. Esta cuestión dice al respecto, como arguyen Fahim y Helmer a que existían, por ejemplo: “... real problems like the differential quality of programs in neighboring countries, which militate against truly reciprocal academic exchange” (Fahim y Helmer 1982:xxix).

Actualmente diversas antropologías *fuera del centro* se encuentran en condiciones objetivas-materiales e institucionales, para poder participar en dicho proyecto. Es decir, se necesitaba también un *madurecimiento* de las diferentes antropologías desloçadas por el mundo, que permitiese que el anterior flujo de figuras emblemáticas se tornase ahora más bien en flujos *masivos* y constantes. Otro punto importante para aquello, fue la instauración y consagración institucional de los programas de pos-graduación, en especial, de doctoramiento, dispersos en diversos países. Estos pos-grados permitieron formar diferentes generaciones de antropólogos/as, como también aumentar los flujos internos

y externos de profesionales y estudiantes. Se posibilita entonces una estructura para fortalecer las propias demandas de equidad – más allá que enumerarlas/enunciarlas. Vale la pena mencionar que se trató de un período diferenciadamente vivenciado tanto nacional como localmente, incentivando en muchos casos, la institucionalización y consagración de centros de pos-graduación y de investigación.

Lo expuesto no significa que se haya disminuido considerablemente la brecha entre las diferentes antropologías, sino más bien, que tanto las nuevas condiciones institucionales de diferentes centros antropológicos, como el nuevo contexto social imbuido por la globalización permiten generar una demanda práctica y epistemológica por antropologías mundiales que procuren una más democrática, transnacional y heteroglósica comunidad de antropólogos/as (Ribeiro y Escobar 2005). Los nuevos contextos mediáticos-comunicativos han posibilitado nuevas formas de comunicación social, que en el caso de la propuesta actual de antropologías mundiales, jugaron y juegan un papel fundamental. Sobre todo, a partir de la fuerza indiscutible de Internet que posibilita y genera puntos-espacios-lugares de encuentro virtual a partir de *sites* y comunicación instantánea. De este modo, la *Internet* permitió y reforzó las bases materiales para la sustentación del proyecto de antropologías mundiales.

Los antecedentes recientemente planteados nos ayudan a comprender y situar las dinámicas inherentes a la propuesta de antropologías mundiales. Considero ahora oportuno entrar de lleno en estas. La propuesta se originaría a partir de una triangulación bastante interesante: el Simposio Internacional *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformation Within Systems of Power* organizado por Gustavo Lins Ribeiro y Arturo Escobar en Italia, durante Marzo del 2003 – nuevamente auspiciado por la Wenner-Gren Foundation, el libro volumen con el mismo nombre con los trabajos de dicho encuentro (organizado por los mismo autores), y los seminarios de pos-graduación dictados en Chapel Hill (por Arturo Escobar) y en Brasilia (por Gustavo Lins Ribeiro). A esto hay que agregar la relativamente reciente, - durante el 2005 -, puesta online del sitio web del colectivo World Anthropologies Network (WAN) / Red de Antropologías del Mundo (RAM): <http://www.ram-wan.net>, junto con su Revista Electrónica (Electronic Journal), como también las diversas instancias de dialogo generada por los organizadores y estimuladores originales del grupo vis-à-vis sus intereses de ampliar la comunidad de diálogo.

Tanto el libro, como el Simposio Internacional, posibilitarían explorar la diversidad de las antropologías y como el heteroglosico potencial de la globalización podría permitir a antropólogos de todo el mundo beneficiarse de esta diversidad (Ribeiro y Escobar 2002, 2005). Más específicamente, las metas vislumbraadas para el simposio, por parte de sus organizadores, eran las siguientes:

a) to examine critically the international dissemination of anthropology – as a changing set of Western discourses and practices – within and across national power fields, and the processes through which this dissemination takes places; and b) to contribute to the development of a plural landscape of world anthropologies that is both less shaped by metropolitan hegemonies and more open to the heteroglossic potential of unfolding globalization processes (Ribeiro y Escobar 2002).

Decidí escoger, antes que contar o resumir, citar a continuación la propia presentación del colectivo, Red de Antropologías en el Mundo (RAM), que en un modo resumido, se encuentra disponible, en varios idiomas, en su página web:

Necesariamente multilingüe, multilocalizada y organizada tanto virtualmente como en eventos e intervenciones concretas, imaginamos la RAM como un entramado de discusión e intervención sobre las heterogeneidades de las antropologías mundialmente y las geopolíticas de conocimiento implicadas en su producción.

La RAM se propone contribuir a transformar las actuales condiciones y circuitos de conversabilidad entre los antropólogos /as en el mundo reconociendo la pluralidad de posiciones y las relaciones de poder que subyacen a las diversas locaciones. No es una celebración del multiculturalismo al interior de la antropología, no es el ‘descubrimiento’ de la diferencia al interior de la antropología. Antes bien, es la problematización de los mecanismos sobre los que se normalizan y naturalizan ciertas modalidades y tradiciones antropológicas desempoderando otras antropologías y antropologías de otro modo.

Así mismo, en una publicación conjunta del colectivo, se destaca:

We propose to facilitate the creation of a flexible

structure, a network, to foster dialogues and exchanges among a number of anthropologies broadly understood... We think of this processual method-objective as *en-redarse* – a permanent act of connecting and thus articulating the network that constantly re-generates it and nourishes the forms of knowledge and politics interlocked and/or produced through it (WAN 2003: 268 y 269)

Quiero resaltar también que en esta misma publicación se discute, o al menos, se plantea el asunto del entrenamiento de estudiantes y de como practicar antropología como parte de los intereses de la red (op. cit.).

Desraizando el pasado del presente

The network should contribute to a plural landscape of world anthropologies less shaped by metropolitan hegemonies and opened to the heteroglossic potential of unfolding globalization process

WAN Collective (2003:265).

Una vez aquí expuestos, en parte, el proyecto de antropologías mundiales y la Red de Antropologías en el Mundo, puedo hacer una relación con las propuestas anteriores de los encuentros ya sea de internacionalización o crítica colonial, como por ejemplo, con el Simposio *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. Recordando que las propuestas finales del encuentro, fueron englobadas en tres cuestiones (Fahim y Helmer 1982), la primera hace concordancia con las de las antropologías mundiales, en la medida que acusaba las asimetrías en la producción del conocimiento. Al mismo tiempo, proponía formas y medios de hacer circular tanto informaciones como reflexiones sobre las diversas antropologías, cuestión que hoy en día se propone claramente a ser tratada por la RAM (La Revista Electrónica) y por el propio Simposio efectuado. El segundo punto hace referencia a los flujos e intercambios de estas antropologías, por una parte, remitida en la actual circulación mundial de estudiantes, profesionales y/o académicos, por otra, esta idea ya se encuentra en parte imbuida en la propia idea de red, así como se hace explícitamente referencia a dichas temáticas en los textos del conglomerado (WAN 2003). Por último, sobre la cuestión de la organización de encuentros regionales o congresos que reflexionen sobre las particularidades de la diversificación de antropologías, esto se llevó a cabo a partir del propio Simposio de Antropologías Mundiales – y en cierta

forma a partir de los seminarios, antes referenciados, de Chapel Hill y Brasilia. Otra concordancia aparece entre el simposio de 1978 y 2003, esta vez, en relación a los propios objetivos iniciales. Al mismo tiempo, las diferentes problemáticas levantadas, así como parte del uso conceptual parecen compartir bastante con los estudios coloniales. De esta forma, hago notar entonces este enlazamiento entre el proyecto de internacionalización de la disciplina y los estudios de crítica colonial, que se entrelazan, de una forma particular y actualizada por las nuevas condiciones globales y por los nuevos contextos locales, en las antropologías mundiales.

La propuesta de antropología mundiales, al llevarnos a pensar sobre sí misma, sobre la propia antropología, se asemeja también a lo que para muchos fue una antropología reflexiva y crítica en Latinoamérica en los 60's¹⁷, pero se diferencia radicalmente de dicho momento, en la medida que prima una unión por la diversidad-diferencia-identidad, y no por una, que se centraba, mas bien, en la búsqueda de una unidad e identidad común. En todo caso, tanto el primer, como este nuevo intento, pueden considerarse inseridos en un marco político, pues se trataba y se trata, antes que nada de proyectos, de posibilidades de futuro.

Cabe problematizar también que si bien parece pertinente conjugar naciones a nivel mundial, resulta irónico no tomar en cuenta que la localización de las antropologías presupone más que fronteras nacionales. ¿Se trata acaso de centros fuera del centro dialogando entre sí para demandar un espacio? ¿Se trata de nuevas formas de luchas de legitimación entre las otras ya consagradas nuevas voces? Mi preocupación radica también no sólo en la contestación de configuraciones de poder a nivel disciplinario a partir del eje de centros-polos-metrópolis hegemónicas tradicionales, sino también con todo centro relativamente nuevo, *de afuera*, que se juzgue hegemónico, o en vía de serlo, frente a otros centros. Realmente, espero que no caigamos, tras la premisa del heteroglosismo frente a luchas, batallas de poder, que trasciendan las memorias de las antropologías nacionales en busca de una legitimación fundacional, y todavía, en perspectiva comparativa frente a otras. Es en dicho momento-situación, que números en orientaciones cuantitativas y cualitativas parecen, en algunos casos, querer enriquecer y exaltar, más que describir o reflexionar sobre el decorrer de las antropologías, apagando, o no problematizando, en muchos casos, la propia diversidad interna de estas *antropologías nacionales*. Los organizadores del Simposio y

17 Edgardo Garbulsky, comunicación personal.

del Libro de Antropologías Mundiales afirman que el presente esfuerzo se diferencia de proyectos de internacionalización anteriores en la medida, que no es hecho ni escrito desde un particular punto de vista nacional (Ribeiro y Escobar 2005). No obstante, en trabajos provenientes de diferentes lugares del orbe, aparecen, y reaparecen diferentes *versiones nacionales*, que pueden, consecuentemente remitir lo local a lo nacional. Parece, que en algunos de ellos, se trata, - y digo en parte, no que sea como un argumento central de todos los trabajos -, que estas experiencias de antropologías busquen un lugar en la historia, en una ahora historia de la internacionalización. ¿Que quiere decir esto? Que se pueda llegar a relaciones jerárquicas como de *semi-periferia*, cuando justamente se está queriendo combatir distinciones que centren su carácter ontológico a base de principios *centro-periferia*. Siendo que hay bastante por cuestionarse y preguntarse que es de *una* antropología, toda vez que en los diferentes revisionismos históricos sobre las diversas antropologías, se asoma con fuerza una unidad que parece bastante más fragmentaria, presentando diferenciaciones internas dentro del mismo cuadro de inequidades y en las diferentes configuraciones de poder dentro de los propios marcos nacionales (Díaz 2005). Rechazo entonces dicha posibilidad, la de una legitimidad fundacional, si se trata para buscar reivindicarse y pedir un pedazo de la torta de la hegemonía frente y entre otras antropologías. La acepto, si me parece que a través de una lectura crítica historiográfica y de memoria tratamos de entender los propios caminos de las diferentes antropologías, preservando uno de los supuestos *boasiano*, en busca de la diversidad y relatividad cultural en la propia experiencia antropológica – como disciplina que ha conjugado de diversas formas su pensar y su praxis. Nuevamente, la antropología es localizada, y es a través de su localización que podemos buscar lo tras-local, lo común, lo diferente, entre otros elementos. Por otro lado, complementario a esto último, las antropologías mundiales o las antropologías en el mundo (RAM) se proponen, claramente, no sólo a combatir lo recientemente señalado, sino también la problemática colocada visible y metafóricamente por Gerholm y Hannerz: “It seems that the map of the discipline shows a prosperous mainland of British, American, and French anthropologies, and outside it an archipelago of large and small islands – some of them connected to the mainland by sturdy bridges or frequent ferry traffic, others rather isolated” (1982: 6).

Resta esperar que la utopía del encuentro con el otro, dentro de la propia antropología, no desemboque en el resalte de la clásica dicotomía de que todo proceso al ser incluyente es a su

vez excluyente, sobretodo en la medida que esta última condición difícilmente puede preverse en relación a su envergadura – en una posible acentuación de las diferencias entre las *periferias*.

The power imbalance between the center and the periphery is such that only those who are familiar with major academic traditions at the center (usually those people who have studied there) can manage these demands (Kuwayama 2004:53)

El Cruce de Alteridades

Articulados por una vocación de irradiar razón, que junto con la moderna geopolítica del conocimiento establecieron un centro (el norte atlántico) y lo sobrepasaron, constituyendo por tanto formaciones académicas (intelectuales) regionales con sus centros (donde las instituciones de la razón se acuñaron) y periferias, donde la lógica racional tuvo una presencia más débil. Estas formaciones regionales constituyen una compleja configuración de múltiples y jerárquicamente organizados centros, algunos de estos son “periféricos” en relación a otros “más centrales”

Marisol de la Cadena (2006:202).

Podemos considerar entonces, la propuesta de antropologías mundiales como parte del juego de las alteridades mínimas, que esta vez, yuxtapuestas, nos afirman que la diversidad siempre buscada y deseada se puede encontrar también en si misma / nosotros-as mismos-as. Esta reflexión necesaria, aquí propuesta, en un borde epistemológico de las antropologías mundiales, nos obliga rever los campos del saber-pensar como los de la práctica antropológica. En el fondo, encarar este proyecto de antropologías mundiales, y seguir un camino posible referido a éste, es antes que nada una posibilidad de centrarse en otro juego de alteridades de la propia diversidad antropológica. De este modo, esta propuesta de antropologías mundiales me recuerda el impacto del proyecto *boasiano*, al considerar el *relativismo cultural*, - o si bien, si se prefiere, como también fue llamado, *particularismo histórico* -, pero ahora, para dentro de si mismo, para, en algo que parecería natural si encaramos la antropología como una práctica cultural, ver y rever la diversidad entre las diferentes antropologías.

Otra relevancia en relación al papel de la enseñanza y transmisión de conocimientos que pueden jugar las antropologías mundiales es que, tomando a modo de ejemplo el presente

trabajo, éstas nos obliguen a re-ver y re-pensar diferentes cuestiones y problemáticas de la experiencia antropológica en diversos momentos y lugares. En este sentido, me parece oportuno resaltar algo que si bien se encuentra en la propuesta de las antropologías mundiales, ya se vislumbraba en el mencionado *Symposio de Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*: "...this would promote a corrective, international dimension within the educational process, prevent the perpetuation of negative, prejudicial attitudes, and encourage new perspectives" (Fahim y Helmer 1982:xxix).

Ahora bien, cabe tener en cuenta como un marco histórico interpretativo, que: "Anthropology is a Western Cosmopolitics that consolidated itself as a formal academic discipline in the 20th century within a growing Western university system that expanded throughout the world" (Ribeiro 2004:3).

Con lo cual, cabe pensar el sentido local de estas antropologías hoy en día, que comparten un pasado ideológico institucional que no les dice respecto, mas al mismo, tiempo, que adquirió y se dio en diferentes formas, en distintos sentidos locales para establecer diferentes dinámicas y experiencias (Peirano 1991), siendo que el Estado, en su más amplia concepción, juega un rol importante que influye e influye en esto (Peirano 1991, L'Estoile, Neiburg y Sigaud 2002). En ese sentido, la antropología tuvo y tiene, necesariamente, un carácter local. Aparentemente ahí radica nuestro desafío, de poder enraizar nuestra reflexión local con otras, en un interesante dinamismo que las antropologías mundiales nos permiten pensar, y que se nos es facilitado por la Red de Antropologías del Mundo. En cierta forma, se nos aparece, como nada más natural que observar y apreciar a la propia antropología y sus antropologías en un horizonte mundial imbricado de interrelaciones, tanto en el *pasado* como en la *actualidad*. Nuevamente ha ahí una oportunidad que nos remite a marcos comparativos por tras de la diferencia y la semejanza, en los contrastes de la alteridad y los marcos prepositivos de la antropología, antes que nada, como práctica sociocultural.

Por último, a pesar que las diferentes antropologías han pasado por diversas crisis y proyectos comunes a lo largo de su devenir, estas, sin discriminar entre las diferentes inserciones en las configuraciones de poder que puedan tener, han buscado legitimación en diversas formas y sentidos. Creo interesante pensar que las diferentes des-contrucciones y construcciones sobre ellas no se encuentran aquí. . . sino, tal vez, irónicamente, lejos, pues la utopía del encuentro con el otro para reverse, parece, más que

nunca, tan presente que ofusca la dinámica entre el texto y todo lo que hay antes de llegar a él.

Comentarios-Reflexiones (Circunstancialmente) Finales

Antropologías mundiales parecen ser, a mi entender, la oportunidad semántica, etimológica de la propuesta de una conceptualización enraizada con un especial marco epistemológico. Al mismo tiempo, la Red de Antropologías en el Mundo, parece ser la posibilidad *práctica* de concretar aquello, presentando con inigualable fuerza, una dinámica creadora que puede entonces, por un lado *configurar la posibilidad de una diversidad epistémica como proyecto universal* bajo la conceptualización de antropologías mundiales, y, por otro, *combatir la ignorancia de la diversidad y complejidad de la producción internacional de la antropología* a partir, entre otros aspectos, del devenir del rol de la Red de Antropologías en el Mundo (Ribeiro y Escobar 2005). Destaco también que la polisemia de los contenidos de la propuesta de antropologías mundiales, son de tanta diversidad que quedan aún muchos aspectos a ser discutidos y analizados, tarea, que debe incluir una verdadera heteroglosia, ahora, con respecto no sólo a las reflexiones sobre ésta sino también de sus propios participantes.

Al final de cuentas, el proyecto de las antropologías mundiales, como un todo, en sus amplios contenidos y propuestas, incluso las de acción, me recuerda la idea de Boas sobre los grupos sociales en contacto, donde ocurrirían procesos de *gradual diferenciación*, y de *nivelación de las diferencias* (2004:45). Esto último parece encontrarse a lo largo y ancho de la propuesta de antropologías mundiales. Con esto, encierro el presente texto, restando poder observar el propio decorrer del proyecto-propuesta de antropologías mundiales vis-à-vis a una red de antropología en el mundo, resaltando que mi opción frente a las antropologías mundiales, es crítica, pero afirmativa y participativa.

Por último, al respecto de los límites reflexivos de una antropología de la antropología, no cabe duda que esta posibilidad sólo puede ser imaginada en la medida que entendemos que no existe ni una sola lectura antropológica, ni una sola antropología. Al aceptar la condición de una antropología de una antropología, no hemos simplemente minimizado nuestro *otro*, nuestra alteridad¹⁸, sino que nos sometemos a nuestras propias subjetividades.

18 Tal vez en un intento único de aproximarnos a la *coevalness* que propone Fabian (2003).

Referencias citadas

- Ahmed, Abdel. 1973. "Some Remarks from the Third World on Anthropology and Colonialism". En: Talad Asad (ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.
- Asad, Talal. 1973. "Introduction". En: Talad Asad (ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. pp. 1-19. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2003. *Imagined Communities*. Londres: Verso.
- Ben-Ari, Eyal. 1999. "Colonialism, anthropology and the politics of professionalization". En: Jan van Bremer y Akitoshi Shimizu (eds.), *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*. pp. 382-409. Hong Kong: Curzon.
- Berdichevsky, Bernardo. 1980. Situación y problemática de la antropología en Chile. *América Indígena*. 40 (2): 309-327.
- Boas, Franz. 2004. *Antropologia Cultural*. Rio de Janeiro: Editorial Jorge Zahar.
- Caldeira, Teresa. 2000. *Cidade e Muros. Crime, Segregação e Cidadania em São Paulo*. Editora 34-Edusp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto. 2003. *O Pensamento Antropológico*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.
- _____. 1998. *O Trabalho do Antropólogo*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp-Paralelo 15.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2002. *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- De la Cadena, Marisol. 2006. "The production of Other knowledges and its tensions. From Andeanist anthropology to interculturalidad?" In: ". En: Gustavo Lins Ribeiro y Arturo Escobar (eds.), *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformation Within System of Power*. pp. 201-224. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Díaz Crovetto, Gonzalo. 2007. *Entre Encuentros y Desencuentros. Reflexiones para una Antropología de las Antropologías*. Actas del

V Congreso Chileno de Antropología del 2005, Santiago de Chile.

Fabian, Johannes. 2003. *Time and the other*. Columbia University Press.

Fahim, Hussein y Katherine Helmer. 1982. "Themes and Counterthemes: the Burg Wartenstein Symposium". En: Hussein Fahim (ed.), *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. pp. xi-xxxiii. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1969. *Las palabras y las cosas. Una arqueología de las ciencias humanas*. México: Siglo XXI.

Gerholm, Tomas y Ulf Hannerz. 1982. Introduction: the Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47 (1): 1-35.

Harvey, David. 2002. *Condição Pós-Moderna*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

Kuwayama, Takami. 2004. *Native Anthropology*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

L'Estoile, Benoit de, Neiburg, Frederico y Lygia Sigaud. 2002. "Antropologia, impérios e estados nacionais: uma abordagem comparativa". En: *Antropologia, Impérios e Estados Nacionais*. Rio Janeiro: Relume Dumarã.

Leclerc, Gérard. 1973. *Crítica da antropologia*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa.

Mignolo, Walter. 2001. "Introducción". En: Walter Mignolo (ed.) *Capitalismo y geopolítica del conocimiento: El eurocentrismo y la filosofía de la liberación en el debate intelectual contemporáneo*. pp. 9-53. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.

Peirano, Mariza. 1991. The anthropology of anthropology. The Brazilian Case. *Série Antropologia* N 110, Universidade de Brasília, Brasil.

_____. 1999. "Antropologia no Brasil (Alteridade Contextualizada)". En: Sérgio Miceli (ed.), *Que ler nas ciências sócias 1970-1995. Vol. I Antropologia*. pp. 225-266. , São Paulo: Editora Sumaré.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins y Arturo Escobar. 2002. "World

Anthropologies: Organizers Statement”. Proposta del Simpósio Internacional de la Fundación Wenner-Gren, World Anthropologies: Transformations within System of Power.

_____. 2005. “Introduction”. En: Gustavo Lins Ribeiro y Arturo Escobar (eds.), *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformation Within System of Power*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 2004. “World Anthropologies: Cosmopolitics, Power and Theory in Anthropology”. Conferencia magistral en el coloquio internacional “¿A dónde va la antropología?”, 23 de septiembre del 2004, en la UAM-Iztapalapa, con motivo del Trigésimo Aniversario de la Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.

_____. 2003. *Postimperialismo: cultura y política en el mundo contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Gedisa.

Restrepo, Eduardo y Arturo Escobar. 2004. *Antropologías en el mundo*. Jangwa Pana (3):110-131. Programa de Antropología, Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta.

Said, Edward. 2003. *Orientalismo*. Barcelona: Delbolsillo.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2003. *Global Transformations. Anthropology and the Modern World*. Palgrave Macmillan.

WAN Collective. 2003. A conversation about a World Anthropologies Network. *Social Anthropology* 11 (2):265-269.

Vidyarthi, L.P. 1979. *Tendencies in World Anthropology*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Wolf, Eric. 2003. *Anthropology among the Powers. Pathways of Power. Building an Anthropology of the Modern World*. pp. 63-80. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fuentes Virtuales

<http://www.ram-wan.net/index.html>

Report from the WCAA meeting in SA

STEREOTYPES AND THE CHANGING IMAGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN BRAZIL

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro¹

This workshop² was organized under the assumption that anthropology is going through a problem with its “public image.” I believe that, to a lesser or greater degree, anthropology has often had a problem with its public image. Our research subjects and the anthropological perspective commonly destabilize the naturalization of the social worlds where anthropologists live. Therefore, I think the “public image” of anthropology needs to be seen as a contentious issue, one that is located within a realm of conflictive representations on academic work, its impacts and functions. On the one hand, anthropologists try to impart certain attributes to their image since the opinions people they study, state, intellectual and political elites have of anthropology may impact anthropological research and practices as well as the academic reproduction of the discipline. Here the role of associations and academic leaders is primordial. On the other hand, other people surely have their perception of what anthropology is all about and I suspect that the discipline is still caught in what Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1991) has called the “savage slot.”

Whatever it may be, anthropologists and anthropologies are more often than not associated with exoticism, especially by the media, the great contemporary opinion maker. Exoticism, a rather exotic creature in itself, is a master discourse that creates stereotypes and taxonomies about others. Its role is quickly changing in a globalized world dominated by multicultural and identity politics. This change, I believe, is a motor underneath the

1 University of Brasília/WCAA.

2 Workshop “The Public Image of Anthropology”. “Transcending Post-colonial Conditions”, joint congress of Anthropology Southern Africa, Pan African Anthropological Association and International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Cape Town, South Africa, December 4-7, 2006.

transformations of the public image of anthropology worldwide, more so in academic environments with a strong presence of disciplines or theoretical orientations, such as cultural studies and postcolonialism, that struggle with anthropology to control the meaning of "culture" in social, political and economic life. All of what I said before varies, of course, according to the contexts where anthropology is practiced. For instance, the sense of crisis that has become rather common among practitioners located in metropolitan centers is not found elsewhere. It certainly is not found in Brazil.

Brazilian anthropology is often seen by anthropologists of other nationalities as an example of an anthropology that has a positive public image given its involvement with relevant political issues in the country. There are always good reasons for a set of practices to be associated with positive or negative public images. Such reasons relate to sociological and historical processes that include the making of state apparatuses as well as nation-building. In our case, we also need to include the proactive role of the academic and political leadership of Brazilian anthropologists in the past fifty years, since the founding of the Brazilian Association of Anthropology in 1955. But it is equally important to consider the broader scenario in which Brazilian anthropologists are immersed. The prevailing social representations, ideologies and utopias on Brazil are deeply traversed by a major discursive matrix I call tropicalism (Ribeiro, 2004). The efficacy of tropicalism is felt both by Brazilians and foreigners and impinges upon an entity called "Brazilian identity." Tropicalism is to "Brazil" as Orientalism (Said, 1994) is to the "Orient." In short, it is a mirror, historically constructed by foreigners and Brazilians, about a paradisiacal land that is never cold, where people are sensual, always happy and future oriented. Legend goes that such a place is also the fortunate result of a mix of three races, Whites, Indians and Africans (Da Matta, 1982). While this universe is more complicated than what my drastic summary suggests -- for instance, in a world dominated by the ideology/utopia of development we need to mention the many representations about social injustice and poverty -- it is a universe both the Brazilian "public opinion" and anthropologists share to a lesser or greater extent.

Although there is a growing number of Brazilian anthropologists who do their fieldwork abroad, especially in Africa and in Latin America, most anthropologists in Brazil do research on a vast array of subjects that pertain to the fabrics of the social life of the Brazilian nation-state. I will not make justice here to the diversity and complexity of the Brazilian anthropological

production and the public issues it addresses. However, there are two main issues that inform what most Brazilians think about anthropology. Both are related to the myth of racial democracy, the hegemonic interethnic ideology in Brazil and a major force underneath tropicalism. They are the Indian and African issues. These political issues regard the role that Indians and Afro-descendants had in the past and currently have in processes of nation-building.

To be true, the prevailing stereotype is that anthropologists are specialists on Indians, in spite of the fact that colleagues who study native populations are themselves a minority within the Brazilian anthropological milieu. This “expert knowledge” gives them a lot of visibility and has been a major source of the authority of the Brazilian Anthropological Association, for instance. To understand the dominant facet of the “public image” of the Brazilian anthropology, we need to consider that although Indians are a tiny minority and the most vulnerable people in Brazil, they are seen as one of the three main contributors, together with “Whites” and “Africans”, to the making of the Brazilian nation and culture. Alcida Ramos (1998) used the term “indigenism” to describe the ideological and political constructions surrounding native groups in Brazil and their role in nation-building. Indians are also seen as a problem. They are portrayed, especially in the Amazon, as owners of huge tracts of land that hinder the development of the country. When Indian lands are located in border areas they are usually seen as a “national security problem.” Therefore, to be able to count on “specialists” on Indians is an asset the state and the media can use whenever they deem necessary. Anthropologists are good to explain why Brazilians are the way they are. They are also good to explain why the Indians, the “internal Brazilian other” (Peirano, 1999), behave the way they do.

The relationships between so called “Whites” and “Afro-Brazilians” comprise the second issue, a rather visible one in the past few years given the fact that “affirmative action” has become a political ideology of the Brazilian black movement. Anthropologists got engaged in this ongoing political struggle with two different positions (see Ribeiro, 2006). On the one hand, there are those who view the introduction of quotas for Afro-descendants in the Brazilian university system as an import from the U.S. that will generate new types of racial conflicts. They do not deny the existence of racism in Brazil but fear that the engendering of state regulations may harden the ethnic frontier between “Blacks and Whites” with unexpected effects

in a country largely made up by mestizos. On the other hand, there are those who think that affirmative action is a mechanism that will help to diminish the huge inequalities between “Whites” and “Afro-Brazilians”. They argue that the current vulnerability of Afro-descendants is a result of the historical inaction of the Brazilian state and that only “focused policies” can remediate the existing social injustices.

These conflictive positions have often been vehiculated in the media, in newspapers, on the radio and TV, in major news shows that reach a wide audience. Anthropologists who are leading figures of these opposing camps organized lists signed by well-known scholars, artists, politicians and intellectuals to lobby the National Congress. In a public audience in Congress, in August 3, 2006, these positions were confronted. The audience was broadcasted to the whole country and a report was shown in Brazil’s most important news program with an estimated audience of 40 million people.

The idea of a new form of “cultural imperialism” aimed at destroying a supposedly racially blind Brazilian society has prompted hot debates within and outside Brazil. Foreign social scientists, such as Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant (2002), for instance, used the Brazilian example to argue that North-American ideologies were being disseminated according to the interests of the Empire, with the help of foundations and other forms of aid. Michael Hanchard (2002), a North-American anthropologist who joined the debate, replied that Bourdieu and Wacquant were unaware of the Black Movement’s transnational character.

Apparently, the idea that racial relations are different in Brazil is a resilient notion that captures the political, sociological and anthropological imagination of Brazilian and foreign intellectuals. It is too early to assess the impact of the changing ethnic relations over Brazilian anthropology’s public image and role. It is interesting to note, though, that while the public image of anthropology remains more unified when the issues are Indian affairs, it is increasingly fractured when Afro-Brazilians enter the scene. This is no surprise. It surely reflects the fact that Indians are a small ethnic segment of the Brazilian nation, a segment that is often idealized and envisioned through the lenses of tropicalism that equate them with the flamboyant natural landscapes of Amazonia. It is no coincidence that the closer an Indian group is located to “White” settlements the more they are the object of prejudice and violence. The picture radically changes when we

consider the participation of the Black population in the nation. Afro-descendants are part of daily life interactions in Brazil. They are the most common target of Brazilian racism, a subject that is always difficult in a country dominated by the myth of racial democracy.

Besides the changing positions of Blacks and Indians in the Brazilian imagined national community, there are other forces that may impact Brazilian anthropology as well. They revolve around the entry of anthropologists and of the Brazilian Anthropological Association in different power fields. I will make brief comments on such forces and trends.

The Brazilian Association of Anthropology (ABA) is a major player regarding the public image of anthropology in that country. It has often been invited to express the point of view of anthropologists about different issues, especially ethnic ones, in several political and media forums. For instance, in the years before the 1988 Constitution, the Association played a critical role in elaborating constitutional precepts that guide the relationships between indigenous peoples and the Brazilian nation-state. In fact, the Brazilian state has had long-standing relationships with Brazilian anthropologists, either via ABA or by making use of their expertise in such state apparatuses as the National Indian Foundation, the Attorney General's office and, more recently, the department of former run-away slave lands, Quilombos, of the Land Reform Ministry.

The preferred self-image of Brazilian anthropologists is one of professionals who struggle for human rights and defend minorities. But with the routinization of the relationships between anthropology and institutions of power, demands on anthropologists also increased and diversified, creating new situations. Brazilian anthropologists are used to writing reports that are central pieces in processes of demarcation of Indian lands or in conflicts involving ethnic territories. These reports have been usually demanded by governmental agencies or judges. But there are recent cases in which anthropologists have worked defending farmers' interests against Indian rights. It is hard to say whether this is the beginning of a process that will bring new tensions and conflicts for the Brazilian anthropological community. This is surely related to other important sources of differentiation such as the increase in numbers of graduates in anthropology alongside with the dearth of academic jobs.

At this point, we can state that the public image of Brazilian anthropologists is split into at least two halves. The more tradi-

tional one relates to the image of the university professor and public intellectual, a rather important persona in the Brazilian public space. The other one relates to the image of a professional engaged in sociocultural, environmental, ethnic and land conflicts as an expert who writes reports in his or her capacity as a state official, a member of a NGO or a private consultant.

How will the image of Brazilian anthropologists change? A stronger presence of the Black and Indian movements struggling for their rights in several public spheres will certainly impact the ideological matrix of tropicalism. Afro-descendants and Indians will less and less comply with the stereotypes that inform the discourses on their participation in nation-building. Since Brazilian anthropologists have for quite sometime avoided the role of brokers in ethnic conflicts and have preferred the role of allies, they will certainly deepen the political understanding that Indians and Blacks are better represented when they speak with their own voices. A possible outcome of this situation may be a further differentiation between those who act in the academic world and those who are engaged in extra-university activities. In any case, I hope that differentiation and specialization do not congeal in a retreat from the political scene. The bypassing of this situation is in the hands of the leadership of our profession in Brazil.

References cited

- Bourdieu, Pierre e Loïc Wacquant. 2002. Sobre as artimanhas da razão imperialista. *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos* 24 (1): 15-33.
- Da Matta, Roberto. 1982. *Relativizando: uma introdução à antropologia*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Hanchard, Michael. 2002. Política Transnacional Negra, Antiimperialismo e Etnocentrismo para Pierre Bourdieu e Loïc Wacquant: exemplos de interpretação equivocada. *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos* 24 (1): 63-96.
- Peirano, Mariza. 1999. "Antropologia no Brasil (alteridade contextualizada)". In: Sergio Miceli (ed.), *O que ler na ciência social brasileira (1970-1995)*. pp. 225-266. São Paulo: Editora Sumaré/Anpocs.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita. 1998. *Indigenism. Ethnic Politics in Brasil*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. 2004. "Tropicalismo y Europeísmo. Modos

de Representar al Brasil y a la Argentina”. In: Alejandro Grimson, Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Pablo Semán (eds.), *La Antropología Brasileña Contemporánea. Contribuciones para un diálogo latino americano*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.

_____. 2006. “O Mestiço no Armário e o triângulo negro no Atlântico”. In: Carlos Steil (ed.), *Cotas raciais na Universidade*. pp. 71-85. Porto Alegre: Editora da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

Said, Edward. 1994. “From Orientalism”. In: Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. pp. 132-149. New York: Columbia University Press.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1991. “Anthropology and the Savage Slot. The Poetics and Politics of Otherness”. In Richard Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology. Working in the Present*. pp. 18-44. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

FATEFUL LEGACIES AND THE BURDENS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE: UK ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE

John Gledhill¹

There are significant national differences between the public profiles of anthropology in different countries and regions of the world today. The obvious way to account for them is to apply sociological analysis to the development of the discipline in different contexts, and at the same time consider the differences between the contexts themselves. In the case of British social anthropology, much, if not all, of what we need to know to diagnose the roots of the problem has already been published. Key texts include Jonathan Spencer's incisive implementation of Edmund Leach's suggestion that: 'the sociology of the environment of social anthropologists has a bearing on the history of social anthropology', in an article published in *Annual Review of Anthropology* in 2000 (Spencer 2000: 21). David Mills has recently been exploring the history of the discipline in a whole range of incisive articles, with a major book on the way. One very accessible example that illustrates the way David makes history ask searching practical questions about the future is his *Anthropology Today* piece on the history of the two UK associations, ASA and RAI, and the implications of their continuing separation (Mills 2003). Adam Kuper's celebrated and thrice updated contribution to the intellectual and social history of 'The Modern British School' remains a rich and indispensable reference (Kuper 1996), even if Spencer's article also makes the important point that we need to continue thinking about what, if anything, makes British anthropology distinctive today. There is much more out there on the historical front, but these examples are sufficient to demonstrate the point that if we have a problem in Britain, it is not due to a lack of analysis and self-reflection.

1 Social Anthropology, School of Social Sciences. The University of Manchester.

Some of those reflections are very explicitly addressed not simply to understanding, but to action for change. Another key text in this regard is the collection *Popularizing Anthropology*, edited by Jeremy MacClancy and Chris MacDonagh (1996), which adopts a valuable comparative focus by comparing and contrasting the histories of 'public anthropology' in the UK, USA and France. The fact that the text is now ten years old but seems to have lost none of its original relevance is perhaps a little disconcerting, as is the fact that things have gone downhill somewhat in France since it was published. But the fact that we still have a problem is not because we have lost interest in the issues. Minds continue to be focused in Britain by repeated problems with the media representation of our work and vocation, and with our apparent incapacity to project our voices into public debates in which many of us would like to be present. Another concern is the sense that weak public presence is an increasing threat even to the academic reproduction of the discipline, one of WCAA's motivations for seeking to foster international debate on these issues at this time. There is, however, an obvious difference between a concern with public presence motivated by considerations of professional self-preservation and one that is motivated by a passionately felt desire to break out of the ivory tower for intellectual, moral and/or political reasons. This latter objective is very much at the heart of the important contribution made recently by one of today's panellists, Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2005). Eriksen's book not only explores why anthropology has not done as much as many of its practitioners hoped to do in terms of 'changing the world' in many countries, including Britain. He also offers many incisive practical suggestions about how to do better, with the authority of someone who undeniably *has* done better than most of us in engaging with serious public issues and taking the flack that such engagement inevitably entails. Even if Norway has offered a more favourable context than Britain for such endeavours in recent years, I doubt any British reader could work through the book and reject Adam Kuper's assessment (in his endorsement on the back cover) that Eriksen has shown that it is at least partly our own fault that our voices are so seldom heard. The question is simply whether, as Adam hopes, we can finally 'raise our game'.

All I want to do here is, firstly, to recapitulate some of the reasons for the British difficulties, and then to say something about how I think they might be overcome. In broaching the second question, I am going to try to combine a dash of realism with a considerable amount of attitude. Let me begin with the first and easier bit.

As all our historical studies show, British anthropology used to have a lot more impact, at least with a relatively educated public. Malinowski sold books and he sold himself, even the gap between promise and substance in his 'sell it with sex' strategy would have violated today's consumer protection laws. Yet as soon as social anthropology consolidated itself in the academy, it immediately turned inward, led by figures such as Evans-Pritchard, turning its nose up at the efforts at popularization that continued to be made beyond the margins of the academic establishment that so grotesquely defended its exclusiveness as a club by limiting access to the Association that I now chair. Although the Colonial Research Council provided the departments with assured funding, the fact that the anthropologists effectively controlled it made 'relevance' *less* rather than more necessary (MacClancy 1996: 14). Anthropologists were prepared to chat to academic colleagues from other disciplines, but the majority legitimated a position that made teaching the subject to undergraduates, let alone school students, inconceivable: anthropology was complex, theoretical and required mature minds. What flew in the popular market was ethnology and popular work on human evolution: to a considerable extent, a desire for simple (and preferably exotic) answers to such questions that have something to do with sex) is still a media obsession in the UK. As Jonathan Spencer points out, this culture of intellectual complexity and exclusiveness was reproduced through a key institution, the weekly seminar, which displayed striking ritual regularities across differences of departmental culture, in a context in which the intellectual life of the discipline was in practice dominated by a handful of core departments (Spencer 2000: 18–19).

One of the fateful consequences of the discipline's trajectory up to the 1970s was that it failed to benefit greatly from the post-war expansion of the university sector, even though new departments were founded in innovative new universities such as Sussex. Although anthropologists did slowly embrace the possibilities of doing research in and on the UK, even those like Gluckman who often called the subject 'sociology' and supported such developments still thought that the really important theoretical stuff lay elsewhere, and were not afraid to talk about 'primitive societies' (Mills 2005). Sociology boomed as a separate academic discipline whose tenuous links with social anthropology have tended to impede the functioning of joint departments and led to the complete extinction of quite a number. It is true that there were also certain advantages in this strategy. Anthropology was spared much of the active aggression manifest towards sociology

by neo-conservatives, even if it was deemed useless (for studying 'the pre-nuptial practices of the inhabitants of the Upper Volta', as Norman Tebbit, Margaret Thatcher's chief bull-dog, put it); it achieved a reputation for grounded intellectual rigour and sophistication that did make dialogue with anthropologists interesting to some other academics; we did carve out our own niches in the world of policy and practice; and we have always come out very well in evaluations of research quality, as benefits a small subject largely confined to elite institutions in which competition for jobs is strong, and not restricted to UK citizens, given our international academic profile. A Manchester Vice-Chancellor once described my own department as a 'jewel' in the institution's portfolio (and it has been consistently supported financially as such). But the strategy probably brought more disadvantages than advantages for those of us who want to be at the centre of the social sciences and humanities rather than on the periphery.

Whatever anthropologists actually worked on in the now post-colonial world, and it is worth remembering that issues of urbanisation and migration were already firmly on the agenda of many colonial anthropologists, this abandonment of potential fields to sociology, together with a continuing popular enthusiasm for posing issues in an evolutionary frame, not only did not help the profession transcend the 'savage slot' but kept the 'savages' firmly savage in the public imagination. These problems do not go away, despite the public impact of the sensitive ethnographic documentaries produced by Granada television in its famous *Disappearing Worlds* series, which were generally firmly contextualising in a world of change and not restricted to so-called 'tribal cultures'. Indeed, if the popularity of the ongoing BBC series *Tribe* is anything to go by, they are deepened by current genres of 'edutainment': we get to know 'tribes' by watching an ex-soldier doing boy's stuff with the natives in exotic locations and the natives do not get much chance to speak for themselves (Caplan 2005). Although *Tribe* does have its defenders as a vehicle for public anthropology (Fish and Evershed 2006), and indeed, recruiting anthropology students, as Pat Caplan points out, it is both ironic and important that TV documentaries that actually stand in a more or less unbroken line of descent from *Disappearing Worlds* are generally not seen as having anything to do with anthropology at all because their subject-matter does not fit a stereotypic view of what anthropologists do and how they do it.

Some British social anthropologists with impeccable academic credentials, notably Edmund Leach, did successfully function as

public intellectuals in what Eriksen (2005) defines as the 'slower' sectors of the electronic media of their day, particularly quality radio, and Leach also wrote for quality weeklies such as *The Listener*. Yet the fact that the latter is long defunct signals the importance of transformations of the media themselves. Leach also played an important role in fostering the efforts of the RAI to bring anthropology to a wider public marked by Jonathan Benthall's appointment as Director in 1973. These efforts remain ongoing and cumulative, despite the Institute's limited resources, and they are now transcending some of the shibboleths of the past, such as keeping the subject away from schools. Yet even a fine publication like *Anthropology Today*, unafraid of courting controversy and fostering debate, is not a newsstand item, but largely read by other anthropologists. This reflects economic realities in the market for 'slower' print media in the UK. Ernest Gellner's prominent public intellectual role reflected the fact that he had established a strong reputation as a philosopher. Furthermore, and not a little ironically, what Gellner stood for as a philosopher² was sharply opposed to the postmodernist brand of relativism to which an increasing number of British anthropologists subscribed during the last ten years of his life (Hickox and Moore 2006). So when one speaks of the decline of anthropologists as public intellectuals in Britain, it is necessary to be restrained in evaluating the impact that UK academic anthropologists ever had in the broader public sphere during the postwar period, although even today, we can perhaps point to a more mediated influence effected through our dialogues with other disciplines and practitioners of various kinds. Indeed, one of the important conclusions of this year's international benchmarking review of British anthropological research is that British anthropologists actually underestimate their impact, relative, say, to anthropologists in the USA, in this

2 Like Richard Rorty, Gellner was anti-foundationalist, but his brand of universalism could be equally uncomfortable to many anthropologists in the certainties it still embodied, despite a degree of respect for difference, about the beneficence of North Atlantic power, knowledge and moral reasoning. But as someone trained in, and frustrated by, Oxford analytical philosophy, I confess to having found Gellner (and Isaiah Berlin) profoundly congenial in other respects. Nevertheless, my generation was more likely to flee from Ryle or Wittengstein into the arms of Hegel and Marx... and thence to the early Foucault. Although Elizabeth Anscombe's willingness to stand up and be counted against war crimes was a plus, her Catholic convictions on other questions detracted from that engagement.

kind of 'knowledge transfer' and opinion shaping, and should do more to shout about it (ESRC 2006).

It is undeniable, however, that the problems that British anthropologists faced in engaging the public sphere were exacerbated by the transformations of British Higher Education from the late 1970s onwards and the impact this had on the cosy world of those who constructed the post-war subject in academia. Funding cuts, loss of exclusive disciplinary control over research funding, the merging of former polytechnics into a unified tertiary sector accompanied by unfunded expansion of student numbers and remorseless 'efficiency savings', along with many other developments carefully documented in the analyses of Jonathan Spencer and others, all transformed the institutional environment. Transformations have also continued remorselessly in areas such as publishing, in which an anthropology ill-adapted to the 'trade' market of high volume sales now finds its even academic niche markets squeezed by rising costs and shrinking sales, at least in the print sector. But the development that has most marked the transformation of the university institution in Britain is our intense and pervasive adoption of neoliberal audit culture and systems of micro-management and evaluation. At one level, anthropologists in the UK have responded to these transformations with unusual vigour: UK anthropologists have led the way globally in developing critical analyses of the logic and perverse consequences of these very systems (Shore and Wright 1999; Strathern 2000). Yet there could be no better illustration of the principle that being able to do a fine academic job on the world is not sufficient to stop it having profound effects on the very subjects formulating the critique, state-dependent proletarians as we are.

Being tight-knit and organised has enabled us to win a few skirmishes in the battle with intervention, but it has not enabled us to prevent the culture of evaluation putting 'research performance' and academic publications at a premium for individuals who have also faced rising everyday burdens of teaching and administration. Furthermore, the game changes endlessly, with the latest threat being a shift from peer review to funding and bibliographic 'metrics' in future forms of assessment, developments justified in the spurious name of 'transparency' by a government eager to reduce the cost of turning the screws of managerialism even tighter. Although we are told that communication with the public and 'research users' is of paramount importance, the latest revisions of the criteria for ranking our 'outputs' place an even greater premium on 'impact' in the academic field itself, with a

'natural science' model increasingly to the fore. Within the peer review based systems, there is at least still some scope for the reviewers to exercise judgement over what constitutes an excellent and valuable contribution to the subject. Our subject sub-panel for the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise continues to resist the imposition of crass measures of grant income accumulated and pecking orders of journals and publishers. But there is still little positive incentive for individuals to dedicate more of their time to public anthropology. Many people hardly have time for their families these days given the intensity of the pressures placed upon them by this neoliberal apparatus.

Audit culture is widely seen as promoting a general culture of professionalisation and academic self-enclosure. Nevertheless, it clearly has not spelled the complete death of the public intellectual to date, and we must look for specific explanations of anthropology's relative weakness in this regard. These are, I suggest, to be found in our early adoption of an excessively professionalised ethos, and a fear of seeing the erosion and dilution of our tradition of problematising and 'complexifying' common sense views of the world through ethnographically grounded and analytically sophisticated sceptical questioning of the apparently obvious. Because our questions now tend to depart from those that instantly fascinate the public, our answers often run against the grain of what most other 'experts' have to say about the world, and we are relatively inclined to answer a straight question by deconstructing it, we are neither media-friendly beyond exotic tales of travelling off the beaten track, nor as able, say, as historians, to tell a tale that makes immediate sense. And to make matters worse, we even turned at the end of the twentieth century to deconstructing our own knowledge claims with a frenzy that left us fragmented and often confusing, even to our own students.

I am certainly enough of a paid-up member of the guild not to want to sacrifice the critical commitment to understanding human life's complexities and contradictions that we have made our hallmark, and I agree that one of the purposes of cross-cultural analysis is to unsettle what we think we know, even if alterity can also be fetishised and exaggerated methodologically. These considerations are certainly far from purely 'academic': anthropologists often, for example, show that we need to understand particular conflict situations in non-stereotypic and more complex ways, in order to discourage interventions that will make bad situations worse. On occasion, such advice is acted upon, though seldom through a direct impact on public opinion,

as the relative lack of success of a 1990s UK initiative to bring anthropological knowledge into the centre of public understanding of so-called 'ethnic violence' in which I was involved in the early 1990s demonstrated. Nevertheless, I do agree with Eriksen that our way of thinking and focusing on talking to each other has produced an unnecessary introversion of language, and an incapacity to accept that there generally is a heart of the matter that we should not have to read to the end of every book to discover, if we ever really do.

There are things we can do about that, but they cannot be done within the world of academic publishing alone, and what it is possible to do within print media in general is variable between countries. This is not an argument against trying to find a greater voice in the established commercial media, but it does suggest that in Britain at least, great energy and coordination will be necessary to transform a situation that is not currently very encouraging. In the brave new world of blogs and web-based independent media, these constraints may be less critical to effective self-expression. Indeed blogging and emailed comments to media websites offer opportunities for anthropologists to intervene in public debates in the mainstream media that are far more extensive than the old 'letter to the editor' columns. The problem with the independent media approach is that the sheer volume of information out there makes having an impact on people who do not share your views more difficult than it might seem. If we are going to go down that road, we are going to have to do it really well and powerfully.

So now for the attitude part. As chair of the ASA, I guess that I should be mindful of the good advice implicitly offered by Jonathan Benthall, in a typically self-effacing commentary on the limits of what he felt he had been able to accomplish at the RAI through the launching of RAIN and its successor, *Anthropology Today*:

If the Institute had had as its Director a more flamboyant personality than myself, that person might have been able to attract the massive support which anthropology certainly deserves. But a temperament of that kind would probably have alienated the numerous anthropologists who expect *their* Institute ... should serve them and the discipline, rather than legitimating some cult of personality (Benthall 1996: 136).

I am certainly not anxious to follow some of the friends whose engagement I otherwise most admire, such as Nancy Scheper-

Hughes, into an occasional excess of foregrounding the self, and I am not totally antagonistic to Eriksen's asking 'what is wrong with a laugh?' in the context of Micaela di Leonardo's swingeing denunciation of some of the ways in which anthropologists still find their way into the media in the twenty-first century (Eriksen 2005: 35). But di Leonardo's critique is not focused on 'trivialisation' but on the far from trivial silences and obfuscations that some kinds of 'anthropological gambits' induce when they work with, rather than against, the grain of the power relations that structure contemporary US society (di Leonardo 1998). By all means let's have a laugh from time to time, including at ourselves. But let's make sure first that we know what's harmless entertainment and when it might be more appropriate to make humour the blacker, more ironic and often downright 'tasteless' sort that we so frequently encounter in poor and powerless people (Goldstein 2003). Entertainment may have its place in anthropology's public profile, but we must be sure we know how to handle it. As anyone who has experience of trying to deal with the contemporary media must know (and di Leonardo amply documents from her own experience), even the most streetwise can easily live to regret the day they stayed on the phone or went down to the studio. There is a fundamental difference, on the one hand, between making the discipline more 'popular' in the sense of getting more people to read or listen to professional anthropologists and, on the other hand, making anthropology make a significant difference to public culture on the kinds of issues that Eriksen wants us to engage.

The first objective has often been accomplished by work that has caused considerable angst, not only to other anthropologists but also to the people it is about, as exemplified by Turnbull's bestselling caricature of the Ik (MacClancy 1996: 43). We clearly simply cannot let ourselves offer what 'the market' might find attractive unselectively, even if we can and should do more to make anything we have to say intelligible and readable. The second involves high levels of risk. There is the risk of saying something we might live to regret in the arena of 'fast media' (Eriksen 2005: 77). I agree with Eriksen that blaming the shallowness of the contemporary media while doing nothing to resist that shallowness is not much of a position (*ibid*: 90), but resistance is not simply about trying to introduce a tad bit more complexity through slightly 'slower' channels of communication. It is about caring enough to risk saying things that are not consensual within one's academic discipline and in some cases, living with controversy that may have effects beyond abusive letters and emails.

Not everything that anthropologists might usefully have to say to their societies has that quality, of course. But if *none* of it does, this might be a cause for concern, and if we avoid those issues or try to euphemise their presentation simply to avoid risk, this is definitely a cause for concern.

At the risk of sounding too serious for words, let me quote a famous passage from Gramsci's writings that is both a diagnosis of the problems posed by the separation of the Italian intellectuals of his day from the life worlds of the masses and a defence of the 'higher knowledge' of science versus 'common sense' as a *political* necessity. In some ways Gramsci the Communist and Marxist – as distinct from the Gramsci 'lite' that sometimes figures in anthropological accounts – is shocking to some contemporary sensibilities: one reason it is shocking is that it takes the debate away from the opt-out that normative stances are a purely individual matter of conscience when it comes to changing society and asserts the responsibility of intellectuals to struggle, collectively, for hegemony:

The popular element 'feels' but does not always know or understand; the intellectual element 'knows' but does not always understand and in particular does not always feel ... the intellectual's error consists in believing that one can know without understanding and even more without feeling and being impassioned (not only for knowledge in itself but also for the object of knowledge; in other words that the intellectual can be an intellectual (and not a pure pedant) if distinct and separate from the people-nation, that is without feeling the elementary passions of the people, understanding them and therefore justifying and explaining them in the particular historical situation and connecting them dialectically to the laws of history and to a superior conception of the world, scientifically and coherently elaborated – i.e. knowledge. One cannot make politico-history without this passion, without this sentimental connection between intellectuals and people-nation (cited in Crehan 2002: 130).

Anthropologists really ought to be able to say something about how their research subjects 'feel', even if, when reading Gramsci on the southern Italian peasantry, we might conclude that his accounts of 'elementary passions' missed quite a lot about subaltern consciousness (and political rationality). Yet much of

what we have to say as intellectuals in an era in which knee-jerk cultural relativism has largely been replaced by more power-laden accounts, is based on claims to offer a 'superior conception of the world' (relative to 'native models' and a multitude of external understandings alike). Our problem is with the other side of the 'feeling' bit. Professionalisation and the container of the modern university as neoliberal knowledge-factory manned by self-regulating helots of audit culture constitute powerful machineries for the suppression of passion. They may also still be spaces for the free expression of criticism and dissent (anti-terror laws and Patriot Acts notwithstanding), but this in itself does not make an intellectual of the kind Gramsci wanted. We have to find ways of making our complicated stories not simply stories that do have a clear conclusion, but we also have to *want* to make those stories the basis for a 'superior conception of the world' that changes it.

This is not a call for anthropologists to advocate 'God-like' policies of social engineering of the kind whose drawbacks Benthall noted in his paper, nor is it as ambitious as the Gramscian call for the theoretical work needed to advance practical steps towards building the proletarian society and culture of the future. Much of what we might want to say in the public sphere is likely to be quite modest in its scope and implications. In Britain at least, a bit more opposition precisely to the kind of God-like stance adopted by Tony Blair might actually be a good place to start. Nor do we all have to work within a single normative consensus. But we do, I think, have to match the increasing normativity of other public discourses with our own, hopefully more humanistic alternatives, with greater conviction and firmness. This does mean translating the complexity we value into an unambiguous position. It may also mean putting the message before the enhancement of the public impact of the discipline of anthropology and not waiting until someone else comes up with a question that they think is relevant to anthropology. If the messages have sufficient power and relevance then they will eventually be linked back to anthropology as the source of knowledge and inspiration.

That might also be the best way of recapturing a public image of anthropology as a truly wide-ranging and universal project for the study of what it means to be human everywhere, a vision that was lost along the road to academic professionalisation and the carving out of an exclusive niche for British social anthropology in the academy. There was always an alternative, and it is not too late to revive it, in a world still blighted by ethnocentrism and the

cynicism and barbarism of North Atlantic defence of a declining global hegemony.

References cited

- Benthall, J. 1996. "Enlarging the Context of Anthropology: The Case of *Anthropology Today*". In: J. MacClancy and C. McDonaugh (eds.), *Popularizing Anthropology*. pp. 135-41. London and New York: Routledge.
- Caplan, P. 2005. In Search of the Exotic: A Discussion of the BBC2 Series *Tribe*, *Anthropology Today*. 21(2): 3-7.
- Crehan, K. 2002. *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Di Leonardo, M. 1998. *Exotics at Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. 2005. *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence*. Oxford and New York: Berg Publishers.
- ESRC. 2006. *International Benchmarking Review of UK Social Anthropology: An International Assessment of UK Social Anthropology Research*. Swindon: Economic and Social Research Council.
- Fish, A. and Evershed, S. 2006. Anthropologists Responding to Anthropological Television. *Anthropology Today*. 22(4): 22-3.
- Hickox, Mike R. and Moore. 2006. Making the Difference: the Emigrés, Relativism and the Enlightenment. *21st Century Society*. 1(1): 59-72.
- Kuper, A. 1996. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. London: Routledge.
- MacClancy, J. 1996. "Popularizing Anthropology". In: J. MacClancy and C. McDonaugh (eds.), *Popularizing Anthropology*. pp. 1-57. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mills, D. 2003. Professionalising or Popularising Anthropology? *Anthropology Today*. 19(5): 8-13.
- Mills, D. 2005. Made in Manchester? Methods and Myths in

Disciplinary History. *Social Analysis*, 49(3): 129-44.

Shore, C. 1999. Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 5(4): 557-575.

Spencer, J. 2000. British Social Anthropology: A Retrospective. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. (29): 1-24.

Strathern, M. (ed.) 2000. *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY: THE CASE OF JAPAN

Junji Koizumi¹

My paper first outlines the five stage of development of anthropology in Japan, and then it gives a brief sketch of the public image of anthropology formed in the latter half of the twentieth century. The reality of Japanese anthropology is amorphous and hard to grasp, but the public image is stereotypical one of centrifugal, useless, romantic and exotic science. The paper finally describes what I call a “practical turn” due to social and institutional changes which started a few years ago, and it concludes with my own experience of transforming the image of anthropology by building a center. My discussion is intended to be a presentation of a comparative material.

History and Five Stages of Japanese Anthropology

It will be safe to say that anthropology in Japan started as a new obscure discipline around the middle of the last century. An anthropology department started in the University of Tokyo in the 1950s, and a few more somewhat later. It is usually said that Japanese anthropology has a history of some sixty years.

But it has a very long prehistory beginning in the nineteenth century. Shinji Yamashita, writing about the history of Japanese Anthropology, divides it into five “developmental” stages: (1) 1884-1913, (2) 1913-1934, (3) 1934-1945, (4) 1945-1964, and (5) from 1964 to the present.

Yamashita follows Kazuo Terada’s view that “anthropology in Japan started in 1884 when a group of young scholars formed a workshop called “Friends of Anthropology” stimulated by a biology professor at the University of Tokyo, Edward Morse. This group was interested in the investigation of the origin of the Japanese people. The search for the origin is always nationalistic,

1 School of Human Sciences, Osaka University.

and thus the first stage of Japanese anthropology was a product of nascent nationalist consciousness.

The second stage begins in 1913, when Ryuzo Torii argued for the separation of ethnology from anthropology. This means a shift of interests from the origin to the ethnic groups surrounding Japan. Torii carried out field investigations in China, Taiwan, Korea, Eastern Siberia, Manchuria, Mongolia and so on, that is, in the region where the Japanese Empire was about to expand. His work was "Oriental ethnology" and it was "the study of the Oriental race." It was a pursuit of "neighboring colonial Others" (Yamashita) who were to be found in the process of the Imperialistic expansion.

The third stage was initiated in 1934 when Nihon Minzokugakkai, or the Japanese Society of Ethnology was established for the Western sort of comparative study of the origin and the diffusion of cultures. In this period Japanese anthropology was divided into two general orientations: ethnology and folklore. This was mainly due to the establishment of Minkandensho no kai, or "Folklore Workshop" of Kunio Yanagita in 1935. Yanagita is the figure in the Japanese folklore, who had a career as a bureaucrat and traveled extensively to remote rural areas of Japan in order to find traditional rural cultures. He collected tremendous amount of folkloric information and wrote a long series of essays and analytic articles with a very conspicuous prosing. He single-handedly created Yanagita Minzokugaku, meaning "Yanagita's folklore," and became a decisive factor in drawing a sharp line between folklore and ethnology in Japan. Folklore is inward looking and strongly associated with Japan and its culture, while folkloric studies concerning other countries were put almost entirely in the realm of "ethnology." In short, folklore is nationalist and ethnology is internationalist. It has been pointed out that this internationalist ethnology was associated with political purpose of the period. Toward the end of this third stage, Minozoku Kenkyusho (the National Institute of Ethnic Research) was established and worked for the research of minority groups in the dominated regions of the Japanese Empire.

Yamashita's fourth stage begins in 1945, the year Japan was defeated. The post-war period is again marked with a strong concern with the Japanese nation. Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* was published and brought about intellectual sensation, for it was amazing to know, it was said, that a non-Japanese knows Japanese better than themselves. The book sold well, and it still is as a classic on the Japanese culture and society.

Social scientists debated widely on Benedict's founding, and *Haji no Bunka*, or the culture of shame, became a stock phrase among the ordinary people. But it was not known that it was a piece of work in anthropology. Hardly it is.

Another factor in this fourth stage is *Kiba Minzoku Setsu*, or "the horse riding people" theory. This is a thesis of Namio Egami, who proposed that the Japanese Imperial family has its origin among the horse riding nomads of the northern Asia who later migrated to Japan and conquered it. The hypothesis is bold and appealing, and it still is a stock theory of the origin of the Japanese nation despite of its deficiencies. Anyway the focus is upon the problem of the Japanese nation. Japanese identity was at the center of the intellectual scene, and it still is. I would argue that the most conspicuous feature of Japanese culture is the fact that it is strongly concerned with the problem of what the Japanese culture is. Once again, the general public was not aware that the horse-riding-people theory was a crude form of anthropology, if it is closer to the discipline of history.

The fifth, and last, stage of the history of Japanese anthropology, according to Yamashita, begins in 1964. This is the year marking generally the end of the post-war period. The Tokyo Olympic Games were celebrated, and with this Japanese economy started to expand to overseas. Restrictions on foreign travel were lifted, and "Japanese anthropology once again focused on other cultures outside Japan." (Yamashita) In this fifth stage Japanese anthropology started to expand regardless of, and beyond, the former colony of the Empire. For some reason anthropology in Japan developed well in the late twentieth century, and JASCA, the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology, with its over two thousand members, is one of the largest anthropological associations of the world, second only to the AAA. Anthropologists from this country have been carrying out fieldwork all over, including the most remote regions of the modern world, and have accumulated a tremendous amount of ethnographic data. They and their products have been almost invisible from outside mainly due to the language barrier, but efforts have been made to change the situation.

The hybrid nature of Japanese anthropology

Thus anthropology in Japan seems to have certain relations with ethnic policies of the war period, and some anthropologists write on the political implications of its involvement. But the argument

is confined in the professional circles and the public opinion seems to be indifferent.

This means that the history before the mid twentieth century does not contribute much to the formation of the public image of anthropology; the development in the latter half of the century does. Beginning in the 1950s, anthropology in Japan has gathered and formed various images. I first describe the reality of anthropology in this period and then the images associated with it.

Anthropology in Japan is a product of confluence. It is a hybrid product and its theoretical framework is mainly, though not always, imported. The word *bunkajinruigaku* (cultural anthropology) with an American tint and the word *minzokugaku* (ethnology) with an European tint are used almost interchangeably, and the word *shakaijinruigaku* (social anthropology) with a British tint is also used to indicate one's inclination towards British social anthropology. Old German historical sort of approach can also be traced.

Chie Nakane, for instance, the best known among Japanese anthropologists, is identified with British social anthropology (she was close to Edmund Leach) and her famous analysis of Japanese society as "vertical society" (Nakane, 1970) is based on the British theory of "social structure." Another well-known anthropologist, Taryo Obayashi (e.g., Obayashi, 1984) was trained in Vienna and possessed a clear diffusionist tendency. Junzo Kawada, another well-known who has been working in Africa (e.g., Kawada, 2001), is not exactly a structuralist but is responsible for the introduction of Levi-Strauss. But functionalism, diffusionism and structuralism are rather outdated fragments, and post-modernism and post-colonialism have strongly affected the field. I myself am heavily influenced by the interpretive approach of Clifford Geertz and Michelle Rosaldo, and the writings of James Clifford and Arjun Appadurai are very popular among younger generations.

This mixed feature of Japanese anthropology should be appreciated if one examines *JRCA, the Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*. This is an official English journal of JASCA and it was initiated several years ago with a specific purpose of propagating information about anthropological activities in Japan. It is a collection of review articles, a la *Annual Reviews* style, written mainly by Japanese anthropologists on the works of Japanese anthropologists. To date six volumes have been published, and review articles on anthropological studies of China and Korea, as well as Mainland and Insular Southeast Asia, Siberia and Russian Far East, Southern Africa and native North America,

have become available in English. Mesoamerican archaeology and Andean prehistory have also been covered.

Another collection of reviews of anthropological works in Japan is a monumental book named *The Dictionary of Anthropological Literature* (*bunkajinruigaku bunkenjitē*), which was written in Japanese and published at the end of 2004. It is an encyclopedic collection of brief papers on eighteen hundred anthropological books reviewed by four hundred and forty-six Japanese anthropologists. (The Dictionary also collects dozens of papers on important debates in anthropology – Mead/Freedman, Anti anti-relativism, Rigoberta Menchu/David Stoll, etc.) About half of the reviewed books are by Japanese authors. The dictionary is complete with a chronology of all the publications taken up in the volume. It begins in 1682: Mary White Rowlandson and James Everett Seaver's *The sovereignty & goodness of God, together, with the faithfulness of His promises displayed; being a narrative of the captivity and restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*; the chronology ends with four books published in 2004: Masahisa Segawa's *Anthropology of Chinese Society: Perspectives from Kinship and Family*, Yasuko Takezawa's *Questioning the Universality of the Concept of Race*, Keiji Maekawa's *Anthropology of Glocalization: International Culture, Development and Migration*, and Osamu Murai's *Arguing Against Shinobu Orikuchi* [a charismatic Japanese folklorist].

By looking at these reviews of anthropology, one can only feel some huge and complicated mixtures of so many elements and traces of omnivorous activities perhaps without clear orientations in sight. In this situation, it is readily expected that the “public image of anthropology” is difficult to come.

Public Image of Japanese Anthropology

Yet it is possible, and it has taken simplistic terms in contrast to the complicated nature of reality. One of the images is that anthropology has a strong centrifugal tendency. This is not only an image but also is a fact, as I recently pointed out in a short article in *Anthropology News* (Koizumi).

Due partly to that separation between outgoing ethnology and inward-looking folklore, Japanese anthropologists have tended to work outside their native country and they have shown a strong centrifugal orientation. This orientation — and their concern with the distant and the marginal — is certainly a hallmark of anthropology in the West from the beginning, but when it is contrasted with the centripetal one of, say, Japanese economists who usually

place their own country at the center of their research, the notion of “uselessness” tends to appear. The tendency is also contrasted with centripetal one of anthropologies in other countries of the contemporary world. As far as my knowledge goes, all the anthropologies in Latin American countries are centripetal, carrying out investigations on their domestic problems and social reforms. The same is true for East Asian and Southeast Asian countries -- anthropologists in China, the Philippines or Indonesia study their own societies and cultures.

Japanese anthropology has left the study of Japan to folklore, economics, sociology, political science and history, and I think that this led to the formation of its second image: “uselessness” or *Yakuni tatanai koto*. In the 1960s, when something that could be called “the public image” started to be formed, it was, if any, tenuous indeed. (I entered University of Tokyo in the late 1960s in order to study law, but soon I switched to anthropology. My father, a businessman who wanted me to be a lawyer, was puzzled and tried hard to find out what anthropology is -- with no avail.) Probably the notion of anthropology (*bunka jinruigaku*) itself has just started to be circulated then, and little was known about it. Not only my father but anthropologists themselves claimed that it is of no use. Particularly Masao Yamaguchi, a former President of the Japanese Society of Ethnology who was very influential and productive in symbolic studies of myths, rituals, tricksters and Japanese Imperial system, often claimed so.

Such a notion of uselessness is not necessarily derogatory. It is an antonym of practical, mundane economic activities of everyday life. While the majority of the Japanese citizens work diligently in various organizations for daily earnings, engaging in an “academic” pursuit with no practical consideration in sight had the image of something pure, unique and valuable. “Going abroad trying to find something extremely remote” seemed to have created an intelligible framework.

Third of the images associated with anthropology is a “romantic” one. Again it is a common image of anthropology; a famous American anthropologist once explained me that he entered anthropology and studied among Amazonian tribes due to his “romantic” passion of the youth. The romantic image tends to come from “primitive” lives and “ancient” civilizations, but I suspect that a successful archaeological project has something to do with the fortification of such an image in Japan.

Shortly after the first anthropology department in Japan was established at the University of Tokyo in 1954, Seiichi Izumi and

his colleagues started ambitious archaeological projects “in search of the origin of human civilizations both in the old world and the new.” Izumi was in charge of the new world and he started his expeditions to the Andes in 1958. The project turned out to be enormously successful and it was succeeded by Kazuo Terada and then by Yoshio Onuki. After half a century, the Andes Project is still going strong under the leadership of Yasutake Kato, the former president of the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology (JASCA). The project greatly contributed to clarify the origin of the civilizations in South America, particularly in the Peruvian prehistory before the Inca period. Formative archaeological sites were excavated in the north highlands of Peru, and Kotosh and Kuntur Wasi came to occupy established places in the Andean history. Now a special room is dedicated to the memory of Seiichi Izumi in the national museum of Peru.

This long tradition, and the public display, of prehistoric research in the Andes seems to have boosted an image of anthropology and give at least one of the reasons why Japanese anthropology is often understood in terms of ancient civilizations. (Just because I am a Latin Americanist, many take it for granted that I do excavations there.)

Another factor giving a strong influence in the formation of the public image is the existence of the National Museum of Ethnology (Kokuritsu Minzokugaku Hakubutsukan, or Minpaku). This is a museum located in Osaka, next to our university, and perhaps it is the biggest anthropology museum in the world. The monumental building of the museum is a piece of art by the famous architect Kisho Kurokawa. It is a colossal and quite extensive four-story building, and the total floor space reaches 51,235 square meters, about 13 acres or 5 hectares, including exhibition halls, research facilities, storage rooms and so on. The museum is run by the budget of 3.6 billion yens, or about 30 million dollars a year. Over 60 researchers -- professors, associate professors and assistant professors -- carry out research on the ethnic cultures of the world together with many more associates and visiting scholars from all over the world.

The Museum was conceived in the 1970s and the building was completed in 1977, although it has been proliferating after its first completion. The one who turned the original idea into reality was Tadao Umesao, a famous and charismatic ethnologist who wrote extensively on Central Asian nomads, the civilization neither Occidental nor Oriental, the methods for organization of information and intellectual production, and so forth. He gave

a tremendous impact upon the general intellectual life of Japan and he was particularly popular not only among the academics but also among bureaucrats, businessmen and mass media. He was a typical public intellectual, and he was ornamented with the Order of Cultural Merit (Bunka Kunsho) in 1994 and became one of the best known anthropologists in this country.

The museum is strongly research oriented and has yielded a tremendous amount of valuable academic products, and no doubt it has promoted a relativistic sense of the variability of world cultures among those who are interested in the museum and its exhibits. But it is also true that it has filled the appetite for exoticism among the popular mass. These interests in exotic customs and extraordinary beliefs may perhaps be an antonym of the supposedly uniform and centripetal nature of Japanese culture. Anyway the museum should have contributed to the creation of a very visual and tangible image of what ethnology and anthropology is.

Centrifugal, useless, romantic and exotic. Even if the reality is composite and ambiguous, the image given in the public sphere tends to be stereotypic and schematic. The public image of anything prefers simpler framework, and it was what was imposed upon a rather amorphous entity called anthropology.

Practical Turn

But the scheme is changing now. Or it must be changed by the action on our part. The image of anthropology can be transformed easily and rapidly, because the reality of the anthropology is rather formless from the beginning: it is not so “hard” as the case of British anthropology.

The change seems to have started in the beginning of the 21st century, and the forces behind it seem to have been largely institutional. For all the academics in our country, particularly for those who are employed in national universities, the foundation of the working environments was totally shaken by what is called *hojinka*, or *kokuritsu daigaku hojinka*, “the non-nationalization of national universities.” In April of 2004, all of close to one hundred former national universities became non-national independent agencies (although they continued to be called “national universities.”). The budget is still supplied mainly by the Ministry of Education and this is a big difference with private universities. Osaka University, for example, receives a half of its annual revenue of one billion dollars as regular governmental subsidies.

But the way the money is distributed and personnel is allocated is totally changing both among national universities and within each university. Distribution is made on a lot more competitive basis than before -- neoliberalism. Cost performance became important in any scientific discipline, and yielding immediate results is now strongly emphasized. Audit culture was of course imported from the United Kingdom, and setting strategic targets and making regular evaluations became part of the routine work of the academics. The audit culture became "obsessive," as one visitor put it, in Japan, and the word *hyoka zukare*, or "worn out of evaluations" is often heard. Competitions among both national and private universities are beginning to bring about university mergers and absorptions just among business corporations. The notions of productivity of research, reform in educational system and contribution to society at large came to the center of all activities and became the source of legitimization of the existence of the university system itself.

Together with this came the reform of SCJ, the Science Council of Japan (*Nihon gakujutsu kaigi*), perhaps the most important academic organization in Japan. SCJ is called the "parliament of the scientists" and composed of about two hundred members and two thousand associate members from every discipline in human and natural sciences. It is influential in Japanese policy making, particularly in the sphere of scientific policy making.

The reform was put into effect in October 2005, and the number of the committee representing each academic discipline was reduced to only thirty. These thirty includes medicine, biology, technology, sociology, physics, mathematics, history chemistry, philosophy, information science and so on, and of course anthropology, whose name had marginally appeared before, lost its seat. Anthropology was put under the rubric of, somewhat strangely, "area studies." We have just managed to secure an anthropology *sub*committee made up of sixteen anthropologists, but clearly we will need to work hard to be recognized in the new environments.

Due to this sort of tectonic movements, we now see something I call a "practical turn" in Japanese anthropology.

The reaction from anthropologists was swift. Some members of JASCA, Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology, formed a new group for the promotion of "practical anthropology" (*jissen jinruigaku renkeijigyo kento iinkai*). This group started to explore the possibilities for the application of anthropological knowledge into practical fields, including development, education, public

health and so forth. Applied kind of anthropology has been weak and no collective effort was made before this move.

All this has been connected to the new emphasis on practical activities by the National Museum of Ethnology. The Museum was also turned into non-national agency in April 2004, and it was incorporated into a newly created umbrella organization called the National Institute for the Humanities (*ningen bunka kenkyuu kiko*). The Museum lost its previous independence and freedom and started to be partially controlled by the Institute. It is clear that the museum entered into a transitional period, and it started to explore the use of anthropology and ethnology in practical fields as one of the four principal projects of the museum.

The image of anthropology can be changed through this kind of action, in addition to the discourse addressed to the public by anthropologists. But it can also be strongly affected by the reform of the educational system, particularly on the level of high school. This is particularly the case in Japan because all the textbooks used in all high schools must be examined and approved by the Ministry of Education, or MEXT. This examination is based on the Official Guideline (*Gakushu Shido Yoryo*) proposed by the central advisory board invited to the MEXT, and most of the board members are university professors. This system of the examination of textbooks by the guideline is not a censorship but a local way of seeking consensus and agreement for developing a unifying momentum and it is found as cultural phenomenon everywhere. In any case, working on this guideline can change the textbooks and thus the high school education itself. After all, there is at present no mention of the word “anthropology” there. Anthropological contents are not completely absent and some anthro-fan teachers can give extra curricular classes on anthropological issues, but anthropology is not officially taught in schools.

My own “strategy” is to build an institution for research and education, putting anthropology at the center and organizing other related fields around it. This is a new center called the Global Collaboration Center of Osaka University, and it will be inaugurated in April 2007. This is a product of reorganization of our university due to the merger with Osaka University of Foreign Studies. The latter university is oriented toward international studies and language trainings, and I became in charge of the creation of a new center based on the resources of two universities. (This project was also helped by the fact that we had been selected one of the twenty COEs, the Centers of Excellence,

in Humanities.) We envision a unique center for international cooperation made up of four sections: research, education, practice and evaluation. The aim is global collaboration, particularly for developing countries, and we are trying to combine the research efforts in anthropology, development studies, political science, public health, disease research, environmental studies and so forth for a common cause. We plan to work together with the National Museum of Ethnology. We also plan to work with JICA, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency. JICA is closely associated with MOFA, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*gaimusho*) and it is the organization which handles Japanese ODA. JICA was also affected by the wave of non-nationalization and audit culture, and it is going to be merged with JBIC, the Japanese Bank for International Cooperation, in April 2007. In these flow of events and ongoing restructuring, they are in need of more effective ways of international cooperation, and we plan to collaborate in finding such ways based on the intellectual assets of the university.

By these movements, the public image of anthropology in Japan has not been affected yet, because they have just begun, but I believe it will. In making such efforts, we do not need to limit collaboration only to anthropology; we may be able to collaborate with any other related fields. We do not need to limit it to academics either; we can work with practitioners, NGOs and national and local governments. After all, the point is not to protect the name of anthropology; it is to strengthen and propagate anthropology's teaching.

ANTHROPOLOGY!? THAT'S INTERESTING!

Henk Pauw¹

Introduction

The title of the paper reflects a fairly general remark from members of the public upon my response to their questions about what I do for a living. The exclamation is normally followed by either silence, or a reference to fossils, or some or other comment that makes very little sense. Some of the “more informed” may pass the following comment: “Oh you are working with/studying Black people.” Most of those who are brave enough not to hide their ignorance normally lose interest when one tries to explain what it is all about or they start asking questions about why x, y and z behave in such and such a way or that x, y and z behave in an a, b and c way. As Paul Erickson (2001) said: “The public image of anthropology is usually unclear or erroneous. ... It doesn't have a bad rap, but people attach a sense of weirdness to it. They wonder what it is and why I do it. Most people don't know there are different kinds of anthropologists, like archaeologists for instance.” (www.canadaeast.com). Likewise The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (RAI) states that “Anthropology is still a subject that is relatively little-known amongst the public at large, and many misconceptions about it still exist.” (http://www.therai.org.uk/pubs/resguide/1_what_anthropology.html).

On the other hand, when journalists, for example, do contact us about our opinions what are the topics involved? Accusations of witchcraft, initiation, whether it is a genetic fact that black women with big bums (sic) are from high status families, what is the African potato, does indigenous medicine work, or are what has been said regarding rape or not in a recent prominent court case (2006) true? Farmers phone and ask whether one could come to the farm and identify a skeleton or stone tools found.

1 Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Why this seeming ignorance? Although studies indicate that with television people read less, in this electronic day and age of information dissemination explanations are readily available. This applies to anthropology as well. Because most of the people commenting in the way mentioned above, on face value, could have had access to Internet, I opted to see whether the World Wide Web (WWW) could shed some light. A search done on 30 June 2006 using Google and Yahoo with the key word “anthropology” yielded approximately 128,000,000 and 21,000,000 “hits” respectively. The same search done on 28 November 2006 yielded “about” 42,300,000 and 22,000,000 “hits” respectively. I obviously did not have the time to browse through all the “hits” but in both instances a large number of the “hits” are duplicates and most of the webpages indicated are from reputable institutions, while some contain very little useful information. The *British Academy Portal* contains a webpage called *Anthro.Net*. *Anthro.Net* is described as: “A collection of links to a wide range of online resources in anthropology and its related fields.” It is mentioned that there are an estimated 250,000 sites on the World Wide Web providing information relating to the subject matter of anthropology, also admitting at the same time that there are many containing little useful information. (<http://www.britac.ac.uk/portal/resource.asp?ResourceID=402> and <http://www.anthro.net/>)

General information sites such as *Wikipedia* (“The free Encyclopedia”), *Answers.com*, *Cyberpursuits*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, online dictionaries, etc. available on the WWW, have quite extensive discussions about Anthropology. I even found a site with a heading titled “Teach yourself Anthropology”, but also one “hit” asking whether I am looking for the album “Anthropology” by *The Bonzo Dog Band* (<http://www.answers.com/anthropology&r=67>).

Analysing the content of the webpages

The information containing different views, fields, divisions, and approaches to the discipline may become quite confusing to the uninformed reader. A few examples of the descriptions or explanations will suffice.

Let us, first of all, look at the dictionary and encyclopaedia type of webpages:

Wikipedia provides the following definition: “Anthropology (from the [Greek](#) word *ἄνθρωπος*, “human” or “person”) consists of the study of [humanity](#) (see genus [Homo](#)). It is [holistic](#) in two

senses: it is concerned with all humans at all times and with all dimensions of humanity. In principle, it is concerned with all institutions of all societies.” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology>). A cross-reference provided the following: “Cultural anthropology, also called socio-cultural anthropology or [social anthropology](#), is a field (one of four that are commonly recognized in the United States) of [anthropology](#), the holistic study of humanity.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cultural_anthropology).

Answers.com, describing itself as the world’s greatest ‘encyclopedia/amanacopedia’, has a number of definitions taken from the webpages of different organisations.

- The American Heritage Dictionaries: –
 1. The scientific study of the origin, the behavior, and the physical, social, and cultural development of humans.
 2. That part of Christian theology concerning the genesis, nature, and future of humans, especially as contrasted with the nature of God: “*changing the church’s anthropology to include more positive images of women*” (Priscilla Hart). (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>)
- McGraw-Hill Professional: - “The observation, measurement, and explanation of human variability in time and space. This includes both biological variability and the study of cultural, or learned, behavior among contemporary human societies. These studies are closely allied with the fields of archeology and linguistics.” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>).
- Britannica Concise Encyclopedia: - “The “study of humanity.” Anthropologists study human beings in aspects ranging from the biology and evolutionary history of *Homo sapiens* to the features of society and culture that decisively distinguish humans from other animal species.” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>).
- Columbia University Press: - “...classification and analysis of humans and their society, descriptively, culturally, historically, and physically. Its unique contribution to studying the bonds of human social relations has been the distinctive concept of [culture](#).” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>).
- Houghton Mifflin Company: - “The scientific study of the origin, development, and varieties of human beings and their societies, particularly so-called primitive societies.” and “The scientific study of the origin, the behavior, and the physical, social,

and cultural development of humans.” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>).

- WordNet: - “the social science that studies the origins and social relationships of human beings” (<http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology>).

Bartleby.com refers to social anthropology as “*Chiefly British Cultural anthropology*.” (<http://www.bartleby.com/61/42/S0524250.html>).

The *WordWeb Online* defines both cultural anthropology and social anthropology as “The branch of anthropology that deals with human culture and society” (<http://www.Wordwebonline.com/en/SOCIALANTHROPOLOGY>).

AnthroTech's exposition is maybe indicative of the problem regarding the possibility of confusion. “There are 100's of definitions of anthropology. The following definition comes from the [American Anthropological Association](#): Study of Human Kind. The word anthropology itself tells the basic story--from the Greek anthropos (“human”) and logia (“study”)--it is the study of humankind, from its beginnings millions of years ago to the present day.” “...Though easy to define, anthropology is difficult to describe. Its subject matter is both exotic (e.g., star lore of the Australian aborigines) and commonplace (anatomy of the foot). And its focus is both sweeping (the evolution of language) and microscopic (the use-wear of obsidian tools). Anthropologists may study ancient Mayan hieroglyphics, the music of African Pygmies, and the corporate culture of a U.S. car manufacturer.” (<http://vlib.anthrotech.com/guides/anthropology.shtml>).

Anthrobase.com, describing itself as a ‘Dictionary of Anthropology’ starts off with: “The word anthropology is derived from Greek and means “The Study of Man” (the title of a once famous introductory text published by the American anthropologist Ralph Linton in 1937). Then mention is made of ‘Social anthropology’, but then the following: “Analytically, anthropology may be regarded as a *holistic and comparative branch of sociology*.” A similar statement is made in the *Sociology Index* under Social Anthropology that “Social anthropology is conceptually and theoretically similar to sociology.” On the same page the following statement is made: “Social anthropology or cultural anthropology is the science of human social and cultural behaviour and its development.” (http://sociologyindex.com/social_anthropology.htm).

Anthropology.net, mentions, under the mission statement, the following: “**Anthropology** is defined as the study of humankind and

their origins throughout different places and times. The study focuses in detail on cultural, biological, linguistic, and archaeological research.” (<http://anthropology.net/>).

Cyberpursuits provides a fairly detailed description of the discipline. “Anthropology is a science of humankind. It studies all facets of society and culture. It studies tools, techniques, traditions, language, beliefs, kinships, values, social institutions, economic mechanisms, cravings for beauty and art, struggled for prestige. It describes the impact of humans on other humans. With the exception of the Physical Anthropology discipline, Anthropology focuses on human characteristics generated and propagated by humans themselves.” (<http://www.cyberpursuits.com/anthro>).

What we find from these webpages is that anthropology studies humans or humanity regarding origin, biological, cultural and/or social aspects. Then concepts like cultural anthropology, socio-cultural anthropology, social anthropology and even sociology and Christian theology are mentioned.

Let us look what some of our fellow anthropologists and academic institutions have to say:

The American Anthropological Association, in answer to the question “What is anthropology?” mentions the following: “The word *anthropology* itself tells the basic story--from the Greek *anthropos* (“human”) and *logia* (“study”)--it is the study of humankind, from its beginnings millions of years ago to the present day. Nothing human is alien to anthropology. Indeed, of the many disciplines that study our species, *Homo sapiens*, only anthropology seeks to understand the whole panorama--in geographic space and evolutionary time--of human existence.” (<http://www.aaanet.org/anthbroc.htm>). This presumably represents a fairly wide distribution of Departments of Anthropology in the United States of America and is also similar to the approach of the *Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research*. One of the Wenner-Gren Foundation’s two major goals is “...to support significant and innovative anthropological research into humanity’s biological and cultural origins, development and variation...” (<http://www.wennergren.org/about/>).

Neither the *World Council of Anthropological Associations*, nor the *European Association of Social Anthropologists*, or the *International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences*, or the *Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth (ASA)* provide any definition/description of what the field of study is about.

At the *University of Oxford* the Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology is mentioned but also no explanation of what the discipline(s?) involve while at the *University of Cambridge* the Department is called Social Anthropology and they teach “anthropology - the study of humankind - in the widest sense.” (<http://www.socanth.cam.ac.uk/about/TheDepartment.html>).

The *London School of Economics and Political Science* has a Department of Anthropology and under one of the programmes on offer the following description of the discipline is provided: “Social Anthropology is concerned with the variety of human societies and cultures. Social anthropologists try to explain the causes of this variation and also attempt to enable us to understand what it means to belong to societies and cultures which, at first sight, appear very foreign to our own.” The reader is then also referred to the webpage of the *The Royal Anthropological Institute* where ‘[What is Anthropology?](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/anthropology/babsc.htm)’ will provide background information and suggested readings (<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/anthropology/babsc.htm>).

The Department of Social Anthropology at the *University of Manchester* provides the following: “Contemporary social anthropology is a critical discipline that tackles an enormous variety of topics, ranging from the social implications of the new reproductive and information technologies through the analysis of the social meanings of consumer behaviour to the study of violence, poverty and the means for resolving conflicts and alleviating human suffering. Although anthropological studies are now conducted everywhere, from middle class suburbs and inner cities, from boardrooms to migrant labour camps, and from Papua New Guinea to Peru, and from a European standpoint, what all our studies have in common is an awareness of human diversity. This is not simply an academic matter but also a practical one.” (<http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/socialanthropology/undergraduate/general/default.htm>).

The Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the School of Oriental and African Studies, *University of London* “...teaches the discipline of Social Anthropology with special reference to the societies and cultures of Asia and Africa, both past and present. The emphasis given to particular regions and approaches varies with current trends in the discipline and contemporary global developments.” (<http://www.soas.ac.uk/studying/courseinfo.cfm?courseinfoid=48>). “Social Anthropology is an academic discipline that in many respects straddles the social sciences and humanities. It both draws from and contributes to such disciplines

as philosophy, linguistics and literature, as well as sociology and history.” (<http://www.soas.ac.uk/studying/courseinfo.cfm?courseinfoid=84>).

At *Brunel University* the discipline is called Social Anthropology. Again we find more of a broader description of what anthropology is all about. “Anthropology offers a unique and powerful means for understanding cultural and social diversity in the modern world. It is concerned with such contemporary issues as multiculturalism, identity politics, racism and ethnic nationalism, changing forms of the family, religious conflict, gender, and the political role of culture. It also addresses the perennial questions about human nature: what do we have in common with each other cross-culturally, and what makes us different?... This course differs from social anthropology courses at other universities because of the broad social science (rather than biological or archaeological) perspective from which it is taught.” (<http://www.brunel.ac.uk/about/acad/ssl/sslcourse/undergraduate/bscsoanth>).

For the *The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* (RAI), “Anthropology concerns itself with humans as complex social beings with a capacity for language, thought and culture. The study of anthropology is about understanding biological and cultural aspects of life among peoples throughout the world. ... A key aim of anthropology is to understand the common constraints within which human beings operate as well as the differences which are evident between particular societies and cultures.” (http://www.therai.org.uk/pubs/resguide/1_what_anthropology.html). However, the rest of the document uses anthropology and social anthropology interchangeably.

Danuta Dylagowa, in explaining the course “Discovering Social Anthropology in Galicia” as part of “Teach yourself Anthropology” that the “...academic packaging in our field is muddled.” He continues: “It would be wrong to deny tensions between the traditional social anthropological perspective and the more ‘culturalist’ orientations popular today.” (<http://era.anthropology.ac.uk/Teach-yourself/chap4.html>).

In South Africa we find the following:

At the *University of Cape Town* the department is called Social Anthropology and according to the webpage “Social Anthropology aims to understand how and why humans interact as they do in families, networks, communities, institutions, organisations, groups, societies, and nations. Central to Social Anthropology

are the concepts of “culture” and “society”.” (<http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/socialanth/aboutsa.htm>).

The Department of Social Anthropology at the *University of the Witwatersrand* provides the following exposition of anthropology: “...Anthropology seeks to produce valid knowledge and generalisations about people and their behaviour, so as to arrive at the fullest possible understanding of human diversity. In their quest for knowledge and understanding of both the universality and diversity of human culture,....” (<http://www.wits.ac.za/Humanities/SocialSciences/anthropology.htm>).

Anthropology, according to the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology at the *University of Pretoria* “...is the comparative study of societies and cultures. ... Anthropology, sociology, history and other social sciences often make use of similar theories, but anthropology adopts a distinctive approach to the study of society and culture. We emphasise participant observation as a research method, pay detailed attention to the everyday lives of ordinary people, study social relationships, and ask not only how things work but also what they mean to the people involved.” (<http://www.up.ac.za/academic/humanities/eng/eng/antarct/eng/abd.htm>).

“Anthropology seeks to uncover the principles governing human behavior that are applicable to all human communities, not just to a select few.” according to the Department of Anthropology at the *University of the Free State* (<http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/index.php?FCode=01&DCode=141>).

Anthropology at the *University of Johannesburg* is within the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies. The discipline is said to satisfy “...the curiosity of those who have an intense interest in human beings by attempting to understand what it means to be human from an insider perspective. It compares human societies and cultures around the world and examines people and their affairs from all possible sides (a holistic perspective).” (<http://www.uj.ac.za/anthrodev/>).

Maybe the reason for some departments not giving an explanation/definition for anthropology is the divergent nature of the definitions/explanations that caused *AnthroTech* (as quoted above) to state that there are hundreds of definitions of anthropology. Maybe anthropologists are weary of possible criticism as to how they define the subject content of the discipline.

Let me give you an example from my own department. In the normal day-to-day practice and teaching we have a very strong

eclectic approach. In *Anthropology Today* (Vol. 22, No1, 2006:18) Van der Waal and Ward raised questions about the following explanation given for anthropology on the webpage of the former Department of Anthropology (now the Department of Sociology and Anthropology) at the former University of Port Elizabeth (now the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University): "The central problem studied by Anthropology is humans as physical-biological beings on the one hand and the behavioural patterns of humans as members of a community or an ethnic group on the other hand." However, what is maybe more significant is the added comment that: "Also of interest is the focus on physical anthropology in a social science department, a survival on the emphasis on 'racial' differences under the dominance of the twin phenomena of *apartheid* and *volkekunde*." (2006:4). Seemingly Van der Waal and Ward have never thought about the fact that some colleagues may have wider horizons than the social sciences but also that it is an anthropological commonplace in the field of, for example, Medical Anthropology (that is indicated in a number of departments of Anthropology and Social Anthropology to be one of their specialities) that health and disease are part of a set of physical, biological, and cultural subsystems, and that the focus on community or group creates a natural foundation for a partnership between public health and anthropology. The following quote from the webpage of the RAI will suffice in this regard: "A biological or physical anthropologist might well work in a laboratory, for example, on blood or bone samples. However, they could equally well work in different cultural contexts which require knowledge and sensitivity to local cultural norms and values. Thus, in understanding the causes of illness within a given population it is necessary to develop a detailed understanding of how physical contact and well-being are shaped by social and cultural factors. For example, it is not enough for a biological anthropologist to discover that a local diet results in deficiencies of vitamin A and therefore increases the possibility of blindness. They would also need to take into account the symbolic and ritual significance of certain foodstuffs before assuming that changes in diet could easily be effected." (http://therai.org.uk/pubs/resguide/1_what_anthropology.html). The question is, in spite of a unified anthropology association in Southern Africa whether the old divide is still slumbering beneath the surface?

The implications

I will be the first one to agree that there is a lot of ignorance

about anthropology outside of academia. However, what can the lay-person derive from the above-mentioned divergent expositions? A discipline divided or a discipline in which there is no agreement on what the subject-content of the discipline entails? Is it then worthwhile to take this discipline serious? Can this discipline contribute anything meaningful to the world, in spite of what is claimed, except for some exotic stories about people in far away places, like Malinowski's (1932) *The Sexual Life of Savages in north-western Melanesia: an ethnographic account of courtship, marriage, and family life among the natives of the Trobriand islands, British New Guinea*? On what grounds can a discipline that does not even agree on what the field of study entails claim that graduates can do the whole array of jobs that are indicated on the various webpages?

Are we still part of what Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2006) described in *Engaging Anthropology: the case for a public presence* as a secret society? He concludes the following: "In spite of the considerable growth, anthropology still cultivates its self-identity as a counter-culture, its members belonging to a kind of secret society whose initiates possess exclusive keys for understanding, indispensable for making sense of the world, but alas, largely inaccessible for outsiders. Anthropologists simply did not want their subject to become popular." (Erikson 2006:p.28).

Anthropology, furthermore, has a number of 'boobos' up its sleeve. The accusation of collusion with colonialist powers, the anthropologist gaining power at the expense of the subjects by exploiting knowledge and artefacts, the accusation of the discipline being ahistorical and exoticizing 'the Other', anthropologists participating in wars, co-operating with Intelligence Agencies, and the debacle around Project Camelot, to name a few.

Are there any answers or solutions?

The answer probably lies in more efficient marketing but also solid research that makes a significant and visible solution to the solving of social problems. This may call for what is called applied research. We may further need to follow the example of The Society for Applied Anthropology (SFAA) with the following mission statement: "The Society has for its object the promotion of interdisciplinary scientific investigation of the principles controlling the relations of human beings to one another, and the encouragement of the wide application of these principles to practical problems..." (<http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html>).

To be successful in this endeavour requires an outward move away from encapsulation and becoming involved in broad-based training drawing upon "...an understanding of the linguistic, archeological, historical, biological, psychological, ecological, economic, technological, social and cultural dimensions of the human condition." (<http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html>). One of the key areas, according to SFAA, where anthropologists can make a contribution is the influence on policy.² "In order to affect policy at all levels, the Society must promote anthropological interests, tools, methods and insights with a very broad array of policy makers. Legislators, lobbyists, funders, government agencies, international organizations, non-profit organizations, community-based leaders are only a handful of actors in the policy arena with whom applied anthropology must interact..." (<http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html>). The American Anthropological Association (AAA), in fact, follows a similar approach with their involvement in, amongst other things, government relations, public policy and human rights and advocacy. (<http://www.aaanet.org>).

In a keynote lecture given at the Conference of Anthropologists of Southern Africa (2003) Pat Caplan referred to 'anthropological commitment' that implies communicating "...something of what we have learned, indeed been taught by our informants, during the course of our work, to people outside of the discipline. This is perhaps particularly incumbent on western anthropologists who work on Africa in order to counter some of the dangerously stereotypical views - including 'well it's all their own fault anyway, isn't it?' - which many people in the West hold." (2003:19).

Anthropology can be promoted through the effective use of the media, press releases, conferences, products and other forms of dissemination. This may cause that some of us will have to be trained to work effectively with the press. In fact, Caplan warned about the possible pitfalls involved in working with the public media (2003: 19). Shaping the public image of anthropology is important for several reasons. Prospective employers can be helped to understand how training in anthropology can contribute to their organisations' success. Furthermore, the legitimacy of anthropologists who have something to contribute to public dialogue on policy matters will be enhanced and, at the same

2 A similar call was made on social scientists at the 2006 combined conference in Pretoria of the Social Sciences Network of South Africa, the African Institute of South Africa and the Human Sciences Research Council.

time, it will increase the standing of professionally practicing anthropologists.

All is not doom and gloom

Konrad P. Kottak and Nicholas C. Kottak have a consultancy firm called “Ethnographic Solutions”. They quote a USA Today News Brief on how anthropology degrees, because of their rarity but also because of their people-centeredness, observation as research method, the diversification of the global workforce, to name a few, become more sought after in the United States of America than MBAs. In fact, anthropology degrees are called a hot asset (<http://www.ethnographic-solutions.com/pages/hotasset.htm>).

CONTEXT (context-based research group) names a number of reasons why ethnography is an important versatile research tool. This includes to gain a deep understanding of who one’s customers are, to understand customer’s unmet product needs, to gauge interest in an idea or test a concept, to gather ongoing deep behavioural insight to track consumer attitudes and behaviours over time, to better understand what’s happening within an organisation, and to learn people within an organisation how they can use ethnography themselves, to name a few. (http://context-research.com/context/howuse/howuse_index_wform.cfm).

An article on the *antropologi.info* webpage entitled ‘Holders of social anthropology Ph.D.s are highly employable’ reports on a study done in Britain that tracked social anthropology doctoral students who completed their studies between 1992 and 2003. The majority of them worked outside academic anthropology, either in other disciplines within academia, or in various non-academic positions. Fifty-seven percent held academic positions, of whom one third were on fixed-term contracts with uncertain long-term prospects. Those who managed to escape a conventional academic career can be found in international development organisations like the World Bank or in high-tech companies like Intel. What anthropologists brought to those settings are special skills of observation and critical analysis, born of Ph.D. projects based on long-term field research in challenging cultural locations. Another blog reports on Intel hiring more than 100 anthropologists to work side by side with its engineers. The work involves the assessment of potential markets and how the technology can be adapted to suit the local needs, abilities and affordability. A further blog explains how anthropologists influenced software

design through participant observation (<http://antropologi.info/blog/anthropology/anthropology.php>) (see also Ferraro 2006: 10-11).

Conclusion

Pat Caplan in her Sterling Memorial Lecture at the University of Kent at Canterbury (2001) mentioned that anthropologists, in spite of much talk about reflexivity, tend to blame external structures for their problems, but at the same time there are constant attempts to "...police boundaries and hierarchies..." giving rise to fellow anthropologists feeling themselves threatened (2001:24). Anthropology is a discipline that can address crucial issues of our time in a globalizing world but then anthropologists need to engage with the wider public through the mass media and through popularising itself, breaking the boundaries between 'applied' and 'pure' anthropology, be more like missionaries than mandarins, and play a more useful or relevant role in matters of public concern. Had these things been done earlier, the 'image' problem of anthropology today might have been different (Caplan 2001:25).

In the final analysis we need to break down the barriers amongst ourselves, practice amongst ourselves the tolerance that we preach, advance anthropological perspectives through public outreach and effective media coverage. We should promote and expand services to various member constituencies, especially students at all levels and M.A. and Ph.D.-level professionals working outside academia, support and expand interdisciplinary networks, membership and perspectives, and the fostering and support of the development of other professional anthropological associations around the world.

References cited

- Answers.com. <http://www.answers.com/anthropology&r=67> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Anthrobase.com. <http://sociologyindex.com/socialanthropology.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006)
- Anthro.Net. <http://www.anthro.net/> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- antropologi.info. <http://antropologi.info/blog/anthropology/anthropology.php> (accessed: 16/10/2006 and

28/11/2006).

Anthropology.net. <http://anthropology.net/> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

AnthroTech. <http://vlib.anthrotech.com/guides/anthropology.shtml> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

Bartleby.com. <http://www.bartleby.com/61/42/S0524250.html> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

Brittanica Concise Encyclopedia. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

Brunel University. <http://www.brunel.ac.uk/about/acad/ssl/sslcourse/undergraduate/bscsocanth> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

Caplan, Pat. 2001. Risky Business: Changing Landscapes of Anthropology. Stirling Memorial Lecture, University of Kent at Canterbury. <http://www.kent.ac.uk/anthropology/department/stirling/caplan.pdf> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

Caplan, Pat. 2003. Anthropology in the new world (dis)order. Keynote Lecture, Annual Conference of Anthropology Southern Africa, University of Cape Town, 24th August. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

CONTEXT. http://contextresearch.com/context/howuse/howuse_index_wform.cfm (accessed: 28/11/2006).

Cyberpursuits. <http://www.cyberpursuits.com/anthro> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

Department of Anthropology, University of the Free State. <http://www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/index.php?FCode=01&DCode=141> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Pretoria. <http://www.up.ac.za/academic/humanities/eng/eng/antar/eng/abd.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

Department of Anthropology and Development Studies, University of Johannesburg. <http://www.uj.ac.za/anthrodev/> (accessed: 28/11/2006).

- Department of Anthropology and Sociology, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. <http://www.soas.ac.uk/studying/courseinfo.cfm?courseinfoid=84> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Department of Social Anthropology, University of Cape Town. <http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/socialanth/aboutsa.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Department of Social Anthropology, University of Manchester. <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/socialanthropology/undergraduate/general/default.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Department of Social Anthropology, University of the Witwatersrand. <http://www.wits.ac.za/Humanities/SocialSciences/anthropology.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Erickson, Paul. 2001. www.canadaeast.com (accessed: 28/11/2006)
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2006. *Engaging Anthropology: the case for a public presence*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Ethnographic Solutions. <http://www.ethnographic-solutions.com/pages/hotasset.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Ferraro, Gary P. 2006. The cultural dimension of international business (5th edition). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Houghton Mifflin Company. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Oxford. http://www.icsa.ox.ac.uk/about/anthropology_at_oxford.shtml (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- London School of Economics and Political Science. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/anthropology/> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Malinowski, B. 1932 (1968). *The Sexual Life of Savages in north-western Melanesia: an ethnographic account of courtship, marriage, and family life among the natives of the Trobriand islands, British New Guinea*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- McGraw-Hill Professional. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006)
- Sociology Index. <http://sociologyindex.com/socialanthropology.htm> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Teach yourself Anthropology. <http://era.anthropology.ac.uk/Teach-yourself/chap4.html> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- The American Anthropological Association. <http://www.aaanet.org/anthbroc.htm> (accessed: 24/11/2006).
- The American Heritage Dictionaries. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006)
- The British Academy Portal. <http://www.britac.ac.uk/portal/resource.asp?ResourceID=402> (accessed: 28/11/2006)
- The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (RAI). http://www.therai.org.uk/pubs/resguide/1_what_anthropology.html (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- The Society for Applied Anthropology (SFAA). <http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html> (accessed: 24/11/2006).
- The Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. <http://www.wennergren.org/about/>. (accessed: 24/11/2006).
- University of Cambridge. <http://www.archanth.cam.ac.uk/> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- Van der Waal and Ward . 2006. *Anthropology Today*. Vol. 22, No1.
- Wikipedia. The free Encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cultural_anthropology (accessed: 12/052006 and 28/11/2006).
- WordNet. <http://www.answers.com/topic/anthropology> (accessed: 28/11/2006).
- WordWeb Online. <http://www.Wordwebonline.com/en/SOCIALANTHROPOLOGY> (accessed: 28/11/2006)

