Archivio
Antropologico
Mediterraneo

Officina di Studi Medievali

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PALERMO
Dipartimento di Beni Culturali
Studi Culturali
Sezione di Scienze umane, sociali e politiche

fondazione ignazio buttitta

Shahram Khosravi

Writing Iranian Culture

Throughout the twentieth century European and American anthropologists traveled to different parts of the world in order to map out, analyze and 'understand' the *others*. However, as part of the modern education system, the discipline of anthropology emerged also in other parts of the world. Unlike the traditional pattern of a triangular relationship between the Western anthropologist, non-Western field, and 'native informant', there are now increasing numbers of so called native anthropologists doing anthropology 'at home'. In many cases non-Western anthropologists' criticism of anthropology as a Western-dominated discipline (Asad 1973) has led to the emergence of what has been called an 'indigenous anthropology' (Fahim 1982). This is a backlash against forms of anthropological representation of non-Western societies.

In Iran too Anthropology has localized and gained a national characteristic. The history of anthropology in the country goes back to the 1930s and to the rise of a modern nation-state. This essay, based on my own observation of the discipline through a limited literature review and through a series of personal communications with anthropologists in Iran, is a reflection on the role and position of the discipline in the Iranian society. This essay is not a historical review of anthropology in Iran. Neither is it a systematic study of the works of Iranian anthropologists (for a comprehensive study of Iranian anthropology see Shahshahani 1986; Fazeli 2006; Nadjmabadi 2010). The aim is to explore the context in which anthropology has been developed and practiced in the country. I will examine the approach of a Tehran-centric anthropology towards the Iranian *other*. I will also look at the role of anthropology in the emergence of the modern Iranian nation-state and how the construction of a domestic 'primitive' people contributed to the building of a Tehran-centric national culture. However, Iranian anthropologists do not make a homogenous group. In this essay, the focus is on one direction namely, *mardomshenasi* (see below). There are various translations of the term anthropology in Persian such as *qoumshenasi* and *ensan-*

shenasi but the most common and official one has been *mardomshenasi*.

Knowing the People

Mardomshenasi literally means 'knowing the people'. The term 'knowing the people' contains an implicit power. During my fieldwork in Iran I frequently heard both seriously and jokingly: «you are a *mardomshenas* [anthropologist]. So you know people. Tell us who we are. Tell us how we are».

Authorized by a 'scientific' (*elmi*) designation ('knowing the people'), the *mardomshenas* (the anthropologist) is conventionally seen to posses the power to describe, to define, and to categorize people. This is the authority of anthropology and its power of representation. Anthropology shapes the notion of a specific people discursively. It generates a knowledge/power in relation to authorizing views of them, to describing them, to representing them and to ruling over them (cf. Said 1979: 2-3). The *Mardomshenasi* has, deliberately or unwittingly, been involved in the power relations in Iran and played a role in the construction of a national imagination. As I mentioned above, the rise of anthropology in Iran is linked to the establishment of a modern nation-state in the country in the 1920s. Reza Shah Pahlavi (reigned 1925-1941), a nationalist army officer, and later his son, Muhammad Reza Shah (reigned 1941-1979) launched the transformation of Iran into a westernized and modern nation-state.

The Pahlavis attempted to construct an Iranian secular national identity based on the pre-Islamic cultural heritage. *Mardomshenasi* was regarded to have potentialities for popularizing this constructed identity based on a fictive linkage between the present Iran and the pre-Islamic Persian civilization. This romantic nationalism showed an interest in folklore, customs and cultural heritage. The role of *mardomshenasi* in the (re)construction of 'the people' fitted in the Pahlavis' nationalist social engineering. Like in the other nation-state buildings,

the Iranian state embarked on the project of constructing its own 'modern people' (*mardom*). The new people would have different characteristics from the 'traditional' people prior to the emergence of the nation-state. Reza Shah's interest in *mardomshenasi* came from a new ruler's need of 'inventing the people' rather than 'knowing the people'. The nation-building project was started with the renaming of the country from Persia to Iran:

> Persia evoked negative associations in international circles. Whenever the word Pars is uttered or written, foreigners immediately remember the weakness, ignorance, misfortune, the dwindling independence [...]. On the other hand, the new title elicited images of a new, progressive nation that could hold its head up high in the company of other 'civilized' world powers. Iran embodied the flourishing present while Persia recalled the country's past circumstances (Kashani-Sabet 2000: 218).

Paradoxically the pre-Islamic Persian cultural heritage became a source for the creation of a national identity for the new 'civilized' nation of Iran. A selective interest in folklore, customs and cultural heritage was included in the plan of the Pahlavis' cultural politics. By order of Reza Shah Pahlavi *Muse-ye mardomshenasi* (The Museum of Ethnology) was established in the 1930s[1]. The museum was directed by bureaucrats and was turned into a center for the production of a nationalist ideology. In the course of the construction of the 'people', Rezazadeh Shafaq, one of the founders of the museum, emphasized the importance of *mardomshenasi* researches in order to «discover the physical and psychological characters of our nation». He believed that the development of the country required knowledge of «the racial [*sic*] characteristics, customs, and morals of Iranians» (quoted in Naraghi 1379/2000: 360).

The state-directed knowledge production by the museum was criticized by Sadeq Hedayat, a modernist writer and cultural critic, who called the museum «a secret intelligence office» (quoted in Shahshahani 1986: 69). Since its birth *mardomshenasi* has been and still is a partly state-dictated research discipline. It has often wittingly or unwittingly been involved in state-designed projects. A huge part of *mardomshenasi* researches in Iran are directed and conducted by *Sazman-e miras-e farhangi*, a governmental office, whose mission is saving the 'cultural heritage'. Thus, preserving, reproducing, and even inventing *miras* (heritage) has become the main aim for *mardomshenasi*.

It is not only in Iran that anthropology has contributed to the emergence of nation-states. This is true for many different parts of the world. Anthropological works (mapping out, categorizing, objectifying cultures in books and museums) have played a significant role in the formation of nation-states and nationalism. This procedure is particularly evident in anthropological museums where cultures are selectively chosen and objectified, fixed in time and space (Handler 1988). The discipline has been used as a 'scientific' means to legitimize the official representation of Iran and Iranians. Anthropologists use more or less the same metaphors and jargon of the state bureaucracy. Like the bureaucratic apparatus of culture-making, the *mardomshenasi* scholars use a common conceptualization of culture (*farhang*) as static and essentialized. The official cultural policy has used this notion of culture in order to glorify an Iranian national identity, which many anthropologists have then reproduced uncritically.

The state's economic and political interest in keeping people fixed in their place, fitted with *mardomshenasi*'s mission to fix people and cultures in time and space through the act of 'writing culture'. *Mardomshenasi* has contributed to the nation-building through the objectification of cultures in museums and publications, incarceration of ethnic groups in time and space, and the construction of an exotic domestic *other*. Primarily dominated by a Tehran-centric perspective, *mardomshenasi* represents the official account of Iranian identity. While Tehran is the center, culture of minorities and of people in the periphery are represented as «exotic primitive art» or as objects of «academic and tourist interest» (cf. Tapper 1983: 29). Tehran-centric anthropology has been part of the advertisement apparatus representing the 'exotic' nature and cultural diversity of Iran to the world, exhibiting their lifestyles and customs on television and in newspapers, magazines, tourist organizations, handicraft shops, and international festivals of arts and folk traditions (Beck 1982: 432).

A central anthropological project has pre-eminently been the production of ethnographic maps (*atlas-e mardomshenasi*). The ethnographic map is a tool for producing a spatial distribution of people and cultures. Maps have not only been crucial in the formation of «imagined communities» (Anderson 1983) but also significant for social engineering. Ethnographic maps represent geographical places as culturally distinct. The ethnographic map is based on an unproblematic link between identity, culture and place. It is a mechanism for naturalizing culture and identity. According to the ethnographic maps cultural borders match geographical ones. The result is a mosaic of ethnicities and cul-

tures that together build the nation. The project is not an innocuous and neutral documentation and description of the facts. Anthropologists fabricate what they write (Clifford and Marcus 1986). The objectification of culture turns people's everyday life into exotic decorations in the museums of Tehran and other large cities. These objectified cultures, which are represented as parts of an authentic national culture, appear also in textbooks and in the education system[2].

An explicit patriotism is a prominent characteristic of the discipline. The main goal of this academic discipline has been seen as representing Iran in terms of cultural grandeur, a glorious civilization. It happens often that the *mardomshenasi* conferences easily turn into a ritual for praising the Iranian nation. Patriotism was explicitly expressed at the Anthropological Conference of Frankfurt in 2004 when the conference was opened by reciting a classical Persian poetry to show «our emotional commitment to Iran»[3]. The poem was also printed on the program, on the folder, and on the cup each participant was given as a gift. One speaker thanked the anthropologists for their valuable contribution to «Iranology and promoting world understanding about Iran and the social and cultural life and identity of the people who live in Iran»[4]. Another speaker emphasized the role of *mardomshenasi* in the reconstruction of what he called *jahan-e irani* (The Iranian World)[5]. According to this approach Iranian culture covers a large part of today's Iran, Afghanistan, and some central Asian countries. Not surprisingly, Parviz Varjavand, one of the first Iranian *mardomshenas* has been the founder of the Pan-Iranist Party.

For patriot anthropologists *miras* (heritage) is crucial. In the search for an authentic Iranian culture, *mardomshenasi* has generally been orientated towards the past (museum activities, historical ethnographies) and been affiliated with archaeology. A large number of Iranian anthropologists at the Faculty of Social Science, Tehran University and the Institute of Social Studies and Research were trained by André Leroi-Gourhan – known as *L'homme de marteau* (the man of hammer) for his analysis of mythogrammes and studies on archaeological anthropology (Rouholamini 1370/1991: 237). This explains also the high degree of interest of Iranian anthropologists in material culture. Two predominant features have characterized *mardomshenasi*, namely an older folklorist tradition and a positivist scientific practice. *Mardomshenasi* literature is often «marked by juxtaposition of a narrative style deriving from folklorist tradition with a tendency towards the measurement of the most observable aspects of the people life – the size of herd/

family, pattern of population movement etc.» (Sanadjian 1996: 16).

The domestic primitive

Anthropology in general has produced its knowledge through interaction with the exotic other (the 'primitive'). In a similar way Iranian *mardomshenas* have found their own exotic 'primitive' outside large cities and mainly among nomadic tribes. These 'primitive' people were exotic as much for Western anthropologists as for their Iranian urban-dweller, mostly foreign-educated, counterparts (cf. Sanadjian 1996). *Mardomshenasi* was for long time limited to the studies of tribes and nomadic people. It was taken as synonymous to nomadic studies. The anthropologist Brian Street, during his fieldwork in Iran, was frequently asked by many Iranian colleagues, which tribe he was studying and not *whether* he was studying tribes (Street 1990: 247). This disproportionate stress on nomadism compared to other groups – peasants and urban population – has not been specific only for Iran but for the whole Middle East (Eickelman 1989: 75).

The interest in tribes and nomads increased drastically after the Revolution. Ayatollah Khomeini called them as «the treasures of the revolution» (*zakhayr-e enghlab*) and the state launched special programs to reconstruct nomadism; pastoralist mode of production, tradition, and cultures of nomadic life (see Tapper 1994). In the same manner the state encouraged more studies of nomads and accordingly literature on nomadic tribes has flourished since the 1990s (Fazeli 2006:187). Many scholars in Iran believe that the focus on tribal and nomadic people was perhaps a way to sustain and protect the identity of anthropology against the predominant and 'hostile' sociology. The quantitative oriented sociology in Iran has overshadowed *mardomshenasi*. It seems that there is a tacit division of research fields between sociology and anthropology (see Tabibi 1992: X). According to Tabibi, a leading sociologist at Tehran University, while sociology deals with social structure, the economic and political dimensions of society, *mardomshenasi* deals with cultural variation. *Mardomshenasi*, he continues, has a tendency to study small societies such as tribes (*ibid*: 21-22).

Anthropology in general has approached culture as a question of one or another kind of past, in terms of customs, heritage, and traditions (Appadurai 2004: 60). Consequently, cultural actors are viewed as people of and from the past. The exotic others are sometimes represented by the anthropol-

ogist as if they, paraphrasing Johannes Fabian (1983), live in another kind of time. The pioneers of anthropology, particularly the British tradition, used hunter-gathering societies as laboratories for studying the 'natural state' of humankind. In a similar neo-evolutionist approach, the Iranian anthropologist Sekandar Amanollahi believes that the knowledge of present nomadism gives us insights into the life of our ancestors:

> They [nomads] have maintained old culture and tradition as well as ancient customs. Contemporary nomadic lifestyle is not very different from that of our ancestors several thousand years ago. Thus, by understanding nomadic culture and life, we can understand the life of our ancestors [...]. Studying their life is a way to perceive the culture-social evolution of human beings (Amanollahi 1368/1989: IX, my translation).

This argument is based on a preconception that tribes and nomadic people have never been in contact with others and that their lifestyle and culture have been static since ancient times. A neo-evolutionary approach within anthropology views tribal societies as the first rung on a ladder of societal scale and complexity. Accordingly contemporary small-scale societies (tribes, nomadic people, hunter-gathers) are viewed as sources of evidence about ancient stages in societal evolution (Keesing 1981: 112-113).

This strategic temporalization of difference is very common in monographs on Iranian tribes. Since the exotic other (as in example above) is sent into the past, the anthropologist's experience of the other is not an experience of an encounter between co-selves. Rather it is an encounter between the knowing self (the well-educated, middle class, urban scholar) and his or her object of study (the 'primitive' nomad from a different time). Accordingly, the 'isolated' people from another time are regarded as a people 'without history'. *Mardomshenasi* pays tribute to itself for «its contribution to the recognition of the cultural identity of a range of ethnic groups of Iranian nomadic and rural communities and has made a written social history for these oral traditional societies with non-recorded history»[6].

The exotic other is not only fixed in a past time, but also in a specific geography, which fits to the ethnographic map. In one of the most famous monographs prior to the Revolution (*Bamedi, tayeefi az il-e Bakhtiari*, 1346/1967)[7] and written by a group of ethnographers, an explicit regret over the migration of the Bakhtiari people to the cities is expressed:

> He is neither Bakhtiari nor urbanite. He is a moving creature [*mojoud*] lacking cultural qualities. He suffers from mental confusion and his condition is far from that of a normal human being (p. 190 quoted in Naraghi 1379/2000: 404).

As Liisa Malkki (1992) asserts, spatial incarceration of the native is perceived not only as normal but also as a moral and spiritual need. The Bakhtiari man in the above mentioned monograph is regarded as deviant. Outside his 'place' he is seen as an identity-less and culture-less person. His right to his identity and culture is recognized as far as he stays within the borders of the Bakhtiari. *Mardomshenasi* creates a hierarchical construction of the native who is linked to a bounded geographical space and is associated with an ideology of authenticity (cf. Appadurai 1988). The object of anthropological investigation is thus imagined at distance, far away from the 'civilized' modern center, Tehran. During my fieldwork in a shopping center in a middle-class neighborhood in Tehran (see Khosravi 2008), I faced often skepticism about the choice of my field. Once I was told by the director of the shopping center that «a *mardomshenas* should be among the people. What do you want to do in a shopping center? You should do research in villages and tribes where real people are». The director verbalized the common idea that the real *mardom* and the subject for an anthropological study are outside the arenas of modern time and space.

Imagining these people being 'out of sync with time' and not being in-time with modern Tehranis, is palpable in textual and visual representation of the domestic *other*. For instance, a recurrent theme is characterizing these people in terms of 'forgotten tribes' (Shahbazi 1366/1987) and 'isolated villages'[8]. Anthropologists have long been fascinated by distant and 'forgotten' groups of people. In fact, it has been mostly anthropologists themselves that made them as isolated, static, and as if they were a part of nature. Consequently the mission of the anthropologist is to 'discovering' [*peyda kardan*] these people[9]. Sima Sedigh, the US-based scholar and the director of *Bakhtiari Alphabet* (2009) – an ethnographic film about nomadic Bakhtiaris – stated in a speech after screening her film in Stockholm 2010 that «it took one year to find Bakhtiaris». Through romanticizing nomadic Bakhtiairs' "natural" and "beautiful" lifestyle, she emphasized repeatedly on the distance and differences between "us" and "them":

> It was like when I lived among natives [*bomiyan*] in Africa [...] since native people are close to the nature they have a different view which is different from our mechanized approach[10].

A comparable example to documentation of the Bakhtiairs by anthropologists in Iran is the exhibition *The Colours of Bakhtiari* by the Swedish carpet collector JP Willenborg in Stockholm in the Fall 2002. The exhibition was a unique collection of older Bakhtiari carpets. Beautiful colorful carpets in different sizes were hanging on walls. However, the exhibition, with its 'authentic' black nomad tent made of goat hair, other items from the Bakhtiair region, photographs, a film playing on a TV set, was rather an ethnographic display of the Bakhtiari tribe than just a carpet show. What caught my interest was a poster, a movie, and a door. The poster at the entrance introduced the exhibition as «unique treasures from Iran's forgotten mountains».

The poster read that the exhibition showed how Bakhtiaris «lived in harmony with nature». Ironically, the first oil well in the whole Middle East was drilled in Masjid Soleyman in the western part of the Bakhtiari region ca 100 years ago. There are four gigantic pipelines which carrying gas from the Persian Gulf to the north Iran through the Bakhtiari land. While damages on the enviornemnt due to the oil and gas industries have been increasing since the mid 1900 century, representing Bakhtiaris as living in 'harmony with nature' seems ideologically dangerous. It attempts at hiding disasters threatening Bakhtiaris for the generation to come. Among all the colorful carpets and kilims, a colorless wooden door in the corner of the exhibition caught my eyes. It was transported from a village in the Bakhtiari to Stockholm. It was old but cleaned and polished. On the front of the left half, I saw some blurred words. With a little effort, I could read *Marg bar Shah* (Death to the Shah) just below the handle. At the top of the door stood a few numbers and a date and *sarshomari shod* (are registered). It was written by the officials from the national statistics agency who after counting the household, took note of this notice on the door. The paradoxes could not be more obvious. How could the people who lived in this house and the village been referred as 'forgotten'? The door certified that the people of the village were included in the national statistics and their village was involved in the revolution against the Shah 1979. Ethnographies likewise have reproduced the 'imagined primitive'. For instance that there is a «different kind of sexuality among the Lurs» (Lum 'eh 1349/1970 quotes in Sanadjian 1996), or that the Bakhtiaris «are not used to washing themselves» (Karimi 1368/1989: 80).

Kanaaneh in an article on the 'anthropologicality' of indigenous anthropology is concerned that the «fundamentally Western "essence" of anthro-

pology [would] restricts the Third World indigenous anthropologist's way of analyzing [...] his/her 'implicit knowledge' and immediate perception/experience of his/her people [...] and rather, produce a *standard anthropological image* of them in terms of Western specific concepts, categories and formulas» (Kanaaneh 1997:18, emphasis in origin). Sharing Kanaaneh's concern, I believe that the Tehran – centric *mardomshenasi,* has produced a local version of Western orientalistic construction of the 'primitive' other.

Mardomshenasi *and moral purity*

Since the notion of *mardom* (people) in the Iranian context is inherently associated with purity, divinity and goodness, *mardomshenasi* in general carries an ethical aspect. It is expected to represent only a proper, correct and good society. The term *mardom* has a sympathetic ring. Its different derivatives also refer to virtuousness. *Mardomi* means admired and popular. *Mardomdar* means generous and tolerant whereas the negation of the word *na-mardomi* means bad behavior and deception. Thus *mardomshenasi* is expected automatically to be a kind of knowledge of morality and ethics. Rezazadeh Shafaq, one of the founders of *mardomshenasi* defined the discipline this way: «It implies a moral sense, which means to know people and their values morally» (1335/1956, quoted in Fazeli 2006).

Mardonshenasi, therefore, is supposed to represent a 'proper' people and culture and has thereby systematically neglected 'improper' and 'immoral' parts of the Iranian society. Loaded with morality and ethics, *mardomshenasi* has generally been normative. It argues about how Iranian society and culture *should* be rather than about how they are. *Mardomshenasi* usually has a normative and moralizing language. In the summer of 2000, I wrote an article on "women and anthropology" for a journal in Iran. After a few weeks the chief editor put the article in front of me and said that she could not publish it. In answer to my 'Why?' she explained that I had mentioned the words 'menstruation' and 'semen' excessively in the text. In her view these words were not 'appropriate' for an anthropological journal. The ethical feature of *mardomshenasi* became more obvious after the Revolution. The Islamic Republic demanded new kind of social sciences, appropriate to the religious values and norms. Influenced by Jalal Al-e Ahmad and Ali Shariati, two ideologues of political Islam in Iran, it was believed that Western anthropology saw human beings only in form of material beings (Shahshahani 1986: 80) and was not concerned

with the spiritual aspect of humanity. Al-e Ahmad's nativist ideology is illustrated in several monographs he published on villages and marginalized communities in the south Iran.

Hence, after the Revolution, search for a local anthropological point of view was part of the Islamization of social sciences. The authorities believed that Western anthropology, restricted by its concepts and theoretical framework, would not understand Iranian and Islamic culture and accordingly an Islamic *mardomshenasi* was needed.

Mardomshenasi came to be used as a theological view on man. Fazeli states that the basic anthropological questions – such as «what is humankind; what are its origins and its processes of cultural development; what is it that makes humankind different from animals?» – in Iran are generally regarded as religious and theological questions (Fazeli 2006: 209). As an attendant at the museum of *mardomshenasi* told me in 1995 «understanding *mardom* is a pre-requisite for understanding God». Gradually, linking *mardomshenasi* to theology became usual even among scholars. At a seminar on the *Future of anthropology* at Tehran University held on first days of June 2005, Ebrahim Fayaz (a faculty member at Tehran University) explicitly emphasized the link between anthropology and theology: «anthropology began when Jesus received God's spirit». In similar manner, Rouholamini, one of the leading Iranian anthropologists and the head of the department at Tehran University until the mid 1990s, likened his work to the Sufi thinker, Rumi's mystical search for the 'real' human being (Rouholamini 1357/1978). Based on a nativist ideology (a yearning for a cultural purity which had been demolished by Westernization), the Islamic Republic created its own 'people' who would differ from the pre-revolutionary Western-oriented 'people'. The revolutionary (*enghelabi*) people have systematically been described with specific attributes such as ready to sacrifice (*isargar*), warrior (*mobarez*), virtue (*najib*), always prepared to act (*hamish-e dar sahne*), and honorable (*ba gheyrat*), just to name a few. Against pre-revolutionary Persian nationalism, the new authorities sought to promote an Iranian Shiite culture. The reconstruction of an authentic culture became a political mission in combating Westernization and what is called *tahajom-e farhangi* (cultural invasion). The Centre for Iranian Anthropology was established in the 1990s to carry out «cultural heritage» studies with the purpose of reinforcing Shiite Iranian culture and identity (Fazeli 2006: 165). *Mardomshenasi* launched researches on religious institutions and rituals, e.g. *Muharram* rituals. As Fazeli put it, anthropology has generally been in the line with the ideology of the Revolution and the political culture of the Islamic Republic (2009: 84). Like prior to the Revolution, anthropology has been used as an instrument for protection of cultural purity against the imagined threats from the outside world.

Final remarks

Either as a state-dictated nationalist project or as a means for discursively designing a nativist Shiite culture, *mardomshenasi* has been a Tehran-centric discipline whose main purpose has been and is to create a common national sense of Iranian-ness. *Mardomshenasi* has been seen merely as a version of the folk model and has generally been practiced in a way to reproduce it. Based on an internalized orientalism, this research apparatus has produced a local version of Western anthropological concepts, categories and formulas. I do not claim that nomadic studies, folklore, or studies of material culture are insignificant in understanding Iranian society. Neither do I deny the importance and high quality of the works done by many Iranian anthropologists. In the absence of qualitative sociology in Iran, anthropology can contribute to understanding contemporary Iranian society.

Anthropology, however, should be more a sort of cultural critique; a defamiliarizing view; a way of critically redefining taken-for-granted assumptions and categories. There is a need of reflexivity and discussions on the issue of language and genre of writing. Iranian anthropologists should reflect for whom they write; for colleagues, for the people who they study, or for bureaucrats? It is important to find a language distinct from the current bureaucratic one which is normative, moralizing, and Tehran-centric. The new but still small direction among some Iranian anthropologists who use the term *ensanshenasi* to dissociate themselves from *mardomshenasi* need more attention to ethnographic enterprise and fieldwork methodology. There is a high risk this new direction becomes more cultural studies than anthropology.

Anthropology has developed by paying attention to its mistakes. If anthropology contributed to the making of cultures, there is today an anthropology that writes against it (Abu-Lughod 1991). If anthropology reduced people to simple cultural units before, today it shows the cultural complexities and fragmentations within each society. *Mardomshenasi* should learn from its mistakes to be able to face the changing world, globalized lifestyle, transnational connections, and the complexity of the small-scale societies.

Ragionare

Notes

¹ Majal-ye *mardomshenasi* n.1, 1335/1956: 3

² Naser Fakohi at the conference *Anthropological Perspectives on Iran: Millennium and Beyond*, Frankfurt, 30 September - 2 October 2004.

³ The poetry was by Jalal al-din Rumi, *Benamay rokh ke bag o golestanam arezost* (Show me your face as I am longing for a rose garden). *Bogoshay lab ke wand-e faravanam arezost* (talk to me as I wish to listen to beautiful things).

⁴ Ali Bulookbashi, «Foreign Anthropologists' Contribution to Iranology», presented at the conference *Anthropological Perspectives on Iran: Millennium and Beyond*, Frankfurt, 30 September - 2 October 2004.

⁵ Mohammad Mirshokraei, «From Anthropology Institute (1935) to Anthropology Research Center (2004)», presented at the conference *Anthropological Perspectives on Iran: Millennium and Beyond*, Frankfurt, 30 September - 2 October 2004.

⁶ Ali Bulookbashi, «Foreign Anthropologists' Contribution to Iranology», presented at the conference *Anthropological Perspectives on Iran: Millennium and Beyond*, Frankfurt, 30 September - 2 October 2004.

⁷ Khorshid, Rakhsh et al., 1967, *Bamedi, tayeefi az il-e Bakhtiari* , p. 190. 10 Khabargozari-ye miras-e farhangi, 12 khordad 1384: http://heritage.chn.ir/newsprint/?id=21600, accessed 2005.06.07

⁸ Conversation with Jalal Rafifar, Tehran 1999.

⁹ *Anthropological Perspectives on Iran: Millennium and Beyond*, Frankfurt, 30 September- 2 October 2004.

¹⁰ http://www.persiran.se/index.php/farsisocial/more/127, accessed 12/10/2014

References

Abu-Lughod Lila
1991   «Writing against Culture», in Richard Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology*, Santa Fe NM, School of American Research Press.

Amanollahi Sekandar
1368/1989 *Kuch neshini dar Iran* (Pastoral nomadism in Iran), Âgâh Pub, Tehran.

Anderson Benedict
1983   *Imagined Communities*, London, Verso.

Appadurai Arjun
1988   «Putting Hierarchy in its Place», in *Cultural Anthropology*, 3, 1: 37-50.
2004   «The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition», in V. Rao and M. Walton (eds), *Culture and Public Action*, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press.

Asad Talal
1973   *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, London, Ithaca Press.

Beck Lois
1982   «Nomads and Urbanites: Involuntary Host and Uninvited Guests», in *Middle Eastern Studies*, 18 (4): 426-44.

Clifford James, Marcus George
1986   *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, LA, University of California Press.

Eickelman Dale F.
1989   *The Middle East: An Anthropological Approach*, Prentice-Hall.

Fabian Johannes
1983   *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Fahim Hussein
1982   *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries*, Durham, NC, Carolina Academic Press.

Fazeli Nematollah
2006   *Politics of Culture in Iran: Anthropology, Politics and Society in the Twentieth Century*, London, Routledge.
2009   «Anthropology in Postrevolutionary Iran», in Nadjmabadi S. (ed.), *Conceptualizing Iranian Anthropology: Past and Present Perspectives*, London, Berghahn Books.

Hadler Richard
1988   *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Québec*, Madison WI.

Kanaaneh Moslih
1997   «The "Anthropologicality" of Indigenous Anthropology», in *Dialectical Anthropology*, 22 (1): 1-21.

Karimi Asghar
1368/1989 *Safar be Diar-e Bakhtiari,* Tehran, Far-hangsara.

Kashani-Sabet Firoozeh
2000 *Frontier Fictions: shaping Iranian Nation 1804-1946*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Keesing Roger M.
1981 *Cultural Anthropology: a contemporary perspective*, London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Khosravi Shahram
2008 *Young and Defiant in Tehran*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Malkki Liisa
1992 «National Geographic: The rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees», in *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 7 (1): 24-44.

Nadjmabadi Shahnaz
2009 *Conceptualizing Iranian Anthropology: Past and Present Perspectives*, London, Berghahn Books.

Naraghi Ehsan
1379/2000 *Nazari be tahghighat-e ejtemai dar Iran*, Tehran, Shokhan.

Rouholamini Mahmud
1357/1978 *Mabani-ye ensanshenasi: gerd-e shar ba cheraq*, Tehran, Payam.
1370/1991 «Shenidane seday-e chakosh», *Nameye Olum-e Ejtemai*, vol. 2 (2): 235-241.

Said Edward
1979 *Orientalism*, London, Routledge.

Sanadjian Manuchehr
1996 «An Anthology of the people, Place, Space and Home: (Re)constructing the Lur in Sought-Western Iran», in *Social Identities*, 2 (1): 5-36.

Shabazi Abdullah
1366/1987 *Il-e Nashenakhte* (the unknown tribe), Tehran, Nashre Ney.

Shahshahani Soheila
1986 «History of Anthropology in Iran», *Iranian Studies,* vol. XIX (1): 65-86.

Street Brian
1990 «Orientalist Discourses in the Anthropology of Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan», in Richard Fardon (ed.), *Localizing Strategies: Regional Traditions of Ethnographic Writing*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Tabibi Heshmatollah
1371/1992 *Introduction to Sociology and Ethnology of Iranian Tribes*, Tehran, Tehran University Press.

Tapper Richard
1983 «Introduction», in Richard Tapper (ed.), *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*, London, Croom Helm.
1994 «Change, Cognition and Control: The Reconstruction of Nomadism in Iran», in C. M. Hann (ed.), *When History Accelerates*, London, The Athlone Press.