

**SÉRIE ANTROPOLOGIA**

**229**

**WHERE IS ANTHROPOLOGY?**

**Mariza G.S. Peirano**

**Brasília**

**1997**

## WHERE IS ANTHROPOLOGY?<sup>⊗</sup>

Mariza GS Peirano

Despite their pretense, the declaredly egalitarian, yet to be routinized, cross-cultural dialogues are never in fact between equals, for the absence of a fully governing convention, of a mutually acceptable third, fosters hierarchy — a (silent) assertion of authority over, an ‘understanding’ of, the position of the interlocutor. (Or its opposite.) There is little to mediate — to attenuate — the challenge each participant, coming, as it were, from somewhere else, poses to the other (Vincent Crapanzano 1991).

An alliance of multiple interests and perspectives is often a stronger political and social force than attempts to enforce a unitary movement (Michael M.J. Fischer 1994).

### 1

#### ***Classics, theoretical history and anthropology in context***

Within the transnational communities of the social sciences, a common ideology that fosters ideals of universality and cements social relations between scientists of various origins is indispensable. It is within this sociological context that *classics* are situated. The systematic reading of texts considered to be classics initiate students in a tradition that, in the case of anthropology, consists of those practitioners who are knowledgeable of the ethnographic corpus of certain key authors who brought the exotic into the awareness of the west and used it two ways: not only in the obvious and banal chore of serving as an existential mirror, but also with the responsibility of refining a theoretical apparatus with universalist pretensions. The classics of a discipline are, therefore, sociologically necessary and theoretically indispensable creations through which practitioners identify and reproduce themselves in diverse academic contexts; they make possible the existence of a community of social scientists, from which is derived both its singular relevance and its continuity.

The acknowledgment of the centrality of the classics, however, does not imply the transformation of the social sciences into a mere story of the disciplines, nor does it

---

<sup>⊗</sup> The original text in Portuguese was published in *Mana*, 3(2): 67-101, 1997.

turn anthropology into a history of anthropology. To the contrary, it requires the differentiation of internal and external proposals amongst practitioners and students of a field. Even though the historiography of anthropology generates ever more data to be considered, *theoretical histories* are phenomena internal to the practice of the discipline. They result from the reconstructions of theory which both accompany and illuminate new ethnographic data. Conscious or not, it is the acceptance of specific theoretical histories that situates certain works or authors as *classics* of a school or tendency and establishes lineages, not only of ethnographers but also of questions, problems and theoretical issues, that new generations inherit, seek to respond to and pass on modified to their successors.<sup>1</sup> This acknowledgment does not make classics eternal, a-historic and disconnected from the context within which they were generated or appropriated. But beyond existing variations, the important sociological fact is that they are essential for the continuity of a corpus of knowledge that, in certain circumstances, becomes disciplinary: the question of knowing who they are, where they are, or how they were incorporated, though important, is secondary to the fact of their indispensable existence.<sup>2</sup>

With these general considerations as points of reference (and acknowledging their empirical as well as normative role), this paper seeks to examine some questions concerning the many expressions of anthropology in contemporary contexts. In a time when the idea of the end of disciplines — feared by some, celebrated by others — is being disseminated, I seek to examine the results of the processes of acculturation that develop within the academic world, and which inform continuities and questionings.<sup>3</sup> I am interested in the possibility of pluralist universalisms, concerned with the founding basis of anthropology vis-à-vis the fragmentation of knowledge, and intrigued by the fact that *classics*, even in the post-modern context, remain indispensable. In this essay, I approach these broad questions by way of two ethnographic entrances: first, a visit to

---

<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere I made a more detailed distinction between *theoretical histories* and historiography (Peirano 1995: 146-155).

<sup>2</sup> The centrality of the classics is being acknowledged in several fields. In sociology, Alexander 1987, 1991, notes that there are no classics in the natural sciences. In focusing on their relevance for the human sciences, Alexander distinguishes the classics with functional/external arguments (the necessity of a minimal basis for communication and coherence) and intellectual/internal ones (they offer a continuous and singular contribution to the science of society), suggesting an approach that he calls historical systematics. Calvino 1993 affirms the centrality of the classics through more essayistic arguments and gives them a more globalizing dimension. By indicating that they are to be distinguished by the influence they assert, that they serve as a mimetic device of the collective or individual conscience and that they become equivalents to the universe, Calvino signals to the cosmological dimension of the classics, while opening up a space for individual appropriations in which the classic elected serves to define, by means of relation or contrast, the work of the author.

<sup>3</sup> For the application of the idea of acculturation in the context of the contemporary intellectual world, see Dumont 1994. On the idea of situated knowledges vis-à-vis the disciplines, see Haraway 1991, chap. 9; for Brazil, see Santos 1995.

American bookstores, where these questions can be revealed; second, by focusing on two pairs of recent monographs, written by authors of successive generations, in the United States and India. I conclude with an agenda for the examination of anthropology with its dual face: at the same time one and many.

## 2

### American bookstores

If today American anthropology dominates the international arena in quantity and quality, serving as an indicator and thermometer for anthropologists in other latitudes, this view of Fredrik Barth indicates that a dialogue with North American anthropologists, or more precisely, with the works and authors who gain visibility and social legitimacy in that context, is inevitable for all of us.<sup>4</sup> In its varied expressions, perhaps today anthropology made in the United States occupies that space socially equivalent to that of England during the first half of the century, or France in the golden moments of structuralism. Nevertheless, given its insertion in a moment and milieu in which the idea of fragmentation is transformed into positive value, ‘anthropology’ becomes the target of criticism and faces threats of dissolution as a discipline.

Curiously, these indications that anthropology was a mere twentieth century phenomenon or, equally gloomy, that it became a type of normal science that only reproduces old models, is not confirmed in the daily life of anthropology departments.<sup>5</sup> In those sites, the existence of multiple tendencies continues to be one of the most notable characteristics of the training of new specialists, and has not undergone major changes. Nonetheless, some modifications can be observed: first, the neighboring fields of anthropology (whether in opposition or alliance) have altered — instead of archeology, biology, sociology or linguistics of the past decades, today when anthropologists leave their department they can be found in those of history of science, literary criticism or philosophy. Second, an extra space is reserved in the pro-seminars for readings that familiarize the student with recent works in cultural studies. I am not afraid to use the term *magic* to indicate the power and the danger associated with these novelties first introduced in the Seventies by the History of Consciousness programs, in the Eighties by the cultural studies approach and, more recently, by the programs of

---

<sup>4</sup> “American cultural anthropology today dominates the international scene, both in mass and quality, and is largely trend-setting for what we all try to do” (Barth 1996: 1).

<sup>5</sup> Articles in the specialized literature question the discipline, though part of the anxiety in the field can be seen in the opposing perspective, as in the recent debate “Objectivity and militancy,” published in *Current Anthropology*, with the participation of D’Andrade 1995 and Scheper-Hughes 1995. In this same context, Crapanzano 1991 denounced a type of scientific fundamentalism and the American Anthropological Association conducted, in 1996, the debate “Anthropology and Science.” Here, see the excellent essay by Latour 1996.

Science, Technology and Society.<sup>6</sup> The polemics that involve these areas, even in the United States, does not impede these disciplines from being incorporated in the transmission of the discipline; but perhaps not to overstimulate the students, zealous professors supervise the absorption of this literature by including it at the end of pro-seminars *after* the classics have been read.

Universities reflect some of the changes, but the privileged ethnographic locus for seeing them is not to be found in the departments or the vanguard programs, but rather in bookstores.<sup>7</sup> In the United States, academic bookstores are those special places — temples of a kind — that, existing between the search for knowledge and the power of the market, owe their survival to the spirit of circulation and reproduction that also motivates the academic world. Good bookstores need to keep a traditional/classic stock but must, particularly, exhibit novelties and anticipate new trends.<sup>8</sup>

Today, to browse in a good academic bookstore in the U.S. immediately reveals the state of being at the threshold of a new century. If the nineteenth century ended in 1914 in Europe,<sup>9</sup> in the United States the present one's close has been anticipated for this decade. Some have already begun to celebrate its end earlier, with dictionaries and encyclopedias reviewing the past one hundred years, but anthropology is not behind (as shown by the project Late Editions of annual reviews).<sup>10</sup> But if time has changed in

---

<sup>6</sup> This last group of programs is denoted by the acronym STS.

<sup>7</sup> Barth 1996 uses, with a similar objective, the citations of recent articles. My observations were made during the last four months of 1995, when I was associated with MIT, with financial help from a senior resident grant from CNPq, and during the months of November/December 1996.

<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, bookstores always need to have their stock available, such that they offer longer store hours and electronic access. The movement within Harvard Book Store, for example, the main bookstore that serves the Harvard and MIT communities, can be evaluated through its store hours: in the month of November, from 9:30 am to 11:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday, extended to mid-night on Friday and Saturday; Sunday from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Generally three people work the cash registers; at the same counter three other people receive special orders (which are usually received within one or two weeks). The access via Internet facilitates purchases, but a majority of buyers prefer to personally browse through the bookstore.

<sup>9</sup> See Eugen Weber 1976 for a historical examination of this proposal.

<sup>10</sup> See W. Outhwaite and T. Bottomore 1993. For the annual review *Late Editions*, see Marcus 1993a, 1995a. In the introduction to the series, George Marcus defines anthropology as empirical and ethnographic, though since it is implicated in the same theoretical and philosophical sources as those of the humanities, it meets up with cultural studies: “Indeed, from the perspective of the institutional politics of disciplines, some would argue that the main dynamic in the development of cultural studies has been the attempt of literary studies to expand and transform itself into a more engaged, socially conscious activity” (1993b: 2). In proposing that the texts of the series have as their privileged target “[the] globally minded U.S. academics” (1993b: 3), one of Marcus’ important objectives is “to evoke a combined sense of familiarity and strangeness in U.S.-university educated readers by selecting subjects that share something of a frame of reference and experience with them, but then differ in often radical and startling ways from them by cultural background and situated fin-de-siècle predicament” (1993: 5).

bookstores, so space has also been altered: the reorganization of areas of knowledge was accompanied by the spatial redistribution of the shelves. Anthropology, which never occupied a prominent place, always being upstaged by history, political science, economics and sociology, is now even further hidden in tucked-away corners. The first impression is that the books are out of place, having migrated to other areas. The path that took many anthropology books to the shelves of cultural and literary theory, and from these to philosophy and science, took less than a decade.<sup>11</sup> In this process there are other surprises. Works by a single author can now be classified according to different categories: for example, *Homo hierarchicus* is to be found in Asia/Pacific, while *German Ideology* is in philosophy. The so-called anti-disciplines are indexed by the presence of the term 'studies' (media studies, feminist studies, science and technology studies, cultural studies), and have become a sign of the vanguard.<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile, philosophy and science continue to share the greatest prestige, though today the term 'science' simultaneously includes knowledge, beliefs and criticism (as well as ethnography, as we shall see).

In this fragmented context, political-geographic (or cultural) distinctions (un)expectedly survive with increased vigor. In many cases, this type of definition is more important than classification by area of knowledge: thus, with regards to some recent monographs, *Writing women's worlds: Bedouin stories* (by Lila Abu-Lughod), is to be found in Middle East, *Debating Muslims* (by Michael Fischer and Medhi Abedi), in Islamic Studies; and, in Latin America, the highlight is *Death without weeping* (by Nancy Scheper-Hughes).<sup>13</sup> Finally, for the occasional visitor, an even greater surprise: traditional disciplines have disappeared or been renamed. Linguistics, for example, is a non-existent category today because, during the past few years, it was transformed into cognitive science.

In this process of displacement and fragmentation, anthropology itself became, within bookstores, a post-modern, *multi-sited*<sup>14</sup> phenomena, and it would not be an exaggeration to fear a Pyrrhic victory: today transformed into intellectual common sense — as occurred with psychoanalysis a few decades ago —, has anthropology not

---

<sup>11</sup> On the shelf of cultural and critical theory one can find a variety of titles that denote the current vanguard (some examples: *Postmodernism and social theory*; *The postmodern turn*; *Cyborg handbook*; *The post-colonial studies reader*; *The anthropology of supermodernity*; *Colonial desire*), as well as an eclectic combination of authors who have influenced this tendency: Michel Foucault, Paul Feyerabend, Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva, Jurgen Habermas, Jean Baudrillard, Edward Said, Walter Benjamin, Georg Lukács, Anthony Giddens, Herbert Marcuse, Louis Althusser, Theodor Adorno, Henri Lefebvre.

<sup>12</sup> See Marcus 1995b on the so-called anti-disciplinary arenas.

<sup>13</sup> See Sigaud 1995 on the reception of Scheper-Hughes' work in Brazil.

<sup>14</sup> Once again the expression is from George Marcus 1995, and refers to the type of ethnography in which the objects of study are discontinuous when they are analyzed from the perspective of the world system.

lost its social and cognitive specificity? This seems to be the crux of the current identity crisis of anthropology in the United States.

Fortunately, anthropology was never limited to anthropologists and has appeared, in concept and practice, in diverse contexts, under the name of philosophy, sociology, folklore, history, literary criticism (as today under cultural studies). Sometimes it is part of the humanities; other times, the social sciences. In India, anthropologists call themselves sociologists; in Brazil, anthropology grew out of sociology.<sup>15</sup> However, in the process of selective absorption of intellectual fashions, we are and have been affected by the anxieties of the academic metropoleis — whether in the present state of fragmentation or, before, when high hopes were at stake for arriving at a definition of the discipline.<sup>16</sup> If this is so, faced with self-decreed dissolution on one hand, but cognizant of the relative continuity of ideologies and institutions on the other, the discussion over the end of anthropology can perhaps be better formulated through some questions: Where is anthropology? Where will it emerge? Perhaps only a context as sensitive to academic classifications as the U.S. may generate so many opposing categories as we see today: not only *post* (as in post-modern), but also *multi* (as in multiculturalism), *anti* (as in anti-disciplinary) and *pre* (as in pre-scientific, pre-categorical, pre-psychological, pre-sociological).<sup>17</sup> However, for our own peace of mind, though anthropology is under suspect, Clifford Geertz still considers himself to be an anthropologist.<sup>18</sup>

### 3

#### **Intermission: anthropology at home**

For a long time anthropology has been defined by the exoticism of its subject matter and by the distance, conceived as both cultural and geographic, that separated the researcher from the researched group. To the other social sciences, such as sociology and political science, had been reserved the role of studying the social scientist's own society.

This situation has changed. Throughout this century, the distances that separated the ethnologist from *his/her* group became increasingly less, with the inevitable questioning of the possessive pronoun (my/yours): from the Trobrianders to the Azande,

---

<sup>15</sup> See Peirano 1992a for a comparison between the characteristics of anthropology in India and Brazil.

<sup>16</sup> Here it is sufficient to mention the conceptions of anthropology as “description,” “placing oneself in perspective,” “comparison,” “interpretation” (see Peirano 1981: chap. 1).

<sup>17</sup> The notions of pre-scientific and pre-categorical orientations are derived from Lacan 1981; that of pre-psychological from Crapanzano 1992; that of pre-sociological from Latour 1987.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the subtitle of Geertz 1995: “Two countries, four decades, one anthropologist.”

and from there on to the Bororo, by way of the Kwakiutl, in the Sixties the academic community discovered that it was the approach, and not the subject matter, that unwittingly had always defined the anthropological endeavor. Lévi-Strauss played an important role in this change of consciousness by establishing a horizontality to social beliefs and practices in any latitude. From then on, the Durkheimian project of the beginning of the century could be reaffirmed, by various means, until Geertz, in the Eighties, proclaimed, as if it were an original idea, “we are all natives now,” with the *other* being located across the seas or across the hall.<sup>19</sup> After the long tradition in which anthropology’s distinctive aspect was cultural and geographical distance, ethnography was brought home, in spite of admonitions from the older generation.<sup>20</sup> But the legitimacy of doing research at home required kinship studies as the acid test of validity and, perhaps it is no coincidence that Raymond Firth, in England, and David Schneider, in the United States, though with differing approaches, were pioneers in this task (Firth and Djamour 1956; Schneider 1968).

It is certainly true that anthropologists who were also *natives* were spared from, since the beginnings of the discipline, the search for radical alterity. Thus, in 1939, Malinowski gave his approval to Hsiao-Tung Fei to publish his monograph on Chinese peasants:

The book is not written by an outsider looking out for exotic impressions in a strange land; it contains observations carried on by a citizen upon his own people. It is the result of work done by a native among natives. If it be true that self-knowledge is the most difficult to gain, then undoubtedly an anthropology of one's own people is the most arduous, but also the most valuable achievements of a field-worker (Malinowski 1939: xix).<sup>21</sup>

If Malinowski surprises us with his bold posture, he was not alone. The approval that Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard gave to the study by M.N. Srinivas on the Coorgs of India suggests that the canon could be developed independent of common

---

<sup>19</sup> See Geertz 1983. But in 1968 David Schneider had already made a similar association: “This is a society and culture that we know well. We speak the language fluently, we know the customs, and we have observed the natives in their daily lives. Indeed, we *are* the natives” (1968: vi).

<sup>20</sup> See Dumont 1986: chap. 8, in which the author proposes that we gain nothing by studying at home and reducing the tension between universalism and difference: “a difficult task and better entrusted to research workers who have gained experience elsewhere; this choice avoids the traumatic experience of *dépaysement* but contains the risk of remaining superficial” (1986: 218).

<sup>21</sup> T.N. Madan (1994: 156) mentions the two occasions in which Malinowski wrote forewords for books authored by his former students, Jomo Kenyatta and Hsiao-Tung Fei, and cites the passage above to point to Malinowski’s defensive attitude.

practices.<sup>22</sup> The ideal of overseas research, however, remained the goal to be reached, to the point that, many decades later, and inserted into a tradition that systematically questioned the need of external fieldwork, in 1982, Satish Saberwal considered that fieldwork in India was a soft experience, since it was mostly conducted within the language, caste and region of origin of the researcher.<sup>23</sup>

In the case of researchers from the ideologically ‘central’ traditions, who only recently came to accept the fact they too are natives, the motives that led them to bring anthropology home are varied: for some, the inevitable conditions of the modern world explain it; for others, it emerges from the desire to transform anthropology in “cultural critique.”<sup>24</sup> It is in this context that we can return to cultural studies in order to suggest an affinity between the current “anti-disciplinary arenas” (feminist studies, media studies, cyborg studies, etc.) and an anthropology done at home. When it comes home, anthropology in the United States fragments into *studies*. In 1986, Marcus and Fischer foresaw this relationship:

Indeed, we believe that the modern formulation of cultural anthropology depends for its full realization on just such a catching up of its lightly attended to critical function *at home* with the present lively transformation of its traditionally emphasized descriptive function abroad (Marcus & Fischer 1986:4; my emphasis).

If in the Fifties and Sixties the linguistic model had served as an inspiration for anthropologists, now literary criticism has become the new source. At home and accepting its critical function, bombarding the borders of the disciplines and proposing a remapping of the areas of knowledge, these attitudes nourished the questioning of the validity of ‘facts’ and the authority of the anthropologist as author.<sup>25</sup> In this context, anthropology came to accept a new slate of legitimate and politically adequate

---

<sup>22</sup> See Srinivas 1952. Radcliffe-Brown highlights in the introduction: “This book, by a trained anthropologist, who is himself an Indian, and who has therefore an understanding of Indian ways of thought which it is difficult for a European to attain even over many years, gives us a scientifically valuable and objective account of the religious behaviour of a particular Indian community” (Radcliffe-Brown 1952: vii)..

<sup>23</sup> See Saberwal 1982; 1983. For reflections on fieldwork “in one’s own society,” see Bêteille and Madan 1975; Srinivas 1979; Uberoi 1968.

<sup>24</sup> For the first case, see Jackson 1987. For the United States, see Marcus and Fischer 1986. In both cases, English and U.S., a genealogy that justifies the effort is always traced, be it from Raymond Firth and Max Gluckman, or from Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict. (Marcus and Fischer 1986 reclaim Margaret Mead as a forerunner; Geertz 1988 redeems Ruth Benedict).

<sup>25</sup> For the questioning of the author, see Geertz 1988; of the fact, see Geertz 1995. In a broader critique, the valuation of the narrative genre lies in opposition to the validity of facts (see Feyerabend 1995).

alternative literatures: fieldnotes, biographies, interviews, science fiction, novels, manifestos — all constituting new styles of the broader genre of ‘stories.’<sup>26</sup>

Inevitably, this movement has been reflected in the wider academic world through a process of selective incorporation. Here, I would like to propose that, perhaps as an equivalent to the political aspect that the genre of *stories* achieved in the United States, in places like India and Brazil the analysis of socially relevant *events* predominates. Events maintain that powerful social dimension previously reserved for social drama and rituals by anthropologists; these are recreated in the text in the effort to capture the lived, lost and crucial moment that the narrator experienced (or which became significant). Furthermore: in the analysis of events, theoretical-intellectual and political-pragmatic objectives are fused; there is no guilt in being inspired by the classics (or, to the contrary, by post-modern influences), and universalism is mixed with ‘committed’ aspects that were always the hallmark of anthropology at home.

Of course, *events* are not discarded in the United States — though there, sometimes, they are fictional —, and telling *stories* is the choice of many Indian and Brazilian anthropologists.<sup>27</sup> But the theoretical, interpretative and political dimensions of these alternatives must be confronted. This comparison between the strategies can be sociologically illustrative in what it says not only with regards to the question of ‘anthropology in context,’ but also with regards to the fundamental topic of how to perceive and present the ‘tangible fact’ that orients ethnography. I shall return to this topic but, for the time being, I shall move on to the second part of this exercise by confronting two pairs of books by American and Indian authors. These books were published during the past three years: for a first generation I chose *After the fact* (Geertz 1995) and *Pathways* (Madan 1994); for the following generation, *Critical events* (Das 1995a) and *Making PCR* (Rabinow 1996).

#### 4

#### Stories and paths

*After the fact*, by Clifford Geertz, and *Pathways*, by T.N. Madan, are tangentially autobiographical books, which immediately brings to fore the awareness of the authors of the influence they have wielded in the development of anthropology. Clifford Geertz has great visibility in international terms; Madan has great prestige amongst those who frequent the ethnographic literature pertaining to India, including

---

<sup>26</sup> In the Science, Technology and Society Programs, the newly-arrived anthropologists appear to threaten, via the use of new genres, the more traditional historians of the field. See, for example, Traweek 1988, 1992; Fischer 1994, 1995a, 1995b; Stone 1994a, 1994b, 1995; Rabinow 1996.

<sup>27</sup> See Stone 1995 on fictional events in U.S. cultural studies; for Brazilian ethnology, see Ramos 1990, chapter 9.

French anthropology in the lineage of Louis Dumont.<sup>28</sup> The parallel publication of both texts, in diverse contexts, is revealing.

Sensitive and attentive to textual form both authors show their initial contrasts in the type of literary construction they adopt. For Geertz, in a time when anthropology's intellectual milieu and moral basis have changed, the anthropologist must also change. One may now rely on "mininarratives that include the author" as a literary option.<sup>29</sup> Following these new winds, *After the fact* puts together accounts of a refined storyteller that, collected from a vast field notebook, provide the grounding for the author to discuss pressing topics. In his well-known style, the titles of various chapters are composed of a single word, all in the plural. The sequence "Towns," "Countries," "Cultures," "Hegemonies," "Disciplines," "Modernities," is certainly not aleatory (for example, the order "towns" / "countries" / "cultures" permeates the discipline; it is politically adequate that "hegemonies" precedes "disciplines," and that it all ends with "modernities"). By the same token, all bibliographic references are consolidated in notes that are not part of the body of the text, but are presented at the end as commentaries.<sup>30</sup> In this impeccable book, Geertz does not present a history nor a biography, but "a confusion of stories, a profusion of biographies."

From India, *Pathways* also speaks of changes in the world, in disciplines, in cultures and in modernities, but Madan opts for an intellectual ethnography which has as its starting point different paths and, as a general strategy, the question of the insertion of the social scientist in them. It is the perspective from which the anthropologist introduces himself into the world of social reflection and existing intellectual pathways that is of concern to the author. The book is divided into two parts: the first, "Pathfinders," is dedicated to the predecessors with whom Madan associated in particular moments of his career and who ended up influencing his work. An Indian scholar, the characters that populate this part of the book are of various origins and intellectual lineages: Mukerji, Majumdar and Srinivas, from the Indian subcontinent; Dumont, the 'outstanding pathfinder' who took over the legacy of Marcel Mauss; and North Americans, from Kroeber to the contemporary McKim Marriott. "In search of a path," the second part, is more personal and reflexive: a series of essays about fieldwork in one's own native contexts allows for a bold examination of the relationship between anthropology and the historical process of rationalization of the

---

<sup>28</sup> See, particularly, Madan 1982, 1987, 1989, 1992. For a review of Geertz' book in Brazil, see Giumbelli 1996.

<sup>29</sup> It is in this context of relative change — anthropologists were always attuned to monographic construction — that comments of the type 'anthropology is no longer, if it ever was...' proliferate in anthropological texts: "Anthropology is no longer, if it ever was, the 'discovery' of *terra nova* or undescribed cultures or social structures" (Fischer 1995b: 2); "Anthropology is no longer a singular discipline, if it ever was, but rather a multiplicity of practices engaged in a wide variety of social contexts" (Moore 1996: 1).

<sup>30</sup> This same style had been adopted in Geertz 1968.

west; another essay illustrates the theoretical-comparative approach of “mutual interpretation;” a third looks at anthropology as ‘critical self-awareness.’ The question of cultural pluralism, a pressing issue in India, is then addressed through three empirical and contrasting themes related to various groups and different moments in the history of India.<sup>31</sup>

Mature writings of two ethnologists who experienced the past decades from different perspectives, their particular visions of anthropology are expressed in their books. But, once again, is it interesting to search for the place *where* they are expressed. For Geertz, for example, the controversy concerning the notion of “discipline” is such that he recognizes that anthropology was always poorly defined, offering more of a blurry image than a Foucauldian model. Yet the topic provokes him, causing him to ask if this is a scandal or a force. At any rate, unable to say “what anthropology *is*” (1995:99), Geertz chooses to examine his academic career, placing emphasis on the institutions he formed a part of, the fieldwork he conducted in the extreme ends of the Islamic world, i.e., Indonesia and Morocco, and the world context of that moment — which provides a discrete examination of the role of the United States in international politics. On this journey, his times as a student at Harvard, then moving on to Chicago in the Sixties, and finally Princeton, reveals a trajectory that was tied to multidisciplinary experiments, though with links to anthropology departments. This trajectory, told through short stories and picturesque examples (though also some murky episodes, such as the “Bellah Affair”), leads him finally to refute the idea of a “discipline.” Thus, if it is in professional life that the anthropologist can be found, this is achieved through indefiniteness:

The sequence of settings into which you are projected as you go if not forward at least onward, thoroughly uncertain of what awaits, does far more to shape the pattern of your work, to discipline it and give it form, than do theoretical arguments, methodological pronouncements, canonized texts. ... You move less between thoughts than between the occasions and predicaments that bring them to mind (Geertz 1995: 134).<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> The topics include: a discussion of religious ideology and ethnic identity of Hindus and Muslims in Kashmir, from the era of the partition of India to the beginning of most recent violence; the change in social identity in Muslim Bengal before and after the founding of Bangladesh; the differential reaction of India and Japan to western influence. See Peirano 1995b for a critical review of Pathways.

<sup>32</sup> Though, at one moment, Geertz accepts that “In the course of all this coming and going and knocking about surely there emerge some governing aims continuously worked toward, some practiced skills habitually exercised, some determinate standards repeatedly applied, some settled judgments as to what is knowable and what isn't, what will work and what won't, what matters and what doesn't” (1995: 134).

T.N. Madan takes a different path. Though he also acknowledges the moments and predicaments — that he develops in stories and fieldwork examples —, Madan makes intellectual pathways the nucleus of his argument and the position of the anthropologist the basis of his discussion. Suggesting the theme of disciplinarity, Madan acknowledges the sociological aspect of paths, but makes it clear that creativity and sociological constraints are not mutually exclusive.<sup>33</sup> Since there are not exactly ‘discoveries’ in anthropology, but renovated efforts, these can only gain by the diverse locations of the researcher: the training the anthropologist receives makes him/her experience the contrast between the literature and the expectation of being surprised — which could as likely happen in India as somewhere else. A non-western anthropologist, therefore, is not a pseudo-European by nature, that is, someone who adopts the many ways that would make one European. Since the encounter between cultures occurs within the mind of the anthropologist, the principles of “mutual interpretation,” the project of “critical self-awareness,” or, still, “an effort to see in the round what is otherwise flat,” is more of a guide than the pursuit of pure otherness. Madan asserts: “An excessive emphasis on the otherness of those studied only results in their being made the objects of study rather than its subjects” (Madan 1994: 159). (Paradoxically, in India it was anthropology itself that contributed to the dissemination of rigid ideas concerning its constitution, as seen in the examples of the role of karma, caste and renunciation. Given this imported anthropological vision, the Indians needed to recover the local idioms of moral responsibility, family, plenitude and promise.<sup>34</sup>)

Here in Brazil, it is interesting to note that an important event in the trajectory of T.N. Madan receives only discrete commentaries in his book. I refer to the role Madan played in moving the journal *Contributions to Indian Sociology* from Europe to India. This move took place when Louis Dumont (École des Hautes Études) and David Pocock (Oxford), the European founders of the journal in 1957, decided to cease publication ten years later. Complex negotiations allowed for its rebirth in India and Madan was the editor of this important journal during the following 25 years, from 1967 to 1992, thereby creating a privileged forum of discussion and debate. The pedagogic, theoretical and political roles carried through the transmigration of *Contributions* from Europe to India are an important legacy of the career of T.N. Madan that only surfaces in *Pathways* as a subtext.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> T.S. Eliot serves as the epigraph for the second part of the book: “And what there is to conquer / By strength and submission, has already been discovered / Once or twice, or several times, by men whom we cannot hope / To emulate... / For us, there is only the trying. The rest is not our business” (Madan 1994: 109).

<sup>34</sup> These images are also fought in India by the Subaltern historians, which Madan refers to, but does not name. For Madan, at least, the central problem does not lie in the diverse interpretations, but rather in the authority conferred to western social scientific literature by Indian students with regards to their own society (1994: 162-163). See, on the idea of an “internal enemy,” Nandy 1983.

<sup>35</sup> The role played by Madan is seen only by reading between the lines of Chapter 4 and its footnotes (cf., for example, Madan 1994: 55, note 1). See Peirano 1991, 1992a: chap. 9, for an evaluation

In a similar fashion, an important subtext in *After the fact* tells of the individual contribution of Geertz to anthropology. Though fearful of the various disciplinary implications, in his individual trajectory Clifford Geertz acknowledges the consequences of being a U.S. citizen (“There are lots of advantages in being the citizen of a superpower in less prominent places, but cultural invisibility is not among them”), as well as of his own notoriety (“[...] in 1980, when, cited all over the place, my contributions were dissected, resisted, corrected, distorted, celebrated, decried, or built upon [...]”). When the author admits that he became a required reference, *After the fact* ceases being a narrative of an individual career and becomes — whether the author wants or not — a chapter in the history of anthropology. After demonstrating, through evidence from his own trajectory, that anthropology has always been in transformation, Geertz unexpectedly considers the current changes to be *sui generis*: the query that subordinates anthropologists to other specialists (in contrast to the old days when the ethnologist alone dominated the field); the even greater scrutiny by local anthropologists; and the significant increase in the number of specialists in the United States.<sup>36</sup> If previously it was an occupation limited to the few so as to be compared to a tribe, “anthropology has become a sprawling consortium of dissimilar scholars held together largely by will and convenience” (1995: 133). By contrast, T.N. Madan contests not only the western ‘truths’ but also those projects couched as native, spontaneous, autonomous or indigenous. For him, these latter terms distort the nature of anthropology and only serve to reinforce the opinion that the appearance of the “native anthropologist” changes nothing:

The crucial question is not Who is doing anthropology? but What kind of anthropology is being done? A mere change of the stage and the actors will not enable anthropology to be reborn. [...] We need to produce a different kind of play under the direction of comprehensive theoretical frameworks, which admit meaning and purpose into our discourse, and which integrate the view from the inside with those from the outside (1994: 138-139).

Two books, two autobiographical assessments; individual stories in one, collective paths in the other. For Geertz, unique occasions do not form part of a discipline; if his biography is constructed of special moments and this is an indication of what occurs amongst specialists, it is possible to derive the conclusion that anthropology reflects “a loose collection of intellectual careers.” Madan starts from the very conjunction of intellectual careers, sociologizes the paths, immerses himself in

---

of the impact of the discussions raised in the section “For a Sociology of India,” published in the second number of each year in Contributions to Indian Sociology.

<sup>36</sup> The number of members of the American Anthropological Association which, in 1950, was 2,000, swelled to over 10,000 in 1992.

their entanglement and, while dispensing with a discussion of the disciplinarity of anthropology, offers his book to readers who sympathize with the idea that “no author is an island complete unto himself; every scholar has predecessors, consociates, and successors.”

## 5 Events and stories

In the coming decade, it is possible that assessments then will reveal how the end of the century was characterized by the return of anthropology to its social point of origin. Research at home will have replaced the canonic ideal of a radical encounter with otherness. “Indeed,” remembers Geertz today, “an increasing number of us work on Western societies, and even our own; a move which simplifies some matters and complicates others” (1995: 132). The awareness that anthropology never completely left home perhaps will be made explicit: that Africa was partially home for the British when they exported the idea of totality to the colonies,<sup>37</sup> and that today a process of selective incorporation legitimizes, in the world metropolis, specialists from the old anthropological research sites who exhibit a kind of knowledge formerly considered as *native*.<sup>38</sup> A comparison between *Critical events* (by Veena Das) and *Making PCR* (by Paul Rabinow) reveals how, where in India research must evaluate one’s own society *and also* anthropology, in the United States politically committed research has science as its subject matter and anthropology becomes a residual category. Let us see.

*Critical events*, by Veena Das, puts together essays on a variety of themes and times: an intellectual debate within anthropology; events of the Partition of India in 1947, focusing on the sexual and reproductive violence to which women were subjected; the discourse on cultural rights, the control over memory, and the right of a community to demand heroic death from its members — as identified in two well-known cases; the violence of Sikh militant discourse; the judicial and medical discourse on victims of the industrial disaster at Bhopal. Veena Das starts from a dual location:

---

<sup>37</sup> The point of view that British anthropologists left England unquestioned was proposed by Anderson 1968, in the context of the spectacular development of anthropology vis-à-vis sociology in that country.

<sup>38</sup> Moore 1996 highlights the attraction that African philosophy holds for cultural studies. This process of selective incorporation can be seen in Louis Dumont’s proposal of an idea of intellectual acculturation: “... the confrontation of modern civilization with autochthonous cultures does not result simply in one-way borrowings. Quite to the contrary, the dominant partner borrows from the dominated not only isolated or special features like the outrigger canoe or African art, but also representations which in all good faith he believes to be his own while in actual fact they result from acculturation and therefore contain an unsuspected holistic component. ... Indeed we can often verify that the new, hybrid representations are *intensified* as compared with the notions from which they proceed” (1994: 15). This issue is taken up further on.

the essays identify critical moments in the history of contemporary India and these moments are then redescribed within the framework of anthropological knowledge. The expression “in the history of contemporary India” sheds light on the idea of *events* as critical moments which, beginning with a strategy which intends to avoid giving a privileged status to locality, substitutes space for time and, in this conjuncture, seeks to “de-essentialize” India.

But the book also reconstructs India. In the course of the book, Veena Das unites as ‘Indian’ the events that occurred between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs; criticizes and reevaluates accepted values of modernity (for example, human rights and the understanding of pain); offers contributions for a change in the Indian metanarrative of the nation-state, while at the same time, in questioning the European nation-state model, warns of the danger of unduly valuing the community as an organic and authentic unity — since it too has its means of oppression. Veena Das’ project ends up achieving other objectives as well: she shows how various levels (local, national and global) can be simultaneously present in the life of a single individual, making evident the reality of the victims of political violence; and proposes the idea of an “anthropology of pain” that, instead of consolidating the authority of the discipline, has as its objective rehabilitating and giving voice to victims of violence, allowing them to be embraced.<sup>39</sup> In the process, the author clarifies her own vision of intellectual paths (to use the expression of T.N. Madan) and her insertion in them.

For Veena Das there are at least three kinds of dialogues within the ethnographic or sociological text on India: that with the western traditions of scholarship in the discipline; with the Indian sociologist and anthropologist; and with the ‘informant’, whose voice is present either as information obtained in the field or as the written texts of the tradition (1995: 26). These dialogues allow for a clearer understanding of the positioning of the author. In the first place, for Veena Das the informant is a *victim*, to whom voice should be given.<sup>40</sup> The concern of Madan to soften otherness finds its parallel here in the proposal to grant to the informant the status of first person (and avoiding the third person). Veena Das substitutes the metaphor of the “gaze,” which has marked anthropology during this century, for that of “voice,” making explicit the influence in her approach of the post-modern perspective and, by the same token, overcoming the reifying perspective of ‘vision’.

The way the book is put together clearly reveals the dialogue with Indian colleagues and, in this sense, the choice of dedicating the book to M.N. Srinivas is extremely relevant. Srinivas, the dean of Indian anthropology, was for a long time a controversial figure due to his links to British anthropology. Yet Veena Das recovers

---

<sup>39</sup> In this regard, the book has a different emphasis from that of Tambiah 1996. Tambiah distinguishes between three ways of analyzing collective violence: the anthropology of the collective aspect of violence; the anthropology of migration processes; and the anthropology of pain. Within this general framework, Das works within the third type.

<sup>40</sup> See, also, Das 1995b. Contrast the place of the ‘victim’ with the ‘oppressed’ in the Brazilian case (Peirano 1981)..

Srinivas' work in the context of an alliance between Subaltern historians and the traditionalist A.K. Saran, so that all of them, though with diverse approaches, are united in the critique of a supposed elitism of Louis Dumont.<sup>41</sup> It is Louis Dumont, in the end, who disturbs and causes the most pain in the anthropologist, revealing her vulnerability:<sup>42</sup>

I reiterate my admiration for [Dumont's] remarkable abilities in bringing together a wide range of materials within a single theoretical frame, but my admiration for his achievements *cannot take away the pain* that an encounter with his formulations entails for an anthropologist who wishes to lay claims to both the resources of the anthropological tradition and the Indian tradition, both of which can act as global traditions or local traditions (1995: 33, note 5; my emphasis).

It would be erroneous and simple minded, however, to think that Veena Das allies herself with Indians in opposition to westerners: in addition to the association with the post-modernists, it is in Wittgenstein that Veena Das finds inspiration to understand the expression of pain, and, from Durkheim, that the sharing of pain can become witness to moral life.<sup>43</sup> Between the sources of western anthropological tradition, on one side, and Indian sources of inspiration, on the other, Veena Das establishes a triangulation with anthropologists “from other peripheral places” and, from this location, indicates a path to pluralize the narratives of the discipline and eliminate the dominant Eurocentrism. A multiplicity of intellectual paths results from this proposal, offering an opportunity to expand the existing dialogue about India. (In terms of visibility, *Critical events* was considered the ‘Book of the Year 1995’ in India; also in 1995, Veena Das was honored at the Vega Day Symposium in Sweden).<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> The criticism of Dumont's work is at the base of the Subaltern historians' endeavor (see Guha and Spivak 1988). See Peirano 1992a on the debates between M.N. Srinivas and Louis Dumont during the decades from the 1950s to the 1970s (chap. 7) and between Louis Dumont and A.K. Saran (chap. 9).

<sup>42</sup> The consideration of Dumont as the privileged opponent of Veena Das differentiates her position with that of T.N. Madan, who sees him as an outstanding pathfinder. In the critique of Dumont, T.N. Madan is singled in a note in which Veena Das comments on fieldwork by Indians in India (1995: 40). See, also, Das 1977.

<sup>43</sup> For Wittgenstein, the expression “I am in pain” is not a declaration that describes a mental state — it is a complaint; it is not the end of a language game, but its beginning (cited in Das 1995: 194-195). Veena Das also takes up the Durkheimian discussion on particular rites from Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse.

<sup>44</sup> Ethnos published in its vol. 60, no. 3-4, under the title “Culture and voice in social anthropology,” the four lectures presented at the Symposium.

\*

Changing location to the United States, the situation is quite different. Taking *Making PCR: A story of biotechnology* by Paul Rabinow as an example, one does not find here any disclosed interlocutors. If ten years ago the so-called post-modern anthropologists were sociologically recognized through their mutual citation, the new book by Paul Rabinow indicates that the era of experiments gelled into a tendency of its own. The consolidation of this tendency is revealed through this critical index: Rabinow does not cite his companions of intellectual adventure. The author presents to his colleagues an acknowledgment and an apology: the acknowledgments are at the end of the book, and include those friends and specialists working in the field of anthropology/history of science; the apology is for not citing their publications in the bibliography that follows. The clever or well-informed reader is left to reconstruct, if possible, the debates that the author chooses not to reveal.<sup>45</sup> The *paths*, here, have been erased.

I regret that it is inappropriate to include more explicit citations to the lively debates of these fields; keen and tolerant readers will find traces abound. I trust that my colleagues will realize that this book seeks a somewhat broader audience, including some who are far less tolerant of the technical language of science studies (1996: 175).<sup>46</sup>

In this text Rabinow examines one of the great inventions of contemporary science: PCR (the polymerase chain reaction) which expanded the capacity of identifying and manipulating genetic material on a previously unimaginable scale. The book includes an analysis of the transformation of the practices and potential of molecular biology, of the institutional context in which the invention occurred and of the principal actors involved: scientists, technicians, and business people. With its provocative subtitle (*A story of biotechnology*), it is significant that the ethnography has a classic structure.<sup>47</sup>

The first two chapters present, first, the ecology of the invention through an evaluation of the experimental and conceptual methodology that led to biotechnology and, second, an examination of Cetus Corporation during the Eighties (where the

---

<sup>45</sup> At only one time is an intellectual lineage established, but the references hardly include any anthropologists (the reference to Lévi-Strauss only comes at the end): “The social study of science (and technology) is today a burgeoning multidisciplinary field. Beginning with the work of Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend and accelerating with the studies of Bruno Latour, Karin Knorr-Cetina, Evelyn Fox Keller, Donna Haraway and many others, these diverse studies of the local practices of science have sought to bring the abstraction of Science, Reason, Truth, and Society down to earth” (1996: 13).

<sup>46</sup> See Rabinow 1992 for his reactions to Brazilian colleagues after his visit to the country.

<sup>47</sup> In terms of classic structure, it is interesting to contrast Rabinow’s book with Latour 1984.

experiments were conducted). The (ever noble) third chapter focuses on the process that culminated in the invention, in which experimental milieu and concept were combined (“PCR: Experimental Milieu + the Concept”), while the last two chapters demonstrate that an idea has little value unless it is placed in action. Here, an attempt is made to tell of the development of the concept, the process that gave scientific visibility to PCR, the conflicts amongst members of the team and the negotiations with large corporations.

The major innovation in this elegant and sober tale is the ethnographic insertion of various interviews throughout the chapters. These conversations (which were reviewed by the interviewees prior to publication) provide a window to the world described by the ethnologist. Moreover, given the affinity with situations experienced by an academic reader, they become particularly familiar and revealing: the evaluation of the disadvantages of the academic world vis-à-vis the industrial one; the means and criteria used to gain research grants; the rules of legitimation and prestige in the industrial-scientific world; the need for public evaluation; the personalities, idiosyncrasies and personal lives of the scientists. Yet an important subtext is in the sequence of the ethnographic construction, which moves from the ecology of science to concept, concept to experimental system, to the development of specific techniques, and, back to the conceptual realm, lands in the *Event*. While revealing the continual motion of experimental science, the book reminds us of certain anthropological monographs, as well as offers us the conditions for understanding social reproduction in the world of biotechnology. Rabinow gives us the context within which investments in scientific progress are directly linked to new products and services in health. It was within this context that molecular biology came of age in the United States.

This is a critical point. *Making PCR*, while presenting a text beginning with a *story*, reveals its classical anthropological inspiration in the gerund of the title. The end is a kind of beginning: the *Event* — without the article ‘the’. Thus the book may be seen as an effort of an experiment made in the United States of today, at home, with both science transformed into subject matter and the appropriation of the canonical tradition (even if the solitude of the field researcher surfaces only in the genre of the text). For the author, the subtext of his story is the advance of technology and the ability to manipulate DNA under laboratory conditions. Rabinow is faced with biotechnology’s hallmark: its potential to get away from nature, to construct artificial conditions in which specific variables can be known in such a way that they can be manipulated. For the anthropologist, brought up in the duality of culture and nature, it comes as a puzzle to confront a situation in which such kind of knowledge as biotechnology “forms the basis for remaking nature according to our norms” (1996: 20). Doubly at home, Rabinow reveals his initial motivation:

I was often intrigued by, but skeptical of, the claims of miraculous knowledge made possible by new technologies supposedly ushering in a new era in the understanding of life and unrivaled prospects for the improvement of health. The weekly *New York Times* science pages

rarely failed to announce that every new discovery or technical advance ‘could well lead to a cure for cancer or AIDS’ (1996: 2).

Here it is noble science, with magical promises, that perk the interest of the researcher. In the process of bringing anthropology back home, ethnography of science becomes a critique of post-modernity — thus fulfilling the Durkheimian project, yet affirming the choice as political. But, in the process, Rabinow also reinforces other canonic aspects of anthropology: that, even at home, the ethnologist needs to learn another language — in his case, that of molecular biology —, during a long period of socialization, and, as always, to face “ the problem of who has the authority — and responsibility — to represent experience and knowledge” (1996: 17).

In this context, it is curious that the book does *not* cite the monograph on high energy physics that Sharon Traweek (1988) published in the United States.<sup>48</sup> Opting for a particular dialogue with a distant *classic* — i.e., Weber —, the book opens and closes with a discussion of “Science as vocation”: the movement of getting distance at/from home perhaps requires the legitimation that Weber gives to the project, with the bonus of the peculiarity given to the United States.<sup>49</sup> The introduction of Lévi-Strauss is equally unique: not only because he is the only anthropologist cited, but also because it is in *bricolage* and the *mouvement incident* that the *story* of biotechnology told by Rabinow is transformed, in the last pages of the book, into *Event*. Scientific revolutions are simple *bricolages*: a young (and controversial) scientist had the idea of making a connection between his research on DNA and experiments with fractals and computer programming — he discovered, in the process, that the results were exponential. PCR became that “simple little thing” which won Kary Mullis the Nobel Prize.

The power of generating unprecedented scientific revolutions is part of a social game, but these revolutions need other participants to place the invention into use. Well made by Rabinow, this point does not lead him to self-reflection: if there is an anthropologist here, there is not, as a result, an *anthropology* — similar to the implication of Clifford Geertz’s *After the fact*. We witness, once again, the movement that in biotechnology as in anthropology brings back the concept, allows concepts to produce new phenomena through new contextualizations, thereby generating new inventions.

---

<sup>48</sup> In Rabinow’s acknowledgments, Traweek is the first on the list, yet her book is not cited. Traweek, who also opted for a classic monographic construction that analyzes accelerators and physicists, rites of initiation, conceptions of space and time, mentions several years later that she was disappointed because readers did not perceive her book as an *ironic* counterpoint to Evans-Pritchard: “Using an Englishman’s ethnographies of Africans as the referent for the structure and tone of my ethnographies also offered some other useful ironies. ... I wanted to invoke for my study of physicists E-P’s insights about the significant cognitive relations between people and their animate/inanimate artifacts while exposing his and our colonialist assumptions” (Traweek 1992: 436).

<sup>49</sup> Rabinow’s introduction opens with the following epigraph, taken from “Science as vocation”: “Permit me to take you once more to America, because there one can often observe such matters in their most massive and original shape.”

But here, it is the story that leads to Event — and not its opposite. (It is revealing, though not surprising, that in American bookstores Rabinow's book is not to be found in anthropology or cultural studies, but in the section of Science).

## 6

### “*Ce qui est donné*”

A ‘book of the year,’ an invention of ‘science’; events that are history, a story that ends up as Event — these are the varied ways in which anthropology can emerge in different places in the contemporary world. Sometimes, arranged in intellectual paths; other times, presenting biographical mininarratives that do not acknowledge disciplinary lineages. Thus, how is one to situate oneself amongst the various options for theoretical-ethnographic construction?

In this exercise, in which the publishing of four books became events in themselves, the delimiting of the narrative and the crucial ethnographic moment were, as always, central problems: Veena Das discovered critical moments through questioning totalizing views and assumed more the role of a listener than an observer; Paul Rabinow told the story of a scientific invention — but included interviews which turn the protagonists into co-authors of the narrative. The events of Veena Das are Indian: they are socially critical in the history of the subcontinent, and the author inserts herself in the intellectual paths that include multiple interlocutors — Europeans, Indians, Brazilians. The story of biotechnology of Paul Rabinow does not offer evidence of the lineages of which he is a part; it deals with an Event of global consequences. The author dispenses with a dialogue with colleagues, choosing as his principal interlocutor a classic author who, in the context of a book that avoids disciplinary definitions, maintains the privilege of distance in time and space.

The story thus repeats itself, though not in the same way: Geertz can do without predecessors in the name of a unique biographical trajectory, while Madan defines them in order to indicate his own search; Geertz passes through institutions and fieldwork sites with a mobility that, in symbolic terms, embraces the whole world, while Madan defines his location in India but includes a lineage that knows no bounds: for the political/geographic world of Geertz, Madan counters with a world made of intellectual paths. Rabinow encounters his Event in universal science, Veena Das defines her events socially and historically in India; Rabinow wants to know more about the social processes that great scientific discoveries hide, Veena Das is interested in the limits of suffering of victims of collective life — including the suffering which result from great discoveries.

Indians or North Americans, of one generation or another, all produce narratives that are legitimate for the international community of specialists. One reason why this was possible may be seen in their positioning themselves within certain *theoretical histories*: for or against, entering or denying them, with links or autonomously, theoretical histories were always present. If Veena Das showed her uneasiness in

relation to Louis Dumont, Paul Rabinow, even while avoiding lineages, found the savage mind of Lévi-Strauss in a large, American industrial corporation. And if her political commitment brought Das to analyze critical events from a multicentered perspective, that of Rabinow brought him to tell a story of science in which he is included as the narrator. Veena Das elected Durkheim; Rabinow chose Weber.

For the anthropologist, produced and fed by fieldwork, the articulation of lived experiences in which s/he is a participant or which are rediscovered as document or memory (of diverse natures, milieus, scopes and dominions), need not only a textual anchor, but also a cognitive and psychic one that encompasses the experiences. The appropriation of the ‘ephemeral moment’ or the ‘revealing incident’ has in the experiences of the discipline the exemplary cases that brought Mauss, upon analyzing the *kula* and the *potlatch*, to express his concerns as such:

Les historiens sentent et objectent à juste titre que les sociologues font trop d'abstractions et séparent trop les divers éléments des sociétés les uns des autres. Il faut faire comme eux: observer *ce qui est donné*. Or, le donné, c'est Rome, c'est Athènes, c'est le Français moyen, c'est le Mélanésien de telle ou telle île, et non pas la prière ou le droit en soi. (1925: 182; my emphasis)

Thus, data is constructed, facts are made. It is Geertz himself who recalls the etymology *factum, factus, facere* (1995: 62). Yet the ethnographic fact mixes time and space. Whether seen as events retold in the text (Das), or as textual stories (Rabinow), what is really at stake is the choice of the best angle for constructing “that which is given” — *ce qui est donné*.<sup>50</sup> Whatever the options or choices, modern or post-modern, theoretical-political implications are at stake, whether acknowledged or not.<sup>51</sup> Stories for some, events and paths for others, these alternatives reinforce the presence of a

---

<sup>50</sup> If today Geertz (1995: 16) is skeptical of the “fateful incident,” many others consider fundamental the establishing of “revealing incidents” that generate ethnographies (Fernandez 1990). Sally Falk Moore follows the path of Victor Turner’s “social drama” when she recognizes “diagnostic moments” and Luc Boltanski defines “les grands moments.” In Brazil, the ethnographic delimitation of “ritual events” and “cases” has been analytic rewarding in focusing politics and religion. See Bezerra 1995; Chaves 1993, 1996; Comerford 1996; Palmeira and Heredia 1995; Peirano 1986; 1992a: chap. 7; Velho 1992; Teixeira 1997. In Elias 1996, the example of duels is brilliant and, in literature, Virginia Woolf coined the splendid phrase “moments of being” (Woolf 1985).

<sup>51</sup> See Ahmad 1993: 175: “... ‘politics’ is everywhere, ‘experience’ is everywhere. [...] Our texts that appear to be (sometimes even claim to be) products of what was once called ‘theoretical practice’ are saturated with what *we* are, our *times* are, our *world* is — so that the best of our theories need to be examined in terms of their irreducible situatedness.”

theoretical and political insertion of the authors, in a realm of what can be alluded to as ‘the politics of theory.’<sup>52</sup>

Max Weber acknowledged, as did Mauss, the need of delimiting and resolving concrete problems, as against “dilettantism adorned with philosophy” (1992: 157), in a text in which the links between events, chance and historicity were also discussed. For Weber, just as with anthropologists today, purely epistemological and methodological reflections never contribute to the sciences of culture. (This is but one more of the many points of discussion that flow from the preceding comparisons and which, while fascinating, can only be mentioned here).<sup>53</sup>

## 7

### Back to bookstores

Today, when a reader looks for anthropology books only on the shelves of this specific area in American bookstores, s/he is limited to a normal science style. In the anthropology section are the books considered to be classics and, among the recent publications, only those which maintain a stable definition of anthropology. Thus, in this section one will generally find books by canonic authors, such as Malinowski, Boas, Margaret Mead, Evans-Pritchard, Radcliffe-Brown, Lévi-Strauss, etc.; recent essay collections on consecrated topics (such as ritual, religion, ethnography, etc.); monographs on indigenous societies — irrespective of their theoretical orientation; and not-so-recent books by celebrated authors who have been legitimated as ‘anthropologists’ (the most evident example is Mary Douglas, but this also includes Clifford Geertz, of *After the fact*).

In terms of the books examined here, where is contemporary anthropology? With respect to many new publications, it migrated to the area of ‘studies.’ Or, also, to philosophy, cognitive science or, purely, Science — this being the case of Paul Rabinow. But new books can also be found in specialized sections of geographic areas that, in dividing up the world (Asia/Pacific, Latin America, Middle East, etc.), encompass a certain political cosmology. These varied places where anthropological production finds a home — corroborating the multi-sited nature of the discipline — poses a central question: the exoticism of anthropology. Today, in pretending to deny this association, much of anthropologically inspired studies are no longer ‘anthropology’: though anthropologists exist, the discipline has lost its fascination. Yet,

---

<sup>52</sup> This expression is from Ahmad 1995: 11 and points to the idea of one’s own social location (1992: 3-9). Contrast, in this regard, the locations (and timing) of Pandey 1995 (‘Voices from the edge’) and Stocking 1982 (‘A view from the center’), in which ‘voices’ and ‘edges’ are paired with ‘view’ and ‘center’.

<sup>53</sup> One can also note the link with the idea of “adequate cause” of Weber and the perception of events, as seen in the perspective of the “symmetrical anthropology” in Latour 1995. The context here is the encounter between Louis Pasteur and lactic acid, both reciprocal “events.”

it is precisely in this process that, paradoxically, exoticism becomes its structuring principle.

A visit to bookstores confirms that the discipline remains so tied to exoticism (despite efforts to the contrary by anthropologists themselves) that not even the intellectual market is able to arrive at a horizontally Lévi-Straussian perspective. The path seems to follow these steps: since anthropology is (still/ever) the study of the ‘exotic other,’ in the Nineties this type of approach is no longer politically acceptable, the result being that the focus is turned back on us — that is, to nearby otherness. But for academic bookstores in the United States, at this moment these studies are no longer ‘anthropology’; they are thus transformed in cultural studies, feminist studies, area studies, or some other category. The result is inevitable: if anthropology *was* the study of the ‘exotic other,’ and we must distance ourselves from exoticism, by denying the fact that new studies are ‘anthropological,’ anthropology becomes definitively associated with exoticism. In this process, the force of the essentialist (and hence, ahistorical) vision reveals itself: either anthropology is a ‘disciplined’ discipline, that is, always the same, or it disappears.

It would be simplistic, though, to maintain the notion of a hegemonic and isolated American intellectual milieu that establishes the categories into which the rest of the world must fit. Here a crucial fact must be mentioned: this refers to the massive presence of non-western authors in the intellectual and academic world of the United States today. The four books analyzed present a clear example of this change and, though Veena Das and T.N. Madan are not readily found in bookstores, what-is-left-of anthropology needs to admit into its ranks authors who were once natives — including for them a role in the crusade against the exoticizing definition.<sup>54</sup> The classification of works by these authors who were absorbed by the market reveals specific paths.

I borrow the idea of *intensification* from Louis Dumont. In order to elucidate the hybrid character of modern acculturations, Dumont shows how transplanted notions become *intensified* when compared with their place of origin — whether in peripheral tendencies or in the very hegemonic and dominant configuration (1994: chap. 1). With regards to the books in question, this mechanism occurs through slippages of meaning: even with the subtitle “An anthropological perspective on contemporary India,” *Critical events* may not be accepted as anthropology in the United States; a (native) anthropologist who studies her own society is not an anthropologist, but a ‘sociologist.’ For having a double alterity (in this case, India and anthropology), the book slides to ‘sociology’ — not a very favorable placement, by the way, in this moment when the disciplines are being questioned.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> It is hard to determine if the books are hard to find because they are out of print or because they are poorly distributed by the Oxford University Press of India.

<sup>55</sup> In India, anthropologists are frequently linked to sociology departments, though the social and historical reasons for this association are not the same (Peirano 1992a: chap. 7). Brazilian literature receives a similar treatment: the book *On literature and society*, by Antonio Candido, was also classified as sociology in the United States. However, confirming prior hypotheses, Viveiros de Castro 1992 is found on the shelf of anthropology.

Here in Brazil, as much as I believe they are in India, the books *After the fact*, *Pathways*, *Critical events* and *Making PCR* are identified as anthropology, just as Geertz, Madan, Das and Rabinow are recognized as anthropologists. In these contexts, the disciplinary pulverization that today marks the area of the human sciences in the United States does not occur. In spite of the exotic and colonial symbolism that is associated with anthropology, in India and Brazil, for example, internal mechanisms of acculturation domesticated — well before it occurred in the United States — otherness *at home*. One could think that, surrounded in the ‘center,’ anthropology thrives in certain ‘peripheries,’ or, if it does not thrive, at least it offers a positive, critical and constructive approach. If the modern world has been constituted by processes of acculturation, this is one of its ironic aspects.

The place of origin of authors is another situation related to exoticism. Here the specific fact to point to is that, coming from diverse areas and written oftentimes from divergent theoretical orientations, in the United States many contemporary books by foreign authors are put together under the cultural studies label. Being well defined in their places of origin as, from India for instance, subaltern studies, literary criticism (marxist or otherwise) and even anthropology, when they take root in the United States, their distinctive characteristics are lost. Once again, the generic designation of cultural studies reveals a current tendency to fragment intellectual fields only to later reunite them as analogous, thereby eliminating their particularities (that are historical and, therefore, in some ways ‘national’) in the name of a shared post-modernity.<sup>56</sup> Today, as always, the old question of otherness, both in bookstores and elsewhere, does not have an adequate (re)solution.

## 8

### **An agenda for reflection**

The new hybrid representations generated by the encounter with the dominant European culture/civilization constituted, during this century, diverse species of syntheses, more or less radical, from two tendencies: on one hand, the ideas and values of autochthonous and holistic inspiration; on the other, the ideas and values stemming from the modern individualist configuration. These encounters generate permanent and

---

<sup>56</sup> This phenomenon was characterized as an “infinite regress of heterogeneity” by Ahmad 1995: 26-27. Ahmad specifically deals with the term postcolonialism: “It is only when the Angel of History casts its glance back at Asian and African societies from its location in Europe and North America, or when it flies across the skies of the world on the wings of postmodern travel and telecommunication, that those societies look like so many variants of a postcolonial sameness” (1995: 28). In the case of cultural studies, one can mention the prestige of works by Gayatri Spivak, Gyan Prakash, Homi Bhabha, Ashis Nandy, Aijaz Ahmad, and their European or American interlocutors (such as Edward Said and Frederic Jameson), along with the many *classics* of this tendency (cf. note 11).

precise processes of acculturation and intensification: the more modern civilization is spread throughout the world, the more the individualist configuration is modified by the incorporation of hybrid products, making it more powerful and, at the same time, modifying it through the permanent mix of distinct values.<sup>57</sup>

A similar phenomenon occurs amongst social scientists, who have, at least, a double and solidary insertion: on one hand, as members of a transnational community that shares an ideology, codes, expectations, rituals, and, equally important, *classics*, from which it derives its *universal* character; on the other, as political individuals whose socialization/social identity is tied to a specific nationality — one is Indian, Brazilian, Australian, English, etc. — revealing, therefore, its *particular* character. In some cases, these are superimposed upon a civilizational identity (as in the Asian case); in others, by a hegemonic one (the ‘American’ one, for example). From Max Weber to Norbert Elias, the links and “relative autonomy” vis-à-vis the national idea were questioned and evaluated.<sup>58</sup> Just as with other phenomena, these are questions that should be approached from a comparative perspective. I conclude, thus, by delineating certain dimensions that were present in the cases examined, that can serve as the basis for an agenda for reflection.

The comparison between diverse tendencies in anthropology is a serious and urgent project. Caught, on one side, by naïve declarations of objectivity and universalism, and, on the other, by subjective notions of knowledge and excessive relativism, communication between anthropologists needs a broad convention (in the epigraph by Vincent Crapanzano, “a fully governing convention”) and, at the same time, a political force that flows from the alliance of multiple interests and perspectives — to which Michael Fischer alludes. In this context, it is well to remember how in the works examined the recognition of certain *classics* was simultaneously reaffirmed with the privileged status given to fieldwork. This process indicates that, in anthropology, the idea of theory as a (Peircean) Third can dispense with a stable and well-defined conceptual base, attributing this function to predecessors and, as a consequence, to ethnography, and both, predecessors and ethnography, allowing for the history of anthropology to be transformed into a multiplicity of ‘*theoretical histories*.’ Thus, no matter how much questioned and criticized, it is the acceptance of theoretical histories that finally makes feasible the pretensions of an egalitarian dialogue among anthropologists of different origins and orientations (we all have the same monographs in our private libraries; field anecdotes are socially shared; similar ethnographical stories are used as productive metaphors).

But one must go further. After focusing on differences, it is imperative to find the opposite axis. In the first place: it is fundamental to accept that academic knowledge, however socially produced, is relatively autonomous from its immediate

---

<sup>57</sup> These ideas are elaborated, for the French and German cases, in Dumont 1994.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Weber 1946 (especially the part on “Structures of power”); Elias 1971 (on “relative autonomy”); Elias 1978 (on the “national idea”).

contexts of production and can, therefore, attain desirable levels of communication. In the second place: comparison, rather than uncontrolled relativism, is the best guarantee against superficial homogenization, allowing for responsible intellectual communication across national and cultural boundaries. Finally: it is necessary to interrogate the current practices of anthropology in the crossroads of theoretical histories with the different approaches through which the discipline gets socially established, with neighboring disciplines or areas of knowledge and with 'national' traditions where broader articulations are rooted. To reflect upon how these questions can be related was one of ambitions of this exercise.

#### **Acknowledgements**

This is a longer version of 'Where is anthropology?', paper presented to the panel 'How others see us', AAA Meeting, San Francisco, 1996. I want to thank Robert Borofsky for the invitation to participate in the panel. I am grateful to Elisa Reis, Monique Djokic and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro for comments on the former version, some of which I fully incorporated into this text. I am grateful to Paul Little for having faced the always difficult task of translation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- ABU-LUGHOD, Lila  
1993 - *Writing women's worlds. Bedouin stories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- AHMAD, Aijaz  
1992 - *In theory. Classes, nations, literatures*. London: Verso.  
1993 - A response. *Public Culture*, vol. 6: 143-191.  
1995 - Postcolonialism: what's in a name? In: R. de la Campa, E. Kaplan e M. Sprinker (eds.), *Late imperial culture*. Londres: Verso. pp. 11-32.
- ALEXANDER, Jeffrey  
1987 - The centrality of the classics. In: A. Giddens e J.H. Turner (eds.), *Social theory today*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. pp. 11-57.  
1991 - Sociological theory and the claim to reason: why the end is not in sight. *Sociological Theory* vol. 9 n. 2: 147-153.
- ANDERSON, Perry  
1968 - The components of a national culture. *New Left Review* n. 50: 3-57.
- BARTH, Fredrik  
1996 - The practise of American cultural anthropology: a view from the margins. Paper presented to the panel How others see us: American cultural anthropology as the observed rather than the observer. AAA Meeting, San Francisco.
- BÉTEILLE, A. e MADAN, T.N. (eds.)  
1975 - *Encounter and experience: personal accounts of fieldwork*. Honolulu: Hawaii University Press.
- BEZERRA, Marcos Otávio  
1995 - *Corrupção. Um estudo sobre poder público e relações pessoais no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará.
- CALVINO, Ítalo  
1993 - *Por que ler os clássicos*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- CANDIDO, Antonio  
1995 - *On literature and society* (translated, edited and introduced by Howard Becker). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- CHAVES, Christine Alencar  
1993 - *Buritis: festas, política e modernidade no sertão*. M.A. dissertation, Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília.  
1996 - A pessoa política: eleições em Buritis, Minas Gerais. In: M. Palmeira & M. Goldman (eds.), *Voto, representação e eleições*. Rio de Janeiro: Contracapa.

- COMERFORD, John  
 1996 - Reunir e unir: as reuniões de trabalhadores como forma de sociabilidade. M.A. dissertation, PPGAS/Museu Nacional/UFRJ.
- CRAPANZANO, Vincent  
 1991 - The postmodern crisis: discourse, parody, memory. *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 6, n. 4: 431-446.  
 1992 - *Hermes' dilemma & Hamlet's desire. On the epistemology of interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- D'ANDRADE, Roy  
 1995 - Moral models in anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 36, n.3: 399-408.
- DAS, Veena  
 1977 - *Structure and cognition: aspects of hindu caste and ritual*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.  
 1995a - *Critical events. An anthropological perspective on contemporary India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.  
 1995b - Voice as birth of culture. *Ethnos*, vol. 60, n. 3-4: 159-179.
- DUMONT, Louis  
 1986 - *Essays on individualism. Modern ideology in anthropological perspective*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.  
 1994 - *German ideology. From France to Germany and back*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- ELIAS, Norbert  
 1971 - Sociology of knowledge: new perspectives. *Sociology* vol. 5: 149-168 (Part 1); 355-370 (Parte 2).  
 1978 - *The civilizing process*. New York: Urizen Books.  
 1996 - *The Germans. Power struggles and the development of habitus in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- FEI, Hsiao-Tung  
 1939 - *Peasant life in China: a field study of country life in the Yangtze valley* (preface by Bronislaw Malinowski). New York: E.P. Dutton.
- FERNANDEZ, James  
 1990 - Tolerance in a repugnant world. *Ethos*, vol. 18, n. 2: 140-164.
- FEYERABEND, Paul  
 1995 - *Killing time*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- FIRTH, Raymond e DJAMOUR, J.  
 1956 - *Two studies of kinship in London*. Londres: Athlone Press.
- FISCHER, Michael MJ  
 1994 - Autobiographical voices (1,2,3) and mosaic memory: experimental sondages in the (post)modern world. In K. Ashley, L. Gilmore & G. Peters (eds.) *Autobiography and postmodernism*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

- 1995a - Eye(I)ing the sciences and their signifiers (language, tropes, autobiographers): interviewing for a cultural studies of science and technology. In: G. Marcus (ed.), *Technoscientific imaginaires. Conversations, profiles, and memoirs*. (Late Editions 2). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. pp. 43-84.
- 1995b - Otobiotopographies: anthropology in new worlds of science & technology. Presented at the Université de Montreal, October.
- FISCHER, Michael e ABEDI, M.  
 1990 - *Debating Muslims: cultural dialogues in postmodernity and tradition*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- GEERTZ, Clifford  
 1968 - *Islam observed. Religious development in Morocco and Indonesia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.  
 1983 - *Local knowledge. Further essays in interpretative anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.  
 1988 - *Works and lives. The anthropologist as author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.  
 1995 - *After the fact. Two countries, four decades, one anthropologist*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- GIUMBELLI, Emerson  
 1996 - Review of *After the fact*, de Clifford Geertz. *Mana*, vol. 2, n. 1: 183-187.
- GUHA, Ranajit e SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty  
 1988 - *Selected subaltern studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HARAWAY, Donna J.  
 1991 - *Simians, cyborgs, and women. The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.
- JACKSON, Anthony  
 1987 - Reflections on ethnography at home and the ASA. In: A. Jackson (ed.), *Anthropology at home*. Londres: Tavistock Publications.
- LACAN, Jacques  
 1981 - *The fundamental four concepts of psycho-analysis*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- LATOUR, Bruno  
 1984 - *The pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.  
 1987 - *Science in action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.  
 1989 - Pasteur and Pouchet: hétérogense de l'histoire des sciences. In: M. Serres (ed.), *Éléments d'histoire des sciences*. Paris: Bordas. pp. 423-445.  
 1995 - Do scientific objects have a history too? An encounter between Pasteur and Whitehead in a lactic acid bath. Manuscript.  
 1996 - Not the question. *Anthropology Newsletter*, vol. 37, n. 3:1.

- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude  
1962 - *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon.
- MADAN, T.N.  
1987 - *Non-renunciation. Themes and interpretations of Hindu culture*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.  
1989 [1965] - *Family and kinship. A study of the Pandits of rural Kashmir* (2<sup>a</sup> edição ampliada). Delhi: Oxford University Press.  
1994 - *Pathways. Approaches to the study of society in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- MADAN, T.N. (ed.)  
1982 - *Way of life. King, householder, renouncer. Essays in honour of Louis Dumont*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.  
1992 - *Religion in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- MALINOWSKI, Bronislaw  
1939 - Preface. In: H.-T. FEI, *Peasant life in China: a field study of country life in the Yangtze valley*. New York: E.P. Dutton. pp. xix-xxvi.
- MARCUS, George  
1993b - Introduction to the Series and to Volume 1. In: G. Marcus (ed.), *Perilous states. Conversations on culture, politics, and nation*. Late Editions 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. pp. 1-16.  
1995b - Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 24: 95-117.
- MARCUS, George (ed.)  
1993a - *Perilous states. Conversations on culture, politics, and nation*. Late Editions 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.  
1995a - *Technoscientific imaginaries. Conversations, profiles, and memoirs*. Late Editions 2. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- MARCUS, George e FISCHER, Michael MJ  
1986 - *Anthropology as cultural critique. An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- MAUSS, Marcel  
1925 - Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques. *L'Année Sociologique* (n.s.), vol. 1: 30-186.
- MOORE, Henrietta  
1996 - The changing nature of anthropological knowledge. In: H. Moore (ed.), *The Future of Anthropological Knowledge*. New York: Routledge, 1996. pp. 1-15.
- NANDY, Ashis  
1983 - *The intimate enemy. Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- OUTHWAITE, W. & BOTTOMORE, T.  
1993 - *Twentieth-century social thought*. London: Blackwell.

- PALMEIRA, Moacir GS  
1994 - Antropologia e política. Ms.
- PALMEIRA, Moacir GS e HEREDIA, Beatriz  
1995 - Os comícios e a política de facções. *Anuário Antropológico/94*:
- PANDEY, Gyanendra  
1995 - Voices from the edge: the struggle to write subaltern histories. *Ethnos*, vol. 60, n. 3-4: 223-242.
- PEIRANO, Mariza GS  
1981 - The anthropology of anthropology: the Brazilian case. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.  
1986 - 'Sem lenço, sem documento: reflexões sobre cidadania no Brasil'. *Sociedade e Estado*, vol. 1, n. 1: 49-64.  
1991 - For a sociology of India: some comments from Brazil. *Contributions to India Sociology* (n.s.), vol. 25, n. 2: 321-328.  
1992a - *Uma antropologia no plural. Três experiências contemporâneas*. Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília.  
1992b - Não foi só por acaso: um depoimento. Ms.  
1995a - *A favor da etnografia*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Relume-Dumará.  
1995b - Trilhas indianas da antropologia. *Anuário Antropológico/94*: 293-300.
- RABINOW, Paul  
1992 - A modern tour in Brazil. In: S. Lash e J. Friedman (eds.), *Modernity and identity*. Londres: Blackwell. pp. 248-264.  
1996 - *Making PCR. A story of biotechnology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- RADCLIFFE-BROWN, AR  
1952 - Introduction. In: M.N. Srinivas, *Religion and society among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. vii-xi.
- RAMOS, Alcida  
1990 - *Memórias Sanumá*. São Paulo: Marco Zero/Editora Universidade de Brasília.
- SABERWAL, Satish  
1982 - For a sociology of India: on multiple codes. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, vol. 16 n.2: 289-294.  
1983 - Uncertain transplants: anthropology and sociology in India. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, vol. 17 n. 2: 301-315. (Reproduzido de *Ethnos*, vol. 47: 36-49.)
- SANTOS, Maria Cecília Mac Dowel  
1995 - Quem pode falar, onde e como? Uma conversa 'não-inocente' com Donna Haraway. *Cadernos Pagu*, vol. 5: 43-72.
- SCHEPER-HUGUES, Nancy  
1992 - *Death without weeping. The violence of everyday life in Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- 1995 - The primacy of the ethical. Propositions for a militant anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 36, n. 3: 409-420.
- SCHNEIDER, David  
1968 - *American kinship. A cultural account*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- SIGAUD, Lygia  
1995 - 'Fome' e comportamentos sociais: problemas de explicação em antropologia. *Mana*, vol. 1, n. 1: 167-175.
- SRINIVAS, MN  
1952 - *Religion and society among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
1976 - *The remembered village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
1978 - The remembered village: a reply to criticisms. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.), vol. 12 n. 1: 127-152.
- SRINIVAS, MN (ed.)  
1979 - *The fieldworker and the field*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- STOCKING Jr, George  
1982 - Afterword: A view from the center. *Ethnos*, vol. 47: 172-186.
- STONE, Allucquère Rosanne  
1994a - Innocence and awakening: cyberdämmerung at the Ashibe Research Lab. In: G. Marcus (ed.), *Science, technology, and culture (Late Editions 2)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. pp. 177-195.  
1994b - What vampires know: transubjection and transgender in cyberspace. In: E. Ursprung (ed.), *In control: mensch-interface-machine*. Graz: Kunstverein W.A.S.  
1995 - *The war of desire and technology at the close of the mechanical age*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- TAMBIAH, Stanley J.  
1996 - *Leveling crowds. Ethnonationalist conflicts and collective violence in South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
1997 - Continuidade, integração e horizontes em expansão. Forthcoming in *Mana. Estudos de Antropologia Social*, vol. 3(2).
- TEIXEIRA, Carla Costa  
1997 - *A honra da política. 'Decoro Parlamentar' e perda de mandato no Congresso brasileiro (1949-1994)*. Doctoral thesis. Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília.
- TRAWEEK, Sharon  
1988 - *Beamtimes and lifetimes. The world of high energy physicists*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.  
1992 - Border crossings: narrative strategies in science studies and among physicists in Tsukuba Science City, Japan. In: A. PICKERING (ed.), *Science as practice and culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. pp. 429-465.

- UBEROI, J.P.S.  
1968 - Science and swaraj. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.), n. 2: 119-128.
- VELHO, Gilberto  
1992 - Unidade e fragmentação em sociedades complexas. In: *Projeto e Metamorfose. Antropologia das Sociedades Complexas*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor. pp. 11-30.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo  
1992 - *From the enemy's point of view. Humanity and divinity in an Amazonian society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- WEBER, Eugen  
1976 - *From peasants into Frenchmen. The modernization of rural France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- WEBER, Max  
1946 - *From Max Weber* (translated, edited and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth e C. Wright Mills). Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
1992 - Estudos críticos sobre a lógica das ciências da cultura (1906). In: M. Weber, *Metodologia das ciências sociais* (translated by Augustin Wernet). São Paulo: Cortez; Campinas, SP: Editora da Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- WOOLF, Virginia  
1985 - *Moments of being* (edited, with an introduction and notes by Jeanne Schlinkind). New York: Harcourt & Brace Company.

## SÉRIE ANTROPOLOGIA

### Últimos títulos publicados

220. DIAS, Eurípedes da Cunha. MST: Rito e Praxis da Democracia Agrária. 1997.
221. RAMOS, Alcida Rita. Convivência Interétnica no Brasil. Os Índios e a Nação Brasileira. 1997.
222. BARRETTO FILHO, Henyo T. Da Nação ao Planeta Através da Natureza: uma tentativa de abordagem antropológica das unidades de conservação na Amazônia. 1997.
223. RIBEIRO, Gustavo Lins. A Condição da Transnacionalidade. 1997.
224. BAINES, Stephen Grant. Tendências Recentes na Política Indigenista no Brasil, na Austrália, e no Canadá. 1997.
225. BAINES, Stephen Grant. Política Indigenista Governamental no Território dos Waimiri-Atroari e Pesquisas Etnográficas. 1997.
226. CARVALHO, José Jorge. Religião, Mídia e os Predicamentos da Convivência Pluralista. Uma análise do Evangelismo Transnacional Norte-Americano. 1997.
227. WOORTMANN, Klaas Axel A.W. O Selvagem e a História. Primeira Parte: Os antigos e os medievais. 1997.
228. CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, Luís R. Between Justice and Solidarity: The Dilemma of Citizenship Rights in Brazil and the USA. 1997.
229. PEIRANO, Mariza G.S. Where is Anthropology? 1997.

A lista completa dos títulos publicados pela **Série Antropologia** pode ser solicitada pelos interessados à Secretaria do:

Departamento de Antropologia  
Instituto de Ciências Sociais  
Universidade de Brasília  
70910-900 — Brasília, DF

Fone: (061) 348-2368

Fone/Fax: (061) 273-3264