

The Place of Theory: Rights, Networks and Ethnographic Comparison

Harri Englund

Thomas Yarrow

Abstract

The relationship between theory and place has remained a central problem for the discipline of anthropology. Focusing on debates around the concepts of Human Rights and Networks, specifically as these traverse African and Melanesian contexts, this paper highlights how novel ideas emerge through sustained comparison across different regions. Rather than understand places as sources of theories to be applied to other contexts, we argue that anthropologists need to recognise how new concepts are generated through reflexive comparison across different regions. This analysis leads us to question a widespread propensity to understand places as the sine qua non of anthropological theory, proposing instead that place emerges retrospectively as an artefact of comparison. We conclude that while it is therefore necessary to acknowledge the analytic construction of Africa and its sub-regions, there remain compelling reasons to recognize its analytic utility.

The New Melanesian Ethnography, a phrase coined over twenty years ago (Josephides 1991), is no longer so new. The reason is the rapid increase, since the 1990s, of anthropological studies that have sought to address topics neglected by this literature. Work by authors such as Robert Foster (2008), Deborah Gewertz and Frederick Errington (1999), Bruce Knauff (1999), and Joel Robbins (2004) has been at the forefront of making the anthropology of

Melanesia investigate the effects of colonialism, post-colonialism, nationalism, commodification, Christianity, and so on. These authors of course have a point. As Marilyn Strathern herself admitted in an interview with *Cambridge Anthropology* in the mid-1990s, she and her then husband were ‘snobs’ during their first fieldwork in the 1960s and stayed clear of Christian churches (Czegledy 1992: 5). They did so despite the fact that the Lutheran Church had become established in their research area before they commenced their fieldwork.

The obvious benefits of expanding the thematic scope of Melanesianist anthropology should not, however, result in throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. A designation used more by its critics than by its practitioners, the New Melanesian Ethnography transcended, even as it anticipated, the anthropological auto-critique of the 1980s. Disciplinary certainties about the ethnographer’s authority had begun to crumble before *Writing Culture* (Clifford and Marcus 1986) was published, because the ethnographic work by authors such as Roy Wagner (1974) and Marilyn Strathern (1980) had started to ask unsettling questions about the assumptions anthropologists had conventionally brought to bear on their study of social groups and gender. Unlike some of the reflexive critique that was to follow, however, the New Melanesian Ethnography presented ethnography as a form of theory or, to put it more directly, refused a straightforward distinction between theory and ethnography. Reflexivity was a function of anthropological fieldwork, not a practice abstracted from it.

The reflexive turn the New Melanesian Ethnography anticipated has taken several directions in anthropology, but its subtle relationship between ethnography and theory has not received

the attention it deserves. Far too often places come to stand for theories, as though ‘composite person’, for example, represented a theory generated by fieldwork in Melanesia, just as ‘segmentary lineage’ once appeared as the distinctive contribution of Africanist anthropology (see e.g. Kuper 2005: 163-178). These two notions are, of course, particularly revealing for the way in which anthropological concepts can and do travel despite their origin in specific ethnographic locations. The concept of the dividual that gave rise to ‘composite person’ was first coined in the anthropology of India (Marriott 1976), and it has been used productively in the ethnographies of East and West Africa (Sanders 2008; Piot 1999). ‘Segmentary lineage’, in turn, had appeared in the study of Arabic societies before its prominence in Africanist anthropology (Dresch 1988). This facility by which concepts travel across ethnographic regions must not, however, be confused with the expectation that they stay intact when they do so. The key lesson of the New Melanesian Ethnography was to make explicit the origins of theory. It involved a degree of specificity about the process of conceptualization and description that a simple application of concepts borrowed from elsewhere can only undermine.

Joel Robbins has suggested that at the heart of the New Melanesian Ethnography was the injunction that “theory be made out of the materials that one finds in the same *place* one finds ones data” (2006: 172; emphasis added). It is worth exploring whether this injunction properly describes the theory-ethnography interdependence. It certainly conveys a sense of situated, reflexive knowledge production for which the New Melanesian Ethnography is justly renowned. Insofar as propositions, claims and arguments can be recognized as being ‘theoretical’ only if they afford a perspective on other situations than the one with which they are initially associated, the injunction would also seem to acknowledge the capacity of ethnographically grounded concepts and ideas to travel. But the emphasis on place may

inadvertently introduce a measure of relativism into the explication of the New Melanesian Ethnography. Once again place – and the localized fieldwork it seems to demand – appears as the source of anthropological theory, whereas a close reading of works by authors such as Wagner and Strathern reveals a more complex set of conceptual and pragmatic debts that give rise to fresh theory. Fieldwork is the crucial component of this mode of knowledge production. But Wagner's (1981) idea of culture and Strathern's (1988a) work on property and gender necessarily refer to modes of knowing and experiencing beyond the instances they ostensibly enunciate. How else would ideas about personhood described in ethnographies on Papua New Guinea provide a productive standpoint for the study of new reproductive technologies in Europe (see Strathern 1992)?

If the distinction between theory and ethnography collapses, the conventions by which anthropologists identify generality and particularity surely have the same fate. The specter of relativism is the one that requires attention, because Robbins's reading of the New Melanesian Ethnography could be supported by citing, for example, Strathern's (1988a) juxtapositions between gifts and commodities and between Melanesian and Western knowledge practices.ⁱ The use of these juxtapositions as analytical fictions to elicit unforeseen problems and possibilities in existing, comparative scholarship is lost when they are regarded as depictions of cultural differences. However, such is the current drive towards a more sophisticated – and more politically consequential – idea of universals both within and without academia (see e.g. Tsing 2005) that these analytical fictions may seem increasingly anachronistic.

In this article, we seek to reclaim the reflexivity of the New Melanesian Ethnography by exploring its insights into relational knowledge production in the contexts of discourses pertaining to ‘rights’ and ‘networks’. After considering how ‘Africa’ has been the recipient of ‘Melanesian’ theories without becoming the donor of theoretical counter-gifts, we attend to Joel Robbins’ notion of the rights of relationships (2010) and to Annelise Riles’s work on the network (2001) to demonstrate how the elaboration of ideas in anthropology necessarily exceeds place-bound theorization.

Comparisons Compared

For much of the twentieth century it has been axiomatic in anthropology (and, indeed, within thinking in the social sciences more broadly) that whilst theories change and evolve, fieldwork stands still. As Richard Fardon (1990) notes, Malinowski the fieldworker remains a part of our ethnographic present, even as theories are located in the past as part of an evolving disciplinary history. Despite over two decades of sustained critical deconstruction, fieldwork is still commonly imagined to anchor the ideas we produce about them. In a related way, anthropologists imagine places as an empirical counterpoint to our theoretical elaborations. This conception participates in a wider ‘multi-cultural’ ontology of a singular ‘natural’ world that can be multiply (culturally and subjectively) perceived (Viveiros de Castro 1998).

Strathern (1990) calls this assumption into question, suggesting that to understand the process by which places are assigned essential features we need to apprehend the analytic framing of regions within wider anthropological discourses. Analytic models, built up through a complex process of synthesis, are localized and regionalized at the moment they are

transferred. For example Mauss's theory of the gift emerged in relation to the potlatch, the *Hau*, the Indian gift and the *Kula*. This complex conceptual history is foreclosed, however, as the ideas are located in relation to different regionalized literatures. Thus we arrive at the idea of the gift *as* Melanesian. As an essential feature of Melanesia, neither can be understood independently of the other. As Arjun Appadurai's (1986, 1988) discussion of 'gate-keeping concepts' makes clear, this process of theoretical regionalization has taken place across a range of spatial and historical contexts. Similarly Fardon notes how regions become exemplars of types, features and phenomena: lineage in Africa, exchange in Melanesia, caste in India, aboriginal marriage and so on.

If theories have been localized by reference to a range of ethnographic contexts, not all are equally successful. Some theories travel whilst others stay put. Strathern (1990) accounts for this discrepancy as a matter of the extent to which different regional literatures have been drawn into the re-arrangement of the existing canon of anthropological thinking. She refers to this conceptual re-ordering as a 'negative strategy'.

Thus the success of 'African' structural-functionalist descent theory is located in its capacity to trouble existing anthropological concepts, and in turn a wider set of Euro-American understandings. For all we might now highlight the ethnocentric assumptions on which such theories were based, the elucidation of a distinct relationship between kinship and polity acted to overturn existing ideas about the distinctiveness of family and government.

Transported to the highlands of New Guinea, these ideas of descent and linearity initially framed the region as an instance of this conceptual framework. This formulation provided the context in which later critiques drew on Melanesian conceptions of the gift to invert African

understandings of descent. Later still these ideas were used to question assumptions latent in Marxist understandings of a commodity logic. Thus Strathern suggests that anthropologists working in Melanesia have inverted anthropological concepts, through the creation of ethnographic artifacts that appear to originate in Melanesia. However, the success of these objects does not straightforwardly derive from the region. Rather:

“... We have to understand that the character of the Melanesian economy is most efficiently grasped through rearranging a particular set of Western concepts, namely those to do with commodification. But the rearrangement can only take place for creative effect when it is seen to be motivated by an external context that stands as an *independent* source. For the inversion not to appear as an internal self-referential move (...), it must appear to have been elicited by conditions outside internal construction.” (Strathern 1990: 210)

An important implication of this insight is that theory and place cannot be understood as the abstract to the concrete nor as the shifting to the stable (Holbraad and Pedersen 2009). Rather the distinction between theory and place is itself an artifact of the way in which we locate the sources of ideas that in practice derive from complex engagements – including with other anthropologists and those we meet whilst doing fieldwork. This view also means accepting that our sense of a world comprised of distinct regions is an artifact of comparison. Places are not the basic units from which comparison proceeds: the concreteness of particular concepts (their location as self-evident facts about particular places) comes through comparison with other places, and the complex inter-textual relations through which ethnography proceeds.

In the light of our discussion so far, we cannot greet with unqualified enthusiasm the recent tendency among anthropologists working in Africa to apply concepts associated with the New Melanesian Ethnography. A notable example is Charles Piot's (1999) work on the Kabre of Togo, which deploys Strathernian theories of Melanesian sociality to overturn the canon of anthropological thinking on Voltaic peoples, and to question key elements of the ways in which Africanist scholars have conceptualized 'society'. Through structural-functionalist, Marxist and practice theory, he shows how successive theoretical innovations have reproduced prevailing Western understandings. His suggestion is that throughout these transformations, a basic concern with social organization and with the relation between individual and society has prevailed. In moving beyond this, he argues that the Kabre exemplify a wider African propensity to constitute the person through the dialectical incorporation of various 'outsides'.

Although the result is a description that interestingly exceeds its theoretical starting point, it does not negate or impose theoretical limits on it. Whilst Melanesian theory is used to illuminate African ethnography, there is no theoretical 'return'. The Melanesian theory of the gift constitutes a theoretical gift, so to speak, that remains un-reciprocated. To the extent that description and analysis exceed their theoretical point of departure, this excess is bracketed out as a difference of culture and place. Excess is registered as another instance of ethnographic concreteness, rather than a fundamental extension of anthropology's conceptual apparatus. The image is of 'Melanesian theory' applied (or extended) to 'African ethnography'.

This effect can be understood as an artifact of the framework by which anthropologists conventionally order their comparisons. Over two decades ago, Ladislav Holy (1987) made explicit the changing conceptualization of the role of ethnographic comparison (see also Gingrich and Fox 2002). Where positivistic anthropologists saw description of ethnographic ‘facts’ as a means to the ends of cross cultural generalization, interpretive approaches entailed the comparison of processes of meaning creation. He noted that since these are different in distinct cultures and societies, they cannot themselves provide the basis of comparison. In his own words: “To carry out comparison, we need a vantage point that is not culturally specific” (Holy 1987:13). For example, the comparison of gift and commodity logics becomes possible through the mediating, external concept of ‘the economy’.

Yet as Strathern (1988b) notes, the problem with this formulation is that anthropology’s mediating terms produce their own sense of disproportion. If certain regions seem more interesting than others, that discrepancy is not reducible to the nature of the societies being studied. It arises in relation to the placement of regions vis-à-vis analytic problems. In a related way, Mudimbe (1988) points to the distortion such mediating concepts have with respect to scholarly accounts of Africa. In their ‘epistemological ethnocentrism’ they set up a ‘silent dependency’. He defines this as “the belief that scientifically there is nothing to be learned from ‘them’ unless it is already ‘ours’ or comes from ‘us’.” (1988: 15)

As a form of conceptual leveling, the New Melanesian Ethnography might appear to provide solutions to this problem, or at least new ways of thinking. This is what Piot (1999) explicitly argues. Yet we need to be alert to the dangers of the comparative possibilities these new conceptual frameworks set up. Piot’s rendering of Kabre sociality is clearly more

sophisticated than a straightforward application of concepts from one region to another. Nonetheless, his analysis rests on a conceptual framework in which comparative possibilities are framed by ideas that appear to derive from other parts of the world. Pointing to new forms of personhood and ‘dividuality’ reinscribes the theoretical importance of Melanesia, providing new *versions* of ideas that appear to *originate* elsewhere. Another, perhaps more important, implication is that such cross-cultural analysis underscores a basic duality: ‘we’ construct a conceptual base from which to compare all others. As another ‘other’, the Kabre do not appear to fundamentally trouble the framework in which ‘otherness’ is conceived.

In highlighting this problem of comparison, our intention is not to critique the Strathernian theories of sociality on which his account rests. Rather it is to highlight how Strathern’s own approach points to the limits of this kind of thinking. In highlighting the theoretical framing of regions, and the regional framing of theory, she cautions us not only against the straightforward application of theories to places, but also against the mutually validating role of theory and place in the ethnographic imagination. Perhaps a more Strathernian approach might draw less heavily on Strathernian theory? If her own approach is precisely concerned to elucidate the dynamics by which theories reflexively emerge through place (and vice versa), then it is clear that the straightforward application of theory (‘Melanesian’ or otherwise) to novel ethnographic contexts will not do justice to this insight.

In highlighting this possibility we draw from her observation that one way of avoiding the sense of disproportion that attends cross-cultural comparison would be to *aim* for comparison whilst keeping in mind the non-comparability of the phenomena compared. This would entail making comparisons without subordinating either to a pre-existing comparative frame.

Strathern outlines how in this approach “... the anthropologist unable to represent the one completely in terms of the other, would use his or her Western concepts to mediate between the two in such a way as to give the analytic language the status of a third voice. The trick would be to demonstrate the non-comparability of [regionally specific] ideas, despite the mediating third language.” (1990: 212)

We have been arguing that recent anthropological accounts have sought to re-arrange our descriptions and analyses of various African realities in line with models of sociality emerging through the New Melanesian Ethnography. By contrast, we suggest that a Strathernian analysis invites us to ask how we might use our descriptions of these ethnographic specificities in such a way as to creatively re-arrange the understandings and concepts that are central to metropolitan anthropological theory. To the extent that these theories are now dominated by models of sociality that locate the source of their insight in Melanesia, this would entail a creative re-working of some of the theories we have come to think of as ‘Melanesian’.

Relational Rights

Recent work by Robbins (2004, 2010) indicates the lingering tension between universalism and relativism in some readings of the New Melanesian Ethnography. Moreover, it also demonstrates the thin line that actually separates universalism from relativism in these readings, because Robbins has used insights from Melanesianist anthropology to argue for both conventional cultural differences and the universalist dimensions of those insights. In his best known work, Robbins (2004, 2007) has attempted to form a new sub-discipline which he

calls ‘the anthropology of Christianity’. He has not so much questioned the validity of the New Melanesian Ethnography as used his own version of it to theorize radical cultural change among the Urapmin people with whom he worked. In fact, Robbins has found the occasion to express his respect for the New Melanesian Ethnography. Reviewing books by James Leach (2003) and Adam Reed (2004), he applauded the approach as “... a brave, final, and radical stand on the side of cultural difference in the context of an anthropology about to grow tired of detailed explorations of local symbolic worlds in all their particularity” (2006: 172). Note the emphasis on *cultural* difference as the main preoccupation of New Melanesian Ethnography, an emphasis on which Robbins’s account of Christian conversion in Papua New Guinea is built.

‘Relationalism’ is the concept Robbins requires to theorize the radical cultural change that Protestant Christianity introduced to the Urapmin. Unsurprisingly, the opposite of relationalism is ‘individualism’, and the sense of a rather conventional approach is conveyed even more strikingly by his desire to carry out an analysis of ‘the encounter between a relational culture and an individualist one’ (2004: 13). Deploying a vocabulary that belongs more to the 1950s sociology of modernization than to the New Melanesian Ethnography, Robbins explains that “... with the coming of Christianity, the traditional relationalism of Urapmin culture has been severely challenged” (2004: 193). However, Robbins belongs too much to the twenty-first century to associate his vocabulary with the teleological vision of cultural change. Contestation and contradiction are crucial to the kind of indeterminacy Robbins identifies among the Urapmin, acknowledging that “Christianity fails to ensure the final victory of the individualism that it has introduced into Urapmin life” (2004: 311). Nonetheless, Robbins recognizes relationalism as a culturally different ‘paramount value’ from those of individualism and holism as theorized by Louis Dumont (1986). Yet what

Robbins has in mind is something more concrete, more empirical, than what Dumont's broad abstractions sought to accomplish.ⁱⁱ For Robbins, these '-isms' signify unique cultures, and cultures delineate actual boundaries of human experience.

It is, at first sight, rather surprising that Robbins has also been able to propose universalist aspects in the Melanesianist insights into relationalism. Shifting his attention from radical cultural change to justice and human rights, he noted the limited appeal of relativism: "It is hard to get an audience even within anthropology, much less outside of it, for a full-blown relativist critique of global discourses of human rights and justice" (2010: 173). It is this avoidance of relativism in current discussions about human rights that he identifies as the main reason why he has not himself previously written about the topic (Robbins 2010: 171). Robbins is concerned to retain an 'anthropological voice' in the efforts to engage the topic of human rights after the appeal of relativism has waned. His answer is to "... set aside relativism and play the universalist game" (2010: 173). He sets himself "... the constructive task of suggesting potential universals currently unrecognized or unelaborated in global debates" (2010: 174). Here relationalism, as it is inflected through Melanesianist anthropology, becomes a 'candidate universal' to qualify the convention by which individuals and groups have been seen as rights-bearers by political philosophers, lawyers and activists across the world. Where the primary unit of value is relationships, people both actively create relationships and experience them as inescapable. As such, relationships cannot be reduced to this or that individual or group and their particular preferences. "It is not so much people who have rights to relationships, but the other way around" (Robbins 2010: 188). Drawing on, among others, Strathern's (2004) account of a human rights NGO's intervention in a dispute where a young woman was supposed to be a part of compensation payment, Robbins (2010: 182-186) highlights contemporary tensions between the relational and individualist models of

justice in Papua New Guinea. He also notes similarities and differences between relationalism and Axel Honneth's (1996) theory of recognition to emphasize the capacity of relationalism to open up fresh perspectives on justice in the contemporary West, a capacity that suggests its potential as a candidate universal (Robbins 2010: 187-188).

The jump from unique cultures to candidate universals seems breathtaking or, at least, inconsistent, but the discrepancy may be more apparent than real and a result of different topics addressed – radical cultural change in one instance and human rights in the other. Relationalism is only one among other universals, and the tension between different models of justice discussed in Strathern's account might be seen to indicate the institutional reasons why some models appear to be more universal than others – backed by transnational NGOs and aid money, the individualist model of justice can be mistaken for a more generally applicable model than relationalism. It is here that Robbins's argument reveals its anthropological credentials by refusing the easy distinction between generality and particularity that such interventions can entail. What he does not mention, however, is the long history of relational rights as a topic of anthropological theory, from Henry Maine (1913) to Bronislaw Malinowski (1926), who both famously emphasized social identity and status as the preconditions of rights. Before the current focus on human rights in discussions about justice, relational rights received an ethnographically and theoretically more sophisticated treatment in the works of mid-century Africanists (see e.g. Epstein 1954; Gluckman 1965), whose insights continue to be evoked in more contemporary settings (see e.g. Comaroff and Roberts 1981; Englund 2002; Griffiths 1997; Oomen 2005). In fact, such has the emphasis been in Africanist anthropology on the embeddedness of dispute settlement in kinship rights and obligations that the paradigmatic cases of Robbins's candidate universal might better be located there than in Melanesianist anthropology.

Tempting as this observation might seem for an Africanist to make, however, the theory of relational rights did not emanate from any particular place. The argument between Max Gluckman (1965) and Paul Bohannan (1957) reveals the extent to which working in the same continent and sharing similar analytical interests did not guarantee consensus on the nature and purpose of anthropological comparison. After identifying the importance of debt and obligation to the definition and practice of relational rights, Gluckman could hope for a greater precision about the meaning of debt only through a comparative analysis involving material not only from his own Barotse study in present-day Zambia but also from other ethnographies of ‘tribal law’ as well as from studies of Roman and early English law. “What is the difference between debt in these contexts”, he asked, “and the fact that any obligation establishes a state of indebtedness, in another sense of the word, while clearly obligation is basic to any system of law” (1965: 245)? The question was skewed neither towards particularity nor generality as such but sought to elicit specificity through a comparative exercise. Gluckman felt, however, frustrated with the cultural particularism of some of his contemporaries working on African ethnography. Bohannan (1957) also emphasized the importance of debt to the idea of justice among the Tiv of Nigeria, but he insisted on the uniqueness of their system that could not be examined in terms of the concepts of Western jurisprudence. Each culture had its folk-system, and it would have been an error to ‘raise’ a folk-system ‘to the status of an analytical system’ (Bohannan 1957: 69). Note the assumption of scaling up when one moves from a folk-system to an analytical system – the first is always smaller in its scale than the second. “The insistence on uniqueness constantly obscures problems”, Gluckman (1965: 255) complained, pointing out the many not-so-unique features of Tiv language on justice and debt.

It was the ‘lack of perspective’ that troubled Gluckman (1965: 251) in cultural particularism, the inability to identify ‘similarities within differences’ (1965: 254) that would permit a more precise understanding of what was specific about the case in hand. To mark his intellectual debt, Gluckman dedicated his book to ‘the jurists of Barotseland and of the Yale Law School’. A close ethnographic study of a particular judicial system was, therefore, more than the result of intense fieldwork in Zambia. The locations of the emergence of his insights were more than two,ⁱⁱⁱ but the point to stress here is the way in which Gluckman understood universals to be specific in their historical scope and therefore the results of careful comparative work. To be sure, his comparison between tribal law and early English law would seem to have denied that the Barotse and the world where he operated outside fieldwork were coeval (Fabian 1983). Yet Gluckman, who pioneered the study of contemporary race and industrial relations in the anthropology of Africa (see e.g. Gluckman 1958, 1961), was equally interested to note the nature of justice in contemporary Britain in the light of his findings from Barotseland. Again, similarities and differences could be identified. Evoking the importance of property among the Barotse in constituting and maintaining relationships,^{iv} he admitted awareness that “... obligations in all personal relations in modern society are expressed in the form of material gifts, and redress for small offences is similarly made” (Gluckman 1965: 266). Such ‘pockets of multiplex relationships in modern society’ (Gluckman 1965: 266) should not, however, obscure the specific nature commodities had taken in contemporary Britain. Rather than being vital to the discharging and creation of debts between persons, “... commodities began to form an autonomous system, and ... increasingly drew people into impersonal, restricted, ephemeral relationships” (Gluckman 1965: 270). Insights from fieldwork in Zambia were crucial to afford this perspective on contemporary Britain. As a comparative exercise, it was no more

anachronistic than the gift-commodity and West-Melanesia distinctions that Strathern (1988a) deployed in her exploration of sociality and knowledge practices.

The notion of relational rights, in other words, was the innovation of neither Africanist nor Melanesianist anthropology but the outcome of careful, reflexive comparison. Robbins's (2010) comparison of Melanesian insights with Honneth's work (1996) continues this approach to a good effect, but his self-professed relativist impulse (Robbins 2010: 171) has also resulted in the emphasis on cultural uniqueness in his readings of the New Melanesian Ethnography, as described above. The dispute between Gluckman and Bohannan demonstrates, however, that such analytical predilections do not simply reflect the place where anthropologists have done their fieldwork. Gluckman worked within a tradition of anthropology that adopted as its key interest the description of difference and specificity in human affairs, without shying away from the possibility of using universal categories in that descriptive work. Unlike relativism, it made possible an engaged anthropology in which "... the right of the ruling community to a monopoly of moral judgement [was] sharply questioned" (James 1973: 46), a position all the more striking when its origin is traced to the colonial period when, for example, E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1931) admonished colonial administrators for their ignorance of the distinctions Africans made between different types of witchcraft and sorcery. Yet the approach did not emanate from some distinct 'British School', as Gluckman's (1975: 27-29) identification of a parallel between Edmund Leach's structuralist fascination with 'cultural grammar' and South Africa under apartheid made clear.^v Rather than localizing anthropological knowledge as a function of the places where anthropologists either do their fieldwork or get their training, it seems more pertinent to assess the extent to which they have acknowledged the multiple sources of their insights. The reflexive overcoming of the theory-ethnography divide among some mid-century Africanists

and in the New Melanesian Ethnography stands out as an antidote to the relativism of place-bound theory.

Networks

Networks, like 'rights', have provided the focus for sustained analytic attention that has localized its insights in a range of ways. Tracing some of the debates surrounding the concept, this section explores how Riles's recent formulation of 'the network' prompts reflection on the theorization of 'networks' by various Africanists.

Concepts of the network occupy a central place in Africanist scholarship. Recent theorizations of the post-colonial state owe much to the work of Jean-François Bayart and his influential formulation of the 'rhizome state'. Challenging the normative basis of Western political thinking, Bayart suggests that in Africa, the state, born of colonial occupation "... has been subject to multiple practices of re-appropriation which each day distance it more and more from its original model." (Bayart 1993: 208). Central to his articulation of this difference is the suggestion that what might at first appear as formally and institutionally distinct domains (reflecting the distinctions of western political thinking), are in fact connected by 'a universe of networks.' Here power is not exercised through class politics, but through the process of 'reciprocal assimilation' by which elites construct and operationalize personal networks on the basis of shifting identities that include kinship, ethnicity and religion. If these personal networks thereby transcend without nullifying a variety of distinctions of status and class, they also lead to the undermining of institutionally distinct domains of life. For Bayart, "... an infinitely variable multiplicity of networks...join together

the scattered parts of society” (1993: 220). Hence in order to understand this post-colonial reality, “we must do more than examine the institutional buds above the ground and look instead at its adventitious roots ... to analyse the bulbs and tubers from which it secretly extracts its nourishment and its vivacity.” (1993: 220).

Bayart’s account is explicitly pitched against a conceptual Euro-centrism that can be related to various forms of African essentialisms. If making Africa dependent involved the attribution of a fictive unity to African culture that confiscated a sense of social change and modernity, it is precisely these latter processes that Bayart seeks to reclaim, along with a concomitant sense of the continent’s heterogeneity. Accordingly, “networks are not invariables which provide us with the thread of continuity. They are constructed and as such are very flexible” (1993: 217). Yet if networks are dynamic and unstable and hence their form may be historically variable, what, for Bayart, remains spatially and temporally constant is the dynamic through which networks unfold. Historical and geographical distinctions notwithstanding, the network emerges as an underlying ordering principle and as a central dynamic of the post-colonial state in Africa. Just as Bayart imagines networks to join disparate social contexts for local actors, so the analytic form of the network orders the otherwise diverse set of contexts that his account encompasses.

Though the mid-century theories of network analysts emerged at a different theoretical and historical juncture, striking conceptual parallels exist. For scholars such as J. A. Barnes (1969), J. Clyde Mitchell (1969, 1974) and A. L. Epstein (1969), at the forefront of the approach, Network Analysis provided a counterpoint to the rigid abstractions of structural functionalist approaches. If network theory can thus be seen as a ‘negative strategy’ in the

Strathernian sense (see above), it was not because it disproved structural functionalism, but rather that it exposed its conceptual limits when applied to the urban contexts these scholars were beginning to examine. According to Mitchell (1969), while in ‘traditional’ rural contexts, the model of lineage descent continued to provide “... a coherent and systematic framework into which nearly all the daily activities of people and their relationships...could be fitted” (1969: 9), structural accounts were inadequate to the realities of urban life. Here the potential of network analysis was seen to inhere in its capacities to reveal how actors were forced to perform multiple roles in order to link domains of life that appeared to be structurally distinct. For network analysts, as for Bayart, the network is invoked as an explanation of the dynamics by which actors link structurally and institutionally distinct domains of life, through the contextual negotiation of roles and relations.

At least on a superficial reading, these accounts might suggest that personal networks are sociologically or ethnographically distinctive features of African sociality. Although Bayart seems to imply this, network analysts themselves offer reasons for circumspection. While recognizing a shifting ethnographic focus (away from ‘tribal’ and ‘traditional’ societies, towards ‘urban’ and ‘modern’ ones) as a significant conceptual stimulus, scholars such as Mitchell, Barnes and Epstein were at pains to distinguish network analysis from the ethnographic circumstances it described. As an explicitly analytic construct, the network enabled comparison, precisely because it stood outside the realities compared. It should be noted that although many of the initial applications of the concept were in African contexts (specifically Southern Africa), significant developments in the approach arose in relation to studies of Norway (Barnes 1954) and London (Bott 1957). Yet the more fundamental point is that even in the context of Africa, social and cultural differences emerged as a property of the distinct forms that networks can take. Rather than an explanation or theory, network analysts

argued that as a *concept*, the network's capacity to facilitate comparison lay precisely in its externality. Thus Kapferer is critical of a tendency to imagine network analysis as a 'theory in itself', proposing, rather, that it should be regarded as "...a concept ... by which we seek 'to organise human perception'" (1973: 84). Networks, as concepts, are not 'natural entities' but a way of organizing the realities that are encountered in the field. Thus the appeal of the concept can be seen to inhere in its capacity to order complexity by enabling comparison across a range of manifestly diverse ethnographic contexts. Epstein (1969), for example, suggests that as an analytic concept the network enables discernment between behavior that is 'random and haphazard', and that which is 'ordered'.

As one instance of a modernist faith in cumulative knowledge, the network therefore held out the possibility of the incorporation of multiple perspectives in an overarching 'whole'. In this pluralist vision, comparison was a matter of identifying general scales to act as common denominators that aided the movement from the particular to the general (cf. Holbraad and Pedersen 2009). Against this ideal, internal critiques foreground the problems that result from a slippage of scale and of the difficulties entailed in moving from the concrete to the abstract (and vice versa). Barnes, for example, comments on the conceptual confusions that have resulted from the application of network analysis to different ethnographic material: "Perhaps because of the diversity of contexts in which the idea of a network has been applied, there is already a good deal of confusion in the literature, for each analyst...introduces new refinements to suit his own particular problem" (1969: 53). His wider concern is that such 'refinements' end up confusing the concept, so that the basis for comparison is annulled. Related problems emerge with respect to the extent to which network analysis is able to operate independently of actors' own understandings of the relationships they hold.

Recent work turns these conceptions of the network in Riles's own terms 'inside out' (2001). Treating the network not as an analytic construct, but as an ethnographically significant fact, she shows how, for NGO workers based in Fiji, the network is itself intrinsic to the sociality they inhabit. For these people, 'the network' and 'personal relations' are not mutually explanatory contexts, but 'versions of one another seen twice' (2001: 27). Accordingly, "Networkers in Suva do not make sense of their personal relations in terms of their networks or vice versa; rather, like in the double view of the hologram as described by Baudrillard (...), it is in seeing the form of each in turn that both become real" (2001: 27). Her own account makes explicit how this ethnographic understanding leads to a reconsideration of the tenets of network analysis. Networkers in Fiji "would insist that personal relationships of the kind social network analysts study are not networks because they are not formal. For networkers in Suva, a network was an entity of a particular form. To include a person, an institution, or a project in a network was to formalize it and vice versa" (2001: 66). No longer an external (analytic) context, the network therefore emerges as a product of the imaginative practices of her informants.

The account elucidates a theory whose elegance and analytic power might suggest its utility as an explanatory device for other contexts – including in Africa. In line with our broader argument, however, our suggestion is that such a theoretical application should be resisted. Rather than seek to replicate the theory, recognition of the power of the insight should direct us to the *approach* that gave rise to it. In particular, the account usefully troubles the analytic place of 'the relation', directing attention to the *form* in which social relations emerge. In questioning the self-evidence of a distinction between 'personal' and 'institutional' relations,

Riles also suggests fruitful possibilities for research that suspends analytic judgment about the ways in which these domains intersect, in order to apprehend how such domains are ethnographically configured (see Yarrow 2011). As a counterpoint to much contemporary theorization, such approaches might fruitfully lead us beyond the generalized terms in which personal relations, as networks, have been variously apprehended as vectors of corruption and neo-patrimonialism across the continent of Africa.

Our wider point is that, as an instance of New Melanesian Ethnography, Riles's insights about the network emerge via a form of reflexivity with epistemological underpinnings profoundly at odds with the comparative framework. If network analysis used the concept of the network to order ethnographic material, Riles reveals how the network as ethnographic artifact, acts to (re-)order anthropological concepts. In line with the New Melanesian Ethnography, from which her approach explicitly draws, her account effectively makes a virtue of the 'confusion' of ethnography and analysis that Barnes decries. Riles's understanding of the network is an outcome of a form of conceptual displacement; the side-effect of taking seriously what her informants take seriously themselves. Here knowledge increases not through the accumulation of contexts within a comparative framework that remains untroubled, but through increasing internal differentiation resulting from the conceptual re-deployment and re-configuration that attends ethnographic engagement.

Conclusion: A Place for Africa?

Relationalism, whether in rights discourses or in network analysis, can be recovered from the relativist morass in which studies emphasizing cultural differences tend to bury it. The self-

consciously heuristic juxtapositions in the New Melanesian Ethnography, such as the one between the West and the Rest and all its attendant distinctions (individuals and dividuals, commodities and gifts, and so on), no longer need to cast a shadow of anachronism over anthropology. At once a concept belonging everywhere and nowhere, 'relationalism' can become a 'third term' that mediates insights gained through long-term fieldwork in diverse locations. Crucial is our insistence on keeping application and approach separate in imagining the relationship between ethnography and theory. Following the spirit of the New Melanesian Ethnography as an approach, it would do no justice to the approach to envisage relationalism as a theory awaiting its application to particular ethnographic cases. As a travelling concept (Tsing 2005), relationalism acquires its significance and makes comparison (theory) possible only insofar as it is inflected ethnographically.

It is worth reiterating our argument that this view of ethnographic comparison marks a departure from the association of anthropological concepts with particular places or regions. As Rena Lederman (1988) has suggested, culture areas were from the outset not just geographical units but theories about the people and environments that pertained there. This mutual validation of theory and place has created problems that persist in certain formulations of regional differences as naturalized and discrete entities. A diversity of people is subsumed to an encompassing logic. Whilst this results in the relation of people and entities who may have little in common beyond geographical contiguity, it also leads to the disconnection of related but geographically discrete people and things. For Africa, others have pointed out that a regional focus has resulted in an un-warranted sense of coherence and a relative lack of attention to the processes by which the continent connects to people and places beyond it (e.g. Guyer 2004, Chabal 1996).

Over the past three decades, the notion of geographically bounded units has come under sustained critical attack in anthropology. The bounded field-sites presupposed as the basis of fieldwork by a previous generation of anthropologists have been shown to be an artifact of the very practices through which anthropologists researched and wrote about them (Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Marcus 1998). At the same time, empirical changes, frequently glossed as ‘globalization’ lead to a situation in which people and things are imagined to be on the move as never before. In this context, anthropologists have questioned the wisdom both of geographically bounded local field sites and geographically bounded regions.

Regional scholarship has been discredited as an outdated relic of previous theoretical frameworks and as an anachronism that fails to reflect the connectedness of the contemporary world we inhabit (for a discussion, see Guyer 2004, Lederman 1988). Yet scholarship emerging from a variety of sources might lead us to question whether a bounded notion of either the field or the region is necessarily problematic, if we recognize the arbitrariness of the terms in which we construct it. Our suggestion draws on Matei Candea’s (2007) recent conceptualization of the ‘arbitrary location’ as a critique of multi-sited fieldwork. His argument is that in privileging connections and relations between entities, recent formulations of fieldwork have led us to overlook the importance of disconnection and detachment. In recasting this insight at a regional level, we also take inspiration from Mahmood Mamdani (1996), who insists that establishing the legitimacy of Africa as a unit of analysis does not entail the ascription of any underlying cultural or historical process to that place.

In this vein, we might acknowledge the analytic construction of Africa and its sub-regions, whilst recognizing its analytic utility. As an arbitrary location, Africa forces us to consider both relation and detachment, connection and disjuncture. Ethnographically this leads us to consider logics and practices that spatially co-exist without relating. Theoretically this regional framing leads to the reflexive decomposition, differentiation and recomposition of concepts, even as particular analysts disagree as to what might be important or even the case about any given place. Anthropologists need to allow places to place limits on their ethnographic and theoretical artifacts even as they recognize their own role in the construction of both. Relationalism, we have suggested, is one instance through which such theoretical and ethnographic limits can be realized for a comparative enterprise that no longer mistakes places for theories.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. "Anthropology: Center and Periphery". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28, no. 2: 356-361.
- . 1988. "Introduction: Place and Voice in Anthropological Theory". *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 1:16-20.
- Barnes, John A. 1954. "Class and Committees in the Norwegian Island Parish". *Human Relations* 7, no. 1:39-58.
- . 1969. "Networks and Political Process." pp. 51-76 in *Social Networks in Urban Situations*, ed. J. C. Mitchell. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Bayart, Jean-Francois. 1993. *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. London: Longman.
- Bohannon, Paul. 1957. *Justice and Judgment among the Tiv*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bott, Elizabeth. 1957. *Family and Social Network*. London: Tavistock.
- Candea, Matei. 2007 "Arbitrary Locations: In Defence of the Bounded Field-site". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13, no. 1:167-84.
- Chabal, Patrick. 1996. "The African Crisis: context and interpretation." Pp 29-54 in *Postcolonial Identities in Africa*, eds. T. Ranger and R. Werbner. London and New Jersey: Zed Books
- Clifford, James and George. E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Politics and Poetics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Comaroff, John and Simon Roberts. 1981. *Rules and Processes: The Cultural Logic of Dispute in an African Context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Czegledy, Andre P. 1992. "(Re)production of the Self: An Interview with Marilyn Strathern. *Cambridge Anthropology* 16, no. 3: 1-18.
- Dresch, Paul. 1988. "Segmentation: Its Roots in Arabia and Its Flowering Elsewhere". *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 1: 50-67.
- Dumont, Louis. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Englund, Harri. 2002. *From War to Peace on the Mozambique-Malawi Borderland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press for the International African Institute.

- Epstein, Arnold L. 1954. "Juridical Techniques and the Judicial Process: A Study in African Customary Law." *Rhodes-Livingstone Papers* 23.
1969. "The Network and Urban Social Organization." Pp. 77-116 in *Social Networks in Urban Situations*, ed. J. C. Mitchell. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1931. "Sorcery and Native Opinion." *Africa* 4, no. 1: 22-55.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fardon, Richard. 1990. "Localizing Strategies: The Regionalization of Ethnographic Accounts." Pp. 1-35 in *Localizing Strategies: Regional Traditions of Ethnographic Writing*, ed. R. Fardon. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Foster, Robert J. 2008. *Materializing the Nation: Commodities, Consumption, and the Media in Papua New Guinea*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gewertz, Deborah B. and Frederick K. Errington. 1999. *Emerging Class in Papua New Guinea: The Telling of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gingrich, André and Richard G. Fox, eds. 2002. *Anthropology, by Comparison*. New York: Routledge.
- Gluckman, Max. [1940] 1958. *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*. Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.
- .1961. "Anthropological Problems Arising from the African Industrial Revolution." Pp. 67-82 in *Social Change in Modern Africa*, ed. A. Southall. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- .1965. *The Ideas in Barotse Jurisprudence*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- . 1975. "Anthropology and Apartheid: The Work of South African Anthropologists." Pp. 21-39 in *Studies in African Social Anthropology*, eds. M. Fortes and S. Patterson. London: Academic Press.
- Griffiths, Anne M. O. 1997. *In the Shadow of Marriage: Gender and Justice in an African Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gupta, Akil and James Ferguson. 1997. "'The Field' as Site, Method and Location in Anthropology." Pp. 1-29 in *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, eds. A. Gupta and J. Ferguson. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guyer, Jane I. 2004. "Anthropology in Area Studies". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:499-523.
- Holbraad, Martin and Pedersen, Morten A. 2009. "Planet M: The Intense Abstraction of Marilyn Strathern". *Anthropological Theory*, 9(4): 371-394
- Holy, Ladislav. 1987. "Introduction: Description, Generalisation and Comparison: Two Paradigms." Pp. 1-22 in *Comparative Anthropology*, ed. L. Holy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Honneth, Axel. 1996. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- James, Wendy. 1973. "The Anthropologist as Reluctant Imperialist." Pp. 41-69 in *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, ed. T. Asad. New York: Ithaca Press.
- Josephides, Lisette. 1991. "Metaphors, Metathemes, and the Construction of Sociality: A Critique of the New Melanesian Ethnography". *Man (N.S.)* 26, no. 1: 145-161.

- Kapferer, Bruce. 1973. "Social Network and Conjugal Role in Urban Zambia: Towards a Reformulation of the Bott Hypothesis." Pp. 83-110 in *Network Analysis: Studies in Human Interaction*, ed. J. Boissevain and J. C. Mitchell. Mouton, The Hague, Paris.
- Knauff, Bruce. 1999. *From Primitive to Post-Colonial in Melanesia and Anthropology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kuper, Adam. 2005. *The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth*. London: Routledge.
- Leach, James. 2003. *Creative Land: Place and Procreation on the Rai Coast of Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Lederman, Rena. 1988. "Globalization and the Future of Culture Areas: Melanesianist Anthropology in Transition". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:427-449.
- Maine, Henry Sumner. 1913[1861]. *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas*. London: George Routledge & Sons.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1926. *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. London: James Currey.
- Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- Marriot, McKim. 1976. "Hindu Transactions: Diversity without Dualism." Pp. 109-142 in *Transaction and Meaning*, ed. B. Kapferer. Philadelphia: ISHI Publications.

- Mitchell, James C. 1969. "The Concept and Use of Social Networks." Pp. 1-50 in *Social Networks in Urban Situations*, ed. J. C. Mitchell. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1974. "Social Networks". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3:279-299.
- Mudimbe, Valentin Y. 1988. *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy and the Order of Knowledge*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- Oomen, Barbara. 2005. *Chiefs in South Africa: Law, Power and Culture in the Post-Apartheid Era*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Piot, Charles. 1999. *Remotely Global: Village Modernity in West Africa*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Reed, Adam. 2004. *Papua New Guinea's Last Place: Experiences of Constraint in a Postcolonial Prison*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Riles, Annelise. 2001. *The Network Inside Out*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Rio, Knut M., and Olaf H. Smedal. 2009. "Hierarchy and Its Alternatives: An Introduction to Movements of Totalization and Detotalization." Pp. 1-63 in *Hierarchy: Persistence and Transformation in Social Formations*, eds. K. M. Rio and O. H. Smedal. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Robbins, Joel. 2004. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2006. "Review of J. Leach and A. Reed." *The Contemporary Pacific* 18, no. 1: 171-175.

- . 2007. "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture: Belief, Time, and the Anthropology of Christianity." *Current Anthropology* 48, no. 1: 5-38.
- . 2010. "Recognition, Reciprocity, and Justice: Melanesian Reflections on the Rights of Relationships". Pp. 171-190 in *Mirrors of Justice: Law and Power in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds. K. M. Clarke and M. Goodale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, Todd. 2008. *Beyond Bodies: Rainmaking and Sense Making in Tanzania*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1980. "No Nature, No Culture: The Hagen Case". Pp. 174-222 in *Nature, Culture and Gender*, eds. C. MacCormack and M. Strathern. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1988a. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1988b. "Concrete Topographies." *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 1:88-96.
- . 1990. "Negative Strategies in Melanesia." Pp. 204-216 in *Localizing Strategies: Regional Traditions of Ethnographic Writing*, ed. R. Fardon. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- . 2004. "Losing (Out on) Intellectual Resources." Pp. 201-233 in *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things*, eds. A. Pottage and M. Mundy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsing, Anna L. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Wagner, Roy G. 1974. "Are There Social Groups in New Guinea Highlands?" Pp. in *Frontiers of Anthropology*, ed. M. J. Leaf. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.
- _____.1981. *The Invention of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Yarrow, Thomas G. 2011. *Development beyond Politics: Aid, Activism and NGOs in Ghana*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Endnotes

ⁱ For the purposes of this article, we do not distinguish between moral, epistemological and cultural relativism.

ⁱⁱ For a recent reassessment of Dumont's work, see Rio and Smedal 2009.

ⁱⁱⁱ Gluckman does not fail to mention Manchester in his acknowledgments.

^{iv} "The Law of Persons, the Law of Things, and the Law of Obligations are inextricably involved in one another" (Gluckman 1965: 271).

^v Memorably, Gluckman noted that it was "possible in the cloistered seclusion of Kings College, Cambridge, to put the main emphasis on the obstinate differences: it was not possible for 'liberal' South Africans confronted with the policy of segregation within a nation into which 'the others' had been brought, and treated as different – and inferior" (1973: 29).