THE ASIANIZATION OF ANTHROPOLOGY

P. L. BENNAGEN

The Asianization of anthropology is no longer merely an idea; already, it is a process taking place in many Asian countries. It is expressed in various ways, vaguely perceptible in some, very definitive in others. In any case, from the realities of the Asian world, geographically and culturally defined, a new anthropology is emerging. It is an anthropology the aim of which is no less than to help strengthen Asia's rightful claim to its heritage as well as to its visions of man, society and culture. To be sure, anthropology cannot do this alone independent of the other intellectual traditions and disciplines, the latter also in need of Asianization. Moreover, in the context of the new world-system of interacting and often conflicting polities, economies and cultures, the Asianization of anthropology and other disciplines is only an aspect, but a necessary aspect, of a commercial praxis of autonomy and freedom (Cf. Bastide 1971 : 170-192 and Bauman 1973 : 118).

In what follows, the Asianization of anthropology will be traced from the origins of anthropology as a discipline and as a profession in the West, to its practice in the colonies, to the radical critique of anthropology by Western scholars themselves and by a few Third World intellectuals, to its indigenization and then to its Asianization. Attempts will be made to discover the various forms of its national expressions, the underlying commonalities and the overall thrust — in a word, its Asianness. For reasons of time, space and limited sources, this effort cannot but be preliminary.

In practice, anthropology flourished in the context of conqueror-conquered relations concomitant with the West's conquest of the non-Western world. This conqueror-conquered relationship made possible the practical and analytic separation between, on the one hand, the native peoples of Africa, America and Asia as objects of investigation, and, on the other hand, Western anthropologists as the investigating subjects.

As a discipline, therefore, anthropology has been preeminently the study of other cultures so much so that its claim to being a science has been argued on the basis of its epistemo-

logy of objectivity, possible only because of the subject-object separation that came in the wake of Western imperialism.[1]

This is, of course, only part of the baggage of anthropology reflecting in no small measure its colonial legacy. But the conditions that engendered this conception of anthropology have been historically abolished with the emergence of the new nation-states from the ruins of the Second World War and the wars of national liberation.

Indeed, since then, native anthropologists have grown in number. While the overwhelming majority of them learned their anthropology in the West, they have increasingly realized that anthropology needs to assume new forms, this time no longer simply as the study of other cultures but the study of one's culture. In the new nations the anthropologist is at once subject and object.

Moreover, while it was once constituted as praxis in the service of Western imperialism, anthropology today promises to be, for Asians (and for Third World peoples in general), a form of communal praxis (Bauman 1973: 118) in the service of the peoples of Asia.

That this reconstitution of anthropology is taking place is only a part of the larger changes taking place in today's thoughtways. As an intellectual process, and also as praxis, it was preceded by the political and economic changes that engulfed the former colonies during the post-colonial period.

Immediately after the war, the task of national reconstruction, or nation-building, made it necessary to have trained manpower. Men and women were sent to the former colonial countries for the acquisition of skills assumed to be necessary for nation-building. Understandably enough, the plans and programs of nation-building were imported from the colonizing countries. The new nation-states were being reproduced in the image of the "mother country". While the apparatus of the old-type relations of conqueror and conquered was being dismantled, it transformed itself to other forms.

For most of the former colonies, it took some two decades or so to recognize the fallacy and folly of uncritical adaptation and to realize that the net effect of this has been the transformation of old-type colonialism into neo-colonialism: the colonial powers became "developed" while the colonized became "underdeveloped". As social structures and processes,

[1] For some of the recent voices in this debate, see Bourdieu 1977 [1972], Hofer 1968, Maquet 1964, Nash and Wintrob 1972, Owusu 1978, Jules-Rosette 1978, Salamone 1979, Scholte 1966 and Taylor 1966.

both development and underdevelopment are best understood in each other's terms.

The politico-economic imperatives of the post-colonial world-system made it necessary for the Western countries to preserve their position of dominance over their former colonies. It may be said, therefore, that nation-building, as an instance of uncritical adaptation by the dominated peoples is simply the other side of the continuing imposition of life-styles and thought-ways on the dominated by the dominant.

Indeed, notwithstanding the Third World rituals of independence and the accompanying flags, anthems, slogans and rhetoric of national sovereignty, the former conqueror-conquered relationship has remained essentially a relationship of domination. Power-wielders do not program power-structures to self-destruct.

The global crisis arising from the continuing domination of the underdeveloped countries by the developed countries led to a critique of domination in its various forms. A few Western scholars, both from Europe and the U.S., and Third World intellectuals started to question seriously the wisdom and feasibility of reproducing Western polities and economies—in brief, Western cultures in the former colonies (e.g. Myrdal 1957, and Furtado 1967 [1961]).

Consequently, demands for national self-determination and self-reliance of the new nation-states began to be heard once more, this time, more insistent and more totalizing than ever. In this context, social science knowledge, of which anthropology is a part, began to be perceived as a necessary component of the over-all efforts toward national self-determination and identity.

Meanwhile, in the mid-sixties, perceptive Western anthropologists and other social scientists, reacting to the use of anthropology in maintaining relations of domination, started to raise issues about anthropology. Its epistemology, its research methodology, its ethics and its future, among others, were all subjected to re-examination.

Taking off from Taylor's conclusion of his work *Primitive Culture* (1881) that anthropology as a science of culture is essentially a reformer's science, Diamond (1964) argued for anthropology to be a revolutionary discipline. By becoming revolutionary, "it is more fully a science precisely because it strives toward a more spacious form of knowing, of "sciencing", and is, therefore, a most potent tool for cultural criticism." But it could become as such, if, while maintaining its synthetic

and analytic habits, it revitalizes two neglected traditions associated with its ancestry. According to Diamond, one tradition has to do with "the conscious search in history for a renewed and basic sense of the possibilities of human nature and of culture . . ." (1964: 432). The other is concerned with "the theoretical, instrumental unity of thought and action" (1964: 435).

From Europe, Maquet (1964) noted the need for the decolonization of anthropology as an aspect of the larger decolonization of the former colonies. Moreover, he (1964: 49-50) added that anthropologists' advice about reforms to be at least as destructive to traditional society and as acceptable as possible to the people was in fact conservative in that these reforms helped to maintain the colonial order.

Having recognized that anthropology is an outcome of the "era of violence" whereby one part of mankind plundered the other and made it its object, Levi Strauss (1966) acknowledged the "right of people made aware of their independent existence and originality . . . to observe their culture themselves, from the inside." For Levi Strauss (1966: 126) it is in this sense that anthropology would "be born again under a new guise."

In the U.S., the involvement of the U.S. government in world events — particularly in the Vietnam War, in counter-insurgency activities in Latin America and in community development in many Third World countries — as well as the threat of a nuclear war created a crisis of conscience among segments of American youth and intellectuals. Among these were anthropologists who were concerned not only with developments in U.S. society, but also with the increasing difficulty of doing fieldwork in the underdeveloped countries due to resurgent nationalism (Gough 1968: 404-405; Nash 1975).

The inquiries of concerned anthropologists and other social scientists into the role of the U.S. government and of the social sciences in the post-colonial world-system led to a number of events that, all told, contributed to a serious re-assessment of anthropology. Notable among these are the following:

1. organizational commitment to the cause of world peace and organizational opposition to nuclear war (AAA 1962: 78);
2. the condemnation by anthropologists of the U.S. role in the Vietnam War during the 1966 meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Berreman 1968);
3. the Current Anthropological Symposium on the Social Responsibility of the Social Sciences in 1968 where,

among other things, anthropology was unmasked as the "child of imperialism";

4. exposé of the Project Camelot (Horrowitz 1967) as an attempt to defuse the revolutionary movements in Latin America.

This initial soul-searching by a few U.S. and Western European anthropologists was elaborated further in the collection of essays, *Reinventing Anthropology* (Hymes 1971). Before long, the indictment of anthropology as part of the apparatus of domination became a part of anthropological self-criticism, not only in the U.S. but also in other parts of the world.

Scholars from the Third World countries joined in what amounted to a world-wide attack on the premises and goals of anthropology. Stavenhagen (1971) made a plea for "decolonializing applied social sciences and in particular, anthropology." Recognizing the dialectical links between social science and society, he pointed out quite correctly that while anthropology and other social sciences have been "handmaidens of colonialist or imperialist domination", it is also out of "the science of society that the most powerful critiques of colonial systems, imperialist domination, totalitarian political structures and burgeoise class society have sprung" (1971 : 334).

Stavenhagen argued that a "radical critique [of anthropology] demands a holistic approach in terms of global social units and total societies", and that a critical and committed social science must shift its object [of investigation] from the underdog to the dominant elites as well as the very system of domination.

All in all, this crisis within the discipline reflected the changing relations between subject and object. True, the relationship of domination still exists but the dominated are now asserting their right to know themselves and define the directions of their future.

Indigenization of Anthropology

Having undergone some "re-inventing", radicalization" and "decolonialization", anthropology is now being "indigenized".

On July 15-24, 1978, a symposium on "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries" was held at Burg Wartenstein, Austria (Fahim 1979, 1980). Among other things, the symposium wanted "to seek systematic and candid discussion of the problems facing local anthropologists of the Third World

and to explore the potential contribution of these anthropologists in relation to global concerns of the discipline . . . (Fahim 1979: 379).

Exploratory in its nature, the symposium somehow brought to the fore theoretical, methodological, pedagogical as well as ethical issues related to indigenous anthropology. In the symposium, indigenous anthropology was taken to mean research conducted by anthropologists within the national boundaries of their countries and would include studies done by anthropologists on their own ethnic groups. The latter type is referred to as native anthropology.[2]

Conceptual and operational confusion characterized the first organized attempt to examine indigenous anthropology in non-Western countries. As is usual with initial undertakings, there was no agreement as to whether indigenous anthropology would represent an epistemological and theoretical breakthrough brought about by the changes in fieldwork conditions, and especially fieldworkers' roles and perspectives.

At any rate, the symposium gave a name to a process that was long in coming — that of non-Western anthropologists finally questioning the premises, uses and directions of anthropology from the perspective of a social scientist striving to understand his own society while actively participating in its transformation.

Indeed, according to Roy (1977 : 19), indigenization, as an expression of self-awareness and self-assertion among Asian scholars, was "a product of their experiences with the transnational system of social sciences...and the internal pressures for playing a more useful role in nation-building. . . ."

It is further expressed in various ways (Roy 1977:19): "...tendency to repect theories and methodologies originating in the West, the felt need to derive them [from] the unique historical experiences of the countries of Asia, and greater awareness of an interest in other developing countries at a similar stage of development."

Writing on the indigenization of the social sciences in general, Kumar (1976:2-3) points out to the following interrelated aspects of indigenization:[3]

---

[2] For Jones (1970:251), native anthropology is "a set of theories based on non-Western precepts and assumptions in the same sense that modern anthropology is based on and has supported Western beliefs and values..." For purposes of this paper, no distinction is made between indigenous and native anthropology.

[3] Kumar (1976:2) refers to these as types of indigenization. Since he also points out that these are interrelated, it might be more appropriate to call these as aspects of the overall process of indigenization.

1) structural indigenization — "institutionalized and organizational capabilities of a nation for the production and diffusion of social science knowledge";
2) substantive indigenization — the focusing of a nation's research and teaching activities on its own social institutions, conditions and problems; and
3) theoretic indigenization — the construction of distinctive conceptual frameworks and meta-theories reflective of their world views, social and cultural experiences as well as perceived goals.

A Canadian sums up the process (Loubser 1977): "Indigenization is the development of national science communities that are self-reliant, self-sufficient and self-directing, in other words, autonomous and independent, with respect to all aspects of the vital functions of the community, including its ability to relate to other communities on an equal, reciprocal basis."

Viewed as such, indigenization may constitute a revolt against "intellectual imperialism" as a complement of the revolt against politico-economic domination. It is perhaps for this reason that it is most needed in Latin America, Africa and in Asia.

The Asianization of Anthropology

It is in this world-wide context of the idigenization of the social sciences and the over-all thrust towards national self-reliance and self-determination that we now turn to an examination of the Asianization of anthropology.

Having different national origins, the anthropologies that developed in the various Asian countries partook, as they still do on lesser degree, of the characteristics of anthropology in the country of origin. Without exception, the anthropology of the colonizer stamped its own brand on that of the colonized. Where no colonization took place, as in Thailand or Japan, anthropology entered as a discipline from the developed countries of the West. In any case, anthropology has been part of the intellectual apparatus subserving the interests of the dominant in the system of domination, whether politico-economic or intellectual, or both. It is sad to note that this is the case not only between nations but also within nations. This is most evident in countries that have not resolved fundamental conflicts concomitant with multi-ethnic and class societies (Bachtiar 1977:38; Bennagen 1979:3).

Be that as it may, there is a perceptive urgency to Asianize anthropology, along with the other social sciences, for its contribution to a fuller and deeper understanding of the Asian countries as well as for its utility in advancing national development efforts, or national liberation movements, or socialist construction.

Thus, the intertwining of intellectual and politico-economic concerns so characteristic of colonial anthropology presents itself in a new anthropological praxis which may be referred to as either the anthropology of national development or the anthropology of national liberation and self-determination.[4]

In any case, in the survey of the social sciences in Asia, done under the auspices of the UNESCO, one gets an idea of the patterning of the Asianization of anthropology (UNESCO, 1976, 1977, 1977a) in particular, and the social sciences in general. In various degrees, this Asianization reflects each country's heritage and social realities as it seeks to be responsive to ideological and practical needs and aspirations. Among other things, the survey shows that there is near-unanimity on the need to contextualize teaching and research in the social sciences in terms of each country's problems, traditions, values and beliefs. This perspective to Asianize anthropology and the other sciences was the logical consequence of the recognition of the inadequacy of Western models, hypotheses and theories.

Country suggestions to nationalize and Asianize the social sciences include the following:[5]

1) writing textbooks and other institutional materials in Asian languages (UN 1976:13) and relevant to the national conditions (UNESCO -977:90);
2) establishment of research infrastructure supportive of development efforts as well as teaching;
3) surveys of the problems common to all the countries of Asia (UNESCO 1976:21);

[4] Anthropology of national development may be reserved for anthropological activities done by anthropologists in the service of national development plans designed by the politico-economic establishment ostensibly on behalf of the people (cf. Cochrane). Anthropology of national liberation and self-determination emerging from the radical critique of Western anthropology explicitly allies itself, under conditions of oppression, with the oppressed. (Current Anthropology Symposium on Social Responsibility; Hymes 1971; Frank 1968 and Stavenhagen 1974).

[5] The list is not exhaustive and focuses only on goals directly relevant to Asianization. The various countries included in the survey are: Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Burma, Mongolia, Korea, Japan, Thailand, Malaysia Singapore, Indonesia Philippines and including New Zealand.

4) publication of an Asian Review of the social sciences, and newsletter in Asian and European languages (especially English and French [UNESCO 1976:21]);
5) development of paradigms related to Asian thought and culture (UNESCO 1976:37, 45; 1977a:17-18; 1977:49);
6) research (to include study of culture, literature and ideology of native races) should contribute to the success of socialist construction (UNESCO 1977a:17, 48);
7) development of each social science discipline as a praxiology useful to solving problems (UNESCO 1977a: 29);
8) founding a university of Asia for advanced research in social sciences (UNESCO 1976:38);
9) founding a regional (Asia) school forw high-level training within the context of local conditions (UNESCO 1977a:33);
10) regional exchange and cooperation between Maxists and non-Marxists in answering such questions as, "What are Asian societies?", "Are there specific characteristics peculiar to Asia?" (1977:47); and doing research projects to arouse common interest among Asian scholars: "the relationship between variation in values and development in various countries; import of dominant religions on Asian development; a comparative survey of some core values among Asian countries."

It is also suggested that organizational links among Asians be made and strengthened even as they exchange and cooperate with non-Asians. In this connection, the contribution of UNESCO has been considerable and by all means should be encouraged. In 1954, it sponsored a Round-Table Conference on the Teaching of the Social Sciences in South Asia (Roy 1977b:13). It has funded surveys of the status of social sciences all over the world as well as supported regional associations such as the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC). The ASSREC held its Third Conference on 12-17 September 1979 in Manila. An item in the agenda was the indigenization of the social sciences.

Some National Cases of the Asianization of Anthropology

Supportive of UNESCO's efforts are activities being undertaken independently by Asian anthropologists.

Malaysia

In Malaysia, for example, a conference on "The Role and Orientation of Social Sciences and Social Scientists in Malaysia" held in 1974 articulated the need for anthropology to be rethought and made relevant to realities and developmental aspirations of Malaysia. Among the highlights of the conference were the rejection of a value-free social science and the rejection of structural-functional anthropology for its failure to explain the structure of power as a total system in the context of change.

It was argued that anthropologists should involve themselves not only in theory-building, but also in nation-building. Issues were raised about the usefulness of the discipline in helping the objects of anthropological study. Bador (1974:10) pointed out that in the context of developing society, it would be unrealistic to assume a detached position relative to developmental concerns.

The Sociology Division (1974:1) of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the National University of Malaya while recognizing the role of "foreign experts" as well as "foreign educational institutions" argued that this should only be secondary to the role of Malaysian intellectuals themselves.

Declared the Sociology Division (1974:35-36):

> "Whilst we welcome the contribution of our colleagues from abroad who sincerely would like to help and cooperate with us by teaching and developing sociology and other branches of social science in our country, we must at the same time, be very vigilant against the perpetuation of academic imperialism, particularly through such means as the continued reliance on expatriates and other foreign staff who occupy powerful and strategic positions in certain institutions, and who determine their academic policies. Such a thing should no longer be allowed to happen in any university or other institutions of higher learning in our country."

As a further expression of this intellectual self-determination there are already a number of bilingual (Bahasa Malaysia and English) publications which carry anthropological articles: *Manusia dan Masharakat, Jernal Antropologi dan Sosiologi, Akademika and Nusantaka.* And thanks to its national language policy, anthropology, as with other disciplines, is taught in Bahasa Malay. But aware of the probable parochialism that might result from focusing their studies on Malaysian society and culture, Malaysian anthropologists further suggested that

studies be made on countries with which they have close relationship as well as on Western society.

These are rather dramatic programs for the Malaysianization of anthropology considering the fact that anthropology was institutionalized in Malaysia only very recently with the establishment of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the National University of Malaysia in 1970 followed by the University of Malaysia in 1971.

The Philippines

In the Philippines, social scientists who trained in the United States and did applied social research in the Philippines on their return gradually realized the "limits of Western social research methods in the rural Philippines" (Feliciano 1965: 114-127). Consequently, suggestions were made to develop methods and techniques (in social research) suited to local conditions.

An anthropologist, stimulated by, and reacting to, the works of American anthropologists such as H. Otley Beyer and Robert Fox, started to re-think Filipino cultural heritage emphasizing the uniqueness of Filipino tradition (Jocano 1965: 53). Specifically, he elaborated on the insight of Fox in relation to borrowing and re-shaping of external influences in conformity with local realities." (Jocano 1965:72) A further expression of this re-thinking is a monograph by Jocano on Philippine pre-history. A related but different version on the nationalization of Philippine pre-history and written in Pilipino is Salazar's *Ang Pagpapakasaysayang Pilipino Ng Nakaraang Pre-Spaniko.* Basically an outline, it promises to be an important framework for understanding the prehistoric foundations of Philippine society and culture.

In all these efforts, an American himself contributed to a critique of the inadequacy of Western social science concepts and methods in understanding Filipino behavior (Lawless 1967).

Carrying the stirrings of Filipinization further, from academic exercises to praxis, the Department of Anthropology of the state-supported University of the Philippines spearheaded in 1977 the formal organization of anthropologists in a conscious effort to create a more appropriate anthropology, i.e., attuned to the conditions, needs and visions of Philippine society (Bennagen 1978:1-2). Since then the organization has tried to interpret Philippine social and cultural problems from the perspective not only of national minority groups but also

of the marginalized groups such as peasants and the urban poor. Organizational activities have been held where the powerless could speak their minds to the powerful (*Aghamtao* 1979).

Another aspect of Filipinization is the increasing use of the national language in instruction and publication at the Department of Anthropology at the University of the Philippines, which is the oldest and leading Department of Anthropology in the country. In this same Department, an introductory text in general anthropology focusing on Philippine society and culture is being tried. As textbook, it has replaced American textbooks which are now used as secondary references.

It is also interesting to note that the graduate program, both M.A. and Ph.D., the latter instituted only in 1978, of the Department of Anthropology has been drawing students from Asian countries such as Thailand, Indonesia, Bangladesh and Japan, with a few applications coming in from Malaysia, Pakistan and India.

Indonesia

Once dominated by the Dutch, anthropology in Indonesia has come under the influence of American anthropology particularly after 1968 when foreigners could once more do research there (Koentjaraningrat 1967:1), anthropology is taking, once more, an applied aspect, this time in various national development concerns such as 1) national integration; 2) population, 3) socio-cultural transformation of the educational system, 4) community development, 6) reorganization of the administration (Koentjaraningrat 1975:252).

In theoretical work, Indonesian anthropologists have gone beyond mere data-gathering and description to the use of sophisticated conceptual framework (Koentjaraningrat 1975: 253). As an agenda for Indonesian anthropology, Koentjaraningrat (1975:252) suggests that Indonesian anthropologists "should analyze cultural processes by focusing on the role and status of individuals within the culture. They should also carry out the analysis of system of symbolization through which recognition, identification and evaluation in present-day socio-cultural interaction take place, rather than adopt the normative approach which dominated pre-war Dutch *adat* law studies and anthropology . . ."

India

Anthropology has been practised as a study of one's culture by Indian anthropologists for at least seven decades (Sarana and Sinha 1976:209). According to Madan and Sarana (1962:3) anthropology was formally recognized in India as a subject when it became part of the curricula of the University of Calcutta in 1920. Long before that, anthropology was part of Indological studies. Practised as an academic interest as well as for solving certain social problems, its focus has changed over the years. Following the practice of British administrator-anthropologists, Indian anthropologists first focussed their studies on the tribal peoples of India who because they were considered to be separate from the rest of the Indian population could be studied as objectively as the other cultures studied by Western anthropologists (Sarana and Sinha 1976: 213-214).

After World War II, foreign anthropologists entered India and studied not only tribal peoples but also caste and lowland villages. Indian anthropologists themselves changed their focus to village studies and only recently, to urban studies.

What Indian anthropologists have been doing all these years, i.e., studying their own culture, may be said to be the early phase of a thorough-going Indianization of anthropology. Aware, nonetheless, of the desirability and importance of studying other cultures but still unable to do it, they feel that "anthropology as self-study should throw light on those aspects of Indian cultures that [they]are more competent to deal with than any foreigner because [they]have learned the goals, values, and ideals of our culture through enculturation" (Sarana and Sinha 1976:216). Part of the indigenization program would be to devise special scheme for holistic description of different levels of organization such as cities, regions, and the entire nation.

The years immediately after Indian independence generated political and economic problems which provided the stimuli for re-thinking the role of anthropologists and other social scientists in national development. Western theories, techniques and other frames of reference were subjected to reassessment.

Recognizing the inapplicability of many European and American social science concepts, themes and methods to Indian society, Vidyarthi (1978:136) in his Presidential Address at the inauguration of the *Xth* International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in New Delhi, pointed out

the timeliness and the need for every community of social sciences to determine its own appropriated methodology and models for research. He argued that the Indianness in social science has to emerge with a proper appraisal of [India's] ancient texts which continue to influence the behavior of Indians.

In a related speech, he (1978a) reiterated the need for Indianization as part of the development of a world-view and social order more comprehensive than those characterizing individual ethnolinguistic groups within the nation. He suggested that this Indianization is important in strengthening an Indianness relative to the international community.

For the practical side and drawing upon the humanistic ideals of Gandhi and Nehru, he (1978:104) issued a call:

> Let us take a vow to speak for such unfortunate and primitive tribes who are unable to speak for themselves. May I ask you as fellow anthropologists to take up their case more seriously, and study, speak and act more for these tribes which are politically inarticulate, ecologically isolated and numerically insignificant, but ethnically — and ethically — so important.

Articulated in 1964 (Vidyarthi 1978:132), Indianization already had unconscious practitioners as early as 1945 with the founding of the Ethnographic and Folk Culture Society in Uttar Pradesh by Majumdar and the publication of the Society's journal, *The Eastern Anthropologist,* in 1947 (Madan and Sarana 1962:7). Majumdar made contributions in physical anthropology, social and cultural anthropology as well as in applied anthropology. As a member of the Research Program Committee of the Planning Commission (Government of India), "he underscored the role which the anthropologist could play in helping administrators by studying the problems of socially and economically backward peoples, and properly assessing them as well as administrating action (Madam and Sarana 1962:6).

In 1956, he co-authored with Madan a book, *An Introduction to Social Anthropology.* A collection of essays edited by Madan and Sarana, written in memory of Majumdar, was entitled *Indian Anthropology.* This work, published in 1962, pointed out that social anthropology in India has maintained its link with developments outside the country even as it has paid attention to the Indianness of its subject matter.

It was in the 1970's, however, when Indianization became a self-conscious effort. Since then, it has not limited itself to institutional and substantive indigenization. Indian anthropo-

logists have started formulating Indian approaches to the study of man, society and culture in India even as others admit that there is as yet no theoretical formulation on the nature of tribal societies in India (Pathy *et al* 1976:401).

Agrawal (1978), for example, tried to show how spatial and emic approaches could enhance understanding of Indian civilization. Malik (1976a, 1976b), arguing against the inadequacy of static or equilibrium models in understanding Indian Society, attempted to re-interpret a number of aspects of Indian history and society according to what he called "civilization framework."[6]

Indeed, anthropology in India has survived as an academic and practical activity. As noted by Dube (1962:238), the ethnographies of different tribes and castes in various parts of India, while used primarily for administrative purposes made possible the disciplinal growth and independence of social anthropology.

Similarly, Sarana and Sinha (1976:213) observed that it was colonial administration and not the academic interests of British anthropologists that motivated early studies.

In recognition of the practice-theoretical attributes of the anthropological tradition, Indian anthropologists have persistently called for the conscious linking of theory and practice (e.g., Dube 1967 and 1979; Vidyarthi 1968 and 1978; Varma 1970, and Sarana and Sinha 1976). Dube (1979:7) has cautioned, however, that because anthropology's contribution to national development has hitherto been insignificant, it should be regarded with humility.

People's Republic of China

An instance of an anthropology that has appeared in a "new guise" is anthropology in the People's Republic of China. Institutionally, it is no longer identified as anthropology in the Western sense. Much of the activities that are anthropological in the Western sense are done in a number of institutions none of which goes by the name of anthropology (Braybrooke 1980; Bennagen 1976 and 1977).

Responding to Cooper (1973), some Chinese "anthropologists", two of whom were trained in the West, pointed out that in China "anthropologist" as a label belongs to the past (Fei Hsiao-Tung et al. 1973). They added that a discipline must have a theoretical system and a practical function, which

[6] Other attempts along these lines may be seen in Indian anthropological journals such as *Man In India, The Eastern Anthropologist.*

to the Chinese is Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung thought (Bennagen 1976).

The transformation of anthropology within the framework of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung thought may best be understood in terms of what Fei Xiatong (1980) has called "people's anthropology". He elaborated on this during his acceptance of the 1980 Malinowski Award given by the U.S.-based Society for Applied Anthropology: "[G]enuine applied anthropology must be a science serving the interests of the masses. That is what is meant by people's anthropology."

He (1980-119) argued that "only when the truthfulness of theories is being constantly examined in practice can we steadily push research work in a scientific direction and make it a prime mover of social progress."

As to the relationship between investigator and investigated, he (1980:119) claimed that there is no longer a valid distinction between "researchers or investigators" and the "objects of study" or the "investigated":

> "Our way of investigation radically changed the relations between investigators and the people under investigation. We carried out these investigations entirely for the purpose of finding the way to bring about equality among nationalities and help the minority peoples forge ahead. This was also what the people we investigated were asking for. So we could be quite frank with them about the purpose of our investigation, and the people investigated already understood what these investigations were for and found them acceptable."

It may be argued that the explicit use of a Marxist framework is a Western import. Koller (1970:275) points out, however, that its expression in China as applied to Chinese conditions and as articulated by Mao Tse-Tung, is in line with "the principles and attitudes of traditional Chinese philosophies."

He (1970:278) commented that: "It would appear . . . . that in his metaphysics and epistemology, Mao carries forward the traditional attitude which sees a unity in particular things and which sees knowledge as inseparable from practice. Consequently, his philosophy also places the traditional emphasis on the unification of humanity through improved practical living."

In China, therefore, the new anthropology seems to be a synthesis of anthropological fieldwork, Marxism and traditional Chinese philosophies.

Japan

Exhibiting a variation on the general patterning of the Asianization of anthropology is the Japanese experience. While the social sciences entered Japan from the West as early as the Meiji period (1868-1912) (UNESCO:1977) and while the Japanese Society of Ethnology was established in 1934 (Nakane 1974:57), it was not after World War II that social and cultural anthropology gained recognition as an independent discipline (Nakane 1974:57). Still, compared with the other social sciences, anthropology has not benefited from the post-WWII reforms. As of 1974, cultural anthropology was taught at the graduate level in only three universities (Nakane 1974: 57). In the Social Science Council of Japan, which advises the Prime Minister, members come from the natural sciences and social sciences but excluding the new-comers such as cultural anthropology, international relations and area studies (UNESCO 1977:44).

According to Nakane (1976), anthropological studies by Japanese first came under the influence of British anthropology with its emphasis on kinship. Studies on Japanese kinship had a parochial focus until studies were made outside Japan after the war. These studies have helped make possible the shift to comparative studies and the critical application of Anglo-American models.

Initially, cultural anthropology in Japan started as a study of Japanese society and culture by Japanese scholars trained in other disciplines who did work that were anthropological. These were done in isolation from the international community which was aided, in part, by publishing results in the Japanese language. In the 1950's with the growing affluence of Japan, research in the other countries, (e.g., India) by Japanese started. Since then, Japanese anthropologists have worked in other neighboring Asian countries and in the Pacific in the areas of social organization, folk beliefs and rituals. In Japan, studies have been confined to Japanese speaking areas of rural Japan and the Okinawa Islands.

There has also been a serious attempt to look at Japan from the outside (Nakane 1974:62). As a reaction to the previous period of isolation from the international intellectual community, efforts are also being exerted to integrate Japan into the mainstream of world anthropology. Methodologically, this is being done through cross-cultural comparisons particularly the efforts at linking Japanese data with those from the other countries of the Malay-Polynesian world. Moreover,

she (1974:71) argues for the view which regards Western works as "common property" and that "[t]he future contributions of Asian anthropologists can only be made on such a richly accumulated scientific ground, not out of a narrow provincial mind." It might be pointed out at this point that Japanese anthropology seems pre-occupied with purely academic concerns. Nakane's (1976) brief historical account of cultural anthropology in Japan does not mention any conscious use of anthropology in solving Japanese social problems.[7]

Conclusion

Clearly, the available data show that anthropology in Asia is undergoing some profound changes. Reflecting the various levels of social development of the various Asian countries, the different periods of the introduction of anthropology, and the type of interaction each country has with other countries, the Asianization of anthropology, however, is not homogenous. It is also taking place at different rates.

Still and all, it may be said that as these countries continue to grapple with their politico-economic problems towards national self-determination in an interdependent world, equity and social justice, so, too, will anthropologists and other social scientists grapple with their theories, methods and practice.

In any case, there are indications that an Asianized anthropology will emerge from the creative tension between efforts at their transformation.

Towards this end, an insight from an Asianized historical analysis is relevant:

> "Sa kabuuan, kalaliman at kahabaan ng kasaysayan ng Asya, tila pinakaimportante ay ang kasalukuyan, ang panahon ng paglaya at ng pagtatag ng kinabukasan." (Salazar et al., 1981:n.p.)

---

[7] This seems a bit odd considering the history of anthropology as a discipline at once utilitarian and intellectual with the former after preceding the other. It is clear from the report however, that anthropological studies have been made by Japanese anthropologists on areas once occupied by Imperial Japan. Moreover, in recent years, with Japanese rise to one of the industrial powers of the world, Japanese anthropologists have increasingly made their presence in other Asian countries particularly Southeast Asia (Tugby, 1968). Without meaning to be alarmist, yet aware of the probable abuse of anthropology in the perpetuation of relations of inequality and domination and bearing in mind the social responsibility of social scientists to their objects of study as well as to mankind in general, it is strongly suggested here that preventing the re-emergence of anthropology as a handmaiden of domination should be an item on the agenda of Asian anthropological communal proxis.

Going back to anthropology and its organizing principle of holism, an Asianized anthropology would be one which in its analytic confrontation with particular cases of man, society and culture would aid in transforming them as wholes. This unified and unifying holistic tradition — at once rejecting the fragmentation of life as total experience and the separation of knowing from acting — is an Asian tradition, which though submerged by the dominance of the West, is now being reconstituted in the new anthropology to help Asia's resurgence as a Great Tradition.

It should be stressed, however, that the Asianization of anthropology is but a part of the Asianization of social knowledge, which, in turn and ultimately, is only a part of an encompassing Asianization of Asia itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agrawal, Binod Chand
1978 Indian Models versus Western Models: Some Perspectives in the Study of a Civilization. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 31 (1): 31-39.

Alatas, Syed Hussein
1972 The Captive Mind in Development Studies. *International Social Science Journal* XXIV (1): 9-25.

American Anthropological Association
1962 American Anthropologists Pledge Efforts to World Peace. *Current Anthropology* 3 (1):78.

Bachtiar, H.
1977 Indonesia, UNESCO, 1977a, *Social Sciences in Asia II*. Paris: UNESCO.

Bador, A.K.
1974 The Role and Orientation of Social Scientists in Malaysia. Delivered at the Conference on "The Role and Orientation of Social Sciences and Social Scientists in Malaysia, 17-18 August 1974.

Bastide, Roger
1971 *Applied Anthropology*, Trans. from the French by Alice L. Norton. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Bauman, Zygmunt
1973 *Culture as Praxis*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Bennagen, P.L.
1976 Social Science in the People's Republic of China. From the Masses to the Masses. *U.P. Newsletter* IV (49):3-4.

Bennagen, P.L.

1977a Archaeology in the People's Republic of China: The Past in the Service of the Present. *U.P. Newsletter* V (3) :4,6.

1977b Pagbabago at Pag-unlad ng mga Agta sa Palanan, Isabela. *Diwa.* 6(14) :1-103.

1977c Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Are We Human After All? (Towards a Humanist Anthropology). A.G. Carlos and A.R. Magno, eds. *The Social Responsibilities of the Social Scientist as an Intellectual.* Diliman, Quezon City. University of the Philippines, pp. 42-50.

1978 Opening remarks during the First National Conference of UGAT (Anthropological Association of the Philippines) on 14-16 April 1978. *Aghamtao I* (1-2).

1979 Some Thoughts on Applied Anthropology in the Philippines. *Aghamtao II*: 1-4.

Bennett, John W.

1966 Comments on "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 68(1).

Berreman, Gerard D.

1968 Is Anthropology Alive? Social Responsibility in Social Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 9 (5) 391-396.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1977 [1972] *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Trans. from French by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braybrooke, George

1980 Ethnology in China. *Current Anthropology* 21 (2) : 264-265.

Bunzel, Ruth and Anne Parsons

1964 Anthropology and World Affairs As Seen by U.S.A. Associates. *Current Anthropology* 5:430, 433-442.

Cochrane, Glynn

1971 *Development Anthropology.* New York. Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Gene

1973 An Interview with Chinese Anthropologists. *Current Anthropology.* 14(4) :480-482.

Diamond, Stanley

1964 A Revolutionary Discipline. *Current Anthropology* 5(5) :432-437.

Dube, S.C.
1962 Social Anthropology in India. In Majumdar and Madan, eds, *Indian Anthropology*. pp 238-253.

1967 Human Problems of Economic Development. *The Eastern Anthropologist*. XX (1): 1-14.

1979 Anthropology and the Challenge of Development: A View from the Third World. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 3(2): 67-73; also in *Association of Third World Anthropologist (ATWA) Research Bulletin* 1 (2): 4-8.

Fahim, Hussein
1977 Remarks on Foreign and Indigenous Anthropology: The Perspectives of an Egyptian Anthropologist. *Human Organization* 36(1): 80-85.
1979 Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries. *Current Anthropology* 20(2):397.

Fahim, Hussein and Katherine Helmer
1980 Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21 (5):644-663.

Fei Hsiao-Tung, Wirwen-Chao and Lin Ysieh-Hwa
1973 Comments on Cooper. *Current Anthropology* 14(4): 482.

Fei Xiatong
1980 Toward a People's Anthropology. *Human Organization*. 39 (2):115-120.

Feliciano, Gloria D.
1965 The Limits of Western Social Research Methods in Rural Philippines: The Need for Innovation. *Lipunan* 1 (1):114-127.

Frank, Andre Gunder
1968 CA Comment on Social Responsibilities Symposium. *Current Anthropology* 9:412-414.

Furtado, Celso
1967 [1961] *Development and Underdevelopment*. Trans. by R.W. de Aguiar & E.C. Drysdale. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gjessing, Gutorm
1968 The Social Responsibility of the Social Scientist. *Current Anthropology* 9(5):397-402.

Goddard, D.
1969 Limits of British Anthropology. *New Left Review* 58:79-89.

Goldstein, Marcus S.
1968 Anthropological Research, Action and Education in Modern Nations: With Special Reference to the USA. *Current Anthropology* 9(4):247-269.

Gough, Kathleen
1968 New Proposals for Anthropologists. *Current Anthropology* 9(5): 397-402.

Haas, Mary R.
1965 "Other Cultures" vs. "Own Cultures"; Some Thoughts on L. White's Query. *American Anthropologist* 67:1556-1560.

1966 Reply to Taylor. *American Anthropologist* 68(4): 1017.

Harris, Marvin
1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory.* New York. Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Hofer, Tamas
1968 Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines. *Current Anthropology* 9 (4): 311-316.

Horowitz, Irving
1965 The Life and Death of Project Camelot. *Transactions* 3(1):3-7, 44-47.

Hymes, Dell ed.
1969 *Reinventing Anthropology.* New York. Vintage Books.

Independent Commission on International Development Issues
1980 *North-South: A Program For Survival.* London: Pan Books.

Jocano, F. Landa
1965 Rethinking Filipino Cultural Heritage. *Lipunan* 1 (1):53-72.

Jocano, F. Landa
1975 *Philippine Pre-history.* Quezon City. PCAS.

Jones, Delmos J.
1970 Towards a Native Anthropology. *Human Organization* 29(4):251-259.

Jones, Delmos J.
1971 Social Responsibility and the Belief in Basic Research: An Example from Thailand. *Current Anthropology* 12(3):347-350.

Johnson, Dale L.
1966 Ethics of the Nature, Procedures and Funding of Research in other Countries. *American Anthropologist* 68(4):1016-1017.

Jules-Rosette, Benetta
1978 The Veil of Objectivity: Prophecy, Divination and Social Inquiry. *American Anthropologist* 80:549-570.

Koentjarinangrat, ed.
1967 *Villages in Indonesia.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Koentjarinangrat
1975 Anthropology in Indonesia: *A Bibliographical Review.* The Hague, Netherlands; S-Gravenhage-Martinus Nijhaff.

Koller, John M.
1970 [1963] *Oriental Philosophies.* New York: Charles Soribner's Sons.

Kumar, Krishna
1976 *Indigenization and Transnational Cooperation in the Social Sciences.* A paper presented at the Conference on "Emerging Issues in Culture Relations" held in Honolulu, 9-10 December 1976, p. 1-26.

Lantis, Margaret
1955 The USA As Anthropologists See It. *American Anthropologists* 57:113-1120.

Levi-Strauss, Claude
1966 Anthropology: Its Achievements and Future. *Current Anthropology* 7(2):124-127.

Madan, T.N. Sarana, eds.
1962 *Indian Anthropology. Essays In Memory of D.N. Majumdan.* London: Asia Publishing House.

Malik, Subhash C.
1976a Study of Indian Civilization: The Background. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 29 (2):171-187.
1976b India C1000BC-AD 1000: Interpreting Economic Patterns in a Civilizational Framework. *The Eastern Anthropologist.* 29(3):249-258.

Maquet, J.
1964 Objectivity in Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 5(1):47-55.

Murty, K. Satchinanda
1978 *Major Asian Intellectual Traditions: Their Philosophy and Creativity.* Tokyo: The United Nations University.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1957 *Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions.* New York: Harper Torchbooks.
Nakane, Chie
1970 *Japanese Society.* Penguin Books.
Nakane, Chie
1974 Cultural Anthropology in Japan, B.J. Siegel *et al.* eds. *Annual Review of Anthropology* vol 3. Palo Alto, Calif.: Annual Reviews, Inc.
Nash, Dennison and Ronald Wintrob
1972 The Emergence of Self Consciousness in Ethnology. *Current Anthropology* 15(3) :527-542.
Nash, June
1975 Nationalism and Fieldwork. Bernard J. Siegel et al. eds. *Annual Review of Anthropology.* Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews, Inc. pp 225-245.
Nivison, David S.
1953 The Problem of "Knowledge" and "Action" in Chinese Thought Since Wang Yang Ming. Arthur F. Wright (ed.) Studies in Chinese Thought. *The American Anthropologist* 53(5) part 2. Memoirs No. 75, pp 112-145.
Owusu, M.
1978 Ethnography of Africa. The Usefulness of the Useless. *American Anthropologist* 80::310-334.
Pafola, T.S.
1969 The Crisis of Indian Planning. *The Eastern Anthropologist* XXII (2) :229-246.
Pathy, Jaganath, Suguna Pail, Manu Bhaskat and Jarayan Panda
1976 Tribal Studies in India: An Appraisal. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 29(4) :399-417.
Peatie, Lisa
1958 Interventionism and Applied Science in Anthropology. *Human Organization* 17:4-9.
Raghavan, V.
1976 India: Tradition and Non-conformism in Creative Arts. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 29(2) :189-200.
Rowe, J. H.
1965 The Renaissance Foundation of Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 67(1) :61-77.
Roy, Ramashray
1977 Social Science Cooperation in Asia. UNESCO *Interregional Cooperation in the Social Sciences.* UNESCO: Paris.

Salamone, Frank A.
1979 Epistemological Implications of Fieldwork and Their Consequences. *American Anthropologist* 81(1):46-60.

Salazar, Zeus
1974-75 Ang Pagpapasakasaysayang Pilipino ng Nakaraang Pre-Spaniko.

Salazar, Zeus ed.
1974-75 Ang Kasaysayan: Diwa at Lawak. *Dyornal ng Malawakang Edukasyon* Blg. 27-28, pp. 163-196

Salazar, Zeus A. Jaime B. Veneracion, Wilfredo E. Tamayo at Elizabeth A. Pastores
1981 *Kabihasnang Asyano,* Quezon City. Pamantasan ng Pilipinas.

Sarana, G. and D. P. Sinha
1976 Status of Social-Cultural Anthropology in India. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5:209-225.

Scholte, Bob
1966 Epistemic Paradigms: Some Problems in Cross-Cultural Research on Social Anthropological History and Theory. *American Anthropologist* 1192-1201.

Sociology Division, The
1974 *The Role and Orientation of Sociology and Sociologists in Malaysia.* Delivered at the conference on "The Role and Orientation of Social Science and Social Scientists in Malaysia, 17-18 August 1974, National University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.

Taylor, Charles W.
1966 Ethno-/Xeno-Views of Other-/ Own-Cultures: Comments on Haas and White. *American Anthropologist.* 68(4):1017.

Tugby, Donald J.
1970 Ethnological and Allied Research Problems of Southeast Asia. *Current Anthropology* 11(1):49-54.

UNESCO
1976 *Social Sciences in Asia I: Bangladesh, Iran, Malaysia, Pakistan, Thailand.* Paris: UNESCO.
1977a *Social Sciences in Asia II: Afghanistan, Indonesia,*
1977b *Social Sciences in Asia III: Burma, Mongolia, New Zealand, The Philippines, Singapore.* Paris, UNESCO.
1977c *Inter-regional Co-operation in the Social Sciences.* Paris: UNESCO.

Varma, S. C.
1970 The Radical Intellectuals. *The Eastern Anthropologist* XXIII (3) :213-216.
Vidyarthi, L. P.
1978a Presidential Address delivered at the Inauguration of the Xth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, New Delhi, Dec. 10, 1978. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 3(2) :129-136.
1978b Aspects of present-day problems: An Anthropological focus. *The Eastern Anthropologist* 30(1) :101-107.
White, Leslie A.
1965 Anthropology, 1964: Retrospect and Prospect. *American Anthropologist* 67:629-657.
Zamora, Mario D.
1978 Marcelo Tangco: Native Father of Philippine Anthropology. *The Eastern Anthropologist.* 31(4) : 589-596.