



Letters

Author(s): Claude Levi-Strauss, Hill Gates, William H. Newell, Keelung Hong, John Ryle, Michael Banton

Source: *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 10, No. 5 (Oct., 1994), pp. 25-28

Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2783085>

Accessed: 11/02/2009 18:13

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=rai>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Anthropology Today*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Turnbull retired in 1983 and became a Buddhist monk in India under the name of Lobsang Rigdol, though he returned to Virginia during his final illness. Controversy continued after his death when his *Times* obituary said that the Ik were a 'vicious' people with 'sadistic customs'. RAI President Professor Roland Littlewood, in a

letter to the Editor (3 August), conceded that Turnbull's ethnography had been challenged on grounds of accuracy but pointed out that 'far from depicting them as some sort of savage civilization, Turnbull speculated that the Ik were merely a little way ahead of the rest of us in disregarding our obligations to

our fellows and to our environment...' (See obituary in *The Times*, 1 August.) □

David Brooks, lecturer in anthropology, University of Durham 1968-89, died on 29 April 1994 at the age of 53. We also regret to announce the deaths of **A.E. Mourant FRS, G. Reichel-Dolmatoff** (RAI Honorary Fellow) and **Ildiko Vasary**. Obituaries will appear shortly.

letters

Anthropology in Taiwan

One of the sadnesses of great age is that one is exposed and even compelled to witness the distortions inflicted to one's thought by commentators either obtuse or malevolent, or both.

To those it seems that Keelung Hong ('Experiences of being a native', A.T., 10.3, June 1994, end of p.7) has fallen a victim as well as I.

May I give him some solace by pointing out that, contrary to what he was made to believe, I was actually (and still am) on his side when writing that 'primitive thought shows itself to be more trustworthy than are some sociologists' (*Elementary Structures of Kinship*, p.450), and that 'each culture has its own theoreticians whose contributions deserve the same attention as that which the anthropologist gives to colleagues'. (*Structural Anthropology*, p.282). □

Claude Lévi-Strauss

Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale, Collège de France, Paris.

Once again, Hong Keelung lambastes a United States anthropologist – Margery Wolf in this case – for work done in and about Taiwan. Once again, he repeats his only real criticisms: that some of us are sometimes inept with the languages used in Taiwan, that there was at one time a tendency to essentialize a pan-Chinese culture and use Taiwan as a locale for sampling it; and that western anthropologists have actively conspired to further Guomintang oppression, and thus to repress and conceal a developing Taiwanese identity.

There is truth in the first two contentions; the third is absurd, a product partly of sincere political commitment, but mostly of the theoretical silliness that would have words more powerful than action.

Ability in the large Sino-Tibetan language family among anthropologists of my generation and older is often weaker than we could wish. In my own case, I began to study one Chinese language, Mandarin, only at age twenty-five. When I began the study of Taiwanese – a Chinese language as different from Mandarin as French is from, say, Romanian – I simultaneously studied with two native speaker teachers, using two different textbooks with separate systems of romanization and tone-marking. My teachers

chose these two books because they spoke two strongly differentiated local dialects (of which each was proud). Each dialect had a slightly different system of tone sandhi. Neither of these two Taiwanese dialects aligned perfectly with the Taipei City local speech in which I was attempting to conduct my fieldwork. Needless to say, my spoken Taiwanese was, and remains, a problem for which I compensate by working closely with multilingual field assistants, as do most anthropologists in most parts of the world where languages not closely related to their own are spoken.

Hong Keelung comments snidely on the absence of 'Chinese' [sic] characters in some anthropologists' texts. An argument can be made for glossing all romanized Chinese-language terms – whatever Chinese language is used – in characters, but very considerable difficulties stand in the way of doing this. One is the expense of adding characters to an alphabetic printing job; another is the unfamiliarity of most Taiwanese with the written form of their own language, which is not (contrary to myth) identical to the written forms of other Chinese languages. But an argument can also be made for abandoning characters altogether as just one more piece of imperialist-China impedimenta, unsuited for Taiwan's current needs, and a horrendous and unnecessary learning burden for the young. I have heard this position voiced by Taiwanese people at all levels of society as a part of a programme of developing a more fully independent and democratic Taiwanese culture. I am surprised that Hong is so eager to retain the dominant icon of an imperializing pan-Chinese culture; the written characters are as central to the construction of a *Chinese* identity as anything in the culture.

To take up Hong's point about anthropologists' seeking 'traditional Chinese culture' in Taiwan: I criticized this notion in a book review in the mid-1970s, and believe anthropologists have long ceased to err in this way. Fortunately, many excellent indigenous anthropologists, historians, sociologists and other scholars remained in or have returned to Taiwan to do scholarly work on Taiwanese culture. They are well

able to supply the necessary correctives to the inevitable faults committed by outsiders.

Hong's final criticism – that western anthropologists' work about Taiwan contributed to continued Guomintang hegemony – smells of opportunism. Of all the outsiders doing research in Taiwan whom I have known, anthropologists may have been the *only* ones who focussed close, specific and principled attention on the indigenous Han cultures there. We lived in Taiwanese villages and working-class neighbourhoods and argued vociferously with outsiders and outside-Taiwan Chinese economists, aid people, political scientists, art historians, and literateurs that Taiwanese culture was rich, dynamic, and worthy of study. I have had young managerial types tell me that Taiwanese (as opposed to Mainlanders) were unintelligent, poorly educated, and incapable of entrepreneurship (!), but have never heard anything but the most vigorous championing of Taiwanese rights in their homeland from anthropologists. Many of us have worked together, often for decades, with Taiwan colleagues – many of them open and strong supporters of Taiwanese independence.

Hong attacks anthropologists, who have at least tried to present the Taiwanese in their fullness and complexity. Yet he says nothing of the many outside scholars who actively assisted Guomintang policies and principles. Hong (and Stephen Murray, with whom he often writes) attacks friends and ignores enemies. Why is this?

Opportunism – taking on anthropologists, who rank low in the academic pecking order, while ignoring economists and other such people who actually get a hearing from governments – is only part of the answer. Hong would get nowhere with his native-robbled-of-his-heritage complaints without *something* concrete to criticize. What does that concreteness consist of? In all his arguments, his strongest evidence for cultural imperialism is in anthropologists' use of language.

That he gains a hearing in ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY on these trivial points is not due to the strength of Taiwanese nationalist arguments, but to the weakness of anthropological thinking. Late in the twentieth century, it may make sense

to focus on the ideational culture of advanced capitalist societies, since we can take their political-economic trajectories for granted. But it makes no sense to do so for Taiwan, where a very different balance of state production, corporate capitalism and family firms create a structure that renders Taiwan culture far from transparent. It is positively dim to argue that words are the main issue in a state where the dominant party still owns massive chunks of what should be the people's property; where militarism still robs people of appropriate public transport; where schools are still brutally overcrowded and undersupplied. Language matters to people. But its misuse cannot do the same damage as neighbourhood naphtha crackers and the rising tide of undisposed garbage and sewage. Western anthropologists must bear some blame for leading Hong Keelung around the linguistic turn to a trivialization of his people's real problems.

As I wrote some years ago to Hong in our correspondence over my own sometimes-careless use of language: language matters very little; political economy matters a lot. I urged him then, and urge him now, to take aim against those who supported the Guomintang in their direct control of power and resources, and to show more generosity of spirit to people like Margery Wolf, whose *House of Lim* does more to honour Taiwanese culture than anything Hong is ever likely to do. □

Hill Gates

Senior Research Associate, Department of Anthropology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. 94305-2145.

1. Guomintang = Kuomintang (KMT). *Editor*.

I take exception to the article by Keelung Hong (A.T., June 1994) which is full of exaggerations or mis-statements that under-emphasize or deny the work done by foreign and Chinese anthropologists on *Taiwanese* culture. I will just mention two or three mis-statements.

Paragraph 4: Anthropologists (especially Chinese anthropologists) working on Taiwan are not interested in Taiwanese culture. False. The Institute of Ethnology in the Academia Sinica, Taipei, published material more or less exclusively on Taiwan. This used to be a contrast to the Institute of Philology and History, which mostly produces comparative material on China including Taiwan. Both are within the Academia Sinica but at the present time both mostly publish material almost entirely on Taiwan. The Institute of Philology has recently sponsored a conference on Austronesian languages (which includes many of the original languages inhabitants of Taiwan still use). Ever since I first entered Taiwan in 1960, the Institute of Ethnology has studied Taiwan as a separate anthropological field (as has the ethnology department of Taiwan National University). A more recent conference recently held by

the Institute of Philology is concerned with how to allow Taiwanese (not Mandarin) languages to be introduced into primary schools. The Institute of Ethnology publishes a list of some hundred publications on Taiwan every few years and has done so ever since I have been associated with the Institute. Hong seems to be unaware of this mass of material.

Paragraph 3. 'Her romanization (*Shang ti kung*) particularly mystified me'. The characters are 上帝公. This last character often means 'public' but it can be used as in 辟公, a feudal prince or in the word *duan kung*, a medium. There is nothing mysterious in the use of this expression. It is just a matter of using a Mandarin expression for a Taiwanese use, extremely common considering that the whole of the school system has been forced to use Chinese mainland speech in schools instead of common Taiwanese usage.

As for graves, Hong seems to have a simplistic notion of Taiwanese custom, which varies very much in different parts of the island. In areas where reburial takes place and the washing of bones, it is quite common not to rebury the dead person earlier than eight or nine years after death. Sometimes the place of first burial is forgotten and I know of several cases where the father's grave is unknown and only the mother's is known. At other times only one descendant's name is written on the parents' tomb. Unmarried girls are mostly commemorated in special nunneries with a photograph only and no names, but this rejection of unmarried girls does not apply to the original Taiwanese, the aboriginal people. For one thing the Paiwanese are matrilineal. The funeral customs of MinNan speaking Taiwanese, north and south of Chang Hua, are quite radically different. In the north the funeral takes about five hours; in the south at least 36 hours from beginning to end. In most of Taiwan, men's and women's names are equally written on tombstones. But in most of southern Taiwan, unmarried girls' names are *never* written on tombstones unless they get married after death.

Hong's gripes against American and Chinese ethnologists are eight years out of date. I think that ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY should not publish an article such as this which is misinformed and out of date and by a non-anthropologist which enters into a denunciatory attack on an anthropologist like Margery Wolf.

Taiwan is an independent country now wishing to enter the United Nations under its own recognizance. It claims to be a unitary multi-national independent democratic state with its own history, its own territory and its own elected government. Each nationality in Taiwan claims the right to use its own language. The most widespread spoken language is MinNan (which is fairly close to the Hokkien spoken on the mainland). This language is mostly spoken by early immigrants from China plus a special group

of what are known as *ping di* (plainspeople) who were formerly *yuantzumin* (aborigines). It is possible now to acquire certain types of written material in other Taiwanese languages also, so that linguistically Taiwan is a multi-national state of different groups each claiming their own language. Some originally aboriginal people especially in Tainan *hsien* now speak only MinNan but again some other tribal groups now speak mainly Mandarin to outsiders but their own language to themselves. They are genuinely bilingual. Both these groups regard themselves as truly Taiwanese, not having originated from overseas. Hong does not seem to refer to them as Taiwanese but to confine all his remarks to MinNan speakers, about 70% of the island. No language census has ever been carried out on the island. □

William H. Newell

Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney

In reply to Charles Stafford (A.T., August 1994): money for 'Chinese studies' did not fall from Heaven! The Chiang family, the Kuomintang (KMT) party, and the 'Republic of China' (ROC) have been inextricable since the 1920s in China and since they were imposed on Taiwan as an army of occupation in 1945. The Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation exists to maintain the conflation of Taiwan with China on which the ROC fiction depends. Money extracted from the occupied island is tainted even if there is no direct quid pro quo.

Given that political discussion was brutally repressed for two generations, Taiwanese interviewed by foreign scholars (especially those officially sponsored) are likely to be reluctant to discuss Taiwanese nationalism. Discussing independence, even without advocating it, remained seditious for some years after martial law was lifted in 1987. What people in a police state say needs to be interpreted with care and with a sense of the context of domination that anthropologists have notoriously ignored throughout the sordid history of anthropologists' seeking to serve colonial and neo-colonial powers.

There are no 'innocent bystanders'. Labelling something 'Chinese' is as political as to call it 'Taiwanese'. Trivializing mutually unintelligible languages as dialects supports the imposition of one. Labelling affirmation that there is Taiwanese culture advocacy of independence is a KMT tactic mimicked by Stafford.

As for Margery Wolf, her most recent pontificating about 'ethnographic responsibility' is anything but 'modest'. 'Bad faith' is Stafford's label. Ours is 'ethnographic irresponsibility'. It is unfair only if ethnographers have no responsibility to the people they study, but only to whatever regime permits them access to the field.

I now turn to the letters above. If I misunderstood 'For conscious models, which are usually known as "norms", are by definition very poor ones, since they are not intended to explain the phenomena but to perpetuate them' (*Structural Anthropology*, p.273), I would be happy to welcome Lévi-Strauss to my side¹, beleaguered as it is by anthropologists defensive about their ability to understand or even to write down accurately what natives say, and impatient with the difficulty of the languages spoken on Taiwan. Other anthropologists who have written to A.T. to criticize me think that anthropologists' claims of good intentions suffice to prove their benignancy, that it should certainly never allow uppity natives to question what these superior beings do, but that when the society studied is anthropology, *only* the natives know anything.

If not Lévi-Strauss, then Hill Gates provides an example of certainty that native concerns (e.g. language and ethnicity) are epiphenomenal and the superior alien has the answer (in this case, Marxism)², repeating again her *a priori* rejection of ethnicity while ignoring the experiences of ethnic oppression I related³.

The KMT made intrinsically unimportant differences of language(s) and culture into justifications for ethnic stratification. How such differences are used in constructing inferiority and rationalizing discrimination matters. Earlier, Gates recognized that the imposition of Beijinghua was important to the reproduction of Chinese-domination of Taiwanese⁴. She may now consider her earlier insight 'trivial', but language (particularly in broadcasting) remains hotly contested in Taiwan. Command of and 'accent' in speaking Beijinghua continue to be used in rationalizing mainlander privilege (as in derogations Gates mentions hearing).

I do not think that someone who is taking money from the ROC (through Academia Sinica) and who was permitted by the ROC to do research on Taiwan while I was barred from visiting my family there is in any position to accuse me of 'opportunism'. I have written and spoken extensively (generally in Taiwanese publications and venues) about the underside of what some offensively call the 'Taiwan miracle'. Political economy is by no means missing from our book *Taiwanese Culture, Taiwanese Society*⁵, which is much harsher about complicity with KMT domination by Gates's Stanford political economist neighbours than is anything in it about anthropologists, and which includes discussion of much other political economy research.

American political scientists and economists indeed have received more money directly from the ROC than have anthropologists, and have written much ideological nonsense. They have not, however, confused Taiwan and China, as anthropologists (including Arthur Wolf and Margery Wolf) *continue* to do. I wrote of a

'dovetailing' of anthropologists' and ROC interest in considering Taiwan to be China, not conscious intent, let alone 'actively conspiring'.

I am unimpressed that Gates employs multilingual field assistants. Like Margery Wolf, Gates omits their names even from acknowledgements, let alone from bylines (see her *Chinese* [n.b.] *Working-Class Lives*, Cornell U.P., Ithaca, N.Y.). Benighted natives cannot perform analysis: superior alien analytical skills must be added to the raw materials mined by drones who can actually speak the languages and who live the cultures. The manufactured product then is credited solely to the foreign manager of such data.

I doubt that Gates's closing slap at me is based on knowledge of what I have done in Holo. In her view culture is doled out to inferior peoples only if and when aliens write something in English. I have never met any Taiwanese who learned anything s/he did not already know about Taiwanese culture from Margery Wolf's writings or who feels that we should be grateful she honoured us by writing about what she continues to call 'Chinese life'. Wolf – who acknowledged weak command of Mandarin and a 'total lack of Hokkien' (which she called a 'dialect') – described *The House of Lim: A Study of a Chinese* [n.b.] *Farm Family*, pp.v-vi (Prentice-Hall, London, 1968) as a contribution to 'our [n.b.] understanding of being Chinese'. This is an 'honour' we can do without, and a prime example of looking through Taiwanese to write about a singular *Chinese* culture. Taiwanese culture is unthinkable to Margery Wolf. That we might tell our lives without an alien intermediary/analyst seems equally unthinkable to Gates.

I did not comment (snidely or any other way) on the absence of characters in some anthropologists' texts. Rather, I related that Margery Wolf did not specify what language she was romanizing. Newell's condescending lesson in Beijinghua does nothing to resolve the question of which language 'kung' is.

Indeed, he writes nothing that is relevant to my points. Wolf wrote about married Han women's names and I refuted her claims. Besides his very offensive assumptions that I do not know anything about Taiwanese funeral customs, or about the language in which I was schooled and in which I taught, and that I need to be told that the Academia Sinica's Institute of Ethnology publishes a bulletin⁶, Newell obfuscates recklessly. I have been extremely careful to include non-Holo speakers as 'Taiwanese', and recurrently have advocated respect for the mother tongues of *all* Taiwanese ethnic groups (including Hakka, which by application of his silly method one would have to conclude that he excludes from 'Taiwanese').

More important than his spurious personal attack on me is his misrepresentation of the

current ROC attempt to rejoin the United Nations. It has *not* renounced its claim to be the legitimate government of China (and of Mongolia). It is *not* applying for UN membership as the Republic of Taiwan. The 'multiple nations' it purports to encompass are Han, Tibetan, Manchurian, Mongol, etc., *not* Taiwanese ethnic groups. Although I think that A.T. should not have published Newell's denunciatory letter, his blatant misrepresentations show that (consciously or not) anthropologists continue to provide ideological service to the ROC, while treating Taiwanese like me with undisguised contempt. Similar arrogance and histories of complicity with domination made anthropologists unwelcome in many post-independence countries. Gates and Newell increase the likelihood that Taiwan will become another. □

Keelung Hong

1360 De Haro Street, San Francisco, CA. 94107.

1. I never believed that he thought *every* 'professional' anthropologist's model was superior to *any* native's. In *Structural Anthropology* he held out the possibility that native models might be true, and cautioned that, even if erroneous, they are consequential (social facts).
2. Also note her ability to judge what is 'real' in her second sentence, her superior ability to distinguish friends from enemies for us, and her deciding for us that our languages should be represented 'alphabetically'.
3. She also ignores the experiences of American anthropology I wrote about. The only part of my experience that interests her is my recalcitrance in recognizing her superior insight. This exemplifies the venerable American genre convention of framing 'natives' as child-like incorrigibles unable to recognize selfless *noblesse oblige* when whites reveal Truth to savages sadly incapable of recognizing and understanding such marvellous gifts.
4. In *The Anthropology of Taiwanese Society*, edited by Emily Ahem and Hill Gates (Stanford U. P., 1981), p.263.
5. Lanham, Maryland: U. P. of America, 1994 (co-authored by Stephen O. Murray).
6. We reviewed many works published here in our book. Newell's scholarship, not mine, is defective.

Ethnic conflict in Africa

Nigel Clarke (A.T. August 1994) is right to draw attention to the role of ethnicity in civil war, but he does not do justice to the work of specialists on Southern Sudan. He accuses anthropologists of 'aloofness' in the face of ethnic conflict and asks how many are aware of the internal fighting among the Nuer. Yet he must know that the two leading outside authorities on the Nuer, Sharon Hutchinson and Douglas H. Johnson, have both made recent visits to the Nuer area (the former under the auspices of Save The Children Fund, the organization Nigel Clarke himself works for). Another distinguished anthropologist of the Sudan, Wendy James, has carried out research for the UN with displaced

peoples from the Ethiopian border whose fate has become entwined with that of the Nuer.

As frequent visitors to the war zone, these scholars are well aware of the fighting between sections of the Lou and Jikany Nuer. The final chapter of Douglas Johnson's recently published *Nuer Prophets* (OUP, 1994) discusses the early signs of this conflict, as does Sharon Hutchinson's forthcoming work *The Nuer in Crisis*.

But it is not just ethnic conflict that demands attention: pastoralist diplomacy and local peace-making are also significant. Currently, southerners and concerned outsiders are awaiting the outcome of a peace conference called in Akobo in an attempt to settle the Lou-Jikany dispute.

In the fields of scholarship, advocacy and documentation – and hands-on relief work – anthropologists of Southern Sudan have, with one or two exceptions, stood by the peoples they spring from or have lived among. A Sudanese anthropologist and diplomat, Frances Mading Deng, has taken a leading part in discussion of the war in international fora. A Southern medical anthropologist, Jok Madut Jok, is working in his home area for Save The Children Fund. Two other anthropologists, Andy Mawson and Alex de Waal, have played prominent roles for some years in the British and US-based human rights organizations that chronicle, *inter alia*, the multifarious abuses perpetrated by the government of Sudan and by the factions of the Sudan Peoples's Liberation Army.

A charge of fair-weather friendship could be brought with more justice against scholars of the Nuba peoples of South Kordofan. The non-Arab and part-islamicized Nuba have been the subject of a sustained campaign of terror by the Sudanese military government. By dispossessing them of their land and suppressing non-Islamic aspects of their culture, government-backed forces in Kordofan province seek to divide the Nuba among themselves and assimilate them

forcibly to the culture of the riverine North, reducing them to landless labourers on Arab-owned farms.

Although Nuba communities have been the subject of several recent monographs by scholars from western countries (as well as two controversial photographic essays by Leni Riefenstahl) none of these scholars, as far as I am aware, has taken part in the campaign to publicize their current plight. A leading role in that campaign has, however, been taken by a French ethnographic film-maker, Hugo D'Aybaury. His film, *The Right to be Nuba*, made in exceptionally difficult circumstances in the rebel-controlled areas of South Kordofan, has yet to find a broadcast outlet in this country. □

John Ryle

2 St Luke's Mews, London W11 1DF

Johan Pottier (A.T. August 1994) asks why the UN Secretary-General was not better informed about events in Rwanda.

One channel of information to him is through reports of the committee which examines reports submitted by states parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination¹. Members of that committee in 1989 expressed increasing concern about trends in Burundi. Alarmed by reports from Amnesty International, and in the absence of further reports from the states, the committee in 1992 used its power to call for further information from the two governments. That may not sound the innovatory step it was, but the UN is an organization of states, and action in all UN bodies is influenced by the principle of the sovereign equality of member states (UN Charter article 2.1). The reporting record of Burundi and Rwanda was not worse than that of many other states.

In August 1993 the committee was due to consider the situation in Rwanda in the light of the report of the international commission of inquiry sponsored by four NGOs. Unfortunately it postponed this item for

seven months, partly in order to respond to the Secretary-General's report, *An Agenda for Peace*, which opened up ways for treaty bodies like the committee to develop a role in preventing the escalation of conflicts. Otherwise the committee could have sounded a warning about Rwanda within the UN system.

Readers should understand that in some countries there is concern about the proposal for treaty bodies to draw the attention of the Security Council to what they consider threatening situations. There is a fear that Security Council action and international tribunals will display the double standards that have been evident on some earlier occasions, and that this is more likely if the action is based upon mass media reports.

Alex de Waal refers to the picture painted by the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Kigali. I can add only that his criticisms do not apply to the reports of the Special Rapporteur appointed by the UN Commission on Human Rights or of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (both 1994 appointments).²

Anthropologists who wish to supply information for the use of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination can send it either to the committee's secretary in Geneva or to the Anti-Racism Information Service (ARIS), 14 Avenue Tremblay, CH 1209 Geneva. Those interested in the reports which the human rights treaty bodies submit and the records of their discussion, should apply to their national UN information centre. □

Michael Banton

The Court House, Llanvair Discoed, Gwent NP6 6LX, Wales.

1. Michael Banton (1987). 'Eliminating Racial Discrimination', A.T., 3-4.
2. For a review of politics in Rwanda it is worth consulting Peter Molt (1994), 'Zerfall von Staat und Gesellschaft in Ruanda' *KAS Auslands-Information* (Konrad Adenauer Stiftung), 3-38.

news

EVENTS

Africa 95 is a nationwide season of African arts in U.K. galleries, museums, community centres and universities, and on television and radio. It will be launched in Birmingham in August 1995, an exhibition at the Royal Academy of classical art from Africa will open in September, and other events will run till the end of the year. It is spearheaded by an Executive Council chaired by Sir Michael Calne and including the newscaster Trevor McDonald. Other exhibitions will be devoted to African textiles in the 20th Century (Barbican Art Gallery, London), multi-media art inspired by the work of Frantz Fanon (Institute of Contemporary Arts), metalwork (Crafts Council),

and new sculpture presented at the Museum of Mankind together with British Museum collections. Enquiries to: Africa 95, Richard House, 30-32 Mortimer Street, London W1N 7RA.

MEDIA

Adam Kuper's new book *The Chosen Primate* (Harvard U.P.) is the subject of an interview by Aisling Irwin in the *Times Higher*, 5 August. Kuper presents his book as a protest against the extremism of both sociobiologists and ultra-relativists. He is quoted as saying that debates about social anthropology are more sophisticated in Europe than in the USA, since

there is more detachment from 'political controversies'. This introduction to anthropology returns to the discipline's Darwinian origins (Darwin being one of the few great intellectual masters of the last two centuries whose theories are not discredited) while referring constantly to recent research, and it aims at a general readership; it has been accepted by a book club in the USA and was discussed on Melvyn Bragg's widely followed Radio Four *Start the Week* programme in Britain. It was greeted in *New Statesman and Society* (27 May 1994) as providing a much needed general introduction to anthropology.