

Political Anthropology and Anthropology of Politics: An Overview

Suresh Dhakal

Abstract

In this short review, I have tried to sketch an overview of historical development of political anthropology and its recent trends. I was enthused to prepare this review article as there does not exist any of such simplified introduction of one of the prominent sub-fields in cultural anthropology for the Nepalis readers, in particular. I believe this particular sub-field has to offer much to understand and explain the recent trends and current turmoil of the political transition in the country. Political anthropologists than any other could better explain how the politics is socially and culturally embedded and intertwined, therefore, separation of the two – politics from social and cultural processes – is not only impossible but methodologically wrong, too.

Keywords: cultural anthropology, political system, political process, ethnography, democracy

1. Introduction

A sub-discipline of political anthropology is considered to have formally begun during 1940s (c.f., Vincent 1996). After more than a decade later, David Easton (1959), in Biennial Review of Anthropology, Vol. 1 wrote, "The burden of my argument will be that although the title of this essay is "political anthropology," such a subfield does not yet exist and will not exist until a great many conceptual problems are solved" (1959:210-262). And, after a decade of Easton (1959), Winkler (1969), in his highly recognized work on political anthropology, reaffirmed 'whether political anthropology as a distinct sub-field yet existed'. Around the same time, Kathleen Gough (1968, 'New Proposals for Anthropologists'

took up the concern shared by many anthropologists of her time, which was a 'complain' that cultural and social anthropologists are failing to tackle significant problems of the modern world. In *Political Anthropology*, a book published in 1972, Geroges Balandier introduced political anthropology as 'a late specialization of social anthropology'. It further strengthened by the argument that political anthropology is believed to have come 'late and comparatively short lived subfield specialisation within social and cultural anthropology' (Vincent, 1996:228).

Spencer (2007), in his latest book *Anthropology, Politics and the State*, indicating to the 'strange death' of political anthropology, asks, "What happened to the anthropology of the politics?" However, optimistic he is about the rediscovering of the anthropology of politics, maintains that, "A sub-discipline which had seemed moribund in the 1980s has moved back to the centre of anthropological argument" (Spencer, 2007:1). Victor Turner while writing foreword for Lewellen's *Political Anthropology an Introduction*, was an evidence of Spencer's claim, where Turners writes, "...that (the book) we have all been waiting for ...It is at once a summation and a new start" (Turner: 2007, foreword, new edition). This is, however, highly indicative that political anthropology as a sub-field of cultural anthropology was neither out of scene nor was distinct and prominent at any point of time over the years. Probably responding to this situation, Seymour-Smith (1986) summarises, "...it is true to say that while analysis of political dimension had formed an important part of the majority of anthropological studies, this dimension has usually been interpreted as an aspect of or as embedded in other domains such as kinship, religion, economy, and so on, and has been little analysed for the features of political system *per se* (Seymour-Smith, 1986:226).

Political anthropology, for Swartz, Turner and Tuden (1966, first paperback printing 2006) is the study of politics, meaning "the study of processes involved in determining and implementing public goals and in the differential achievement and use of power by the members of the group concerned with these goals. They view politics as a process of competition to influence outcomes. And, arguably the anthropologist should study the 'dynamic

processes', 'a continuum' related to the past as well as to the present and continually influenced by pressure within and outside of a society (Swartz *et.al* 1966). Thence, political anthropology as a sub discipline of social anthropology has the long-reigned body of knowledge, which is well exemplified in *The Anthropology of Politics* (2002), a comprehensive reader in ethnography, theory, and critique, an edited volume by Joan Vincent.

In the following paragraphs, I will sketch an overview of the attempts made by anthropologists to explore the issues of politics and political power within anthropology. Materials on political anthropology are not abundant. Moreover, I have picked up only some selected works that are more helpful in this regard. Beginning with the cursory treatment of the issues related to the formation of the sub-discipline of cultural anthropology, i.e., political anthropology, I intend to contextualize my work within the larger tradition of anthropology but it should by no means be confused with an exhaustive treatment of the subject.

In this endeavour, a brief history and recent trends of political anthropology by exploring anthropological works that establish close affinity with the political anthropology stand as a point to begin. I have drawn heavily from Vincent (1996), since her contribution, to borrow from Gledhill (2000), is considered as 'a magisterial survey of anthropological perspectives on politics'. Similarly, I will be following the works and analysis of Swartz, Turner and Tuden (1966/2006); Winkler (1969); Lewellen (1983); Gledhill (1994/2000), Spencer (2007) and Paley (2007, 2002). In addition, I will be reviewing some seminal works by Evans-Pritchard (1940/1969) and Leach (1954) among others. I have based my review on some basic texts therefore, may not be dealing with the regional variations or specificity. However, references will be drawn from particular case studies illustrated in the texts reviewed.

Lewellen (2003) proposes eight basic phases in the history of the anthropology of politics/political anthropology, which include, 1) Nineteenth-Century Evolutionists; 2) a Reaction period, including American historical particularists and a European shift toward sociological/Durkheimian conceptions of socio-cultural

organization; 3) British Functionalism, an extension or outgrowth of earlier work in the Durkheimian theoretical paradigm; 4) a Transitional period, approximately beginning the political anthropology era, associated with a shift toward a political anthropology associated with describing process rather than static interpretations of political institutions; 5) Neo-Evolutionism, a return to the idea that cultural processes change in an (admittedly non-unilinear) evolutionary way; 6) Conflict and Criticism, a period characterized by assaults on the status quo, both as a theoretical objective and as a more general challenge to the accepted world order and including movements toward political economy, feminism, and similarly politically charged interpretations of human behavior; 7) Postmodernism; and, finally, 8) Globalization. On the other hand, Vincent has recognised three phases of anthropology's relationship with the politics, Formative era (1879-1939), when anthropologists studied politics almost incidentally to their other interests (anthropology of politics); second phase (1944-66) political anthropology developed a body of systematically structured knowledge and self-conscious discourse; and the third phase began in the mid-1966s when all such disciplinary specialisation come under sever challenge (Vincent, 1996). As I find it logical and comprehensive to follow Vincent (1996) in general to discuss the sub-discipline.

2. Structural-Functionalism and System theory in Political Anthropology

A generation of political anthropologists, between 1940s and the mid-1960s, was exceptionally cohesive, "establishing a canon and setting out a programme for the subfield" (Vincent 1996, pp. 428). Gledhill (2000), however, remarked that the political anthropology of the 1940s and 1950s tended to offer a 'commentary on the tension that colonial rule produced and on the reason why it might be resented' (Gledhill, 2000:2). Nevertheless, Gledhill (2000) further observes "the critical strands of an anthropological approach to politics were not those that became hegemonic in the discipline in the period of 1940s. This was the period when the British structural-functionalists established political anthropology as a formalised sub-field (p. 3). The case of Nuer, a pastoral people in the southern Sudan, by Evans Pritchard (1940) was a seminal

work to represent that period in British structural-functionalists, where he details the political system of the Nuer as an 'ordered anarchy' based on the principle of 'segmentary opposition'. Though the earlier structural-functionalist contributed little to political anthropology per se., particularly Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, nevertheless, their works 'cleared the way for the type of specialisation that would later become commonplace' as their 'intense works' of African societies would establish a political anthropology as a 'legitimate sub-discipline' (Lewellen, 1983:6). The major works to represent that era was *African Political System* (1940), a collection of eight essays, edited by Meyer Fortes and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, which has remained as a classic in the field (cf. Spencer, 2007; Vincent, 1996 and 1990; Lewellen, 1983).

Vincent observed that with the end of the World War II, a 'more orthodox political anthropology emerged to capture the field, which focused more on the 'structure of the government and the systemic nature of political anthropology' (1996:431). The political anthropology had gained its prominence in colonial era, as most of them carried out field research in imperial and quasi-imperial settings (Vincent, 1996, p. 429). Later the construction of the colonial 'other' entered the political anthropology. Roy Franklin Barton's multifaceted monographs on Ifugao law, society, economy and religion (published between 1919 and 1930) reflected the modern ethnographer's goal of providing a rounded description of the way of life of a 'native' people at the particular moment in time. Barton's case materials were a rich source of political anthropology. And, his works are equated with or even considered as more grounded than Malinowski's landmark *Crime and Custom in Savage Society* (1926). For many, a distinction between society and politics was meaningless (Vincent, 1996: 429-30).

After all, these works made a valuable contribution to illustrate 'how indigenous notion of authority and justice might conflict with Western notions during the era of formal colonial rule. Their approach and assumptions, as those of most of the anthropologists of the 'colonial era', were, 'the West and its way of doing things represented the future for all humanity, and hence, in this regard,

political anthropology became an analysis of the 'tensions and transitions' (Gledhill, 2000:4).

Franz Boas' works among Native North Americans, Robert Redfield's fieldwork in Tepoztlan in Mexico and Malinowski's studies in the Pacific Islands, exemplified the growing interest in political anthropology equally in Europe and America. These studies, however, did focus not on political contact and change but on the structure of government and the systematic nature of political organisation' (c.f., Vincent, 1996; Gledhill 2000). The publication of *African Political Societies* (1940), a collection of eight essays, edited by Meyer Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard proved to be the major achievement of 1940s, which not only established the system theory in political anthropology, Evans-Pritchard's own structural analyses of the Tallensi and Nuer set the trend in the field. For two decades after its publication, *African Political System* constantly influenced the African political ethnography (Aiden, 1969).

3. From Structural to Agency, Process to Action

'Constitutional approach' of structural-functionalists focused on 'political institutions', 'offices, 'rights, duties and rules', but no or little attention was paid to 'individual strategies', 'strategies', 'processes', struggle for power and political change (Vincent, 1996:431). However, Edmund Leach's *Political Systems of Highland Burma* (1954) provided an internal critique of the system paradigm established by Evans-Pritchard (1940) offered political alternatives with change coming about through individual and group decision making (Leach, 1954; also see Vincent, 1990). Leach in his work suggested that individual's choice are the result of conscious or unconscious power-seeking, which, is a universal human trait (Leach, 1954). Hence, after Leach, in particular, political anthropology set out to establish a distinctive agenda for itself. Victor Turner's rich ethnography of schism among the Ndembu of Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) and his hand in writing long expository introduction to a challenging new set of essays, *Political Anthropology* (1966) brought about a paradigmatic shift in the subfield. In the volume, politics was defined as, 'the processes involved in determining and

implementing public goals and in the differential achievement and use of power by the members of the groups concerned with these goals' (Swartz, Turner & Tuden, 1966:7). Bailey's trilogy on Indian politics (published between 1957 and 1963) was a tour de force (Vincent, 1996) within the genre of process and action theory. Bailey's political ethnography followed the action from the village through the district level to national electoral politics.

4. The Recent Trends

With the new and unconventional issues and agenda, concerns and voices, modern social science era of political anthropology came to an end in late 1960s. By late 1960s, 'six paradigms had emerged and co-existed successfully within the subfield: neo-evolutionism, cultural historical theory, political economy, structuralism, action theory and processual theory (Vincent 1996: 432). But, since 1960s, political anthropology began to confront with new areas of study, for example, Third World's political struggle, decolonisation, neo-imperialism or economic imperialism, peasant resistance, labour movements and crises in capitalism in Africa and Latin America (*C.f.* Vincent 1996).

At the meantime, historians of South Asia developed one of the exciting trends under the rubric of Subaltern Studies (*c.f.* Ludden, 2002; Cohn, 1987; Guha, 1982). Under this 'movement', historian along with anthropologists and literary critics began to dismantle the sun continent's imperial historiography in an attempt to recover the political activities of subordinated groups. Bernard Cohen's studies (Cohn, 1987) on power relations in colonial India stimulated the anthropology of politics into further rethinking imperialism, nationalism, peasant insurgency, class and gender. Such a historical explanation began to replace those of the sociologists and economists in the new anthropology of politics. Lewellen termed this new phenomenon as the political anthropology of 'formal institution of industrial society' essentially relating it with the process of modernisation (1983).

Eric Wolf's *Europe and the People without History* (1982) became the key text of global, historical political economy; Clifford Geertz's *Local Knowledge* (1983) asserted the interpretive

paradigm with a particularly strong (and long) chapter on fact and law in comparative perspective. Political anthropologists generally engaged themselves in 'localised and particularistic tales' of resistance and accommodation, challenge and riposte. For them resistance appeared to be the key concepts, even to the extent of being romanticized and overused. Gramsci and Raymond Williams were so influential that 'hegemony' had become the 'key notion' in the study of political anthropology (Vincent, 1996:433).

In recent years, political ethnographies, which once provided introductory setting and closing frames were 're-viewed' by post-postmodernists as constructed, controlled, and transformed features of political design. Edward Said's discussion of Orientalism, which was critically received by the anthropologists, heightened anthropology's established concern with the politics and ethics of representation, particularly the representation of subordinated people, introduced into the subfield a 'poetic and politics trope' that succeeded in combining interpretive anthropology and political economy, thus, opened up a new analytic space for a political anthropology of symbolic actions (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1993, quoted in Vincent, 1996).

Ferguson (1997), Paley (2002, 2004, 2008), Li (2007) and Spencer (2007) as late comers in the sub-field, however, have tried to establish their distinct version of the 'political' that differentiate their arguments from earlier and established traditions of political anthropology. Lewellen foresaw, "Globalisation, although inchoate in anthropological studies, may turn out to have an even greater impact than did postmodernism. The increasing flow of trade, finance, culture, ideas, and people brought about by the sophisticated conceptions of culture, locality, community, and identity. Power in globalized world is both more diffuse and more locally concentrated as decision making simultaneously shifts upward from states to multinational corporations and the World Bank and downward to community-level nongovernmental groups and ethnic organisations" (2003:13-14). He further maintained, "The challenges of the future will be considerable for political anthropology".

Lewellen (2003) is further supported by Spencer, where, he attempted to work with an expansive definition of the political, a definition, 'which gives as much weight to the expressive and performative aspects of politics to the instrumental' (2007: 17). His arguments about the 'dynamic force of the political' where 'politics' and 'culture' are not two discrete 'things', brought together in a controlled interaction. He argues that "analytically they can be better treated as two perspectives on a single dynamics process and the central mystery of the process is the promise of democracy – it ought to be ordinary people...and not extraordinary people who rule' (Spencer, 2007: 17-18). Hence, Spencer provided much broader perspective and scope for the study that I have been taking up. After all, as Gledhill explored some of the various ways that political anthropological concepts can be explored through an examination of micro-processes. Indeed, from an ethnographic stand point, it would be hard to do otherwise (see, for e.g., (2000:127-135).

5. Some Reflections on Nepal

Coming to Nepal, as we know, there has been a long tradition of collective actions and associational life in the country. For example, Bista (1967), Thapa and Gautam (1994), Bhattachan (1997), Chand (1998) have illustrated such traditions and institutions among the different ethnic groups of the country. Now several of such traditional institutions of different ethnic groups have got renewed attentions in the recent years (c.f. Bhattachan, 1997). One of my earlier studies (Dhakal, 2010) has illustrated that the types and functions of these local level organisations vary in a number of ways, nevertheless, most of such CBOs are of small-scale and highly localised through the involvement in such organisations, people's participation in various social and economic processes concerning their everyday lives has significantly increased. The participation of people in the activities guided towards transformation of their social relationships, economic conditions and cultural meanings may bring about substantial changes in people's socio-cultural lives and thereby their understanding of themselves and outside world construct the 'public spheres where people discuss and debate from local to global issues' (Calavan, 1993). All of such collective actions,

associational life, formal and informal CBOs, whether they are described as NGOs or civil societies, constitute the community based public spheres.

We have observed and experienced that village-level organisations have increasingly been able to construct and communicate ideas and meanings about socio-cultural and political issues that matter to them and that have impact on their lives. By making certain types of decisions, they have played roles not only in improving the living conditions of different groups of people in the local community, but also in making them aware of and enlightening about their social, economic, political and cultural rights (See also Bhattachan et.al., 2001).

Long ago Borgström (1976) in his *The Patron and Pancha: village value and the Panchayat Democracy in Nepal* had underlined the 'relevance of social relations for an understanding of the role of official ideology', for example, democracy in our context. And, he illustrated due to the dominant personal relations the 'necessary condition' did not exist for democracy (Borgström (1976:161). After a decade or so, Miller (1990), highlighted the importance of associational life and community based decision making process in his *Decision Making in Village Nepal*.

Dahal (1988), Ramble (1993/2008), and Vidning (1994) explicitly explored and discussed the 'traditional', 'local' and 'indigenous' political systems in Nepal. Dahal (1988) discussed about the political organisation of Athpahariya Rai, one of the minority groups of eastern hill of Nepal and assessed the changing role of leadership among them. Ramble (1993/2008) and Vinding (1994) have presented the detail examinations of traditional political system of Thakalis in Te and Syan villages respectively of Mustang districts. These three articles, I consider, to be the fine examples in the field of political anthropology in Nepal.

There have been a few other studies in Nepal's context (for e.g., Mishra 2011; Ojha, 2008; Pedersen, 2005; Fujikura, 2004; Rankin 2005; Tarnowski, 2002 etc.), however, they did not discuss political organisations and political processes, or democracy, in particular, rather discussed their own issues but touching upon the

larger political, democracy contexts. Some more studies that seem to touch upon these issues appear to be on a very general level with an aim to introduce the concepts rather than study these processes and issues in a more theoretical level (for e.g., Dhakal, 2010; Dhakal & Pokharel, 2011; Karki, 2005). For that reason these studies do not actually study the processes, mechanisms and issues related to participation of the community members in such community based public spheres.

Lately, scores of works have come out on Maoist-government conflicts, current political transitions and turmoil, rising ethnic and identity politics, recently on the issues of restructuring of the state, and so on. All these have substantially contributed to grow the political sociology and anthropology in the country, therefore, needs special attention and treatment. I will separately deal with them in a subsequent article.

6. Conclusion

This is arguably an anthropological contribution to introduce a 'still emerging field' (Paley 2008) to the Nepali readers. As we discussed earlier that the political anthropology consists of the outpouring of the collective works, its objective is to study political institutions and processes and their interaction with other cultural processes. Anthropologists study these matters in a variety of ways, including fieldwork around the world and comparative ethnological work. Although both Lewellen and Vincent characterize "politics" as essentially indefinable or anything that is public is political (Lewellen, 2003:231; Vincent, 2002:1), all efforts at political anthropology have a common aspect, that is they study "[t]he processes [and means] involved in determining and implementing public goals and... the differential achievement and use of power by the members of the group concerned with those goals" (Swartz, Turner & Tuden, 1966/2006:7). In other words, the objective of political anthropology has been to describe these processes and means of manipulating power. This interpretation is supported by Kurtz (2001), Lewellen (2003), Vincent (2002), and Spencer (2001). This definition is broad, but necessary because of the plethora of political activity around the world. The diversity of political institutions, means for organizing political power and

even the political construction of the discipline of anthropology itself have all come under the purview of political anthropology (Spencer, 2007:116-28). In addition, I conclude that political anthropology should consider the 'non-political' spheres and institutions to understand the political processes and how they are shaped by such non-political spheres. This is even more relevant while studying politics and political processes in the country like ours.

Reference

- Aidan, S. (1969). 'Orientations in Political Anthropology'. *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines*, Vol. 3, No. 1, Special Issue: Rural Africa (Winter, 1969), pp. 42-52
- Algappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2004). *Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratic Space*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation, JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 216-224.
- Banarjee, M. (2008). 'Democracy, Sacred and Every day: An Ethnographic Case from India', in Paley, J. (ed.) (2008) *Democracy: Anthropological Perspectives*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Bellamy, B. (2009). "Tradition in Transition: Tharu Traditional Governing System in Post-Conflict Nepal" *ISP Collection*. Paper.798.
http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/798
- Beteille, A. (2002) *Sociology: Essays on Approach and Methods*. New Delhi. Oxford University Press.
- Bhattachan, K.B., Dev Raj Dahal, Sheetal Rana, Jyoti Ghimire, Min Bahadur Basnet, Kashi Ram Bhusal and Ram Raj Pokharel (eds.) (2001) *NGO, Civil society and Government in Nepal: Critical Examination of their Roles and Responsibilities*. Kathmandu: Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology, TU in cooperation with Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Bhattachan, K.B. (1997). 'People/community-Based Development Strategy in Nepal', pp. 100-148, in Krishna B. Bhattachan and Chaitanya Mishra (eds.) *Development Practices in*

- Nepal. Kathmandu: Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Tribhuvan University in co-operation with Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), Nepal.
- Bista, D.B. (1967). *People of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Information and Broadcast, HMG, Nepal.
- Bleie, T. (2002). 'The Historical Path to Violent Destabilisation in Nepal: Elements of an Exploratory Framework', in Martin Scheinin and Markku Suksi (eds.) *Empowerment, Participation, Accountability and Non-Discrimination: Operationalising a Human Rights-Based Approach to Development*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Borgström, B. (1976). *The Patron and Pancha: village value and Panchayat Democracy in Nepal*. Stockholm: Stockholm Series of Social Anthropology-3.
- Burghart, R. (1996). *The Condition of Listening: Essays on religion, History and Politics in South Asia*. Chapter 11 'The Condition of Listening: The Everyday Experiences of Politics in Nepal' (pp. 300-318). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Calavan, M.M. (1993). 'Local bases for the democratic transition of Nepalese society: some exemplary and cautionary tales', paper presented at first SASON seminars in Kathmandu, September.
- Chand, D. (1998). 'The Role of Civil Society in Democratization: NGO Perspective'. In Anand P. Shrestha (ed.) *The Role of Civil Society and Democratization in Nepal*. Kathmandu: NEFAS/FES.
- Chhetri, R.B. and Pandey, T.R. (1992). *User Group Forestry in the Far-western Region of Nepal*. Kathmandu: ICIMOD.
- Cleaver, F. (2001). 'Institutions, Agency and the Limitations of Participatory Approaches', in Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari (eds.) *Participation: The New Tyranny*. London: Zed Books.
- Cohn, B. (1987). *An Anthropologists among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1988). "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital" in *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (supp): - S95-S120.
- Colman, J. (1987). 'Microfoundations and Macrosocial Behaviour', in Alexander, J.C., Bernhard Giesen, Richard

- Munch and Neil J. Smelser (eds.) *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dahal, D. R. (1988). Political Organisation and the Changing role of leadership: a study of Aathpahariya Rai community', in *Contribution to Nepalese studies*, 5(1):95-106.
- Dahal, D. R. (2000). 'Nepal's Governing Elite: Their Composition and Role in Constituting the State' in Dhruba Kumar (ed.). *Domestic Conflict and Crisis of Governability in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- Dahal, D. R. (2001). 'Problems and Prospects of Relationship between Government Organisations and NGOs/INGOs in Nepal', in Bhattachan, K.B., Sheetal Rana, Jyoti Gyawali, Min Bahadur Basnet, Kashi Ram Bhushal and Ram Raja Pokharel (eds.) *NGO, Civil Society and Government in Nepal*, Kathmandu: Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology in cooperation with Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On Democracy*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Devkota, P. L. (2001). 'Anthropology, society and development in Nepal: A native perspective', in *Occasional Papers in sociology and Anthropology*. 7:26-40.
- Dhakal, S. (2010). 'Politics beyond the political sphere: Community Based Organisation and Local Democracy'. *Silver Jubilee Proceedings of the Department of Sociology/Anthropology, TU, Kathmandu*
- Dhakal, S. (1996). 'Bheja as a strategic cultural convention: community resource management in the Baraha Magarat', *Occasional Papers in sociology and Anthropology*. 5:38-51.
- Dhakal, S. and Pokharel, S. 'Local Movements, Political Processes and Transformation of Bhaktapur: A Case Study'. *Occasional Papers*. Vol. 11. Central Department of Sociology Anthropology, TU.
- Dole, G. E. (2006). 'Impotency and Power: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Effect of Alien Rule', in Swartz, M.J., Victor Turner, and Arthur Tuden (eds.) (2006). *Political Anthropology (originally published in 1996 in hard cover)*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- Easton, D. (1959). *Political Anthropology*. *Biennial Review of*

- Anthropology*, Vol. 1, pp. 210-262
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1940). *The Nuer: A Description of modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, J. (1997). *The Anti-politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fisher, W. (2002). 'The Politics of Difference and the Reach of Modernity: Reflections on the State and Civil Society in Central Nepal', in David N. Gellner (ed.) *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experience*, New Delhi: Social Science Press.
- Fujikura, T. (2004). *Discourses of Awareness: Development, Social Movements and the Practices of Freedom in Nepal*. A Ph. D. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Anthropology, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gautam, R. and Thapa, A. (1994). *Tribal Ethnography of Nepal*. Two Vols. New Delhi: Book Faith Indian.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Harper Collins: Basic Books.
- Gellner, D. N. (2003). 'Introduction: Transformations of the Nepalese State', in David N. Gellner (ed.) *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experience*, New Delhi: Social Science Press.
- Glassman, R.M. (1986). *Democracy and Despotism in Primitive Society: A Neo-Weberian Approach to Political Theory*. Vol. 1. New York: Associated Faculty Press.
- Gledhill, J. (2000). *Power and its Disguises: Anthropological Perspectives on Politics* (second edition). London: Pluto Press.
- Gough, K. (1968). 'New Proposals for Anthropologists'. *Current Anthropologists* 9 (5), pp 403-7.
- Hofer, A. (1997). *The Caste Hierarchy and the State in Nepal: A Study of Muluki Ain of 1854*. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner.
- Hoftun, M., William, R. and Whelpton, J. (1999). *People Politics & Ideology: Democracy and Social Change in Nepal*. Kathmandu. Mandala Book Point.
- Joshi, B.L. and Rose. L.E. (1996). *Democratic Innovations in*

- Nepal: A Case Study of Political Acculturation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, printed in Nepal by Mandala Publications, Kathmandu.
- Karki, A. (2005). 'Political economy and social movements', in Seminar: the Monthly Symposium. No. 548, April.
- Karlstrom, M. (1996). 'Imagining Democracy: Political Culture and Democratisation in Buganda' in *Afric66*(4), 1996.
- Krämer, K.H. (2003). 'How Representative is the Nepali State?' In David Gellner (ed.) *Resistance and the State: Nepalese Experience*. New Delhi: Social Science Press.
- Lewellen, T.C. (1983). *Political Anthropology an Introduction*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers Inc. Li, T. M. (2007) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lin, Nan. (2001). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Capital and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ludden, David (ed.) (2002). *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning, and the Globalisation of South Asia*. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Messerchmidt, D (1973). "Dhikur: Rotating credit associations in Nepal," in *The Himalayan Interface*. Edited by James Fischer. The Hague: Mouton. In press. [DAM]
- Mikesell, S. (2004). 'Prajatantra' (Democracy), in Mary Des Chene and Pratyoush Onta (eds.) *Nepalko Sandarvama Samajatriya Chintan* (Sociological Thought in Nepalese Context). Kathmandu: Social Science Baha.
- Mishra, C. (2011). *Badalido Nepali Samaj*. (Changing Nepali Society), Kathmandu: Fine Print.
- Mishra, C. (2007). *Essays on the Sociology of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Fine Print Inc.
- Mishra, C. (2004). 'Locating the Causes of Maoist Struggle', in *Studies in Nepali History and Society*. Vol.9 No.1. (pp. 3-56). Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Mishra, C. (2001). 'New Predicaments of "Humanitarian" Organisation', in Krishna B. Bhattachan et.al. (eds.) *NGO, Civil Society and Government in Nepal: Critical Examination of Their Roles and Responsibilities* Kathmandu: Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology, TU/Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

- Moore, B. Jr. (1966). *Social Origin of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasants in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mosse, D. (2001). 'People's Knowledge', Participation and Patronage: operations and Representations in Rural Development', in Cooke, B and Uma Kothari (eds.) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Ojha, H. R. (2008). *Reframing Governance: Understanding Deliberative Politics in Nepal's Tarai Forestry*. New Delhi Adroit Publishers
- Paley, J. (ed.) (2008). *Democracy: Anthropological Perspectives*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- _____. 'Introduction'. In Paley, J. (ed.) (2008) *Democracy: Anthropological Perspectives*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- _____. 'Participatory Democracy, Transparency and Good Governance in Ecuador: Why Have Social Movement Organization at All?' In, Paley, J. (ed.) (2008). *Democracy: Anthropological Perspectives*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Paley, J. (2004). 'Accountable Democracy: Citizens' impact on public decision making in post dictatorship Chile'. *American Ethnologists*. Vol.31, Issue 4 (pp. 497-513).
- Paley, J. (2002). 'Towards an Anthropology of Democracy'. *Annual Review of Anthropology 2002 (31): 469-96*.
- Pedersen, J.B. (2005). *Mapping Social Movements in Nepal*. Kathmandu: DANIDA/HUGOU.
- Pigg, S. L. (1993). 'Unintended Consequences: The Ideological Impact of Development in Nepal'. *South Asia Bulletin*. Vol. XIII Nos 1&2. (pp. 45-58).
- Ramble, C. (1993/2008). 'Rule by Play in Southern Mustang'. In Charles Ramble and Martin Brauen (eds.), *Anthropology of Tibet and the Himalaya*. Kathmandu: Vajra Books. First Published in 1993 by Ethnological Museum of University of Zurich.
- Rankin, K. N. (2002). 'Social Capital, Microfinance, and the Politics of Development'. *Feminist Economics*. 8(1), 1-24.
- Regmi, M.C. (1976). *Landownership in Nepal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Seymour-Smith, C. (1986). *Macmillan Dictionary of Anthropology*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Shah, Saubhagya. (2004). *A Project of Memoreality: Transnational Development and Local Activism Among Rural Women in Nepal*. A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Anthropology, Harvard University in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
- Sharma, A, and Gupta, A. (2006). *The Anthropology of the state: a reader*". (Introduction, pp 1-42). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Sharma, P. R. (2004). *The State and Society in Nepal: Historical Foundations and Contemporary Trends*. Kathmandu: Himal Books.
- Spencer, J. (2007). *Anthropology, Politics, and the State: Democracy and Violence in South Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swartz, M.J., Victor Turner, and Arthur Tuden (eds.) (2006). *Political Anthropology (originally published in 1996 in hard cover)*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- Tarnowski, C.B. (2002). *Forest Places, Political Spaces: The Social Implication of Community Forestry in Nepal*. A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy. Georgia.
- Turner, V. (1983). 'Foreword' of *Political Anthropology an Introduction* by Ted c. Lewellen. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Vincent, J. (1996). 'Political Anthropology' in Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. (paperback edition 1998) London: Routledge.
- Vincent, J. (1990). *Anthropology and Politics: Vision, Tradition and Trends*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Vinding, M. (1994). 'Traditional Political Systems in Mustang Nepal'. In *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*' Vol. 21(2): 169-190.
- Winkler A. A. (1969). 'Political Anthropology' In *Biennial Review of Anthropology*' Vol.6:301-386.