

Intellectuals and Nationalism: Anthropological Engagements

Dominic Boyer¹ and Claudio Lomnitz²

¹Department of Anthropology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853; email: dcb25@cornell.edu

²New School University, Graduate Faculty, New York 10003; email: lomnitzc@newschool.edu

Annu. Rev. Anthropol.
2005. 34:105–20

First published online as a
Review in Advance on
May 25, 2005

The *Annual Review of
Anthropology* is online at
anthro.annualreviews.org

doi: 10.1146/
annurev.anthro.33.070203.143937

Copyright © 2005 by
Annual Reviews. All rights
reserved

0084-6570/05/1021-
0105\$20.00

Key Words

intellectuals, nationalism, public culture, knowledge

Abstract

To what extent are intellectuals artisans of nationalism? In this chapter we review past and present anthropological research that has helped to reveal the agency of intellectuals in the projects and operations of states and nations. If the intellectual has long been defined in the Marxian-Gramscian tradition as a social actor with a special praxical investment in ways and forms of knowing, then what we discuss as “intellectualism,” the social formation of knowledge, should be understood as a central dimension of the (re)production of nations and nationalism both inside and outside of states. We suggest that further drawing anthropological attention to intellectuals and their knowledge practices (ranging from the poetic-literary to the technical-administrative) will help the anthropology of nations and nationalism to (a) locate the role of human agency in the creation, circulation, and contestation of national culture, (b) capture the intellectual work involved in nationalism and bureaucracy in its full diversity, and (c) imagine a new series of ethnographic access points among educated professionals for the study of nationalism in action.

Contents

INTRODUCTION: ENGAGING THE INTELLECTUAL	106
INTELLECTUALS IN ANTHROPOLOGY: A BRIEF HISTORY	108
INTELLECTUALS, STATES, AND NATIONS.....	110
CONCLUSION: TOWARD AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF INTELLECTUALS IN NATIONALISM	113

INTRODUCTION: ENGAGING THE INTELLECTUAL

To paraphrase an observation of Bauman's (1987b, p. 8), the thing about writing on intellectuals is that every representation is bound to be, to some extent, a self-representation. Any move to produce definitive knowledge of intellectual works and lives must be measured against the certainty that this knowledge is also a product of a situated, motivated, gendered intellectual whose writing reflects a specific time, place, and position in intellectual culture. In what Bauman views as a post-modern condition *par excellence*, the chief certainty of a social analyst of intellectuals becomes the relationality of his/her own interpretive knowledge and of the knowledges produced by his/her subjects (cf. Mannheim 1955, 1971a,b).

There is indeed no accepted point of departure for the analysis of intellectuals as social actors. Bauman's observation also captures the long and difficult journey of "the intellectual" as a conceptual category never able to separate itself entirely from its discursive, indexical origins as badge of humanist honor and epithet of antinationalist shame in the European public culture of the late nineteenth century. The intellectual has been variously deployed over the course of the twentieth century to anchor lexically a sphere

of social identification containing anyone from those who should speak truth to power (Zola 1998, Benda 1969, Said 1994), to "men of ideas" and guardians of national traditions and cultural knowledge (Coser 1965, Nettl 1969, Parsons 1969, Shils 1972), to a historically emergent technocratic class (Bell 1973, Djilas 1957, Gella 1976, Gouldner 1979, Konrád & Szelényi 1979, Szelényi 1982), to those cultural elites inhabiting fields of knowledge production and authorization (Bourdieu 1988, Boyer 2003, Lomnitz 1992, Verdery 1991), to a languishing breed of public person in an era of privatization and academic compartmentalization (Aronowitz 1998, Jacoby 1987, Posner 2002).

Rather than extending this list with another definition of the intellectual's function or essence, we have the more modest objectives of (a) exploring past and present anthropological research on intellectuals and their practices and (b) asking how these engagements could inform our understanding of the communitarian relations and horizons of nationalism. In the following sections of this review, we offer first a brief overview of anthropological work on intellectuals since the Boasians, moving from Radin's discussion (1927) of "primitive philosophers" to contemporary research on the politics of intellectuals "articulating the nation" (Suny & Kennedy 1999) and participating in the operation of states. Then, we explore how these research directions contribute to an interdisciplinary reconsideration of the relations between states, nations, and cultural elites through their greater attention to elite agency in large-scale political and social formations. We close with a brief discussion of how research on intellectuals helps to expose the social relations that produce the apparent incommensurabilities of modern nationalism, and we suggest that further research on intellectual practices and nationalism will clarify further the contribution of knowledge specialists to the production and reproduction of the communitarian horizons of the nation.

Our objectives, of course, by no means release us from offering a working definition of the intellectual. We recognize, for example, that the aforementioned tension between the intellectual as category of analysis and as category of social distinction is a constant companion of this project. Indeed, we regard the overall advantage of an ethnographic and anthropological engagement with intellectuals as forefronting such tensions through anthropology's dual commitment to historical and analytical knowledge forms, to balancing emic and etic modes of interpretation. Our own strategy is to concentrate on intellectualism (rather than on "the intellectual" per se). By "intellectualism" we mean intense praxical investment in modes and forms of mental activity, an investment that is structured by a broader social division of labor and that reciprocally encourages some actors to pursue and to valorize those dimensions and applications of human knowledge that are apparently more formal, objective, and transcontextual (see also Boyer 2005a,b). But, of course, what we might call the social-phenomenological disposition of intellectualism is further mediated by a wide range of sociohistorical forces and circumstances. The politics and poetics of legitimacy in intellectual life (Bourdieu 1988, 1991, Lyotard 1984), for example, always map particular logics and relations of inclusion and exclusion over the modes of attention and specialization that define intellectualism. Moreover, in mundane life, every fully accredited intellectual has her or his nonintellectual moments, whereas the vast abundance of intellectual attention and work undertaken in society never receives a seal of intellectual validation. This is also the essential insight of Gramsci's well-known phrase that all human beings are intellectuals, even if all are not legitimated to operate that way in society (1971) and of Marx & Engels's link of the origin of "ideology" as a relational mode of consciousness to the division and specialization of mental labor in society (1970).

We consider the intellectual then less as the executor of a particular set of functions or

as the possessor of a certain set of attributes, credentials, or capital and more as a social actor who has, by local, historical standards, a differentially specialized engagement with forms of knowledge and their social extensions. This is not a radical break with the definitions outlined above because a strong common thread between them is the argument that in any social environment there are actors who have a special relationship to some mode of knowing (whether the mode is philosophical, ideological, or technical) and therefore to particular forms of knowledge. But ours is an approach that seeks to appreciate intellectualism in its full idiosyncrasy of social and historical forms while remaining cognizant of the particular social and phenomenological dispositions that do distinguish intellectuals more broadly as social actors.

Given the thematic concerns of this review, we engage primarily those intellectuals who contribute to defining the social knowledges at play in nationalist discourse and the technical types of knowledge at work in state administration. We propose that enhancing anthropological attention to intellectuals and their knowledge practices will be helpful in at least three ways for understanding nations and nationalism: (a) locating the place of human agency in the creation, circulation, and contestation of national culture, (b) capturing the intellectual work involved in nationalism in its full diversity (from literary labors of national evocation to mediating labors of national-cultural production, such as pedagogy and journalism, to administrative labors of state bureaucracy), and (c) imagining a new series of ethnographic access points among educated professionals, e.g., teachers, journalists, scientists, lawyers, architects, advertisers, designers, consultants, academics, researchers, literati, and pundits, that give praxical substance to conceptually abstract yet analytically important formations like nationalism, the state, and public culture. In sum, we argue that an anthropology of intellectuals concerned with those social actors specializing in the production and management of

social knowledge should occupy a key place in contemporary anthropological conversations about nations and nationalism.

INTELLECTUALS IN ANTHROPOLOGY: A BRIEF HISTORY

It may surprise some to discover that intellectuals have accompanied anthropological research since the first decades of the twentieth century. Given the centrality of problems of knowledge (especially rationality, logic, and cognition) to early tensions between the modes of anthropology associated with Victorian universalism, Boasian particularism, and post-Boasian pluralism, it is perhaps not surprising that an interest in social actors holding a special relationship to knowledge emerged early in anthropological inquiry. Perhaps the most extensive of earlier anthropological engagements with intellectuals was Paul Radin's *Primitive Man as Philosopher* (Radin 1927), which reacted strongly against what he saw as the unquestioned assumptions of primitive mental difference and inequality of anthropology in the universalist mode (Frazer 1890, Lévy-Bruhl 1996, Tylor 1970). Radin offered instead an analysis of the division of labor between "men of thought" and "practical men" in any society largely as a matter of individual psychological inclination. Despite a greater degree of investment in natural sensuousness than western intellectuals, Radin argued forcefully that there were genuine philosophers within any primitive society, philosophers who wrestled with the same epistemological problems as did university-trained and -accredited scholars. Radin devoted great sections of his text to the exposition of myths and other oral texts that demonstrated the diversity and rigor of intellectual engagement among primitive peoples. He further explained that the conceit of primitive mental and philosophical inequality was largely a matter of ethnologists evaluating primitive philosophy using the clumsy interpretations of nonintellectuals.

Beyond Radin's work, which has received subsequent recognition for its significance to the sociology of knowledge (Bauman 1987b, Radin 1938), intellectuals occasionally appeared as cultural producers elsewhere in the writings of the Boasians (Benedict 1934, Boas 1929, Powdermaker 1950) usually as a foil for the sensuousness of the nonwestern intellect and for the intelligence of the nonintellectual. Edward Sapir's description of the ecology of "genuine culture," in terms of networks of creative activity, exchange, and virtuosity, suggests a prominent if never explicitly formulated place for intellectuals in his culture theory (1924). In British anthropology, detailed ethnographic descriptions of specialists in traditional or ritual knowledge emerged, such as those of the leopard skin chiefs among the Nuer (Evans-Pritchard 1940, pp. 172–77) or of Ndembu doctors (Turner 1967), as well as narratives of intellectual engagement and collaboration (Turner's description of "Muchona the Hornet" is exemplary). The recognition of the anthropological significance of ethnographers' dialogical relations with key informants (Crapanzano 1980, Dwyer 1982, Herzfeld 1997b, Tedlock & Mannheim 1995) as well as more recent reflections on how analytical frameworks and ethnographic knowledge develop in field situations and in academic professionalism (Appadurai 1997, Boyer 2003, Brenneis 1994, Holmes & Marcus 2005, Jackson 1998, Maurer 2002, Munasinghe 2005) equivalently confirm Radin's impression that all anthropology is, to some extent, an anthropology of intellectuals because ethnographers often coordinate their analyses of social and cultural totalities with the assistance of other, local intellectuals, whose interpretations in turn are colored by their own social positions and interests. There is, in other words, always culture at work in academic knowledge (Sahlins 1996).

Yet, despite a variety of ethnographic sightings and soundings, in none of these works does the intellectual and his/her social role emerge explicitly as a research problem, certainly not to the extent that it did in

parallel sociological investigations of knowledge and intellectuals (Elias 1994, Gramsci 1971, Mannheim 1955, 1971a, Marx & Engels 1970, Parsons 1969, Shils 1972). The first wave of critical and reflexive work produced within anthropology about the discipline's political and ideological entanglements (Asad 1973, Hymes 1974) helped to broaden and intensify awareness of the politics and poetics of anthropological knowledge making. In turn, the much-publicized second wave of critical reflections upon anthropological knowledge focused around the "crisis of representation" debates of the mid- to late 1980s (Boon 1982, Clifford 1988, Clifford & Marcus 1986, Fardon 1995, Grimshaw & Hart 1993, Marcus & Fischer 1986, Mascia-Lees et al. 1989, Polier & Roseberry 1989) further raised the politics of knowledge production back to a central research problem for anthropology.

One could fairly say, however, that the detail of Radin's anthropology of intellectuals was not again matched and exceeded until the early 1990s when anthropologists began to analyze intellectuals as key social actors in the formation and circulation of public knowledge. Drawing inspiration from the works of Weber (1947), Gramsci (1971), Bourdieu (1977, 1991), and Foucault (1980), among others, ethnographers have focused increasingly on the place of intellectuals within the production of culture, especially of public knowledge of social identity and belonging. Several studies appeared in the 1990s that analyzed the role of intellectuals in the shaping of nationalist (or variously culturalist) ideologies associated with particular ethnic, national, or regional politics (Feierman 1990, Herzfeld 1997b, Lomnitz-Adler 1992, Verdery 1991, Warren 1998). Intellectuals appear in these studies as social actors who are relatively privileged in their capacity to articulate schemes and settlements of cultural knowledge and difference, although, as Verdery shows, they are highly factionalized and politically contentious even though, as Lomnitz's study of local intellectuals in Huasteca testifies (1992, pp. 221–41), not all intellectuals are elite

or privileged in their access to information, resources, and social legitimacy. Beyond the Weberian notion of a status group, intellectuals are also defined by their possession of a certain epistemic "virtuosity" (Friedrich 1986, pp. 46–47) that resonates well with our portrait of the phenomenology of intellectualism.

These authors have also made a case for the anthropological importance of studying intellectuals more broadly. Herzfeld explains his decision to produce an ethnographic portrait of the Greek writer Andreas Nenedakis as a challenge to "the anthropological imagination to go beyond a concern with social institutions and structures and especially to let individual and collective agency subvert the conflation implied by the ever-present definite article: '*the* values of *the* Greeks'" (1997b, p. 11; on the intersection of literature, intellectuals and anthropology, see also Daniel & Peck 1996, Fernandez & Huber 2001, Handler & Segal 1990, Rapport 1994, Reed-Danahay 1997, Taylor 1997). Herzfeld's call to anthropologists to address the human agency behind the seemingly *sui generis* quality of both nationalist imaginings and everyday national idioms has echoed elsewhere as well. Verdery sums up her Bourdieuan approach to studying intellectuals as a means to analyze the "cultural politics" of nationalist discourse more broadly, "intellectuals engage in contests over different definitions of cultural value, competence and authority; they strive to impose their definitions of value and to gain recognition for their version of social reality" (1991, p. 18). Warren's analysis of the Pan-Mayan movement of Guatemala in its complex politics of linguistic and cultural revitalization and unification seeks to surface the agency of educated Mayans in spearheading the organization of the movement, the institutionalization of its agenda, and the articulation of its ideology as well as the agency of other educated elites in contesting the legitimacy of the movement (1998, pp. 33–51).

Beyond anthropological research with public intellectuals and literati, other fields

of anthropological inquiry, particularly the anthropology of media and the anthropology of science, have likewise come to forefront the agency of educated professionals in the scoping and sculpting of persuasive semiotics and narratives of national identity and belonging (Abu-Lughod 1991, 2005, Boyer 2000, 2001, Dornfeld 1999, Ginsburg et al. 2002, Gusterson 2004, Hannerz 2003, Hess 1991, Latour 1988, Martin 1994, Rabinow 1999, Winegar 2003). Because much of this ethnographic work occurs within institutional contexts, this research contributes a better appreciation for the refraction of intellectual practices and agency through professional expectations and institutional exigencies. It augments research on the politics of social knowledge formation with a richer sense of the technical practices and institutional relations that coelaborate and hierarchize languages and knowledge of social belonging. Similarly, recent anthropological research on intellectuals and nationalism (Boyer 2005a, Lomnitz 2001) has also come into dialogue with the sociologies of nationalism (Brubaker 1996, Chatterjee 1986, 1993) and knowledge (Bauman 1987a,b, Collins 1998, Fabiani 1988, Giesen 1998) via a shared interest in how social knowledge, or, better yet, “knowledge of the social,” is produced, contested, circulated, and accredited. This convergence of interests invites, in the terms of Suny & Kennedy, “a theory of national intellectual practice” (1999, p. 383) focusing on the role of human agents in the making of nations and nationalism both inside and outside of states through practices ranging from the poetic/literary to the technical/administrative.

INTELLECTUALS, STATES, AND NATIONS

Theories of state formation have indeed often appreciated the role of intellectualism in governance and have pointed toward a kind of codependency between states and intellectuals. In his analysis of Chinese literati, for

example, Weber (1958) noted the connection between the formation of an erudite class, an elaborate written culture, and a working imperial bureaucracy that spanned vast territories, peopled by speakers of multiple languages (also Elman 2000, Fei 1953). The arts of domination and of administration in states require attention to rhetoric, ideological invention, and communication across different stations as well as rational calculation. This holds true even for empires without writing systems, such as the Incan, that nonetheless occupied specialists to shape a highly complex and integrative ritual system and to administer trade and storage (Zuidema 1990, Boone & Mignolo 1996). Even theorists who have emphasized the role of expropriation and crime in the origins of the state (Engels 1972, Nietzsche 1956, Tilly 1985) recognize that the routinization of domination involves a kind of cultural revolution (Elias 1994, Foucault 1980, Corrigan & Sayer 1985), even if the agency shaping these inventions rarely receives the attention that Weber proffered on the cultural underpinnings of state formation in China.

The rise of modern nationalism involved new roles for intellectuals, although these have been recognized in different ways depending on varying theories of nationalism and on differing cases of nationalism. If we trace the origins of nationalism back to the early modern period, for example, we witness the emergence of imperial law, political philosophy, cartography, history, and grammar, each of which had its intellectual practitioners. A new cohort of historians, writing a kind of universal history, emerged in early modern Portugal and Spain (Subrahmanyam 1998). The political philosophies of Thomas Hobbes, Jean Baudin, Nicholo Machiavelli, and Francisco Vitoria are all part and parcel of the consolidation of the early modern empires that eventually framed national identification and national sentiment. Although there are a growing number of historians who locate the origins of nationalism in these early modern empires, the phenomenon is generally

understood as properly modern, originating in the eighteenth century.

Gellner (1983) argued that nationalism is directly connected to the rise of industry and that industrial society positively requires shared systems of communication in a way that sets it apart from all predecessors. For Gellner, modern states require “a mobile, literate, culturally standardized, interchangeable population” (Gellner 1983); the nation-state, with its schools and its national language, is the mold for this process of cultural standardization. Thus, industrialism would rely simultaneously on scientific inquiry, new forms of pedagogy, and new methods of publicity.

In Hobsbawm’s account (1990), nationalism emerged along with popular politics and revolution, a situation that in some respects implies the emergence of what Gramsci called “organic intellectuals,” that is, intellectuals whose role is to formalize and enunciate a class position within a totalizing language of community (or nation) (1971). Both the English revolution of the late seventeenth century and the French Revolution of 1789 involved deep cultural transformations (Chartier 1991): the circulation of books and leaflets, as well as the rise of what Habermas (1991) has called the bourgeois public sphere, with its coffee houses and salons, increasing secularism in the case of France, and intensifying religious polarization in the case of England.

The most influential work on the origins of modern nationalism, Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1983), does not directly discuss intellectuals but implicitly provides them with pivotal roles in the invention of nationalism; journalists, novelists, architects, curators, grammarians, philologists, folklorists, and artists are the agents that actually “image” the national community. The labor of some of these writers in narrating the nation has been explored by Sommer (1991), Bhabha (1990, 1994), Shumway (1991), and others.

In addition to these broad cultural processes, both the English and the French revolutions were also shaped by disgruntled and

unemployed intellectuals (clerics, lawyers, literati), whose ranks had been swollen in the decades preceding revolution (Stone 1972, Chartier 1991). Similarly, Giesen (1998) has demonstrated that romantic nationalism in Germany was the product of a generation of underpaid and underemployed intellectuals who eventually turned to the task of inventing traditions. These are processes that have been studied with ethnographic care by Handler (1988), Guss (2000), Breckenridge (1989), Cole (1985), and Hobsbawm & Ranger (1992), all of whom have explored the role and history of the heritage industry in the formation of national and imperial imaginings.

In the colonial world, the role of intellectuals in the formation of nationalism has taken a related but distinct course. Doing anthropological and historical work in India, Cohn (1996) demonstrated that census takers and colonial administrators played a key role in crystallizing or in inventing the social categories that became basic units in the structure of colonial domination. In a related vein, Said (1978) argued that orientalist intellectuals had a central role in constructing images of alterity that underwrote modern imperialism, obscuring the connections between the metropole and its colonies. Rich historical and ethnographic studies have followed in this tradition in many parts of the world (Mitchell 1988, Tenorio-Trillo 1996). Following a Foucauldian method, Escobar (1995) explored the ways in which development economists and other professionals shaped a “development discourse” that, in some ways, was the post-WWII heir of early orientalist representations of the economic periphery.

Extending these issues in a different direction, Taussig (1987) has argued that the violence of the colonial encounter was a negative projection of bureaucratic rationality onto the fringes of civilization. Thus, barbarism, which has been a key figure and image in post-colonial nationalism, is itself a kind of inverted image of Enlightenment, and the violent dialectic between rational production and

barbarism is channeled and elaborated both by local intellectuals, such as spirit healers, as well as by national intellectuals (Bartra 1997). The role of intellectuals in state cultural production in current conditions of postmodernity and globalization has been a prominent theme in the past decade. Appadurai (1998) has explored the connection between ethnic nationalism and the cultural production of high modern states. Boyer (2000, 2001) has explored the work of journalists in constituting and circulating social knowledge of easternness and Germanness, whereas Malkki (1995) has touched upon the role of journalists and humanitarian aid organizations in representing ethnic violence within Africa to the outside world. Hannerz (2003) has described the work of journalists in shaping a postnational world and in the narration of globalization. Kang critiques the work of the neocolonial Korean intellectual “clearing up the vestiges of colonialism and imperialism” (2000, p. 139).

Colonial conditions generate their own effects on consciousness and on cultural elaboration (Stoler 1995, 2002), effects that generate a tension between cosmopolitan and localist identification (Bhabha 1994, Herzfeld 1997b, Duara 1995). At the same time, the unification of the postcolonial nation has required particular efforts on the part of the intelligentsia because colonial administration involved severely limiting the emergence of a unified public sphere (Scott 1999). As a result, the role of intellectuals in articulating a fragmented national space has been a prominent theme for anthropologists of postcolonial nations (Chatterjee 1986, Lomnitz 2001).

The pivotal role that intellectuals have played in the development of nationalism has its dialectical counterpart in their reliance on nationalism as a rhetorical device that is required to further their specific interests. Latour (1988) showed that this held true for scientists as much as for intellectuals whose livelihood is more directly connected to shaping public opinion. Indeed, the justification of science itself has often been nationalized, in-

sofar as it is subordinated to a public interest that is easily collapsed into national interest (Shapin 1994, Jackson 2000).

The image of the intellectual itself has been pegged to national fantasy, either as the incarnation of the nation’s spirit (Boyer 2005a, Giesen 1998, Herzfeld 1997a, Siu 1990) or as the architect of national planning (Scott 1999, Escobar 1995, Eyerman 1994). In the case of colonial or postcolonial administrative cities, intellectuals represented civilization itself and the domination of the city over its rural hinterlands (Rama 1994, Schweizer 1988).

At the same time, the turbulent process of national transformation has confounded the august image of the intellectual as a (male) embodiment of the spirit and rationality of the nation. Indeed, much anthropological work on intellectuals has concentrated on emergent intellectuals who are connected to a variety of social movements and whose bodies and activities are marked precisely because they depart from the ideal modal citizen. Thus, Warren (1998) and Gutiérrez (1999) have studied the challenge that indigenous intellectuals in Latin America raise to the national intelligentsia and to national schooling. At the same time, these studies also reveal the key role of emerging forms of “ethnonationalism” for Indian intellectuals. Feierman (1990) discusses the thought and social engagement of Tanzanian peasants in social movements.

The exploration of the margins of national imaginings has not yet been pursued in systematic fashion. The relevance of the nation as a way of framing communitarian relations for various subaltern groups has been an open question since the days in which peasantries were conceptualized as “part societies” because of their tenuous inclusion in the nation. In urban settings, the deployment of nationalism among the organic intellectuals of youth subcultures or street culture is yet to be explored in a systematic fashion. Fragmentary evidence suggests that nationalism is an important framing device in these movements. For example, Bourgois (1995) describes a street culture in Spanish Harlem (New York

City) that is suffused with formulations of the American Dream; Holston (1989) shows that new religious movements in Brazil's proletarian peripheries develop their own versions of Brazil's modernist utopia; whereas studies of British subculture have explored the circulation (subversion, appropriation, transformation) of national and ethnonational identity in the dynamics of rupture and distinction (Hebdige 1979, Willis 1977).

In sum, the nation is a kind of communitarian relation that has framed, justified, or been directly performed in the work of scientists, planners, and organic intellectuals who are attached to emerging social movements. Classically, the limits of these communitarian formulations were expressed as a tension between universalism and nationalism. However, ethnography has also shown that there are other competing communitarian formulations that are equally relevant, including religious, local, linguistic, ethnic, and class identification. Regardless of the communitarian imagination at play, intellectuals participate as key social actors in their specification, articulation, and dissemination.

CONCLUSION: TOWARD AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF INTELLECTUALS IN NATIONALISM

One of the advantages of thinking about nations and nationalism through the lens of the intellectual is how intellectuals appear to embody certain dialectical contradictions and incommensurabilities normally associated with modern nationalism and its social and political formations. We have noted above, for example, the spirit of nations that is routinely contrasted in nationalist imagination to the exterior forms and institutions of civil societies and states. Looking at intellectuals in their full diversity of practices, we find that this distinction is oddly aligned with intellectuals' own division and specialization of labors. As we have seen, intellectuals mediate at once the poetics and publics of communitarian sen-

timent (Abu-Lughod 2005, Herzfeld 1997a) and the forms of technical knowledge characteristic of administration, science, policy, law, and so on. What is so vexing and otherwise spectral about the intellectual—that its analytic is always strung across ratios such as those of vocationalism/professionalism, technicism/*poesis*, tradition/modernity, functionality/radical critique—actually becomes a surprisingly helpful site of research for bridging the apparent impass between externalities and intimacies of modern nationalism (Shryock 2004).

In this respect, as in others, the study of intellectuals is also very suggestive for understanding why nationalist imaginations cultivate the particular knowledge of the social that they do. By addressing the formative processes of social knowledge, the anthropology of intellectuals challenges the more formalist or epistemological readings of nationalism that dog, for example, Anderson's (1983) model of the "imagined community." Instead, the research we have reviewed points toward a social and phenomenological basis for nationalist epistemology, toward the processes by which schemes and settlements of national knowledge come to be aligned with the social experience and social imagination of intellectuals themselves. This phenomenon is a fascinating and important one and deserves much further research. But we would suggest provisionally that the particular intimacy of intellectuals' mediating labors within nationalism offers many opportunities for intellectuals' self-knowledge to be generalized, codified, and publicized as social knowledge (Boyer 2000, Giesen 1998). If, as Marx & Engels wrote, all social actors are disposed to project their relational knowledge of the world as absolute knowledge (1970), then the elite cultural status and mediational opportunities afforded certain intellectuals guarantees that their visions of social belonging and identity will influence and even channel social imaginations more broadly.

To our minds, recognizing the agency of intellectuals in nationalism (and the

significance of nationalism as one kind of expression of the social knowledge of intellectuals) should assure the comparative study of the intellectual practices a vital place in future anthropologies of nationalism. The anthropology of intellectuals within nationalism promises to dip below the cloud cover of public culture and social movements and into the rich social complexity of intellectual culture that contributes so much of the epistemic and semiotic work associated with the cultural forms and processes of nationalism. It also promises to strengthen the reflexive horizon of the anthropology of nationalism

because, following Bauman 1987b, acknowledging the intimate relationship of intellectualism and nationalism is also, invariably, acknowledging something about ourselves and about the stakes of our own labors of interpretation and representation in academic, political, and public culture. In this respect, by confronting us with the opportunities and dilemmas of our own intellectualism, we feel that the anthropology of intellectuals will also be well placed to contribute to the growing call for new modes of “public anthropology” (see Besteman & Gusterson 2005).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank especially their colleagues at Cornell, the New School, and the University of Chicago for a series of stimulating conversations that contributed to the formation of the analyses and arguments in this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abu-Lughod L. 1991. Finding a place for Islam: Egyptian television serials and the national interest. *Public Cult.* 5:493–513
- Abu-Lughod L. 2005. *Dramas of Nationhood: The Politics of Television in Egypt*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Anderson B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
- Appadurai A. 1997. The research ethic and the spirit of internationalism. *Items* 51(4):55–60
- Appadurai A. 1998. Dead certainty: ethnic violence in the era of globalization. *Public Cult.* 10(2):225–47
- Aronowitz S. 1998. The last good job in America. In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University*, ed. R Martin, pp. 202–21. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Asad T, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities
- Bartra R. 1997. *The Artificial Savage: Modern Myths of the Wild Man*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Bauman Z. 1987a. Intellectuals in East-Central Europe: continuity and change. *East. Eur. Polit. Soc.* 1:162–86
- Bauman Z. 1987b. *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Bell D. 1973. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books
- Benda J. 1928. *The Treason of the Intellectuals*. Transl. R Aldington, 1969. Boston: Beacon (From French)
- Benedict R. 1934. *Patterns of Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin

- Besteman C, Gusterson H, eds. 2005. *Why America's Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Bhabha H, ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London, UK: Routledge
- Bhabha H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London, UK: Routledge
- Boas F. 1929. *Anthropology and Modern Life*. London, UK: Allen & Unwin
- Boon JA. 1982. *Other Tribes, Other Scribes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Boone E, Mignolo W, eds. 1996. *Writing Without Words: Alternative Literacies in Mesoamerica and the Andes*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Bourdieu P. 1984. *Homo Academicus*. Transl. P Collier, 1988. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press (From French)
- Bourdieu P. 1988. *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*. Transl. P Collier, 1991. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press (From French)
- Bourgois P. 1995. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Boyer D. 2000. On the sedimentation and accreditation of social knowledges of difference: mass media, journalism, and the reproduction of East/West alterities in Unified Germany. *Cult. Anthropol.* 15(4):459–91
- Boyer D. 2001. Media markets, mediating labors, and the branding of East German culture at 'Super Illu.' *Soc. Text* 68:9–33
- Boyer D. 2003. Censorship as a vocation: the institutions, practices, and cultural logic of media control in the German Democratic Republic. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 45(3):511–45
- Boyer D. 2005a. *Spirit and System: Media, Intellectuals and the Dialectic in Modern German Culture*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Boyer D. 2005b. The corporeality of expertise. *Ethnos* 70(2): 243–66. In press
- Breckenridge C. 1989. The aesthetics and politics of collecting: India at world fairs. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 31(2):195–216
- Brenneis D. 1994. Discourse and discipline at the National Research Council: a bureaucratic *Bildungsroman*. *Cult. Anthropol.* 9(1):23–36
- Brubaker R. 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Burt RJ. 1994. Introduction: the "new" censorship. In *The Administration of Aesthetics: Censorship, Political Criticism and the Public Sphere*, ed. R Burt, pp. xi–xxix. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Chartier R. 1991. *The Cultural Origin of the French Revolution*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Chatterjee P. 1986. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*. London, UK: Zed
- Chatterjee P. 1993. *The Nation and Its Fragments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Clifford J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Clifford J, Marcus GE, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Cohn B. 1996. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Cole D. 1985. *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts*. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
- Collins R. 1998. *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap
- Corrigan P, Sayer D. 1985. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell

- Coser LA. 1965. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. New York: Free Press
- Crapanzano V. 1980. *Tubami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Daniel EV, Peck JM, eds. 1996. *Culture/Contexture: Explorations in Anthropology and Literary Studies*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Djilas M. 1957. *The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System*. New York: Praeger
- Dornfeld B. 1999. *Producing Public Television, Producing Public Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Duara P. 1995. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Dumont L. 1994. *German Ideology: From France to Germany and Back*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Dwyer K. 1982. *Moroccan Dialogues: Anthropology in Question*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- Elias N. 1939. *The Civilizing Process*. Vol. 1: *The History of Manners*. Transl. E Jephcott, 1994. Oxford, UK: Blackwell (From German)
- Elman BA. 2000. *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Engels F. 1972. *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. New York: International
- Escobar A. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Evans-Pritchard EE. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Eyerman R. 1994. *Between Culture and Politics: Intellectuals in Modern Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Fabiani JL. 1988. *Les Philosophes de la République*. Paris: Minuit
- Fardon R, ed. 1995. *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge
- Fei H. 1953. *China's Gentry: Essays in Rural-Urban Relations*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Feierman S. 1990. *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Ferguson J. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Fernandez JW, Huber M, eds. 2001. *Irony in Action: Anthropology, Practice and the Moral Imagination*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Foucault M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. C Gordon. New York: Pantheon
- Frazer JG. 1890. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion*. London, UK: Macmillan
- Friedrich P. 1986. *The Language Parallax: Linguistic Relativism and Poetic Indeterminacy*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press
- Frykman J, Löfgren O. 1987. *Culture Builders: A Historical Anthropology of Middle-Class Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
- Geertz C. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press
- Gella A, ed. 1976. *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals: Theory, Method, and Case Study*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Gellner E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Giesen B. 1993. *Intellectuals and the Nation: Collective Identity in a German Axial Age*. Transl. N Levis, A Weisz, 1998. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press (From German)
- Ginsburg F, Abu-Lughod L, Larkin B, eds. 2002. *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

- Goody J. 1986. *The Logic of Writing and the Organization of Society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Gouldner A. 1979. *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York: Seabury
- Gramsci A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and transl. Q Hoare, GN Smith, 1947. New York: International (From Italian)
- Grimshaw A, Hart K. 1993. *Anthropology and the Crisis of the Intellectuals*. Cambridge, UK: Prickly Pear
- Guss D. 2000. *The Festive State: Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism as Cultural Performance*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Gusterson H. 2004. *People of the Bomb: Portraits of America's Nuclear Complex*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Gutiérrez N. 1999. *Nationalist Myths and Ethnic Identities: Indigenous Intellectuals and the Mexican State*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
- Habermas J. 1962. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Transl. T Burger, 1991. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (From German)
- Handler R. 1988. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Handler R, Segal D. 1990. *Jane Austen and the Fiction of Culture: An Essay on the Narration of Social Realities*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
- Hannerz U. 1990. Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In *Global Culture*, ed. M Featherstone, pp. 237–51. London: Sage
- Hannerz U. 2003. *Foreign News: Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Haraszti M. 1986. *The Velvet Prison: Artists Under State Socialism*. Transl. K Landesmann, S Landesmann, S Wasserman, 1987. New York: Basic Books (From Hungarian)
- Hebdige D. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen
- Herzfeld M. 1997a. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*. New York: Routledge
- Herzfeld M. 1997b. *Portrait of a Greek Imagination: An Ethnographic Biography of Andreas Nenedakis*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Hess DJ. 1991. *Spirits and Scientists: Ideology, Spiritism, and Brazilian Culture*. State College: Penn. Univ. State Press
- Hobsbawm EJ. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth and Reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Hobsbawm EJ, Ranger TO, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Holmes DR, Marcus GE. 2005. Cultures of expertise and the management of globalization: toward the re-functioning of ethnography. In *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*, ed. A Ong, SJ Collier, pp. 235–52. London: Blackwell
- Holston J. 1989. *The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Hymes D, ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage
- Jackson M. 1998. *Minima Ethnographica: Intersubjectivity and the Anthropological Project*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Jackson MW. 2000. *Spectrum of Belief: Joseph von Fraunhofer and the Craft of Precision Optics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Jacoby R. 1987. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books
- Kang NH. 2000. Mimicry and difference: a spectralogy for the neo-colonial intellectual. *Traces* 1:123–58

- Konrád G, Széleányi I. 1978. *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power: A Sociological Study of the Role of the Intelligentsia in Socialism*. Transl. A Arato, RF Allen, 1979. New York: Harcourt Brace (From Hungarian)
- Latour B. 1984. *The Pasteurization of France*. Transl. A Sheridan, J Law, 1988. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press (From French)
- Lévy-Bruhl L. 1910. *How Natives Think*. Transl. L Clare, 1996. New York: Washington Sq. (From French)
- Lomnitz C. 2001. *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico: An Anthropology of Nationalism*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Lomnitz-Adler C. 1992. *Exits from the Labyrinth: Culture and Ideology in the Mexican National Space*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Lyotard JF. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Transl. G Bennington, B Massumi, 1984. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press (From French)
- Malkki L. 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Mannheim K. 1929. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Transl. L Wirth, E Shils, 1955. New York: Harcourt Brace (From German)
- Mannheim K. 1971a. The problem of a sociology of knowledge. See Wolff 1971, pp. 59–115
- Mannheim K. 1971b. The ideological and the sociological interpretation of intellectual phenomena. See Wolff 1971, pp. 116–31
- Marcus GE, Fischer MMJ. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Martin E. 1994. *Flexible Bodies: Tracking Immunity in American Culture from the Days of Polio to the Age of AIDS*. Boston: Beacon
- Marx K, Engels F. 1970. *The German Ideology*. New York: International
- Mascia-Lees FE, Sharpe P, Cohen CB. 1989. The postmodernist turn in anthropology: cautions from a feminist perspective. *Signs* 15(11):7–33
- Maurer B. 2002. Anthropological and accounting knowledge in Islamic banking and finance: rethinking critical accounts. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 8(4):645–67
- Mitchell T. 1988. *Colonising Egypt*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Munasinghe V. 2005. Reclaiming theory in the face of epistemological collapse: rescuing theory from the nation. In *Knowing How to Know*, ed. N Halstead, E Hirsch, J Okely. Oxford, UK: Berghahn. In press
- Nettl JP. 1969. Ideas, intellectuals, and structures of dissent. In *On Intellectuals*, ed. P Rieff, pp. 53–122. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday
- Nietzsche F. 1956. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday
- Parsons T. 1969. ‘The intellectual’: a social role category. In *On Intellectuals*, ed. P Rieff, pp. 3–26. Garden City, NY: Doubleday
- Polier N, Roseberry W. 1989. Tristes tropes: post-modern anthropologists encounter the other and discover themselves. *Econ. Soc.* 18(2):245–64
- Posner R. 2002. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Powdermaker H. 1950. *Hollywood the Dream Factory*. Boston: Little, Brown
- Rabinow P. 1999. *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Radin P. 1927. *Primitive Man as Philosopher*. New York: Appleton
- Radin P. 1938. *Primitive Religion, Its Nature and Origin*. London, UK: Hamilton
- Rama A. 1994. *The Lettered City*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Rapport N. 1994. *The Prose and the Passion: Anthropology, Literature, and the Writing of E.M. Forster*. Manchester, UK: Univ. Manchester Press

- Reed-Danahay DE, ed. 1997. *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. New York: Berg
- Robbins B. 1993. *Secular Vocations: Intellectuals, Professionalism, Culture*. New York: Verso
- Sahlins MD. 1996. The sadness of sweetness: the native anthropology of western cosmology. *Curr. Anthropol.* 37:395–415
- Said EW. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon
- Said EW. 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. London, UK: Vintage
- Sapir E. 1924. Culture, genuine and spurious. *Am. J. Sociol.* 29(4):401–29
- Schweizer P. 1988. *Shepherds, Workers, Intellectuals: Culture and Centre-Periphery Relationships in a Sardinian Village*. Stockholm: Univ. Stockholm Press
- Scott D. 1999. *Refashioning Futures: Criticism after Postcoloniality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Scott JC. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press
- Shapin S. 1994. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth Century England*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Shils E. 1972. *The Intellectuals and the Powers, and Other Essays*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Shryock A. 2004. *Off Stage/On Display: Intimacy and Ethnography in the Age of Public Culture*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press
- Shumway N. 1991. *The Invention of Argentina*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Siu H, ed. 1990. *Furrows: Peasants, Intellectuals, and the State. Stories and Histories from Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press
- Sommer D. 1991. *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Stoler AL. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Stoler AL. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Stone L. 1972. *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529–1642*. New York: Harper & Row
- Subrahmanyam S. 1998. *The Career and Legend of Vasco da Gama*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Suny RG, Kennedy MD, eds. 1999. *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Szelényi I. 1982. The intelligentsia in the class structure of state-socialist societies. In *Marxist Inquiries*, ed. M Burawoy, T Skocpol, pp. 287–326. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Taussig M. 1987. *Shamanism, Colonialism and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Taylor L. 1997. Mediating Martinique: the “paradoxical trajectory” of Raphaël Confiant. In *Cultural Producers in Perilous States*, ed. GE Marcus, pp. 259–329. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Tedlock D, Mannheim B, eds. 1995. *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
- Tenorio-Trillo M. 1996. *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Tilly C. 1985. War making and state making as organized crime. In *Bringing the State Back In*, ed. PB Evans, D Rueschemeyer, T Skocpol, pp. 169–91. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Turner V. 1967. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Tylor EB. 1970. *Religion in Primitive Culture*. New York: Harper & Row

- Verdery K. 1991. *National Ideology under Socialism*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Warren KB. 1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Weber M. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Transl. AM Henderson, T Parsons. New York: Free Press (From German)
- Weber M. 1958. The Chinese literati. In *From Max Weber*, ed. HH Gerth, CW Mills, pp. 416–44. London, UK: Routledge
- Willis P. 1977. *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House
- Winegar J. 2003. *Claiming Egypt: the cultural politics of artistic practice in a postcolonial society*. PhD thesis. New York Univ.
- Wolff KH, ed. 1971. *From Karl Mannheim*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Zola E. 1998. *The Dreyfus Affair: J'accuse, and Other Writings*, ed. A Pages. Transl. E Leveux. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press
- Zuidema RT. 1990. *Inca Civilization in Cuzco*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Copyright of Annual Review of Anthropology is the property of Annual Reviews Inc.. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of *Annual Review of Anthropology* is the property of Annual Reviews Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.