PART I Locations

CHAPTER 1

Argentina: Contagious Marginalities

Claudia Briones and Rosana Guber

This chapter explores the development of anthropology in Argentina in relation to both ideas and practices of politics and the political, and official common-sense understandings of cultural diversity. As Ana María Alonso (1994) has warned us, anthropologists need to exercise caution when working with analytical categories such as *ethnicity*, *nation* and *state*, in that they also form part of our common knowledge as citizens. The Argentine experience suggests that such problems result less from the uncritical reproduction of commonly accepted categories, than from the exchange between scientific theories and wider social theories. The fact is that anthropologists, other academics, state agents, and the public all create meaning from direct and indirect practices permeated by state mechanisms. These practices inform the terms "ethnicity," "nation," "state," as well as "race" and "pueblo" (the people). We also, however, create meaning from notions and practices of what constitutes "politics," "realpolitik," and "the political," and from national formations of alterity. Together these constitute our civic subjectivity.

Although anthropological constructs were at times backed by the Argentine state in its most authoritarian and intrusive phases, we argue here that there are no automatic alignments between the constructs of diversity endorsed by ethnology, folklore and social anthropology and the "officially" sponsored ones.[1] The effects of a century-old journey, the alternately tense and complicit interaction between anthropology and the Argentine state, began in the mid 19th century with state centralization and the 1853 National Constitution. Territorial expansion into native populations by the military followed from 1870 to 1920, with the incorporation of survivors into the proletariat. The decades from 1880 to 1910 brought mass immigration from overseas, laws for compulsory and free education (1880), and the assimilation of second-generation immigrants and other native inhabitants into the military via the 1901 law of compulsory male conscription. Finally, in 1912 a new law mandated voting by secret ballot for all men, and the 1918 university reform granted autonomy to institutions of higher education. This foundational moment was followed by alternating phases of democracy, partial democracy, and dictatorship, until the infamous

A Companion to Latin American Anthropology, First Edition. Edited by Deborah Poole.

Proceso de Reorganización Nacional (Process of National Reorganization, 1976–1983) and its 30,000 *desaparecidos* (disappeared persons). The democratic *apertura*, or opening, of 1983 paved the way to an unusually long period of constitutional institutionalization. This path of fitful twists and turns nonetheless contrasts with the extraordinary endurance of the matrix of "diversity" endorsed by the national state (Segato 2002). By relating sociological inequalities, read as cultural differences that are selectively rendered as ethnic or racial (Briones 1998), this state construct has operated in terms of marks and thresholds of uniformity and "alterity". The state-led ideal of Argentina as a country made up of "few Indians," "no Negroes," "mostly immigrants," and "criollos" (creoles) has shaped and stratified collective entities by "assigning them disparate qualities in terms of the consistency, porosity or even feebleness of their ethnic/racial boundaries and profiles" (Briones 2002).

The anthropological side of the story started with the first museums of "natural history" founded after 1870, and with the inclusion of anthropology courses into the teaching programs at the national universities. The first degrees in Ciencias Antropológicas (Anthropological Sciences) came out in 1957 and 1958. From then on, with varying degrees of success and duration, several undergraduate and graduate programs were established in Anthropology, Social Anthropology and Archaeology.[2]

As many others have noticed, the disciplinary process intertwines with political struggle in 20th century Argentina (Bartolomé 1980; Herrán 1985; Perazzi 2003; Ratier and Ringuelet 1997; Vessuri 1992). In its most obvious and dramatic sense this means that some colleagues paid – with their lives, in prison or in exile – the price of being seen as "dangerous dissidents" or "internal enemies." In a less obvious sense, it means that in some ways the political process shaped the professional and academic tasks of the discipline (setting objects of research, topics and formats of scientific debate and research teams). These in turn affected anthropological theory and methodology. Nonetheless the articulation between the two routes – one based on the nation-state and the other based on the discipline itself – is hardly a one-way relationship.

Here we show that anthropological constructs of otherness produced by ethnologists, folklorists and social anthropologists have differed from the hegemonic constructs of alterity sponsored by the state. Such differentiation depended upon the political and institutional positions held by each subdiscipline, as well as on the ways in which each one forged its objects of knowledge. Anthropological diversity, however, has itself often fueled divisiveness and animosity, while keeping its own secrets and maintaining its sense of marginality vis-à-vis "official alterity." The official construction of alterity promotes a white, eurocentric, "nonracist" nation, while it discriminates against indigenous people, Argentines of African descent, as much as against some immigrants and *criollos* by lumping them altogether as *cabecitas negras* ("little dark heads"), because of their "inadequacy" not only in terms of skin color, but also of class and political culture. Thus, despite shared denunciations of widespread and subtle racism, Argentine anthropologists have been unsuccessful not only in unmasking the hegemonic racialization of class and region and the "enclassement" of racial and territorial segments of society, but also in regarding objectively the political predicament of the identification of "internal enemies" by means of ubiquitous standards of "unbearable politicization."

"Anthropological styles" in Latin America have often been linked to national, social, political, and academic discourses (Cardoso de Oliveira and Ruben 1995;

L'Estoile et al. 2002; Ramos 1990; Visacovsky and Guber 2002). The point in noting these "styles" is not to uncover the complicity of anthropology and anthropologists with the colonial legacy or with neocolonialism and collaborationism, as occurred in the United States with the 1980s political critique of anthropology (Asad 1973). Rather the goal is to show that the same hegemonic force against which self-appointed opponents take their antagonistic stand ends up being part of this stand itself (Laclau 1993). In Argentina, anthropologists have often complained about the marginal status of their traditional "objects of study" (Indians, *Afro-argentines*, *cabecitas negras*) in an allegedly European country, whereas their own field becomes marginal to the social sciences and the humanities. Unlike in Mexico and Brazil, Argentine anthropology also ended up in the margins "of general interest and of the common good." Founded to study the relics or survivals of the past in the present, the origins of American man, mythic consciousness, or the persistence of rural workers in an apparently modern country, the discipline has not yet managed to find a conceptual and authorized place for itself vis-à-vis its local audience. This situation has reinforced the marginality and even public silence of anthropology as a discipline (see Gordillo, this volume).

"Few Indians, No Blacks, Tons of Internal Enemies"

Since its modern formation, intellectuals and statesmen have characterized Argentina as a dual country, split into opposing segments that are difficult or impossible to reconcile. This characterization has had direct and indirect practical impact. First, the fate of the nation is conceived in terms of opposing factions, deeply rooted in the Argentine common sense (port–interior, centralists–federalists, civilization–barbarism, Peronists–anti-Peronists, authoritarianism–democracy) (Shumway 1991; see Neiburg 1998 for a critique). Second, Argentine dualism has set in motion a process through which political and social groupings have produced a myriad of internal enemies to be silenced, suppressed, or removed. As a result, the actors of modern history have taken part and taken sides, as allies or enemies, in the ensuing military coups and sudden *aperturas*. Between 1930 and 1983, there were 20 years of unconstitutional regimes, 13 years of partial democracies, and only 12 years of government by free and open elections. Hemispheric political trends and guidelines such as the US National Security Doctrine entered Argentina to enforce the ban of Peronism, and later on to eradicate the social and political militants of the early 1970s. The self-named "Proceso de Reorganización Nacional" – known today simply as either "el Proceso" (the Process) or "la dictadura" (the dictatorship) – was the climax of mounting accusations and repression, the traces of which can still be seen in the recent accusations against those who have voiced demands for indigenous rights (Muzzopappa 2000).

Encompassing ideas of "otherness" have tended to reproduce the traits that exclude both those groups identified as "unacceptable inappropriates" – who are defined in terms of their "differences" as internal others – and those sectors classified as "tolerable subordinates," that is, as the ones who are already seen as (actually or potentially) part of the national mainstream, despite their differences (Williams 1993). The moral elites of the 19th century adopted the trope of the "melting pot," less as a diagnostic

than as a project of social engineering whose goal was to create a homogeneously white Europe at the southern tip of South America. Soon after the end of the wars of independence, the leaders of the 1810 Revolution abandoned the Enlightenment dream of abolishing all forms of difference and incorporating indigenous peoples into the new nation-state, while respecting the ideal of human equality before the law (Menni 1995). To the romantics of the generation of 1837, the *civilization* that belonged to an *external other* (Europe and/or the United States) became the guiding utopia for nation-building. While indigenous peoples were progressively externalized, the label of "barbarism" (*barbarie*) was also extended to those masterless rural residents – the *gauchos* and bandits – and to the Creole masses who formed the rural armies or *montoneras* who rebelled against the centralizing power of the Port of Buenos Aires. The collective term *criollo* gained a negative connotation of a lasting nature. Native romanticism represented by the organizers of the modern state – Juan B. Alberdi, D. F. Sarmiento, José Echeverría – was based on a social realism (Soler 1979) which turned the polarity of *civilización* or *barbarie* into a representation of society, a principle of legitimization of power, and the way in which moral elites planned to take it over (Svampa 1994). The symbolic geography of the nation thus coined two images of extraordinary interpretative and pedagogic strength: the "desert" as an empty space that the government should populate; and a country in need of filling its voids with people coming down "from the ships" – mostly Europeans whose human and cultural potential were seen as a "key to progress."

Decades later, the moral elites refined those two aesthetic tropes of territorialization to justify a military advance on "Indian territory." The resulting "Conquest of the Desert" spilled over the Pampa and Patagonia regions (1879–1885), whereas "the conquest of the green desert" (1884–1911) covered the Gran Chaco. Led by the ideals of "order and progress," the modernizing "generation of the '80s" did not establish a global indigenous policy to "civilize the barbarian Indians" (Briones and Delrio 2002). State intellectuals and large portions of the non-indigenous population believed that the civilizing crusade would solve the aboriginal question in due time and in its own way, by means of physical and cultural extinction, and by the encroachment of the white population (Lenton 1992). Even those who promoted more lenient policies toward these "barbarians" rejected the idea that the indigenous peoples had any cultural contribution to make to the Argentine nation.

This negative attitude toward the aborigines and the creoles was complemented with a positive attitude toward the European immigrants whose alterity, it was believed, would disappear through racial mixing and cultural assimilation, while improving and whitening the local inhabitants. Interestingly enough, this quality, which rendered the immigrants "assimilable" and which distanced them from the indigenous peoples, also removed them from the *criollo gaucho*. This other "native" element implied a social rift in economic, educational, cultural, and politico-ideological terms. The *gaucho* was out of control, since he dwelled on the margins of the Nation, as a liminal being (Archetti 1999).

The apparently unrestricted receptiveness toward European immigrants soon gave way to a call for more "authentic" national values. The *gaucho* – already tamed – was established as the national (social) symbol. This process paralleled the condemnation of those foreigners suspected of anarchism or left-wing activism. The 1902 Residency Law allowed for the deportation of "undesirable elements" from Argentine territory,

although the hegemonic image of the Nation still maintained the civilizing and pedagogic potential of the European contingent, the absence of blacks and the scattered presence of *indios*.[3] These models for the "racialization" of both internal others and the nation in construction gave the Argentine melting pot a specific character in *mestiza* Latin America. Although Europeanness was a central and distinctive feature of the "Argentine mix," the overt exclusion of Indians and blacks (as well as "yellow" Asians), made it obvious that not just any kind of European immigrant could effect progress and civilization. In this classification game, those identified as "ethnically inconvenient elements" became markers that would devalue the chemistry of a racial, class, and politico-ideological pot.

The anti-immigration attitude and the conversion of "immigrants" into "foreigners" or "refugees" – labels which increased the threshold of "alterity" – paralleled the stock market crash of 1929 and its authoritarian effects in Europe and the Americas. The sectors that ran the state after 1930, the date of the first coup against a democratic government, until Juan D. Perón's decade (1946–55) shared a similar view concerning the "Argentine race." For example, Perón founded the Instituto Étnico Nacional (National Ethnic Institute, 1946–55) in order to regulate the entrance of foreigners. This was the first attempt at involving the national government in racial biopolitics in Argentina (Schneider 1994; Lazzari 2004). The subsequent emergence and consolidation of "Justicialismo" (or "Peronism") as a movement calling for the social and political inclusion of the urban and rural proletariat, however, was a turning point in the redefinition of the idea of the "Argentine people" (Martínez Sarasola 1992; Carrasco 1991). This notion referred first to the "pueblo trabajador" (the workers), a synonym for "pueblo peronista" which the elite or "antipatriotic oligarchy" (in Eva Perón's words) chastised as *cabecitas negras* (little black heads), *aluvión zoológico* (zoo-like alluvium), and *descamisados* (the shirtless ones) for trying to occupy the public sphere (Taylor 1979). Such labels resulted in a national core that included all those of humble economic status, no matter what their ethnic background. Therefore, the constitutional reform of 1949, which was in force until the 1955 anti-Peronist coup, acknowledged social and economic rights – mainly labor rights – for all citizens, while it revoked the only article that mentioned indigenous peoples.[4] To maintain such a distinction within the body of the Argentine people constituted, according to Perón, an act of flagrant and unforgivable discrimination. Paradoxically, if indigenous peoples were "integrated" for the first time into the "Argentine people" because they were unprivileged, they remained deprived of their character as original peoples, distinct, and predating the nation-state.

Anthropology established its professional credentials in the open wounds of the 1955 coup and the mounting repression of Peronistas. Although the political change did not entail a radical transformation in the "official theories" of diversity, nor a uniform adoption of state proposals on the part of the subdisciplines within anthropology, the juncture reinforced the marginality of the "dark melting pot" vis-à-vis the nationality of the "white melting pot," and the anthropologists' marginality vis-à-vis the social sciences devoted now to promoting "social change." This racialization of the subaltern condition (Ratier 1971; Guber 2002; Margulis et al. 1998; Quijada et al. 2000) depicts a melting pot that parallels the Euro-Argentine one. The former is a symbolic space where the indigenous, the *Afro*, and the popular sectors of the provincial "interior" merge. Undesirable Europeans of Sicily and Calabria, of Andalusía

and the Middle East were grouped with those thought of as "gauchos," "paisanos" or country-men, "montoneros," and poor "criollos." These nationals could not be made into foreigners, nor be symbolically removed from the nation, nor othered in any strong sense, because of the risk of losing critical mass and the possibility of an independent nation altogether. Just as the official and explicit *melting pot* "Europeanized" the Argentines by turning the European immigrants into Argentineans, the dark "melting pot" of the *cabecitas negras* "interiorized" a color line represented by the "interior" of the country (Ratier 1971). Here, the darkening of a generic condition of subalterneity epitomized as "tolerable subordinates" allowed for the reconstruction of a class system without questioning the assumption of whiteness as the attribute of the whole nation, nor the premises of progress and upward mobility which justified it, in order to establish its profile as a country of immigrants.

Anthropological Sciences as University Discipline

The programs in Ciencias Antropológicas at La Plata (1957) and Buenos Aires (1958) started in what Argentine intellectuals have termed "the golden age of the university." Immediately after a decade of Peronist political interference with the administration of public universities,[5] a process of "normalization" took place: deans, rectors and faculty were replaced in order to put an end to academic "obscurantism," and to expel those involved with the regime of the so-called "fleeing tyrant" (*tirano prófugo*) (Sigal 1991; Neiburg 1998). In all, universities were heading for a successful process of modernization. In the early 1960s, Argentine universities were at the top of Latin American higher education. In 1957 the University of Buenos Aires launched programs in Sociology, Psychology and Educational Sciences, at the School of Philosophy and Literature. The three programs boasted a modern, professional and applied profile.

Ciencias Antropológicas – which opened in Buenos Aires in 1958 and began classes in 1959 – on the other hand, maintained a marked continuity with the previous period. The only changes were the forced retirement of Italian anthropologist José Imbelloni – former director of the Institute of Anthropology and of the Ethnographic Museum of the University of Buenos Aires and strongman of anthropology under Peronism (Garbulsky 1987) – and of the director of the Institute of Archaeology, Carlos Casanova. These resignations, however, did not jeopardize the hegemony of the Culture-Historical school in its Austrian version. In fact, although the faculty differed in their political sympathies – Fernando Márquez Miranda, the first chair of the Ciencias Antropológicas department, was a liberal, and Imbelloni a fascist – most of them operated with the same theoretical background. When in 1948 Oswald F. A. Menghin – a leading prehistorian who applied culture cycles to world prehistory, and who became rector of the University of Vienna in 1935–36 (Kohl and Pérez Gollán 2002) – and Marcelo Bórmida, an Italian with a bachelor's degree in Anthropology and a former *balilla* (from the Italian fascist youth organization Opera Nazionale Balilla), entered the Ethnographic Museum on Imbelloni's invitation, Anthropology was more attuned with the German Romantic trends that considered "culture" as the soul of peoples and nations, than with the blueprint of political and social organization.

Unlike the Department of Sociology – led by an antifascist Italian, Gino Germani, who instructed his students to look for the underlying sociocultural factors of Peronism – the three orientations in Ciencias Antropológicas (Archaeology, Ethnology and Folklore) continued to aim at the reconstruction of the origins of the American man and his heritage, and at salvaging material and symbolic mores under the threat of extinction. In their comparative studies ethnologists privileged indigenous peoples, as did ethnographers in their "description" of ways of life (Bórmida 1961; Lafón 1970). Folklore, a degree course in itself, led by literature professor Augusto R. Cortazar, entered Ciencias Antropológicas for the study of the "Folk." Unlike Robert Redfield's notion, in Argentina the "folk society" did not emphasize the indigenous pole, but rather the Spanish component of a Spanish–indigenous mix: the folklore of a people being seen to be made of cultural "survivals" of the colonial past, rather than as current expressions of social inequality (Cortazar 1949).

Imbelloni's master plan

The division between Folklore and Ethnology was already contained within Imbelloni's blueprint, since each anthropological discipline had its own "object of study." Like other founding precursors and researchers, Imbelloni cultivated both fields as "full professor" at the University of Buenos Aires, in charge of the course on Anthropology and General Ethnology.[6] Imbelloni systematized the entire discipline along with its branches. Prehistory and Archaeology dealt with "lost civilizations"; Ethnography brought together "pottery, basketry, puzzles, dances, songs, prayers, cult rituals, funerary mores of the inhabitants of the territories where the natural civilization of the peoples described by nineteenth-century evolutionists as 'primitive' and 'savages' is still alive"; Folklore dealt with "the populations that belong to civilized nations" (Imbelloni 1959:17).

In Imbelloni's view, three notions justified the separation of Ethnography from Folklore: "survivals" (*supervivencias*), "stratum" (*estrato*) and "tradition." While the latter referred to the process through which a particular patrimony was preserved, "supervivencia" concerned that patrimony once preserved. The idea of "stratum" was twofold. On the one hand, it was related to the ways in which class, cultural and political elites within the "modern nations" acted as the cultural model for the "vulgo" (lower orders), that is, for the rural and urban masses who operated as "the substratum of the social hierarchy" (1959:34–35). On the other hand, it referred to the combination of modernization and the informal process of cultural transmission or "tradition" which resulted in the coexistence of modern and inherited forms, threatened by new cultural developments (1959:41–42). Such "inherited forms" were also defined as "substrata" from a temporal point of view, thus acknowledging the coexistence of different levels or layers from a remote to a recent past (1959:51). Imbelloni endowed Ethnography with populations and patrimonies that were not seen as underlying strata of the national culture, and Folklore with the "substrata" or popular heritages which had digested some fragments of the indigenous culture (1959:60), thus rooting his *Americanística* in the temporal–spatial margins of Argentineness.

This approach differed from the Boasian framework in the way it defined the objects for each subdiscipline, since demarcations hinged less on "cultural products" than on

the human subjects to be dealt with. While for Boas and his students Folklore should study living systems of oral traditions, and Ethnography other remaining cultural products (Zumwalt 1988:29–30), in the Argentine case Folklore and Ethnography studied sectors with a different sociocultural distance from the national mainstream and the patterns of modernization.

Amid such a backdrop, the "professionalization" of Anthropology in the late 1950s resulted in a progressive separation of Ethnology and Folklore, two fields quite integrated in the past, as Imbelloni's own trajectory attested. The leading characters of this new arrangement were Marcelo Bórmida for Ethnology and Cortazar for Folklore. Their influence outreached their lives (1978 and 1974) even to the threshold of the democratic *apertura* in 1983, and shaped official anthropology, except during Perón's third government (1973–74).

Ethnology's barbarians and Folklore's survivals

Bórmida learned physical anthropology and ethnology from Imbelloni, and the application of cultural cycles (*Kulturkreisse*) to preceramic Argentine archaeology from Menghin. After Imbelloni's expulsion, Bórmida pursued theoretical elaborations pointing at the autonomy of Anthropology from the Natural Sciences. Unlike Anthropology at the University of La Plata, *latu sensu* Anthropology was for him part of the Sciences of Spirit and of Universal History, rather than of the Sciences of Nature. He defined Anthropology as the study of the "barbarians," in its classic Greek sense of the "people we do not understand" (Bórmida 1956:7). Barbarianism could not, however, simply be dealt with from a civilizing project, as national statesmen had proclaimed since 1854, because – "irreducible" as it was – mythical consciousness expressed a feature of human subjectivity which epitomized a valued "temperament and manner of being in the world." Although myths were not exclusive to indigenous peoples, indigenous myths revealed the essence of an ahistorical, spontaneous logic, as opposed to Western rationality. Native mythologies were not only the privileged object of research, but also the guide to ethnographic work on the sociopolitical organization and the material lives (ergology) of their bearers.

Two conclusions ensue. First, myths resisted the causal-explanatory methods of modern science; and as a result, only a phenomenological ethnology based on Wilhelm Dilthey's interpretation of the sociological concept of *Verstehen* (understanding) was deemed suitable as a method for comprehending the true "cultural essence" these myths contained, without preconceptions (Bórmida 1969–70:27). Second, the *epojé* or epistemological disengagement required to approach the indigenous world with no trace of ethnocentrism and other reductionisms – economicism, sociologism – ended up fostering a more ontological than methodological relativism. In this framework, Bórmida's Ethnology called for the study of those immanent essences that formed the conceptual heiresses of the essences that had anchored the cultural cycles adopted by Imbelloni in his *Americanística* (Fígoli 1995). Now, if Imbelloni's anthropological studies of race, ethnicity, peoples and nations had the characterization of what was "Argentine" and "American" as a reference point, for Bórmida, Ethnology mainly offered incomparable access to the "inexorable" and immanent nature of the indigenous peoples. Historical contingencies such as their incomplete citizenship

were beside the point. Moreover, by limiting its universalizing humanism with notions of objectivity and neutrality specific to positivism, Bórmida's Ethnology claimed a legitimacy denied to Folklore and to Social Anthropology, which had begun by the early 1960s to advocate scholarly "commitment" to the subjects of study as key actors in and for social transformation.

Extolling Ethnology and taking advantage of an increasing monopoly of directorial posts, Bórmida's approach shaped the academic field at the main Argentine university and, on account of its academic and geographical proximity, at the national agency for the promotion of scientific research, CONICET. Bórmida's presence throughout the institutional breaks of 1955, 1966, and 1974–6 moved his direct disciples – who grouped together in the Argentine Center of American Ethnology (Centro Argentino de Etnología Americana, CAEA) – to base their scientific practice not only on the acceptance of the radical alterity of indigenous peoples, but also on withdrawal both from indigenous needs and demands, and from applied anthropological knowledge (Califano et al. 1985).[7]

The professionalization of Folklore, by contrast, resumed an early path of union with the national state. Together with Peronism, increasing value was assigned to the "popular" and the "national." The National Institute of Tradition was founded in 1943, to be renamed according to political context as the National Institute of Philology and Folklore in 1955, the National Institute of Folkloric Research in 1960, the National Institute of Anthropology in 1964, and the National Institute of Anthropology and Latin American Thought in 1992. In the view of its first director, Juan Alfonso Carrizo, the Institute was meant to save "the spiritual patrimony inherited from our country," and to study "the recorded material in its historic and literary value, as well as in its relation with the other countries of America and Europe, especially with Spain and those of a Greco-Latin ancestry, to which the material belongs" (Carrizo 1953:26).

Folklore's "patrimonialist" perspective concentrated, as already stated, on sectors of the Argentine population termed "folk society." Scholars such as Cortazar and Imbelloni, but also Ismael Moya, Bruno Jacovella, Carlos Vega, and Armando Vivante, believed they could find values of the farming–stockbreeding oligarchy among the subaltern sectors arising from the early miscegenation of Spaniards and Indians (Blache 2002). Forever revealing its anonymous, common and oral character, folklore was precisely what could be found "like residual elements among subordinate sectors" (Cortazar 1949).

Cortazar's influence in Argentina and in most of Latin America resulted from his ability to seize concepts from the culture-historical theory of the cultural cycles, Malinowskian functionalism, North American culturalism, and folklore experts in North and South America. Although restricted by the theory of survivals, Cortazar confronted sociocultural totalities much in the way of community studies, a remarkable step forward in an environment that usually split cultures into particular features corresponding to this or that *kulturkreisse*. Nevertheless, the Cortazarian stance was established as a disciplinary dogma, not only on account of its theoretical and broadcasting merit, but also because of an academic promotion indebted to the political-academic process (Blache 2002). Cortazar's interpretation worked as a barrier against those readings of Argentine culture as "national and popular" which prevailed in the increasingly radicalized academic atmosphere surrounding Perón's return to Argentina in 1972 (Gurevich and Smolensky n.d.).

In any case, if the theory of the folk society was one of the very few hints of a quite absent theory of *mestizaje* (cross-breeding) in Argentina's hegemonic national ideology, the obvious predominance of the Spanish component within this framework showed once again the downplaying of the indigenous contribution to Argentine-ness, and also the exclusion of immigrants from the possibility of "producing 'authentic' folklore" (Blache 2002). In time, Folklore became more flexible. Rescuing folklore goods turned out to be less important than coping with the issues confronting "folk communities" (Lazzari 2002). From the 1960s onward, Folklore also made room for all things indigenous. But here "indigenous" meant less a feeble contribution to the early Argentine cultural patrimony than a powerful factor in the reproduction of marginal and marginalized communities, with their own cultural distinctiveness, and without full citizenship. Along with this gradual shift, Folklore also included people of European descent, first as objects of Argentinization and as recipients of Argentine folklore (taken to be emblematic of national culture), and later as subjects who were equally distinctive and valued in their contributions to Argentine-ness. Yet, seen as the product of a twofold shift – from an indigenous society to a European one, and from traditional to modern organization – the subject-objects of Folklore could not help being defined as marginal both in the past and in the present. Nonetheless, their marginality remained linked to an alterity seen as transitional rather than radical, like that of the subject-objects of ethnology.

In sum, the two main branches of Argentine Anthropology – Archaeology and Ethnology/Folklore – looked back to the past. This orientation stemmed in Ethnology and Folklore from their respective conceptualizations regarding the cultural products of groupings as emblematic either of prehispanic Argentina or of mestizaje. This division was also geopolitical; Ethnology and its junior partner Ethnography spread through Chaco and Pampa-Patagonia, that is, through the so-called "new provinces" of the Argentine territory that mushroomed in what were "Indian lands" until the late 19th century. Meanwhile, Folklore was located in central and northwest Argentina, in the "old provinces" arising from early Spanish colonization. While the dominant Ethnology was concerned with the native presence as radical and inexorable alterity, Folklore dealt with the rural "peasant" world as a transitional otherness.

Nevertheless, not all Anthropology would be concerned with times past. The marginalization of which ethnologists and folklore experts were so fond would change most dramatically among social anthropologists, for whom the formations of alterity resulted from the formative processes of inequality.

Social Anthropology as a place of dissidence

The basis of "social anthropology" in Buenos Aires and La Plata, Rosario and other university centers revolved, for a long time, around the theoretical-ideological mix that prevailed in the 1960–1970s. For some anthropologists and sociologists, "social anthropology" referred to a combination of ethnography concerned with social change and intellectual commitment to the fate of social subjects. Such a mix surfaced in exchanges among Argentina's political and institutional processes and the modernizing enlightenment of the post-Peronist university (Terán 1991; Neiburg 1998),

at times in line, at others in marked disagreement with British anthropology. In all, social anthropology, Argentine style, stemmed from three stances.

The modernizing Department of Sociology offered a course on social anthropology that was optional for sociologists and mandatory for anthropologists. Its first professor, as late as 1961, was US anthropologist Ralph Beals, who was succeeded by native and foreign experts. None of them belonged to the Ethnographic Museum. Apparently, the chair of Sociology considered anthropologists unable to teach a course in social anthropology that combined functionalism and structural functionalism, culture and personality, cultural ecology, neo-evolutionism, symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, and ethnographic fieldwork (Visacovsky et al. 1997). Interestingly enough, some faculty members at the Museum, such as Enrique Palavecino and Cortazar, taught British and American anthropology. But this was neither all, nor enough.

As for the second stance, Esther Hermitte – who graduated with a History teaching degree (*profesorado*) – encountered social anthropology in two visits to the Anthropology Department of the University of Chicago between 1947 and 1949. In 1957, before traveling to Chicago to pursue her doctorate in anthropology, Hermitte started to do research in the mining complex of El Aguilar, in the Argentine Puna. Here, she talked to Bolivian and *atacameño* miners and their families, and to the white-collar workers of the Aguilar company. But this time she was not concerned with cultural heritage or folk traditions, but rather with social relations at work, within the family and in the mining neighborhood as well. In 1958, Hermitte presented her conclusions as "applied anthropology," while her works were acknowledged by her two field assistants as social anthropology (Sanguinetti and Mariscotti 1958–59).[8] This line, however, was somehow interrupted when Hermitte departed to the US with a fellowship at CONICET, Argentina's National Science Foundation. The degree in Ciencias Antropológicas was created thereafter.

In contrast with Bormidian Ethnology and without labeling it "social" yet, the first students of the brand new degree in Anthropological Sciences at the University of Buenos Aires started to talk about a "committed" and "grass-roots" anthropology, aiming at "development" and "social change." Official anthropology at the Museum promptly identified social anthropology as a suspiciously modernizing, up-to-date, applied, Anglo-Saxon, mainly foreign kind of anthropology, as long as its main promoters were trained in the US (archaeologist Alberto Rex González at Columbia, Ph.D. 1959, and social anthropologist Hermitte at Chicago, Ph.D. 1964). Moreover, social anthropology was envisaged as a contaminated orientation tainted by its immediacy and its politicization (Bórmida 1961). For their part, committed young people accused the anthropological status quo of being "ahistorical" and also Nazi/fascist, in the troubled context of the Vietnam war, the Cuban revolution, Algerian independence, the events of May 1968 in France, and the growth of the first guerrilla groups in South America.

In any case, from the graduation in 1962 of the first bachelor in Anthropology at the University of Buenos Aires, Blas Alberti, to the first seminar on the modern Maya ethnography to be taught by Hermitte in 1966 (Hermitte 1971), students and young teaching assistants learned that anthropology could be undertaken among several groupings (rural inhabitants, people of African descent), in different areas (urban

contexts), and from several theoretical approaches (structural functionalism, symbolic interactionism, and Marxism). Most of these approaches and topics were absent from the official anthropology. Far from merging with the projects of the Sociology Department, or even with open-minded career professors who were still teaching and even applying functionalism and structural-functionalism, the new degree holders attempted to forge a committed anthropology that would become the fourth orientation, along with Ethnology, Folklore and Prehistory.

The military coup of 1966 aborted those plans. After the violent police intervention at the university in July of that year, many teaching assistants resigned, along with a group of professors. Hermitte was among them, the only professor from the Anthropology Department to leave the university. Bórmida became the new chairman. Obviously enough, he did not encourage the consolidation of an orientation in Social Anthropology. In La Plata and Rosario there were fewer resignations, and Social Anthropology continued to be taught as a single course, albeit within an adverse context still dominated by the culture and history school. Meanwhile, those who had resigned from the University of Buenos Aires became advisors at public institutions, such as the Instituto de Tecnología Agropecuaria (Institute of Farming and Fishery Technology), Consejo Federal de Inversiones (Federal Investment Council), housing, education, and health departments. They were hired to deal with what federal and state administrations interpreted as the burdensome effects of anachronistic "peasant cultures," namely "resistance to change" and "traditionalism." In the "developmentalist" age influenced in Argentina and most of Latin America by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean from the middle of 1950 and by marginalist theory, anthropologists contributed with their critical readings, based on Wright Mills, French and Italian versions of Marxism, and through ongoing debates on peasantries led by Eric Wolf, Sidney Mintz, June Nash, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, and Pablo González Casanova (see Seligmann, this volume).

These approaches made it possible to do research on *compadrazgo* (spiritual coparenthood), *patronazgo* (patronage) and clientelism, which cleared the way for the study of politics. Together, Hermitte, the Argentine Ph.D. candidates who were coming back to do their fieldwork, and the young *licenciados* who had remained in the country started to explore the ties of the economic system with issues of social and political organization. With a strong empirical bias rooted in Malinowskian fieldwork – extended intensive stays with a holistic approach uncommon in Argentine Ciencias Antropológicas (Hermitte 2002; Vessuri 2002; Menéndez 1970) – social anthropology challenged the culturalist model prevailing among those trained in the Sociology Department. Social anthropologists such as Eduardo Archetti, Leopoldo Bartolomé, Santiago Bilbao, Esther Hermitte, Carlos Herrán, Eduardo Menéndez, Hugo Ratier, and Hebe Vessuri argued that Argentine underdevelopment resulted from unequal integration and dependence on the economic and political core. Argentina was not a dual entity split into a modern, industrial, fully capitalist, politically liberal and democratic half, on the one hand, and a traditional, rural, precapitalist and *caudillo*-led half, on the other. Argentina was an unequal whole, driven by "internal colonialism," and explained under the new paradigm of Fernando Cardoso's and Enzo Faletto's "dependency theory" (in Argentina, also of Miguel Murmis and José Nun).

Peronism was a case in point. While official sociology equated Peronism with the hindrances of tradition and backwardness, social anthropologists and *dependentista*

sociologists thought of it rather as the expression of the underclass's material and political conditions, and of their attempts to gain control over their reproduction. Since such a debate was quite removed from the aims of official anthropology, social anthropologists decided to publish in social science journals (for example, *Desarrollo Económico* (IDES), *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología*, *Coloquio*, *Índice*), rather than in strictly anthropological ones (*Runa, Cuadernos del INA*, and *Relaciones de la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología*). In fact, social anthropologists did not talk about "ethnographic" or folk groups. They referred to "cases" or units marked by their spatial location and by their place in the relations of production: *yerba mate* (Argentine tea), cotton and sugar growers and workers, small and big *poncho* weavers, and so forth. Research was defined by "problems and objectives situated 'here and now,' with a regional and/or national perspective and an ethno-historical dimension" (Menéndez 1968:49).[9] Thus, Social Anthropology in the 1960s and 1970s was located on the institutional, conceptual and editorial periphery of Ciencias Antropológicas, striving with some success to enter the social sciences debate, without surrendering, however, to the public discourse of other social sciences (Guber and Visacovsky 2000).

This disciplinary shift led to the opening of specific academic orientations in Antropología Social at the universities of Salta (L. Gatti), Mar del Plata (E. Menéndez) and Misiones (L. Bartolomé) between 1972 and 1974, and to the creation of a working group in the Latin American Council for Social Sciences (CLACSO), which brought together anthropologists from the Americas to define a thematic and theoretical agenda. The Social Anthropology degrees were led by graduates from the traditional Ciencias Antropológicas courses of Buenos Aires and La Plata, but their programs were totally innovative. Two of the three experiments were interrupted in 1974, when the Federal Administration took temporary control of the national universities. The CLACSO group coined the notion of "social articulation" to contest more traditional theses that labeled social and cultural relations as "acculturation," "transculturation," and "syncretism" (Hermitte and Bartolomé 1977). Launched from the Social Anthropology section at the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, which Hermitte chaired from 1965 to 1974, this group brought together the main characters of the best of Latin American anthropology, such as Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, Guillermo Bonfil Batalla and González Casanova, as well as social anthropologists from Argentina, Latin America and North America who were working in Argentina and Brazil. The group disbanded with the advent of the Argentine dictatorship in 1976, but set a vital precedent in shaping a way into otherness that stemmed from inequality.

The Locations of Alterity, or The Margins from The Margins

To sum up, we began our journey with the exploration of the effects of national formations of alterity and *politicity* (the ideas and practices of politics and the political) on the practices of Argentine anthropology and, conversely, with the analysis of how these practices coped with those very formations. First we looked at the composition of the Argentine nation-state, pointing to the formation of two parallel melting pots. We argued that, even when some cross-over was allowed, the civilizing, white and European-laden melting pot prevailed over the barbarizing, indigenous and criollo/

cabecita-laden one – the legitimacy and dominance of the former being rarely questioned. We then situated the emergence of professional anthropology in the context of a deepening political rift between Peronists and anti-Peronists. Even though the two polarities – the racial/ethnic and the political/partisan – do not overlap in any simple fashion, their coexistence and the use of such terms as *cabecita negra* as synonyms for *Peronista* show that this is a pivotal question for Argentine anthropology, as a discipline that must deal with otherness-diversity-inequality.

Ciencias Antropológicas, particularly those subdisciplines devoted to the present – ethnology, folklore and social anthropology – took a stance concerning the two melting pots as featuring sociocultural alterity, a stance that overreached the disciplinary field. Institutional continuities and breakdowns fostered or aborted the trajectories of some individuals and the theoretical standpoints and fields embodied by them. To talk about ethnology, social anthropology or folklore, therefore, means much more than simply referring to subdisciplines stemming from a common scientific field. It also entails political and academic positions that the opponents equate with a troubled past ravaged by bloodshed, persecution, military coups, university takeovers, generational breaks, legal and clandestine militancy, social utopias, images of science, personal decisions in light of political and academic shifts, models of the "committed intellectual," and the search for horizons other than the strictly academic. Social anthropologists, ethnologists and folklore experts made use of all this to establish their differences within and beyond anthropology and its subdisciplines. Boundaries among the subdisciplines were thus reproduced, dragging behind them political options and explanatory keys to the national formation of alterity, even if internal public debates usually called those ideas into question.

Once the program in Ciencias Antropológicas at the University of Buenos Aires was consolidated, "official" ethnology – always an official term – subscribed to a radical alterity as a means to understand humanity in its cultural diversity. Assuming that cultural difference had a greater chance of surviving and being imitated in the spiritual/representational field than in the daily practices of material reproduction, hegemonic ethnology concentrated on the study of native populations, far removed from the implicit national norm. Any less distance would imply a loss of authenticity, thus reducing the possibility of recording legitimate variants of humanity before they were wiped out by the (supposedly) homogenizing forces of modernity. The urge to collect paramodern, para-industrial, paracapitalist and paranational cultural responses discouraged further work with indigenous peoples visibly affected by processes rendering them both whiter and less visible, such as those who lived in urban shanty towns and/or were part of the industrial proletariat. Argentine *criollo* groups or those of foreign origin – whose cultural peculiarities could only be viewed from within and as emanating from their very modernity – were also side-stepped. Ethnology mimicked the territorialization of indigenous peoples, confined during their "pacification" to faraway enclaves and pushed toward the national borders. Its field was both geographically and socially distant, thus spatializing its fieldwork in the boundaries of the national territory, and even entering neighboring countries in search of the mores and goods that urbanization supposedly annihilated. Radical alterity, however, reflected only partially the hegemonic official rhetoric of the bureaucratic state circles and of the nation-building moral elites, since ethnology cast indigenous cultural differences in a positive light that had always been denied by those circles and those elites

(Vecchioli 2002; Visacovsky et al. 1997). But, paradoxically enough, this positive stance was presented and analyzed in ways that reinforced those very differences as a rarity on the margins of the lives of most Argentines. In this context, not even blackness could be considered a legitimate field of study. This was less because "blacks" were gone – as proclaimed by the founding myths of the nation – than because the black population had been "decultured" by the actions and effects of slavery. In this light, dominant ethnology remained as the established discipline of a mythical consciousness that would always survive outside or on the margins of modern Argentina.

Social Anthropology, on the other hand, set out to identify a structural otherness, produced and reproduced by exploitative social relations. In this view, any subordinate group – indigenous, *criollo*, immigrant, *Afro* – was a legitimate object of research mainly as a victim of domination, discrimination or oppression. But the explanatory focus was less on the reproduction of cultural practices than on the reproduction of class relations. At any rate, the "cultural" element was another factor to be taken into account, insofar as it might facilitate or resist the pattern of prevailing inequality. Social anthropologists, then, did not locate themselves within previously established ethnographic areas or folk regions, but rather according to a geopolitical and sociological division in terms of "center–periphery." This division demonstrated its effects both in rural and urban zones, even more so in a country spanned by "port–interior" inequality and dependence. In rural areas, the subordination was embodied by peasants, small producers, landholders, farm laborers, and tenant farmers; in towns and cities, it was embodied by industrial workers, slum dwellers, and *cabecitas negras* everywhere. To be black, aboriginal or foreign did not make anyone an object of study per se on account of their cultural traits, but rather because of their subaltern class reproduction. The marginal location of these subjects vis-à-vis those considered main actors of modernizing or revolutionary processes – whatever such processes could be – placed anthropological interests on a periphery of the Argentine social science mainstream. Meanwhile, social anthropology seriously challenged the hegemonic rhetoric of radical alterity, although it ended up recreating an official concept of citizenship by contract, which boasted of its color-blindness.

As for Folklore, it found its raison d'être in the premise of transitional otherness. Unlike ethnology and social anthropology, folklore was early implicated in a state biopolitics that advocated the cultural melting pot. Interest in the "Argentine people" and their traditions as a sphere of fusion, metamorphosis and cultural survival differed from ethnology's, since folklore experts appreciated indigenous culture precisely on account of the processes of cross-breeding, cultural change and whitening that ethnologists took as an obstacle to their work, or as evidence of their object's decline. In turn, that very interest came with a cultural emphasis that distanced folklore from social anthropology even when, in time, both disciplines would come to work on almost the same research subjects, rural and urban. Paradoxically, what caused the hegemonic folklore to be estranged from its sister subdisciplines became alluring to state racial biopolitics. In fact, folklore experts prevailed at the National Institute of Tradition (later on, renamed National Institute of Anthropology). This does not mean that folklore was the only discipline to provide organic intellectuals, who were instrumental to nation-building, either when folklorists focused on "folk society," conceived of as the fruit of a hispanic-indigenous womb located in the "old provinces" with colonial ancestry, or when they worked on immigrants' offspring. Along with

those who endorsed the hegemonic formation of alterity, folklore also produced other more autonomous interpretations of a supposedly homogeneous "Argentine-ness," either by praising the recreation of cultural differences among those inhabitants enjoying access to full citizenship, or by positively valuing immigrant communities of Asian or Latin American origin, whose contributions official rhetoric tended to ignore. Interestingly enough, and largely for political/academic reasons, this subdiscipline ended up on the margins of Ciencias Antropológicas. As a repository for what neither ethnology nor social anthropology claimed for themselves, folklore became from 1984 onward a marginal orientation, squeezed by both the subdiscipline that had been hegemonic during the dictatorship, and the one that would take over with the arrival of democracy.

In 1983, still under military rule but with presidential elections in sight, the first Argentine Congress of Social Anthropology was held at the National University of Misiones. The tone of the encounter of colleagues and former students from different subdisciplines, places and trajectories foreshadowed the structures of feeling that would characterize the coming years. The joy of getting together in the open was not enough in itself to address openly the painful effects of internal and external exiles, the necessary revisions of what had taken place during the "leaden years," and the urgent need to discuss the role of anthropologists at this new juncture. In turn, theoretical and political/institutional disagreements became open disputes about the status of each subdiscipline and its involvement with a particular segment of the past, thus hindering the critical revision of each one's contribution to Argentine anthropology and to the knowledge of Argentine society and culture. By equating each subdiscipline *in toto* with a specific university and national administration – and all too frequently, with a theoretical orientation – such defensive claims, whether true or not, classified and ranked the anthropological branches with its ensuing hierarchy. While folklore's contribution was downplayed, responsibility and blame was attributed to ethnology or to social anthropology. These two subdisciplines, alternating academic power (ethnology in 1959–65, 1966–73, 1975–83, and social anthropology in 1966, 1973–74, and since 1984), became trapped in a duel between two supposedly homogeneous blocs, as mutually exclusive, noncomplementary endogamous halves.

In the early years of democratic transition, the symbolic reordering of an intellectual field ready to acknowledge and give hegemony to the previously banned social anthropology revived oppositions imprinted under the *Proceso* rule. Not only did social anthropologists *say* they did not study "ethnographic groups," they did not, in fact, study them; not only did they understand structural analysis to be of vital importance, they rejected the study of so-called "superstructural matters" such as arts, religion, and even kinship and material production. Myths, rituals and material objects – topics allied with ethnology during the *Proceso*, but also favorite areas of the best of anthropology globally – were taken as emblematic of reactionary and uncommitted anthropology. The baby was thrown out with the bath water: systems of anthropological ideas were banished with ethnology, still regarded as being concerned with irrelevant or marginal matters, even though ethnologists were now striving to analyze indigenous life within interethnic relations, and even though social anthropologists of the 1960s and 1970s had done work on indigenous peoples in Patagonia and Chaco (see Gordillo, this volume).

Nonetheless, it soon became anachronistic to summarize the newly opened political and academic process in these terms. First, in 1984 the University of Buenos Aires, as well as most other universities in the country, changed the programs of study for Ciencias Antropológicas. From then on, they offered only two orientations: archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. The year of 1984, however, was not 1973. The world was no longer "prerevolutionary," and the theoretical trends working on the relative autonomy of intellectual, political and belief systems were a far cry from classic Marxism. Secondly, the 1980s marked the appearance of political and ideological identities based on ethnicity, race, religion, nationality, gender, and memory. Such movements were based on demands for the recognition of legitimate differences, and the adoption of legal frameworks updated to institutionalize diversity in the language of rights.

Such processes, previously unknown to Argentines, have transformed anthropological debates in myriad ways as they experiment with novel approaches to new research areas and subjects. There is, consequently, a fresh questioning of the traditionally muted effects of hegemonic formations of alterity and politicity that have permeated the anthropological field. While the typical subjects of anthropology – indigenous and black groups – actively question their marginality and, along with newly organized groups such as retired senior citizens, *jubilados*, and the unemployed *piqueteros* take on an unprecedented visibility, we Argentine anthropologists have yet to come out of the margins. We still face the challenge of raising multiple, visible platforms to speak out, so that the public debates of Argentina's 21st century can address their anthropological dimensions from anthropological perspectives.

NOTES

1 Although Prehistoric Archaeology, Physical or Biological Anthropology and Forensic Anthropology form an integral part of the Anthropological Sciences in Argentina, we are concerned here only with the fields of ethnology, folklore and social anthropology. For reasons of space, we also focus here on *porteño* or Buenos Aires anthropology, which is symbolically and materially tied to the Federal administration.

2 Undergraduate programs evolved in Buenos Aires, La Plata, Mar del Plata, Olavarría, Rosario, Posadas, Catamarca, Tucumán, Salta and Jujuy; Masters and Ph.D. programs are currently taught at Posadas, Buenos Aires, Córdoba and La Plata.

3 According to Reid-Andrews (1982) and Segato (1991), the "disappearance" of the blacks in Argentina was more ideological than demographic. Nevertheless the presence of blacks in the whole of Argentina is confirmed by names, census, birth registers and cultural activities (Bilbao 1962).

4 The constitution of 1853 stated that Congress should "provide for the security of the frontiers; conserve the peace accord with the 'indios' and promote their conversion to Catholicism" (article 67, inc. 15). The amendment of 1949 took out the article 67, inc. 15. It was put back in place again in 1955, and remained as such until the reform of 1994, when the recognition of indigenous rights as special rights was incorporated instead (Carrasco and Briones 1996).

5 From the reform of 1918 onward public universities have been led by an autonomous board of representatives of each "claustro" or segment: professors, pupils and graduates. Perón's intervention was direct and, among other measures, required card-carrying membership

in the Partido Justicialista in order to work in public administration, including the state universities.

6 Biased less toward the historic-cultural school than toward a strongly anti-evolutionist Italian historical Ethnology, Imbelloni promoted "la Americanística" or the study of the origins and patrimony of the American Man. This project included an editorial series (Humanior), a journal (*Runa*), and a degree course whose guidelines would be taken up again by Marcelo Bórmida to design the degree course of 1958 (Fígoli 1995).

7 See Gordillo (this volume) for more details on Bórmida's proposal and on official Ethnology at the University of Buenos Aires which, up to 1983, allowed little space for autonomous developments within the institution, such as those carried out by ethnologists and also UBA's professors Edgardo Cordeu and Alejandra Siffredi.

8 Almost at the same time, the third stance developed at the Rosario branch of the Universidad del Litoral. (Medical) Doctor Alberto Rex González – with a Ph.D. in archaeology from Columbia University – introduced a program of study in sociocultural anthropology in the Department of History. In 1959, part of this program involved the interdisciplinary study of cultural areas in the Valley of Santa María, Catamarca – of the type done by Julian Steward – and included social-anthropological fieldwork (Meister et al. 1964). In 1969, this sociocultural orientation was consolidated as a specialization within Anthropology in the Humanities School at the Universidad Nacional de Rosario, and as an undergraduate course in the Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

9 Some titles illustrate the aims of early Argentine Social Anthropology: "Social Structure of a Creole Provincial Town, Seen through Its Social Organization, Economic System and Local Power Forms" (Hermitte); "Sociocultural Study of a Migrant Community: San José del Boquerón (Prov. de Santiago del Estero)" (Bilbao); "Study of Agrarian *Fiestas* and Their Current Function in the Economic Context of the Southern *Sierra* of Perú (Kanas and Chumbivilcas, Depto. Cusco)" (Lischetti, Muñoz, and Gorbak); "Assimilation of European Ethnic Groups to a Community of the Center of Entre Ríos Province" (Menéndez); "Archaeological and Socio-Anthropological Study with Special Emphasis on Cultural Ecological Problems, East of the Quebrada de Humahuaca" (Madrazo) (*Actualidad Antropológica* 1968).

REFERENCES

Actualidad Antropológica (1968) Journal of Museo Dámaso Arce, Olavarría, Provincia de Buenos Aires.

Alonso, A. M. (1994) The Politics of Space, Time and Substance: State Formation, Nationalism, and Ethnicity. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:379–405.

Archetti, E. P. (1999) *Masculinities: Football, Polo and the Tango in Argentina*. Oxford: Berg.

Asad, T. (1973) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Bartolomé, L. (1980) La antropología en Argentina. Problemas y perspectivas. *América Indígena* 40(2):207–215.

Bilbao, S. (1962) Las comparsas del Carnaval porteño. *Cuadernos del Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Folklóricas* 5:155–187.

Blache, M. (2002) Folklore y nacionalismo en la Argentina. Su vinculación de origen y su desvinculación actual. In S. Visacovsky and R. Guber (eds), *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina* (pp. 127–152). Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Bórmida, M. (1956) Cultura y ciclos culturales. Ensayo de etnología teorética. *Runa* (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras) 7(1):5–28.

Bórmida, M. (1961) Ciencias antropológicas y humanismo. *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires* 6(3):470–490.

Bórmida, M. (1969–70) Mito y cultura. Bases para una ciencia de la conciencia mítica y una etnología tautegórica. *Runa* (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras) 12.

Briones, C. (1998) *La alteridad del "Cuarto Mundo." Una deconstrucción antropológica de la diferencia*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Sol.

Briones, C. (2002) Mestizaje y blanqueamiento como coordenadas de aboriginalidad y nación en Argentina. *Runa* (Universidad de Buenos Aires) 23:61–88.

Briones, C. and Delrio, W. (2002) Patria sí, colonias también. Estrategias diferenciales de radicación de indígenas en Pampa y Patagonia (1885–1900). In A. Teruel, M. Lacarrieu, and O. Jerez (eds), *Fronteras, ciudades y estados…*, vol. 1 (pp. 45–78). Córdoba: Alción Editora.

Califano, M., Pérez Diez, A., and Balzano, S. M. (1985) Etnología. Centro Argentino de Etnología Americana. In *Evolución de las ciencias en la República Argentina, 1872–1972. Antropología*. Special issue of *Sociedad Científica Argentina* 10:9–71.

Cardoso de Oliveira, R. and Ruben, G. R. (1995) *Estilos de antropología*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Carrasco, M. (1991) Hegemonía y políticas indigenistas argentinas en el Chaco centro occidental. *América Indígena* (Mexico City) 51(1):63–122.

Carrasco, M. and Briones, C. (1996) *La tierra que nos quitaron. Reclamos indígenas en Argentina*. Serie Documentos en Español, no. 18. Copenhagen: IWGIA.

Carrizo, J. (1953) *Historia del folklore argentino*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Dictio.

Cortazar, A. R. (1949) *El Carnaval en el folklore Calchaquí*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana.

Fígoli, L. (1995) A antropología na Argentina e a construçao da naçao. In R. Cardoso de Oliveira and G. Ruben (eds), *Estilos de antropología* (pp. 31–63). Campinas: UNICAMP.

Garbulsky, E. (1987) José Imbelloni. Positivismo, organicismo y racismo. *Cuadernos de la Escuela de Antropología* (Universidad Nacional de Rosario) 3:3–23.

Guber, R. (2002) "Antropología Social": An Argentine Diaspora between Revolution and Nostalgia. *Anthropology Today* (Royal Anthropological Institute, London) 18(4):8–13.

Guber, R. and Visacovsky, S. E. (2000) La antropología social en la Argentina de los '60 y '70. *Desarrollo Económico* 40(158):289–316.

Gurevich, E. and Smolensky, E. (n.d.) La antropología en la UBA. 1973–1983. MS, Buenos Aires.

Hermitte, E. A. de (1971) *Poder sobrenatural y control social*. Mexico City: Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, no. 57. Reprint 2004, Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Hermitte, E. A. de (2002) La observación por medio de la participación. In S. Visacovsky and R. Guber (eds), *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina* (pp. 263–288). Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Hermitte, E. A. and Bartolomé, L. (eds) (1977) *Procesos de articulación social*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Amorrortu.

Herrán, C. A. (1985). Antropología social en la Argentina. Apuntes y perspectivas. Paper presented at the Simposio sobre Teoría e Investigación de la Antropología Social Mexicana. El Colegio de México, May 11–14.

Imbelloni, J. (1959) Introito. Concepto y praxis del folklore. In J. Imbelloni et al., *Folklore Argentino* (pp. 7–83). Buenos Aires: Editorial Humanior.

Kohl, P. and Pérez Gollán, J. (2002) Religion, Politics, and Prehistory: Reassessing the Lingering Legacy of Oswald Menghin. *Current Anthropology* 43(4):561–586.

Laclau, E. (1993) *Nuevas reflexiones sobre la revolución de nuestro tiempo*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.

Lafón, C. R. (1970) *Nociones de introducción a la antropología*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Glauco.

Lazzari, A. (2002) El indio argentino y el discurso de cultura. Del Instituto Nacional de la Tradición al Instituto Nacional de Antropología. In S. Visacovsky and R. Guber (eds), *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina* (pp. 153–202). Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Lazzari, A. (2004) Antropología en el estado. El Instituto Etnico Nacional (1946–1955). In F. Neiburg and M. Plotkin (eds), *Intelectuales y expertos. La constitución del conocimiento social en la Argentina* (pp. 203–230). Buenos Aires: Editorial Paidós.

Lenton, D. (1992) Relaciones interétnicas. Derechos humanos y autocrítica en la generación del '80. In J. Radovich and A. Balazote (eds), *La problemática indígena. Estudios antropológicos sobre pueblos indígenas de la Argentina* (pp. 27–65). Buenos Aires: CEDAL.

L'Estoile, B. de, Neiburg, R., and Sigaud, L. (eds) (2002) *Antropología, impérios e estados nacionais*. Rio de Janeiro: Relumé Dumará.

Margulis, M., et al. (1998) *La segregación negada. Cultura y discriminación social*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.

Martínez Sarasola, C. (1992) *Nuestros paisanos los indios. Vida, historia y destino de las comunidades indígenas en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.

Meister, A., Petruzzi, S., and Sonzogni, E. (1964) *Tradicionalismo y cambio social. Estudio de área en el Valle de Santa María*. Rosario, Argentina: Universidad Nacional del Litoral.

Menéndez, E. L. (1968) Correo antropológico. *Actualidad Antropológica* (Olavarría, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Museo Dámaso Arce) 3:48–51.

Menéndez, E. L. (1970) Ideología, ciencia y práctica profesional. In *Ciencias sociales. Ideología y realidad nacional* (pp. 101–124). Buenos Aires: Tiempo Contemporáneo.

Menni, A. (1995) *Relaciones interétnicas en Argentina y Chile del siglo XIX*. Serie Tierra Indígena Americana, no. 6. Neuquén: IREPS–APDH.

Muzzopappa, E. (2000) Metáforas estratégicas. El concepto de cultura en y sobre el ámbito de la seguridad. Undergraduate dissertation in Anthropological Sciences, University of Buenos Aires.

Neiburg, F. G. (1998) *Los intelectuales y la invención del peronismo*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Alianza.

Perazzi, P. (2003) *Hermenéutica de la barbarie. Una historia de la antropología en Buenos Aires, 1935–1966*. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Argentina de Antropología.

Quijada, M., Bernard, C., and Schneider, A. (2000) *Homogeneidad y nación con un estudio de caso. Argentina, siglos XIX y XX*. Colección Tierra Nueva e Cielo Nuevo, no. 42. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Ramos, A. R. (1990) Ethnology Brazilian Style. *Cultural Anthropology* 5(4):452–457.

Ratier, H. (1971) *El cabecita negra*. Buenos Aires: CEDAL.

Ratier, H. and Ringuelet, R. (1997) La antropología social en la Argentina. Un producto de la democracia. *Horizontes Antropológicos* (Porto Alegre, Universidade Federal do Río Grande do Sul) 3(7):10–23.

Reid-Andrews, G. (1982) *Los afroargentinos del Río de la Plata*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor.

Sanguinetti, A. C. and Mariscotti, A.M. (1958–59) Notas para el estudio de la cultura de la Puna. *Runa* (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Departamento de Ciencias Antropológicas) 9:1–2.

Schneider, A. (1994) The Two Faces of Modernity: Concepts of Melting Pot in Argentina. *Critique of Anthropology* 15(2):173–198.

Segato, R. (1991) Uma vocação de minoria. A expansão dos cultos Afro-Brasileiros na Argentina como processo de reetnicização. *Dados, Revista de Ciências Sociais* (Rio de Janeiro) 34(2):249–278.

Segato, R. (2002) Identidades políticas y alteridades históricas. Una crítica a las certezas del pluralismo global. *Nueva Sociedad* (Venezuela) 178:104–125.

Shumway, N. (1991) *The Invention of Argentina*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sigal, S. (1991) *Intelectuales y poder en la década del sesenta*. Buenos Aires: Puntosur.

Soler, R. (1979) *El positivismo argentino. Pensamiento filosófico y sociológico*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Svampa, M. (1994) *El dilema Argentino. Civilización o barbarie. De sarmiento al revisionismo peronista*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones El Cielo por Asalto.

Taylor, J. (1979) *Eva Perón: The Myths of a Woman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Terán, O. (1991) *Nuestros años sesenta*. Buenos Aires: Puntosur.

Vecchioli, V. (2002) A través de la etnografía. Representaciones sobre la nación en la producción etnográfica sobre los tobas. In S. Visacovsky and R. Guber (eds) *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina* (pp. 203–228). Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Vessuri, H. M. C. (1992) Las ciencias sociales en la Argentina. Diagnóstico y perspectivas. In Enrique Oteiza (ed.), *La política de investigación científica y tecnológica argentina. Historia y perspectivas* (pp. 87–126). Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.

Vessuri, H. M. C. (2002) La observación participante en Tucumán (1971). In S. Visacovsky and R. Guber (eds), *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina* (pp. 289–316). Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Visacovsky, S. E. and Guber, R. (eds) (2002) *Historias y estilos de trabajo de campo en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Visacovsky, S. E., Guber, R., and Gurevich, E. (1997) Modernidad y tradición en el origen de la carrera de Ciencias Antropológicas de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. *Redes* (Universidad Nacional de Quilmes) 10:213–257.

Williams, B. (1993) The Impact of the Precepts of Nationalism on the Concept of Culture: Making Grasshoppers of Naked Apes. *Cultural Critique* 24:143–191.

Zumwalt, R. (1988) *American Folklore Scholarship: A Dialogue of Dissent*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.