Abhik Ghosh

THE NEXT HUNDRED YEARS OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN INDIA

Abstract

The last hundred years have shown us that Anthropology has grown slowly and gradually into a discipline leaving its own mark in the arena of other disciplines in universities. However, this history has not been without its ups and downs. In this season of merry-making and the bittersweet ending of an epidemic year, it would be the right time to reassess our hundred-year past of teaching Anthropology and see where we would be headed in the next hundred years or so. Perhaps some of these reflections would be of some benefit.

This paper begins by discussions on certain well-known aspects of Anthropology as it has evolved in the last hundred years. Using that as a platform one would like to look at how this subject would evolve over the next century as a discipline. This would be a very useful exercise in understanding ourselves and our credentials in the future development of society.

For some people, Anthropology has been losing its 'edge', its methodological tricks and details, to the greater world. Many things covered by Anthropologists are now being done, sometimes much better, by other disciplines using methodologies invented and tested out by Anthropology. Over all this, Anthropologists excursions to the field has become much less like 'field visits' and much more like a 'stay' at a different location, often well-known to the researcher.

Against this background is the pressure from academia to publish short, fast and hard in larger numbers using the currency of the present rather than the distillation of a long-term research. Those who have done so have benefitted much in the current regime.

This paper is a sort of a critique as well as an exposition of how Anthropology would be making its own future in times to come. Without an ideal, we would be in danger of 'being the thing of shreds and patches' that we have criticized so much in our own past.

Introduction

When I begin on such an enterprise, it is with some trepidation, for I am in an august company with many well-known anthropologists in line who

ABHIK GHOSH, Professor, Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

have made comments about the future of Anthropology in India over the years. I wish to add on to rather than review these works and so I shall begin with some degree of stock-taking, of understanding what we have achieved and reached so far.

Early Indian Anthropological Ideas: A Beginning

Manu's *Dharmashastra* (2nd-3rd century BC) comprehensively studied the Indian society of that period, based more on the morals and norms of social and economic life. Kautilya's*Arthashastra* (324-296 BC) was a treatise on politics, statecraft and economics but also described the functioning of Indian society in detail. Megasthenes was the Greek ambassador to the court of Chandragupta Maurya from 324 BC to 300 BC. He also wrote a book on the structure and customs of Indian society. Al Biruni's accounts of India are famous. He was a Persian scholar who visited India and wrote a book about it in 1030 AD. Al-Biruni wrote of Indian social and cultural life, with sections on religion, sciences, customs and manners of the Hindus. In the 17th century Bernier came from France to India and wrote a book on the life and times of the Mughal emperors Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb, their life and times. As we uncover the Sanskritic writings and study them, over the years more and more such writings have become part of our knowledge of human beings including the major Indian philosophies. Some issues have been included in Indian Anthropology.

India and the World

Of new interest in this narrative has been the spate of recent studies that show how Indian concepts and ideas have influenced Western thoughts, ideas and philosophies. People are now writing detailed texts of this kind of 'deep' history that happens to be extremely invigorating to our analysis, enlightening us about areas that we have ignored so far.

The Formative Phase (1774-1919)

For Majumdar (1950), this phase ended in 1911. According to Vidyarthi (1975), this period extended to 1920.By 1807, the Company had realized the importance of anthropological knowledge. The Governor-General had appointed Dr. Francis Buchanan to collect information on the life and culture of the people of Bengal.

One of the first things that happened in Anthropology in India was the setting up of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1774 by Sir William Jones. Under this organization, a number of anthropological works were conducted and many were printed in the journal of the Society. It is said by many that such work did not constitute an anthropology since they were written by British administrators and missionaries rather than 'true' anthropologists. However,

many were well trained and their works are still studied, albeit as matters of historical interest, in Indian universities. They included famous names like L. S. O'Malley, E. Thurston, Edward Tuite Dalton, Herbert Hope Risley, R.V. Russell, William Crooke, J. T. Blunt, Buchanan, J. P. Mills, R.E. Enthoven, J. Todd, Valentine Ball, Baden-Powell, Sir Edward Gait, Sir Richard C. Temple, Sir Denzil Ibbetson, H. A. Rose, E. T. H. Atkinson, J. Shakespear, P. R. T. Gurdon, N. E. Perry, T. V. Grigson, Sir Edward Gait, Campbell, Latham, and others. These men compiled encyclopaedic material on castes and tribes of various parts of India. What they could not collect, they compiled in other works where they described regions as well as the people they met on their travels. 'True' anthropologists like W. H. R. Rivers, J. H. Hutton, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and C. G. Seligman also came to India. Their work influenced people like Paul Olaf Bodding, Hoffman, Emelen, etc. to work on Indian communities in a greater degree of sympathetic detail.

The Asiatic Society was established in 1774 (it became the Asiatic Society of Bengal later in 1784) and this seems to be the beginning of anthropology in this part of the world. By 1784 the journal of the society also started coming out regularly. By 1893, a separate section or Part III was being published of the journal which contained only anthropologically relevant material. This continued till 1904. Recently these old issues have been digitized for future generations and copies of articles contained there may be obtained for a price. The Academic Association began in 1828, the Bethune Society in 1851, the Benaras Institute in 1861 and the Bengal Social Science Association between 1867 to 1878. All of these were Institutes where social science research began to be carried out.

The Constructive Phase (1920-1949)

For Majumdar (1950), this phase began in 1912 and ended in 1937.By 1920, Anthropology came into the curriculum of Post-graduate studies at Calcutta University with R. Chanda as Head. This was a marked change from the earlier period. By 1918 it was a subsidiary subject in Calcutta University but its true identity emerged only with its development into a full-fledged discipline. K. P. Chattopadhyay was one of the first to be appointed there with R. P. Chanda (who is famous for his idea of brachycephalization in Western India). They were joined by L. K. A. Iyer. The first group of students included luminaries like N. K. Bose, D. N. Majumdar, B. S. Guha, P. C. Biswas, T. C. Das, S. S. Sarkar, Dharani Sen and Andre Beteille.

Ethnological work suffered after the transfer of Sir Herbert Risley to other work and no one seemed to be willing to revive it. Eventually, the Anthropological Survey was originally begun in 1946 as a Department of Anthropology, Government of India. This happened after the Government of India held a consultation between B.S. Guha and Dr. R. B. Seymour-Sewell, at the time the Director of the Zoological Survey of India. It was located in Benares

(Varanasi) for a couple of years due to problems in Kolkata but after the building of the Indian Museum was built, it was shifted there in 1948. It was intended to carry out extensive Anthropological work in all the three spheres of Anthropological work under B.S. Guha. The unit was also intended to teach and train students in Anthropological work with a stipend of Rs 150 per month starting with six from 1946-47 (when they went to Odisha) and then four from 1947-48 (when they went to Jaunsar-Bawar). A trip to the Andaman Islands was also organised in the same year (1948) (Anthropos; 1948).

The Analytical Period (1950-1990)

For D. N. Majumdar (1950), this phase began in 1938 and carried on to the present.The earlier anthropologists like Surajit Sinha called this the recent phase. By this time Indian Anthropologists had started regularly interacting with anthropologists abroad and many kinds of collaborative works were taken up. A shift was seen from the descriptive studies of preliterate villages to the analytical studies of complex societies. Village studies still remained the norm and began to be raised to the level of a methodological deity. The Americans who came to India during this period made their works famous for all time and immortalized also the names of the villages they worked in. These studies began with the work of Sir Henry Sumner Maine in 1871 and Sir Baden-Powell in 1892. Morris Opler of Cornell University (Madhopur and Rampur), Oscar Lewis of the University of Illinois (Rampura) in 1952, David Mandelbaum of the University of California, W.H. Wiser and Charlotte Wiser of Cornell University in 1933-36 (Karimpur), Alan and Ralph Beals from University of California(Namhali and Gopalpur), Harold A. Gould (Sherupur), Kathleen Gough (Wangala, Dalena, Kumbapettai), Stephen Fuchs, T. Scarlett Epstein (Mangala, Kalenahalli), Gitel Steed (Kasandra), Ruth and Stanley Freed from the National Museum of Natural History at New York (Shanti Nagar), F. G. Bailey (Bisipara), Robert Redfield, W. A. Rowe of Cornell University (Senapur), M. S. Luschinsky in 1954-57 (Senapur), M. R. Goodall of Cornell University (Chittora), David Mandelbaum, McKim Marriott (KishanGarhi, Wai town near Pune), John T. Hitchcock (Khalapur), John J. Gumperz (Khalapur), Kolenda (Khalapur), Ralph R. Retztaff (Khalapur), Leigh Minturn (Khalapur), A. P. Barnabas (Sharanpur), Adrian C. Mayer (Ramkheri), G. M. Carstairs (Deoli), Henry Orenstein (Gaon), Robbins Burling (Rengsanggri), Milton Singer (Madras), Gerald D. Berreman (Sirkanda), David G. Mandelbaum, O. T. Beidelman, Bernard Cohn (Senapur), Martin Orans (Jamshedpur), etc. Indian anthropologists who were included in this group included S. C. Dube (Shamirpet), M. N. Srinivas (Rampura), A. Aiyappan, D. N. Majumdar (Mohana), Prof.Inder Pal Singh (Deleke), K. S. Mathur (Potlod), Yogendra Singh (Chanukhera), G. S. Ghurye (Haveli Taluka), etc. A large number of village study monographs were published in the 1960s through the Census of India 1961. The first of these was a study of Ghaghra by L. P. Vidyarthi.

Further, it was already apparent that studies on women was a requirement in Indian Anthropology. Many studies showed problems of equity as well as issues emanating from patriarchial biases in agricultural societies, especially in Northern India (for example, Sharma; 1982).

By 1997, the idea that women were not just a commodity but there were many nuances to the idea of women could be seen by Anthropologists working on women in India. As the Miss World contest was aired on Indian television, an anthropologist visualised the various viewpoints aired during and after the show from the vantage of a room in Shillong, Meghalaya, India. He saw many things about how people discussed issues of morality, ethics, modesty and change. He also saw how it was seen to be 'wasteful' expenditure which could be put to more useful avenues. While some felt issues of modesty others felt that they had moved on. These fractured dialogues showed a difference of opinion in the population that needed to be researched in much greater detail (Russell; 1997).

The Evaluative Phase (1990-present)

The complexity of Indian society was frequently described by Western anthropologists in terms inimical to many Indian anthropologists. Hence, Indian anthropologists began to feel that a better interpretation of such complex interrelationships could be given by Indian anthropologists. As a result, many anthropologists have proposed their own theories. The study of recent improvements and changes in anthropology in India deserves to be done in much more detail. However, it has become clear that not only are the earlier trends being maintained but many areas of anthropology are emerging anew and other sub-fields within are becoming active. An increasing interest in Medical Anthropology, Religion, Development studies, Psychological studies, as well as other areas is becoming more evident.This stage involved many studies relating to the complex relations between Colonialism and Anthropology in the Indian context of traditional customs as one example (for instance, see Dirks; 1997). One of the offshoots of this attitude has been to restudy villages earlier studied during the various village studies programme mentioned again. This is also producing fruitful data on social change.

In fact for Bottomore (1962), Indian social anthropology had much to teach sociologists from India as well as those in Britain. This, he felt, would lead to a close and long-lasting relationship. For Cohn (1965), there was enough ethnography on the legal aspects and on disputes for a comparative study in India, as he amply showed. He claimed that comparative and pan-Indian studies on other aspects had already begun. It was only to be expected that this trend would continue to critically examine not specific cases merely but a pan-Indian idea of the Indian legal system.

Agehananda Bharati (1971) claimed that all the sociologists and

anthropologists critically evaluated Other peoples' religions but did not note the 'affective and orectic' elements that made belief systems and rituals work. He called for a much more intensive and perhaps more objective as well as subjective analysis of religion than had previously been done in Anthropology. This could have come from no more experienced person than he, since he was known as a practicing tantric and had written a book on *Tantric Traditions*.

Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (born on 16 November 1916 in Mysore), was educated initially in Karnataka. In his own house he was close to Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Marathi, as well as a colony of urban shepherds or Kurubas. A graduate from Mysore University in 1936, with a Masters in 1939 in Sociology, he was taught by G.S. Ghurye taught both Sociology and Anthropology, though he often disagreed with his views. He then completed anLl.B. before completing his Ph.D. from Bombay University. He proposed the idea of 'Brahminisation' as a form of caste mobility in this work among the Coorgs for the first time. He also promoted the idea that there was a 'field view' and a 'book view' to looking at ritual practices. He was structural-functional in his outlook through his following of the work of A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski. He worked with the former and E.E. Evans-Pritchard to complete his D.Phil. from Oxford in 1947. Over time, more concepts like 'Sanskritization' began to be included in his work since 1962, as well as a differentiation between the terms *varna* and *jati*. He promoted the study of village life in India to understand social change. His work in Rampura led to a new concept – that of 'dominant caste' being used to explain the behavior of certain castes in the field context in 1959. In 1966, he developed the term 'Westernization' to explain a set of changes happening among the rural elite and among others. When he founded the Department of Sociology at the University of Delhi, one of the people he appointed was Andre Beteille. He focused on fieldwork as a very important part of the work of Anthropology and Sociology. His *Remembered Ethnography* is a unique enterprise which he wrote after his field notes were accidentally burnt. He went on to write papers on national integration, dowry, bridewealth, industrialization and its effect, urban communities, hospitals and gender issues, among others before his death in 1999 in Bangalore.

Another major set of models were created by trendsetter ShyamaCharanDube (born 25 July 1922 in Seoni in Madhya Pradesh), who first completed a degree in Political Science before deciding to join Anthropology. He then conducted a study of the Kamars of Raipur for his doctoral dissertation in Sociology, studying the society holistically using traditional anthropological methods. He then went to England as a Lecturer in Anthropology, from where he developed his love for studying multi-caste villages from India, and began with Shamirpet in Hyderabad, and then in Western Odisha. He became interested in studying the impact of community development planning on villages. This formed a very important part of this

period of his research interests, where he contributed both to Sociology as well as to Social Anthropology. He wrote *Indian Village* in 1955 and then *India's Changing Villages: Human Factors in Community Development* in 1958 as well as *Power and Conflict in Village India*, as well as several research papers. He also worked on red tapism in Indian bureaucracy and was in favour of the development of an indigenous Anthropology, especially issues of exploitation, inequality and injustice. He wanted a dynamic social science to respond to changes in society. This was to be his major theme till 1988. Dube contributed to Sociology as well as to Social Anthropology, and taught Political Science at Lucknow University and Sociology/Social Anthropology at Nagpur and Osmania universities. He served for some time at in the Anthropological Survey of India and also at the National Institute of Community Development (1961-64). He died on 4 February 1996.

Triloki Nath Madan (born in Kashmir on 12 August 1933) was most well-known for his textbook of Social Anthropology that he wrote with D.N. Majumdar. He was also known for his work on the *Family and Kinship among the Pandits of Rural Kashmir* (1966). His details of the rituals and their symbolic reasons behind their performance was frequently cited by scholars across the world. He also taught both Sociology as well as Social Anthropology and became one of the experts in religious renunciation as well as on domesticity. He has also written much about the lived aspects of different forms of Hinduism, life cycle rituals as well as comments on Islam. He continues to influence many students, scholars and academics even today.

André Béteille(born 30 September 1934) may be seen as a very major social scientist of eminence who has again worked both in Anthropology as well as Sociology.He saw many current problems happening due to certain practices of society (after Weber) and he also looked at the idea of hierarchy, inequality, change and the way castes were functioning today in many spheres of today (after Rawls). He looked at institutions and how they helped to embed the ideologies of individuals. The ideas of politics, secularism and religion also became analysed through his framework. His initial work was on Tanjore (Tamil) Brahmins and fieldwork conducted among them which was added to by intense perceptive observations of society.

Vinay Kumar Srivastava (1991) on future of Anthropology said: the point was to stand up and make the identity of the Anthropologist felt for others. It was also an issue that one needed to show the move towards playing a second fiddle to the market was that ordinary Anthropological work itself led to future market skills. In other words, the move towards skilling was already a part of Anthropology but this was often not being acknowledged.

It was necessary to integrate the different branches of Anthropology and also to integrate 'special branches of Anthropology' like Medical Anthropology, Economic Anthropology with the rest of the field.The

Anthropologist thus needed to be political and moral in order to engage with current issues in society. Only then could we solve the problems that engage us today. However, this did not mean being subjective. This meant a scientific, rational approach to moving towards a just, ethical, moral and more egalitarian society.

We need to study the transnational links of our local areas and problems and conduct good fieldwork to become better. Further, we need to hone and create methodological and theoretical tools for the purpose.As an addendum, it would be useful to remember that economists and historians found the use of Anthropological methods like case studies, genealogies and concepts like dominant caste important in analysing long term trends quite some time ago (see Kessinger; 1972). Other methods call for a rethinking of the use of archives (Mathur; 2000).

For Persoon and Van Est (2000), different communities have different ways of measuring time, hence their conception of future is different.The past is often thought of as a resource.Anthropological writings and the future (which is hidden) include Divination, religion, oral traditions, material culture, development discourse, economy, environmental issues.Often last chapters of monographs end with a view by the anthropologist about the future of the community studied (especially if it is a hunting-gathering or nomadic one). There is mention of influence of a dominant culture like 'hinduization' of a tribal community, etc.Use of resources unsustainably is also a case in point. Often they claim community harmony with natural resources without adequate scientific data.So terms like 'sustainability' and 'future generations' proliferate in anthropological literature. So much of the things recommended use such ideas to propagate their ideas.

Vineeta Sinha (2005) begins with a detailed account of the interaction of Indians with the rest of the world through written accounts.The struggle to be relevant to others continues. Also, the focus on tribal studies and its importance was also evident.What she claims is that Indian anthropology needs to theorize these separations and unities as a means of engaging with the problem. The idea of an 'intellectual crisis' is often mentioned for the social sciences and Anthropology using different terms (as in Danda; 1981 and Padhy; 1988). There is seen to be a 'lack of enthusiasm and creativity' (Misra; 1972) as well as the lack of new theories and methods, coherence and proper direction coupled with a mindless imitation of Western models (Sharma; 1990). It was also seen that Indian Anthropology was lagging in terms of Western Anthropology (Basu and Biswas; 1980). However some (as in Atal; 1976, Hasnain; 1988). The overall idea has been to re-evaluate and redefine the content and priorities of Indian Anthropology as well as to relook at the crisis for a more in-depth reading (Chatterjee; 2002).

Those with good knowledge of their field areas may be potentially used

by various government departments, which sometimes happens but Indian Anthropologists needed to be heard and to apply their knowledge to particular problems. However, relations with the government cause distrust, mistrust, scepticism and suspicion (Sachidananda; 1980: 17-18). This tension between anthropologists and the government preclude the use of Anthropology for practical solutions.

The terms 'indigenous' and 'native' are problematic. They need to be contextualised epistemologically and politically within the idea of knowledge production in Anthropology in a colonial context. This context has been missing in most works and it has only become more attended to in recent works. Many in the Third World use the term 'native' to mean refashioned identities without having a tone of subjugation or marginalization. It has also been labelled 'other' or 'indigenous'. The true meaning of such terms need to be put firmly within the Indian context (Karlsson; 2003).

Peter Berger (2012) looked at early anthropologists who studied caste and the village and unravelled their theoretical orientations and the beginnings of the argument of understanding the village as a microcosm of the whole.Dumont's work was analysed with all the critics' comments.

However, other general trends in the discipline of anthropology made themselves felt in India as well: Geertz's symbolic anthropology, Lévi-Strauss' structuralism, Asad and Said's criticism of colonialism and Orientalism, feminist anthropology and neo-Marxist theories, to name just the main currents. As more anthropologists came to conduct fieldwork in India the themes also diversified. Caste and social structure became less dominant topics, while religion began to receive more attention (see Fuller and Spencer; 1990).

Much like Raheja, Dirks, Burghart, and Marglin in the 1980s, Wadley contributes to widening Dumont's narrow focus on purity as the single value, hierarchy as the single type of relationship, and power as nonreligious.

Next was an analysis of Subaltern Studies by RanajitGuha.Also, this and Cohn, began the idea that incorporation of history in Anthropology was not just a sub-discipline but an incorporation in the basic way that the discipline looked at society itself.

Postcolonial theory not only criticizes the complicity of culture with power but generally "targets academic disciplines." This is the reason why "disciplines devoted to representing the Other . . . have been less enthusiastic, if not hostile" to this approach, as the historian Gyan Prakash wrote in the volume edited by Dirks (Prakash; 1992: 376). The latter stated more generally, that "Western scholarship has consistently been part of the problem rather than the solution" (1992: 9). In this view, anthropology is not only morally dubious because of its entanglement with colonialism right up to the present, and its ignorance of that very fact, but in addition its aims (discovering

"authentic" culture) are questionable, its ethnographic method (spending a year in a village and then generalizing the findings) doubtful, and its epistemological assumptions (ignoring the "knower's involvement in the object of knowledge") naïve (Prakash; 1992: 262, Dirks; 2001: 54, 79).

Dirks deliberately abandoned both culture and ethnography. He offered anthropology a dead end and advised us to do his kind of history instead of ethnographic fieldwork.

This outline has shown that theoretical perspectives involved in the anthropology of India have been as diverse as the social and cultural phenomena being studied. No single approach can claim pre-eminence, nor—despite shifts in urgent issues and popular trends—can particular themes or methodologies claim hegemony over others. However, in my view, to amend an expression of Marshall Sahlins (1985: 149), a theory needs to be "burdened with the world," that is, with ethnography and the microscopic dimensions ethnographies usually describe. As long as a scholar working from a theoretical perspective is able to engage in an ongoing dialogue with ethnographic material and can generate new analytic impulses on the basis of this correspondence that will in turn facilitate the understanding of social processes and patterns, it will be alive and well; disconnected from ethnography, a theory soon loses its heuristic value for anthropology. Since "ethnography is never impossible" (Ortner 1995: 188), the prospects of further theoretical development in the anthropology of India could be promising.

P. Venkata Rao (2012) suggested to help students understand the arenas in the market where they may be gainfully employed after having done Anthropology. Further the Development Project Evaluation should have process Evaluation, Outcome/Effect Studies; Systems Evaluation: Social Soundness Analysis, Social Impact Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment, etc.; Cultural Resource Assessment and Management (recording, conservation, and management of cultural resources including prehistoric and historic sites); Corporate or Business Anthropology: Product Design, Project Management, Program Management, Marketing and Consumer Behaviour; Sales Strategies; Applied Visual Anthropology, Advertising, Reporting, Audience Research, Documentary making; Needs Assessment (for different types of needs); Capacity development training to increase the capacity of processes of organizations and/or institutions; disaster management, preparedness, relief plans, training, environmental risk assessment; creating own consultancy or non-governmental organization; social marketing and social entrepreneurship.

Participatory methodologies which anthropologists are relearning from non-anthropologists, recognition of emphasis on importance of indigenous knowledge for sustainable development, use of anthropological insights in management schools, etc., could be mentioned here also.

Buddhadeb Chaudhuri (2015)

Buddhadeb Chaudhuri (2015) said that, "to my mind, the main challenge is that often we, the anthropologists, are following such techniques which cannot really provide us the true anthropological perspectives. I am not against other/ new techniques in the context of the emerging areas of research, but the whole problem is if instead of observation, case studies etc., we go for schedules or structured schedules and cover small samples (unlike the sociologists who generally in such studies cover large samples), it cannot provide us the true perspective or insight for proper analysis. Some of the emerging areas that he identified included the following:

1. Health, Anthropology and Indigenous wisdom and knowledge;

2. Anthropology and Area Studies;

3. Environment, Development and Forest; and

4. Anthropology and Human Rights".

Needless to say, Chaudhuri himself worked on these four arenas of research in great detail throughout his career, in support of his views.

Understanding Some Aspects of Anthropological Trends in India Today

Ganguly looks at the present political scenario through which she explains how public opinion has often curtailed research that has been seen as offending the public. Under such circumstances, she claims that due to the popular opinion on current academic work, we are forced to address our work and our language for a much bigger audience than originally intended. The challenge would be to do so without compromising on ethics and academic integrity in India (Ganguly; 2017).

In the current atmosphere, Anthropologists deal with their overall disagreement development programmes even as they deal with current assessments of development in specific cases. It shows us how development in the Indian context has often overlooked local solutions as opposed to top-down programmes. According to many, this particular brand of development would need to become the hallmark of true development, overseen by anthropologists in different roles (de Zwart; 2000).

Recent trends include relaxations in norms for rigorous fieldwork.Some results of research from other social science or fields in biology seem better than those done by anthropologists.Fieldwork decreases in intensity and in detail. People work on specific arenas than on holistic approaches.In research students and researchers work in narrow specific areas forgetting its links with wider arenas of the study called anthropology. This was perhaps done to suit the current trends in Anthropological studies which show publications in a large range of subjects which do not show a direct link to Anthropology. This

is often done to increase the range of publications to higher Impact Factors. So, then, each anthropologist attends to one major arena of research and also deals with some other areas that interest them. This scattered nature of research increases data and publications but is bad for the continuity of research.

Apart from these areas some fields have been added as important arenas of research in Anthropology in India that have led to higher publications and reports. These include Palaeoanthropology, Corporate and Business Anthropology, Human Rights issues, Visual Anthropology, among others. This period also strengthened Forensic Science and Human Genetics.

Where do we go from here? We can either have history happen to us or we can make it as we go along and shape it in a particular manner. It is with this responsibility that we must ensure fieldwork for basic ethnographic work. Ethnographic data and its changes must be recorded since this is the baseline for all of our predictive and theoretical data inputs.

New ethical dilemmas and problems are also likely to emerge as fieldwork by Anthropologists occupy other areas of social life and inhabit other mental maps of personal space of the fieldworker as well as of the Other. These have often been related through individual cases (for example, Kunnath; 2013 about fieldwork among Maoists).

Academic teaching of Anthropology will certainly keep spilling out of our Departments and institutes in much greater volume than ever before. We should welcome it even as we welcome the impact of other disciplines on Anthropology. I think I see that there will be much financial pressure to monetize and commercialize the discipline, if only to finance our academic environment. Though sad, without a more benign governance this is to be our reality.

To wit, arenas like Corporate and Business Anthropology, SIA, research methodology, Anthropology of Development and arenas like Forensics, nutritional anthropology and developmental and growth research, among others may become the next platform on which the growth of the discipline might depend.For Paul Sillitoe (1998), Development Anthropology might hinge on studies on Indigenous Knowledge, which we have seen was a harbinger for studies on bottom-up development.

To remain meaningful, one may then state that Anthropological research would be required to be itself a skill set. It is wrong of industry to state that skilled individuals for industry are needed and they are not available. Any industry would require only a few Anthropologists as per their requirement – too small a number to be commercially trained. Thus, they would push the onus of last-mile training for being within their organization to academia – which is highly unfair. By pressurizing this through government is doubly unfair. Perhaps they would do better by accepting the high level of training and skill sets Anthropologists give and then deal with the way the employees

adapt to their environment rather than the other way around! Also, the people whom we consider today as 'textbook anthropologists' were considered to be mavericks when they lived and worked (for example, see Srinivas; 1997).

Anthropological research, in general, is intrinsically useful. The focus need not be given through outside agencies and funding organizations but by our own understanding of our disciplinary boundaries. So, we should not look for people to tell us what we should be but should tell others what we are. How are we any different from the disciplinary boundaries of, say, Medicine? Further, Anthropology can be useful not by being applied in a focussed manner but by collecting baseline data that may be used in many spheres and many areas simultaneously. This is why it is seen to be so multifarious in its operations.

One aspect is the issue of numbers and metrics as a guide to academia for the world. Begun by profit-making journal companies, today Universities and the Indian government have accepted this with alacrity, notwithstanding the murmurs of dissent globally becoming more and more strident. Whatever be the cause, reason or dynamics, research guided by large-scale academic metrics at the national scale may guide funding and thus much research, a case of the tail wagging the academic dog.

The fact remains that Anthropologists in India suffer from a lack of manpower as well as funding to do intensive long-term research. Sometimes they are also pushed into arenas of research which they are not comfortable with or may even disagree to. The idea of national agendas for research was also hotly debated since it was felt that it created closed systems with closed minds. The only way was to give adequate funds for research and personnel so that work could be carried out at a suitable pace to compete with International colleagues (Singh, Wood and Vidyarthi; 1971). This situation does not seem to have undergone much change in fifty years.

The major research work required are in the arenas of conflict and insurgency, inter-faith relations, inter-community relations, online modes of data collection, epidemics, as well as on food and culture. A new arena would be in the spaces of local history and its interaction with the community.

Another arena that needs to be covered (already begun by INCAA) is to frame clear ethical guidelines for Anthropologists in India. They may be critical of government plans and policies or even of whole governments if it is warranted by general consensus of Anthropologists. This is crucial for further commercialization of Anthropology which is inevitable.

Conclusions

Anthropology is itself a skill set, it does not, over and above itself need to become one. We need to get our discipline understood and clarified to others. This would ensure a basic understanding of the subject to others. This includes

a set of ethical guidelines. Wagging the market instead of being the dog that is wagged by the market is a necessity if we are not to be sold to the market, lock stock and barrel. In fact we are in imminent danger of having our results manipulated to suit market forces since they would be the financing body of our projects. Research scholars, graduates and PGs in Anthropology are to be seen as skilled labour. Prof. Srivastava would have seen us as independent entities. Today, that he is no more, we must underline this responsibility for ourselves and become what we wished him to guide us to.

Acknowledgements

References

Anthropos.

1948.   "Department of Anthropology, Government of India", *American Anthropologist*, Jul.-Sep., New Series, Vol. 50, No. 3, Part 1, pp. 576-581.

Atal, Yogesh.

1976.   *Social Sciences: The Indian Scene*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

Basu, Amitabha and Suhas K. Biswas.

1980.   "Is Indian Anthropology Dead/Dying?", *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*, Vol. 15, pp. 1-14.

Berger, Peter.

2012.   "Theory and Ethnography in the Modern Anthropology of India", *HAU*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 325-357.

Bharati, Agehananda.

1971.   "Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion: Ritual and Belief Systems", *Biennial Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 7, pp. 230-282.

Bottomore, T.B.

1962.   "Sociology in India", *The British Journal of Sociology*, Jun., Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 98-106.

Chatterjee, Partha.

2002.   "Institutional Context of Social Science Research in South Asia", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31 August, pp. 3604-3612.

Chaudhuri, Buddhadeb.

2015.   "Some Emerging Areas of Research in Anthropology in India", *Indian*

Anthropologist, Vol. 45, No. 1, January-June, pp. 1-14.

Cohn, Bernard S.

 1965. "Anthropological Notes on Disputes and Law in India", *American Anthropologist*, December, New Series, Vol. 67, No. 6, Part 2: The Ethnography of Law, pp. 82-122.

Danda, Ajit K.

 1981. "On the Future for Anthropology in India", *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*, Vol. 16, pp. 221-230.

deZwart, Frank.

 2000. "Practical Knowledge and Institutional Design in India's Affirmative Policy Action", *Anthropology Today*, April, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 4-7.

Dirks, Nicholas B.

 1997. "The Policing of Tradition: Colonialism and Anthropology in Southern India", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Jan., Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 182-212.

Dirks, Nicholas B.

 2001. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fuller, Christopher John and Jonathan Spencer.

 1990. "South Asian Anthropology in the 1980s", *South Asia Research*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 85-105.

Ganguly, Tuhina.

 2017. "Academic Freedom and the Future of Anthropology in India", *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 119, No. 3, September, pp. 526-529.

Hasnain, Nadeem.

 1988. *Readings in Indian Anthropology*. New Delhi: Harnam Publications.

Karlsson, Bengt G.

 2003. "Anthropology and the "Indigenous Slot": Claims and Debates about indigenous Peoples' Status in India", *Critique of Anthropology*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 403-423.

Kessinger, Tom G.

 1972. "The Study of Social and Economic Change in Rural India", *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Autumn, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 313-322.

Kunnath, George J.

 2013. "Anthropology's Ethical Dilemmas: Reflections from the Maoist Fields of India", *Current Anthropology*, Dec., Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 740-752.

Mathur, Saloni.

 2000. "History and Anthropology in South Asia: Rethinking the Archive", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 29, pp. 89-106.

Misra, P.K.

1972.   "Social Science Researches in India: Their Relevance", *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*, Vol. 7, pp. 89-96.

Ortner, Sherry B.

1995.   "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*,Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 173–93.

Pathy, Jaganath.

1988.   "Emerging Frontiers for Anthropology from Third World Perspective", *Indian Anthropologist*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 11-19.

Persoon, Gerard A. and Diny M. E. van Est.

2000.   "The Study of the Future in Anthropology in Relation to the Sustainability Debate", *Focaal*, No. 35, pp. 7-28.

Prakash, Gyan.

1992.   "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories in the Third World: Indian Historiography is Good to Think", in Nicholas B. Dirks (ed.) *Colonialism and Culture*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 353-388.

Rao, P. Venkata.

2012.   "Future of Anthropology in India: A Reflection and a Perspective", *The Eastern Anthropologist*, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 205-220.

Russell, Andrew.

1997.   "Miss World Comes to India", *Anthropology Today*, August, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 12-14.

Sachidananda.

1980.   "Planning, Development and Applied Anthropology in India", in L.P. Vidyarthi and K.N. Sahay (eds.) *Applied Anthropology and Development in India*. New Delhi: National Publishing House.

Sahlins, Marshall D.

1985.   *Islands of History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sharma, K.N.

1990.   "Western Sociology with Indian Icing", *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 251-258.

Sharma, Ursula M.

1982.   "Women's Participation in Agriculture in India", *Current Anthropology*, April, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 194-195.

Sillitoe, Paul.

1998.   "The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New Applied Anthropology", *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 223-252.

Singh, R.D., Evelyn Wood and L.P. Vidyarthi.

    1971.   "Further Comment on Urgent Social Research in India", *Current Anthropology*, Feb., Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 97-98.

Sinha, Vineeta.

    2005.   "Indigenizing Anthropology in India: Problematics of Negotiating an Identity", in Jan Van Breman, Eyal Ben-Ari and Syed FaridAlatas (eds.) *Asian Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp. 139-161.

Srinivas, M.N.

    1997.   "Practicing Social Anthropology in India", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 26, pp. 1-24.

Srivastava, V.K.

    1999.   "The Future of Anthropology", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 34, No. 9, 27 Feb – 5 Mar, pp. 545-552.