Analyzing and Celebrating Survival in a Globalizing World: Hunters, Others and Us

Harvey A. Feit*

グローバル化する世界における文化存続の分析と祝福
——狩猟採集民の他者と我々——

ハーヴェイ フェイト

The intellectual excitement, the maturity, and the scholarly and public importance of hunter-gatherer studies were apparent throughout the conference. Highlights of the conference were hearing from Ainu people about their urgent situation, and also listening to the important contributions of third world scholars. An emerging theme of the conference was the active survival of these societies and of diverse cultural traditions in a globalizing world. I suggest that these contemporaneous experiences of challenges and renewals unite the lives of scholars and of the peoples of the societies with which they work. In conclusion, I offer thanks, for all the conference participants, to the Japanese hosts for their truly extraordinary efforts and success at making CHAGS 8 so intellectually stimulating, and culturally and personally enriching.

会議全体を通じて，狩猟採集民に関する研究が知的興奮をもたらすものであり，またこれらの研究がいまや成熟の域に達しつつあり，さらには学問的のみならず一般の人々にとっても重要であることが明らかになった。この会議の注目すべき点はアイヌの人々から彼らのさしせまった状況について話しを聞いたこと，そして第三世界の研究者による学術的な報告に耳を傾けたことである。この会議の中で出てきたひとつのテーマは，グローバル化が進む世界の中で諸社会と多様な文化伝統がいきいきと生き残っていることであった。挑戦と再生というこれらの同時代の体験が，学者たちの生活（生き方）と彼らが研究している諸社会の諸民族の生活とを結びつけると私は考えている。最後に，すべての参加者に代わって，チャグス８が知的に刺激的で，文化的そして個人的に実り多いものになるようにと，驚くべき努力を重ね，成功させたことに対し，日本の主催者の方々に感謝を捧げる。

* McMaster University

Key Words : hunters and gatherers, cultural survival, globalization, Minpaku, Ainu
キーワード：狩猟者と採集者，文化の生き残り，グローバリゼーション，民博，アイヌ

HIGHLIGHTS

I could only listen to a small portion of the papers that were offered during this Conference, but what I heard included an extraordinarily rich, diverse and stimulating set of papers on contemporary research about hunting and gathering peoples.

There has been a basic renewal of much that is old and very traditional in hunter-gatherer studies. As I thought about what I was hearing here, compared to what we used to say, I saw a renewal going on in research about territoriality, sharing, history, ecology, gender, symbolism, missionization, politics, resource management, relations with agricultural peoples, and hunter-gatherer archaeology. In each area we mixed new, rich ethnography of the local with analyses that included state and market and media dynamics.

There has also been much at this Conference that is new, although what each of us sees as new will vary, including topics such as: traditional knowledge and knowledge transmission, self-images, identities, tourism, environmentalism, landscapes, and economic globalization.

We have been called on to return to basic ethnographic tasks, and to account for inter-systemic complexities of local connections to national and international processes.

Part of this renewal has been led by the unprecedented number of younger scholars presenting at this Conference. There has been an equally strong representation and voices of Indigenous and Third World scholars from several regions that has been much welcomed.

In addition, it has been very important to hear from and learn about the Ainu and their struggles from a diverse group of Ainu lecturers and panelists. Their moving accounts of the situation of Ainu people were both familiar and very disturbing, especially their limited role in the current new national legislation recognizing indigenous rights, and the limited resources which are directly available to them to assure the future of the Ainu as a people. Their presentations were compelling and urgent.

APPRECIATION AND THANK YOU

I think that the best indicator of the vitality and diversity of the presentations and discussions at this Conference is that one could, before arriving here,

ask oneself whether this would be the last CHAGS, whereas it was transparently clear after the first day here that this would not be the last. There was too much energy, too much engaging conversation in corridors, and too many occasions when papers echoed each other in productive ways, or suggested new directions for old dilemmas, to think this was a venue without a future.

It is nevertheless fascinating, that we cannot agree on who are hunter-gatherers, or even on the utility of the category. But we have matured, and the lives of the peoples we work with, and the work itself, constantly transform us and our scholarship in ways that are powerful, thought-provoking, and important to communicate to others. This richness is reflected in the value of our dialogues when we come together. I have heard a number of people say they will redo this or that aspect of their paper based on what happened here, or even that they had a partly sleepless night, after they had given their paper, writing down ideas stimulated by discussions.

It has been essential to this intellectual vitality that we have been hosted so well. The venue here at the National Museum of Ethnology of Japan has been superb-professional, yet personal and welcoming. The Japanese organizers and hosts from the Museum, from the University of Kyoto, and from the other institutions contributing to the Conference, have treated us with exceptional thoughtfulness. There has been an attention to social relations and informal communications, and to practicalities, that have made it possible for this to be such a valuable meeting. Our hosts have also made visiting Japan, many of us for the first time, not just comfortable but a truly memorable experience.

This has been a large CHAGS Conference, but one that felt focussed and intimate despite having representatives from over 26 countries, and encompassing a wider diversity of themes and issues than any previous meeting. One cannot but leave enriched by new perspectives and thinking about renewed questions. Each of us will take away different questions, ideas and impressions, but I was struck by the important but rather unexceptionable refocussing on ethnography, on histories, on connections across scales of analysis, on policy issues, and on bringing academic activity into everyday lives in a diversity of ways.

I cannot do justice to the substance of the diverse Conference presentations and discussions, and I will not try. But I want to take a few moments to reflect on two perspectives that are foremost in my mind as I leave: the renewal of complex research linkages; and, a basic question I will ponder after I have left.

COMPLEX RESEARCH LINKAGES: PAST AND PRESENT

This conference re-affirmed, for me, that we need to attend to linkages that make us both marginal and central to our discipline. First, hunter-gatherer

research is an area of study in which basic, indeed fundamental, analytical issues can be raised not just in abstract discussions but in the context of grounded ethnographies. This is not unique within anthropology, but it is a rare strength to see it not just in the work of an individual author but at work in a community of scholars. That is why I think we have something to say to each other that has urgency when we come together every few years. It is why we still have something important to say to the discipline more widely.

Second, this is an area of research with a certain tradition. Therefore it can, at its best, respond to and contribute to new developments, trends and fashions in the discipline without being constantly swept away. We can attend to questions of long-term interest in continually renewing ways, without rejecting either our past or the new.

Third, hunter-gatherer studies is a margin connected by images and practices to the centers of the discipline and of the wider societies in which we live. As we know, so many of the ideas about hunter-gatherers are based on oppositions to the images that exist of national and urban life. Thus hunter-gatherer research tends to be read as an account of either what its audience is not or what they once were. Even though we ourselves are critical of this process, we remain historically and culturally embedded in it as social actors, for better and for worse.

One consequence of this link through difference is that there are continuing audiences, both public and academic, for our research.

The challenge we face is neither to succumb to popular images, nor to become too self-focussed. Here, I think, our collective traditions, in combination with our openness to other centers of innovation in the discipline, have reached a level of maturity where we are no longer in danger of being too inward looking, any more than we are in danger of thinking of hunter-gatherers in isolated simplicity. There are a density and momentum in our studies that have direction and dynamics of their own, but that link our research more and more closely to some of the most important challenges in the discipline.

MY QUESTIONS: OUR FUTURES

While each of us has a vision of which directions our collective studies might take, I will tell you what the Conference suggested to me as key problems to think about. A theme that recurred in a multitude of forms during the Conference was what has been called the fact of survival of hunter-gatherer peoples, the real, if always uncertain, continuing presence of hunter-gatherers in today's world.

I think that many of the papers I heard here were efforts to record, understand, analyze and celebrate how and why the societies we work with are surviving today. The authors indicated the significant losses these societies are often

forced to bear, and also what these societies are in the process of becoming, and what they seek to be in their futures. These themes unite our concerns for past and present, structure and history, tradition and change, system and pastiche, environment and power, identity and borders, global economy and local sharing, and they have been implicit in a myriad of papers and discussions. In these numerous guises, I think many of us are struggling with how to write about, represent, and analyze these successes, and the suffering and disjunctures, that characterize the contemporary situations and practices of many of the people we study.

We live in a world in which cultural, market, political, and environmental globalization are very real. Yet, we know these processes are not leading to simple cultural, social or economic uniformities. Imposed changes are running into ongoing local lives and social processes that have their own trajectories. What we are seeing, reporting and seeking to analyze as ongoing survival and autonomy, and as contradiction and conflict, are therefore widespread.

What is striking is that these same processes affect us fully as much, and at the same time, as they affect those societies we work with. The societies we work with are not just responding to and resisting external threats, important as those processes are, many are actively trying to continue and enhance real trajectories of autonomy. Some do this by seeking specific interactions with the wider institutions and processes, national and global. Some choose to act directly in market and political centres to pursue their goals. Some seek, against powerful intrusions, to limit these interactions and withdraw themselves and their lands. Many seek to control the impacts of interactions. The consequences are both intended and unintended, but all are explorations of possibilities for different futures than those that institutions of wealth and power assert that all should seek.

In these respects, we are like the societies we study, for our own societies are going through a period of similar rapid and fundamental conflicts. As a social scholar and citizen I seek to understand these changes and to act responsibly in my own society in complicated times. If we could identify, and maybe help to create, the languages, the concepts and the narratives with which to describe and communicate what the societies we work with are doing to survive, we would have something from them that was relevant to many of our own societies. In this respect, the societies in which we live and those with which we work are no longer other to each other.

In the past, anthropologists have tended to translate and represent what we learn from the peoples we work with by several scholarly and social processes. We have sought to revise our own societies' senses of our own pasts, showing the present has not always been this way. We have also sought to show that our societies' ways of living are not the only ones possible, with the implication that the present will not be forever, and that we could have different futures.

On some occasions, we have also been able to help the peoples we work with in their efforts to create their own futures.

The challenge that I feel we are faced with now is to see that the peoples we work with can now extend help to us. I am struggling to create continuing and enhanced possibilities of plural futures in my own society. This kind of project has defied adequate analysis in a rapidly changing world, and the great ideologies of social action and social analysis have proved inadequate, although not without insights. Increasingly, it is clear that it is not a project well addressed simply in global analysis, but more effectively in a discourse between practice and reflection that is partly rooted at the local level.

In our work with other societies, we find ourselves in the midst of peoples who carry on some autonomy by creating grounded everyday practices, extensive knowledges and broad values, without grand ideologies, and with some surprising successes, despite much suffering and some failures. We need to ask what we can learn from them, and I think that the most probable answer is "quite a bit." The small scale and distinctive features of those societies do not isolate their experiences from ours, for although there are differences, we all live in the context of states, capitalist economies, and mass media. The impacts of differences of scale are themselves part of the analysis, for we all must act at different scales. If we can present and analyze how the societies we are studying are building distinctive futures we will almost surely find much about how we can build futures too. Here is a foundation for a grounded practice and analysis of one of the major dynamics of our times.

If we can do this, we can be partners in a cross-cultural project of analysis and possibly of active alliance. The aim might be to use our field research to address large and basic questions we face as citizens today by learning from others, partly through ethnography and through collective action and analysis. We could learn how to take solid if modest steps by putting practice into analysis.

I will therefore leave Osaka with these questions and challenges in my mind: to explore how social, cultural and economic survival in small scale societies in the modern world is happening, as well as when and why it fails; and, to consider what might be learned for our own uncertain futures by linking our conditions of life and social action with those of the people we study.

This has been a very stimulating conference, and I deeply thank the Japanese organizers for the opportunity to be here, for the marvellous organization and venue, and for the Conference's intellectual vitality and ambience.