



THE OTHER AS READER ETHNOGRAPHIC TEXT AND INDIGENOUS CRITIQUE

Dr. Volker Gottowik, M.A.
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität
Frankfurt am Main

1 Formulation of the Question

Almost exactly forty years after the publication of "Tristes Tropiques" (1955) Claude Lévi-Strauss has edited a book of plates showing hitherto unknown photographs from his legendary expedition to inner Brazil. This absolutely fascinating book entitled "Saudades do Brasil" (1994) consists of pictorial documents from the time period 1935 to 1939. In addition to views of Brazilian cities and landscapes, it contains several photos of the Indian peoples, whom Claude Lévi-Strauss once met: Caduveo, Bororo, Nambikwara, Mundé and Tupi-Kawahib. One of these photos of the indigenous population of Central Brazil is particularly noticeable. It was obviously taken much later and is exceptional not only for the fact that it was not taken by Claude Lévi-Strauss himself, but rather: It shows three Indian children leafing through a French edition of "Tristes Tropiques" (cf. Lévi-Strauss 1994-1995:223).

The children aged perhaps from five to eight years are poorly dressed in their torn trousers and open shirts. They sit close together on the floor of a hut and are leaning against one of the wooden walls. While the two older ones look at the open book with serious expression, the youngest child is turned towards the camera and seems to be somehow distracted - or perhaps just a bit sleepy. - How did a copy of "Tristes Tropiques" fall into the hands of these Indian children?

What could they have thought about the photos in this volume, showing them a culture which was once their own? Are there moments of perception and recognition? Do the pictures embody

a safe but lost world which they are longing for ? Or are they overcome with shame or even scorn at the sight of naked bodies openly sprawling about in the dust in front of the camera? Presumably, the scenes portrayed are just as strange to them as to the western observer. But no-one knows exactly; no-one has asked them about it.

It is at exactly this point that my interest is aroused : I am interested in how ethnographic documents (photos, texts, etc.) of *the own culture* are perceived and comprehended : Do the observers recognize in these documents or do they feel alienated? Do they see realistic portrayals of their own culture in ethnographic depictions and description or do they perceive themselves only as distorted, as parodied and caricatured ? What do the ethnographicized persons criticize about ethnographic documents and of what value is such indigenous criticism within the ethnographic research process ?

2 Historic Context of Question

How ethnographic description of foreign cultures are read and understood by the members of these cultures is not necessarily a question with which the founding fathers of modern anthropology saw themselves confronted. In order to pose the question of indigenous reception of ethnographic documents and to consider it relevant, prerequisites a special moment in the history of anthropology. This moment, if you wish, has been captured paradigmatically in the above described photo from "Saudades do Brazil": It is the moment, when ethnographic documents find their way back to the natives. This moment - and thus the question posed in this paper - is of recent date.

During the classic epoch of ethnographic field research (1920-1960) hardly any of the contemporary specialists anticipated, that the divide between object and recipient of ethnographic portrayals would dissolve at least partially. Historic changes had to come about first, which have been only insufficiently paraphrased with the collapse of colonial empires and the establishment of educational facilities in the Third World. How far reaching these changes actually were and had to be, so that the response to ethnographic works by

natives could be added to the research process as a revealing date, becomes particularly clear from an autobiographic remark by Margaret Mead with regard to her research in Tau, Samoa, and the resulting ethnographic work :

"When I wrote *Coming of Age in Samoa* (...) I did not include the girls I had studied among the reader for whom I was writing; it seemed extremely unlikely that any of them would ever learn to read English. Today, however, the children and grandchildren of girl like the ones I knew in Tau are attending American colleges - for nowadays half of the Samoan population lives in the United States - and as their classmates read about Samoans of fifty years ago, they wonder how what I have said applies to them" (Mead, 1972:154).

Here, Margaret points out the changes, which the response to ethnographic works has undergone since the mid 60s. These changes consist essentially in that the once illiterate savages have become potential readers of ethnographic texts. Indeed, due to their access to educational establishments, the Samoans (who are only representatives here) are now in a position to take in ethnographic works about their own culture : They can give other people their *opinions* about the extent the described applies to them. Thus this addresses a development taking place in global measure. The spreading of reading and writing capabilities in the Third World has led to the fact, that representatives from nearly every culture have gained access to classic, ethnographic literature. Today, they can be considered potential reader of this literature. The numerous controversies about ethnographic texts sparked up by the ethnographic persons in the last years show that they are not only potential reader, but rather that such indigenous response actually takes place.

Thus, it is not without a certain irony, that "*Coming of Age in Samoa*" (1928) has become the object of such a controversy too (cf. Wendt, 1983 and Gizycki, 1984; cf. also Freeman, 1983). During the course of this case, Samoans trained mainly in the west criticized an ethnographic text about Samoa from a time distance of more than

fifty years. Indeed, this prominent case raises a basic question : Who can claim to speak in the name of the ethnographic persons ?

3 Problems of the Question

The epistemological demand, not to describe foreign cultures on the basis of one's own values, but rather from their members perspective marks the beginning of modern anthropology. This demand was first made by Franz Boas, afterwards applied paradigmatically by Bronislaw Malinowski and renewed emphatically by Clifford Geertz (cf. Boas, 1887:589, Malinowski, 1922-1979:49 and Geertz, 1974-1983b:290). Even if this demand for a depiction "from the native's point of view" lays the foundation of modern anthropology, there is still great obscurity as to which criteria should be applied when claiming this demand. In view of this epistemological shortcoming, the question of how the natives read these texts gains particular relevance. It is a question, whether they think their standpoint has actually been depicted in these texts and to what extent the rejection of an ethnographic description by a member of the described culture can be looked upon as a criteria for the failure of the ethnographer to represent "his vision of his world".

In view of the range of this question for modern anthropology, it must come as a surprise, that there are only very few analyses available about how members of foreign cultures read ethnographical descriptions of their own culture (cf. Feld, 1987 and Brettell/Ed., 1993). The forms of response to come to the fore with regards to these texts have not been examined systematically until now. In that respect they can be attached at the most heuristically to Malinowski's work, *insofar* as the founder of modern social anthropology was discovered relatively early as an author by the Trobriand monograph sparked up is probably one of the earliest to be scientifically documented :

Thus, the anthropology Murray Groves reports in an article for the magazine "Man", when in 1955 a Trobriander addressed him in the middle of the road in Port Moresby. After a short preparatory talk

("Are you an Anthropologist?"), the Trobriander, called Lepani Watson, points out, that Malinowski incorrectly described the order of rank of the various clans in his monograph about the Trobrianders. The native took a corrected edition out of his pocket and handed it to the consternated antropologist with the remark : "I should be much obliged if you would make the facts available to those who have been misinformed" (Groves/Watson, 1956:164).

Murray Groves actually fulfilled the Trobriander's demand and passed on this - if you wish - indigenous counter- representation to the periodical "Man", in which it was published in November 1956 under the following heading:

"Increasing literacy in English among Melanesians now threatens alien fieldworkers in that area with new occupational hazard" (Groves/Watson, 1956:164).

This phrasing brings the problem discussed here right to the point. Indeed, if anthropologist, as *purported*, are actually confronted with a "new occupational hazard" - how are they to cope with it? An answer to this question is largely dependent on the value, that anthropology is prepared to attribute to an indigenous form of response amounting to a criticism of facts and contents : on the one hand the native critics cannot be sweepingly denied a certain inner knowledge of the described clan system; on the other hand isolated errors by the ethnographer cannot be excluded completely in view of the complexity of the social relation in question. But how should it be understood when the corrections of the *aformentioned* Trobriander amount to an elevation of his own clan's order rank - which is probably not without benefits?

The "new occupational hazard" mentioned exists insofar as the criticism by the ethnographicized people could be taken for the whole truth. It could be overlooked thereby, that statement about their own culture are carried by interests of their life-world. But as an anthropologist - at least according to the interpretive turn in the social and cultural sciences (Rabinow/Sullivan 1979;cf. also

Habermas 1983:30) - should not believe, that he himself is completely without interest, he cannot reject this criticism without examining it carefully. According to an interpretive comprehension of the ethnographic research process, he would rather have to confront this criticism and to examine its plausibility and validity conscientiously. In other words, the native does not have any privileges when examining his own culture; however, in the event of analysis, their objections cannot be rejected entirely.

There are a whole series of good reasons, why the objection made by the indigenous with regard to ethnographic texts should be taken seriously and why a way should be sought to secure the productive potential contained in such criticism. In the possibility of gaining such criticism and analyzing it with regards to specific types of response lies a peculiarity of the ethnographic research process. This peculiarity comes clearer to the fore if one transfers the question raised to the science of history for a moment; there it reads for example as follows : How would Karl the Great have read a modern biography about Karl the Great?

Although the historic facts may not have changed during the last twelve-hundred years, Karl the Great cannot be expected to recognize such a text. However, this question can only be answered hypothetically for the field of historiography as it is raised on an exclusively asynchronous level ; in other words : Karl the Great cannot comment directly on the issue in question. But this is completely different with regards to the field of ethnography : The question is raised here on a synchronous level ; in other words : members of an examined culture can be asked directly whether they recognize themselves at all in an ethnographic text. In contrast to most other social and cultural sciences, anthropology is plainly exposed to criticism by the persons portrayed; it may be genuinely capable of an independent contribution to the methodology of the social or cultural sciences. This may be especially the case, where question of describing and conveying radically deviating ontological and metaphysical belief systems are concerned. Anyway, the resulting

possibilities, which open up to the anthropologist here, pose a special privilege and an opportunity, which has been taken too rarely hitherto.

The English missionary B. Baldwin is one of the few, who have tried to talk to natives about ethnographic texts describing their culture. He lived in Boyowa, the main island of the Trobriand Archipelago for about 30 years. When Baldwin settled there at the end of the 30s, he became acquainted with lots of inhabitants, who knew Malinowski personally. Now, in order to find out if the Trobrianders shared his fascination with Malinowski's work, Baldwin went through them - paragraph upon paragraph. Baldwin describes his observation and experiences while reading Malinowski's Trobriand monograph together with the natives as follows:

"I feel that (...) the people he describes would still seem some what foreign to the Trobrianders themselves. I was surprised at the number of times informants helping me with checking Malinowski would (...) say it was not like that. They did not quarrel with facts or explanations, only with the colouring, as it were. The sense expressed was not the sense they had of themselves, or of things Boyowan" (Baldwin n.d., 1991:75).

In this case the response to the same ethnographic work obviously took a completely different path. It does not lead - as in the before mentioned example - to a criticism, which refers to facts and contents, but has rather to cope with other problems : the problem here is obviously, that the natives are not directly able to identify their own world and the attributions of sense and meaning reigning there. Their criticism does not apply to single facts or explanations, but is rather indirectly articulated in the shape of vexations caused by the ethnographic text. In this case, the response leads to a meaning oriented or formal criticism which shows, where culture inherent sense attributions were missed by the ethnographer. Additionally, such a criticism draws the attention to ethnographic conventions assigned to this genre, which prevent the native's comprehension of the text.

In other words : responses to ethnographic texts from the native's point of view may reveal the disjunctions found in ethnographic depictions. In a certain way, these disjunction are somehow a structural element of this genre : well-know, things are perceived from another angle, put in an unusual context and are described awkwardly. These disjunctions are due to the circumstance, that the ethnographic description of a cultural cannot represent the matter of course, with which it's members live, it (cf. Kramer, 1978:19). So, it could happen, that an ethnographic work about one's own culture may seem stange to the reader or even, that he insofar as becoming strange is a hermeneutic condition of understanding, this difference in the perception between ethnographer and ethnographicized contains potential recognitions about the ethnographic research process. These potential recognitions cannot only be revealed from the native's perspective, but also - in a second step - communicated to others.

Such a dialogue about differences in the perception of the self and the other seems possible, insofar as the things described in ethnographic texts do not become totally strange to the native reader. The natives are capable of "identifying their own world in fact not without a smile, the meaning of which is difficult to decipher" (Kramer, 1977:7)

Other anthropologist have told of this smile, that often accompanies the indigenous response to ethnographic texts and that again may have irritated the editors (cf. for example Rosaldo, 1989:49). The meaning of this smile can once again be illustrated by resorting to Malinowski, who once termed anthropology as "the science of the sense of humour". In particular, he expounds :

"Anthropology is the science of the sense of humour. It can be thus defined (...) For to see ourselves as other see us is but the reverse and the counterpart of the gift to see other as they really are and as they want to be" (Malinowski 1937:VII).

Malinowski is hinting here at the dialectic between the recognition of the foreign: The perception of others goes inevitably with the observation of how one is perceived by others. This dialectic moment takes a definition of anthropology as a basis, to be found in Malinowski's foreword to a work by the German anthropologist Julius Lips. In this work, entitled "The Savage Hits Back", Lips has put together portrayals of Europeans in paintings and sculpture done by non European artists (cf. Lips, 1937). These artistic depictions allow the European observer to see himself through the eyes of others and - as a matter of fact - they show him different from how he is used to seeing himself. Insofar as they are supposed to emphasize his weaknesses and vanities, they actually do expect the western observer to show a great sense of humour.

This dialectic between the recognition of the self and the recognition of the other can be located on the side of the ethnographicized since they have access to ethnographic texts. For the ethnographic cognitive process has in principle become reversible thereby; in other words: the natives too are now in a position, thanks to the ethnographic text, to see themselves as others perceive them. Reading the ethnographic text from the perspective of the ethnographicized reveals not only the conventions of the genre; it requires also a certain sense of humour because of the disjunction, which are inherent in ethnographic texts. It can probably be assumed that is where the strange smile comes from, which often accompanies the indigenous response to ethnographic texts. One could phrase it, slightly exaggerated, as follows: The ethnographicized recognize their selves grinningly in the ethnographer's exotics. At this point at the latest, parallels between ethnography and caricature or parody come to the fore.

It has already been emphasized variously in the literature how flowing the transition between "objective characterization and objectifying caricature" are in ethnographic depictions (cf. Rosaldo, 1989:54). Indeed, in spite of the intimacy hinted at between ethnographic and artistic types of depictions, one formal difference

should not be overlooked: A caricature or a parody is always an expression of conscious disjunction, an ethnographic disjunction is in contrast mostly involuntary. But it can be said of all the genres mentioned, that a textual or pictorial depiction, in which the people portrayed recognize themselves as being strange, the dialectic between the recognition of the self and the foreign sets in, because of this disjunction and not in spite of it. Only when the picture of the observer does not coincide with his own view of himself, does he gain a surplus of recognition in his own culture. Whether it is possible to save this surplus of recognition based on talks with members of the depicted culture is the subject of the further considerations.

4 Interpretive Anthropology and Indigenous Criticism

What position does interpretive anthropology take in view of an indigenous criticism of ethnographic texts? What role does Clifford Geertz attribute to the Balinese for example with regards to validation of his ethnographic statements about Bali?

Geertz certainly does not claim to represent the "native point of view" in the frame of a thick ethnographic description. Rather, he emphasizes, that it can always consist of an interpretation of their interpretations only (cf. Geertz, 1973b-1983b:22). But even if indigenous and ethnographic interpretations are not in a position to represent the other, they do not stand by each other at will.

In order to illustrate the difference between indigenous and ethnographic interpretations, Geertz compares the foreign culture with a text which the ethnographer somehow tries to read while looking over the native's shoulder (cf. Geertz, 1974-1983b:259). By reading culture as a text, the ethnographer - according to Geertz - is discovering meanings and structures which remained concealed from the natives themselves. Geertz establishes connections there by with well-known hermeneutic premises. According to them, the author cannot necessarily be considered the appointed interpreter of

his own texts. Rather, it is more important to understand an author better than he himself did (cf. Bollnow, 1982).

In reference to the French hermeneutist Paul Ricoeur, Geertz tries to illustrate that not only the meaning of his text, rather also that of a social action changes during the course of time. It changes with historic contexts and thus successively emancipates itself from the original intention of the actor. The text as well as the "track", which an important action leaves in time (cf. Ricoeur, 1971-1972:264) gains new referential meanings during the course of history. These can no longer be experienced by resorting to the author's or actor's original intentions. Rather, they emerge in the interpretations of future readers respectively in the reactions of later generations. They can be read there as signs or can be interpreted with a view to the logic fundamental to them. Geertz now transfers this cognitive theoretical conception to anthropology: The original intention of the natives are to a great extent unimportant for the meaning of the social discourse actually carried out by them in word and actions. Rather the affect, that those discourse inscribed in field notes have on the researcher, when he constantly resorts to these notes as a primary source during the examining process, are decisive for the meaning of this discourse. The "thick description" showing the culture from the native's point of view is followed by the "diagnosis" in a second step (Geertz, 1973b-1983:39). During this step the structural meaning and the logic of discourse, which are almost completely unknown to the natives, are revealed. This conception leads to a privileged position for the ethnographer (cf. Phipps, 1989), which opens up to Geertz from the text metaphor and the connected paradigma of reading.

This privileged position of the external observer over the member of a culture has a long tradition, not only in culture theory and philosophy (cf. for example Simmel 1908 and Husserl, 1936-1954: 183f.) ; more recently the privileged position of the reader over the author when laying down the meaning of a text may be qualified by the science of literature (cf. Jauss, 1982 for example). It

goes back ultimately to a semiotic theory of meaning developed in philology (cf. Noth, 1985:50), which in the first instance lays down the meaning of signs, actions and texts according to their use or affect. Geertz pleads quite explicitly in favor of such a *pragmatic theory of meaning* (cf. Geertz, 1973b-1983b:25).

The connection of the ethnographer's privileged position over the ethnographicized with a pragmatic theory of meaning has become problematic, since the divide between object and recipient of ethnographic text is partially suspended. As the ethnographic object is now a reading subject, this leads to a new constellation, which James Clifford describes clearly in reference to Geertz's metaphor of culture as text :

"If the ethnographer reads culture over the native's shoulder, the native also reads over the ethnographer's shoulder as he or she writes each culture description" (Clifford, 1986:119).

The reciprocity, which has set into the ethnographic process thus leads to the following situation: The ethnographer reads the foreign culture as a text and writes a text about it, which is read by the members of this culture. Here too, the text develops referential meanings, that go beyond the author's original intentions. As an author, the ethnographer has lost the exclusive privilege of deciding on the meaning of the text. In other words: "Not only occasionally, but always the meaning of a text surpassed its author" (Gadamer, 1960:280).

The meaning of *every text* goes through changes in time, which can be compared to growing children : The older they become, the more they begin to develop their own lives, for which the author has only a certain amount of responsibility lies with the readers and in recent times, the ethnographicized can be included amongst them.

Likewise, in the frame of his response theory, the German literary scholar Hans Robert Jauss places the reader as a third dimension beside author and work. He attributes him with an active

role in the definition and emergence of the text's meaning (cf. Jauss, 1982:22). Here, the reader decides about the meaning of the text, insofar as it develops in the dynamic relation to his expectation, judgements and conclusions. So, when determining the meaning of a text, the attention shifts from text to reader. With regards to ethnographic texts, this leads to a special situation: It seems absolutely possible, that the reader of the text is also the subject of the text.

In other words: A pragmatic theory of meaning leads away from the question: What does the text mean? And to the question: What does it do with the reader? The interaction between reader and text become the object of the examination. Indeed, as the literary scholar Stanley Fish expresses it, the reader does not react to the meaning of the text. rather, his reaction is the meaning of the text (cf. Fish, 1980:349).

Now, how the natives as readers respond to an ethnographic text about their culture seems relevant in view of this background. Their readings open up areas of meaning which are not necessarily accessible to ethnographers and other Western interpreters. Here too, referential meaning are uncovered, which the ethnographer had not intended and may strike him as strange. Nevertheless, based on the pragmatic theory of meaning with it's indifference towards the author's original intention, there is no cognitive theoretical evidence to reject indigenous interpretation as inappropriate. more ever an examination of the interaction between text and reader - according to Stanley Fish - would appear to be fruitful in any case:

"If you begin assuming that reader do reader do something and the something they do has meaning, you will never fail to discover a pattern of reader activities that appears obviously to be meaningful" (Fish, 1980:345; accentuated by V.G.).

This statement by Stanley Fish I had in mind, namely that "you will never fail" to discover something meaningful in reader activities, when I started to plan my research project. This project is

about reading experience that Balinese intellectuals make, when dealing with ethnographic texts about Bali. These reading experience of Balinese intellectuals are not completely disparate from each other; rather these readers have plenty of common factors, which lead to a certain union of their interpretations. In this sense, the Balinese intellectuals form an "interpretive community" (Fish, 1980:14), whose manner of reading differs from that of other social groups and which competes with other interpretations, for example with those of Western Scholars. But can one distinguish between right and wrong, or between good and better interpretations among competitive manners of reading?

With regards to this question, one points to a consensus theory of truth, which predominates critical hermeneutics (represented by Gadamer and Habermas for example), but which Clifford Geertz in contrast does not share. According to such a theory of truth, every side should - in principle - be in a position to convince the other side about the plausibility and validity of its interpretation with regards to different ways of reading culture and text. The medium in which the plausibility of interpretation has to prove itself, would be a consensus oriented discussion, that is a dialogue:

"In order to distinguish right and wrong statements, I refer to the judgement of others, that is to the judgement of all others with whom I could ever have a discussion (...). The prerequisite for the truth of statements is the potential consent of all others" (Habermas, 1973:219).

Accordingly, the demands made by ethnographers with regards to true statements about others must be taken up discursively and made inter-subjectively understandable (cf. Habermas, 1973:221). Claims connected with his text about the other; rather he can confront the "judgement of the examined" in real situation (cf. Kohl, 1993:127). In such a real situation, the dialogue aims at a contextually founded criticism and at handling the ethnographic text along the lines of a better argument. Where such handling, regardless of the reasons, is not possible, the text remains

the reason to come to grips with one another and to get an idea, why our interpretations differ. However, the debate about the meaning of text and culture always aims at getting the "judgement of all others", because any kind of exclusivity would render the idea behind such a discourse absurd.

But, at exactly this point, a problem is revealed. The ethnographicized have a connection to the described traditions, they are in other words - familiar with the object depicted. But usually they are not familiar with the way, in with these traditions in separated from one another, the ethnographic text must inevitably strike the ethnographicized as stange, largeley independent of the statements made therein. Whether reading ethnographic text together can contribute to reading *a culture as a text* an at the same time *a text as a culture*, that is as an expression of a specific, cultural practice, cannot be decided here beforehand. The aim of such a reading would be to become aware of common traits of ethnographic texts, which cannot be taken from the object of examination, but rather derive from conventions of depiction. Becoming foreign in view of these conventions would mean understanding the functions these conventions have in an ethnographic text, for example with regards to the ethnographic authority (cf. Clifford, 1983). Anyway, an attempt at reading ethnographic texts together with those, who are the object of these text could be understood as a contribution to intercultural hermeneutics, which so far has not gone beyond "preperatory remarks" (cf. Wierlacher, 1983).

Literatur

- Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah. 1978 : Die Kasten und ihre Sprache. In :
Merian: Bali, Oktober 1978: 90-92
----- 1991 : Bali in the 1950s: The Role of the Pemuda Pejuang
in Balinese Political Processes. In: Geertz (Hg.) 1991:165-
197

- Baldwin, B. o.J : Traditional and Cultural Aspects of Trobriand Island Chiefs. In: Canberra Anthropology 1991:14(1):67-87
- Barley, Nigel. 1995 : Bali. Wo das Paradies erfunden wurde. In: Geo Spezial: Indonesien 1995:2:110-125
- Berg Eberhard/Martin Fuchs (Hg.) 1993 : Kultur, soziale praxis, Text. Die Krise der ethno-graphischen Repräsentation. Frankfurt am Main
- Boas, Franz. 1887 : Museums of Ethnology and their Classification. In: Science 1887:9:587-589, 614
- Bollnow, Otto Friedrich. 1982 : Was heißt einen Autor besser verstehen, als er sich selbst verstanden hat ? In: Ders.: Studien zur Hermeneutik, Bd. 1. Freiburg/münchen 1982
- Brettel, Caroline B. (Hg.) 1993 : When They Read What We Write. The Politics of Ethnography. f☺ Westport/London
- Buhl, Walter L. (Hg.) 1972 : Vertehende Soziologie. Grundzüge und Entwicklung-stendenzen. München
- Clifford, James. 1983 : On Ethnographic Authority. In: Clifford 1988:21-54
- 1986 : On Ethnographic Allegory. In: Clifford/Marcus (Hg.) 1986:98-121. Übers.: Über ethnographische Allegorie. In: Berg/Fuchs/Hg. 1993:200-239
- 1988 The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Cambridge/London
- Clifford, James/Georg E. Marcus (Hg.) 1986 : Writing Culture. The Poetics and politics of Ethnography, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London
- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1986 : Hermes´ Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethno-graphic Description. In: Clifford/Marcus (Hg.) 1986:51-76
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983 : Time and the Other. How Anthropology makes its object. New York
- Fahrenbach, Helmut (Hg.) 1973 : Wirklichkeit und Reflexion. Pfullingen

- Feld, Steven. 1982 : Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics and Song in Kaluli Expression. Austin
- 1987 : Dialogic Editing: Interpreting How Kaluli Read "Sound and Sentiment". In: Cultural Anthropology 1987:2 (2):190-210
- Fish, Stanley. 1980 : Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge, Mass.
- Freeman, Derek. 1983 : Margaret Mead and Samoa. The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth. Cambridge/Mass. 1983
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1960 : Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. Tübingen 1975.4
- Geertz, Clifford. 1964 : Tihingan: A Balinese Village. In: Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land-en Volkenkunde. Dordrecht 1964:120:1-33
- 1966 : Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali. In: Geertz 1973a:360-411. Übers.: Person, Zeit und Umgangsformen auf Bali. In: Geertz 1983b:133-201
- 1972 : Deep play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight. In: Geertz 1973a:412-453. Übers.: 'Deep Play': Bemerkungen zum balinesischen Hahnenkampf. In: Geertz 1983b:202-260
- 1973a: The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays. New York
- 1973b: Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In: Geertz 1973a:3-30. Übers.: Dichte Beschreibung. Bemerkungen zu einer deutenden Theorie von Kultur. In: Geertz 1983b:7-43
- 1974 : 'From the Native's Point of View': On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding. In: Geertz 1983a:55- 70. Übers.: 'Aus der Perspektive der Eingeborenen'. Zum Problem ethnologischen Verstehens. In: Geertz 1983b:289-309
- 1983a: Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology. New York

- 1983b: Dichte Beschreibung. Beitrage zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme. Frankfurt am Main
- 1992 : Tafsir Kebudayaan (The Interpretation of Cultures). Yogyakarta
- Geertz, Hildred (Hg.) 1991 : State and Society in Bali. Leiden
- Gizycki, Renate von. 1984 : Margaret Meads Samoa: Eine Kontroverse mit oder ohne Samoaner? In: Anthropos 1984:79(4/6):647-653
- Groves, Murray/Lepani Watson. 1956 : Trobriand Island Clans and Chiefs. Increasing literacy in English among Melanesians now threatens alien fieldworkers in that area with new occupational hazard. In: Man 1956:56:164
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1973 : Wahrheitstheorien. In: Fahrenbach (Hg.) 1973:211- 265
- 1983 : Moralbewußtsein und kommunikatives Handeln. Frankfurt am Main
- Husserl, Edmund. 1936 : Die Krise der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phanomenologie. In: Ders.:Gesammelte Werke, Band 6. Den Haag 1954
- Jauss, Hans Robert. 1982 : Zum problem des dialogischen Verstehens. In: Iachmann (Hg.) 1982:11-24
- Jensen, Gordon D./Luh Ketut Suryani. 1992 : The Balinese People. A Reinvestigation of character. oxford
- Kohl, Karl-Heinz. 1979 : Exotik als Beruf. Erfahrung und Trauma der Ethnographie. Frankfurt am Main/New York 1986
- 1993 : Ethnologie - die Wissenschaft vom kulturell Fremden. Eine Einführung. Munchen
- Kramer, Fritz. 1977 : Verkehrte Welten. Zur imaginären Ethnographie des 19. Jahrhunderts. Frankfurt am Main
- 1978 : Die social anthropology und das Problem der Darstellung anderer Gesellschaften. In: Kramer/Sigrist (Hg.) 1978: 9-27
- Kramer, Fritz/Christian Sigrist (Hg.) 1978 : Gesellschaften ohne Staat, Band 1: Gleichheit und Gegenseitigkeit. Frankfurt am Main

- Lachmann, Renate (Hg.) 1982 : Dialogizität. München
- Lekkerkerker, C. 1920 : Bali en Lombok: Overzicht der litteratuur omtrent deze eilanden tot einde 1919 (Bali and Lombok: Survey of the Publications on These Island up to and Including the Year 1919). Rijswijk
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1955 : Tristes Tropiques. Paris
 ----- 1994 : Saudades do Brasil. Paris. Übers.: Brasilianisches Album. München 1995
- Lewis, Ioan M. 1968 : Review of: A Diary in the Strict sense of the Term by B. Malinowski. In: Man 1968:3(2):348-349
- Lips, Julius. 1937 : The Savage Hits Back or The White Man Through Native Eyes. London
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1922 : Argonauts of the Western Pacific. New York. Übers.: Argonauten des westlichen Pazific. Frankfurt am Main 1979
 ----- 1937 : Introduction. In: Lips 1937:VII-IX
- Marcus, George E. 1937 : One Man's Mead. In: New York Times Book Review v. 27.3.1993
- Marcus, George E./Michael M. J.Fischer. 1986 : Anthropology as Cultural Critique. Chicago/London
- Mead, Margaret. 1928 : Coming of Age in Samoa. New York
 ----- 1972 : Blackberry Winter. New York
- Mead, Margaret/Gregory Bateson. 1942 : Balinese Character. A Photographic Analysis. New York
- Noth, Winfried. 1985 : Handbuch der Semiotik. Stuttgart
- Phipps, Peter. 1989 : Monopoly on Meaning: On Clifford Geertz's Interpretive Theoretical Program. In: CHAI 1989:2:83-88
- Rabinow, Paul/William M. Sullivan (Hg.) 1979 : The Interpretive Turn: Emergence of an Approach. In: Rabinow/Sullivan (Hg.) 1979:1-21
- Rabinow, Paul/William M. Sullivan (Hg.) 1979 : Interpretive Social Science. A Reader. Berkeley/Los Angeles

- Ricoeur, Paul. 1971 : The Model of the Text. Meaningful Action Considered as a Text. Übers.: Der Text als Modell. Hermeneutisches Verstehen. In: Buhl (Hg.) 1972:252-258
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1989 : Culture and Truth. The Remaking of Social Analysis. London
- Shankman, Paul. 1984 : The Thick and the Thin: On the Interpretive Theoretical Program of Clifford Geertz. In: Current Anthropology 1984:25(3):261-270
- Simmel, Georg. 1908 : Exkurs über den Fremden. In: Ders.: Gesammelte Werke, Band 2: Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung. Berlin 1958.4
- Stuart-Fox, David J. 1992 : Bibliography of Bali. Publication from 1920 to 1990. Leiden
- Vickers, Adrian. 1989 : Bali. A Paradise Created. Penguin Books Australia. Übers.: Bali. Ein Paradies wird erfunden. Köln/Les Bois 1994
- Wendt, Albert. 1983 : Margaret Meads Samoa - eine Anklage. In: Frankfurter Hefte. Zeitschrift für Kultur und Politik 1983:38(9):45-53
- Wierlacher, Alois. 1983 : Mit fremdem Augen. Vorbereitende Bemerkungen zu einer interculturellen Hermeneutik deutscher Literatur. In: Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache 1983:9:1-16
- Wikan, Unni. 1990 : Managing Turbulent Hearts. A Balinese Formula of Living. Chicago et al.

**MASALAH BUDAYA DAN PARIWISATA
DALAM PEMBANGUNAN**

**Suntingan
I Gusti Ngurah Bagus**



**PROGRAM STUDI MAGISTER
(S2) KAJIAN BUDAYA
UNIVERSITAS UDAYANA
2002**

Perpustakaan Nasional : Katalog Dalam Terbitan (KDT)

Masalah Budaya dan Pariwisata dalam Pembangunan
Suntingan, I Gusti Ngurah Bagus,---
Denpasar : Program Studi Magister (S2)
Kajian Budaya Universitas Udayana, 2002
330 hlm 14 cm.

ISBN : 979 - 96936 - 1 - 6

1. Kebudayaan. 2. Pariwisata Industri
1. Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah.

306.

**@. 2002 KAJIAN BUDAYA UNIV. UDAYANA BALI.
Jl. Pulo Nias No. 23 DENPASAR
Telp / Fax : 0361 246653.**

Dilarang mengutip dan memperbanyak, sebagian atau seluruhnya dalam bentuk apapun, baik cetak, photoprint, microfilm dan sebagainya, tanpa izin penerbit.

**Cetakan kesatu 2002
001 - 09 - 01 - 02.**

ISBN 979 - 96936 - 1 - 6