
Citation: COMITAS, LAMBROS / Professor of Anthropology and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University. **ETHNOLOGY: WEST INDIES.**

Subjects:
[ETHNOLOGY: WEST INDIES.](#)

HLAS Volume: 35

Essay: WHAT FOLLOWS DEPARTS SOMEWHAT FROM THE USUAL introduction by this contributing editor in previous issues of the Handbook. Rather than an assessment of publication trends for a very limited time period, this prolegomenon is essentially a personal, albeit partial, view of the state of social and cultural anthropological research in the Caribbean region. It is an attempt to present a perspective of the present firmly placed within the context of efforts in the past — a past that extends back only a few decades but one marked by considerable activity and accomplishment. For a lengthy period of time before World War II, the obvious value of the Caribbean as a focus of anthropological research was obscured by the then prevailing academic trends and fashions. Some anthropologists of this period argued that the area was one of 'broken' or hybrid cultures too small and insignificant to warrant serious study and therefore of little research interest. Totally transformed as it was by European colonization, the region was, quite naturally, not suited to the traditional ethnographic study of simple societies. After the war, the Caribbean (mainland littorals controlled by European powers as well as Antillean archipelago) became an important focus of attention for Americans British, Dutch, Canadian, and West Indian anthropologists, and by 1960, the literature on the area can be said to rival that of many of the larger, longer studied, and better established world ethnographic areas. Furthermore, this anthropology has greatly influenced, if not dominated, other social science efforts in the region. The underlying reasons for these developments are not difficult to perceive. The Caribbean includes a larger number of politically demarcated societies of relatively small size and population, each different but sharing many commonalities in history and structure and epitomized by cultural, social and racial complexity. Given the nature of anthropological techniques and methods, the Caribbean, particularly the Antilles presents almost ideal conditions for research into complex societies, a subject which over the past few decades has tended to replace the traditional preoccupations with tribal, homogeneous, and isolated populations. In addition, the abruptness of the original European intrusion into the Caribbean in the sixteenth century and the almost complete extinction of the aboriginal societies at that time has provided the contemporary scholar with an absolute historical baseline from which to work. During the last quarter century, I would estimate that at least two hundred anthropologists from many nations have carried out field investigations in the Caribbean. Scores of doctoral candidates have received their initial training and field experience in both the Greater and Lesser Antilles as well as in the mainland territories. Presently, no fewer than fifty professional anthropologists actively continue their research interests in the area, adding to an expanding literature on Caribbean social and cultural anthropology. In addition, the discipline has made contributions in archaeology, linguistics, folklore,

comparative religion, and in a wide range of applied subject matter. By the early 1960s, a combination of factors permitted the establishment of a flourishing, often exciting, regional field of anthropological investigation. Among these factors were: the intrinsic research attributes of the Caribbean; the initial ease of access of the region for foreign scholars; the early involvement of major anthropologists such as Melville J. Herskovits, Robert Redfield, Alfred Métraux, Julian Steward, M.G. Smith, George Eaton Simpson, and R.T. Smith among many others; the research stimulation stemming from contact and cross-fertilization of the American traditions in cultural anthropology and the British school of social anthropology; and finally and very importantly for the British Caribbean, the emergence of a resident West Indian research group housed at the Institute for Social and Economic Research in Jamaica which provided continuous, systematic regional study as well as guidelines, advice and critical comment to foreign Caribbeanists for almost a decade. Anthropological research, by the 1960s, had taken several principal forms: ethnohistorical and synchronic studies of cultural continuities in the Afro-American and East Indian components of the population; functional-structural analyses concentrating particularly on family, domestic, and economic organization; cultural-ecological investigations of regional variations and uniformities; the community study approach; and total society and social stratification analyses stemming from divergent concepts such as levels of sociocultural integration, pluralism, and consensualism. In these thrusts, Caribbean research has had important implications for the study of other world areas and for social science in general. Complexity of society and culture together with manageable conditions of research have permitted the Caribbean to serve as a backdrop for the examination of some of the most significant theoretical developments in contemporary anthropology and sociology. Limiting myself primarily to research and researchers on the Commonwealth Caribbean and to very few references to work in other parts of the region, I shall first briefly review the major anthropological approaches in Caribbean anthropology and then turn to recent developments and their possible causes. For purposes of the discussion, the West Indian literature can be conveniently divided into three gross categories: Continuities, that is, research and publications dealing with theoretical, methodological, and problem themes, or population segments, which have received considerable attention or development in the past and which have persisted to the present; Newer Thrusts, or research which, in terms of problem or subject matter, departs from past experience; and Consolidations, or bibliographic work, collections of essays by single authors, and readers.

I. CONTINUITIES

1) Amerindian-Bush Negro Studies: with roots into the 19th century, this research continues, in the main, to be the province of French, Dutch, and British anthropologists. Dealing with the relatively isolated peoples of the interior of the Guianas who are generally outside the mainstream of national life, these studies have tended to be primarily ethnographic, social organizational, and ethnohistorical in orientation. Recent work has been marked by considerable methodological and theoretical sophistication, for example, that of Silvia W. de Groot on the ethnohistory of the Djuka and of Peter Rivière on marriage and organization among the Trio. Other important contributions have been made in the past ten years by Audrey J. Butt, Jean-Baptiste Delewarde, D.C. Geijskes, Jean Hurault, Peter Kloos, A.J.F. Köbben, Peter Neumann, Richard Price and Jens Yde. It must be noted, however, that this often meritorious research has often related conceptually more to Tropical Forest anthropology than to the main currents of Caribbean study.

2) Afro-

West Indian Studies: In the 1930s. Herskovits envisaged a coordinated effort to study the Afro-American in the New World. While his design was never fully implemented and little of his approach and method remains in Caribbean anthropology, Herskovits and his colleagues initiated and stimulated interest and reaction in several areas of black, lower-class, West Indian life, most notably in family organization and religious behavior. In the former area, the work of R.T. Smith on household developmental cycle, Edith Clarke on variations in household organization, and M.G. Smith on mating patterns and domestic organization provided the parameters for a productive debate on the sociology of West Indian family and household which reached beyond the boundaries of the region. More recently, this interest has continued but has been buttressed by less field work and methodological direction. Sidney M. Greenfield and Keith F. Otterbein have provided monographs on the general subject with the first arguing that the Barbadian family system emanates from English cultural tradition and the second indicating that economic and demographic factors underlie the mating system of Andros islanders. Others who have written on the subject during the last years include Norman Ashcraft, Hyman Rodman, Michael M. Horowitz, William B. Rogers and Guy Dubreuil. Research on religious behavior and organization of black West Indians has also continued but at a diminished pace and again with less emphasis on sustained field work than in the past and certainly with less explicit grounding in method and theory than studies of domestic organization. George Eaton Simpson, the most productive scholar in this field, has contributed analyses of the Shango Cult, Rastafarianism, and the Shouters and has issued a collection of his essays on religious cults in the Caribbean. A comparison of dissociation states and possession beliefs in Haitian vodun and among the Shakers of St. Vincent has been provided by Erika Bourguignon. J.D. Elder has dealt with a Yoruba ancestor cult in Trinidad and Lydia Cabrera has written on the Abakua, a Cuban secret society. Reviews and descriptions of a variety American religious cults have been published by Angelina Pollack-Eltz. Other post World War II work on the black lower classes, stimulated British social anthropology and a growing concern with social problems than kovits and the Afro-American approach, has dealt with the sociocultural parameters of making a living. This genre of anthropological research includes the path breaking studies of Sidney W. Mintz on Jamaican and Haitian marketing; M.G. Smith on rural labor supply; William Davenport and Lambros Comitas on fishing and fishing cooperatives; and Mintz, Elena Padilla, Jerome S. Handler, and Constance Sutton, among others, on plantation life. This thrust, over time, has generated discussion and controversy on the sociocultural attributes and taxonomic classification of rural populations. Concepts such as "rural proletariat," "flux equilibrium," and "occupational multiplicity," have been used with some effectiveness on the analysis of the structure and dynamics of the economic life of working people. 3) East Indian Studies: The accumulated research on East Indians, as contrasted with that on Afro-Americans or Amerindians, has been, implicitly or explicitly, the most relevant to what is probably the central concern of Caribbean social science — the nature of regional societies. In part, this orientation is linked to the debate initiated in the late 1950s by Morton Klass and Daniel J. Crowley over whether East Indians were culturally conservative and exclusionist or culturally adaptable and assimilationist. The directions of later studies, limited in number but generally high in quality, were undoubtedly influenced by this debate. In recent years, various elements of East Indian life have been systematically probed: for example, the

nature of egalitarian ideology of plantation workers and the institutionalized breaches of this ideology by Chandra Jayawardena; patterns of social control at the village level and family organization by Barton M. Schwartz; reformist Hinduism as a facilitator of participation in national activities and of the incorporation of national values and attitudes by Jayawardena and by Schwartz; the functions, reformulation, or disappearance of caste by Arthur Niehoff, Schwartz, R.T. Smith, Jayawardena, and J.D. Speckmann; and, East Indians in Jamaica by Allen S. Ehrlich. 4) Total Society Analyses: The debate on the indicated in a recent conference paper, has been strongly identified with Caribbean sociology. It should also be stressed that this debate on the nature of West Indian society, with all its ambiguities, has had a subtle and salutary side effect on the field anthropology of the region. At present, even fledgling anthropologists, entering the field for the first time, have been made profoundly aware of the problems and complexities in the alternative explanations of the nature of the society in which they will work. This early awareness, as experience with students demonstrates, has helped improve the initial selection of problem as we of R.A.J. van Lier, Lloyd Braithwaite, M G. Smith, R.T. Smith, H. Hoetink, and Leo Despres has done much to stimulate This major advance in anthropological perspective. Anthropology, however, has been remiss in providing studies and data which would directly test the basic tenets in both the pluralist and consensualist positions in this debate. Quite correctly, Hoetink has noted the quasi-systematic neglect by researchers of traditional white groups in the region as well as of Syrians, Chinese and other migrant groups. Only one full-scale anthropological study of white elites exists for the Lesser Antilles, that of Edith Beaudoux-Kovats on the békés of Martinique. Few articles have dealt with other minorities, and these often have been limited and dated. Probably more damaging to total society studies in the Caribbean, especially in horizontally stratified social systems, is the virtual lack of anthropological research on the middle classes or segments and on urban areas. II. NEWER THRUSTS In recent years anthropologists have ventured into relatively unexplored territories of the Caribbean. There are hopeful signs of anthropological stirrings in Cuba, and, since the death of Trujillo, there has been a significant increase in research by foreign scholars in the Dominican Republic. In the latter country, Malcolm T. Walker studied the source of power in a mountain town, how this power is exercised and the way in which decisions are made. Nancie Solien de González has worked on aspects of rural-urban migration and Glenn Hendricks studied Dominicans in their native land and in New York City utilizing Robert Manners, Richard Frucht and Stuart B. Philpott on remittances, emigration and social field to analyze the Dominican patterns of circulatory migration. In increasing collaboration with professionals of other disciplines, anthropologists are now contributing to the solution of practical problems and issues. One such project, directed by anthropologists, studied the effects of chronic smoking of cannabis in Jamaica. During the course of this project, the anthropologists who studied ganja users in vivo, and the medical clinicians who studied the sample population in the hospital, collaborated productively and effectively and the project report was cited as being instrumental in amending the ganja legislation of Jamaica. As a spinoff of this project, at least three doctoral dissertations are forthcoming on different aspects of the anthropology of ganja. Alcoholism and its sociocultural context is another health area beginning to receive serious attention. Other recent developments in anthropological activity have been in the area of education. Vera Rubin and Marisa Zavalloni, an anthropologist-social

psychologist team, analyzed the attitudes of secondary school students in Trinidad. Nancy Foner, employing traditional anthropological techniques in a study of a Jamaican community, probed into the effects of national education on the local status system, on status aspirations, and on village crises and disputes.

III. CONSOLIDATIONS Recently, a surprising number of Caribbeanists have turned to research and to publishing efforts that reflect attempts to bring together meaningfully the published data on the region. Some anthropologists have become bibliographers of Caribbeana as, for example, Comitas and Handler; others such as George Eaton Simpson and M.G. Smith have brought together their own articles into single volumes, still others have become editors and annotators of readers on the Caribbean, Jean Benoist, Comitas and David Lowenthal, Michael M. Horowitz, and Richard Frucht. These developments in publishing have significance. On one level, they indicate some consensus that ample regional scholarship exists which warrants coordination and consolidation in bibliographies, readers, and collections. Probably more importantly however, these ventures demonstrate a growing interest in Caribbean affairs in the United States (where almost all of this material has been published) fueled by West Indian migrants, by heightened sensitivities of the American public to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico, and, by the rise of Black consciousness. In time this American interest might well have serious repercussions on the conduct and direction of social science in the Caribbean.

IV. SOME ASSESSMENTS Although it is difficult to support in any quantitative sense, Caribbean anthropology has changed significantly over the past few years. Eschewing judgements, what was once a relatively cohesive disciplinary effort on a limited number of major research foci which heavily emphasized sustained field research has now become a much more eclectic enterprise, somewhat fragmented in its methodological and theoretical orientations, apparently placing less importance on long term field work and more involved with service or applied research. In my introduction in volume 31 of the Handbook, I characterized the period under review as one of consolidation and transition arguing that established Caribbeanists, with some exceptions, were publishing ethnography based on data collected during early field work, or that they were utilizing such data for the formulation or refinement of theory and, on the other hand, a new generation was emerging which had not yet reached full professional status and had yet to publish systematically. I now find this assessment possibly subject to misleading interpretation — that it may carry the implication that the causes for shifts in Caribbean anthropology are to be found within the discipline itself. Certainly it is clear that recent West Indian research has veered from directions followed in the past. However, these shifts in focus and operation appear to me to be the direct result of new pressures and conditions, both within the region and in the home countries of foreign scholars who are specialists on the Caribbean region. The present state of the field can best be understood in these terms. With reference to regional West Indian conditions the decrease in publications based on field research, diversification away from an earlier, more coherent effort, and the attempts at "relevance" seem to be linked to 1) the serious brain drain of qualified West Indian social scientists to the United States and the United Kingdom, 2) the promotion of others to high administrative posts away from research, 3) the lack of training facilities for a potential new generation of field oriented West Indian anthropologists; 4) the growing sensitivities to foreign researchers and the growing difficulty of research access to the region. Much of this can be understood in the light of

pressures and demands emanating from political independence and selfgovernment, a process that began to take effect, most significantly, in the early 1960s. The possibilities of maintaining a cohesive disciplinary effort have been further exacerbated by the lack of active, resident research units which could take on the vital academic functions assumed by the Institute of Social and Economic Research a decade ago. Foreign constraints on Caribbean anthropology are coming primarily from the United States. In that country, a belated consciousness of the black population has led, in part, to the introduction of Black Studies programs at many universities. Almost paradoxically, an inordinate number of these programs are staffed and run by West Indian scholars. This has led to heightened interest in Caribbean lifeways and consequently in Caribbean materials (for example, there is almost a reprint explosion of West Indian classics and near classics) but has also contributed heavily to the brain drain and has done little to improve the quality of research on the region. Furthermore, this newly awakened awareness of the Caribbean threatens to compound the long-standing problem of indiscriminately utilizing the region as a dumping ground for the training and for the cross-cultural exposure of large numbers of undergraduate and graduate students. In the past, this has proved to be a burden and irritant to already overworked local professionals with little compensation by way of productive field results. In sum, Caribbean anthropology still appears to me to be very much in a state of transition. And, given the volatile nature of determining factors external to the discipline, it is likely to remain in flux and uncertainty for some time to come. I am indebted to Frances Karner Hulser for annotations of Dutch language references in the section which follows.