Rereading *Rengsanggri*: A Text on Post-Colonial Northeast India

Rengsanggri
North East T.B. Subba
Post-Colonial, North-East

One would agree that an ethnographer is much more visible today than he or she was even three decades earlier.[1] This may have a hundred demerits but I prefer this to the earlier trend of hiding himself/herself. I would not only like to read the text but also know the author and under what circumstances was the text produced. It may undermine my imagination but it certainly gives me a clearer understanding of the text and I hope to be in a better position to appreciate the value of it.

A few words about why I chose *Rengsanggri* by Robbins Burling will perhaps make myself a little more visible than if I do not write anything about it. *Rengsanggri* is in many ways the most important anthropological text on the northeast India. It is perhaps the only book that is based on a doctoral research conducted by any western anthropologist till date. There is no dearth of anthropological literature on the region and some of them, such as those produced by Verrier Elwin and Furer Haimendorf, have earned a lot of fame. Similarly, the monographs produced by anthropologist-administrators like J.H. Hutton and J.P. Mills are some of the most authoritative even today. But their writings clearly evince a superior position for themselves vis-à-vis the local tribes. Burling is also a White but he was there as a researcher and not as an administrator or

missionary. This is perhaps the only anthropological text which, to the best of my knowledge, was based on a prolonged, rigorous, research that a doctoral degree of a western university like Harvard (where the thesis was submitted) required.

Two, the author of this book had conducted the research in vernacular language. This in itself is not a great feat because most western universities insist that the scholars learn the vernacular language before doing the research but the author distinguishes himself by being fluent in it even now, after about four decades of his doctoral research. Most other western anthropologists do not require that long a period to forget the language used for their doctoral research. About the secret of his linguistic ability he responded through e-mail as: "I would never have been able to speak Garo as well as I did if I hadn't been making regular visits to live among the Garos in Bangladesh. When I first went there in 1984 I was tongue tied, and it took many months before I felt that I had brought my language skills back up to the standard of the 50's."

Three, the author is one of the few living anthropologists who has equal command over the various branches of anthropology like cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, linguistic anthropology and pre-historic archaeology. While at North-Eastern Hill University in 1997 at the age of about 71 years he lectured in anthropology, linguistics and history departments. On his return to Oslo, he wrote to me saying that he had started taking lessons in ice-skating! At that age, he was still unbaptized. Of course, he was widely known and respected as a serious anthropologist not only in America but also in European and Scandinavian countries. Many young anthropologists in these countries interact with him regularly even now.

Four, that he is alive to react to what I have written is one of the most important reasons why I chose his work.[2] I could have chosen softer targets like J.H. Hutton, J.P. Mills, Verrier Elwin, or Furer Haimendorf but they would not be there to defend themselves. In other words, it would be sort of a

monologue principally aimed at an audience that did not exist anymore. However, besides the fact that he is living his work certainly excels, as a modern anthropological text, all other previous works. The book also, so to say, problematizes the overwhelming tendency in the East to essentialize the West and vice versa.

Any re-reading is indulging in a discourse, which is by nature a subordinating, if not subversive, act. The *Rengsanggri* of 409 printed pages is discussed here in 15-odd pages. This amounts to, very often, serious violation of the text which is sifted, if not distorted, according to the taste and capability of the person engaged in such a discourse. What the author would have liked to be highlighted is seldom highlighted; what he would have liked to hide is dug out; and how the author would have liked it to be read is ignored. Any post-modernist reading is pregnant with such possibilities. A living and kicking author can fight back, take one to the court of law, or merely refuse to be commodified like that. This is one other justification in favour of *Rengsanggri*.

One last reason that I might like to give here for choosing this text is the fact that it is produced by an American whereas most other anthropological texts on northeast India are produced by British or European scholars. Even the work of Chie Nakane, a Japanese anthropologist, on Khasi and Garo matriliny (1967) can be safely taken as one very much in European anthropological tradition. America, as we all know, had never colonized India. Would that make a difference? It might be worthwhile to examine even just that! A word more. I know the ethnographer as well as the tribe he studied personally. I could not have this rare privilege if I had chosen any other anthropological text on the northeast.

Representing Rengsanggri

Rengsanggri is the name of the Garo village that Burling studied between October 1954 and October 1956. This village lies in Rongram valley, about 10 miles away from Tura, the

headquarters of the Garo Hills Autonomous District Council. The total number of households in this village, which was one of the larger Garo villages, is 60 only. The subject matter of this study is, as the sub-title of this book shows, family and kinship among the Garos – a Mongoloid tribe of Meghalaya – living in its northwestern border adjoining the plains of Assam. They share matrilineal system with the other two tribes of Meghalaya, viz., Khasi and Pnar or Jaintia but linguistically they are very different from the other two tribes. Whereas the Garo language belongs to the Tribato-Burman family, the Khasi-Jaintias are a Mon-Khmer speaking people.

Burling went to Rengsanggri because he wanted to "study the operation of a special form of cross-cousin marriage in a matrilineal society" and according to him, he decided to study the Garos "because of their unique combination of kinship traits, particularly their matrilineal descent and their matrilateral cross-cousin marriage" (p. 3). Fifties and sixties saw a number of high-quality researches on kinship, family and marriage in India, in both caste and tribal societies. Some of those studies were done by European and some by Indian anthropologists. The general theoretical atmosphere was dominated by functionalism. Methodologically synchronic studies based on intensive fieldwork in a village, supplemented with occasional forays into the neighbouring villages defined the general tenor of anthropology at that time. Many anthropologists believed then that anthropology was a science.

Burling, however, writes: "... I have avoided being so scientifically objective as to hide my feelings of affection and admiration for my friends of Rengasanggri" (p. 4). Such confessions are quite rare in most prefaces of anthropological texts. His love for the villagers must have made him try for forty long years for a permission to revisit the village. And, when he was in Shillong for a brief spell in March 1999, I asked him if he could participate in the seminar on "Anthropology & Allied Disciplines in the Northeast" that I was organizing at that time. He told me that he was going to his village and nothing,

not least an anthropology seminar, could prevent him from going there. His earlier visit, in 1997, was much longer than the one in 1999 and the outcome of that visit is Chapter XIII titled simply "1997" wherein he talks about the changes and continuities that he observed in the village.

Before I proceed further, I would like to briefly dwell upon the Garo cross-cousin marriage to study which he came all the way from the United States of America. In this form of marriage men marry women from their mothers' lineages (classificatory MoBrDas) rather than women marrying men of their fathers' lineages (classificatory FaSiSos).

The distance between the cousins entering into such a marriage is not really important for they can, at least theoretically, be close as well as distant cross-cousins at the same time. This happens because the Garo definition of a cross-cousin not only includes the actual daughter of mother's brother or father's sister but also distant classificatory relatives. Their marriage rules result in, according to Burling, half of the first marriages between classificatory cross-cousins. The avuncular authority is great in a matrilineal society like the Garo's and it has considerable significance in the cross-cousin marriages as well. Burling writes: "The authority that the nephew dislikes is precisely what makes the relationship attractive to his uncle, the latter may be delighted to have a son-in-law whom he can control by virtue of their lineage relationship" (p. 174). Another important aspect of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage is rule of residence. In this regard, Burling shows that if an heir is marrying the rule of residence becomes uxorilocal, which for all practical purposes also becomes avunculocal whereas it is neolocal if the couple are not heirs (pp. 93–97).

The 13 chapters of this book are titled in such a language that they remind one of the mongographs prepared by some colonial administrator-anthropologists. The language is as lucid and readable as that of any monograph prepared by the colonial ethnographers. The curiosity, the hard work put into data collection and recording, and the cautious language in which

the people and their customs, manners, etc. are represented are also quite similar. If one did not know the ethnographer personally *Rengsanggri* could easily pass off as one of those monographs, which some Indians would find absurd and objectionable but the like of which they have had not been able to produce by themselves, not even in one of the Indian languages, which are very well developed.

Our preliminary understanding often begins with bracketing and categorizing unknown things/persons with those we know already. But, while doing so, a precaution is necessary so that the critical differences are noticed and given adequate space while representing such texts. For instance, like the colonial monographs, the present monograph too has a number of photographs. But, out of 33 photographs included in the book, just one – serial number 18 – might be considered as 'embarrassing' by some readers. On the other hand, most other colonial monographs would be full of photographs that could perhaps be considered as soft pornography.

Representing the 'primitive' societies as sex-obsessed and describing their sexual life both in words and with visuals has been one of the oldest practices in anthropology. This is perhaps the reason why anthropology was once jokingly defined as the "study of man to embarrass women". Many ethnographic texts can safely pass off as a text on eroticism: the veil of 'science' makes the text only more attractive. Sexual relations among the Garos have not escaped the attention of Burling and he discusses the same quite at length at various places but the relations are seldom eroticized. According to him, sex is much talked about among the Garos and to leave this subject would be to omit "something that is important in the culture". He further argues that anthropologists are not the only ones to be interested in sex, "the people they work with are too".

No matter what might his justification be now, he cannot escape from the general allegation that the White ethnographers had a lot of interest in the sexual life of the tribes they studied. Burling's representation of this life of the Garos is very subtle

and suggestive, which makes it all the more interesting to read. He seems to have been fairly successful in depicting the sexual life of the Garos though he was honest to admit so: "I cannot make any reliable estimate of the frequency of either premarital intercourse or adultery" (p. 74). This indicates that the notion of anthropology as a 'science' seems securely located somewhere in a corner of his mind.

Burling's is perhaps one of the most balanced representations of the life and living of the Garo tribe. His writings are too strongly fortified with a desire to neither make it a scientific treatise nor are they allowed to transform themselves into a literary fiction. He brings quantitative data into his writings as sparingly as possible. The respondent too is often invisible. He knows exactly what and how much his readers expect him to say, whether it is about their supernatural world, their marriage, their household, their agriculture, their kinship and their quarrels. There is little romanticization of their social life. Yet, the words carry quite a feeling for the people. The use of native words is made sparingly though some readers are unhappy that there are very few native words in a study of kinship. But, in his own words: "I have little patience with ethnographic reports which use so many foreign terms that the reader is required to learn portion of the language in order to understand what is being said" (p. 4). The Garo words that he has used are essentially kinship words for which no appropriate English equivalents seem to exist. One other thing which is noticeable in his way of representing is the use of actual names of persons and places. There are many ethnographic accounts published around that time, which have used pseudo names of places as well as persons. Most of the latter category of monographs was of course produced by Indian anthropologists but the predicament or privilege as authors was hardly different between the Indian and the European/American anthropologists.

Burling does occasionally contrast the Garos of Rengsanggri with Americans whenever he finds it appropriate to do so. For instance, on page 107, he writes: "At the age when American

children crawl, Garo children are much less active, rarely creeping more than a few feet and never with any serious intent to go somewhere." But, the contrast is often to show the difference rather than to show superiority of the Americans. Even while he cites a Garo saying like "a child who drinks no rice beer will not have blood", he does not pass any judgement of his on such matters. However, to hide his own expectations seems to have been difficult at times and he seems to have slipped such as when he says: "Adults never expose their genitals even to members of their own sex" (p. 109). Did the American adults do so? Or did Burling expect them to show them to members of their own sex?[3]

Theoretically speaking, the text in question is a functionalist representation of the Garo society where both change and conflict are occasional and secondary.[4] The primary theme is interrelatedness, interdependence, reciprocity or mutuality. There is a chapter on disputes (Chapter X) but this speaks mostly of the principles, procedures, and institutional framework available for the same. The functionalist bias is quite apparent in his words: "People continually step beyond the limit and every society provides means of punishing them, and thereby of pushing them back in the direction of acceptable behaviour. A whole battery of sanctions can be mobilized with which to punish nonconforming behaviour" (p. 242). A theoretical obsession is, however, what he denies in the very first line of his preface where he dissociates himself from those who go to the field in order to test a theory or have single thesis to prove. Though he merely wanted to understand and describe the cross-cousin marriage prevalent among the Garos, he has written on many other subjects while ignoring some other dimensions of this society. The retention of some aspects and elimination of others, or engagement with certain aspects of those retained here and not all possible aspects is the handiwork of a theoretical framework though probably not in the same sense in which Burling understands by 'theoretical framework'. The important point to be noted here is that it is not a crime to have or not to

have a theoretical framework. An academic evaluation should instead focus on whether the monograph does justice to what the author has intended to do.

His observations were some of the most profound that I have even come across. Take, for instance, the following lines: "Considerable skill is required in house construction, and several distinct jobs must be done; nevertheless, the work is organized without any formalized leadership. There are no specialized carpenters, and even the owner never directs others in their work. The owner does not, in fact, come right out and ask others to help, but simply lets it be known that he will be building a house; he relies on the others to volunteer, knowing that those who have no other pressing business will be willing to help. On the job, each helps where he sees the need. Houses are built according to a standard pattern, which the workers know well, so nobody seems to make any decisions or direct the work. The older men mostly sit to one side shaping pieces of bamboo, while the younger men do the actual construction" (pp. 196–97).

Unlike many contemporary anthropologists who were under the spell of the 'primitive isolate' theory about tribes, Burling emphatically says: "The Garos have not been isolated from the rest of the world; indeed, contact with the civilization of north India undoubtedly stretches back for hundred years. There are no records in existence to substantiate this, but it is clear that innumerable cultural traits found in other parts of India have made their way into Garo culture and have now become Garo traits as well" (p. 289). However, he certainly did not share the sense of bitterness about the British colonialists which was quite rampant among many anthropologists of his time. He has found no reason to criticize the British administration or the anthropologist-administrator J.P. Mills whose behaviour was quite abrasive to many Indians. Burling has instead chosen to vindicate the British administration's efforts to settle disputes and establish courts of law when he writes: "There is no evidence that the British administration was anything but completely

sincere in its effort to settle disputes according to the traditional Garo law" (p. 300). I am not prepared to accept it as an instance of racial loyalty: our views of the British administrators could have been equally biased and it is quite likely that only another man from the West could appreciate what other people from his hemisphere were doing.

One of the standing criticisms against anthropologists is that they do not want change. They are believed to be against the erosion of the cultural traditions of simple societies. This allegation does not seem incorrect about Burling though he is more pragmatic about it. He writes: "An anthropologist cannot help being saddened at the loss of traditional dancing and music, especially when it is replaced by rather hackneyed American Protestant hymns; but it is unrealistic to expect people who can recognize the value of modern drugs to retain unaltered their faith in sacrifices or in the spirits toward whom the sacrifices are directed" (p. 316). The other allegation against anthropologists is that they overgeneralize. They claim what their micro studies do not enable them methodologically to do so. If this is a problem with anthropologists, it is also true of Burling. For instance, he writes: "... but almost all Garos think of themselves as Garos only and not at all as Indians." He should have qualified it as "almost all Garos I know" or "almost all Garos I have met" for he knew only a miniscule fraction of the numerically quite a large Garo tribe.

Is Burling the same anthropologist when he returned to Rengsanggri in 1997? Did the separation between him and his text ever take place? These are theoretically as well as methodologically interesting questions and I may dwell briefly upon them but before I try and answer the same, let me briefly present what he writes in his 13th chapter. First and foremost is the fact that this chapter contains much information about the village in 1950s, which were screened out earlier but, which flow in now as he gets nostalgic about earlier visit. The information that was not much relevant then is quite relevant now. This is perhaps why some anthropologists continue to

write on the basis of their first fieldwork for their whole life and yet such writings do not become stale. The information we collect do not get stale: they are raw materials which can be given different shapes each time we want to handle them. I am not sure how often he opened his field dairies between these two visits though I believe that diaries cannot take down everything that we observe, hear, smell, feel, etc.

Coming back to "1997", he mainly describes what changes have come about during the last four decades or so and while doing so he does rarely refer to the data in the other 12 chapters published earlier. This makes this chapter interesting to read. There is also a remarkable continuity in the style of his writing and one does not feel that this chapter was written after about four decades. Unlike what Roland Barthes (1973) wants us to believe the author has not died here. He has not even changed, so to speak.[5] He has compressed the last four decades into a few moments. Of course, his gender sensitivity is well evinced in "1997" though he might have been gender sensitive even in the fifties. He is also concerned with soil pollution and the havoc that plastic bags have caused to the contemporary society. He is happy that the village was without plastic pollution though a village might not be the right place to expect it. Further, he has grown sensitive to the generation gap that seems to be widening in the Garo society as perhaps in any other society in the world. But then, for him, Rengsanggri is not just any village, it is the very epicentre of the Garo cosmos.

As regards the factors responsible for change, three were important in his earlier visit: imposition of external political control, new methods of cultivation and Christianity. Education was obviously not at all a factor then but in 1997 it is found to be as important in brining about changes as Christianity. That Barthes' 'death of the author' has not taken place here is supported by the fact that Burling is still a functionalist in 1997. This may be clear from his own words: "The changes that came to Rengsanggri in the four decades between my visits have been profound, but even more than the changes, I was impressed by

the continuities, and these are nowhere more striking than in the practice of kinship" (p. 339). As I have already remarked, there is really nothing wrong in being a functionalist and all of us are so in some sense or the other. The point to be noted here is that he does not seem to have abandoned this theory even after four decades.

Robbing Rob of His Anthropological Privilege

In this section I would like to question the anthropological privilege of Rob (as Robbins Burling is called by his friends) as one of the first to have lived among the Garos and represented them. This privilege was unquestioned until fairly recently though the question of representation is debated from much earlier times than the currency of this word.

I have indulged in such exercises earlier in association with a friend of mine who teaches post-colonial theory at Aarhus University, Denmark. We have deconstructed three Indian texts on the Lepcha tribe of Sikkim and Darjeeling (1991) as well as innumerable Orientalist texts on third world tourism (1999). Singly, I have also examined the contributions of individuals like Verrier Elwin, Furer Haimendorf and Nari Rustomji to tribal development in northeast (1998). In all these writings one of the most important theoretical inspirations was drawn from *Orientalism* (1978) by Edward Said, and to a lesser extent from the writings of Michel Foucault (1980). The tools of scrutiny were epistemological and ontological. I was quite satisfied with the thought that I was not lagging behind the theoretical developments taking place after mid-eighties. My intellectual association with Said or Foucault was rather natural. There was no problem of finding texts as books, individuals, or institutions that would nearly fit into the formulae of challenging existing anthropological texts. This relationship has now weakened and I have begun to question the very tools that are employed for questioning the cultural reproductions. This is perhaps the result of my growing disillusionment with post-modernism. I often wonder if Rob, or for that matter, Hutton and Mills, could

have done something different from what they have done. Did they have a choice for themselves? Were they not slaves of their own epistomes?

Cultural critique of existing anthropological texts has of late been one of the most popular exercises in anthropology and there are many, not to speak of Marcus and Fischer (1986), who are totally immersed in this exercise and plead for more of it. Critical approach to the ethnographic data on which are built our theories is welcome and there should perhaps be no let up in this effort. This makes ethnography not only challenging but also difficult for one is constrained by one's awareness of the arsenals that have piled up for an onslaught on such cultural reproductions. Doing ethnography prior to mid-eighties, that is prior to a series of publications like *Writing Culture, Anthropology as Cultural Critique, The Speakable,* and *The Predicament of Culture,* was certainly less strenuous than it is now.

Rengsanggri, though an ethnography done prior to the publication of these works, would not subject itself easily to either epistemological or ontological onslaught. The subject matter of this book – family and kinship with particular reference to cross-cousin marriage among the Garos – is clearly influenced by the theoretical interests in anthropology in America at that time and not the least prompted by the needs of interests of the Garos though Rob claims that it is both (p. 93). This is ironical for a discipline that specializes in both theory and practice of representing the other. The other has no control over here what is to be represented and what not: this has already been decided for by Rob who had also decided what he would like to observe even after four decades. Yet he is quoted with as much reverence as the text produced by the colonial anthropologist-administrators like J.H. Hutton and J.P. Mills. His authority over the Garo ethnography is thus unchallenged. Sporadic comments earlier on this paper have indicated that this is not too difficult.

When Rob wrote this book, a fairly large number of published literature existed on the Garos but there is little space

given to such literature except towards the end of the book. Thus, this monograph differs from others written during then and is quite similar with the early monographs written by Boas or Malinowski when hardly any secondary literature existed. Almost all informations for this book seem to have emerged from his fieldwork and one does not feel that he had the burden of making space for those who had already written on this tribe. One feels that one is reading a book on the Garos for the first time. This 'feel', according to Clifford, is a fiction because the ethnographer has transformed the complex and ambiguous realities into simple patterns that can be easily understood (1983:132). Even when he refers to earlier works, he does it in such a manner that they quickly disappear from the reader's sight. This certainly makes reading much more lucid than it would otherwise be but it also leaves one suspecting that some of what he has written might have been written by the previous scholars on the Garos albeit in different words.[6]

The Levi-Straussian binary relationship between the subject and the object is not too strong in *Rengsanggri*. Of course this boundary was quite visible in fifties but he seems to have been able to develop, more clearly in 1997, a Garo identity as well. He is excited to be addressed as Raben Marak and he fondly remembers and writes on "Old Friends" (pp. 351–54). He is acutely aware of how he relates himself to the people and how the people relate themselves to him. He occasionally superimposes the American values on that of the Garos and the Garos make an estimate of him (and his impending death for he has grown old) on the basis of their own. To him, both are fine and he has no qualms about either. I wonder what his work would be like if he had gone there and got married to a Garo woman.

One of the most important shortcomings of Burling, if I may say so, is the essentialization of the Garo society. He seems to have been aware of informations that do not fall neatly into the pattern but he is always seen trying to ignore them rather than give them due space. Generalization is a necessary step in

any research but this does not mean that the picture must be homogeneous, neat, well ordered, etc. The positivistic tradition often compels us to do so but this tantamount to politics of ethnography for it involves the silencing of the subaltern voices within a culture. Similarly, the entire West is often essentialized as the dominant, the subject, the powerful, etc., and the East as the opposite of it. Under the influence of Orientalism I too began to think so until I read *Anthropology as Cultural Critique* and began to interact at personal level with many friends in the West. This habit is rather strong in academics and it exists here almost as an unwritten rule.

Before closing, *Rengsanggri* may be ideally read as a fine piece of literature, ignoring both the author and the object. This would be the best way of savouring this book. But, the book does not have the privilege of being simply read so. It also stands as a sacrificial goat at the altar of anthropology as science and therefore it allows itself to be examined in the light of anthropological theories, methods and traditions. To sum up, kinship theories were very much contemporary when Burling did his work and it obviously broadens the horizon of kinship theory in the sense that it deals with a non-ranked clan system whereas most other studies on kinship were on rank-based clan societies. Methodologically, not much can be said because conventionally this work is interesting in the sense that it resembles those early 20th century monographs without having the trappings of post-colonial ethnography in India.

Acknowledgement

I am extremely grateful to the participants at the workshop on Anthropology as Culture Critique (August 17–19, 1999), organized by the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata for their useful comments on the earlier draft of this article. I am also thankful to Professor Robbins Burling of Michigan University for commenting on the paper submitted at the above workshop and allowing me to use that here.

Notes

1. The earlier practice of hiding himself in his/her book, hiding the real name of his/her village/respondent, and referring to himself/herself in the second person may be attributed to the vision of many anthropologists that the discipline could be brought at par with physical or life sciences. This practice has not yet vanished but the tendency to make him/her more visible in the text is becoming popular today. I consider this to be an important paradigmatic shift in anthropology in the recent past.
2. I sent a copy of what I wrote about his work to him and he got back to me with his comments, which I am permitted to include here wherever I think it is necessary.
3. Commenting on this point, Burling writes: "May be you are not aware that western men do not hesitate to be nude in front of other men. High school and college boys expect to take showers in common shower rooms ..." So to a westerner like myself, the Garo standards of modesty seemed odd.. "yes", I would have expected them to show their genitals to members of their own sex."
4. This is agreed by Robbins Burling. In his mail dated 2 October, 1999, he wrote: "You are right, though I don't usually think about it, that I am a functionalist, at least in the sense of wanting to know how things fit together. We all were in the fifties, and of course my fascination with kinship dates from that time too, as you point out."
5. In response to this comment, he writes: "In 40 years one should have changed, learned, grown, and perhaps I have not changed and grown as much as I should have. I'm still a functionalist, more or less."
6. In this respect, he replies in the same mail: "Your charges of overgeneralization and of not taking the older literature into account are entirely fair."

References

Barthes, Roland 1973, *Mythologies*, St. Albans: Paladin.

Burling, Robbins 1997, *Rengsanggri: Family and Kinship in a Garo Village*, Tura: P.S. Momin. First published in 1963 by the University of Pennsylvania.

Clifford, James 1983, "On Ethnographic Authority", *Representations*, 2:132–43.

Clifford, James 1988, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Foucault, Michel 1980, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Random House.

Manganaro, Marc (ed) 1990, *Modernist Anthropology: From Fieldwork to Text*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, George E. and Michael M.J. Fischer 1986, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nakane, Chie 1967, *Garo and Khasi: A Comparative Study of Kinship in Matrilineal Systems*, Paris: Mouton & Co.

Poddar, P.K. and T.B. Subba 1991, "Demystifying Some Ethnographic Texts on the Himalayas", *Social Scientist*, 19 (8–9):78–84.

— 1999, "Designing Destinations: Advertising and Touristic Desire" in T.B. Subba (ed.), *Wonder That Is Culture*, New Delhi: Mittal, pp. 259–78.

Said, Edward W. 1978, *Orientalism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Subba, T.B. 1998, "Understanding Tribal Development in Arunachal Pradesh: Elwin-Furer Haimendorf-Rustomji" in A.K. Danda et al (eds), *North East India: Ethno-Cultural Perspectives and Process*, Calcutta: Indian Anthropological Society, pp. 121–27.

Tyler, Stephen 1987, *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.