This course traces out the relations over time of anthropology, as a discipline, and global history, and is divided into two sections: the first, describing various ways the insights of anthropological theory and observation have been brought to bear on historical problems, the second, on how historical perspectives can throw new light on classic anthropological case studies (the Nuer, Bali, Merina of Madagascar) and a few not-so-classic ones (pirates, the alter-globalization movement.) While there is no single theoretical framework, the course begins with the creation of meta-narratives and each week's lecture deals in one way or another with questions of the relation of narrative, structure, and event. Traditional questions such as the “origins of social inequality,” the nature of the state, the “rise of the West”, are problematized and challenged; different questions are suggested; the course culminates by asking, how is history self-consciously produced by historical actors? How does the potential narrative framing of events itself become a key stake in politics, if not, the defining feature of political action itself?

PART I – WHAT ANTHROPOLOGY CAN DO FOR HISTORY

Week 1
Inequality and Evolution: on Baron de Lahontan & the how the idea of progress was created in response to the indigenous critique.

We begin with the Enlightenment. The conventional narrative is that anthropology began as an historical discipline, but a bad historical discipline: arranging human beings into speculative stages of development, as a justification for colonial empire (“la mission civilisatrice”). In fact the story is a far more subtle. In fact, one might argue that the earliest key elements of what came to be Enlightenment thought—the skeptical challenge to received (particularly religious) authority, the emphasis on individual freedom and egalitarianism, were as much imports from indigenous North American societies as internal European developments. The notions of progress and theories of stages of technological development in turn were born as reactions to the indigenous critique of European civilization—which were wildly popular. Rousseau merely provided a kind of synthesis of the two positions. Despite the current ostensible “suspicion towards metanarratives”, the resulting metanarrative has not, in any sense, gone away. What would
primary readings:

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1754. *On the Origins of Social Inequality*. (Whatever edition. Doesn't matter. This piece speaks for itself, but note how it integrates the critical and just-emerging evolutionary positions. This synthesis was enduring.)

Kandiaronk. “‘Are you delusional?’ Kandiaronk on Christianity.” In Barbara Alice Mann, *Native American Speakers in the Eastern Woodlands: Selected Speeches and Analysis*, Westport, Greenwood Press, 2001, pp. 35-82. (A nice background and analysis of part of one the most historically important indigenous critique of European civilization – long thought to be a mere sockpuppet for a French author - by an indigenous historian.)

Lahontan, Baron de. “A Conference or Dialogue Between the Author and Adario, A Noted Man Among the Savages, Containing a Circumstantial View of the Customs and Humours of that People” in *New voyages to North America giving a full account of the customs, commerce, religion, and strange opinions of the savages of that country, with political remarks upon the courts of Portugal and Denmark, and the present state of the commerce of those countries*. London, Walthoe, 1735. (Here is the full text of the dialogue with Adario/Lahontan. Skim, but note particularly the conversations about property and inequality.)

additional readings

Ellingsen, Trer. *The Myth of the Noble Savage*. Berkeley, Ucal Press. 2001. (Shows interestingly that the 'noble savage' concept was not commonplace until the 19th century, and first was a reactionary notion related specifically to the idea of savages as hunters, and hence, parallel to aristocrats, rather than innocent egalitarians.)

Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. NY, Columbia UP, 2002. (The classic statement of how even post-evolutionist anthropology still casts its object as in another time than the ethnographer; still worth taking a look at. This is the relatively recent reissue which notes this is one of the few works of the “reflective” period that seems to have enduring relevance.)

Graeber, David. 2007. “There Never was a West: or, Democracy Emerges from the Spaces in Between.” In *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion and Desire*. Oakland: AK Press. (Argues that "the West" is a relatively recent construct with no coherent object, and contains a relevant passage on the "influence debate."

Grinde, Donald and Brice Johansen. *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, UCLA, 1991. (Classic development of the “influence debate”, which however got side-tracked on specific questions of the influence of the structure of the League of Six Nations on the US constitution. The original argument is much more on indigenous influence on the very Western notion of individual liberty.)

Ipswich, Massachusetts: Gambit, Inc. (From the original book that set off the “influence debate” - important arguments about how the indigenous critique played a role in American settler self-conceptions.)

Lafitau, Joseph François. *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times* (edited and translated by William N. Fenton and Elizabeth L. Moore). Toronto: Champlain Society, 1974. (This book, by a Jesuit missionary on the Huron/Wendat, is important because it is often considered one of the founding texts of comparative anthropology, but it was written explicitly to counter Lahontan's representation of First Nations as skeptical rationalists.)


Nisbet, Robert. *A history of the idea of progress.* New York: Basic Books, 1980. (Important background to Enlightenment ideas, going back to ancient and medieval world. Important to remember though that in the Middle Ages and Renaissance degenerationist ideas were much more prevalent.)

Pagden, Anthony. *The Fall of Natural Man: the American Indian and the origins of comparative ethnoology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1986. (This is a classic: goes through the debates, mainly in Spain, over the humanity and legal status of the peoples of the New World in the 16th and 17th centuries, including how the notion of an egalitarian state of nature first emerged.)

Pagden, Anthony. 1983. “The Savage Critic: Some European Images of the Primitive.” *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 13, Colonial and Imperial Themes Special Number, pp. 32-45. (The first origins of the indigenous critique trope. Rather downplays the degree to which actual indigenous people influenced the debates, but useful to see how these kind of arguments were deployed from very early on.)


Steckley, John. “Kandiaronk: A Man Called Rat” In *Untold Tales: Four Seventeenth-Century Hurons.* Toronto: Associated Heritage Publishing, 1981. 41-52. (More background on the fascinating figure of Kandiaronk, the Huron/Wendat statesman and one of the unacknowledged figures most responsible for the early direction of Enlightenment thought.)

* 

**Week 2**

**prehistory and the stubborn meta-narrative**

(with David Wengrow)

If we do brush aside either the Hobbesian or Rousseauan versions, either primordial chaos or primordial innocence, what does anthropology really have to contribute about
the much-vaunted question of the origins of “social inequality”? Largely, that this is a false question. This lecture, an initial report of a research project being carried out with archaeologist David Wengrow, builds on an ethnographic tradition exemplified by Mauss, Lowie, and Clastres to argue that human societies have typically moved back and forth self-consciously between different social possibilities on a seasonal basis, and hierarchies have typically been assembled and dismantled in different ritual contexts rather than becoming permanent and absolute. This in turn lays open the possibility of radically rethinking the entire “civilizational narrative,” and with the assumption that distinctions of property emerged from the advent of agriculture, or that the emergence of cities brought with it the rise of the state.

**primary readings:**

Wengrow, David, and David Graeber. “Farewell to the Childhood of Man: Ritual, Seasonality, and the Origins of Inequality.” JRAI 2005 v.21 n.3, pp. 597-619. (This is our first academic publication on seasonality and the “sapient paradox”, arguing that at least from the Ice Age onwards, human beings were self-consciously experimenting with political and social possibilities.)

Lowie, Robert. 1948b. “Some aspects of political organization among the American aborigines.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 78 (1/2): 11–24. (A long-forgotten essay that basically lays out almost all of the argument Clastres was later to make famous in *Society Against the State*, but with the addition of important considerations on seasonality that Clastres left out.)

Clastres, Pierre. 1977. “Society against the State,” in *Society against the state: The leader as servant and the humane uses of power among the Indians of the Americas*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Urizen Books. (This one is so famous I really don't need to say anything, but interesting to re-read in the context of the other two.)

**secondary key summary reading**

Wengrow and Graeber, “How to Change the Course of Human History (at least, the part that’s already happened.)” *Eurozine*, 2 March, 2018. (This was a pop piece in which we give away our larger project, eventually to be a book, or even book series.)

**additional readings:**


Formicola, Vincenza. 2007. “From the Sunghir children to the Romito dwarf: Aspects of the Upper Paleolithic funerary landscape.” *Current Anthropology* 48: 446–53. (Spectacular “princely” burials, often cited as evidence of hereditary leadership, can be traced back to 40,000 years but there is a problem: almost all of the early
bodies buried with rich treasures are physically anomalous in some way, giants, hunchbacks, or dwarfs… What are we to make of this?

Flannery, Kenneth. and Joyce Marcus. *The creation of inequality: how our prehistoric ancestors set the stage for monarchy, slavery, and empire*. Harvard: Harvard University Press. 2012. (One attempt by an archaeologist and anthropologist to solve the “origins of inequality” riddle, which despite noble efforts and surveys of a lot of ethnographic data, largely ends up reproducing Rousseau.)


Morris, Ian. *Why the West Rules - For Now: The Patterns of History and what they reveal about the future*. NY, Profile Books, 2011. (A genuine archaeologist attempts to apply Gini-coefficients to apply a Piketty-style argument about inequality and energy-capture all the way back to the Stone Age.)

Scott, James C. *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*. New Haven, Yale UP, 2017. (Interesting effort to change the narrative on the Neolithic, arguing that agriculture did not imply inevitable decline from innocence into property relations, and that it is only particular circumstances which allowed the emergence of early states. In many ways very refreshing. How far though does it really depart from the standard narrative?)


Week 3
kingship and stranger kings

Since the time of Sir James Frazer, anthropology has had a particular fascination with “divine kingship”—an institution that on the one hand, seems the most odd and exotic of all possible political forms, but at the same time, in the form of “sovereignty”, continues to define the basic terms of political life to the present day. This week continues the
theme of “origins” by taking up the tradition leading from Arthur Hocart to Marshall Sahlins’ “stranger king”, that argues for a cosmological origin for the institution of kingship and by extension, government itself. The key concepts to be developed are, first of all, a distinction between “divine kingship” (that is, kingship as the exercise of sovereign, external, arbitrary power) and “sacred kingship” (the accumulation of ritual restrictions and taboos in order to contain that power; and the non-equivalent of kingship/sovereignty and the state.

primary readings:


Sahlins, Marshall and David Graeber. “Introduction.” On Kings, HAU books, Chicago, 2017. (Lots of wild and crazy ideas, also some very solid ones; following Hocart, argues that even hunter-gatherers can be said to live in states, since they typically insist they have overlords imposing rules on them. How then did divine sovereignty come to be embodied in humans and what were the implications? The path was not necessarily what one would think.)

Graeber, David. 2011. “The divine kingship of the Shilluk On violence, utopia, and the human condition, or, elements for an archaeology of sovereignty.” HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory 1 (1): 1–62. (My own re-analysis of the classic case study, made famous by Frazer and Evans-Pritchard. Actually you might want to read the slightly different version in On Kings, it's updated in some ways. Here the principle of sovereignty operates in the almost complete absence of other typical aspects of the state, and the institution of sacred kingship was clearly designed in part by popular forces to prevent a state from emerging.)

additional readings


Brisch, Nicole, ed. 2008. Religion and power: Divine kingship in the ancient world and beyond. Oriental Institute Seminars no. 4. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. (This is a nice collection of essays about divine kingship in the ancient world, mostly Middle East but has Roman, Chinese, and other examples. Again, for those interested, nice place to start delving and searching through bibliographies.)

Claessen, Henri J. M. 1986. “Kingship in the early state.” Bijdragen tot de taal-, land-, en volkenkunde 142 (28): 113–27. (Claessen has made the “early state” concept quite famous. But were these states at all? One intriguing thing about kingdoms is that they often aren't states. What becomes different ones they are?)
de Heusch, Luc. 1997. “The symbolic mechanisms of kingship: Rediscovering Frazer.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 3 (2): 313–32. (De Heusch is one of the great theorists of kingship, and this is a classic statement of what has come to be known as neo-Frazerianism, concentrating on the fact he developed two concepts of kingship – the god king and the scape-goat king.)

Ekholm, Kajsa. 1985. “Sad stories of the death of kings: The involution of divine kingship.” *Ethnos* 50: 248–72. (A nice essay that brings in world-systems analysis to argue that in Africa, at least, Frazerian sacred kingship is really a result of the collapse of secular kingdoms or empires under pressure from the slave trade, merchants and colonialists. Probably not generalizable but intriguing.)

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. *The divine kingship of the Shilluk of the Nilotic Sudan*. The Frazer Lecture for 1948. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (E-Ps famous smack-down of Frazer, in which he argues, inaccurately as it turns out, that Shilluk never really killed their kings. Classic structural-functionalist formulation of the problem of why the king must be external to the community he rules.)


Graeber, David. “Notes on the Politics of Divine Kingship, or, Elements for an Archaeology of Sovereignty.” In *On Kings* (Marshall Sahlins and David Graeber), Chicago, HAU Books, 2017, pp. 377-463. (My own effort to come up with a model for how sovereignty comes to be embodied in humans – via clowns, of all things – with an argument about how kings exist in a constituent war with those they govern, and how sacred kingship and divine kingship can be seen respectively as what happens when kings definitively lose, or definitively win, that conflict.)

Hocart, Alfred M. *Kings and Councillors: an essay in the comparative anatomy of human society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1936. (Hocart isn't a very compelling writer, to be honest, he lays out his ideas in a rather didactic way, but still, it's good to glance back at the sources sometimes because his work has been extremely influential.)

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King’s Two Bodies: a Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. (On the distinction between the body politic and body natural, this is probably the single most brilliant book on European monarchy ever written, and has been hugely influential as well. Obviously it's huge and you're not going to read it but it's definitely worth poking around in.)


Scubla, Lucien. 2005. “Sacred king, sacrificial victim, surrogate victim or Frazer, Hocart, Girard.” In The character of kingship, edited by Declan Quigley, 38–62. Oxford: Berg. (Strong Girardian argument: to what degree does ritualized royal transgression set them apart or to what degree does it make them criminals-in-waiting, who the people can turn on in time of misfortune.)

Simonse, Simon. 1992. Kings of disaster: Dualism, centralism and the scapegoat king in the Southeastern Sudan. Leiden: Brill. (This is a whole book and probably more than anyone can take on but the material is fascinating: one of the few people who actually witnessed the killing of divine kings – in this case rain-makers – which if nothing else pretty much put an end to the ’do they really kill their kings?’ debate. Uses Girard but in a very creative and theoretically innovative way.)

Week 4
world-systemic approaches and the “rise of the West”

A key question in any historical or ethnographic study is one of scale. What is the basic unit of analysis? A culture? A society? Or something bigger? A regional network, a galactic policy, a “world-system”—whether based on war or trade—as Wallerstein originally put it? This is a key question not only when one considers not only how to exercise power from afar, but on the origins of the modern capitalist world economy—leading to endless debates, first of all, about the reasons for the “rise of the West” and also, the degree to which contemporary global patterns represent a fundamental break with longstanding patterns of growth and interaction, and to what degree they are merely the same thing in slightly modified form. What does anthropology have to contribute to these debates? Actually quite a lot. This week we shall briefly look at anthropological contributions to the debate over the rise of the “modern world-system” and some of the main resulting topics of debate, from Friedman's embrace of the (late Gunder-Frank's) “continuationist” argument to arguments about culture and modes of (commodity versus human) production.

primary readings

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang Tastes of Paradise: A Social History of Spices, Stimulants and Intoxicants. Vintage, 1992., chapter 1 “Spices, or the Dawn of the Modern Age”. (The role of drugs, spices, tastes and desires in the gradual formation of what was to come to be known as the “modern world-system.” Important not to forget this stuff.)

Graeber, David. 2006. “Turning Modes of Production Inside Out: Or, Why Capitalism is a Transformation of Slavery (short version).” Critique of Anthropology 26 (1): 61-81. (My initial contribution to arguments about world-systems, modes of production, and so forth. Using slavery as an example, attacks the continuationists, but also the bias that causes analysts to privilege commodity production rather than human production as the basis of social inequalities even at a great distance.)

additional readings


Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Thomas D. Hall. 1997. Rise and Demise: Comparing World-Systems. Boulder: Westview Press. (An alternative approach to world-systems analysis, inspired by Wallerstein, but more anthropology-friendly in many ways. Their key innovation is the importance of the semi-periphery as the typical place of innovation, experiment, and major historical change.)

Friedman, Jonathan. 2000. “Concretizing the continuity argument in global systems analysis.” In World System History: the social science of long-term change (Robert A. Denemark, Jonathan Friedman, Barry K. Gills, George Modelski, editors), London: Routledge, pp.133-152. (A strong version of the continuationist argument, introduced by Gunder-Frank as a kind of heresy in world-systems analysis, which held that one world-system, rather than many, had existed at least in Eurasia-Africa for 5000 years and that it's boom-bust dynamic was in many ways commercial or even capitalist – Gunder-Frank drew the line at actually using the word 'capitalist' but Friedman totally goes there.)

Goldstone, Jack A. 2002. “Efflorescences and Economic Growth in World History: Rethinking the ‘Rise of the West’ and the Industrial Revolution.” Journal of World History 13 (2): 323-89. (This is perhaps a classic state of the art about this much-vaunted question by a very well-respected historian.)
Goody, Jack. 1990. *The Oriental, the Ancient, and the Primitive: Systems of Marriage and the Family in the pre-Industrial Societies of Eurasia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Anthropology does have something to say about global patterns! Unsurprisingly, they remind people of the existence of kinship. Goody's famous contrast of the implications of plow/dowry and hoe/bridewealth systems as a way of explaining core-periphery relations as well.)

Graeber, David. n.d. “Chapter 3: Cores and Peripheries Reconsidered.” A chapter from an unpublished book. (I was going to write a book on world-systems myself with a friend but the friend kind of flaked on me. Well I wrote my chapters. This one expands on the MoP piece to argue that cores and peripheries can be identified not just by the flow of raw materials vs manufactures but by patterns in the flow of people and ideas.)

Hamashita, Takeshi. 1994. “Tribute Trade System and Modern Asia.” In *Japanese Industrialization and the Asian Economy* (A. J. H. Latham and H. Kawakatsu, editors), pp. 91-107. London and New York: Routledge. (The Chinese world-system with its tribute-trade arrangements has always seemed in some way anomalous, or operating in the opposite way as more imperial systems. There are some, such as Giovanni Arrighi, who argue that this pattern still exists in the region today, with the US during the Cold War taking the place of China to contain it. An introduction to the issue.)

Hobson, John M. *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilisation.* Cambridge University Press, 2004. chapter 7: "The myth of the Vasco da Gama epoch.” (A very powerful book exposing false claims of “Western” social, technological, and intellectual superiority. Basically at first they were better than the rest of the world at naval warfare and little else, and got much of their subsequent advantage from selective pilfering.)

Ho, Engseng: "Empire through Diasporic Eyes: A View from the Other Boat" *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol 46 no 2, April 2004, pp. 210-246. (Fascinating discussion of the role of the Hadrami trading/religious diaspora in the Indian Ocean, how they were the first to identify the pattern of European colonialism, and including a provocative comparison of George Washington and Osama bin Laden in world-systemic terms.)


Pomeranz, Kenneth 1998. *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (This book got a lot of attention at the time. Why did China, which has such obvious advantages and was economically well ahead of Europe for most of its history, not become the world hegemon? Offers a series of interesting hypothesis, ranging from where its coal was located, to the fact that unlike China, West European powers had colonies to which to drain off surplus population.)

Marxism). Here is Wallerstein making an exposition of Braudel's rather subversive theory of capitalism as a perversion of the market.

Week 5 – case study: money and the debt cycles of history

This week will look at some of the same questions considered in the world-systems literature from a slightly different perspective, by focusing on a single, much debated phenomenon: the history of money and debt, and specifically, patterns of alternation between virtual credit money and physical, bullion money, which seem to coordinate surprisingly across Eurasia for perhaps 5000 years. Anthropologists have long had a role in these debates, in pointing out that the conventional economic view—that money emerged from the “inconveniences” of barter, has no basis in ethnographic reality—but have tended to hold back from suggesting alternative narratives. In fact, the elements for such an alternative narrative do exist, and reframing history in those terms opens up intriguing questions about the relations of money-forms, class formation, conceptions of material and ideal, and the nature of social power.

primary readings

Graeber, David. Debt the First 5000 Years. Melville House, Brooklyn, 2011. Chapters 8, “Credit Versus Bullion”, 9 (The Axial Age, 800 BC-600 AD), 10, “The Middle Ages (600 AD-1450 AD),” 10 “The Age of the Great Capitalist Empires (1450-1971).” (These are the historical chapters where I set out a model for the alternation of credit money-dominated periods, and those dominated by bullion – the latter, typically involving widespread warfare, empires with standing armies, materialist philosophies, and exploitation of slave labor.)

Hart, Keith. 1986. “Heads or Tails? Two Sides of the Coin.” Man (N.S.) 21: 637-56. (The essay that first brought post-Keynesian and other heterodox economic approaches to the attention of anthropologists, who had basically ignored them.)

additional readings

Flynn, Dennis and Arturo Giráldez. 2002. “Cycles of Silver: Global Economic Unity through the Mid-Eighteenth Century.” Journal of World History, vol.13, no 2, pp.391-427. (Most of the treasure looted by the Iberians from the New World ended up in China and India, and this was the trade that really established what we now see as the world capitalist trading system.)

Ghazanfar, Shaikh M. 1991. “Scholastic Economics and Arab Scholars: The 'Great Gap' Thesis Reconsidered.” Diogenes: International Review of Humane Sciences; No.154: 117-33. (Adam Smith and other Enlightenment pioneers of economics weren't just making that stuff up; they got a lot of their ideas directly from Medieval Islam.)

by a numismatist of the Early Middle Ages, but in this case, for anthropologists, who unfortunately didn't mostly pay a lot of attention.)

Hudson, Michael. 1993. “The Lost Tradition of Biblical Debt Cancellations.” Research paper presented at the Henry George School of Social Science, 1992 (http://www.michaelhudson.com/articles/debt/Hudson,LostTradition.pdf ) One of Hudson's first great entrees into world history. Makes the argument that interest-bearing loans were invented in the ancient Middle East with the assumption of periodic jubilees or “clean-slate” cancellations, and it is the world's misfortune that only half the package usually got exported.)


Innes, A. Mitchell. 1913. “What is Money?” Banking Law Journal (May1913): 377-408. (This was the original credit theory of money essay, remarkably brilliant for its time, now almost entirely forgotten by the mainstream, even though most of its empirical arguments have been proved entirely correct.)

MacDonald, Scott B. and Albert L. Gastmann. 2001. A History of Credit & Power in the Western World. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. (This one is pretty much the mainstream, conventional version but it's good to know what that is. Has some very interesting material. Worth a skim.)


Seafoord, Richard. 2004. Money and the Early Greek Mind: Homer, Philosophy, Tragedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (A great book which makes a very strong argument but argues it compellingly: the invention of coined money in ancient Greece set off an intellectual and moral crisis which, Seafoord holds, is directly responsible for the rise of Greek philosophy.)


Schoenberger, Erica. 2008. “The Origins of the Market Economy: State Power, Territorial Control, and Modes of War Fighting.” Comparative Studies in Society and History 50 (3): 663-691. (Rather than state and market being opposed, they have always been intimately linked, and tied to modes of mobilizing resources for warfare.)
Shell, Marc. 1978. “The Ring of Gyges,” Chapter 1 of *The Economy of Literature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (The original, slightly zany, but very brilliant, statement about the relation of the invention of coinage and the rise of Greek philosophy. Check it out. You might well enjoy it.)

**PART II**

*what history can do for anthropology*

**Week 6**

*historicizing the Nuer*

Part II begins with a classic ethnography. The Nuer are one of the classic test-cases of mid-century British anthropology, and many consider the book the finest ethnography ever written; but its author claimed it was impossible to do a proper ethnography under the conditions under which he was working. Evans-Pritchard was basically sent in as a spy, and refused to provide the information (largely about prophets) that colonial officials were after. Yet despite that he managed to produce exactly the kind of ethnography that administrators interested maintaining a system of indirect rule would have found most useful. Placing the Nuer in a larger historical context, and considering some of the themes that Evans-Pritchard left out but were developed by those who reinterpreted his ethnography, shows how even the most apparently brilliant synchronic analysis falls short without understanding larger processes of change and their effects on local patterns of gender and patriarchal authority.

**primary readings:**


**additional readings**
Beidelman, Thomas. 1971. “Nuer priests and prophets: charisma, authority and power among the Nuer”, in The Translation of culture: Essays to E. E. Evans-Pritchard. London: Tavistock, pp. 375-416. (One of the great things about classic ethnographies like Malinowski's or E-P's is that they give you enough data you can reinterpret it. This is a Weberian re-interpretation of the Nuer focusing on the role of prophets.)

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.. Kinship and Marriage among the Nuer. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1951. (E-P divided his ethnography into The Nuer, the "boy book" about politics, and this one, the "girl book" about kinship and marriage. As Gough shows by doing so he missed the real politics of what was going on.)

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. The Sanusi of Cyrenaica. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1949. (Was E-P anti-colonial? Was he really on the side of the prophets? Was he even aware of the prophets as forces of resistance? Yes, pretty much, to all as this book shows what he could write when the colonialists were Italian so he didn't have to pull his punches.)

Hutchinson, Sharon, 1996. Nuer Dilemmas: coping with money, war, and the state. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Most substantial re-study of the Nuer, concentrating on changes due to integration in markets and states, including the classic distinction between “the cattle of money” and “the cattle of girls.”)


Johnson, Douglas. 1982. “Evans-Pritchard, the Nuer, and the Sudan Political Service.” African Affairs 81/323: 231-246. (Historian of the Nuer specifically on E-P’s role as spy who refused his mission.)

Johnson, Douglas. 1994. Nuer Prophets: A History of Prophecy from the Upper Nile in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Oxford: Clarendon. (Very detailed historical work on Nuer Prophets and their ambivalent and complex relation both with the nascent hierarchies of a largely egalitarian Nuer society, and with British colonizers. The work of Judd Newborn is very good here too but I couldn't put it on because he never published any of it.)

Week 7  
**Societies of the Indian Ocean: Bali**

Often conceived as self-contained cultural universes, societies like those of (Hindu) Bali, or (Austronesian speaking) Madagascar, are impossible to understand outside of their place in the Indian Ocean ecumene and currents of historical interaction they entail—not to mention the subsequent centuries of European intervention and empire. In fact, the dreamy, gentle artistic Balinese character that so fascinated mid-century anthropologists turns out to have been a creation of colonialism, and even the famous Balinese cockfight cannot be understood except as the site of the intersection of both Bali's peculiar place in a larger world commercial economy, and its unique gender politics. Rituals like the Balinese cockfight or famous “Rangda Barong dances” that so fascinated anthropologists are not just “stories people tell about themselves” they are forms of narrative framing both a product of, and creative of, history.

**primary readings:**

Geertz, Clifford. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth Century Bali*. Princeton, 1989, chapter 1. (This might be said to be the classic expression of the anthropological understanding of Bali as place where hierarchy is everything. Power just exists to put on performances, and performances are all an expression of hierarchy.)

Geertz, Clifford. 1975. “Deep play: notes on the Balinese cockfight” In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Chicago, U Chicago Press. (I know I have four essays as primary readings this week but I'm pretty much assuming you've already read this one. If not do so immediately and if necessary ignore the others.)

Vickers, Adrian. *Bali: A Paradise Created*. Berkeley: Periplus, 1989. Chapter 1-2. (Explodes all assumptions of Bali as an eternal poetic dreamland obsessed with etiquette. Actually during the pre-colonial period their reputation was precisely the opposite: Balinese were seen as rude and violent. So what happened?)

Warren, Carrol ‘Disrupted Death Ceremonies: popular culture and the ethnography of Bali.” *Oceania*, 1993. (A fascinating essay which represents what might be called the anti-hierarchical underside of Balinese obsessions with hierarchy: the directly democratic seka system and violent egalitarianism of funerary ritual.)

**additional readings:**


Connor, Linda “Corpse abuse and trance in Bali: the cultural mediation of aggression.” *Mankind*, 1977. (A complement to Warren if you want to know more about the weird aggressive death rituals.)

Bateson, Gregory. 1963. “Bali: The Value System of a Steady State.” In *Social Structure: Essays Presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown* (Meyer Fortes, ed.), New York, Russell & Russell, pp. 35-53. (This is here to give the interested reader a sense of what the mid-century anthropological consensus about Balinese culture was like—specifically the resistance to drama and hence history.)

Geertz, Clifford. 1975. “Person, Time and Conduct in Bali”. In *The Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, U Chicago Press. (A classic, again of the steady-state resistance to history literature.)

Geertz, Hildred. 1991. ‘A theatre of cruelty: the contexts of a topeng performance.’ In *State and Society in Bali*. (The main way history is made manifest in Bali is through constant theatrical performances. Yet it is notorious that in plays, all the emotions everyone actively suppress expressing in public – say, grief at funerals – are instead over-played dramatically. Characters speak in ancient languages no one understands and clowns interpret them.)

Geertz, Hildred and Clifford Geertz. 1975. *Kinship in Bali*. Chicago. (Actually there is history after all, but it's a curse. Descending status and the general sense of gradual degeneration that marks Balinese history is key to ranking and social relations, marked by ritualized “sulking” and avoidance between neighboring kin groups. All this is key to what's really happening in cockfights.)

Weiner, Margaret. *Visible and Invisible Realms: Power, Magic, and Colonial Conquest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1995. (Reintroduces history – and also colonialism – to the “theatre state” picture. The Dutch public was scandalized that the conquest of Bali involved the mass suicide of whole courts who, having smoked large amounts of opium, charged into the machine guns knowing they'd be killed. What was going on here? A long book seeks to explain it.)

---

**Week 8**

**pirates (a brief return to the Enlightenment)**

Turning to the other side of the Indian Ocean, we also loop back to the original question of the real origins of Enlightenment thought, and the curious case of pirate settlements in Madagascar. From the 1690s onwards rumours swept Europe of a new kingdom of Caribbean pirates established on the northeast coast of that island, which gradually coalesced into the legend of the utopian experiment of “Libertalia”, whose reality has been endlessly debated to this day. In fact, the adoption of the pirates into local society was in according with a longstanding tradition of adopting foreign
intermediaries, and the arrival of the pirates set off a chain of internal conflicts within coastal Malagasy society which ultimately lead to the foundation of a new political order (the Betsimisaraka Confederation) which was—it is argued—itself the real utopian project, a synthesis of pirate democracy with local Malagasy traditions, and in fact, the first Enlightenment political experiment. All the major actors here—pirates, their Malagasy wives, and coastal political figures—were all deploying stories as a key part of their political projects, even, as a means of warfare, in the pirates’ case, so successfully that the effects are still being felt to this day.

**primary readings**

Graeber, David. “Pirate Enlightenment: Or the Mock Kings of Madagascar.” In On Kings (expanded edition), forthcoming. (An epic, 40-page essay on the pirates in Madagascar which sets out in detail the week's argument, that the real Libertalia was the Betsimisaraka Confederation, and the arrival of the pirates set off a chain of events that rendered the inhabitants of the Northeast Coast, a ranked aristocratic society with an endogamous caste of ritual specialists who claimed to be Jews, into one of the most egalitarian on the island.)

**additional readings**

Bialuschewski, Arne. 2005. “Pirates, Slaves, and the Indigenous Population in Madagascar, c. 1690-1715.” International Journal of African Historical Studies volume 23, no. 3, 401-25. (This is a good example of the current mainstream, I'd say rather creepily neoliberal, approach to such questions, which assumes cynical maximizing motives for all involved.)


Carter, Marina. 2009. “Pirates and Settlers: economic interactions on the margins of empire.” In Fringes of Empire (S. Sameetha Agha & Elizabeth Kolsky, editors), pp. 45-68. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. (Some interesting comparative work on pirates during the Golden Age of piracy, so called.)


Ellis, Stephen. 2007. “Tom and Toakafo: The Betsimisaraka Kingdom and State Formation in Madagascar, 1715-1750.” The Journal of African History (48) 3: 439-55. (Ellis was very pleased that he discovered the legendary founder of the Betsimisaraka Confederation, a half-Malagasy son of a pirate, as councilor and assistant to a slaving king on the West Coast. Interesting, but again in neoliberal historical mode. Full implications are left frustratingly unexplored.)
Faller, Lincoln. 2002. “Captain Misson’s Failed Utopia, Crusoe’s Failed Colony: Race and Identity in New, Not Quite Imaginable Worlds.” The Eighteenth Century 43 (1): 1-17. (A good literary analysis of the Libertalia story, as it appears in Johnson, who's probably Defoe. Assumes the whole thing is a European fantasy though and nothing interesting can be said about the Malagasy.)


Kuhn, Gabriel. 2010. Life Under the Jolly Roger: Reflections on Golden Age Piracy. Oakland: PM Press. (A contemporary anarchist but non-romantic reassessment of the importance of pirates in general; for some reason has to use Deleuze.)


Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. 2001 Many-headed hydra : sailors, slaves, commoners, and the hidden history of the revolutionary Atlantic. Boston: Beacon Press. (A classic, but somewhat suspect according to some historians, argument about the pre-racial “Atlantic proletariat” that emerged alongside and against the ship as—with the factory—the first factory-like institution of capitalist organization. Long, not always directly relevant, some parts might be just wrong, but it's still great.)

Mayeur, Nicholas. Ratsimilaho Manuscript. c.1803. (Pdf, from mss. in British Library). (This is a manuscript written by a French spy in the employ of a con man pretending to be a Polish count, but he became fascinated in the origins of the Betsimisaraka confederation two generations before, conducted interviews, and wrote this very peculiar book that has never been published. Might be fun to look over to get a sense of what it's like to work with primary material.)

McDonald, Kevin P. 2015. Pirates, Merchants, Settlers, and Slaves: Colonial America and the Indo-Atlantic World. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Best of the contemporary historical approaches to the subject, read the chapter on Madagascar for an excellent argument about Malagasy-pirate hybridity, much confirmed by my own researches.)


Pennell, C. R. 1998. “Who Needs Pirate Heroes?” The Northern Mariner/Le Marin du nord, VIII (2): 61-79. (It's hard to be objective about pirates. Historians tend to either idolize them, as revolutionary paradigms, or see them as simple criminals. Here's one of the latter chastizing some of the former.)


Wilson-Fall, Wendy. 2011. “Women Merchants and Slave Depots: St. Louis, Senegal and St. Mary’s, Madagascar,” in *Slaving Paths: Rebuilding and Rethinking the Atlantic Worlds* (ed., Ana Lucia Araujo), pp. 272-302. Amherst: Cambria Press. (The only text I could find that concentrates specifically on the role of the Malagasy women who became allies and partners of the pirate settlers; however briefly.)

•

**Week 9**

**Betafo: the Past in the Present**

This week is marked by an intense case study of a community trapped, as it were, in history; the rural community of Betafo, in central Madagascar, divided between the descendants of a “noble” clan and those of their former slaves. The place was rife with narratives, which, in the absence of a formal political sphere, became the primary medium of political life—thus allowing the formulation of a general theory of the relation of narrative form and political life, critical, in its own way, to any theory of what “history” and historical events actually are. What's more, the importance of the past, for highland Malagasy in general, meant that there were unusually rich records (archival and otherwise) with which to reconstruct what had happened in pre-colonial (“Malagasy”) and colonial times, even in this one small rural community, as well as how those same events or individuals are remembered today.

**primary readings**

Graeber, David. *Lost People: Magic and the Legacy of Slavery in Central Madagascar*. Bloomington, Indiana UP, 2006. Especially chapters 1, 5, 6, 7, 9. (But really you should read the whole thing. This is of course based on my dissertation work in Betafo between 1989-91. It is an attempt to use dialogism, narrative description, and an attention to narrative theory to create an innovative style of historical ethnography which no one much paid attention to and didn't at all take off.)

**secondary readings (on narrative)**

Carrard, Philippe. 2015. “Narrative and History: an Overview.” *Narrative Works: Issues, Investigations & Interventions* vol 5 no 1, 174-196. (This is a good summary of the state of the art to roughly the present. Go through the bibliography to find good material if you're interested in the topic.)
Danto, Arthur. *Narration and knowledge*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. 1985. (Danto was a brilliant philosopher and this is considered a classic statement on the topic in general.)

Gallie, W. B. *Philosophy and Historical Understanding*. London: Chatto and Windus. 1964. (Mink and Gallie are often cited together as mapping out the argument that history departs from other social sciences, if indeed it is a science at all, because of its peculiar relation to narrative and narrative form)

Mink, Louis. 1978. “Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument.” In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding* (Robert Canary & Henry Kozicki, eds.), Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 129–149. (Another old classic: how thought organizes events in narrative terms and thus narrative cannot necessarily be dismissed as the analyst forcing events into his own preferred shape – though it can be that – since a host of such frameworks are always already there.)


**additional readings (on Madagascar)**

Berg, Gerald. 1979. “Royal authority and the protector system in nineteenth-century Imerina.” In *Madagascar in history: Essays from the 1970s*, edited by Raymond K. Kent, 102–22. Albany: e Foundation for Malagasy Studies. (Classic analysis of what might be called the “hasina school” of Malagasy historical-ritual studies where everything is about the distribution of sacred force. Flawed, as I explain in my Nurselings article, but still this is an excellent analysis of ody and sampy for anyone curious from reading the book.)


Evers, Sandra. *Constructing History, Culture and Inequality: the Betsileo in the extreme southern highlands of Madagascar*, Leiden, Brill, 2002. (Fascinating parallel case of the effects of slavery in a rural highland context; Evers actually managed to find a community where a group of people were effectively reduced into slave status long after its abolition.)
Graeber, David “Dancing with Corpses Reconsidered: an Interpretation of Famadihana (in Arivonimamo, Madagascar).” American Ethnologist 22:258-278. (My reanalysis of mortuary ritual, the famous re-wrapping of the dead. Questions to assumptions in Bloch about the necessarily idealized and benevolent role of ancestors. This would have been the social structure chapter of the book but it had to be cut as it was long enough already.)

Graeber, David. “The People as Nursemaids of the King: notes on monarchs as children, women’s uprisings, and the return of the ancestral dead in central Madagascar.” In In On Kings (Marshall Sahlins and David Graeber), Chicago, HAU Books, 2017, pp. 249-344. (My history of the Merina kingdom, and why for almost all of the 19th century, it was ruled by women. Excellent historical background to the Betafo book in my own humble opinion.)

Larson, Pier. 2000. History and memory in the age of enslavement: Becoming Merina in Highland Madagascar, 1770–1822. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. (Historian takes on the very origins of the Merina kingdom and its relation to the slave trade. Also essential background for anyone who wants to understand the full background to the events described in the book, just mostly a little earlier.)

Patterson, Orlando. 1982. Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (This is obviously not about Madagascar but I threw in one book about the nature of slavery, in my opinion the single most insightful, to provide some theoretical depth and background for some of the reflections in the book, or for anyone interested enough to pursue the matter.)

•

Week 10

a history of the (near) present

The course ends with extremely recent history—the Global Justice Movement of the turn of the millennium—which was the object of intense ethnographic “observant participation” by a number of its participants. One of the key conceptual problems in ethnographizing a geographically and organizationally decentralized movement is, what is the unit of analysis? My own conclusion was that an ethnography had to be organized not around specific groups but around events, “actions,” involving multiple actors (activists, police, media…) who could not all be studied at the same time, but who were usually indirectly negotiating both the terms of engagement, and, crucially, battling over the story of how the events in question would be narrated afterwards. We are speaking then, much as with the pirates, of self-conscious attempts to make history, a point where much of the theoretical reflection described in the second half of this course becomes self-conscious practice.

primary readings

Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion and Desire (Oakland, AK Press), 375-418. (This book summarizes some but not all of the key points of my big Direct Action ethnography: the symbolism of the Black Bloc, puppets, terms of engagement between police and protestors, etc. Read this and choose one of the below.)

additional readings


Freeman, Jo. 1972. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." First officially published in the Second Wave (Vol. 2, no 1). Reprinted in Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-feminist Reader (Dark Star Collective, 2002), 54-61. Edinburgh: AK Press. (This is a feminist classic but has set off endless debates; shows how autoethnography has always been crucial in setting the terms of debate and influencing the direction of grass-roots movements since at least the '70s.)

Graeber, David. Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology. Prickly Paradigm Press, Chicago, 2006. (Felt I had to put this in here. Origin of many of the ideas I developed elsewhere. But honestly, the point was there is no “anarchist anthropology” and I never really proposed creating one.)

Graeber, David. Direct Action: an Ethnography. Oakland, AK Press. 2009. (The big book. The chapters on meetings and typology of actions might be particularly useful. I honestly felt this was a very innovative book in terms of ethnographic style, but I don’t know of anyone who ever reviewed or discussed it as such.)


Jordan, John. 1998 "The Art of Necessity: e Subversive Imagination ofAnti-Road Protest and Reclalm the Streets." In DiY Culture: Par & Protest in Nineties Britain (edited by George McKay), 129-151. London: Verso. (It seemed only right to have a piece from Reclalm the Streets, which pioneered so many of the forms discussed here. This is by John Jordan, the quintessential artist-activist.)


97. (An article about what's at stake in direct action, again, from an observant participant rather than participant observer point of view.)

Maeckelbergh M.E. 2011. “Doing is believing: Prefiguration as strategic practice in the alterglobalization movement.” Social Movement Studies 10 (1): 1-20. (Good introduction to the key notion of “prefigurative politics,” that the structure of one's action has to be consistent with, or even, a microcosm of, the kind of world one ultimately wishes to create.)

Shukaitis, Stevphen. 2005 “Space. Imagination/Rupture, the Cognitive Architecture of Utopian Thought in the Global Justice Movement.” University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History Vol. 8: 1-14. (Also about prefiguration, from an artistic perspective. The arming of the imagination, as against neoliberalism perceived as a series of mechanisms for the destruction of the imagination, at least as a force in politics.)

Starhawk, Webs of Power: Notes from the Global Uprising. Gabriola Island, New Society Publishers, 2002. (Starhawk was definitely the best and most vivid chronicler of the Global Justice Movement as it happened and these are all brilliant little essays, for those inclined to dig deeper.)