SOCIALINĖS ANTROPOLOGIJOS IR ETNOLOGIJOS STUDIJOS

LIETUVOS ETNOLOGIJA

19(28)
2019

LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY

STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

TAUTOS TYRIMŲ IŠTAKOS IR ANTROPOLOGIJA
Sudarytoja VIDA SAVONIAKAITĖ

THE ROOTS OF THE STUDY OF PEOPLE AND NATIONS AND ANTHROPOLOGY
Edited by VIDA SAVONIAKAITĖ

LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS
LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

VILNIUS 2019

Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos – mokslinis etnologijos ir socialinės ir kultūrinės antropologijos žurnalas. Jame spausdinami recenzuojami straipsniai, konferencijų pristatymai, knygų recenzijos ir apžvalgos, kurių temos pirmiausia apima Lietuvą ir Vidurio/Rytų Europą. Žurnalas pristato mokslo aktualijas ir skatina teorines bei metodines diskusijas. Tekstai skelbiami lietuvių arba anglų kalba.

Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology – is a peer reviewed journal of ethnology and social and cultural anthropology. It publishes articles, conference presentations, book reviews and review articles, which may be in Lithuanian or English, primarily focused on Lithuania, Central and Eastern Europe. The journal represents current debates and engages in methodological discussions.

Leidyklos adresas / Address of the Publisher:
Lietuvos istorijos institutas
Kražių g. 5, LT-01108 Vilnius
<www.istorija.lt>

Redakcinės kolegijos kontaktai / Editorial inquiries:
Tel. / Phone: + 370 5 262 9410
El. paštas / E-mail: etnolog@istorija.lt
vytis.cubrinskas@vdu.lt

Žurnalas registruotas / The Journal indexed in:
European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH)
EBSCO Publishing: Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Ultimate, Energy and Power Source, SocINDEX with Full Text, Sociology Source Ultimate
Modern Language Association (MLA) International Bibliography

Leidybą finansavo Lietuvos mokslo taryba pagal Valstybinę lituanistinių tyrimų ir sklaidos 2016–2024 metų programą (Sutartis Nr. S-LIP-19-58)

ISSN 1392-4028

TURINYS / CONTENTS

Pratarmė (*Vytis Čiubrinskas*) 5
Editorial *(Vytis Čiubrinskas*) 7

Atsisveikinant su Christianu Giordano / Obituary for Christian Giordano 9

Christian Giordano
Politinis korektiškumas: antropologinė „geradarystės“ forma 11

Straipsniai / Articles

Tautos tyrimų ištakos ir antropologija / The Roots of the Study of People and Nations and Anthropology

Vida Savoniakaitė
Įvadas. Tautos tyrimų ištakos ir antropologija 17
Introduction. The Roots of the Study of People and Nations and Anthropology. Summary 27

Olga Mastianica-Stankevič
Mečislovo Davainio-Silvestraičio etnografija, tautosakos rinkimas ir lietuvių modernios tautos kūrimosi procesai 31
The Importance of Mečislovas Davainis-Silvestraitis' Ethnography and Folklore Collection in the Process of the Creation of the Modern Lithuanian People. Summary 48

Vida Savoniakaitė
Jono Basanavičiaus požiūris į lietuvių tautos tyrimus, 1879–1927 51
Jonas Basanavičius' View on the Research of the Lithuanian Nation, 1879–1927. Summary 77

Irma Šidiškienė
Iš Lietuvos etnologijos istorijos: aprangos tyrimo pagrindų paieškos 81
From the History of Lithuanian Ethnology: In Search of the Basics of Clothing Research. Summary 109

Auksuolė Čepaitienė
Kultūriniai lietuviškumo vaizdiniai *Aušroje* ir moksliniai kontekstai 113
Cultural Images of Lithuanianness in *Aušra* and their Scientific Context. Summary 138

Kiti straipsniai / Other Articles

Rūta Staniulytė
Piligrimystė Šiauriniu Šv. Jokūbo keliu: kelionių motyvai ir piligrimų santykiai 141
Pilgrims on the Northern Way of St James: Motives and Relationships of Pilgrims. Summary 166

Dalia Sabaliauskienė
Ritualinis mandagumas (*ta'ârof*) šiuolaikinio Irano visuomenėje ir tarpkultūrinėje komunikacijoje: Teherano šiaurinės dalies atvejis 169
Ritual Courtesy (*ta'ârof*) in Contemporary Iranian Society and Intercultural Communication: The Case of Northern Tehran. Summary 188

Diskusijų forumas / Forum

Thomas A. Reuter
World Anthropology and its Institutional Challenges: A History of the Transformative Impact of Democratic Internationalisation on the Discipline of Anthropology 191
Pasaulinė antropologija ir jos instituciniai iššūkiai: demokratiškos internacionalizacijos poveikio antropologijos disciplinai istorija. Santrauka 204

Recenzijos ir apžvalgos / Reviews

Ethnologie française. Lituanie. Une anthropologie face à l'Histoire. V. Čiubrinskas (éd.), M. Segalen et al. (réd.) (*François Ruegg*) 207

Monika Frėjutė-Rakauskienė, Neringa Klumbytė, Andrius Marcinkevičius, Kristina Šliavaitė. Socialinis ir istorinis teisingumas daugiaetninėje Lietuvos visuomenėje: sampratos, patirtys ir kontekstai (*Dovilė Budrytė*) 210

Yearbook of Balkan and Baltic Studies. E. Anastasova, M. Kõiva, Ž. Šaknys (eds) (*Audronė Daraškevičienė*) 214

Konferencijos / Conferences

XIV *SIEF* kongresas Santjago de Komposteloje (Ispanija) (*Jonas Mardosa, Skaidrė Urbonienė, Žilvytis Šaknys*) 221

IUAES 2019 kongresas Poznanėje – atsakas į disciplinai kylančias grėsmes (*Auksuolė Čepaitienė, Vytis Čiubrinskas, Aušra Teleišė, Vytautas Tumėnas*) 224

SIEF II tarptautinė vasaros mokykla doktorantams Škotijoje (*Vaida Rakaitytė*) 229

Seminaras Angelės Vyšniauskaitės gimimo šimtmečiui paminėti (*Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė*) 231

In Memoriam

Stasys Gutautas 1954–2018 (*Jonas Mardosa*) 235

Diskusijų forumas

World Anthropology and its Institutional Challenges: A History of the Transformative Impact of Democratic Internationalisation on the Discipline of Anthropology

Thomas A. Reuter

Anthropology reveals a rich diversity of human cultures, while also highlighting our commonalities. The discipline is a distorted mirror of this unity in diversity, however, so long as anthropologists from only a few, privileged cultures dominate the process of global knowledge construction. The World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA) was founded to address this. The WCAA provides a global platform for democratic participation in the spirit of a new 'world anthropologies' paradigm, which recognises that our understanding of other cultures is perspectivistic, and hence, to be fully understood, every culture needs to be contemplated from the multiple perspectives of all 'anthropologies'.

Key words: *world anthropologies, World Council of Anthropological Associations, history of anthropology, internationalisation in anthropology, equity in anthropology*.

Antropologija atskleidžia didelę kultūrų įvairovę, kartu pabrėždama jų bendrumus. Tačiau ši disciplina gali įgauti ir iškreiptą tokio kultūrų bendrumo jų įvairovėje vaizdą, nes globalių žinių kūrime vis dar dominuoja kelių privilegijuotų kultūrų antropologai. Siekiant išspręsti šią problemą buvo įkurta Pasaulinė antropologų asociacijų taryba. Ji suteikia galimybę demokratiškai dalyvauti naujoje „pasaulio antropologijų" paradigmoje, kuri pripažįsta, kad mūsų supratimas apie kitas kultūras yra paremtas tam tikru žiūros tašku, todėl visos kultūros, norint jas suvokti išsamiai, turi būti apmąstomos iš daugybinės visų „antropologijų" perspektyvų.

Raktiniai žodžiai: *pasaulio antropologijos, Pasaulinė antropologų asociacijų taryba, antropologijos istorija, antropologijos internacionalizavimas, lygiateisiškumas antropologijoje.*

Professor Thomas Reuter, Asia Institute, University of Melbourne, Vic 3010, Australia, email: thor2525@gmail.com

LIETUVOS ETNOLOGIJA: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos. 2019, 19(28), 191–206.
https://doi.org/10.33918/25386522-1928009

Introduction

Anthropology is the science of human diversity, embodied in our cultures and societies, while also highlighting our commonalities as human beings. The discipline has been a distorted mirror of this unity in diversity, however, because anthropologists from only a few, privileged cultures have dominated the process of global knowledge construction in the discipline. The World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA) was founded in 2004 with the aim of ameliorating this problem by providing for the first time a global platform for the democratic participation of all national 'anthropologies', represented by the democratically elected presidents of their national or regional associations, in the spirit of a new 'world anthropologies' paradigm.

World anthropology departs from the insight that every ethnographer's understanding of other cultures is perspectivistic, and therefore both inspired and limited by the cultural peculiarities of their subjectivity. In order to be fully understood, every culture thus needs to be contemplated from the multiple perspectives of all 'anthropologies', without privileging or excluding any national traditions within the discipline. The present paper describes how the WCAA has been seeking to achieve this aim through greater cooperation and exchange between the world's diverse 'anthropologies' within the framework of an egalitarian institutional context.[1]

The Founding of the WCAA

The WCAA was established during a historic meeting of presidents of 14 anthropological associations in Recife, Brazil, in June 2004. This meeting was conceived by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro, after he had attended a small ad hoc meeting of association presidents at the AAA conference the previous year. Realising the potential value of holding such a meeting of elected national representatives on a more global scale, he sought and received funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research for this purpose. The presidents of the national associations for Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Russia, South Africa, the United Kingdom (ASA) and the United States were invited to attend the meeting. The Japanese society sent its director of international relations. The presidents of the following regional (inter-national) associations were also present: the European Association of Social Anthropologists, the Latin American Association of Anthropology, the Pan African Anthropological Association, and the In-

[1] Please refer to the WCAA website for more detailed information on past and present activities, panels and symposia, as well as reports on activities, public statements and a list of current members (*WCAA* … 2019).

ternational Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. While funding limitations had restricted the number of attendees, they were nevertheless able to represent all continents.

The declared aim of the meeting was to explore possibilities for greater collaboration between diverse national and regional anthropologies. Participants were asked to submit their ideas for collaboration in writing before coming to Recife. In his own statement, the organiser and then ABA (Brazilian Association of Anthropology) president Gustavo Lins Ribeiro explained his objectives as follows:

> I was invited for a working breakfast at the 2002 [AAA] meeting in New Orleans. It was an interesting occasion to meet colleagues working in metropolitan anthropologies. But the issue is how to promote more diversified meetings. Furthermore, besides these much-needed informal opportunities to know of other associations' characteristics, I feel we need something more structured. Perhaps the creation of a committee of presidents of associations within the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences would provide for an instance where more concrete articulation could happen […] Another possibility could be the creation of a website financed by all associations and dedicated to the dissemination of international anthropological knowledge.

Australian Anthropological Society president Thomas Reuter voiced a more ambitious idea in his statement, proposing the formation of an independent 'organisational structure on a global scale, such as a permanent council of national presidents.' He also stressed the power a global communication network in anthropology would have.

> Imagine being able to reach the presidents of all or most national organisations with a single email, and each of them being able to reach all of their members by forwarding that email. In combination with a global organisational framework, such as a council of representatives, wherein some matters of shared interest and common interest would be discussed and articulated, this kind of communication flow would have a major role in encouraging and facilitating the creation of global research networks [and…] other collaborative projects.

Other delegates in their statements made more specific proposals for collaboration. The Canadian Anthropology Society (CASCA) president James Waldram suggested, for example, that:

> … associations [should] consider multilateral agreements that offer reduced membership and conference rates to paid-up members of other national associations […] Information exchange could also be facilitated by the establishment of a global 'virtual' anthropology association which could act as a clearing house for information on the national associations and […] this organisation could be funded on an ongoing basis by structured contributions from member associations on behalf of their members. Access to the global association then would be a benefit of membership in the national associations, an important value-added benefit of membership.

These quotes show that the WCAA was an idea whose time had come, given the lack of a global umbrella organisation wherein the world's many national and regional anthropology associations could come together, share their concerns, engage in joint activities and collaborations, and, above all, to raise awareness about cultural diversity within the discipline itself. In a rapidly globalising world, the discipline of anthropology was lagging behind in its institutional internationalisation, notwithstanding the fact that anthropology is essentially a global endeavour to study all human cultures in their dynamic development and mutual interaction.

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Thomas Reuter met before the meeting and spent several hours in discussion over Reuter's tentative proposal to create a worldwide council of association presidents. There was some doubt whether such an ambitious goal could be achieved, because national associations might fear a global alliance could compromise their sovereignty. In the course of the meeting it became evident, however, that such concerns were absent. Rather, there was enthusiastic support from the whole group of delegates, most of whom had never met before this meeting.

Delegates managed not only to agree on the creation of a council at this first meeting but also drafted and signed a founding agreement, essentially the first WCAA constitution. Gustavo Lins Ribeiro was elected the first chair (2004–2005). The following communiqué (on the WCAA website) summed up the aims and goals of the new network:

> After discussing several possible mechanisms and initiatives to increase international cooperation in anthropology, participants in the conference wholeheartedly decided to create the World Council of Anthropological Associations. This network is open to new members, and has as its primary objectives to promote (a) the discipline of anthropology in an international context; (b) cooperation and the sharing of information among world anthropologists; (c) jointly organised events of scientific debate and cooperation in research activities and dissemination of anthropological knowledge. Besides the fact that anthropologists are always prone to acknowledge the value of diversity, there are other reasons why the WCAA is an idea that quickly became a reality. It is based on a democratic vision of how anthropologies should intercommunicate and cooperate in a global era. The WCAA represents the recognition that now is the time to start new, more horizontal modes of exchange and dissemination of knowledge among world anthropologies. Hopefully, the 2004 Recife conference was just the first in several events designed to implement new institutional policies, with a view to promoting greater visibility for diversity in anthropological production worldwide. It undoubtedly initiated a process that is bound to deepen international cooperation in anthropology in a more cosmopolitan vein. By bringing the leaders of anthropological associations together for a dialogue on

> the construction of democratic and heteroglossic communication across national boundaries, the WCAA seeks to bring about the internationalisation of the profession in such a way as to deal with the challenges of a transnational world.

The new World Council has met on a regular basis since that time, holding interim meetings with partial attendance at major anthropology conferences in cities around the world, including the AAA in San Francisco in 2008, the IUAES in Kunming in 2009, the AAA in New Orleans in 2010, the AAS and the IUAES in Perth in 2011, the AAA in San Francisco in 2012, the IUAES in Manchester in 2013, the AAA in Chicago in 2013, and the IUAES and the JASCA in Chiba City in 2014. Major meetings with full attendance were held every two years. Delegates from developing countries or small associations were subsidised to attend these biennial meetings and associated academic symposia (Bristol 2006, Osaka 2008, Maynooth 2010, New Delhi 2012, and Taipei 2014), drawing on support from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, voluntary contributions from fellow associations, and generous support from the hosting organisations. A sense of community evolved among association delegates, and intensified in the course of these regular meetings, despite the constant turnover of office holders within the associations. Most past delegates have joined the WCAA Advisory Board after the end of their term.

Interim meetings are now held at every opportunity. For example, in 2015 meetings were held at the Anthropology Association of Ireland (AAI) meeting in Cork (March), the IUAES inter-congress in Bangkok (June), the International Society for Ethnology and Folklore (SIEF) meeting in Zagreb (July), the AAA in Denver (November), and the meeting of Mercosur Anthropology (RAM) in Montevideo (December). As examples of activities at these meetings, the WCAA-sponsored panels from the year 2014 alone included the following: 1) at the IUAES 2014 Inter-Congress in Chiba City, Japan: *Urban Futures; Situating Statelessness: Anthropological Perspectives*; *The Past and Future of the World Council of Anthropological Associations*; 2) at the ASA Decennial Meeting in Edinburgh, UK: *Postcolonial Perspective on the Enlightenment and Ethics*; 3) at the joint conference with the Taiwan Society for Anthropology and Ethnology in Taipei, Taiwan: *Environmental Anthropology: Rethinking Environmental Constraint and Construction in the Human Condition*; *The State of/and Anthropology in Asia*; *Relating Regional Anthropologies to World Anthropologies; Making Sense of Contemporary Capitalism: Off Centre Perspectives*; *WCAA Anniversary Panel: World Anthropologies and the World of Anthropology*; 4) at the Czech Association for Social Anthropology Conference, Prague, Czech Republic: *'Us' and 'Them' in Postsocialism* (keynote by the chair M. Buchowski); and 5) at the 113th AAA Meeting in Washington, USA: *Spaces of Security: Global, National and Local*. In addition, presidents of various clusters of national associations have also collaborated to bring their individual members together by holding joint annual conferences on a number of occasions.

The founding chair (initially referred to as 'facilitator') of the WCAA, Gustavo Lins Ribeiro, was succeeded by the former Japanese Association (JASCA) president Junji Koizumi (2005–2008), and then the former Australian Anthropological Society president Thomas Reuter (2008–2012), the Polish Ethnology Association president Michal Buchowski (2012–2014), the International Association for Southeast European Anthropology president Vesna Vucinic-Neskovic (2014–2016), Irish Anthropology Association president Chandana Mathur (2016–2018), Brazilian Anthropological Association president Carmen Rial (2018–2020) and Pan-African Anthropology Association president Isaac Nyamongo (chair elect). Chairs and all other members of the 'organising committee' (executive) are democratically elected by the members of the council. All member associations, large or small, have equal rights and membership has been free of charge, with a flexible donations scheme.

The council grew slowly over the first few years, and then expanded rather rapidly. Twelve years after its foundation, the membership of the WCAA had risen to include about 50 national and international associations. The council thus came to include the elected representatives of most of the world's professional associations, who democratically represent tens of thousands of individual anthropologists. Many countries still lack an association, however, and the WCAA has assisted with the formation of national associations in some cases, in keeping with its aim of facilitating worldwide inclusiveness within the discipline.

Significant constitutional amendments were added in later meetings. New governance procedures were necessitated by the growth of the council to protect and permanently enshrine principles of egalitarianism and participatory democracy. The activities of the council also became more diverse and extensive, some of them managed by designated task forces. For example, the WCAA Advocacy and Outreach Activities Task Force has initiated the formation of *Antropólogos Sem Fronteiras* (ASF, 'Anthropologists without Borders'), leading up to its incorporation as an independent organisation in 2014. The WCAA Ethics Task Force, established in 2012, aims to review ethics guidelines worldwide, to explore potential for a universal set of guidelines, while also pointing out the main issues that emerge and how they may be productively negotiated. The WCAA has also started the innovative, new journal, *Déjà Lu*, which aims to republish important scholarly works from journals published in languages other than English, so as to showcase and make more accessible some of the diversity of voices within world anthropologies.

The WCAA's Relationship with the IUAES and the Founding of the WAU

Delegates at the WCAA founding meeting in Recife did not give much consideration to the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), even though it was represented by its president. The WCAA was to be a different organisation and to serve a different purpose. The few delegates who did consider the IUAES were sceptical, perhaps in the light of the rather problematic IUAES congress in Florence in 2003. For example, the Indian Anthropological Society (IAS) president Ajit Danda observed in his statement that '[the] International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences with its contemporary preoccupations do[es] not seem to be adequately prepared to undertake the responsibility thus outlined. In fact, they seldom took the national anthropological societies or associations into much confidence.'

Louis Vargas, the president of the IUAES, sought to highlight the capabilities of the IUAES. He maintained that:

> The Union itself consists of national and institutional organisations in more than 50 countries in all parts of the world, together with hundreds of individual members. Each country is represented by a delegation numbering not more than six individuals, chosen by the anthropologists of the country concerned, on the Permanent Council of the IUAES. The Permanent Council is the governing body of the Union, each national delegation having a single vote in its decisions […] Briefly, our Union can serve as a forum for anthropologists and anthropological societies from all countries.

This statement glossed over the structural weaknesses of the IUAES Permanent Council. The main issue was that country delegates were by no means the elected presidents of the national associations of those countries, but rather persons of diverse nationalities selected from among individual members of the IUAES. The Permanent Council delegates thus had no democratic mandate to represent the anthropological associations and communities of their respective countries of origin, and represented only the IUAES' own diverse membership. There was also no signal that the IUAES might welcome the creation of a council of association presidents within its own structures, as a possible way to recreate and strengthen the democratic mandate of the Permanent Council. The IUAES was also virtually without any funds by the time of the Kunming Congress, and had no paid-up members due to a lack of appropriate procedures. In any case, Professor Vargas did not oppose the formation of WCAA, and was ultimately not in a position to prevent it. The WCAA never saw itself as a competitor of the IUAES.

At first, the relationship between the two organisations was marked by a degree of distrust and a lack of understanding of the aims of the WCAA by the IUAES. This began to shift gradually when a new IUAES executive was elected at

its 2009 Kunming Congress. Several former national association presidents were elected to the new executive, who knew and appreciated the WCAA for what it was and saw it as the IUAES' best friend, that is, as a complement rather than a competitor. The future of the Permanent Council, however, became increasingly controversial. A new constitution was eventually drafted by Andrew Spiegel and Thomas Reuter, and after several rounds of consultations with members, much heated debate and countless revisions, it was ratified at the Manchester World Anthropology Congress in 2013. The main change was that the new constitution abolished the superseded institution of the Permanent Council. The IUAES openly declared itself to be foremost a global community of individual anthropologists, which is what it really had been all along. The General Assembly of individual members gained sovereign power within the IUAES for the first time, which had formerly been vested in the Permanent Council. As a global community of scholars with a renewed sense of ownership of their organisation, a rejuvenated and financially recovered IUAES could then focus fully on facilitating intellectual exchange within an inclusive and growing global community of anthropologists from around the world, particularly through its thematic research networks or 'scientific commissions'. This is an important task, and completely different to the task of the WCAA, membership of which is not accessible to individual anthropologists.

We could say that the WCAA model is one of representational democratic internationalism, based on its larger membership of national and regional associations, while the IUAES is a democratic global community of scholars. The two organisations' structures have thus complemented each other from 2013 on. The two models reflect accurately the fact that national anthropologies and global anthropology coexist in the discipline as it currently stands. Despite an ongoing trend toward globalisation, the internationalist model is likely to remain important in anthropology, given that diversity is highly valued in the discipline, not just regarding the cultures we study but also when it comes to various anthropological traditions. Today, most anthropologists still happen to be organised within national scholarly communities. Of course, individual anthropologists have always been very mobile and cosmopolitan. Many attend the conferences of other national associations or migrate to another country in search of work. Many are also multi-lingual and read across several national anthropologies. The national traditions, like cultures in general, thus do not have any sharp boundaries, and all have much in common. Without this common ground, neither the IUAES nor the WCAA would be able to function. More broadly, while these new or reformed institutions can assist the flourishing of the discipline in numerous ways, changes to the realities of worldwide anthropological practice are gradual, and also dependent on individual intellectual leadership, and many other factors.

Given their different structural designs, the WCAA and the IUAES today fulfil different and fully complementary roles vis-à-vis the needs of anthropology as a global and international discipline. Steadily growing cooperation and harmony between the two organisations ultimately led to a merger into a single, bicameral organisation, the World Anthropology Union (WAU), which took effect in Ottawa in 2017. Under the WAU's constitution, there is a secure balance of power between international and global forms of association, represented by the two chambers. This is a rather unique model for a worldwide scientific organisation, reflecting the special concerns of the discipline.

The 'World Anthropologies' Agenda within the WAU

The current concerns of anthropology as a practice have been very clearly articulated within 'world anthropologies', which is an emerging paradigm for an anthropology of the 21st century. My concern here is not to provide a detailed account of this paradigm, as others have done already (Cardoso de Oliveira 1999; Restrepo, Escobar 2005; Ribeiro, Escobar 2006; Marcus 2008; Reuter 2005; Reuter 2011; Bošković 2008). The aim is more specifically to show how this paradigm was instrumental in, and has strongly shaped, the ethos of the WCAA and IUAES, now under the common umbrella of the WAU.

The emergence of critical historical analyses of culture and power in the anthropology of the 1980s and 1990s paved the way for the more recent emergence of a world anthropologies approach. From different perspectives, the discipline's entanglement in the European and American imperial mission to establish a system of worldwide political, economic and cultural domination was rightly criticised. This multifaceted critique has been necessary and beneficial, has led to greater awareness and honesty, and gives us the freedom to change, providing we can find suitable means. Anthropology may or may not be able to bring about significant change in the world at large, but the one change we can make, and are solely responsible for making, is to eliminate patterns of domination within the discipline itself. If anthropology has developed its own internal structures of dominance, overcoming them should be our first concern if we really wish to change. Recent debates under the heading of 'world anthropologies' identify some of the key issues.

One major issue is the cultural dominance of British-American anthropology, which grew throughout the 20th century, and is associated with the fact that English has become the universal language of science. This is perhaps the most striking pattern of dominance in the discipline to this day. This pattern in academia may reflect a wider geopolitical reality, whereby a Western alliance under US leadership achieved global political and economic dominance. But even if it turns out to be true that this unipolar world-political order is set to be replaced

by a more multipolar order in the 21st century, we cannot assume that anthropology will automatically also become more multipolar. The language advantage of native speakers of English is likely to continue, for example, because of the intrinsic utility of having an established medium of global communication. Similarly, anthropological texts written in other languages are likely to remain less widely read. As anthropologists, we well appreciate that the confinement of anthropology to a single language of analysis is problematic, no matter how useful it may be to have a universal medium of communication. Making anthropology ever more monolingual would constitute cultural impoverishment, and the discipline would be the poorer for it.

The world anthropologies paradigm and the WAU, as an institution built on this paradigm, takes the view that we must actively transform our own practices, rather than wait for the world to change around us. The WAU does so by promoting greater equity between world anthropologies, written and spoken in a diversity of languages, namely by facilitating the systematic translation of important works (the WCAA's journal *Déj*à *Lu*), by calling on national education departments to give full academic credit to publications in non-English-language journals, and by educating international anthropological audiences about the diversity and richness of world anthropolog*ies* with the help of a long and continuing series of WCAA and IUAES-sponsored plenary panels.

A lack of eye-level communication between different anthropologies across national, cultural and linguistic boundaries is perhaps the biggest obstacle we face on the way to a more equitable anthropological world. Information flows have been one-sided, especially between US-European and non-European anthropologies. A European anthropologist is unlikely to know very much about Indonesian anthropology, for example, or Tunisian or Philippino anthropology, unless this is where he or she conducts field research. Those who conduct research in countries with their own, less-known national anthropologies thus have a special responsibility to promote them, to cite them, to publish in their national journals, and to collaborate with local colleagues as equal partners, wherever possible. At an institutional level, meanwhile, the WAU is working hard to help overcome this visibility problem by showcasing the unique characteristics and achievements of non-US/European anthropologies.

A second pattern of dominance in our discipline is to do with ownership of the technical means of knowledge production. Domination over high-quality print media (and less so online media) is vested in journal and book publishers based predominantly in affluent, industrialised Western nations. Most of the major global publishers are also corporately owned today, rather than controlled by academics, and ownership concentration has risen steadily. This concentra-

tion of top-ranking print and online production in the global north is being reinforced systematically by a worldwide trend towards so-called 'research quality ranking' of publications by government education departments, and indeed the performance ranking of individuals and whole universities on the basis of such publication rankings. This trend destroys the principle of equal participation, because highly ranked international journals tend to exclude authors from developing countries whose scholarship does not conform with these publishers' style, they are too expensive for libraries in the developing world, and their dominance further marginalises journals that are small, critical, or alternative in some other way. Journals in national languages are usually not highly ranked outside their own countries, with some notable exceptions. The WAU, in collaboration with the American Anthropological Association and the Wenner-Gren Foundation, is currently working on a repository that would allow more even distribution and access to anthropological works from around the world on an online platform. Reform of the publishing industry as a whole may be beyond the strategic means of anthropology acting on its own, but it is currently being pursued by some of the large interdisciplinary science organisations of which the WAU is a member, notably the International Science Council, with support from major public research funders and libraries.

While these and other major obstacles still stand in the way of realising the ideals of a world anthropologies paradigm, the WAU and other international and global organisations in anthropology are now engaging seriously with these issues, as are many individual anthropologists. A conscious effort is being made to cultivate a sense of a worldwide anthropological community, based on diversity, equal democratic participation and active collaboration.

It has become easier for associations and individuals to cooperate internationally and globally since the foundation of the WCAA and the reform of the IUAES, and more so since they came together in the WAU. The WAU is now on the whole in a fairly good position to improve access to anthropological knowledge for all, and also to help disseminate information about previously almost invisible anthropologies. It also presents the world's anthropologists with an opportunity to make representations to other international bodies such as Unesco or the UN, or to wayward governments and corporations who impinge on the rights of indigenous peoples or on the freedom of research, as well as to universities considering the closure of their anthropology departments. This kind of lobbying has already been happening for some years now, and has frequently been successful. And, for the first time, it can happen, because we now have fair and transparent democratic structures in place that enable anthropologists to speak with one voice on matters where we have a clear consensus.

Looking Forward

Anthropology is catching up with globalisation, and is no longer just a spectator of this historic process. Indeed, one possible challenge for the WAU and for all anthropologists is to provide a model of what globalisation could be at its very best; a model of how humanity can come to appreciate its unity as well as its rich cultural diversity. Anthropologists have specialised training and a professional ethos that should equip us well to be exemplary world citizens. By demonstrating the feasibility of an alternative globalisation, based on solidarity and equality, the discipline may inspire others to consider that peaceful global cooperation may also be achievable for the world at large.

The 'world anthropologies' movement builds on the realisation that anthropology has in fact never been an enterprise specific to Europeans, but rather that a keen interest in travel and in finding out about other cultures is extremely widespread. This curiosity has given rise to a rich variety of national and regional scholarly traditions, from Tunisia to Lithuania, from Brazil to India, from Catalonia to Taiwan. It may surprise some readers to hear that in Tunisia, for example, it is possible to trace back a pedigree of anthropological writing in Arabic spanning several centuries, a tradition of scholarship that has remained all but invisible to Western-centered mainstream anthropology. When the Tunisian association joined the WCAA, and its delegate gave an account of this long history at a symposium, everyone in the room was silent, and everyone was forcibly reminded of why we were there: universal participation of all anthropologies in the intellectual life of the discipline is certainly something worth fighting for!

A great lack of mutual awareness and recognition still prevails between national anthropologies. Encounters between members of different national anthropologies thus need to be actively facilitated at our conferences, and the WAU has been encouraging this. One recent and unprecedented encounter occurred when the Canadian Anthropology Association (CASCA) held its offshore annual meeting in Cuba, in full collaboration with Cuban colleagues, in 2018. Another example was a recent effort to enhance communication between Korean and Japanese anthropologies (Moon, Koizumi 2015: 151). Such collaborations illustrate how the 'world anthropologies' idea can be put into practice.

If we succeed in creating a global inter-subjective sphere of free, mutual ethnographic representation, underpinned by an individual commitment to critical reflexive subjectivity at the level of research practice and analysis, we may at last escape the panopticon of Jeremy Bentham's modern prison, described in Foucault's now classic account of the history of modernism (Foucault 1977). In the modernist prison, emblematic of the old colonial epistemology in anthropology and other social sciences, all cultures were to be surveyed from the European

centre, where the warden sat, privileged but alone, all-seeing, and yet blind to himself and his own parochial condition of reciprocal imprisonment. In a sphere of free and mutual interpretation, however, every culture is a centre from which the world is rightfully viewed, and simultaneously also an 'Other' that is being viewed through a multitude of outside cultural perspectives. The resulting vision of human diversity is kaleidoscopic rather than panoptic, self-reflexive rather than self-congratulating. Its aim is not to judge, condemn and discipline others or to homogenise cultural diversity but rather for us all to come to know and accept ourselves more deeply through the eyes of others. This kind of mutual understanding could be a life saver for humanity as we voyage together on this fragile planetary ship, caught in high seas.

References

Bošković, Aleksandar (ed.). 2008. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Cardoso de Oliveira, Roberto. 1999. Peripheral Anthropologies 'Versus' Central Anthropologies, *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4(2)–5(1): 10–30.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Marcus, George E. 2008. Development in US Anthropology since the 1980s, a Supplement: The Reality of Centre-margin Relations, to Be Sure, but Changing (and Hopeful) Affinities in these Relations, Aleksandar Bošković. 2008. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*: 199–214. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Moon, Okpyo; Koizumi, Junji. 2015. Introduction: Special Issue, Anthropology of Japan in Korea and Anthropology of Korea in Japan, *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* (JRCA) 16: 149–155.

Restrepo, Eduardo; Escobar, Arturo. 2005. Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise: Steps to a World Anthropology Framework, *Critique of Anthropology* 25(2): 99–128.

Reuter, Thomas A. 2005. Towards a Global Anthropology, *American Anthropological News* 4: 7–8.

Reuter, Thomas A. 2011. Defining the Practical Tasks of a Global Anthropology and the Role of Democracy in their Accomplishment, G.L. Ribeiro (ed.). *Global Anthropologies*: 58–63. Beijing (China): Intellectual Property Publishing House.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins; Escobar, Arturo. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford, New York: Berg Publishers.

WCAA. World Council of Anthropological Associations. <http://www.wcaanet.org> [accessed on 04 04 2019].

Pasaulinė antropologija ir jos instituciniai iššūkiai: demokratiškos internacionalizacijos poveikio antropologijos disciplinai istorija

Thomas A. Reuter

Santrauka

Antropologija yra mokslas apie žmonių įvairovę, kuri kartu išryškina ir mūsų bendrumus. Tačiau antropologijos disciplina gali įgauti ir iškreiptą tokio kultūrų bendrumo jų įvairovėje vaizdą, nes globalių žinių kūrime vyrauja tik kelių privilegijuotų kultūrų antropologai. Siekiant išspręsti šią problemą, būtent sukurti platformą demokratiniam visų nacionalinių „antropologijų" dalyvavimui naujoje „pasaulio antropologijų" paradigmoje, 2004 m. įkurta Pasaulinė antropologų asociacijų taryba (*The World Council of Anthropological Associations, WCAA*).

Apie *WCAA* pirmą kartą užsiminta 2004 m. birželį Resifėje, Brazilijoje, vykusiame istoriniame keturiolikos antropologų asociacijų prezidentų susitikime. Susitikimą suorganizavo Gustavo Linsas Ribeiro po prieš metus Amerikos antropologų asociacijos konferencijoje įvykusio keleto asociacijų prezidentų pasitarimo. Suprasdamas, jog panašus susitikimas turėtų vykti globaliu mastu, Ribeiro būsimam renginiui užsitikrino Wennerio-Greno antropologinių tyrimų fondo finansinę paramą. Posėdyje dalyvavo Australijos, Brazilijos, Kanados, Prancūzijos, Japonijos, Indijos, Rusijos, Pietų Afrikos, Jungtinės Karalystės ir JAV nacionalinių asociacijų prezidentai. Jame taip pat buvo atstovaujama Europos socialinių antropologų asociacija, Lotynų Amerikos antropologų asociacija, kelių Afrikos valstybių antropologų draugijų asociacija ir Tarptautinė antropologijos ir etnologijos mokslinė sąjunga.

Australijos antropologų draugijos prezidentas Thomas A. Reuter prieš konferenciją išplatintame pranešime pasiūlė įkurti „pasaulinę organizaciją, tokią kaip nuolatinė nacionalinių prezidentų taryba". Visų nuostabai, delegatams pavyko įgyvendinti šį ambicingą planą. Susitikime suformuluota ir pasirašyta pradinė *WCAA* steigimo sutartis. Pirmuoju tarybos pirmininku (2004–2005) išrinktas Gustavo Linsas Ribeiro.

Atrodo, jog sumanymas įsteigti *WCAA* buvo savalaikis, ypač atsižvelgiant į tai, kad tuo metu nebuvo pasaulinės skėtinės organizacijos, kurioje nacionalinės ir regioninės antropologų asociacijos būtų galėjusios pasidalyti savo rūpesčiais ir imtis bendros veiklos. Sparčiai globalėjančiame pasaulyje antropologijos disciplinai trūko internacionalizacijos dėmens, nepaisant to, kad antropologija siekia ištirti visas kultūras, jų dinamišką vystymąsi ir tarpusavio sąveiką.

Nauja pasaulinė taryba renkasi kas dveji metai. Posėdžiuose dalyvauja ir besivystančių šalių ar mažų asociacijų atstovai. Pirmojo prezidento Ribeiro pareigas perėmė Japonijos asociacijos (*JASCA*) prezidentas Junjis Koizumis (2005–2008), po to Australijos antropologų draugijos prezidentas Thomas A. Reuter (2008–2012) ir kiti. Per dvylika metų į *WCAA* pakviesta apie penkiasdešimt asociacijų. Tokiu būdu į tarybą pateko daugumos pasaulio asociacijų atstovai, kurie savo ruožtu demokratiškai atstovauja dešimtims tūkstančių antropologų.

Postkolonijinė kritika antropologijoje leido kritiškiau apmąstyti mūsų disciplinos kolonijinę istoriją. Tol, kol hegemonija ir toliau bus vienas iš pagrindinių geopolitikos dėmenų, mūsų veikla bus kompromituojama. Tačiau antropologija gali sumažinti nelygybės apraiškas savo kaip disciplinos viduje. Neseniai vykusios diskusijos, skirtos temai „pasaulio antropologijoms“, parodė, kad ir pačioje disciplinoje egzistuoja ne viena hegemoninė struktūra.

Viena iš jų atspindi britų-amerikiečių kultūros ir imperinės galios dominavimą XX amžiuje. Didelės dalies antropologinės literatūros apsiribojimas viena – anglų kalba – nors ir palengvino susikalbėjimą ir apsikeitimą informaciją, tačiau tuo pat metu prisidėjo prie kultūrinio nuskurdimo. Vienas iš būdų sprendžiant šią problemą yra pasaulio antropologijų lygiavertiškumo skatinimas per vertimus, pripažįstant ir neangliškus žurnalus ir mokantis pažinti pasaulio antropologijų įvairovę kaip daugiskaitą. Antroji hegemonija mūsų disciplinoje yra paremta žurnalų ir knygų leidėjų, įsikūrusių daugiausia pasiturinčiose pramoninėse šalyse, dominavimu. Jų ypatingai vertinami leidiniai paprastai nespausdina autorių iš besivystančių šalių, kurių žinių lygis neatitinka dominuojančio stiliaus, o patys leidiniai yra per brangūs, kad juos įsigytų besivystančio pasaulio bibliotekos, be to, šių leidinių dominavimas kitakalbius žurnalus nustumia į paribius. Trečioji hegemonija yra nevienodas įvairių antropologinių bendruomenių matomumas.

Nors šios yra pagrindinės kliūtys siekiant įgyvendinti pasaulio antropologijų paradigmą, *WCAA* ir kitos organizacijos sąmoningai stengiasi sukurti pasaulinės antropologų bendruomenės, pagrįstos įvairove, lygiateisiu ir demokratiniu dalyvavimu bei aktyviu bendradarbiavimu, atmosferą.

Vienų ar kitų antropologijų nustūmimas į šalį yra ne tik nesąžininga, bet ir prasilenkia su mokslo principais. Antropologinių žinių bus neįmanoma pagrįsti ir įvertinti tol, kol disciplina bus plėtojama siauruose kultūrų rėmuose. Tik reprezentavimas, kuris skleistųsi abipusiškoje ir intersubjektyvioje erdvėje, kuriai būtų būdinga prieigos laisvė ir lygiateisis pripažinimas, galės suteikti tvirtą epistemologinį pagrindą, kurio antropologija taip ilgai ieškojo. Bloga žinia yra tai, kad to dar nesame pasiekę, o gera žinia yra tai, kad tokios „pasaulinės

antropologų bendruomenės“ idėja šiandien sulaukia plataus palaikymo. Tarptautinės institucijos yra pasiryžusios tokią universalaus intersubjektyvumo globalią socialinę erdvę sukurti visų šalių antropologams.

Gauta 2019 m. balandžio mėn.

Lietuvos istorijos instituto mokslinis žurnalas „Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos“ leidžiamas vietoj nuo 1996 metų ėjusios etnologinių monografijų ir studijų serijos „Lietuvos etnologija“. Čia publikuojami Lietuvos ir užsienio etnologų ir antropologų straipsniai, recenzijos, mokslinė informacija, atskleidžiamos mokslinio gyvenimo realijos. Šis numeris – specialus teminis: „Tautos tyrimų ištakos ir antropologija“, jo sudarytoja – Vida Savoniakaitė.

ISSN 1392-4028

Mokslinis tęstinis leidinys

Lietuvos etnologija 19(28)
Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos
2019

Redaktorė *Aldona Radžvilienė*
Dailininkė *Audronė Uzielaitė*
Maketuotoja *Žydronė Jakonytė*
Anglų kalbos redaktorius *Joseph Everatt*
Vertėja iš anglų kalbos / į anglų kalbą *Dalia Cidzikaitė*

2019 12 20. 16,38 leidyb. apsk. Tiražas 150 egz.
Išleido Lietuvos istorijos institutas
Kražių g. 5, 01108 Vilnius
Spausdino UAB „Baltijos kopija“
Kareivių g. 13B, Vilnius