

56. 'Other' anthropologies

Convenors:

Aleksandar Boskovic, Rhodes University
a.boskovic@ru.ac.za

Thomas Hylland Eriksen, University of Oslo
t.h.eriksen@sai.uio.no

Discussant:

Mariza G. S. Peirano, University of Brasília
mpeirano@uol.com.br

The main purpose of this workshop is to explore one of the main themes of the conference, namely, the metaphors of ethnographic practice. They are going to be explored in specific contexts of various national/regional anthropological traditions – both in Europe and in a wider context (Americas, Africa, Asia), but excluding the 'great' traditions (Anglo-American, French and German). The questions to be discussed include: how have these metaphors changed in a changing world? What do traditions such as (for example) Scandinavian, Polish, Yugoslav, Kenyan and Argentinian have in common, and how do they differ? How have discourses of post-colonialism, post-Marxism and post-structuralism influenced these traditions and what relation did they have with the more dominant ('central') anthropological traditions? Finally, what is the future of anthropology in these countries, sometimes referred to as 'peripheral'? The idea of anthropology that we wish to explore with other participants in this workshop is an idea of a horizontally-structured discipline (or a conglomerate of scholarly disciplines), coping with the challenges of multiculturalism, globalization and transnationalism. These challenges bring closer different anthropological traditions, but they also invoke the necessity for dialogue and co-operation. We believe that bringing together scholars from different traditions and different backgrounds can provide a fruitful basis for discussion, as well as for comparisons of the changing metaphors of ethnographic practice, both within the discipline of anthropology, and within the broader field of social sciences and humanities in general.

Anthropology in Russia: Old Traditions and New Influences

Anatoly M. Kuznetsov, Department of Social Anthropology, Far Eastern State University
akuzn@vimo.dvgu.ru

The foundation of Russian anthropology is closely connected with the inclusion of Siberia, Caucasus, and Middle Asia in the Russian Empire. The study of peoples of these regions was a part of Oriental studies and somewhat later of ethnography. The ethnography was institutionally formed in Russia in the end of the 1890s. It was a strong tendency of this discipline to make evaluations in ethnology – which was understood as a synthesis of social sciences and humanities (S. M. Shirokogoroff). Such ethnology may be regarded as a kind of social anthropology. But after the 1917, this tendency was stopped, and there was an idea to abolish ethnography as a bourgeois discipline. It was considered, after some discussions, that ethnography should be a part of history, and both of them based on the Marxist theory. It was only physical anthropology that was recognized in the USSR, while social anthropology

was considered as a kind of a “colonial sociology”. The situation changed radically after the Perestroika. The social anthropology was officially revived in Russia in 1995. Some scholars from other social sciences have migrated into this new field. Some years later, a number of ethnographers came to consider themselves as anthropologists, too. So we have a number of ideas on Social Anthropology in Russia now – a theoretical discipline that continued Soviet traditions, ethnology (the same as ethnography), and a part of the shared (Western) tradition.

Specificities of History and Peculiarities of Future in Slovenian Ethnology

Rajko Mursic, University of Ljubljana

rajko.mursic@guest.arnes.si

Ethnology can be understood as a comparative type of anthropological research. Considering its subject, aims and the position in idiosyncratic division of research fields as inherited from the past, it can be as well considered as a successor of the Central European discipline of “ethnography” (*Volkskunde, narodopis...*).

If we understand it as a comparative type of the study of a way of life in its most general sense, we are faced with a very simple question: what is the ground for the comparison? Does the “etic” of the discipline provide such ground? Well, if it is possible to omit pitfalls of the “lost” grand narratives, it still remains to define “etics” of the discipline in its actual appearance. The author will present the self-developed “etics” of the Slovene ethnology.

He will try to show that the present-day predominant form of the discipline – as manifested in institutional development and research programmes in Lakatos’s sense – is not exactly straightforward result of its manifold points of departure in the past. Anthropological orientation of the research programme to which the author is committed, far from being the exclusive one, is better grounded and designed exactly with referring to the history of the discipline in Slovenia, despite the fact that some of its prominent scholars did not (and still do not) recognise anthropology as its logical continuation.

The author hopes that various examples in development of social/cultural anthropology in peripheral European (and Non-European) countries may enrich the discipline in the global sense.

The end of ethnography – the beginning of anthropology? Changing disciplinary boundaries within the social sciences: the Polish case

Marian Kempny, ISNS UW/IFIS PAN, Warsaw

mkempny@ifispan.waw.pl

The paper aims at arguing that, despite the clearly visible differences in the development of social anthropology as a separate field within the academic division of labor, the common tendencies toward reshaping the internal boundaries within the field of the social sciences are recently easily seen – especially in Europe. This claim will be substantiated in the context of the shaping up of social anthropology in Poland, perceived as a gradual redefinition of ethnology as its disciplinary predecessor, and eradication of the historical divisions between ethnography/ethnology and sociology. The similar, emerging tendency toward changing boundaries of social anthropology and its neighboring disciplines can be also attributed to the other national traditions – especially within the so-called peripheral European anthropologies. This is why, having my analyses grounded in the Polish context, my intention is also to look at the processes of dwindling of the traditional divisions of ethnography vs. anthropology, and ethnography vs. sociology,

in a wider perspective of de-localization of East-European scholarship, which has been especially since 1989 responsive to the world-wide intellectual trends. It can be argued that this changing of boundaries has also to do with the universal challenges the contemporary culture poses in the wake of globalization, multiculturalism, and transnationalism. In effect, the diversity of factors responsible for the shaping of these various areas of intellectual practice that we used to objectivize as the scientific disciplines will be reconsidered in an effort to explain the redrawing of these more or less arbitrary boundaries that has recently taken place.

Sociocultural Anthropology in Bulgaria: Desired and Contested

Magdalena Elchinova, New Bulgarian University

melchinova@nbu.bg

magi_el@hotmail.com

Anthropology is a young academic discipline in Bulgaria, its development has started only after the fall of state socialism in the country. The paper comments on the following issues:

1. What were the political and ideological premises for the development of anthropology in Bulgaria in the early 1990s and how did they influence ethnographic practice, especially in terms of selection of research subject?
2. What were the national academic traditions of anthropology in Bulgaria (i.e. folklore, ethnography, history, philosophy, sociology) and how did each particular scholarly tradition take part in the debate about the nature of ethnographic practice?
3. What is the impact of the 'great' anthropological traditions (British, French, German, American) upon the shaping of the identity of anthropology in Bulgaria? In this perspective some aspects of the heated debates about what should the nature of anthropology in Bulgaria be are discussed in the paper: what is 'true' anthropology, is anthropology 'at home' as valuable and influential as the anthropology of faraway societies and cultures, which pattern(s) and methods should be given preference in search for a 'true' anthropology, etc.

Finally, the paper tries to outline the perspectives for the development of anthropological studies in Bulgaria as interdisciplinary and engaged with topical social issues, such as migration, globalisation, multiculturalism, tolerance and discrimination, European integration.

Political/Epistemological Problems of Japanese Anthropology

Kaori Sugishita, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

sugishitak@social.wits.ac.za

Anthropology was introduced to Japan in the late 19th century through the mediation of Western investigation into the origins of the Japanese. Hence Japanese anthropologists were initially preoccupied with their own history, society and culture. Today, by contrast, the majority of them focus upon 'other' peoples (with Westerners included in this category), exploring almost every corner of the globe. This paper addresses the question of how Japanese anthropologists, as non-Westerners by definition, conceptualise and engage in a disciplinary system that originated in the West, with discourses and practices grounded in an epistemological endorsement of the political inequalities of contemporaneous worlds. While their Western

counterparts have become aware of the political/epistemological problems of anthropology through postcolonial or 'postmodern' self-reflection, many Japanese anthropologists do not seem to recognize such concerns as *their own problem*. They tend to affiliate themselves with anthropology as a universal system, failing to reflect on how the system has operated in their society throughout the periods of 'enlightenment', imperialism, post-war reconstruction, economic growth and thereafter. This tendency should be corrected in order for Japanese anthropology to assert its validity and relevance at home and abroad.

Anthropology and the Publics in India

Veena Das, Johns Hopkins University

veenadas@jhu.edu

In this paper, I will examine the mutual construction of categories of anthropological analysis and administrative and legal discourse. My argument is that ideas about uniqueness and exception play an important role in the construction of anthropology of India and anthropology in India. I will take two specific concepts - that of caste and that of communalism – to show how local anthropologies are constructed and acquire a life through the administrative concepts of crisis, public order and governance.

Other social anthropologies. Argentine *antropologías sociales* as counter-institutional accounts (1956-1970)

Rosana Guber, CONICET, Buenos Aires

guber@arnet.com.ar

This paper explores the meanings that Argentine social scientists, mainly anthropologists, have assigned to “social anthropology”. Here I argue that *antropología social* became the name for various practices and scopes, but all of them have shared more than strict academic concerns. More than a field of research based on ethnography and fieldwork, *antropología social* refers to the relationship of social sciences and intellectuals’ political involvement, usually alluded to by means of an anti-colonial discourse in a largely independent country. This paper explores the trajectories of the main trends in Argentine *antropología social* and their uses of theory, empirical data and writing in the midst of political turmoil and institutional breakdown.

Mexican Sociocultural Anthropology as Contribution to the Emergence of the Anthropologies of the South

Esteban Krotz, Autonomous University of Yucatán

kroqui@prodigy.net.mx

The first part of the paper presents, in a panoramic mode, the principal characteristics which distinguished Mexican anthropology from other Latin American anthropological traditions during the first half of the last century. The second part of the paper analyzes the work of some of the most creative and influential Mexican anthropologists of the second half of the 20th century as a part of the still emerging "anthropologies of the south".

