

Introduction [*Other People's Anthropologies*] [2008]

ALEKSANDAR BOŠKOVIĆ & THOMAS HYLLAND ERIKSEN

If Western anthropology is, as most anthropologists consider it to be, a way of looking at "others" in order to reflect on the meaning of "self," it is interesting to contemplate switching positions and giving the vantage point to "other" anthropologists. This contemplation is a goal of the book *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins* (2008), of which this selection by anthropologists Aleksandar Bošković (b. 1962) and Thomas Hylland Eriksen (b. 1962) is the introduction. Applying aspects of postcolonial, political-economic, and globalization theory to anthropology itself, Bošković and Eriksen reach beyond the conventional "centre" anthropologies of the United States, France, and Britain (the anthropologies that organize Part Two of this reader) to embrace the "margin" anthropologies of Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Japan, Kenya, the Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Turkey, and the former Yugoslavia. These anthropologies have varying experiences with colonialism and differ in the way in which they conceptualize self versus others. While expanding their horizons of anthropology, readers of this selection should begin to understand why, as Bošković and Eriksen assert, anthropologists on the margin have not experienced the crisis of confidence that anthropologists at the centre have been grappling with for the last 25 years.

Key Words: anthropologies and colonialism, the anthropology of short-time consultancies, at home and abroad, decolonization, no crisis in anthropology, other people's anthropologies, peripheral anthropology, publishing in English, self and other

About This Book

There were several formative moments in the creation of this book [i.e., *Other People's Anthropologies*]. First of all, the idea of organizing the workshop on "Other Anthropologies" at the 2004 EASA conference in Vienna was suggested by Thomas Hylland Eriksen, as we were walking through the High Street of Grahamstown (South Africa) on a windy Sunday morning in May 2003. The two day (10–11 September) and three session workshop in Vienna went extremely well, in terms of both attendance and the discussions. Many papers from this workshop (by Kuznetsov, Elchinova, Sugishita, and Guber) eventually made it into this book.

This book cannot be viewed in isolation from the earlier discussions of "indigenous" or "non-Western" (Fahim 1982; Asad 1982), "native" or "nativist" (Narayan 1993; Mingming 2002), "central/peripheral" (Hannerz and Gerholm 1982; Cardoso de Oliveira

2000), "anthropologies of the South" (Krotz 1997; Quinlan 2000), or "world anthropologies" (Restrepo and Escobar 2005; Ribeiro and Escobar 2006). Apart from the collection of articles in *Ethnos* (Hannerz and Gerholm 1982) and Fahim's book, we must also mention the edited volume dealing with the European anthropology and ethnology, by Vermeulen and Roldán (1995). The fact that all of these books have been out of print for a long time stands at odds with the growing interest in these issues. Last but not least, the leading Russian anthropological journal, *Etnografičeskoe obozrenie*, recently also devoted a special issue (2/2005) to "world" anthropologies, edited by Alexei Elfimov.

One or Many?

It would probably be safe to say that the issues of alterity and difference were crucial for the human questioning of different (and potentially threatening)

and many more during the twentieth century. It has been argued that even some "great" or "central" traditions arose as a direct consequence of the encounter with the other (Brunana 2002, Latour 2004).

But just as anthropology never had a single point of origin, it also never had a single stream of development—and this becomes, perhaps, more pronounced than ever in our "post-colonial" or "post-industrial" times. Some projects focusing on particular (imagined) points of view therefore become a bit problematic—for example, the distinction between "Western" and "non-Western" anthropologies has been so described (Madan 1982, Asad 1982). On the other hand, anthropology as a discipline is usually defined in terms of the "centers" or "central" traditions (de Oliveira 2000 mentions the American, British and French traditions [Cardoso de Oliveira 2000]; one might add the German one as well)—the processes of marginalization go so far that, for example, it is practically impossible for non-members of the biggest anthropological association in the world (the AAA) to even submit papers to some AAA journals.⁴

The processes of decolonization, along with critical interrogation of the dominant narratives, led to much greater visibility of the non-central anthropological traditions. Of course, some of them (like India, for example) have been quite visible for many decades. Others, like the Russian one, have been around for a very long time, and along with the Japanese and the Brazilian traditions, are quite impressive when it comes to the numbers of professional anthropologists or ethnologists. However, there are some differences in the focus of research (Asad 1982: 285; Madan in Fahim, Helmer et al. 1980: 655, Fahim 1982: 265ff.), as "Western" anthropologists tended to study societies "abroad," while their "non-Western" (or "peripheral") counterparts much more often opted (or had to, due to financial and/or political constraints) to study "at home."

4. Non-members of the American Anthropological Association are required to pay the "processing fee" if they want to submit to the journals like *American Anthropologist*, *American Ethnologist*, or *Cultural Anthropology*. This fee of around 30 USD can be quite steep for someone living in a developing country, where it can form a substantial part of one's monthly salary.

others, at least from José de Acosta's *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* in 1590.² It would also be safe to say that the quest for understanding others was at the same time defining for the (rarely explicit task of) understanding ourselves, and anthropology has contributed to this since its very beginnings. Naturally, there were different traditions and different theories; there were grueling intellectual debates between advocates of the "monogenetic" and "polygenetic" theories in the early nineteenth century; then there was the issue of the "psychic unity of mankind," so forcefully championed by Bastian and his followers (and Franz Boas was one of them); finally, the issue of the "cultural circles" and the spread of culture and civilization (with Rivers' 1911 address to the Section H of the British Association for the Advancement of Science as the defining moment),³

1. José de Acosta (1539–1600), Spanish Jesuit and at the time of his death, Rector of the University of Salamanca. He spent several years (1571–1576) in South America, then two years in Mexico. As a result, he published *De natuna Novi Orbis et de promulgatione evangelii apud Barbaros* (Salamanca, 1588–1589), which was subsequently translated into Spanish. His book became an instant bestseller, and it is interesting to note that he assumed that the American Indians came from Asia (Mongolia) via land—and this was more than a century before Beringia was "discovered" by the West Europeans.

2. Of course, it could be argued that the interest in explaining "the Other" predates this—going as far back as Herodotus' *Histories* in the fifth century BCE, or Diodorus and Pausanias also in ancient Greece (Levi-Strauss 1987: 37), or Ibn Khaldun's travel accounts in the twelfth century CE. Levi-Strauss claimed these accounts were not really "anthropological" (or "ethnological") because they did not use critical methodology and comparisons between cultures—preferring mostly to describe them.

3. W.H.R. Rivers in his opening address claimed that changes in human societies were a direct consequence of the mixture of peoples and cultures. Here Rivers referred to the works of German ethnologists (Fritz Grahnert and Bernard Ankermann, both of whom presented their groundbreaking papers in Berlin in 1905, in support of Leo Frobenius' theory of "cultural circles"), who were establishing a diffusionist model for the development of cultures. This model would provide a crucial tool for Rivers' monumental *History of Melanesian Society*, because as Melanesian cultures were "complex" (as they included a mixture of elements from a variety of different cultures), their histories could not be studied using evolutionary theories. Rivers also had a frequently overlooked influence on functionalism, as his first student in Cambridge was Radcliffe-Brown, while Malinowski took to the field the edition of *Notes and Queries* prepared by him.

PART IV \ THE EARLY TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

On the surface, this creates a very different situation: this anthropologist begins with considerable knowledge of cultural and social patterns, she often does not have to learn a new language, etc. Yet, it can be argued that this supposedly crucial difference between works of "Third World" or "non-Western" anthropologists does not really affect the quality of work or research, although the fact remains that the most influential anthropological works today are published in English (and occasionally French).⁵ Some questions follow from this. Firstly, is this leading to a certain "auto-provincialization" of anthropology? Secondly, how does this contribute to a "critical Third World vision" (Cardoso de Oliveira 2000: 11)?

The work of anthropologists from non-metropolitan traditions displays enormous variation, much of it poorly known in dominant, largely Anglophone anthropology. Some of these anthropologists have had extensive training in the metropolitan schools, while others have been educated in a domestic or regional intellectual environment. Some have done their fieldwork at home, or among "others at home," making for a closer relationship to the domestic public sphere and domestic politics; while others have worked overseas. Some publish chiefly in non-hegemonic languages (which increasingly means any language but English); some depend on extensive consultancy work to make ends meet, while others have a strong institutional base in their national university system. Some may function as free intellectuals and scholars, while others are expected to conform to strictly academic or ideological norms. In brief, the differences between "marginal anthropologies" are just as pronounced as the similarities, and make comparisons both demanding and necessary—even more so as the stories of these anthropologies may stimulate critical reflection on the basis for the assumed centrality of hegemonic anthropologies.

In the introduction to their pioneering collection of peripheral anthropologies, Gerholm and Hannerz

(1982) compared the center-periphery relationship in anthropology with that of a mainland to the outlying archipelago. People living in the islands were variously connected to the mainland by ferry, bridges, etc., but their main point, which remains valid today, is that the island people needed the mainland to survive, while mainland dwellers did not even need to be aware of the existence of the islands. While this discrepancy in symbolic power is well known in the "islands," it is rarely noticed on the mainland. Majorities do not need to learn the minority languages; minorities are forced to learn majority languages. Majorities define the terms of discourse, while minorities can either remain marginal or adapt. Such basic insights into intergroup power relations, taught in Anthropology 101 courses everywhere (both on the mainland and in the archipelago, incidentally), are rarely brought to bear on anthropology itself. Do peripheral anthropologies create their own centers, or do they slavishly adapt to the latest fashions of the metropolises? Do they at all perceive themselves as peripheral? Do they represent alternative theoretical or methodological perspectives which should have been better known at the center, or is their work either second rate or similar to metropolitan anthropology?

In this Introduction, we ask these and related questions by drawing on eleven original, hitherto unpublished accounts from as many countries,⁶ ranging from the huge to the tiny; from countries with an old, confident, and venerable tradition of anthropology, to countries where the subject was either developed during twentieth century colonialism or even more recently, that is, after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The stories cover Argentina and Brazil in the Americas, Cameroon and Kenya in Africa, Bulgaria, Russia, and the former Yugoslavia in Eastern Europe, the Netherlands and Norway in Western Europe, as well as Japan and Turkey.

Diverse Origins

British and French anthropology had partly overlapping origins with colonialism, although it would be

5. This seems to be so different from the situation in the late nineteenth century—for example, Tylor's *magnum opus*, *Primitive Culture*, was soon after its original publication in 1871 translated into Russian and German, and the editions in French and Polish soon followed.

6. Several papers were presented at the September 2004 meeting of the EASA in Vienna, at the workshop "Other Anthropologies," convened by Bošković and Eriksen.

although the pioneering Norwegian sociologist Eilert Sundt (1817–1875) wrote sensitively about traveling communities and rural customs, the impetus to a modern Norwegian anthropology in the twentieth century came wholly from abroad; initially from German, French, and Anglophone sources, but after the Second World War increasingly from Britain and the USA. Following a period of eclecticism with a strong base in museum anthropology, Norwegian social anthropology was institutionalized and professionalized in the 1950s under the leadership of a few individuals, foremost among them in the formative period the young rebels, Fredrik Barth and Axel Sommerfelt, who were both reputed to have said, at various times, that one ought to sell off the Ethnographic Museum's collections in order to fund fieldwork. Since this period, Norwegian anthropology has been developed by Dutch scholars in Dutch, and somewhat opposite to the Dutch situation, Norwegian language anthropology has flourished since the early 1990s. The Norwegian story reminds us, relevantly in the present context, of the fact that a handful of individuals can make a great deal of difference.

Moving east, Russian anthropology shares its colonial origins with Dutch anthropology, but since its empire was contiguous with its center, the clear cut distinction between ethnology (local culture) and anthropology (faraway peoples) is more fuzzy in Russia than in the Netherlands. Kuznetsov shows that in their pioneering studies of the *ethnos*, Russian anthropologists included themselves, or Russians rather, as one of the ethnic groups. Informed by both German *Volkskunde* and, obviously especially after 1917, a particular brand of Marxism or "Diamat" (dialectical materialism), Russian anthropologists saw prior to that carried out in the West. Before 1990, little anthropology was translated between Russian and the West European languages, in spite of efforts by people like Ernest Gellner (1980) to develop a dialogue. The post-1990 situation seems to be characterized by a dual desire to "catch up" (the self-proclaimed provincial attitude) and to show the West that a powerful Russian anthropological tradition does exist.

Lacking the means to carry out fieldwork overseas, Russian/Soviet anthropologists were always forced

7. The idea of anthropology as a "handmaiden of colonialism" is a greatly exaggerated and essentialized image of only a number of traditions and some anthropologists—it can easily be contrasted with early anthropologists like Rivers or Haddon (who were socialists and who despised colonialism), for example, as well as some of the key liberation figures of African postcolonial resistance, like Z.K. Matthews in South Africa, or Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya (see Ntarangwi in this volume).

preposterous to claim, as many have done, that they were "an extended arm" of the colonial endeavor.⁷ The relationship with colonial authorities was much more complicated than that. Regarding the anthropology that emerged outside the centers, their relationship with global power structures varies greatly. Han Vermeylen traces Dutch anthropology back to the 1830s onwards—a generation ahead of Morgan and Tylor. In the Netherlands, the early interest in systematic studies of faraway peoples was quite clearly a result of colonialism, and early (proto-) anthropologyists stood in a complex relationship to the VOC (the Dutch East Indies Company). Through most of its history, Dutch anthropologists have concentrated on the country's colonies, largely Indonesia. Independent theories of social and cultural dynamics have been developed by Dutch scholars in Dutch, and their awareness of metropolitan traditions naturally exceeded the metropolitan knowledge of their work. Even more interestingly, scholars working seriously with Indonesian ethnology need to acquire a reading knowledge of Dutch.

Although there is a strong publishing tradition in Dutch, anthropology in the Netherlands is increasingly bilingual; even the central journal, *Bijsdragen*, publishes articles in both English and Dutch. In the last decades, Dutch anthropology has become more diverse in terms of regional orientation, and it must by now be said to be fully integrated into the mainstream, as witnessed in the fully English language journal *Focaal*, which takes on topics such as immigration and "the Other" in Europe.

While Dutch anthropology quite clearly has colonial origins, this cannot be said to be the case with the other West European country in our sample, Norway. Although there was considerable scholarly interest in the Sami in the nineteenth century already, and

PART IV \ THE EARLY TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

to problematize the distinction between "self" and "other" in ways Western anthropologists began to do only in the 1970s, notwithstanding their dependence on a stifling evolutionist explanatory scheme. In Brazil, Peirano points out, the "self-other" distinction has also played itself out in a way shaped by local circumstances. While anthropological theory in Brazil has been heavily influenced by both French and North American impulses, its articulation with society is very different. Like in Russia, the peoples studied by Brazilian anthropologists live in areas contiguous with their own. They have often assumed the advocate's stance, and, as Peirano puts it, "guilt has not prospered in a context which has always demanded social scientists' commitment to the objects of their study."

The Japanese situation, again, is qualitatively different. Sugishita points out that Japanese made the "shocking discovery" already in the 1870s that they were the object of Western observation! Their first anthropological association was founded as early as 1884. Not a conventional colonial power, Japan nevertheless was a regional power in East Asia, and yet twentieth century Japanese anthropology has been truly global in its reach. Sugishita, in a critical assessment of anthropology in Japan, argues that it remains a neocolonial enterprise based to a great extent on an unquestioned contrasting of "self" and "other," lacking careful self-reflection on "the complicated relationship between Japan, the West and the rest of the world." In this, Japanese anthropology seems to mirror, oddly, concerns which have been at the forefront of Western anthropology for a long time.

Spanish language Latin American anthropology has stood in a more direct, and arguably more dynamic, relationship to Western anthropology than either Russian or Japanese anthropology. Many Mexican and Argentinian anthropologists received their training overseas, and their work has developed in close dialogue both with metropolitan anthropology and with foreign anthropologists working in their own regions. Argentina parallels Norway in that anthropology was for a long time oriented towards cultural history. Guber notes: "Until the late 1950s, Argentinian anthropology only dealt with the past and with what anthropologists and most state agents conceived of as survivals of pre-Hispanic and

pre-modern times—archaeology, ethnology and folklore."

The Soviet/Russian case is unique. There exists a rich and theoretically significant research literature in Russian that goes back to the eighteenth century. Research was later curbed and shaped by Soviet authorities with an active ideological interest in ethnology, subsuming it under Marxist universal history, a fact which did not prevent Soviet scholars from developing sophisticated theories and amassing enormous comparative ethnographic knowledge. The USSR was at the same time a hub attracting students, many of them interested in the ethnology of their own country, from socialist countries worldwide.

Some "peripheral" anthropologies may in fact claim to represent "great traditions" in their own right, and this is clearly the case for the former Soviet Union and possibly for Japan and Brazil as well. The Russian anthropologist V.I. Kozlov wrote in 1992 that, "I often had to socialise with American scientists from the prestige universities, as well as from the average ones, and I must say that their 'doctors' and 'professors' are scientifically inferior to ours" (quoted by Kuznetsov).

Brazilian anthropologists would probably not go this far, but it is clear from Peirano's account that Brazilian anthropology, chiefly Lusophone, never saw itself as marginal or peripheral. Ethnological research has been carried out in Brazil for many generations, and today it plays a social and political role rarely paralleled in the North. Although the indebtedness to European and North American anthropological theory is evident in Brazil, there appears to be no sense among Brazilian anthropologists of living in a backwater or running a remote branch office.

Geographically closer to the centers, Serbian, Turkish, and Bulgarian anthropologies have histories which perhaps justify the term "periphery" more easily than some of our other examples. The most extreme example is Bulgaria, where anthropology appeared, according to Elchinova, only after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and where it is still very much in the making. Anthropology lacks a domestic tradition and even singular prominent scholars like Holy, Stuchlik, Gellner, and Skalník (from the former Czechoslovakia), Gusti (Romania), and Malinowski

the country and to develop local research expertise. However, in spite of this, it is probably fair to say that no truly independent research paradigms with an overseas influence have seen the light of day in post-colonial African societies (with the possible exception of South Africa). The funding remains erratic and the institutional infrastructure remains poor.

These are our eleven cases. With the exception of the Netherlands, Norway, and Japan, research in these countries is largely carried out at home or in the library. One characteristic of "peripheral anthropology" may thus appear to be that one tends to do fieldwork "at home." However, this will clearly not work as a general description. Certainly in Russia and Brazil, but also in the other countries under consideration, the tendency has been to study "the others at home"—Amerindians in Brazil, ethnic minorities in Russia, and rural farmers in Kenya and Cameroon.

Nevertheless, the empirical focus and breadth of research in a country is obviously interesting. Conversely, it is just as relevant to look at the domestic impact of anthropology in a country, which may be inversely related to the extent of overseas fieldwork—a topic to which we will return.

The extent of foreign ethnographic interest is also relevant, not least for its contribution to the internal dynamics of the subject in the country. Foreign anthropologists have consistently studied, published about, and engaged in dialogue with local scholars in Africa and Latin America, to some extent in Japan and the former Yugoslavia, but to a much lesser extent in Russia, the Netherlands, Norway, and Bulgaria. According to Elchinova, only two anthropological monographs have been written about Bulgaria, and to date, their influence on Bulgarian scholars has been modest.

The varying relationship to colonialism is also interesting. Some anthropologies developed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were connected, however tenuously and uncomfortably, to colonial expansion; others were subjected to colonial interests, while yet others developed independently of colonialism, sometimes in direct competition with the anthropologies of the centers. This kind of difference is an important dimension of comparison. The Japanese case is such an example. Japanese

(Poland). However, like in most Central and Eastern European countries, an ethnological research tradition existed long before this; yet, according to Elchinova, the academic interest in faraway places was almost nonexistent. (Interestingly enough, Bulgarian exiles like Julia Kristeva and Tzvetan Todorov, who have written superbly about cultural differences, are non-anthropologists.)

Tandogan dates the origins of Turkish anthropology to 1925, just after the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Significantly, it was founded not by foreigners, but by domestic scholars. In Turkey, rural sociology overlapped with anthropology and possibly still does. In Serbia, anthropology has been practiced (as part of the so-called "human geography") at least since 1884. Its history is fraught with political concerns, political factionalism, and a difficult relationship to the nationalist discipline of ethnology, but there has also for decades been a very active dialogue with foreign (largely Anglophone, but recently also German language) anthropologists who carried out research in Yugoslavia and in the neighboring countries.

In the two African countries included in our sample, anthropology was quite clearly established by foreigners or expatriates like the Leakeys (Kenya). In Cameroon, there are few domestic scholars; Kenya has more, but in both countries, most of the well-known ethnographies have been published by foreigners. In Brazil, by contrast, the vast majority of anthropologists working in the country are locals.

In spite of Jomo Kenyatta's early monograph, *Facing Mount Kenya*, foreigners have dominated Kenyan anthropology. The famous paleoanthropologist Louis Leakey's mounting presence for decades in Kenyan academic life may have influenced sociocultural anthropology in the country; it is nonetheless a fact that it appears to be much more interdisciplinary than in most other countries. Anthropology is taught at several Kenyan universities, and also has an institutional base at the country level that has produced some remarkable polyhistorians, easily transcending the boundaries of social or cultural anthropology. Anglophone Cameroonian anthropology has been shaped by a handful of engaged foreign anthropologists, from Phyllis Kaberry to Edwin and Shirley Arden, who helped to institutionalize research in

PART IV \ THE EARLY TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

anthropologists followed the colonial expansion of the Japanese state in the early twentieth century by concentrating their research on Eastern Siberia, Southern China, and other regions of imperial interest. After the demise of Japanese imperialism in 1945, Japanese anthropology became more global, sometimes seeing itself as a competitor to Western anthropologies. With Cameroon, the situation is very different in almost every respect. Cameroonian anthropologists depend on external funding for their research, lack a firm institutional and publishing base at home, publish in the colonial languages, and rarely do fieldwork abroad. The contrast reminds us that there is no such thing as "peripheral anthropology," but many, arising from highly distinct historical circumstances, and functioning under extremely different institutional, financial, and intellectual conditions.

Language Issues

Issues of language enter into the discussion in a variety of ways. Does it make an anthropological tradition peripheral if its main body of published work is in a non-metropolitan language? If this is the case, then Russian, Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish must be considered peripheral languages. Arguably, Anglophone anthropologists are more parochial than their Brazilian counterparts. Brazilians read English language works, either in the original or in translation; the opposite takes place much more rarely.

In Cameroon and Kenya, anthropological works are published almost exclusively in the colonial languages—English and French. The Dutch, Turkish, Serbian, Slovenian, and Norwegian anthropologies tend to be bilingual, while Russian, Japanese, Brazilian, and Argentinian anthropology is chiefly published in a non-English language. Who is peripheral, he who emulates the language of the hegemon or he who opts for his own? There is obviously no answer to this question, and it hardly makes sense to raise it. When Eriksen began to write up his Mauritian fieldwork in the late 1980s, it was easy for him to decide to publish in English rather than Norwegian. Otherwise, it would have been impossible for him to take part in any well-informed professional dialogue about Mauritian culture and society. The point here is about

scale, not about language as such, but it is worth noting that important anthropologies remain unknown to Western Europeans because of a lack of translations.

As a rule, anthropology is translated *into* these languages, mostly from English and French, and rarely *out of them*. Worldwide, the number of translations into English is much lower than the number of translations out of English. In fact, according to UNESCO statistics,⁸ more books are translated in Finland (with five million inhabitants) than in the USA (with 300 million). Thus, it is not just in anthropology that the English-speaking world tends to isolate itself.

Naturally, the paucity of translations into English indicates the symbolic power and discursive hegemony of the Anglophone world. The majority rarely needs to learn the language of the minority. However, it could be the case that the majority sometimes has important lessons to learn from the minority!

As a result of globalization, there is currently a great pressure to publish in English among academics in a very many countries. In small country new-speak, the term "international publication" means "any grotty little piece that has been accepted by an English-language journal or edited volume." In this book, Japan appears to be the only country where it gives a scholar higher prestige to publish in the national language than in English.

Using the vernacular has its costs, but also its benefits, as it enables the writer to engage with the public sphere in his or her country. As Eriksen argues, the widespread use of the Norwegian language among the anthropologists of the country has given them considerable influence in the public sphere. The situation is somewhat similar in Brazil. When Tandogan describes anthropology in Turkey as "a silent discipline" in the greater public sphere, one cannot but ask if this has anything to do with the eagerness on the part of Turkish anthropologists to write in English. Bilingual publishing is probably the best solution, intellectually speaking, at least in smallish countries with a limited domestic public sphere. Significantly,

8. The source is the "Index Translationum," see <http://databases.unesco.org/xtrans/stat/xTransStat.a?VL1=C&top=50&lg=0>.

social and cultural anthropology, non-western sociology, and development studies. As a result, a large number of research projects are funded every year. This is also the case in Russia, Japan, and Brazil. Others depend on international foundations. Varying degrees of academic freedom also create distinct opportunity spaces. In the so-called post-Communist world, academic agendas had for decades been shaped by ideological concerns and relatively fixed theoretical blueprints. Soviet ethnology was grafted onto universalist Marxist theory after the Revolution, but this was a controversial move among ethnologists and anthropologists who rejected unilinear evolutionism. According to Kuznetsov, ethnology, which was very nearly abolished in the 1920s because of its inherent un-Marxist tendencies, was rescued by the adoption, among Soviet ethnologists, of the principles of "stabilism." Since the early 1990s, Russian anthropology has partly been concerned with "catching up" and partly concerned with asserting its own identity.

The Turkish case is also a reminder of the ideological and political constraints on research. It was the formation of a state committed to modernization that led to the establishment of anthropology in the first place; later, the military coups of 1971 and 1980 led to a temporary curtailing of all social science research, including anthropology. Faced with such oppression, one may be forgiven for thinking that Thatcherism was a trifling annoyance.

Anthropology often struggles for its legitimacy, but it may also suddenly become fashionable. In Kenya, where social anthropology had been associated with a romantic view of the "tribals"—a difficult role to undertake in a country where modernization was the main political goal—Ntarangwi tells of a sudden change in the early 1980s. This was when the Moi regime decided that traditional forms "ought to be preserved and documented." All of a sudden, anthropology became perfectly legitimate.

The role of individuals is always emphasized in standard histories of anthropology. Quite clearly, in countries with a fledgling academic structure, unpredictable funding for anthropological research, and uneven access to metropolitan publications, outstanding individuals may play an enormously important part. In remote Norway, Fredrik Barth was extremely

fund research, along with university departments in research councils and ethnographic museums may have many potential sources of funding. Both national and international funding for research is still available, the situation is fiercely competitive, but at the same time there are funding for research is still available, the situation is

In the Netherlands and Norway, where public anthropology tradition than Kenya.

In South Africa, which has a much broader and larger paid work. This is also rapidly becoming a major issue intellectual energy is deflected from research to better anthropology of short-time consultancies, where Kenyan anthropology, Ntarangwi talks about "the their income outside the academy. In the context of the marginal existence and have to supplement with few tenured posts and small departments. Some policy is often precarious at the institutional level, funding has become less reliable. In general, anthropology is often precarious at the institutional level, to depend on international foundations since state the transition, anthropologists have increasingly come in their essays. In Central and Eastern Europe after home. Both Elchinova and Boškovíc make this point the brightest stars and the end of anthropology at sudden financial cuts may lead to the departure of professional infrastructure. In less fortunate countries, survived due to its strong institutions and solid professional infrastructure. In less fortunate countries, extremely limited in the 1980s, but the discipline nature. In the UK, funding for anthropology was of an institutional, infrastructural or simply financial

a West European one is perhaps extreme, but anthropologists in many countries face serious constraints

The contrast between a West African country and a West European one is perhaps extreme, but anthropologists in many countries face serious constraints

ily, and no money to go to conferences.

made it impossible to support oneself, let alone a family, and no money to go to conferences.

with an erratic Internet connection, a salary which had access to few journals, a slow and dated computer was necessary for his academic work. At home, he move to the cold north, he simply answered that it Western Europe. When asked why he wanted to scholar who had applied for a research position in back, where the interviewee was a West African

One of us remembers a job interview some years

Constraints

there appears to be no anthropological publishing activity to speak of in African languages.

PART IV \ THE EARLY TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

important in establishing social anthropology as a high prestige academic discipline. But often, the heroes and heroines are less well known. In Argentina, Esther Hermitte, who studied in the 1950s at a Chicago department still heavily influenced by Radcliffe-Brown's research ideals, was decisive in shaping the subject at home. Guber also mentions eclectics like Eduardo Menéndez, whose politically engaged and anti-colonial views would shape students' perspectives through textbooks and lecturing. In fact, as mentioned above, Elchinova partly explains the poverty of anthropology in Bulgaria by mentioning the lack of one or two outstanding local scholars.

In the larger countries, individuals have played a less pronounced role as the subject slowly grew and became more solidly institutionalized. It may also have become more streamlined and standardized. Perhaps, by this token, it is from the anthropologies which can still properly be described as peripheral that real originality may be expected in the future.

That said, it may be a sign of true peripherality that one oscillates between trying to emulate the metropolises and to assert one's independence. In a critical characterization of Japanese anthropology, Sugishita speaks about a Japanese "we/here" that continues to reproduce similar us/them distinctions as those produced by Western anthropologists. In her view, Japanese anthropology "is inseparable from Japan's desire to join the West as the dominant socio-cultural entity" in the world. Lacking reflexivity, she adds, a major epistemological shortcoming of Japanese anthropology consists in its lack of reflection "on the complicated relationship between Japan, the West and the rest of the world." If truly original anthropologies are to emerge from one or several of the sprawling non-metropolitan traditions, she seems to imply, a mental decolonization must first take place. Perhaps the answer to Sugishita's concern can be found in one of the rich anthropological traditions concentrating on the study of cultural variation within the borders of one country, namely one's own.

Anthropology at Home

A tension running through anthropology in many parts of the world, but perhaps more strongly in Central and Eastern Europe than elsewhere, is that

obtaining between ethnology (the study of local customs, often favoring material over ephemeral culture) and the study of faraway places. In Germany and many other countries, this is the contrast between *Volkskunde* (the study of one, usually one's own, people) and *Völkerkunde* (the study of peoples). Although the distinction was clear enough a few generations ago, it is more difficult to draw the boundary today. For example, Swedish ethnology has, under the leadership of scholars like Orvar Löfgren and Jonas Frykman, been transformed into a cultural anthropology of Swedish society. Moreover, social and cultural anthropologists increasingly write about their own society even if they have the means to pursue overseas fieldwork. Turkish anthropologists seem to have evaded the confrontation with nation-building ethnology by turning towards rural sociology.

Yet, there is something important in this distinction. Elchinova notes that young Bulgarian anthropologists strongly recognize the significance of their break with the earlier folklore and ethnological research, which was among other things encouraged by the Communists. In Serbia, as well as in several other countries, a similar tension exists, there is little contact between folklore/ethnology and anthropology; different sets of questions are being asked and different underlying political and intellectual agendas inform the research.

Nevertheless, anthropologists in most of the countries we consider here do the bulk of their research "at home," meaning in the country where they have academic jobs. Even in Norway, the Netherlands, and Japan, many anthropologists now write about their own majority society.

The question is when one does fieldwork "at home," and to what extent does this compromise one's ambition to contribute to a discipline with a global outlook rather than a nation-building ambition. There can be no simple answer to this huge question, but some of our cases shed light on it. In other cases, like the one discussed by Narayan (1993), the very positioning of the "native" scholar in her own cultural context becomes a very important issue.

The Latin American cases seriously question the notions of "remote areas" and "otherness," and the way they tend to be conceptualized in metropolitan

anthropologists had an important ethical, and by implication political, role to play here. As a logical extension, anthropologists could—and do—propose models of modernity which are based on local customs. This can probably only be done efficiently and credibly by local anthropologists.

A peculiar form of domestic anthropology which has popped up in several countries is the ironic, but often quite illuminating anthropology of "one's own tribe," which implicitly and sometimes explicitly makes it clear that the "normal" way of life is to be found in the Trobriands or some such place. In Norway, there has been a great demand for this kind of self-saturating anthropology in recent years. It can only be undertaken with credibility by local anthropologists, or by foreigners such as the late Eduardo Archetti, who had lived for many years in the country (see Eriksen 2005 for more details).

In a strong statement about the difference between the conceptualizations of "otherness" in metropolitan countries (where anthropologists go overseas for fieldwork) and countries where the bulk of research is carried out at home, Peirano states:

[I]n Brazil, (i) otherness has been predominantly found within the limits of the country; (ii) research by a group of ethnographers has been quite common, especially in the case of Indian populations; (iii) salvage anthropology was never an issue—rather the study of "contact" between Indian and local populations as considered more relevant than preserving intact cultures; (iv) funds for research have come mainly from state agencies for advanced research.

The logical conclusion of Peirano's challenging analysis is, in fact, that the "metropolises" are being othered. *They* are the provincials.⁹

9. As such, it provides an interesting response to a question raised by Peter Pels, "what does a Parisian anthropology look like from Brazil?" (2003: 144, 148).

anthropology. Guber and Peirano emphasize that their anthropologies have grown out of questions that arise from specific local circumstances and issues, and that their view is not as much from afar as from within. As an anthropologist working in one's own country, one is never insulated from domestic issues and can often be forced to take political positions. The intellectual detachment often praised, but just as often lamented, by commentators on anthropology does thus not present itself to anthropologists working "at home" like it does to those who choose to do fieldwork far away.

Yet there are varying degrees of being at home. The partly discredited Afrikaner *Volkekunde* tradition, which in its day was a main source of inspiration for *apartheid*, might credibly claim that its detailed, but often completely a-theoretical treatises about the customs of local African groups amounted to studying at home. However, it would not be fair to compare Brazilian anthropologists writing about Amerindians to Afrikaner intellectuals writing about Zulus. The ethical codes guiding anthropological research in Brazil are quite different from those that were informing *volkekundige* ethnologists (for more details, see Bošković and Van Wyk 2005), and Brazil is an open society where people are made accountable in ways unthinkable under *apartheid*.

However, it is quite clear that there are centers and peripheries, not just globally, and not just between the metropolitan and the "peripheral" anthropologists, but also in a general way within each country. The anthropologists at the University of Brasília in Brazil are part of a center; the Xingu are part of a periphery. Who studies the elites or even urban middle classes? Few anthropologists in any country do, it must be granted. Studying "the other at home" can be a virtue in itself, not just because it leads to valuable knowledge, but also because of its ideological implications. In many countries of the South, the modernization policies of the latter half of the twentieth century implied that cultural variation was undesirable, and especially that traditional cultures were inferior. Modernization was generally equated with "Westernization," and this view was naturally at odds with the aim of anthropology to value and appreciate non-western, non-industrial cultures. So

Conclusion: Crisis, What Crisis?

The past changes really quickly. Article titles in Gerholm and Hannerz' 1982 collection read, for example, "Polish ethnography after World War II" (it would have been integrated into a radically different narrative now), "The state of anthropology in the Sudan" (with no mention of ethnicity or religion), "After the quiet revolution" (about Quebec; today, few speak about the quiet revolution—it happened such a long time ago), and "Through Althusserian spectacles: Recent social anthropology in Brazil." Peirano, unsurprisingly, does not mention Althusser in her review of Brazilian anthropology.

Claude Lévi-Strauss, writing almost five decades ago, specifically mentioned the "three sources of the ethnological reflexion," as the "discovery" of the Americas, the French revolution, and the beginnings of evolutionism in mid-nineteenth century France and the UK. These are all very political and deeply influential historical events. In recent years, his idea of anthropology (*ethnologie*) as a humanistic discipline has become increasingly influential even outside the French-speaking circles, as the boundaries (as well as genres) between social sciences, humanities, and "cultural studies" increasingly become blurred. The intersections of anthropology, politics, and history also become very apparent when one looks at the development of the discipline in the "peripheral" traditions. They were of course very much present in the "central" disciplines as well (Detienne 2002; a good example also being AAA's censure of Franz Boas in 1919, because he objected to American anthropologists serving as spies), but outside the centers, the very fact of conducting anthropological research could be seen as potentially subversive (as in Argentina), or part of the global nation-building endeavour (like in India or Brazil). Historical knowledge, experiences, and their interpretations traditionally formed important parts of considerations of different scholars (Archetti 2003, Augé 1989), but one should also note the dissatisfaction of some leading anthropologists from the "non-central" traditions for what they perceive to be lack of understanding of their culture on the part of more "central" scholars (for China, see Mingming 2002).

This lack of understanding can be easily remedied through increased and improved communication, which so far has mostly been surprisingly one-sided. "Third world" scholars are supposed to know everything that is going on in the "main" traditions, but their own work (regardless of its actual quality), even when it is published in English or French, mostly goes unnoticed. As noted above, there is a growing need for this type of communication to be increased and become less one-sided. Together with the authors around the "Other Anthropologies" project, we would like to argue for a pluralistic, multicentered discipline of a type suggested by Latour (2004).

It is striking to see the excitement of many "Third World" scholars at the international meetings, as well as the fervor with which they present their research results. This is very different from the frequent disillusionment and scepticism expressed by colleagues from "great" traditions, perhaps burdened with the idea of a discipline in crisis.

But how does one justify the general "crisis talk" when anthropology seems to be thriving in distant and extremely diverse traditions, such as Brazil, Norway, Japan, Kenya, or India? Russia is perhaps a slightly more complicated case, as already noted by Tishkov (1992). Even much smaller nations and newcomers to the global scene, such as Slovenia, invest in research and produce some very good and original work (for example, Brumen 2000). Even in countries without institutional backing, like Croatia or Serbia, the interest for studying other peoples and cultures is continuously growing. The generations of younger scholars throughout the world are coming out of the academic programs also armed with healthy doses of scepticism, but with the addition of important lessons learned from their predecessors and put in a very global contemporary context. The amount of research coming out in various forms is truly fascinating, so it is easy to agree with Peirano that there is no global crisis of anthropology.

Or, to put it differently, perhaps an old scholarly discipline that refused to change with the times is in crisis—as summed up wryly several decades ago by Diamond: "a study of men in crisis by men in crisis" (2004: 11). But anthropology as we know and practice

- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1987. "Les trois sources de la réflexion ethnologique." *Gradhiva* 2: 37-41. (Orig. pub. 1960.)
- Madan, T.N. 1982. "Anthropology as the Mutual Interpretation of Cultures: Indian Perspectives." In Fahim 1982: 4-18.
- Mingming, Wang. 2002. "The Third Eye: Towards a Critique of the 'Nativist Anthropology.'" *Critique of Anthropology* 22(2): 149-74.
- Narayan, Kirin. 1993. "How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95(3): 671-86.
- Pels, Peter. 2003. "Editorial/Editorial." *Social Anthropology* 11(2): 143-51.
- Quinlan, Tim. 2000. "Anthropologies of the South: The Practice of Anthropology." *Critique of Anthropology* 20(2): 125-36.
- Restrepo, Eduardo, and Arturo Escobar. 2005. "Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise." *Critique of Anthropology* 25(2): 99-129.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations in Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Tishkov, Valery. 1992. "The Crisis in Soviet Ethnography." *Current Anthropology* 33(4): 371-94.
- Vermeylen, Han F., and Arturo Roldán, eds. 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Barth, Fredrik, Robert Parkin, Andrew Gingrich, and Sydel Silverman. 2005. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bošković, Aleksandar, ed. 2008. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*. New York: Bergahn Books.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2006. *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence*. Oxford: Berg.
- Archetti, Eduardo P. 2003. "O 'gaúcho,' o tango, primitivismo e poder na formação da identidade nacional Argentina." *Mana* 9(1): 9-29.
- Asad, Talal. 1982. "A Comment on the Idea of Non-Western Anthropology." In Fahim 1982: 284-87.
- Augé, Marc. 1989. "Les lieux de mémoire du point de vue de l'ethnologie." *Gradhiva* 6: 3-12.
- Bošković, Aleksandar, and Iliana van Wyk. 2005. "Troubles with Identity: South African Anthropology, 1921-2004." *Emigračnískoe obozrenie* 2: 96-101.
- Brumana, Fernando Gobelina. 2002. "Entre Tintin y Tartarin: la mission Dacar-Yibut En el origen de la etnografía francesa." *Revista de Antropología* 45(2): 311-59.
- Brumen, Boris. 2000. *Su. Peter in njegovi časi*. [St. Peter and its History, and the Art of Constructing Comparables." *Common Knowledge* 8(1): 178-87.
- Diamond, Stanley. 2004. "Anthropology in Question." *Dialectical Anthropology* 28: 11-32.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2005. *Engaging Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.
- Fahim, Hussein, ed. 1982. *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- , Katherine Helmer, et al. 1980. "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration." *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 644-63.
- Gellner, Ernest, ed. 1980. *Soviet and Western Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Hammerz, Ulf, and Tomas Gerholm, eds. 1982. *The Shaping of National Anthropologies*. Special issue of *Ethnos* (Stockholm) 47(1-2).
- Krotz, Esteban. 1997. "Anthropologies of the South: Their Rise, their Silencing and their Characteristics." *Critique of Anthropology* 17(3): 237-51.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. "Whose Cosmos, which Cosmopolitics?" *Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck*. *Common Knowledge* 10(3): 450-62.
- Archetti, Eduardo P. 2003. "O 'gaúcho,' o tango, primitivismo e poder na formação da identidade nacional Argentina." *Mana* 9(1): 9-29.
- Asad, Talal. 1982. "A Comment on the Idea of Non-Western Anthropology." In Fahim 1982: 284-87.
- Augé, Marc. 1989. "Les lieux de mémoire du point de vue de l'ethnologie." *Gradhiva* 6: 3-12.
- Bošković, Aleksandar, and Iliana van Wyk. 2005. "Troubles with Identity: South African Anthropology, 1921-2004." *Emigračnískoe obozrenie* 2: 96-101.
- Brumana, Fernando Gobelina. 2002. "Entre Tintin y Tartarin: la mission Dacar-Yibut En el origen de la etnografía francesa." *Revista de Antropología* 45(2): 311-59.
- Brumen, Boris. 2000. *Su. Peter in njegovi časi*. [St. Peter and its History, and the Art of Constructing Comparables." *Common Knowledge* 8(1): 178-87.
- Diamond, Stanley. 2004. "Anthropology in Question." *Dialectical Anthropology* 28: 11-32.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2005. *Engaging Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.
- Fahim, Hussein, ed. 1982. *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- , Katherine Helmer, et al. 1980. "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration." *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 644-63.
- Gellner, Ernest, ed. 1980. *Soviet and Western Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Hammerz, Ulf, and Tomas Gerholm, eds. 1982. *The Shaping of National Anthropologies*. Special issue of *Ethnos* (Stockholm) 47(1-2).
- Krotz, Esteban. 1997. "Anthropologies of the South: Their Rise, their Silencing and their Characteristics." *Critique of Anthropology* 17(3): 237-51.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. "Whose Cosmos, which Cosmopolitics?" *Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck*. *Common Knowledge* 10(3): 450-62.

References

it, along with many of our colleagues in the "develop-
ing countries," certainly is not!

Further Readings

1. As globalization increases, might national traditions in anthropology become obsolete?
2. How do "other" anthropologies differ from the dominant anthropologies of Britain, France, and the United States?
3. Is the anthropological crisis referred to by Bošković and Eriksen theoretically self-indulgent?

Questions