Interview with Gunnar Haaland

Man Bahadur Khattri
Madhusudan Subedi

Gunnar Haaland is an Emeritus Professor at the University of Bergen, Norway; who has contributed several fields of anthropology including ecology, meaning, ethnicity and identity. His idea of North-South University co-operation in anthropological works linked not only to Nepal and Norway, also Sudan, China and other countries. The application of the idea has contributed significantly to develop Nepal's anthropology. Professor Gunnar Haaland developed and coordinated Tribhuvan-Bergen Human Ecology Project with the Central Departments of Sociology/Anthropology, Geography, and Botany of Tribhuvan University from 1992–2002. This program provided funds for senior faculty to stay short-term at the University of Bergen and share their research findings with wider audiences. Financial and academic supports were provided for the students to accomplish their dissertation writings in Nepal, and M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Bergen. More than a dozen persons completed their M.Phil. and Ph.D. courses from the University of Bergen and currently leading in Nepal's academia, development fields, and bureaucracy. Professor Haaland was awarded Gold Medal of Merit by the Norwegian King for his significant academic contribution.

Life History

Gunnar Haaland was born in 1938 in Randaberg – a municipality in southwestern Norway. His father (Ola Haaland) and mother (Sofie Haaland) had a small farm providing them a meager income in cash and kind. As the only child, who was expected to take over the farm and become a small farmer himself by the family. His parents had taken a one-year course at 'peoples high-school' after their primary school education. It was a non-formal educational institution that provided youth's access, mainly from peasants, to the basic knowledge about literature, history, and natural science. It constituted an important channel of communication between knowledge produced and acted as a 'bridge' between the culture of the elite university institutions and the understandings among

Email: Gunnar.Haaland@uib.no

peasants. It thus served as a key factor in fostering the strong egalitarian culture that has played such an important role in Norwegian nation-building. The 'people high-school' education also gave him a stimulating environment that encouraged him to learn more about the world beyond the farming community. He read boys' books about people in different places in the world. He was particularly fascinated by books about Indians and cowboys, hated the cowboys, and wished he could have been able to fight against them in support of the Indians. He was particularly enraged by Spain's brutal conquest of the Aztec and Inca empires

During his childhood, Norway was occupied by Nazi (Germany). He was greatly disturbed by the holocaust and anti-Semitic propaganda. At the age of seven, he went to primary school for seven years, where his interests in culture and history beyond Norway were enhanced. At the age of 14, as the only youngster from his municipality, he studied in a secondary school in Stavanger for five years. They had brilliant teachers that profoundly affected his career. He took science because he found mathematics easy and his English waspoor compared to other students. His history and literature teachers encouraged him to study humanities instead of science. He had 16 months of obligatory army service before he joined University. He also got the opportunity to serve the UN Peace-keeping forces in Gaza for six months. It stimulated his interests in the world beyond Norway. He had become concerned about political integration and economic development in the newly independent states in Africa and Asia. When he joined the Faculty of arts at University of Oslo, they first had to study a four-month introductory course in philosophy and the scientific method. Philosophy (French existentialism as well as Anglo-American philosophy of science) has been his life-long interest. After the course, he decided to start history. He read a lot but hardly any books from the syllabus. At the three-day exam with 12 hours on each subject, he answered the questions focusing on the causes and consequences of the events rather than referring to historical dates/persons. The questions were regarding the French revolution and the decline of Norway in the middle ages. He focused on politico-economic and socio-cultural processes, different from other candidates, achieving the highest score. While he studied history, he discovered social science subjects and decided to continue Political science and Economics. He had read about these subjects when he studied history and could pass his exam in half time and answered exam questions in the same way – searching for causes and consequences of events – and achieved a high score. He then could choose the discipline for his Ph.D. for the problem-field that interested him most (political integration and economic development in newly independent states). He was admitted in Political science.

Questions and Answer

Question 1: What factors or who influenced you to study anthropology? Do you think that was the best choice for your academic career? What was the imagination to be anthropologists at your college time?

During my preparation for a project proposal in Political Science, I discovered that there was a discipline called Ethnography (called 'social' in Norway). The syllabus consisted of publications from the world beyond Euro-American world. I dropped into a lecture where the teacher (Harald Eidheim) was sitting on the table and discussing analytical perspectives that might help us to understand aspects of social life among a central Asian tribe called Chuckchee. I had not planned to go to central Asia, bud Eidheim introduced to how an ecological analytical framework might help us to understand how social institutions and cultural ideas might contribute to maintaining adaptation to components in the natural and politico-economic environment of social groups. Furthermore, his discussion of anthropological perspectives on politics in communities that were not organized as a state, and where economic life was not structured according to the capitalist market principles fascinated me. I found this much more fascinating than Political Science and Economics, and I really went into the ethnography – reading the syllabus and related literature full-time and forgetting to follow other subjects as well as to go to the theatre or read poems and novels. Of course, my exam was a disaster, but my teacher (Eidheim) believed in me and persuaded me to go to the University where there a newly established department led by a brilliant teacher educated in Chicago and Cambridge (England). I decided to follow the advice and went to Bergen. The most important thing that happened during my time in Oslo was that I met Randi (also from a modest community background in Eastern Norway. We married when I started the study of ethnography and had our first child during my exam.

Question 2: At the University of Bergen, you studied under Fredrik Barth. What types of anthropological research trend was common at that time? You also taught University of Khartoum, Sudan. What exciting experience did you get as an anthropologist in Africa?

When I arrived at the University of Bergen in the Autumn 1963, Barth had gone on a UNESCO assignment to Sudan. We had an interesting group of teachers that constituted a stimulating academic environment. We made ourselves familiar with different branches of anthropology and with ethnographic material covering variations in human life-worlds– Australian Aboriginals (Thompson's Economic Structure and the Ceremonial Exchange Cycle in Arnhem Land; Sharp's Steelaxes for Stone-age Australians; Stanner's publications on aboriginal religion), to modern industrialized communities (e.g. Whyte's Street corner Society; W. L Warner: The social system of a modern factory, Elisabeth Bott on Family and Social Networks). We discussed a variety of different branches - human ecology (e. g. Barth's articles on Ecological relations among ethnic groups in Swat valley, and Geertz' book Agricultural involution); Radcliffe-Brown's structural functionalism; Levi-Strauss' structuralism; Bateson's work on communication; Goffman's work on role analysis; and not the least the works Edmund Leach (Barth's supervisor at Cambridge) was a most stimulating inspiration; so was Turner's work on symbolic interaction; while Barth's 'theory of games' inspired work was most important before

I went to do my first fieldwork in Sudan in 1965. Barth had all the time emphasized the importance of combining applied research with 'so-called pure' research. By trying to apply our theoretical-methodological approaches to advice on improving practical human problems, we had the opportunity not only to show that anthropology might be practical use, but also because it exposes us to shortcomings in our conceptual tools. Likewise, applied work may lead to empirical phenomena observations that stimulate conceptual rethinking (my contributions to the conceptualization of ethnic processes occurred in an assignment as an applied anthropologist).

My engagement with FAO came about as a lucky chance event. In the 1960s, it was virtually impossible to get funding for fieldwork outside Norway. Towards the end of 1964, I could not get more funding for my studies, and I decided to enlist again as a soldier in UN forces in Gaza where I could earn enough money to sustain my family and hope to study the army camp as a total institution along the lines suggested by Goffman. Just a week before I should sign the enlistment contract with FAO, I got a cable from Rome informing me about a job as Fredrik Barth's assistant in a big FAO regional development project in Darfur. I immediately accepted and went to the FAO headquarter in Rome and from there to Khartoum. At Khartoum I met Ian Cunnison, Talal Assad, Wendy James, and James Farris, who had written a devasting critique of the German fascist filmmaker Leni Riefenstahl's books on the Nuba and the external examiner Evan-Pritchard. The UNDP office provided a train ticket to Darfur. I went to the project headquarter and was particularly impressed by a natural ecologist I traveled with to the project area. I decided to start in the lowlands of Darfur, close to the Chad border. I was not happy with my applied work for FAO. Barth, however, managed to produce a satisfactory report on its basis. It allowed me to collect material that I could use for my thesis that I had to complete in half a year to qualify for a new position in Economic Anthropology at the department. However, I was not happy with my dissertation, although Barth used it extensively in his plenary address to the Anthropological Association in 1966 (later published as 'On the Study of Social Change').

An important aspect of my FAO work was that I had been exposed to several aspects of Fur culture and social organization that stimulated my curiosity. In 1969 I got a small research grant to follow up broader themes in Darfur ethnography, and I went back on nine months of fieldwork. While I followed up my earlier studies on human ecology, economic anthropology, and ethnic processes, I became increasingly interested in the existential issue of trust in human relations – it's symbols/rituals that expressed and fostered it and their politico/economic consequences.

During my second fieldwork, I developed close personal and intellectual contacts with a group of young Sudanese students at the University of Khartoum, most importantly Abdul Ghaffar Muhammed Ahmad who went to Norway for his Ph.D. This relationship became increasingly important when I returned to Norway and felt sick and tired of life at the University, and I wanted to resign as a university lecturer. Abdul Ghaffar persuaded me not to resign but request the University of Bergen for two-year payless leave and apply for a lecturer at the University of Khartoum. I followed his advice and got the job on a local salary level. Somehow my wife and I sustain our family of four from the local salaries. The teaching load was hefty – I taught various courses from 'Introduction to society' for Intermediate level students, to 'Sociology of Development' for third-year students, to Contemporary 'Social Science' and 'Muslim Communities' for fourth-year students. It was an exciting period – the students were brilliant and were coming from different ethnic and class backgrounds in the socio-cultural heterogeneous country. I benefitted enormously from discussions and their theses supervision, which made me realize that university life was not so bad. During the last half-year of my leave from the University of Bergen I was invited to work as applied anthropology in a big Land-use Planning Survey in Southern Darfur.

I agreed to the same salary as I had at the University of Khartoum. It was important because I was sure that I would produce a report about relevant socio-cultural factors in land-use planning that would justify the projects' salary expenses to me. In this project, I worked with ecologists, economists, livestock experts, and agronomists that stimulated me to develop a perspective on pastoral systems of production that came to influence my career in applied research. While back at the University of Bergen I was engaged in various projects on short-term or long-term leaves for various projects in Sudan such ILO 'Comprehensive Employment Strategy Mission to Sudan (1975), Norwegian Church Aid regional development project in Southern Sudan (1967), IFAD Special programming Mission to Sudan (1986), World Bank Energy Sector Environment Program. Sudan (1987), Danish red Cross Derudeb Environment Protection Program (1987). During these assignments, I always kept close contact with my colleagues, and I gradually become convinced about the importance of having national experts in influential positions in applied projects. It was one reason I decided to engage more of my time in competence building at universities in Sudan and elsewhere instead of employment as an over-paid development expert in big projects.

Question 3: Your research in West Darfur on ethnicity and identity (e.g. Economic Determinants in Ethnic Processes) F. Barth has highlighted on many occasions. What was the key finding of your research on ethnicity and identity? How does it fit in the present context of ethnicity and identity debates?

In my opinion, the most lasting contribution of our symposium on 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries' was that we changed the focus from the discussion of cultural features that objectively defined so-called ethnic groups to a focus on the cultural features that people considered significant for the way they identified who 'did' or 'did not' belong to particular so-called 'ethnic' groups. At the time when we had the symposium the Anglo-American anthropological community was still dominated by the assumption that the ethnographic map consisted of different people that could be conceptualized as separate holistically integrated systems of social relations (societies), and as sharing

holistically integrated systems of ideas and symbols (culture). This assumption seemed somehow to correspond to the ethnographic 'reality' ethnographers were exposed to in the field – people tended to differentiate their social 'universe' as consisting of differently named groups that were categorized as different because of cultural features assumed to be fundamental (e.g. language, ritual, technology and lifestyle). It, therefore, seemed reasonable for ethnographers to take this 'native point of view' as the basic premise for the social 'universe' they aimed to document and 'explain'. In the symposium, we took the 'native point of view', but we did not assume that documenting this view constituted a unitary, coherent and all-embracing description of social groups as though their members shared a 'cultural whole' distinct from 'cultural wholes' shared by members of contrasting 'ethnic' groups. We did not assume that particular groups' culture and social organization could be understood as 'islands' of integrated 'cultural wholes' maintained and reproduced in 'islands' of integrated 'social wholes' (ethnic groups). In contrast to such perspectives, we conceptualized 'ethnicity 'as an idea that regulated interaction between members of groups that were associated with different cultural features. Interaction boundaries, we thought of as a mechanism that might serve to maintain certain cultural differentiations.

Question 4: You have worked whole of your life to build North-South University co-operation at the level of professor and students. What would you emphasize as important in co-operation university in so-called developing and developed countries?

I see two interrelated reasons for stimulating cooperation. On the conceptual side, it is clear that most of the vocabulary in social sciences has been taken from western languages, and their conceptual content has to a large extent, been influenced by western cultural ideas. The problem is the extent to which this content shapes the way we 'see' and 'explain' the socio-cultural 'worlds' we are exposed to in the non-western 'worlds' (as well as in the western 'world'. My opinion is that it does have such a distorting influence, but I am not drawing the conclusion that it is impossible to 'weed out' ethnocentric biases. Anthropologists are better placed than any other social scientists with regard to such 'weeding' – because of our relative orientation and of our program of taking 'the native point' of conceptualization as a fundamental component in our attempt to describe and analyze the 'life-ways' we are exposed to. However, I am convinced that there is still a load of ethno-centric biases in our conceptual vocabulary. Although our comparative approach may help us to discover ethnocentric biases, I consider that anthropologists from non-western backgrounds may have an advantage in discovering such biases. Scholarly cooperation I thus consider an important approach in promoting improvements in our conceptual framework. Joint field studies by staff and students from cooperating universities may be crucial in promoting such rethinking.

I expect that this may stimulate the deconstruction of our texts, contributing to the development of conceptual frameworks more adequate for cross-cultural studies. Conceptual flaws in our models may of course, have disastrous consequences when such models are used for applied purposes. This is particularly important because the logic of such models (anthropological and economic) may not adequately 'mirror' socio-cultural and politico-economic processes in the empirical world, thereby leading to unintended consequences that are contrary to stated development objectives. Even more important in development planning is that its practitioners are frequently recruited from the international 'expert' community. When their advice's disastrous consequences are manifest, these 'experts' are usually out of the country and cannot be called to task. I have a wide experience from participation I high level planning missions for various agencies (e.g. FAO; ILO IFAD, World Bank) in various countries. Over time my experiences from engagement with aid-agencies made me realize that they to a large extent, lived by selling images of being effective providers of 'good deed' to suffering people. How well they can sell this image affects the flow of funds to the agencies (private and governmental, and international. The agencies are becoming money-earning institutions – an important aspect of development work depends on having employees who "aid-pushers" – people who are good to persuade receiving countries to accept the agencies project proposals. The outcome is often that the 'aid-receiving countries become "aid-addicted". This transformation of the noble idea of reducing human pain (starvation, violence, disease) into a well-paid 'development-business' is tragic. However, I will argue that understanding this must not make us lose compassionate engagement in the reduction of human suffering. Instead of losing compassion for those who suffer, we should try to search for ways to make sure that aid beneficiaries are those who suffer and not primarily those employed in providing aid. Secondly, we should be aware of success in reducing suffering on the individual level may have large-scale consequences of increased population growth – probably the most important conflict producing factor in our globalized world. There is a great need for enlightened social science inputs advising on measures that may counteract such macro-level processes. My decision to apply for a new professorship in development anthropology at University of Bergen was based on a reflection on such issues and experiences. I saw this as a way of escaping from a largely counter-productive applied work I had been engaged. I started to engage in a different and less profitable activity, such as cooperation in research and teaching at universities in Africa and Asia. It led to cooperation with the University of Khartoum, Tribhuvan University, Makerere University, Yunnan University of Nationalities, and Fudan University. I consider the development of applied research competence within national institutions of utmost importance. It is national experts that should play the main role in applied research – international experts should, if desired, be employed as their counter-parts

Question 5: We know that you developed a co-operation with Tribhuvan University as TU-Bergen Human Ecology program, and we benefited from that program. How did you develop your ideas to work in Nepal? Who

actually initiated from Tribhuvan University? What were the challenges to implement cooperation program, and how do you assess some significant achievements of that program?

The idea about development of cooperation between the University of Bergen and Tribhuvan University grew out of the above reflections. The idea shaped my interest in expanding my scholarly background from the African continent to Asia. I had read several monographs on Himalayan ethnography (books by Führer Heimendorf), and I had got a romantic kind of interest in the people of the region, and news-media informed me about environmental problems of land-degradations. During my visit to India to participate in an international conference, I took a trip to Kathmandu and contacted Tribhuvan University. I met the Head of Department – a young scholar Mr. Om Gurung. He was a bit surprised when he met this middle-aged unknown European entering his office and started discussing cooperation. Of course, he was not impressed. When I returned to Norway, I contacted our University authorities and inquired about the possibility of inviting Om for a short visiting scholarship to Bergen. They agreed, and this, I think, made Om believe that we were serious. Om arrived in Bergen during one of the worst midwinter months I can remember – I guess he wished he had stayed in Nepal. Towards the end of his stay, we had a sunny day, and Om took on his short-sleeved shirt (although it was freezing cold) and we went to the Rector where we had a good meeting that led to an understanding to proceed with a rather modest approach of inviting other TU staff-members to short visiting scholarships and encouraging Norwegian MA students to go to Nepal for field studies. After a few years, we thought we should make a more formal agreement on a joint Research and Teaching program. The main problem was to cope with the enormous size of the Anthropology department (about 1300 students spread on 72 campuses around the country. It was impossible to have a teaching input that could reach this large group. We decided to select (based on a short essay exam and interviews) a small group (10-15 students) for participation in a research program focused on Human Ecology. The University of Bergen had a kind of reputation in this field, and we thought training in this field might be of applied importance in Nepal. By unconventional and partly controversial approaches, we got quite good results - in terms of degrees our students achieved at TU, developing links between Nepalese and Norwegian students and staff, and developing interdisciplinary cooperation with other disciplines such as botany, geography, and economics. Since 2000 Ram Chaudhary and Chaitanya Mishra have played significant roles in Nepal and Tor Aase, Reidar Vetaas, and Magnus Hatlebakk in Bergen.

Question 6: You are a student of Fredrik Barth. What element of theory, methods, and practice you love most developed and practiced by Barth? Why?

I will try to answer with a quotation from Cosmologies in the Making (1987) by F. Barth. "I suggest that we here, as so often, can take a cue from Darwin. In the wandering naturalist tradition, his strategy was to focus on small parts of the picture, closely observed and revealingly interpreted. He did not reach directly for the overall pattern in a myriad of forms or the general shape and direction of phylogenies. Whether in the courting display of golden pheasants (Darwin 1871: 728) or the relations of beak form, environment, and feeding habits of Galapagos finches (Darwin 1843), he looked for the generalizable features in the particular situation which might give cumulative direction to small increments of change. In other words, he sought to extract generalizable mechanisms and processes from his particulars." Barth (1987) Barth was influenced by ideas current in social sciences and related disciplines when he started his studies, which influenced his research. However, he always warned us against letting such a pre-conceived idea determining everything we observed, in this world, we studied. We should develop a capacity to recognize things that did not fit our theories – what the sociologist Robert Merton has called 'serendipity – the ability to pay attention to chance events not anticipated in our project proposals - events that are anomalous, surprising, either because they seem inconsistent with prevailing theory or facts. In either case, the seeming inconsistency provokes curiosity; it stimulates the investigator to make sense of the data. I was attracted to Barth's insistence on letting the empirical world posing the problems. Theories were just tools that might help us to get a provisional understanding of the world we studied. When I became familiar with Barth's work, his use of approaches developed in ecology fascinated me. Ecological models helped us to understand some aspects of human interactions in their natural and social environment. Those models did not explain other aspects. Later Barth was stimulated by approaches disciplines like economics to reason on other aspects of interconnections that emerged in social interaction. However, the different use of theoretical ideas was all integrated in a broad sociological/ anthropological tradition with roots in the works of giants like Max Weber, Edmund Leach and Erwin Goffman. From the 1970s Barth was increasingly fascinated by the dimension of knowledge and symbolism, and I think his many contributions in this field would be his most lasting legacy. If I should draw attention to the main point in his research practice, it is his intense fieldwork as the main inspiration to theoretical development – it is in the field the challenge to rethinking is greatest, not the ivory tower of the university office. Another point that fascinated me with Barth was his willingness to apply his conceptual perspectives to applied tasks – if we as social scientists claimed that we could understand social processes, we should try to use our approach to diagnose processes that produced unintended and undesired consequences in society. He insisted that we should view the social organization of the people we planned for as a kind of comprehensive "infra-structure2 within which and based on which development-measures could be formulated. This infra-structure we should look at as opportunities for channeling development consistent with development objectives (this perspective was in contrast to the office-desk planning (whether Marxist or neo-liberal inspired). Experience has shown that our approach's main advantage

was it allowed us to make fairly well to identify planning measures that would be unsuccessful, while we were less successful in prescribing development inputs that would work. The present organization of development activities is not very sensitive to suggestions that look at processes beyond the narrow-preconceived measures formulated by aid bureaucracies.

Question 7 Nepal is a very heterogeneous country in terms of dichotomization of social identities and of cultural values regulating the interaction between people. How do you think multi-ethnicity will develop in the future within Federal republic Nepal?

This is a complex problem, and I can old sketch some dimensions I think one should explore in order to understand the interlocking processes at play.

a) The flow of information within the population and especially the way it links up with local social differentiations – the educational system and the social media

b) The global flow of goods and service and its impact on local income-distribution – e.g. labor migration, tourism, export, import

c) The flow of influence – the institutional mechanisms affecting articulation of different interests on different levels of political decision making

Question 8: Another focus of your research has been symbolic constructs fostering ideas of solidarity in a population - particularly their relation to reproductive processes. Do you think they are also related to structural level, such as state?

In small-scale acephalous communities, it seems that metaphors of solidarity are rooted in experience-near concepts, for example, 'mother' as the source of nurturance and trust, and 'father' as a source of protection of life and property. With the growth of large-scale communities, particularly in the civilizations that emerged after the axial breakthroughs, metaphors of solidarity seem increasingly rooted in experience distant concepts, for example, concepts of transcendental almighty Gods and Goddesses.

a) With the growth of State power, ethnic prose is channeled in different directions. It is manifested in political movements that take variations in cultural and social features as a platform for articulating 'ethnic sameness' to mobilize support in the power struggle– a problem that is manifested in political campaigns during an election to political positions or assemblies in multi-ethnic states. It generally stimulates the symbolic construction of metaphors that are 'good' to express group 'belonging' and group contrast. It is manifested in the politics of the state in dealing with socio-cultural variety. Examples of this are Stalin's nationality theory and its political consequences. Stalin's "Nationality Theory" can be seen as an element in a strategy of reducing possible conflicts between loyalties to particular 'ethnic' groups versus loyalty to the state. This theory classifies the population of culturally heterogeneous states according to an assumed correspondence of four criteria (common territory, common language, common economy, common psychological make-up as manifested in cultural similarities). This classification served as a justification for administrative divisions of a State's territory into sub-territories and sub-sub-territories that were identified with particular nationalities; while all the State's nationalities were under the control of a dominant state-wide Communist Party. China followed a similar policy of nationality (minzu) administration, including certain privileges (extra points for university entry, number of children per family) to peripheral 'nationality' groups. In most multi-ethnic states, competition for Government distributed spoils have consequences for 'ethnic' processes on individual and group level.

Question 8: You have been critical to books on research methods. What are your suggestions to young scholars on the research methods in social sciences in general and anthropology in particular? How should a researcher use his/her anthropological lenses in anthropological research?

Let us start by distinguishing between 'method' and methodology:

Methods are the specific tools and procedures you use to collect and analyze data. Methodology refers to the ways researchers try to justify statements about the 'world' by using conceptual reasoning (theories) on observations (collected by specific methods of data collection) of features of the 'world'. My worry is not booked on methods, but that we in training students tend to forget the methodological issues involved in making statements about what the data collected says about the world we study – making such statements involves theories (ontologies) about how this world is constituted. Methods are very useful to find answers to specified questions – questions related to demography or economics. They are not adequate for finding answers to questions about factors structuring social processes such as symbols, identity, and institutional arrangements. If you want to understand chess and the way particular games of chess are played out, it is not a good idea to start counting particular moves. It is a better idea to place yourselves I the boots of the players and intuitively tries to grasp the rules of the game and the way particular moves affect the outcome of games. In the study of social life, this involves placing yourselves in positions of the actors of social actors and try to learn from participation in social life what values they consider important to realize; the institutional rules and regulations regulating ways of realizing these values; and the distribution of resources particular actors have at their disposal.

Participant observation is a rather informal way of placing oneself in a position that stimulates the development of an understanding of how the social life is played out, while formal methods may serve to document quantitative outcomes of the 'social game'. As well as questions about how such outcomes may feedback on the qualitative institutional dimensions (values and rules) of the game.

Question 9: What do you think about the future of anthropology in Europe, USA and countries like Nepal in the changing world political, social, and economic

order?

The anthropologist Roy Rappaport has made the following statement; "Two traditions have proceeded in anthropology since its inception. One objective in its aspirations and inspired by the biological sciences seeks explanation and is concerned to discover causes, or even, in the view of the ambitious, laws. The other, influenced by philosophy, linguistics and the humanities, and open to more subjectively derived knowledge, attempt interpretations and seeks to elucidate meanings. -----any radical separation of the two is misguided, not only because meanings are often causal and causes are often meaningful, but because more fundamentally, the relationship between them, in all its difficulty, tension, and ambiguity, expresses the condition of a species that lives and can only live, in terms of meanings it itself must construct in a world devoid of intrinsic meaning but subject to natural law"

This position between natural science and humaniora is an important aspect of the anthropological discipline. However, one should keep in mind that the humanistic tradition does not only consist of western ideas but of knowledge developed in other non-western traditions of knowledge. I think the future of anthropology significantly depend on the extent to which anthropologists manage to make conceptualize socio-cultural reality in terms of conceptualizations current in different traditions of knowledge

Question 10: Do you have specific suggestions to the editorial Team of Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology? How shall we continue this journal, what area should we focus and how can we develop higher quality and visibility of the paper published?

I think it is important that the journal foster dialogue between scholars from different cultural backgrounds focusing on similar problem fields. Personally, I think the western concept of CASTE has a distorted understanding of social differentiation in the Indian subcontinent. Maybe one could benefit by trying to conceptualize differentiation through the concept of JATI – not by making a dictionary definition of this fuzzy concept but by drawing attention to the 'family resemblances' (in Wittgenstein perspective) between its different uses. .