WHEN ANTHROPOLOGY IS AT HOME: The Different Contexts of a Single Discipline

Mariza G. S. Peirano

Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília, 70.910-900 Brasília, DF, Brazil; mpeirano@uol.com.br

KEY WORDS: otherness, exoticism, difference, anthropology in context

ABSTRACT

For a long time anthropology was 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. This situation has changed. In a few years we may assess the twentieth century as characterized by a long and complex movement, with theoretical and political implications, that replaced the ideal of the radical encounter with alterity with research at home. But "home" will, as always, incorporate many meanings, and anthropology will maintain, in its paradigmatic assumption, a socio-genetic aim toward an appreciation for, and an understanding of, difference. In some cases, difference will be the route to theoretical universalism via comparison; in others, it will surface as a denunciation of exoticism or a denial of its appeal. This review examines different moments and contexts in which an attempt at developing anthropology "at home" became an appropriate quest.

INTRODUCTION

Until recently, the idea of an anthropology at home was a paradox and a contradiction of terms. Throughout the twentieth century, however, the distances between ethnologists and those they observed—once seen as "informants"—have constantly decreased: from the Trobrianders to the Azande, from these groups to the Bororo by way of the Kwakiutl, by midcentury the academic community discovered that the approach, not the subject matter, had unwit-

105

tingly always defined the anthropological endeavor. Lévi-Strauss (1962) played a fundamental role in this change of perspective by imprinting a horizontal sense to social practices and beliefs in any latitude; Firth (1956) and Schneider (1968) provided the necessary test of validity in the realm of kinship studies. The awareness that the search for radical otherness contained a political component allowed "indigenous" anthropologies to enter the scene during the 1970s (Fahim 1982); in the 1980s Geertz (1983) could proclaim that "we are all natives now." But admonitions from the older generation attested that the movement from overseas to across the hall was not smooth; studying at home was seen by many as a difficult task and better entrusted to researchers who had gained experience elsewhere (Dumont 1986).

From the beginning, anthropologists who had their origins in former anthropological sites were exempted from the search for alterity—provided that their training had been undertaken with the proper mentors. Thus Malinowski gave his approval to Hsiao-Tung Fei to publish his monograph on Chinese peasants, remarking that if self-knowledge is the most difficult to gain, then "an anthropology of one's own people is the most arduous, but also the most valuable achievement of a fieldworker" (Malinowski 1939:xix). The approval that Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard gave to the study by Srinivas (1952) on the Coorgs of India also suggests that the canon could be developed independent of shared practices. The ideal of overseas research, however, remained the goal to be reached. Decades later, and as part of a tradition that had firmly questioned the need for external fieldwork (Béteille & Madan 1975; Srinivas 1966, 1979; Uberoi 1968), Saberwal (1982) remarked that for many, fieldwork in India could be seen as a soft experience, because it was accomplished mostly within the language, caste, and region of origin of the researcher.

In the case of researchers from metropolitan centers, who recently came to accept that they too are natives, the drive for bringing anthropology home has various motivations. Some explain it as one of the inevitable conditions of the modern world (Jackson 1987a); for others, it emerges from the purpose to transform anthropology into cultural critique (Marcus & Fischer 1986). In the United States particularly, when anthropology comes home it is recast as "studies" (cultural, feminist, science and technology) and seen as part of "anti-disciplinary" arenas (Marcus 1995), thus attesting to an inherent affinity between anthropology and exoticism. Whatever the case, a lineage that justifies the attempt is always traced, be it from Raymond Firth and Max Gluckman (Jackson 1987b), or from Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict (Marcus & Fischer 1986 for Mead, Geertz 1988 for Benedict).

In places where anthropology was ratified locally via social sciences during the 1940s and 1950s (e.g. Brazil and India), mainly as part of movements toward "modernization," an open dialogue with national political agendas became inevitable, thus reproducing canonical European patterns (E Becker

1971). In these contexts, alterity has rarely been uncommitted and (Weberian) interested aspects of knowledge are oftentimes explicit. This distinct quality has blinded many observers to a timeless quest for theoretical excellence, fundamental in these contexts, which results in a pattern of a threefold dialogue: with peer anthropologists and sociologists, with the metropolitan traditions of knowledge (past and present), and with the subjects of research (Madan 1982b, Peirano 1992, Das 1995).

In this essay I look at some of the indexical components of the term home in the expression "anthropology at home." First, I examine the moment and the context in which the attempt to develop anthropology at home became an appropriate goal. I focus my attention on the socially legitimate centers of scholarly production—that is, as per Gerholm & Hannerz (1982b), the sites of "international anthropology"—where the ideal of a long period of fieldwork and overseas research was first established. This endeavor includes Europe and the United States. (I assume that nowadays the United States plays a role socially equivalent to that of England during the first half of the century or France in the golden moments of structuralism.)

In a second part, I shift to a different perspective. I take a look at otherness in contemporary anthropology in Brazil. Contrary to traditional canons of anthropology, the overall pattern has been to undertake research at home (though the expression "anthropology at home" is not usual). I point to a configuration of different projects that, though not exclusive, may be distinguished as attempts at radical otherness, at the study of "contact" with otherness, at "nearby" otherness, or as a radicalization of "us."

By indicating variances in the notion of otherness, I conclude with an agenda for the examination of anthropology with its dual face: at the same time one and many.

ANTHROPOLOGY AT HOME

In the context of a new historical awareness at "international" centers of production, personal concerns about the future of anthropology in the 1960s gave way in the 1970s to more sociological analysis, denouncing political relations that had always been a trait of anthropological fieldwork. Soon the idea of an anthropology at home made its debut in Europe, while in the United States it twirled into "studies," at the intersection of several experiments in the humanities.

Antecedents: Worries in the Center

In the 1960s, two minor papers by prestigious anthropologists expressed paradoxical feelings about the future of anthropology. Exactly at the point in time when the discipline had gathered momentum, its subject matter ran the risk of

disappearing. In France, Lévi-Strauss (1961) warned that anthropology might become a science without an object because of the physical disappearance of whole populations following contact or because of the rejection of anthropology by newly independent nations. Would it survive? For Lévi-Strauss, this development was a unique chance for anthropologists to become aware, if they had not been previously, that the discipline had never been defined as the study of primitives in absolute terms but instead had been conceived as a certain relationship between observer and observed. Thus, to the extent that the world became smaller, and Western civilization ever more expansive and complex— reborn everywhere as *creole*—differences would be closer to the observer. There should be no fear: No crisis of anthropology was in sight.

For Goody (1966) the "single-handed community study of uncomplicated societies" (1966:574) was no longer possible as primitives became players in much larger and complex social networks in Third World countries. It was a crossroads for anthropology, which could either become social archaeology, a branch of historical sociology based on "traditional preserve," or accept turning into comparative sociology. Suggesting a "decolonization of the social sciences," Goody stressed that the distinction between sociology and social anthropology in England was basically xenophobic: Sociology was the study of complex societies, social anthropology of simple ones, but in the new nations, their "other culture" was "our sociology" (1966:576).

Lévi-Strauss's optimism and Goody's proposal for disciplinary adjustment in the 1960s must be seen in the context of the undisputed prestige of the discipline. Latour (1996) has characterized the ethnographer of that period as an antithetical King Midas, "cursed with the gift of turning everything to dust" (1996:5). But that decade also witnessed Leach's (1961) rethinking of anthropology, the legitimization of the study of complex societies (Banton 1966), Firth (1956) and Schneider (1968) making incursions into studying their own societies via kinship, and the publication of Malinowski's field diaries. The latter alone led to much dispute (Darnell 1974), and in a rejoinder first published in 1968 in the United States, Stocking (1974) reminded us that anthropological fieldwork was a historical phenomenon, thus implying that it could just as well be transient.

Relations of Power and Self-Reflection

Of course, in 1965 Hallowell (1974) had already laid the foundations for looking at anthropology as "an anthropological problem," and soon after, Hymes (1974) proposed a reinvention of anthropology. Retrospectively, the idea of centering one's questions on the conditions that produced anthropology in the West proved to be the basis for much in the self-reflection projects that followed. International conferences resembling collective rituals of expiation were a mark of the 1970s. These conferences led to books that became well

known to the profession, and the frequent publication of profiles of different national trends of the discipline became usual in prominent journals. In some cases, journals published special issues on these topics.

CONFERENCES OF THE 1970S   Asad (1973a) was the classic publication of the period, the result of a conference under the auspices of the University of Hull in 1972. It was direct in its denunciation that British (functional) anthropology had been based on a power relationship between the West and the Third World. Anthropology had emerged as a distinctive discipline at the beginning of the colonial era, became a flourishing academic profession toward its close, and throughout this period devoted itself to description and analyses "carried out by Europeans, for a European audience—of non-European societies dominated by European power" (Asad 1973b:15). Such an inequitable situation could be transcended only by its inner contradictions.

Diamond (1980a) and Fahim's (1982) papers came out of conferences sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Openly Marxist, Diamond (1980b) alluded to national traditions only to dismiss them; for him, professional anthropology was an instance of diffusion by domination meaning that "an Indian or African anthropologist, trained in this Western technique, does not behave as an Indian or African when he behaves as an anthropologist. . . . he lives and thinks as an academic European" (1980b:11–12). [In this sense, Diamond was in a position different from the positions of those who, like Crick (1976), at that moment tried to encourage anthropologists of other cultures to develop "traditions of their own—scrutinizing themselves in ways which are not just a pale reflection of our interest in them—but also that they will make us the object of their speculation" (1976:167).]

In this context, when Fahim (1982) brought together a number of anthropologists from different non-Western parts of the world (the organizer was an Egyptian anthropologist), the term indigenous anthropology was proposed as a working concept to refer to the practice of anthropology in one's native country, society, and/or ethnic group.[1] From the organizer's point of view, the symposium accomplished its goal of replacing the Western versus non-Western polemics with a constructive dialogue, in the same process shifting the focus from indigenous "anthropology" to "anthropologists" (Fahim & Helmer 1982). Madan (1982a,b) received special credit from the editor for his forceful defense of the idea that the crucial discussion should not address where anthropology is done or by whom, merely replacing one actor with another, but rather should face up to a much-needed change in anthropology's perspective. Because anthropology is a kind of knowledge, or a form of consciousness, that

[1]Mott (1982) expressed his surprise that in Brazil the term indigenous is used to denote Amerindians; he also wondered why Brazil had been included among non-Western countries.

arises from the encounter of cultures in the mind of the researcher, it enables us to understand ourselves in relation to others, becoming a project of heightened self-awareness.

ANTHROPOLOGY OF ANTHROPOLOGY   A second perspective concerning different contexts for anthropology can be discerned in the challenge some anthropologists felt about looking at the discipline with anthropological eyes, thus following the wise lead given by Hallowell (1974). McGrane (1976) attempted to face the paradoxical situation that the discipline sees everything (everything but itself) as culturally bound by tracking the European cosmographies from the sixteenth to the early twentieth centuries. [See Fabian (1983) for a similar later attempt.] Peirano (1981) contrasted Lévi-Strauss's classical position on the issue of the reversibility of anthropological knowledge with Dumont's (1978) assertion that there is no symmetry between the modern pole where anthropology stands and the nonmodern pole (thus frustrating the idea of a multiplicity of anthropologies). The thesis explored the variability of anthropological questions in different sociocultural contexts, and Brazil was used as its starting point.

Also framed within the concern for an anthropology of anthropology was Gerholm & Hannerz (1982a), whose editors, untroubled by whether traditions were Western or non-Western, invited anthropologists from different backgrounds (which included India, Poland, Sudan, Canada, Brazil, and Sweden) to discuss the shaping of national anthropologies. Distinguishing between a prosperous mainland of British, US, and French disciplines (i.e. "international" anthropology) and "an archipelago of large and small islands" on the periphery (Gerholm & Hannerz 1982b:6), they inquired into the structure of center-periphery relations and its inequalities; confronted the variety of discipline boundaries; looked at the backgrounds, training, and careers of anthropologists; and asked: Could it be that if anthropology is an interpretation of culture, this interpretation itself is shaped by culture? Diamond (1980a) and Bourdieu (1969) were mentioned as stimuli, and, as in Fahim's book, here Saberwal's (1982) far-reaching implications were given special attention by the editors. Stocking (1982) closed the special issue with "a view from the center" in which, taking the lead from O Velho (1982), he highlighted the "privileges of underdevelopment" while distinguishing between anthropologies of "empire-building" and of "nation-building," alluding to the question of the reversibility of anthropological knowledge suggested by Peirano (1981). (See Stocking 1982:178.)

Doing Anthropology at Home

Displayed in the titles of the books, doing anthropology at home became a legitimate undertaking for Messerschmidt (1981) and Jackson (1987a). But

home, for them, was basically the United States and Europe. That the Mediterranean area, for instance, remained unstudied by insiders—and, if it had been studied, the literature could be ignored—is shown in Gilmore (1982), where the author reveals his explicit choice to review only works published in English.

In Messerschmidt (1981), the subjects of research were those nearby the ethnographers in the United States and Canada: kinspeople, elderly in a large city, a bureaucratic environment, a mining company. Offering an extensive bibliography, the editor proposed that the term "insider anthropology" carried less-negative connotations than, for instance, "indigenous" or "native." (The same term was also proposed by Madan 1982b.)

Jackson (1987a) went further and brought together anthropologists from Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Zimbabwe, Israel, and France, under the sponsorship of the Association of Social Anthropologists in England. Once again, home was Europe (or, suggestively enough, Africa), and non-European research would be a specific category. Jackson (1987b) asked why the close relationship between anthropology, folklore, and archaeology that existed in England no longer obtained, and Jackson suspected—in a comparison to sociology—that the difference between them was a love of (by one) and a distaste for (by the other) modern society: Anthropologists were the folklorists of the exotic (1987b:8). Although research abroad would continue, it was clear that fieldwork at home was here to stay. For some of the contributors, home was always transient, but wherever it was (Strathern 1987), there was a need to proceed by a phenomenology of the idea of remoteness (Ardener 1987). Okely (1987) maintained that home was an increasingly narrow territory in a postcolonial era; Dragadze (1987) commented on the fact that a Soviet anthropologist is a historian, not a sociologist; and Mascarenhas-Keyes (1987) discussed the process by which a native anthropologist becomes a "multiple native."

IN THE UNITED STATES   The project of bringing anthropology home in the United States was cast with an enormous measure of social legitimacy and success as "cultural critique." Following Geertz's interpretive proposal, postmodernism caught on as if by powerful magic. In due time, the affinity with the idea of bringing anthropology home was lost, but it may yet be recalled: "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). "Home" and "abroad" continued to be distinctive sites, but by denouncing exoticism, there was a sense that a metamorphosis was being advanced and ethnographers were moving past anthropology toward experimentation and cultural studies. The term "post anthropology" was hinted in Clifford & Marcus (1986), with novel intellectual lineages drawn or emphasized, whether from

the Chicago school of urban sociology (Clifford 1986) or from Margaret Mead in the United States and Raymond Williams in England (Marcus & Fischer 1986). In this context, the term "repatriated anthropology" was suggested.

For Clifford (1986), the new experimentation was being developed in works such as Latour & Woolgar (1979) on laboratory biologists, Marcus (1983) on the dynastic rich, Crapanzano (1980) on new ethnographic portraits, all of them opening the way for successors, such as Traweek (1988) on physicists, Fischer & Abedi (1990) on postmodern dialogues across cultures, and the subsequent questionings of classic fields and concepts such as ethnography (Thomas 1991) and culture (Abu-Lughod 1991). For some, repatriated (or at home) anthropology was identified as "American culture" studies: "The boundaries between 'foreign,' 'overseas,' 'exotic,' or even 'primitive' or 'nonliterate' and 'at home' or 'in our culture' are disappearing as the world culture becomes more uniform at one level and more diverse at another" (Spindler & Spindler 1983:73; see also Moffatt 1992, Brown 1994, Traube 1996).

Parallel to these developments, Stocking (1983a,b) launched the successful HOA (History of Anthropology) series, explaining in the first introductory text that the profound issues of disciplinary identity that the discipline was facing in the early 1980s had mobilized anthropologists into looking at the history of anthropology. The diagnosis was familiar: "With the withdrawal of the umbrella of European power that long protected their entry into the colonial field, anthropologists found it increasingly difficult to gain access to (as well as ethically more problematic to study) the non-European 'others' who had traditionally excited the anthropological imagination" (1983b:4).

Conferences and congresses continued to produce publications well received by the profession (e.g. Fox 1991), and the launching of new journals (e.g. *Cultural Anthropology* in 1986 and, a few years later, in 1988, *Public Culture*) signaled new arenas for experimentation and for the remaking of existing disciplines: "One source of transformation is from the sheer power and influence of ideas from the margins toward the putative center or mainstream. Another simultaneous source is from distaff voices situated within the realm of the official" (Marcus 1991:564). [Meanwhile, *Dialectical Anthropology* (1985) dedicated part of an issue to discuss "National Trends," which included the cases of French, British, Soviet, and German anthropology.]

Of course, Said (1978) had been a main reference from the moment it was published, and issues about colonialism continued to be analyzed (e.g. Thomas 1994), with close connections to the literature on gender and feminism (e.g. Dirks et al 1994, Behar & Gordon 1995, Lamphere et al 1997).

Post-Exotic Anthropology?

A shift from the concerns with writing to attention on sites and audiences has marked the present decade. Strathern (1995) examines the (shifting) contexts

within which people make different orders of knowledge for themselves (including anthropologists) as a prelude to questioning assumptions about global and local perspectives. (Meanwhile the European Association of Social Anthropologists was founded in 1990 and two years later launched *Social Anthropology*.)

Almost simultaneously, two books on locations were published: Clifford (1997) examines "routes" as spatial practices of anthropology, noting that fieldwork has been based on a distinction between a home base and an exterior place of discovery. However, notions of "homes and abroads, community insides and outsides, fields and metropoles are increasingly challenged by post-exotic, decolonizing trends" (1997:53). Fields must be negotiated; and because there is no narrative form or way of writing inherently suited to a politics of location, anthropological distance sometimes may be "challenged, blurred, relationally reconstructed" (1997:81). Gupta & Ferguson (1997a,b) also recognize that anthropology has developed as a body of knowledge based on regional specialization. The spatial separation between "the field" and "home" leads the authors to examine the fieldworker as an anthropological subject. Whether "postmodern migrancy" (Ahmad 1992) may be at stake or not, authors feel a need to propose solutions: Clifford (1997) suggests that traditional fieldwork will certainly maintain its prestige, but the discipline may come "to resemble more closely the 'national' anthropologies of many European and non-Western countries, with short, repeated visits the norm and fully supported research years rare" (1997:90). Gupta & Ferguson see possible alternative solutions for fieldwork in strong and long-established "national" traditions as those of Mexico, Brazil, Germany, Russia, or India (1997b:27), and they suggest that from "spatial sites" anthropologists move to "political locations," following feminist scholarship.

Such alternatives were the guiding inspiration for Moore (1996), who looked at local practices and discourses as sets of "situated knowledges" (cf Haraway 1988), all of which are simultaneously local and global. For the editor, the future of anthropological knowledge must be seen as the result of a challenge by Third World, Black, and feminist scholars.

Audiences have become another topic. Almost two decades after the unsuccessful attempt by MMJ Fischer (unpublished data) to include an introduction for Iranians different from one for Americans (see Fischer 1980), the concern with readership finally emerged in Europe (Driessen 1993) and in the United States (Brettell 1993), in the context of queries related to a "politics of ethnography." An awareness of audiences led Marcus (1993a,b), in his introduction to the first issue of *Late Editions*, to propose that the different volumes of the series had "globally-minded U.S. academics" (1993b:3) as their privileged targets, in an attempt to prompt a meeting of anthropology and cultural studies. The purpose was "to evoke a combined sense of familiarity and strangeness in

U.S.-university educated readers," by selecting subjects that share a sort of frame of reference and experience with them "but then differ from them by cultural background and situated fin-de-siècle predicament" (Marcus 1993b:5).

Questions of audience, location, politics, and theory were present in the special issue of *Public Culture* devoted to the discussion of Ahmad (1992), but only to reveal the disparity of interpretations about what theory is all about and whether there could be any agreement on the field of "politics of theory" (Appadurai et al 1993, Ahmad 1993). Another attempt at an international discussion was put forward by Borofsky (1994), in a collective publication that came out of a session organized for the 1989 American Anthropological Association's annual meeting. The book included individual statements on authors' "intellectual roots." The project was extended in 1996, with another section at the same meeting, in which the title "How others see us: American cultural anthropology as the observed rather than the observer" indicated an exercise in reversibility (despite the fact that "others," with few exceptions, were located in the United States or Europe).

Among contemporary ethnographies at home, I single out Rabinow (1996), on the invention of the polymerase chain reaction, for a number of reasons: first, for the classic anthropological motivation ["I was often intrigued by, but skeptical of, the claims of miraculous knowledge made possible by new technologies supposedly ushering a new era in the understanding of life and unrivaled prospects for the improvement of health" (Rabinow 1996:2)]. Second, I single out this reference for its canonical structure: The first two chapters present the ecology of the invention, the (ever noble) third chapter focuses on the processes that culminated in the invention, while the last two demonstrate that an idea has little value unless it is put in action. Third, the book is innovative in the process of making both interviewees and readers collaborate in the text; in the style of *Late Editions*, transcripts of conversations with scientists, technicians, and businessmen are presented. Finally, despite protests of antidisciplinarity, the book also reinforces the idea that even at home, the ethnologist needs to learn another language (in this case, molecular biology) during a long period of socialization and, as always, to face the problem of who has the authority and the responsibility to represent experience and knowledge (Rabinow 1996:17). The fact that the book is not found on anthropology shelves in US bookstores, but on science shelves, reinforces by exclusion an enduring ideological association of anthropology with exoticism.[2]

----

[2]See Peirano (1997) for a comparison of four recent books, two of which were published in the United States (Geertz 1995, Rabinow 1996), two of which were published in India (Madan 1994, Das 1995).

FROM (AN)OTHER POINT OF VIEW

Observing the Greek case from anthropologists' own accounts, Kuper (1994) criticizes what he calls "nativist ethnography"—an extreme case of anthropology at home. Oftentimes taking a lead from Said and postmodern reflexive discourse, nativist ethnography assumes that only natives understand natives and that the native must be the proper judge of ethnography, even its censor. Sensibly, the author shares a skeptical view of this trend. He spares some native and foreign individual ethnographers, while sanctioning different traditions of ethnographic study, and proposes a "cosmopolitan" alternative for anthropology. For Kuper, cosmopolitan ethnographers should write only to other anthropologists (and not for curious foreigners and armchair voyeurs; nor should they write for natives or even the native community of experts, i.e. social scientists, planners, intellectuals). For him, such a cosmopolitan anthropology is a social science closely allied to sociology and social history that cannot be bound in the service of any political program.

Kuper's notion of a cosmopolitan anthropology may be contrasted to the multicentered project of Indian anthropologists (Uberoi 1968, 1983; Madan 1994; Das 1995). Well before the current concerns with anthropology at home, India offered the academic world long discussions on the study of "one's own society" (Srinivas 1955, 1966, 1979; Uberoi 1968; Béteille & Madan 1975; Madan 1982a,b; Das 1995), which directly lead to the question of audiences for anthropological writing. India was also the scene of the unique rebirth of *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, after its founders, Louis Dumont and David Pocock, decided to cease publication of the journal in Europe after 10 years of existence (see Madan 1994). The debates carried on in the section "For a Sociology of India," the title of the first article published by the editors (Dumont & Pocock 1957) and later a regular feature of the journal, revealed it as a forum for theoretical, academic, and political (even pedagogical) discussion, involving scholars from a variety of backgrounds and orientations. If science's life, warmth, and movement may best be perceived in debate (Latour 1989), then this 30-year-old forum has a most thoughtful history to tell.

Indian anthropologists are aware of their multiple readerships. Madan (1982b:266) mentions two types of triangular connections: (*a*) the relationship between insider and outsider anthropologists and the people being studied and (*b*) the relationship between the anthropologist, the sponsor of research, and the people. Das (1995) also points to three kinds of dialogues within sociological writing on India: the dialogue with (*a*) the Western traditions of scholarship in the discipline, (*b*) with the Indian sociologist and anthropologist, and (*c*) with the "informant," whose voice is present either as information obtained in the field or as the written texts of the tradition. In this sense, anthropology in India evaluates and refines, at one and the same time, anthropological dis-

course and the scholarship about one's own society. In this context, it is worth recalling that outsider anthropologists who have worked in India have also engaged in dialogues with insider scholars; some of these exchanges deeply influenced both sides. Good examples are the unending debate between Dumont and Srinivas, the reactions by Dumont to the Indian philosopher AK Saran (see Srinivas 1955, 1966; Dumont 1970, 1980; Saran 1962), and the subaltern historians' (Guha & Spivak 1988) dissension with Dumont and their reception and influence in Europe and elsewhere.

ALTERITY IN BRAZIL

A characteristic feature of anthropology in India is that social scientists aim at a mode of social reflection that does not merely duplicate Western questions. Yet Indian social scientists are fully aware that Western questions predirect their efforts, even their contestation. In Brazil, the image of an unavoidable dialogue with the centers of intellectual production is invariably present, but the undertone is different: Brazilian anthropologists feel that they are part and parcel of the West—even if, in important aspects, they are not. As one of the social sciences, anthropology in Brazil finds its usual intellectual niche at the intersection of different streams: first, canonical and/or current trends of Western scholarship; second, a sense of social responsibility toward those observed; and third, the lineage of social thought developed in the country at least from the early 1930s onward (which of course includes previous borrowings and earlier political commitments).

In this complex configuration, theory is the noble route to actual or idealized intellectual dialogues, and social commitment is in fact a powerful component of social scientists' identity (see, e.g., Candido 1958, Peirano 1981, Bomeny et al 1991, Schwartzman 1991, H Becker 1992, Reis 1996). Where theory has such an ideological power, communication is made more intricate by the fact that Portuguese is the language of intellectual discussion (oral and written) and English and French are the languages of scholarly learning. A quick glance into current anthropology in Brazil thus reveals no great surprises in terms of individual production—provided one knows Portuguese well. However, exactly because a dialogue is always taking place with absent interlocutors, alternative answers to existing concerns such as ethnicity, cultural and social pluralism, race, national identity, and so on are routine. [It is in this context that Arantes (1991) has ironically characterized Brazilian intellectual milieu as a "settling tank in the periphery."]

Somewhat of a singularity arises when academic production is depicted collectively. As opposed to the United States or Europe today, the critical point is neither exoticism nor the guilt generally associated with it. Concern over exoticism took a different path in Brazil. A (Durkheimian) notion of "difference"

rather than "exoticism" has generally drawn the attention of anthropologists whenever and wherever they encounter "otherness," thus sanctioning the idea that French influence has been stronger than the German heritage. Moreover, because of an overall inclination that is both broadly theoretical and political, and therefore congenial to nation-building values and responsibilities, otherness is recurrently found within the limits of the country (but see exceptions in G Velho 1995) and often related to an urge to track down a possible "Brazilian" singularity (DaMatta 1984; see Fry 1995 for the explicit question).

In this section I look at different conceptions of otherness in Brazil. This endeavor results from an inquiry into possible equivalent notions of exoticism in the Brazilian context (and may eventually help decipher why anthropologists in Brazil do not partake the current sense of crisis as in other contexts).[3] I discern four configurations, presented here for heuristic purposes, which are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Cutting across a continuum of concerns about the location of otherness, many authors move from one to another or combine them at different moments in their careers; all of them are socially recognized as legitimate anthropology. I cite publications that I take as representative, but by no means do I touch below the surface of the available literature.

Radical Otherness

The canonical search for radical otherness may be illustrated in Brazil in terms of ideological and/or geographical remoteness: first, in the study of indigenous or so-called tribal peoples; second, in the recent wave of research beyond Brazilian's frontiers. In both cases, radical otherness is not extreme.

In the first case, as befalls the study of Indian societies, interlocutors for Brazilian specialists are located both inside and outside the local community of social scientists. This is the area where outside debates are more visible. (Is one's difference another's exoticism?) Actual fieldwork, however, has been restricted to the limits of the country, even when the larger ethnological area is perceived as South America. Though funding may be one major constraint, there are crucial political and ideological implications in this fact.

A distinguished body of literature on South American ethnology is available to inform contemporaneous specialists, going back to nineteenth-century German expeditions seeking answers in Brazil to European questions about the state of "naturalness" of the primitives (Baldus 1954) up to more recent generations, such as Nimuendaju's (e.g. 1946) celebrated monographs on the social organization of the Gê tribes and the late 1930s research of Tupi groups

---

[3]A different approach was adopted in Peirano (1981), which examines the process by which, from the 1950s on, a common stock of sociological questions was progressively dismembered and couched as sociology, anthropology, and political science.

(e.g. Baldus 1970, Wagley & Galvão 1949). Soon after, Ribeiro & Ribeiro (1957) carried out research among the Urubu-Kaapor; during the late 1940s and early 1950s Fernandes (1963, 1970) published his classic reconstruction of Tupinambá social organization and warfare based on sixteenth-century chroniclers, and Schaden (1954) studied the different aspects of Guarani culture. Having been the best-studied peoples in Brazil, after Nimuendaju the Gê attracted the attention of Lévi-Strauss (1956) and, following suit, the Harvard Central-Brazil Project (Maybury-Lewis 1967, 1979). In due time, the results of this large-scale research program emerged as the strongest ethnographical cases supporting structural anthropology, having served as fieldwork experience for a generation of ethnologists (among those who developed their careers in Brazil, see DaMatta 1982; Melatti 1970, 1978).

Today, newcomers to the field can thus discern some antinomies: Tupi or Gê; kinship or cosmology; Amazonian and Central Brazil or Xingu; external historical sociology or internal synchronic analysis; ecology or culture; history or ethnography; political economy or descriptive cosmology (see Viveiros de Castro 1995b). As in every antinomy, reality is a step removed. But in this context, Tupi research, having practically disappeared from the ethnological scene during the 1960s and early 1970s (but see Laraia 1986), has recently reemerged with a driving force both within and beyond the limits of the Portuguese language (Viveiros de Castro 1992, T Lima 1995, Fausto 1997; see also Muller 1990, Magalhães 1994). Prompted by that body of research, interest in kinship was also rehabilitated (Viveiros de Castro 1995a,b; Villaça 1992; for a recent debate with French ethnographers, see Viveiros de Castro 1993, 1994; Copet-Rougier & Héritier-Augé 1993). Meanwhile, research on Gê groups continued (e.g. Vidal 1977, Carneiro da Cunha 1978, Seeger 1981, Lopes da Silva 1986).

The second trend of radical otherness is more recent. While it takes the observer away from the geographical limits of the country, it still confirms the idea that some relative link to home is essential. In this context the United States has become a sort of paradigmatic other for comparative studies, from the classic study on racial prejudice by Nogueira (see 1986) to more recent analyses of hierarchy and individualism by DaMatta (1973a, 1981, 1991). This trend has unfolded in the works of L Cardoso de Oliveira (1989), R Lima (1991), and, in this issue, Segato (1998). An emergent topic is the study of Brazilian immigrants (e.g. G Ribeiro 1996). A recent interest in Portuguese anthropology, as indicated by congresses and conferences in Brazil and Portugal, attests again to historical and linguistic links.

Contact with Otherness

Considered by many the most successful theoretical innovation produced in Brazil, the idea of interethnic friction made its appearance in anthropology as a

bricolage of indigenist concerns and sociological theoretical inspiration. Coined by R Cardoso de Oliveira (1963), interethnic friction was proposed as a syncretic totality emerging from the contact of Indian populations with the national society and revealing "a situation in which two groups are dialectically unified through opposing interests" (1963:43). Seen from this perspective, concerns about the integration of Indians into the national society—which have always been a source of distress for ethnologists and indigenists—were shifted onto theoretical grounds. Contact was seen as a dynamic process, and the notion of totality did not rest with one agent or the other (national or Indian) but in the universe of the observed phenomenon. Interethnic friction was proposed in a context in which British and US theories of contact, namely social change (Malinowski) and acculturation (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovitz), had proved inadequate; Balandier's views and Fernandes's (1972) studies on race relations in Brazil were chosen instead as inspiration.

Contact with Indians had been a major social concern in Brazil since the foundation of the Service for the Protection of Indians (SPI) in 1910. In the 1940s and 1950s it proceeded through observations carried out by ethnologists (generally published apart from their major ethnographical work) and set shore in academic anthropology as a legitimate topic in the 1950s, merging academic with public-policy concerns for indigenous populations (see D Ribeiro 1957, 1962). During the 1960s a peculiar academic scene emerged in Brazil: Sharing the same space, and often involving the same individual researchers (Laraia & DaMatta 1967, DaMatta 1982, Melatti 1967), studies were being developed that, on the one hand, focused on specific features of Indian social systems (cf Harvard Central-Brazil Project) and, on the other hand, focused on contact as interethnic friction.

This thematic inspiration survives today in studies that bear the hallmark of interethnic friction but have become a distinct lineage of concern (though theoretical bonds span from postmodern to historical and sociological concerns). Its topics vary from an evaluation of Yanomami ethnography in a context of crisis (Ramos 1995) to analyses of indigenism, Indian lands, and frontiers (Oliveira 1987, 1988; Ramos 1998, Souza Lima 1995) to social conditions of South American Indians (Carneiro da Cunha 1992).

During the 1970s, in due course the concern with contact embraced the theme of frontiers of expansion, making issues related to internal colonialism, peasants, and capitalist development a legitimate anthropological subject (O Velho 1972, 1976). At the same time, studies on peasants gained their own thematic status, as extensive studies were carried out by both anthropologists and sociologists (among the former, see Palmeira 1977, Sigaud 1980, Moura 1978, Seyferth 1985, K Woortmann 1990, E Woortmann 1995). This thematic movement's location eventually reached the fringes of large cities (Leite Lopes 1976).

Nearby Otherness

As early as the 1970s, anthropologists in Brazil began to do research nearby. Because academic socialization takes place within social science courses, anthropological approaches have become a counterpart to sociology. In the unfolding of political authoritarianism in the 1970s, anthropology was seen by many as a promising counterpart to Marxist challenges coming from sociology—a silent dialogue that has persisted ever since. For some, the qualitative aspects of anthropology were appealing; others were attracted by the microscopic approach to social life; still others were attracted by the challenge of understanding certain aspects of the "national" ethos. The preferred route was via theory.

The Chicago school of sociology was one of G Velho's significant interlocutors (e.g. 1972, 1975, 1981) in his choice of sensitive urban issues, ranging from middle-class and elite lifestyles to psychic cultural habits, drug consumption, and violence. His students enlarged this universe by including popular sectors, aging, gender, prostitution, kinship and family, and politics. One major motivation of the overall project was to uncover urban values and the criteria for defining social identity and difference. Theses and books produced by this line of inquiry are numerous and far-reaching (e.g. Duarte 1986, Gaspar 1985, Lins de Barros 1989, Vianna 1995; Salem 1985 for a review on middle-class family).

In the horizontality bestowed on each society by structuralism, DaMatta (1984, 1991) found a legitimate avenue for his long-standing inquiry into the national ethos through the relationship between individualism and holism in Brazil. Of course, Gilberto Freyre's monumental work (see Segato 1998) is a predecessor in any search for Brazilian identity and DaMatta acknowledges the link. Having participated in the two major Indian research projects in the 1960s (cf above), since the 1980s the author has shifted to national themes. DaMatta (1973a) may be seen as a point of transition, pulling together a canonical structuralist analysis of an Apinajé myth, a story by Edgar Allan Poe, and an examination of *communitas* in Brazilian carnival. By means of a dialogue with Dumont's notion of hierarchy, DaMatta (1991) develops a comparative analysis of carnival in Brazil and the United States, discloses hierarchy in popular sayings and songs, and probes literary works.

In neither of the two approaches above was the relevance or appropriateness of developing anthropology at home ever seriously questioned. After a short exchange on the nature of fieldwork in general, on the disposition of ethnographers toward "anthropological blues," and on the idea of familiarity (DaMatta 1973b, 1981; G Velho 1978), both nearby and far from home, the issue was put to rest. (This debate was contemporaneous to Indian anthropologists' discussion on the study of one's own society.)

Meanwhile, other topics have emerged since the 1950s, first related to the social integration of different populations and later to minority rights. Such topics brought together sociology and anthropology, thereby reaffirming and giving historical validation to authors such as Candido (1995), who had never totally distinguished the social sciences from each other. To mention just a few, on immigrants see Azevedo (1994), Cardoso (1995), Seyferth (1990); on race relations, see Segato (1998), Borges Pereira (1967), Fry (1991); on gender studies, Bruschini & Sorj (1994), Gregori (1993); on religion, messianism, and Afro-Brazilian cults, R Ribeiro (1978), Maggie (1975), O Velho (1995), Birman (1995); and on popular festivities, Magnani (1984), Cavalcanti (1994). More directly focused on politics as a social domain in Brazil are studies in Palmeira (1995) and Palmeira & Goldman (1996).

Radical Us

As if to confirm that social sciences in Brazil have a profound debt to Durkheim—who proposed that other forms of civilization are sought not for their own sake but to explain what is near to us—from the 1980s on anthropologists have launched a wave of studies on the social sciences themselves, with the overall purpose of understanding science as a manifestation of modernity. Although topics of study vary from local social scientists to classic authors of social theory, interlocutors are often French: See, for example, Castro Faria (1993), Corrêa (1982, 1987), Miceli (1989), Goldman (1994), and Neiburg (1997). Melatti (1984) stands as the richest bibliographical account of contemporary anthropology in Brazil. A comprehensive project to study different styles of anthropology was launched in Cardoso de Oliveira & Ruben (1995), with proposals to focus on different national experiences. This project was preceded by an independent study by Peirano (1981), who later, having chosen social sciences developed in India for interlocution (Peirano 1991), attempted a comparative approach based on the theoretical enigma put forth by Dumont (1978). For a comparison between Brazilian folklorists and sociologists vis-à-vis nation-building ideology, see Vilhena (1997); for a comparison between Brazilian and Hungarian folk musicians and intellectuals in the first half of the century, see Travassos (1997). An examination of the literature on anthropology and psychoanalysis in Brazil is found in Duarte (1997).

In these studies, one striking feature is that the vast majority deal with broad issues related to Western intellectual traditions but, because they are published in Portuguese, have a limited audience. The question of for whom these works are produced thus steps in; these dialogues with major sources of scholarship result in local exercises that (either by design or owing to power relationships) are free from external disputes. Nonetheless they fulfill the performative function of ideologically linking Brazilian social scientists to the larger world.

Brazil as Site, or Otherness in Context

The founding of the social sciences at a moment of thrusts toward nation building is a well-known phenomenon (E Becker 1971 for France and the United States; Saberwal 1982 for India), as is the paradox of a critical social science surviving against the vested interests of the elites that created them. In these contexts, social science is not necessarily specialized; anthropology and sociology separate at times and in places that create a (political and conceptual) need for differentiating approaches, theories, or perspectives.

In Brazil in the 1930s, social science was adopted to provide a scientific approach to designing the new country's future. It was then believed that, in due time, social science would replace the literary social essay, which had been, "more than philosophy or the human sciences, the central phenomenon of spiritual life" (Candido 1976:156). Thus, from the 1930s to the 1950s, while social science was maturing a sociology "feita-no-Brasil" (which actually became hegemonic during the next two decades), canonic anthropological studies of Indian groups were the rule. In the 1960s, these studies began to share the stage with the new wave of studies on contact as interethnic friction and, immediately afterward, in the 1970s, with peasants and urban studies. Throughout these decades the blurring of disciplines has gone hand in hand with the quest for social commitment and ambitions for academic standards of excellence, difference being found nearby or, at most, not far from home.

Some decades ago, Anderson (1968) suggested that a flourishing British anthropology was the result of the export of critical social thought to subject peoples during the first half of the century and that the sociology England failed to develop at home had given rise to a prosperous anthropology abroad. More recently, Fischer (1988) suggested that North American anthropologists do not seem to play the same role enjoyed by Brazilian anthropologists as public intellectuals, not because of the formers' lack of engagement, but because of "the loss of a serious bifocality, able to be trained simultaneously at home and abroad on American culture as it transforms (and is transformed) by global society" (1988:13). My intention here has been to further discussions on the indexical components of the notions of home and abroad, by pointing out some anthropological difficulties that are inherent in intellectual dialogues. Significantly enough, the juxtaposition of an international experience and a Brazilian experience—as if they were distinct—indicates (and this very review is a good example) that, more often than not, authors meet only in our "Literature Cited" section.

CONCLUSION

There are many meanings to the expression "anthropology at home," the most obvious of which refers to the kind of inquiry developed in the study of one's

own society, where "others" are both ourselves and those relatively different from us, whom we see as part of the same collectivity. In this respect, after banning exoticism, anthropology at home was a historical shift for some. For others it has always been the major trend within a long-standing tradition; others still have chosen to develop their anthropological inquiries both at home and abroad. But whenever observers and observed meet, new hybrid representations arise, which are intensified in comparison to the notions from which they proceed (Dumont 1994). The more modern civilization spreads throughout the world, the more it is itself modified by the incorporation of hybrid products, making it more powerful and, at the same time, modifying it through the constant mix of distinct values.

Anthropologists have taken on multiple roles, as members of transnational communities sharing codes, expectations, rituals, and a body of classic literature—all of which allow dialogues to ensue—and, at the same time, as individuals whose socialization and social identity are tied to a specific collectivity, making their political and social responsibilities context-bound. Their prevailing values may vary, be they national, ethnic, or other. In some cases, a civilizational identity (as in South Asia) is superimposed on this configuration; in others it is hegemonic (as in "America," for instance).

Just as in other complex social phenomena, an examination of the different contexts of anthropology should be approached from a comparative perspective. For this purpose, some conditions are necessary: First, we must grant that academic knowledge, however socially produced, is relatively autonomous from its immediate contexts of production and therefore is capable of attaining desirable levels of communication. Second, we must accept that rigorous comparison, rather than uncontrolled relativism, is the best guarantee against superficial homogenization across national and cultural boundaries. And third, we must examine contemporary currents of anthropology at the convergence of the many socially recognized theoretical histories, including their neighboring disciplines (either models or rivals) and local traditions, where these broader relationships are embedded.

Visit the *Annual Reviews home page* at
http://www.AnnualReviews.org

Literature Cited

Abu-Lughod L. 1991. Writing against culture. See Fox 1991, pp. 137–62

Ahmad A. 1992. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso

Ahmad A. 1993. A response. *Public Cult.* 6: 143–91

Anderson P. 1968. The components of a national culture. *New Left Rev.* 50:3–57

Appadurai A, Berlant L, Breckenridge C, Gaonkar D. 1993. Editorial comment: on theory's empire. *Public Cult.* 6(1):vii–xi

Arantes P. 1991. Ideologia francesa, opinião brasileira. *Novos Estudos CEBRAP* 30: 149–61

Ardener E. 1987. "Remote areas": some theoretical considerations. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 39–54

Asad T, ed. 1973a. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca

Asad T. 1973b. Introduction. See Asad 1973a, pp. 9–19

Azevedo T. 1994. *Os Italianos no Rio Grande do Sul*. Caxias do Sul: Editora Univ. Caxias do Sul

Baldus H. 1954. *Bibliografia Comentada da Etnologia Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Souza

Baldus H. 1970. *Tapirapé: Tribo Tupi no Brasil Central*. São Paulo: Cia. Editora Nacional

Banton M, ed. 1966. *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. London: Tavistock

Becker E. 1971. *The Lost Science of Man*. New York: Braziller

Becker H. 1992. Social theory in Brazil. *Sociol. Theory* 10:1–5

Behar R, Gordon D, eds. 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Béteille A, Madan TN, eds. 1975. *Encounter and Experience: Personal Accounts of Fieldwork*. Delhi: Vikas

Birman P. 1995. *Fazer Estilo Criando Gêneros*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará

Bomeny HM, Birman P, Paixão AL, eds. 1991. *As Assim Chamadas Ciências Sociais*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará

Borges Pereira JB. 1967. *Cor, Profissão e Mobilidade: o Negro e o Rádio de São Paulo*. São Paulo: Pioneira

Borofsky R, ed. 1994. *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Bourdieu P. 1969. Intellectual field and creative project. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* 8(2):89–119

Brettell CB, ed. 1993. *When They Read What We Write: The Politics of Ethnography*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey

Brown BA. 1994. Born in the USA: American anthropologists come home. *Dialec. Anthropol.* 19(4):419–38

Bruschini MC, Sorj B, eds. 1994. *Novos Olhares: Mulheres e Relações de Gênero no Brasil*. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas/Marco Zero

Candido A. 1958. Informação sobre sociologia em São Paulo. In *Ensaios Paulistas,* pp. 510–21. São Paulo: Anhambi

Candido A. 1976. *Literatura e Sociedade*. São Paulo: Cia. Editora Nacional

Candido A. 1995. *On Literature and Society* (trans. and intro. by Howard Becker). Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press

Cardoso R. 1995. *Estrutura Familiar e Mobilidade Social: Estudo dos Japoneses no Estado de São Paulo*. São Paulo: Primus

Cardoso de Oliveira LR. 1989. *Fairness and communication in small claims courts*. PhD thesis. Harvard Univ.

Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1963. Aculturação e "fricção" interétnica. *Am. Lat.* 6:33–45

Cardoso de Oliveira R, Ruben GR, eds. 1995. *Estilos de Antropologia*. Campinas: Unicamp

Carneiro da Cunha M. 1978. *Os Mortos e os Outros. Uma Análise do Sistema Funerário e da Noção de Pessoa Entre os Índios Krahó*. São Paulo: Hucitec

Carneiro da Cunha M, ed. 1992. *História dos Índios no Brasil*. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras

Castro Faria L. 1993. *Antropologia. Espetáculo e Excelência*. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ/ Tempo Brasileiro

Cavalcanti ML. 1994. *Carnaval Carioca: Dos Bastidores ao Desfile*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ/MinC/Funarte

Clifford J. 1986. Partial truths. See Clifford & Marcus 1986, pp. 1–26

Clifford J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Clifford J, Marcus GE, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Copet-Rougier E, Héritier-Augé F. 1993. Commentaires sur commentaire. Réponse à E Viveiros de Castro. *L'Homme* 33:139–48

Corrêa M. 1982. *As ilusões da liberdade. A escola de Nina Rodrigues*. PhD thesis. Univ. de São Paulo

Corrêa M, ed. 1987. *História da Antropologia no Brasil. Testemunhos: Emilio Willems e Donald Pierson*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp

Crapanzano V. 1980. *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Crick M. 1976. *Explorations in Language and Meaning*. London: Malaby

DaMatta R. 1973a. *Ensaios de Antropologia Estrutural*. Petrópolis: Vozes

DaMatta R. 1973b. O ofício de etnólogo ou como ter "anthropological blues." *Comunicações do PPGAS* 1. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional

DaMatta R. 1981. *Relativizando: Uma Introdução à Antropologia Social*. Petrópolis: Vozes

DaMatta R. 1982. *A Divided World: Apinaye Social Structure.* Transl. A Campbell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

DaMatta R. 1984. *O Que Faz o Brasil, Brasil?* Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara

DaMatta R. 1991. *Carnivals, Rogues, and Heroes: An Interpretation of the Brazilian Dilemma.* Transl. J Drury. Notre Dame, IN: Univ. Notre Dame Press

Darnell R, ed. 1974. *Readings in the History of Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row

Das V. 1995. *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press

Dialec. Anthropol. 1985. Natl. Trends, pp. 165–348

Diamond S, ed. 1980a. *Anthropology: Ancestors and Heirs*. Paris: Mouton

Diamond S. 1980b. Anthropological traditions: the participants observed. See Diamond 1980a, pp. 2–16

Dirks N, Eley G, Ortner S, eds. 1994. *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Dragadze T. 1987. Fieldwork at home: the USSR. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 155–63

Driessen H, ed. 1993. *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Western and Indigenous Views*. Saarbrücken, Germany/Fort Lauderdale, FL: Breitenbach

Duarte LFD. 1986. *Da Vida Nervosa (nas Classes Trabalhadoras Urbanas)*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar/CNPq

Duarte LFD. 1997. *Dois regimes históricos das relações da antropologia com a psicanálise no Brasil*. Presented at Seminário Ciências Sociais, Estado e Sociedade, Rio de Janeiro

Dumont L. 1970. *Religion, Politics and History in India*. Paris: Mouton

Dumont L. 1978. La communauté anthropologique et l'ideologie. *L'Homme* 18: 83–110

Dumont L. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Dumont L. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Dumont L. 1994. *German Ideology: From France to Germany and Back*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Dumont L, Pocock D. 1957. For a sociology of India. *Contrib. Indian Sociol.* 1:7–22

Fabian J. 1983. *Time and the Other. How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Fahim H, ed. 1982. *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*. Durham, NC: Carolina Acad. Press

Fahim H, Helmer K. 1982. Themes and counterthemes: the Burg Wartenstein Symposium. See Fahim 1982, pp. xi–xxxiii

Fausto C. 1997. *A dialética da predação e familiarização entre os Parakanã da Amazônia oriental.* PhD thesis. Univ. Fed. Rio de Janeiro

Fernandes F. 1963. *A Organização Social dos Tupinambá*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro

Fernandes F. 1970. *A Função Social da Guerra na Sociedade Tupinambá*. São Paulo: Pioneira

Fernandes F. 1972. *O Negro no Mundo dos Brancos*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro

Firth R, ed. 1956. *Two Studies of Kinship in London*. London: Athlone

Fischer MMJ. 1980. *Iran: From Religious Dispute to Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Fischer MMJ. 1988. Scientific theory and critical hermeneutics. *Cult. Anthropol.* 3(1):3–15

Fischer MMJ, Abedi M. 1990. *Debating Muslims: Cultural Dialogues in Postmodernity and Tradition*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press

Fox R, ed. 1991. *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe, NM: Sch. Am. Res. Press

Fry P. 1991. Politicamente correto em um lugar, incorreto em outro. *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos* 21:167–77

Fry P. 1995. Why is Brazil different? *Times Lit. Suppl.*, Dec. 8, no. 4836:6–7

Gaspar MD. 1985. *Garotas de Programa: Prostituição em Copacabana e Identidade Social*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Geertz C. 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books

Geertz C. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Geertz C. 1995. *After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Gerholm T, Hannerz U, eds. 1982a. The shaping of national anthropologies. *Ethnos* 42 (special issue). 186 pp.

Gerholm T, Hannerz U. 1982b. Introduction: the shaping of national anthropologies. See Gerholm & Hannerz 1982a, pp. 5–35

Gilmore DD. 1982. Anthropology of the Mediterranean area. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 11:175–205

Goldman M. 1994. *Razão e Diferença: Afetividade, Racionalidade e Relativismo no Pensamento de Lévy-Bruhl*. Rio de Janeiro: Grypho/UFRJ

Goody JR. 1966. The prospects for social anthropology. *New Soc.*, Oct. 13, pp. 574–76

Gregori MF. 1993. *Cenas e Queixas: Mulheres, Relações Violentas e a Prática Feminista*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra/ANPOCS

Guha R, Spivak GC, eds. 1988. *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Gupta A, Ferguson J, eds. 1997a. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Gupta A, Ferguson J. 1997b. Discipline and practice: "The Field" as site, method and location in anthropology. See Gupta & Ferguson 1997a, pp. 1–46

Hallowell AI. 1974. The history of anthropology as an anthropological problem. See Darnell 1974, pp. 304–21

Haraway DJ. 1988. Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Fem. Stud.* 14(4):575–99

Hymes D, ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Random

Jackson A, ed. 1987a. *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock

Jackson A. 1987b. Reflections on ethnography at home and the ASA. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 1–15

Kuper A. 1994. Culture, identity and the project of a cosmopolitan anthropology. *Man* (NS) 29:537–54

Lamphere L, Ragone H, Zavella P, eds. 1997. *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge

Laraia RB. 1986. *Tupi: Índios do Brasil Atual*. São Paulo: FFLCH/USP

Laraia RB, DaMatta R. 1967. *Índios e Castanheiros*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro

Latour B. 1989. Pasteur et Pouchet: hétérogenèse de l'histoire des sciences. In *Éléments d'Histoire des Sciences*, ed. M Serres, pp. 423–45. Paris: Bordas

Latour B. 1996. Not the question. *Anthropol. Newsl.* 37(3):1, 5

Latour B, Woolgar S. 1979. *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Leach ER. 1961. *Rethinking Anthropology*. London: Athlone

Leite Lopes JS. 1976. *O Vapor do Diabo*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra

Lévi-Strauss C. 1956. Les organisations dualistes, existent-elles? *Bijdr. Tot Taal Land Volkenkd.* 112:99–128

Lévi-Strauss C. 1961. La crise moderne de l'anthropologie. *Le Courr.* (UNESCO) 14(11):12–17

Lévi-Strauss C. 1962. *La Pensée Sauvage*. Paris: Plon

Lima RK. 1991. Ordem pública e pública desordem. *Anu. Antropol.* 88:21–44

Lima TS. 1995. *A parte do cauim. Etnografia Juruna*. PhD thesis. Univ. Fed. Rio de Janeiro

Lins de Barros M. 1989. *Autoridade e Afeto: Avós, Filhos e Netos na Família Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Lopes da Silva A. 1986. *Nomes e Amigos: Da Prática Xavante a uma Reflexão Sobre os Jê*. São Paulo: FFLCH/USP

Madan TN. 1982a. Anthropology as the mutual interpretation of cultures: Indian perspectives. See Fahim 1982, pp. 4–18

Madan TN. 1982b. Indigenous anthropology in non-western countries: an overview. See Fahim 1982, pp. 263–68

Madan TN. 1994. *Pathways: Approaches to the Study of Society in India*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press

Magalhães AC. 1994. *Os Parakanã: espaços de socialização e suas articulações simbólicas*. PhD thesis. Univ. de São Paulo

Maggie Y. 1975. *Guerra de Orixá: Um Estudo de Ritual e Conflito*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Magnani JG. 1984. *Festa no Pedaço: Cultura Popular e Lazer na Cidade*. São Paulo: Brasiliense

Malinowski B. 1939. Preface. In *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*, H-T Fei, pp. xix–xxvi. New York: Dutton

Marcus GE, ed. 1983. *Elites: Ethnographic Issues*. Albuquerque: Univ. NM Press

Marcus GE. 1991. Editorial retrospective. *Cult. Anthropol.* 6(4):553–64

Marcus GE, ed. 1993a. *Perilous States. Conversations on Culture, Politics, and Nation*. Late Editions, Vol. 1. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Marcus GE. 1993b. Introduction to the series and to volume 1. See Marcus 1993a, pp. 1–16

Marcus GE. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:95–117

Marcus GE, Fischer MMJ. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Mascarenhas-Keyes S. 1987. The native an-

thropologist: constraints and strategies in research. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 180–95

Maybury-Lewis D. 1967. *Akwë-Shavante Society*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Maybury-Lewis D, ed. 1979. *Dialectical Societies: the Gê and Bororo of Central Brazil*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

McGrane BD. 1976. *Beyond Europe: An archaeology of anthropology from the 16th to the early 20th century*. PhD thesis. NY Univ.

Melatti JC. 1967. *Índios e Criadores: Situação dos Krahó na Área Pastoril do Tocantins*. Rio de Janeiro: Inst. Ciências Soc.

Melatti JC. 1970. *O sistema social Krahó*. PhD thesis. Univ. de São Paulo

Melatti JC. 1978. *Ritos de uma Tribo Timbira*. São Paulo: Ática

Melatti JC. 1984. A antropologia no Brasil: um roteiro. *Bol. Inf. Biblio. Ciênc. Soc.—BIB* 17:3–52

Messerschmidt DA, ed. 1981. *Anthropologists at Home in North America. Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Miceli S, ed. 1989. *As Ciências Sociais no Brasil*. São Paulo: Vértice

Moffatt M. 1992. Ethnographic writing about American culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 21:205–29

Moore HL. 1996. *The Future of Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge

Mott LR. 1982. Indigenous anthropology and Brazilian Indians. See Fahim 1982, pp. 112–17

Moura MM. 1978. *Os Herdeiros da Terra*. São Paulo: Hucitec

Muller R. 1990. *Os Assurini do Xingu: História e Arte*. Campinas: Unicamp

Neiburg F. 1997. *Os Intelectuais e a Invenção do Peronismo*. São Paulo: Edusp

Nimuendaju C. 1946. *The Eastern Timbira*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Nogueira O. 1986. *Tanto Preto Quanto Branco. Ensaios de Relações Raciais*. São Paulo: Queiroz

Okely J. 1987. Fieldwork up the M1: policy and political aspects. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 55–73

Oliveira JP, ed. 1987. *Sociedades Indígenas e Indigenismo no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Marco Zero/UFRJ

Oliveira JP. 1988. *O Nosso Governo: Os Ticuna e o Regime Tutelar*. São Paulo: MCT/CNPq/Marco Zero

Palmeira M. 1977. Emprego e mudança sócio-econômica no nordeste. *Anu. Antropol.* 76:201–38

Palmeira M, ed. 1995. *Política e Relações Pessoais*. *Comunicações do PPGAS* 5. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional

Palmeira M, Goldman M, eds. 1996. *Antropologia, Voto e Representação*. Rio de Janeiro: Contracapa

Peirano MGS. 1981. *The anthropology of anthropology: The Brazilian case*. PhD thesis. Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA

Peirano MGS. 1991. For a sociology of India: some comments from Brazil. *Contrib. Indian Sociol.* (NS) 25:321–27

Peirano MGS. 1992. *Uma Antropologia no Plural*. Brasília: Editora Univ. Brasília

Peirano MGS. 1997. Onde está a antropologia? *Mana* 3(2):67–102

Rabinow P. 1996. *Making PCR: a Story of Biotechnology*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Ramos AR. 1995. *Sanumá Memories: Yanomami Ethnography in Times of Crisis*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press

Ramos AR. 1998. *Indigenism: Ethnic Politics in Brazil*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press. In press

Reis EP. 1996. Making sense of history: political sociology in Brazil. *Curr. Sociol.* 44:81–105

Ribeiro D. 1957. Culturas e línguas indígenas do Brasil. *Educação e Ciências Sociais* 2:5–100

Ribeiro D. 1962. *A Política Indigenista Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Agricultura

Ribeiro D, Ribeiro B. 1957. *Arte Plumária dos Índios Kaapor*. Rio de Janeiro: Seikel

Ribeiro GL. 1996. *Brazilians are hot, Americans are cold. A non-structuralist approach to San Francisco's carnival*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 95th, San Francisco

Ribeiro R. 1978. *Cultos Afro-Brasileiros do Recife*. Recife: MEC/Inst. Joaquim Nabuco

Saberwal S. 1982. Uncertain transplants: anthropology and sociology in India. *Ethnos* 42(1–2):36–49

Said E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon

Salem T. 1985. Família em camadas médias: uma revisão da literatura. *Boletim do Museu Nacional* (NS) 54. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ

Saran AK. 1962. Review of contributions to Indian sociology, n. IV. *East. Anthropol.* 15:53–68

Schaden E. 1954. *Aspectos Fundamentais da Cultura Guarani*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro

Schneider D. 1968. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Schwartzman S. 1991. *A Space for Science: The Development of the Scientific Commu-*

nity in Brazil. University Park, PA: Penn. State Univ. Press

Seeger A. 1981. *Nature and Society in Central Brazil*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Segato RL. 1998. The color-blind subject of myth; or, where to find Africa in the nation. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 27:In press

Seyferth G. 1985. Herança e estrutura familiar camponesa. *Boletim do Museu. Nacional* 52. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ

Seyferth G. 1990. *Imigração e Cultura no Brasil*. Brasília: Editora Univ. Brasília

Sigaud L. 1980. A nação dos homens. *Anu. Antropol.* 78:13–114

Souza Lima AC. 1995. *Um Grande Cerco de Paz*. Petrópolis: Vozes

Spindler GD, Spindler L. 1983. Anthropologists view American culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 12:49–78

Srinivas MN. 1952. *Religion and Society Among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford: Clarendon

Srinivas MN. 1955. Village studies and their significance. *East. Anthropol.* 8:215–58

Srinivas MN. 1966. Some thoughts on the study of one's own society. In *Social Change in Modern India*, pp. 147–63. New Delhi: Allied

Srinivas MN, ed. 1979. *The Fieldworker and the Field*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Stocking GW Jr. 1974. Empathy and antipathy in the heart of darkness. See Darnell 1974, pp. 281–87

Stocking GW Jr. 1982. Afterword: a view from the center. *Ethnos* 47(1–2):172–86

Stocking GW Jr, ed. 1983a. *Observers Observed. Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. HOA 1. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press

Stocking GW Jr. 1983b. History of anthropology: whence/whither. See Stocking 1983a, pp. 3–12

Strathern M. 1987. The limits of auto-anthropology. See Jackson 1987a, pp. 16–37

Strathern M, ed. 1995. *Shifting Contexts: Transformation in Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge

Thomas N. 1991. Against ethnography. *Cult. Anthropol.* 6(3):306–21

Thomas N. 1994. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press

Traube EG. 1996. "The popular" in American culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 25:127–51

Travassos E. 1997. *Os Mandarins Milagrosos. Arte e Etnografia em Mário de Andrade e Béla Bartók*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Traweek S. 1988. *Beamtimes and Lifetimes. The World of High Energy Physicists*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Uberoi JPS. 1968. Science and swaraj. *Contrib. Indian Sociol.* (NS) 2:119–28

Uberoi JPS. 1983. *The Other Mind of Europe: Goethe as Scientist*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press

Velho G. 1972. *A Utopia Urbana: Um Estudo de Antropologia Social*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Velho G. 1975. *Nobres e anjos: um estudo de tóxicos e hierarquia*. PhD thesis. Univ. de São Paulo

Velho G. 1978. Observando o familiar. In *A Aventura Sociológica*, ed. E Nunes, pp. 36–46. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Velho G. 1981. *Individualismo e Cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Velho G, ed. 1995. *Quatro Viagens: Antropólogos Brasileiros no Exterior*. Comunicações do PPGAS 6. Rio de Janeiro: Mus. Nac.

Velho O. 1972. *Frentes de Expansão e Estrutura Agrária*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar

Velho O. 1976. *Capitalismo Autoritário e Campesinato*. São Paulo: Difel

Velho O. 1982. Through Althusserian spectacles: recent social anthropology in Brazil. *Ethnos* 47(1–2): 133–49

Velho O. 1995. *Besta-Fera. Recriação do Mundo*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará

Vianna H. 1995. *O Mistério do Samba*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar/Editora UFRJ

Vidal L. 1977. *Morte e Vida de uma Sociedade Indígena Brasileira: Os Kayapo-Xikrin do Rio Catete*. São Paulo: Hucitec

Vilhena LR. 1997. *Projeto e Missão: O Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro (1947–1964)*. Rio de Janeiro: Funarte/Fundação Getúlio Vargas

Villaça A. 1992. *Comendo como Gente: Formas do Canibalismo Wari*. Rio de Janeiro: Anpocs/UFRJ

Viveiros de Castro E. 1992. *From the Enemy's Point of View. Humanity and Divinity in an Amazonian Society*. Transl. C Howard. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Viveiros de Castro E. 1993. Structures, régimes, stratégies. *L'Homme* 33:117–37

Viveiros de Castro E. 1994. Une mauvaise querelle. *L'Homme* 34:181–91

Viveiros de Castro E, ed. 1995a. *Antropologia do Parentesco: Estudos Ameríndios*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ

Viveiros de Castro E. 1995b. Pensando o parentesco ameríndio. See Viveiros de Castro 1995a, pp. 7–24

Wagley C, Galvão E. 1949. *The Tenetehara Indians of Brazil: A Culture in Transition*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Woortmann E. 1995. *Herdeiros, Parentes e Compadres*. São Paulo/Brasília: Hucitec/EdUnB

Woortmann K. 1990. "Com parente não se neguceia": o campesinato como ordem moral. *Anu. Antropol.* 87:11–76