APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY IN FRANCE.
COMMENTS FROM A COLLECTIVE SURVEY.
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HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS AND TENDENCIES

A French no man's land or a French way?

The question of "applying" anthropological knowledge seems particularly underrated in the French institutional landscape, as compared with other countries dominant in anthropology, like the USA or Great-Britain. Arguments about the validity of this very project do exist in these two countries. Still they take place within professional surroundings where practicing anthropology has long been recognized as a usual dimension of professional activity. It can seem paradoxical to believe at the same time that anthropology is actual knowledge (not speaking of a "science" in the traditional sense) but that it should not be used by anyone or for anything; that, however, seems to be the position of many French professionals. As an example of a related attitude one can call a major witness, C. Lévi-Strauss, who was writing in 1973 that, although "(human sciences) are apt to confer to their practitioners something intermediate between pure knowledge and efficiency" (they), as of now, have almost nothing to offer as to practical action". In 1991, Lévi-Strauss was declaring to a well-known daily newspaper that "human sciences can only be called sciences through a flattering imposture", that "they are and will always be unable to master their object". It would be so because "the realities they aspire to know present the same order of complexity as the intellectual tools that they use." Although no published argumentation is available by French anthropologists (R. Bastide's *Anthropologie appliquée*, dating from 1971, comments almost exclusively on American and British matters), discussions about applying anthropological knowledge are often dismissed at once with a joke or a look of disapproval. Even at ORSTOM, an
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Institute devoted to "development" issues and therefore seen as more "applied" than C.N.R.S., no overall reflection had been carried out until recently about orienting anthropological knowledge towards some "developmentalist" goal, although it is true that such a project can appear self contradictory from certain points of view. In contrast with the UK’s British Association for Anthropology in Policy and Practice, the US’s Society for Applied Anthropology or the American Anthropological Association’s distinct societies, France presents no institutional body such as an association of applied anthropology in general, nor any specific university training about applied anthropology, at least at the undergraduate level.

For many French anthropologists, the very idea of "applying" a "science" in a definite way is an absurdity, since research cannot know what it can find; it cannot be "piloted" through questions that are not of its own. If people want to use anthropology, they should just read anthropology books. These last opinions manifest a French belief in the relative immediacy of Science and Reason, which seems also to imply that "People" have to reach "Science", not the opposite, and that some kind of natural diffusion is somewhere at hand. M-E Gruénais (forthcoming) quotes in a related way R. Bastide (1971:26), for whom "applied anthropology could only be born in a pragmatist country as Britain, (...) cautious (...) and taking resistances into account".

According to other opinions, applied anthropology is of a mercantile kind, or incompatible with ethical issues. Finally, it is generally seen also as hasty, the subject being ill-defined or irrelevant, and on the whole rather unappealing, intellectually speaking.

But, surprisingly enough, numerous undertakings can be known, and dominant themes spotted: corporations, minorities, policy development issues, public health, medical research. In fact, an important proportion of French anthropologists have been related at some point to the problem of application, but, until recently, in a kind of silent or individualistic way. Since 1990 two specialized associations have been created, A.P.A.D. (Association Euro-africaine pour l’Anthropologie du Développement et du changement social) and A.M.A.D.E.S. (Anthropologie médicale appliquée au développement et à la Santé), which gather a good proportion of research scattered otherwise.

A Few Historical Trends

France’s situation regarding applied anthropology is the result of a specific historical process, where an intellectual tradition and an institutional framework
can be distinguished, albeit related. One has to stress that French anthropology (as other social sciences around the world) was born "applied"; the tradition of distrust is therefore recent. To briefly sum up the outlook given by G. Lencud (Baré 1995a), the distrust is manifest in a country where the very project of an applied social science was present since the French Revolution. One can here quote Condorcet who was designing in his *Tableau Général de la Science* a program for social sciences, as able to improve varied aspects of human life: elections, rents, ballots, insurance etc. During the XIXth century especially, when anthropology gained an autonomy (under its first name of sociology), forefathers like E. Durkheim keep advocating its social utility. Along with his main research, Durkheim worked for instance on subjects such as conflicts between entrepreneurs and workers, inheritance, education etc. But even essays such as *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, that could hardly seem "applied" are designed in a somewhat applied perspective: finding the secret of society so as to prevent the disorders of civilization. Authors like Robert Herz and Maurice Halbwachs, close to the Durkheimian school, paid constant attention to the world of the workers.

For G. Lencud, who follows in this regard the arguments of J-J. Salomon (1970), this attitude breaks up clearly into two important historical periods. First, when Max Weber pronounced in Paris his lectures on *Le savant et le politique* in 1918, the First World War having left its cortège of tragedy. Then, when the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* was created around 1939, and the prominent physicist F. Joliot-Curie, close to the communist party, strongly advocated for scientific institutions to be independent from capitalism. Strangely enough, it was then "pure" or "fundamental" science which became a state affair in a democracy, a unique situation then in the world. Whatever the political options of French anthropologists, this state of mind -- the construction within society of an autonomous world for scientists -- has been prevalent in post-war French anthropology. Even if the design of scientific institutions (like the Institut d'Ethnologie created in 1925 by L. Lévy-Brühl) did advocate the use of knowledge for social goals and still does, very few anthropologists have been engaged in research projects applied to colonial policy for instance, as opposed to the British situation. The creation of an *Office Colonial de Recherche Outre Mer* in 1943 employing anthropologists, whose designs were made precise through various decrees after World War II, did not give way, surprisingly enough to a definite philosophy of application, nor did those of the current *Etablissement Public Scientifique et Technologique* called ORSTOM, distantly proceeding from the former.

More generally, the French situation seems to be related to a global ideology in L. Dumont's sense which, although rich in concepts, does not leave space for notions so important to Anglo-saxon civilizations such as "community" and "club". As recalled independently by Gruénais and Hubert's comments on medical
The situation of applied anthropology in France has also to be related to a specific institutional design. The question of applied science in France can only be perceived through the history of the notion of "service public". France is, to the best of our knowledge, the only country to employ full-time researchers in the position of civil servants, as distinct from that of university teachers (who work still under the same status). Research is generally administered, including the general directors of E.P.S.T., by academics. The position of civil servant in research is generally obtained after years of endeavors, in a very competitive context; civil servants in research must account for less than 1% of the whole French fonction publique, comparatively important it is true, whose relative importance in the employed population keeps diminishing. Although this professional status has been sometimes commented on in a polemic or uninformed way (including in France), one would like to stress here that it seems particularly adequate to the practice of applied anthropology, since it guarantees the anthropologist’s freedom against financial pressures from a contractant—a relationship that seems the very core of applied anthropology issues. It can thus seem a pity or a distinctive feature that so few French anthropologists declare themselves interested in applied anthropology. The very position of fonctionnaire has been precisely invented by the Third Republic to protect the civil servant from the intervention of a partisan state (Zeldin 1980), as it is recalled in various cases documented in Baré (1995a). One should recall to readers of the Anglo-saxon tradition that the French notion of fonctionnaire does not imply to work for "the government" (which is established on a political basis, and renewed through democratic life) but for "the French republic" (which is a founding and permanent figure of contemporary France). This job security is generally considered to be counter-balanced by wages inferior to those comparable (if possible) in the private sector.

All this implies that French researchers do not have to hunt for contracts to earn their living, a compelling necessity in the American context for instance. French officials who advocate for an "American system" should probably enquire further about the counter-productive effects of a professional life dedicating a good 50% of time just to find out where money is.

Other consequences follow. French statutory anthropologists not necessarily having to chase money, are not induced in that way to defer to applied projects,
whatever their nature or opportunity. But, since quite a few of them do work on applied projects, a direct relationship does not seem to appear between the anthropologists' position in France and the practice of applied anthropology. It seems to pertain more to a state of a mind, learned or not, transmitted or not, than to professional or legal constraints.

Areas of Concern, Difficulty and Controversy

One can see from the above that these areas relate to almost every aspect of "practicing" anthropology in France. They can be seen as pertaining to a professional dimension (the job market in anthropology) and a scientific or intellectual dimension.

Professional Concerns

The "tenured" status of research as mentioned below, designed in other times, cannot fully integrate new generations of anthropologists at the graduate level. In that regard, the French situation can be compared to that in the UK and the US, as is often recalled in various professional newsletters. At the main Institutes employing anthropologists, C.N.R.S. and ORSTOM, the ratio of applicants per anthropology tenure varies from around 30 to 100, for a basis of around 2 positions per year. For a university job, it can reach around 20, for around 2 or 3 positions per year. Among these, 5 to 10 persons are already good professionals, experienced in fieldwork and research thanks to various ways of managing their professional life (grants, personal savings, part time jobs etc.). It does not follow for that matter that anthropological training produces jobless people. As is shown from the first enquiry undertaken in two major anthropology departments about the occupational outcome of graduate students, the unemployment ratio for anthropology is pretty low (Baré 1995a). But the "reproduction" rate in P. Bourdieu's sense (access to University and Research) is highly variable, very high in one example (around 80%) and very low in the other one (around 10%), as probably in most university cases. The other occupational trends concern either professions seen as close to anthropology (press, film-making, medicine, marketing for instance) or applied anthropology in the sense of contracting, mainly for municipalities, the Ministry of Culture, or corporations. The area of controversy lies here between titulars and applicants, and to some extent between new and older generations. As well known, it is a wholly different question to address scientific issues when being the tenant of a scientific occupation or not.
Intellectual and Scientific Concerns

In the French case these issues may appear to pertain to a widespread anxiety about anthropology's scientificity (hence, about the project of application, seen as challenging it). This way of thinking, akin to a theology of purity, is seriously challenged by essays such as J-C. Passeron (1991), which question the very validity of a classical model of science's extension to social sciences. Anthropology in other words could well be of an empiricist nature in the philosophical sense, (being able to recognize some kind of orders in the social world but not being able to master or reproduce them experimentally), but on the other hand the "hard" scientific model could also be more empiricist than is usually put forward. One can note that the eventual empiricist nature of anthropology could not disqualify the project of application, on the contrary. That plumbing, for instance, does not meet criteria of scientificity stricto sensu never prevented someone from repairing a tap, fortunately enough.

What one could call without exaggeration a French anxiety (or a French procrastination, in the "let us not do it" way) about the very field of the discipline is certainly present in the ever-going arguments at hand on the other side of the Channel or the Atlantic. Let us recall well-known discussions about basic anthropological issues, like the ones on "culture" and "practical reason" by Sahlins (1976), or on the intricate relationships between the "global" and "local" levels of description or analysis by Geertz (1983). All these matters are certainly directly relevant to the project of application; if one does not exactly know how to define the field of anthropology, one cannot apply something insufficiently defined. One can quote here the subjects of papers displayed by international congresses of applied anthropology e.g., "the part of nurses in urban situations posterior to earthquakes in Central America". There is certainly nothing wrong in itself to pay attention to earthquakes (maybe as "social dramas" in V. Turner's sense), but why pay more attention to nurses than to next-door cousins, or the ambulance maintenance system?

Applied anthropology could sometimes be defined as not being anthropology (since the subject is hardly anthropological) and unapplied (since transferring some undefined information is barely possible).

In that sense French anxiety would be useful, if it was not confined to anxiety. Because it focuses the attention towards the difficulties of implementing and transferring anthropological knowledge, but also because it implies that anthropology, to be understandable by the contractant, has to be made explicit. Applied anthropology in that sense is at risk of not being able to be differentiated from some sort of journalism (minus the accessibility and efficiency of informati-
on) or from some sort of fundamental research about application or applied projects, minus the process of application itself.

Reflections about the field or the consistency of anthropology always displayed a considerable oscillation. See, for instance, the evolution from Lévi-Strauss's inaugural lesson at Collège de France (1958), talking of "small, distant, jointed" societies and a recent interview mentioning "the ability to discern amongst the chaos of social facts some phenomena of auto-organization". M. Augé (1978, 1979, 1987) pinpointed relevant epistemological difficulties, such as the very existence of a dilemma between "function" and "meaning", or the definition of "alterity" (1987). A "State of the Art" published in 1986 by L'Homme displayed what one can call without any polemic intention an intellectual disarray, as is shown by the somewhat perplexed presentation by the editor-in-chief (Pouillon 1986). The main lines of controversy are presented for instance in the contributions by Sindzingre, Lenaud, Jorion, Testart, Terray, Bernard and Digard. The questions raised - whether anthropology is one (despite its specialized topics) or plural (despite its very existence), studies "stateless" societies or not, whether it is mainly a psychology or not, whether individuals are to be taken into account, whether it can be extended to industrial societies, do not receive even the beginning of a decisive answer. One can quote here J. Jamin's comment from the recent Dictionnaire de l'ethnologie et de l'anthropologie (Bonte et Izard eds., 1991) observing that "although French anthropology is often perceived as 'theoretical' it seems to have great difficulties to define itself theoretically" (my translation). One can note also that until recently, no published reflexion seemed at hand about fieldwork practice in France, in contrast with the US, for instance.

One should note that L'Homme devoted a whole issue to the "Anthropologie du proche" (1992), a decisive issue for our subject in that application has generally to take into account western, industrial or post-industrial forms of organization. The French oscillation can seem to pertain to a broader one which confronts many anthropologists in the world. Is anthropology defined by a preexisting kind of human object ("stateless" or "exotic" societies for instance), that would have been waiting for anthropology to come and study it, or is it defined mainly by a method, or a way of looking at things human? To the author of these lines, an answer in favor of the last option makes no doubt.

Concerns Regarding the Application Relationship

The specific relationship that builds up between an anthropologist and a contractant, also pertains to a controversial area. One could say that it is a controversial relationship as such, whatever the country at hand, since it
confronts persons who, by definition, do not know very precisely what anthropology is all about since they are not anthropologists (the contractants) with persons that, by definition, are not aware of the exact nature of the problem at hand (the anthropologists). This relationship is certainly a privileged locus of "working misunderstanding".

In France, one area of controversy seems to take place from a specific perception of money issues, which, according to different observers, seem to pertain to French contemporary culture. The job-market for consultancy being hardly organized, people do not generally have a clue about what they should ask for a consultancy job, not speaking of how to base it. For instance, the existence of a given indicative standard like the one retained by the US National Science Foundation (as far as it has some international dimension) had recently to be indicated to state agencies as well as to some anthropologists involved. On that chapter, another area of controversy could come from the intellectual framework. French anthropologists tend to treat delays of less than a year as short calls, whereas contractants whether public or private generally work within some kind of "urgency". Here springs up again the false dilemma between "quick and dirty" and "long and dirty" coined by Chambers in discussions of his Rapid Rural Appraisal method (Cemea 1991). French anthropologists tend to view spontaneously applied projects as the fundamental research they are used to, hence to have apparent difficulties extracting the operational information from its envelope, or to display arguments about the impossibility of arguing the project. This explains partly why French ministries archives, for instance, are full of unused reports written by social scientists.

A relevant argument put forward by the anthropologists is that contractants tend often to strongly indicate the "good answer" or are vague enough to "drown the fish" as the French saying goes. One should still mention that out of dozens of projects surveyed in France, very few showed constraining terms of reference, generally formalized by the anthropologist, not by the contractant. Given recognizable pressures, political or politician, seem very rare, a factor all the more worthy of notice given the shape taken by research in France.

Another related aspect of controversy concerns ethical and/or political issues. French anthropologists often tend to think that if they contract outside the academic world, some kind of perversity is there at hand, which is not questioned or identified in fundamental research. This unargumented position can be related to a French anthropological "tradition" as briefly evocated before. It is questioned by prominent researchers, and also by administrators of research.
Unlike the British case, ethical or deontological questions do not appear to have been explicitly addressed by the French anthropological community. Still, two special issues of the Association Française des Anthropologues bulletin, were devoted to "L'Anthropologie sous Contrat" (contracting anthropology) and "L'Anthropologie sous Conditions" (Anthropology On Condition) (1989). French anthropologists' ethics appear to advise more about what should not be done than about what should be done; for instance, not to research on the best way to expel from France workers from the Mahgreb just because of their origin, not to work on family planning campaigns recommending sterilization without being aware of the argumentation at hand, not to work on politically biased projects, etc. This ethics, which remains implicit and "oral", gets close, when expressed, to the classical human rights chart of UNO. Unlike the British ASA's code, French anthropologists do not seem to think it necessary to protect contractants from anthropologists.

Although it is frequently unknown, French law offers "strong" protections against misuses of information according to a specialized lawyer in Paris, D. Jalouques. They proceed from a 1957 law concerning "artistic and intellectual property", now under a revision tending to its modernization (software). We have not been aware of any case of lawsuit.

CURRENT STATE OF APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY IN FRANCE.

Key Focal Areas and Contributions

The selection of topics presented here proceeds from what professionals in France agree to be a given topic, which does not necessarily cover a consistent field of study. One is again related to the definition of the object studied. Paying attention for instance to "corporations" can also be dealing with the strange category of "economic development"; still, the word development tends confusedly to evoke something extra-European (although Europeans institutions are devoted to their own development of Europe) unlike the word "corporation". But French anthropologists tend to think there is something called a "development anthropology" (or an "anthropology of development"); we have been faithful to this way of seeing things. It follows that attaining exhaustivity would be here a delusory goal. Two topics considered of an applied nature could not be thoroughly documented.
First, cultural heritage is a French specificity, as far as the Ministry of Culture employs a limited amount of permanent anthropologists (around ten) in the design of knowing, maintaining and valorizing French regional cultures. They are employed by the administrative levels called régions (which regroup départements). These posts depend on the Directions Régionales de l'Action Culturelle or D.R.A.C., also able to finance projects on a contractual basis. The question of cultural heritage in countries foreign and abroad is also dealt with by different anthropologists or "ethnoarcheologists" at ORSTOM and CNRS.

A second topic concerning environmental issues has not been embodied in anthropological institutions, although it has been so frequently mentioned in France since before the "Summit of Rio", and all the more after it. Still quite a few anthropologists in France have been dealing with what is called "environment". ORSTOM, along with various academic and regional public institutions, is currently (1994) implementing an important project on these matters. Still, a synthesis by the Programme Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur l'Environnement at CNRS notes abruptly, concerning the perspectives of applied anthropology: "anthropology displays an extremely rich field of knowledge(...) This thesaurus stays unexploited for the moment". The attention drawn on the subject of environment can seem to proceed from the existence of industrial or post-industrial societies, intervening so strongly on nature; an anthropology applied to environmental demands probably pertains also to an "industrial" or "development" anthropology.

Corporations

The idea of an anthropology specifically devoted to corporations and business (anthropologie de l'entreprise) appeared recently in France; it is delineated within an "industrial" and "urban" anthropology already long in existence. A synthesis of various approaches is available in the Journal de l'Association Française des Anthropologues n° 43-44 1991, edited by M. Selim (ORSTOM) and K. Sugita (CNRS), titled "Ethnologie de l'Entreprise". An article "Anthropologie de l'entreprise" by K. Sugita is also available in Izard et Bonte (eds.) 1991. This expression appeared in a period where a world wave of economic liberalism coexisted with various endeavors by French authorities to "reconcile" French people with corporations, business and the stock exchange. This approach's newness is related by J. Copans (1991) to the existence of a former "leftist" tradition of French anthropologists. Research units, generally created in the 1980s, do not seem to have impelled a strong or definite policy about application and consultancy. Among them one can quote l'Equipe de Recherche sur l'Anthropologie Urbaine et Industrielle, associate to CNRS and EHESS, directed by G. Althabe; the Laboratoire
d'Anthropologie Urbaine of CNRS, directed by C. Pétionnet. At ORSTOM, starting a few years ago, various programs have been implemented for a few years, depending mostly on research units devoted to "development models" (UR 5B) and "workers and mobility" (UR 5E) (see for instance Selim 1991). These anthropological studies follow or coexist with studies pertaining strictly speaking to sociology and politology (for instance Contamin et Fauré 1990). French sociology has long been attentive to work and labor, as is shown for instance by the periodical Sociologie du Travail around A. Touraine; as it has been recalled, the study of work is quasi consubstantial to sociology from the beginning (Durkheim, Maurice Halbwachs etc.). For J. Copans (personal communication) the emergence of an anthropological specialization has taken advantage of former approaches about West African industrial matters. The sociology of corporations takes into account national ”traditions” and ”cultures”, as is shown for instance in d'Iribarne 1989, and gets then close to anthropology. R. Cabanes (1991) notes for instance the persistence of a Brazilian ”paternalistic” model.

We know of two specific training courses. One titled "ethnomanagement" is delivered by T.K. Schippers, associate professor at the Université de Provence's department of anthropology in Aix en Provence. The other, a specialized master degree or ”magistère” is delivered by D. Desjeux and S. Taponier at Paris V University.

One has to quote here a research unit although it does not pertain institutionally to anthropology: the Centres de Recherche en Gestion (C.R.G.) de l'Ecole Polytechnique in Paris, Associate Unit to CNRS, founded and long directed by the management specialist M. Berry. A group “ethnography of organizations” has existed for a long time within C.R.G.; the very notion of management is treated as a ”local knowledge” in Geertz's sense when the 1992 report recalls the semantic field of ”to manage” (CRG 1992). See also the lecture by M. Berry at the 1986 Colloque International des Hautes Etudes Commerciales where he recalled that ”the relevance of the explanation of a problem of management depends on the question at hand, the one to whom it is addressed and the one who expresses it and varies in time and space”, which gets very close to an anthropological approach as far as speaking subjects are taken into account. Unlike anthropological research units, CRG is regularly involved in consultancy work with corporations. D. Guigo (1991) stresses the intricate relationships of applied and fundamental research in this field.

Strangely enough, the cultural -- hence anthropological -- nature of corporations, or corporation as a concept, seems much more evident to French practitioners or even managers than to French anthropologists, even if this perception recently gave way to fashionable although intellectually void notions
such as "culture d'entreprise". Anthropologists greatly hesitate on the object's definition. G. Althabe, insisting for instance on the necessity of "desacralizing corporations" notes that "a corporation is a space where one can accede to social subjects (...) which can be understood from inside (...) but these subjects' social existence is not entirely present there (1991: 18 my translation). This tends to mean that a corporation as a given organization does not seem to be a privileged object of study, in contrast with what would be "the subjects" who work there. J. Copans (1991) notes the necessity of "studying up", French anthropology having been devoted quasi exclusively to the world of workers. He feels it necessary to mention that "Labor does not exist without Capital".

The anthropology of corporations seems indeed inclined to try and find its would-be traditional object in this new field. M. Jeudy-Ballini (1991), working on an applied project for a luxury goods' group, kept asking herself whether she "was really doing anthropology", the workers having remarked to this PNG's specialist that they were not "Papuas". E. Desveaux (1991) studying the organization of a food industry unit found a specific social relationship, a kind of "worker's nepotism", but independent as such of an analysis of the corporation itself.

One can note for instance that we did not know of any applied project concerning the corporation's management itself, as if it was outside the realm of anthropology. For some cultural aspects of finance and stock exchange one can see Baré 1991. A study by F. Zonabend (1990), which is not of an "applied" nature stricto sensu has been devoted to the part played in a region of France (Cotentin) by the nuclear waste recycling factory of La Hague. It mentions the overall organization of the firm.

Consultants.

Very few private consultancies have been implemented (we knew of three of them in Paris). Generally speaking, whatever the richness of French industrial anthropology, anthropological consultancy for corporations appears to be still at the infant age as compared to the state of things in the US (see for instance Baba 1986). This relates certainly to national "traditions" and to the way French anthropologists are socialized.
Numerous French anthropologists work on problems related to development, the main area being French-speaking Africa. As it has been recalled, a national institute explicitly devoted to development, ORSTOM, employs dozens of anthropologists and sociologists. At C.N.R.S. and E.H.E.S.S., quite a few research programs can be seen as dealing, in a more distant way, with development issues as far as they are devoted to social and economic transformations in the world. Some of them directly relate to the part played by the State in contemporary African societies (see for instance Terray ed. 1987). An important proportion of these works were notably inspired by G. Balandier; some of them are defined as relating to an "anthropologie du développement".

The quasi-absence, until recently, of a systematic reflexion about the ways of applying anthropological knowledge towards some developmentist goal is all the more surprising. One can compare again this situation to the wealth of endeavors displayed in this field by such Anglo-saxon periodicals as Human Organization, and Practicing Anthropology in the US, or Anthropology in Action in the UK, or to the undertaking by Cernea et al. (1991), whatever the critical issues at hand. This undertaking, the main one (to the best of my knowledge) with respect to consistency, and reflecting only dates, it is true, from the 1980s. One can quote also Grillo and Rew 1984.

The situation in France seems often to be due to the anthropologists’ belief that development (seen as westernization of the world) is "bad", to put it that way. This explains perhaps why development issues often are treated under the angle of "advocacy work" and the defense of stateless minorities against the state. Although the existence of tyrannical aspects in state planning and intervention cannot be denied, a weakness of this attitude is that the efficiency of an outsider's point of view, critical as it can be, is questionable as shown in M. Cernea (1991, Introduction). In that sense, French anthropology faces the well-known dilemma of non-intervention, in the case when a critical collaboration is on the contrary possible. The non-intervention attitude is also criticized by Albert (Baré 1995) commenting on the very topic of "advocacy work". This can seem to relate also to a certain ignorance or indifference by anthropologists in general concerning economic and planning matters.

Still, some French anthropological research has, for a long while, paid attention to development processes in themselves, seen as the result of a confrontation between different "conceptual systems" and "social logics" (see for instance Boiral, Lantéri et Olivier de Sardan 1985, on the configuration displayed by farmers, experts and academics in Africa; Olivier de Sardan et Paquot 1991,
on the "middleman" part of development agents going between different systems of knowledge; Dupré 1992 on the confrontation between folk taxonomies and what could be called developers' taxonomies in rural development matters (Africa); and the recent overall program drawn by Olivier de Sardan, 1995). A good deal of the association called A.P.A.D.'s reflexion, devoted to the anthropology of development and social change, concerns more specifically what can be labeled as "situations de développement", in other words the specific social objects produced by development projects and policies.

All these reflexions surround the topic of the application relationship, between "developers" and anthropologists. Very few French anthropologists consult for French development agencies such as la Caisse française du Développement (former Caisse Centrale de Coopération Economique). At the former Ministry for Cooperation and Development (now Ministry of Cooperation), a transitory bureau of evaluation was created in the 1980s around a team of sociologists (See Freud 1988).

At ORSTOM, a research team created around 1987 has for its main purpose to describe and know better the social, cultural and intellectual issues at hand in development processes and projects, and in development theories themselves. It deals directly with what one could call the "world" of developers as a social fact in itself. For J-F Baré (1987), development as a process of action and a theory is hardly describable except through local categories displayed by development theories, development projects, and developers, and is then only distinguishable through an anthropological observation. From a survey of numerous economy handbooks, the very notion of development can only be described as a "premium found by chance in a pack of economic growth", hence appears to pertain to some kind of savage mind in Lévi Strauss's sense. It follows that anthropology cannot be used to improve development theories, no more than to improve Swazi rituals. Anthropological knowledge can only be used within development processes, in an empiricist way. For J-P. Chauveau, development can be defined as "what people working for development agencies do". Chauveau devotes specific attention to development theories in historical perspective, which display surprisingly recurrent features (see for instance 1992).

These reflexions do surround the application relationship in these matters, but they do not show systematic thinking. For J-F Baré (1995b), an anthropology applied to development has to consent to an important effort in knowing better the constraints of planning and administration, in a kind of "zen" attitude. It can only be an anthropology directed towards "developers", in at least three regards. A better evaluation of aid to development needs some kind of ethno-history, then oral interviews, of projects (see for instance Baré 1992b). It can help knowing
better the 'informal sector', a design widely commented on but which can help to design better 'light' financing of informal small scale industries or individuals (see for instance Uvin and Pinguet 1988). Finally, it can show the important linguistic aspects of development processes, because they confront actors who often do not speak the same language and that in the various meanings of the word. One can see for instance how specific can be basic political economy notions such as 'wages, corporations, external trade' and so forth, whether in French or English, when one tries to translate them in other languages; Baré 1992b). (On medical issues, see the work of B. Brunet-Jailly at ORSTOM and CIRELFA, on modernizing crafts see A-M. d'Ans at Paris VII University (Langues et développement), Jaffré at APAD on rural development administration and medical issues.) A consistent effort by French linguists, anthropologists or ethnolinguists has been in progress for a few years around R. Chaudenson, professor at the Université de Provence in Aix en Provence, also general secretary of CIRELFA.30 (See the collection Langues et Développement (9 volumes), whose general argument is precisely to enquire about the paradoxically ignored or ill-treated field of language in development matters.) As treated, the issue does not relate to the naive belief that the injunctions of developers are not understood, since no one can understand them as a non-speaker. Since, as A-M. d'Ans puts it about the modernization of forges in southern Mali, "one needs the intellectuals' self-delusion to believe that a Malian forger does not know what is a bumper when he does not know the word 'bumper'". The question is in getting conceptual systems through; in other words, it lies in the various disruptions occurring in translating, which involves aspects like code and syntax (See Mounin 1963). The reflexion does not pertain only to transcultural aspects (see the analysis of the way Bambara is taught in Mali; Dombrowski, Dumestre and Simonis 1993). All these topics pertain to anthropology insofar as it can hardly be separated from linguistic dimensions (Baré 1992 a).

One should probably devote a special paragraph to land tenure, as far as reflexions generally sharing the same kind of inspiration on induced development in Africa as well as Europe. In one case, Le Bris and Le Roy insist on the point of sending the information through for state-planners (1991). On the other hand, historians and anthropologists of rural France showed the variety of tenures and inheritance rules within France itself, a centralized country. This analysis leads to applied situations, as in the question of natural parks, notarial practice, agricultural policy especially on the question of "set-aside" land (through the EEC new policy; see notably Lamaison 1989a and b.)
The Global Practice of Anthropology

Minorities and the State

For B. Albert, (Baré 1995a), the reflexion in France pertains more to an "involved" than of an "applied" anthropology (a pun between impliquée et appliquée). In that regard, French anthropology has always presented distinctive features. In the 1930s, at the height of colonization, French anthropology was not well enough established to communicate with colonial administration, while on the other hand some colonial civil servants devoted themselves to some kind of ethnography. This explains partly why one could not find in France, until recently, a conception of the anthropologist as middleman comparable, for instance, to that of the British. The works by M. Griaule in West Africa or Leenhardt in New Caledonia advocated for indigenous systems of thought through a kind of French cultural relativism, while staying apart from the administration (Clifford 1987). This tradition was continued through ethics based on political solidarity with colonized people (Leiris 1950) and the advent of the notion of "situation coloniale" by G. Balandier (1951). After decolonization, a French "Marxist" anthropology criticizing the new world of development according to dependency theories also can be inscribed in this intellectual heritage. One should notice however that A. Métraux became a member of the Department of Social Sciences at UNESCO from 1947 to 1962 and implemented important applied projects in Latin America (Métraux 1953). In the 198Os, new attitudes developed especially at ORSTOM; they tended to deal with development institutions and projects as social facts, while they criticized the position of non-intervention (See for instance Bonnafé et al. 1985; Geffray 1987; Dozon 1991).

On the contrary, it is well-known that for C. Lévi-Strauss, the westernization of the world constituted a "monstrous and incomprehensible cataclysm for so many innocent people" (1955). The author of A World on the Wane always expressed his distrust in making anthropology an "auxiliary to the social order" (1958). For B. Albert, this led to the "neo-Rousseauism" of R. Jaulin (1970); (for a critical view see Amselle ed. 1979.) The field of "advocacy work" presented for B. Albert important reorientations as early as the 1970s, when a somewhat paternalistic attitude was challenged by minorities and people themselves, this led also to an "inner decolonization" in the minds of French anthropologists. Anthropological advocacy could address directly state policies for instance, through the progressive recognition of minorities rights (UNO 1989 and 1992). Non-Governmental Organizations, not uniquely French, are the most instrumental tools. At the end of the 1970s, a "Groupe d'Information sur les Amérindiens" was created within the Société des Américanistes which will gave way to a French section of Survival International, a London-based organization. Still, a good number of French anthropologists prefer to shy away from the problem of state intervention, even if this outsider attitude is becoming less and less easy.
For Albert, this variety of approaches and reactions is related to the variety of societies studied by French anthropologists. A global contrast can be drawn notably between farming societies, on the one hand, which produced the majority of the new states’ peasantry (as in West Africa), hence subject to “rural development” insofar as labor can be integrated in the national and international market (see Geffray 1993), and societies of hunter-gatherers, hunters and gardeners, herdsmen (as in South America or in the Arctic), on the other hand, which seem to be approached by state development only through deconstruction (in the case of Amerindians see Albert 1993a and 1993b; for a synthesis of new perspectives about Indian communities in Latin Tropical America see Descola and Taylor 1993). For Albert, as for different French anthropologists, an applied anthropology in this kind of context is often just a means of “ethnifying” a technocratic and murderous reality. Application can only take place after recognizing the relationship between states and minorities already at hand. Albert stresses that many anthropologists agreed to reject applied anthropology in government for a sort of anthropological intervention accompanying the movement of emancipation of dominated communities. This movement has been considerably enforced by the new rhetoric of ecology consubstantial to the idea of a self-sustainable development, so widely mentioned since the 1992 Summit of Rio. From this perspective application according to Albert can take four forms: witnessing, mediating, assessing, and research in itself, whereas all these approaches concern mainly five topics: land, health, justice, education, economy.

Applied medical anthropology

French anthropologists from every research institution (CNRS, ORSTOM, INSERM or Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale E.H.E.S.S. and various universities) long have worked on medical topics and public health issues; although it can be noted that only one is employed by INSERM. F. Héritier, a professor at Collège de France presides at the AIDS National Council and is a member of other national committees concerning bioethics, along with N. Echard at C.N.R.S..

For M-E Gruénais (Baré 1995a) the expression anthropologie médicale is of a controversial nature, but he considers that an applied dimension is present as soon as anthropologists work with health professionals (epidemiologists, physicians, public health managers, nurses etc.). For Gruénais, the application relationship is particularly obscured by the divergent attitudes of physicians and anthropologists toward medicine and anthropology. More generally the consistency of medical anthropology as a subdiscipline is questioned by anthropologists specialized in the field of illness like Augé (1986) and Zempléni
Conversely, the physicians' training in France does not often include social sciences, or topics involving social matters such as public health and epidemiology, as compared to other European countries or the USA. Only one school of "public health" is available, in Rennes. Almost every managerial post in health institutions is occupied by physicians. However, demands for cooperation more often come from the physicians; the first congress devoted to medical anthropology and the first association devoted to applied medical anthropology were created by physicians who became anthropologists, respectively A. Retel-Laurentin (see 1983) and J. Benoist, (AMADES 1992).

For Gruénais, questioning the applicability of medical anthropology could be a rather French question. One can also think of the enduring presence in France of a Durkheimian tradition paying no attention to "the individual", who can be seen as the privileged object of medical care. Gruénais notes in that regard the way other traditions in medical anthropology and sociology have paid attention to the "patient" himself, as in North America.

The increasing demand for anthropology could be related to growing costs of the French medical care system, and to the attention paid by health policies to the part played by prevention, hence to the knowledge of populations' "habits" leading to pathology. It could be also related to a saturated job-market for town physicians, attracting young graduates to specializations like epidemiology. But these economic reasons still remain unsatisfactory to explain the increase in the demand for anthropological analysis; sometimes health-care systems are confronted with a total epidemiological ignorance, as in Malawi, that only a direct anthropological enquiry can improve (AMADES 1992). More generally the need for a better knowledge of the patient’s social environment, hence for the part played by anthropology in relieving the physician’s anxiety is noted (Benoist in AMADES 1992; Aiach 1992; Marintabouret 1990). Some physicians do recognize the "reductionist" aspect of medicine (Rousset 1989). French medical anthropology also is concerned with "traditional" or "alternative medicines" as far as medical authorities see there a privileged focus of cooperation, as well as for "primary health care" in the inspiration of the declaration of Alma-Ata (1978). Several French anthropologists however have criticized the "myth of traditional medicine" (see for instance E. et D. Fassin 1988; Gruénais 1991). Traditional medicine, as it is stressed by medical people, can be used for providing new insights and new therapeutics; there the anthropologist plays the part of a "scout" in Wilson's terms (1988). The administration of herb-teas by mothers could, for instance, be used as the opportunity for rehydrating diarrhoeic children. (AMADES 1992). Although French anthropology remains for the most part very weary of approaches which bind biological and cultural facts, physicians suggest new proceedings in "human ecology". (Cathebras 1989; Froment 1992).
A long established way of cooperation concerns "mental illness". A founding experience has been the one of Pr. Collomb’s team in Dakar’s Fann Hospital, regrouping anthropologists such as E. and C. Ortigues, A. Zempléni, R. Collignon, J. Rabain (Collignon 1978). Experiences are pursued in Benin (Tall 1992); in France, the psychiatrist T. Nathan holds a specialized consultation for immigrants in France involving anthropological approaches (see also Nathan 1986).

Anthropology is also used as a discipline for privileged training of "tradipraticians", populations and health professionals. The part required of the anthropologist could be the one of middle-man adapting medical information to the features of the actor concerned (Basse 1986), the main ones being the medical and paramedical staff. In France training sessions are regularly held in Lyon and le Havre; see Julliard in AMADES 1992; Castelain 1990). M-E Gruénais has taught in such a course of public health implemented in Congo, which included a part on "community care". J. Chiappino’s experience for some Yanomami groups in Venezuela seems to share the same inspiration as far as "in the case of isolated groups, (...) badly known as far as epidemiology goes, (...) the existence of an area for training and coordinating is essential" (Chiappino 1992). For D. Bonnet (1990) an anthropological study of the representations of malaria "has been essentially useful to clinicians, demographers and epidemiologists".

Still for M-E. Gruénais (1995), the relationship between anthropologists and physicians tends invariably to disintegration. Although the physician is aware of unperceived aspects of his practice, he has difficulties in admitting the fact that it can be questioned, since this would address the very paradigm of modern medicine, the debt of humanity towards it and, probably, the dominant aspect of medical profession in other aspects of life. Some anthropologists do advocate for the medical positivism (Laplantke 1989). Medical people would tend to ignore the social mediations of biological causality, deal with "cultural features" as isolated variants they never are, and treat culture as the "subjective" and "bizarre" part of man that it is not; hence, statistical biases would go unperceived. Culture would explain everything including the medical practitioners' inability to do their job. See, for example, the case quoted by Benoist (in AMADES 1992) of a Canadian team unable to take blood from possessed people because "then they are the God"; as Gruénais remarks, another instant than a trance can always be chosen to take blood samples. For him, the physicians' demand towards anthropology could well have for hidden reason the reassertion of their own faith in medicine.

Conversely, anthropology does not succeed in appearing as a unified and usable corpus in training sessions, for instance as in Lyon (AMADES 1992). Anthropology often is denounced as "lacking clarity (...) talking about simple things in a confused way" (Martin 1990). It is also seen as lacking intellectual
The direct cooperation of anthropology with biomedical research is uncommon in France. The only example that we are aware of is the program led by A. Hubert with physicians at CNRS and the Institut Pasteur (see de Thé and Hubert 1989). It is worth mentioning since it shows not only that such approaches are not inconceivable, but also display some of the general issues at hand.

A. Hubert (Baré ed. 1995) stresses, like M.-E. Gruénais, the vagueness of an expression such as medical anthropology. She notes that approaches towards biomedical research are long in existence, for instance in the US (see the part played by M. Mead in the national council in charge of food and health problems during World War II), and also in Britain with the design and implementation of "community care". She notes, as M.-E. Gruénais, the poor part taken by anthropology in public health, partly due to the absence of relevant institutions. For her, as for Gruénais, any research implying cooperation with non-anthropologists is of an applied nature. She notes four items: biomedical research, clinical research, public health and prevention, and medical people's training.

As to biomedical research, she presents the program on nasopharyngeal carcinoma undertaken some ten years ago in cooperation with a virologist at CNRS and Institut Pasteur, G. de Thé, and other medical people at Centre International de Recherche sur le Cancer (C.I.R.C. of W.H.O.). The initial demand for an anthropological analysis was due to the classic statistical analysis' inability to explain the extremely contrasted distribution of this cancer with peaks in China, Tunisia and Greenland. Inadequate enquiries would lead to redundant conclusions, such as the cause for this cancer's diffusion, especially in China, being "Chineseness". The physicians would then look for "environmental factors".

Anthropology and bio-medical research

Rigor (Desclaux 1989). As Benoist (in AMADES 1992) puts it: "Informed positions (i.e. by anthropologists) about pathology, therapeutics, etiology are a required condition of any kind of cooperation. Otherwise, how could they (medical people) take seriously statements on their field by people who do not know what they are talking about; see for example this classical question about 'how do (traditional) curers heal' without asking 'do they heal or not'?" For him, "when anthropologists are not aware of medicine as a knowledge and a process of action altogether they expose themselves to real aggressions." (ibid, my translation). For M.-E. Gruénais, one main course to smooth out the difficult relationship between anthropologists and physicians in France would be to deal with this very relationship as pertaining to basic research, while being firmer on the question of anthropology's definition by physicians.
For Hubert, these factors were actually pertaining to an ethnographic approach of "ways of life". This would imply a reversal of the classical position of medical analysis (thinking of people as divided between "ill" and "healthy") for a qualitative approach seeing what the three communities or sub-communities at hand would have in common.

Hubert stresses the difficulties of "tuning" required by necessary cooperation, due to the views of social sciences held by medical people. First, with the physicians themselves, who would tend to think of ethnography as a kind of osmotic - or even "feminine" "intuition", and not as a professional practice; second, with biostatisticians, for whom the very existence of individuals and not of communities is the very ground of professional practice. She acknowledges the compelling necessity for the anthropologist in this kind of situation to devote a specific effort to arguing clearly his or her position. This position can be summed up in the possibility of relating new qualitative data to quantitative analysis. In this case it brought out results sufficiently consistent to be considered as such by biologists. She stresses the determinant importance of the effort of "tuning" to be consented with bio-medical research professionals, and the specificities of their professional practice. For instance the way of presenting published materials; the amount of publications possible and required (much more important in the case of physicians, but comporting important redundancies); the delays required. For A. Hubert, anthropology is slow to the eyes of hurried biophysicians, who take considerable time to admit it.

Whatever the real areas of cooperation and applied research, public health should not be left only in the hands of people describing themselves as "hard scientists". Anthropological research for implementing prevention systems in France and abroad should play a major part in French research. The importance of medical people's training to anthropology also is stressed, while remarking, as noted by M-E. Gruénais (Baré 1995a), that this course should include aspects considered "useless" by the medical side (such as kinship, study of myth etc.). In other words, the definition of anthropology should not be left to physicians.

This is due to another "parallaxe" effect, as noted by Gruénais, that medical people agree to leave culture to anthropologists if the last ones reserve them human life; and conversely. In that case, cooperation with biomedical research is hardly possible.
CONCLUSION

It is hardly conceivable to "conclude" on such a wide range of subjects given only that they pertain, in one sense, to French history. One can recall the contrast between a general distrust in France towards "applying" anthropology and a good variety of endeavors pertaining to some kind of application. Therefore stating the absence of an "applied" or "practicing" anthropology in France would be inaccurate; the absence of "applied anthropology" as a specific sub-discipline or as embodied in specific institutions would be more to the point. This implies conversely a lack of systematic collective reflection regarding the process of application itself, including its intellectual as well as professional aspects. This void is precisely what the research group here represented undertook to fill.

NOTES

1. Directeur de recherche à l'ORSTOM
   Unité Mixte de Recherche ORSTOM-CNRS "Regards", Bordeaux.

2. These lines attempt to summarize the main points of a collective reflection undertaken in 1990 by members of two national institutes, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (C.N.R.S.) (G. Lenclud, A. Hubert) and ORSTOM (Institut Français de Recherche Scientifique pour le Développement en Coopération) (B. Albert, M-E Gruénais) in collaboration with O. Herrenschmidt (University of Paris X) and P. Lamaison (C.N.R.S.), within the Action Scientifique Programmée between ORSTOM and CNRS. This group has been labeled as GRAF (Groupe de Recherche sur l'Anthropologie Appliquée ou Finalisée en France et hors de France) in various occasions. This program has given way to a book referred to as Baré ed. 1995. It involved interviews or written exchanges with dozens of professionals that cannot all be quoted here. These positions do not pretend, at any rate, to represent the official or institutional point of view of French anthropology. Special thanks to Annie Hubert for improving greatly the English.


5. As it will be recalled, ORSTOM's research programs seem to be defined more intuitively, within the very broad indications of the Institute's general policy. It is interesting to note that one of the only professional anthropology associations clearly devoting itself, amongst other goals, to applied matters is concerned with development issues (APAD or Association Euro Africaine pour le Développement et le Changement Social).

6. Some specialized post graduates degrees in D.E.S.S. mainly in Paris could be quoted.

7. Centre de la Vieille Charité, Marseille, président J-P. Olivier de Sardan.

8. c/o Laboratoire d’Ecologie Humaine, Pavillon de Lenfant, Aix en Provence, Président Jean Benoist.

9. See the survey by a former Deputy Director M. Gleizes (1992) and Baré (Baré ed. 1995).


12. Since the first drafts of this text an excellent reflexion on the practice of fieldwork has become available in Olivier de Sardan (1995a).


14. It is true that very few of them being by anthropologists. A relevant example of this overdose of information could concern the recent reform of France Telecom. One could quote reversely the clear and intelligent study by A. Semprini et al. concerning the trading feasibility of a gold coin in France, Europe and the States, through the South African Chamber of Mines and A.N.V.I.E. (1993), conducted by a non-French anthropologist.

15. The "oral memory" gathers numerous commentaries about political pressures, but they concern quasi-exclusively the obtaining of posts by candidates at research institutions and universities. These pressures are generally considered to involve political "friends", not what they are supposed to do in their job.

16. One could quote here the French saying "do not eat with the Devil, even with a long spoon". (My translation)
17. As the sociologist M. Jollivet, long in change of P.I.R.E.N. (Programme Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur l'Environnement at C.N.R.S.). (Seminar held at Paris X, 1991)


19. Two of the most senior ethnologues régionaux are F. Calame in the région Nord-Pas de Calais and C. Jacqulin in the région Midi-Pyrénées. Reports and valuable documents can be found at Direction du Patrimoine Ethnologique du Ministère de la Culture 65 rue de Richelieu 75002 PARIS.

20. For ORSTOM see the Centres de Documentation, CEDID 213 rue Lafayette 75480 PARIS Cedex 10 or Fonds Documentaire ORSTOM, 72 route d'Aulnay 93143 BONDY Cedex (data base). Amongst the recent experiences a notable one has been the creation of An Office Culture Kanak in the 1980s, in New Caledonia (an Overseas Territory of France or T.O.M), through the collaboration of political leaders like the late J-M Tjibaou and anthropologists like A. Bensa, from E.H.E.S.S. (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales).

21. A founding institution to that regard has certainly been the former Laboratoire d'Ethnobotanique at the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle founded by J. Barrau and C. Berthe (M.N.H.N., CNRS), now an Equipe de Recherche Associée of CNRS labeled Ethnobiologie.


24. As the Monde columnist C. Sarraute was stating about recent fashionable expressions, "ne dites pas les habitudes de la maison, dites, la culture d'entreprise" (do not say "the household routines", say "the corporation culture"). The passage from "staff" to "human resources", from "public relations" to "communication" has been commented by numerous observers.

25. SHS (directed by A. Etchegoyen), Argonaute (directed by D. Desjeux), QIPO (Pantin, directed by C. Neveu).

26. Since the first drafts of this text a book gathering different articles by J-P. Olivier de Sardan (1995b) indicates a "modest and minimal instrumentality", and addresses mainly the social forms at hand in development projects.


29. This team which works within a research unit devoted to "development models and realities" includes now about 20 researchers and research associates that cannot be all quoted here.

30. Institut d'Etudes Créoles, 29 Av. R. Schuman 13000 Aix en Provence. CIRELFA (Centre International d'Etudes de Recherches et d'Etudes en Linguistique Fondamentale et Appliquée, dépendant on Agence de Coopération Culturelle et Technique or A.C.C.T.). CIRELFA regroups research from various Universities participating in AUPELF, devoted to "la francophonie".

31. For various examples of this approach see Gruénais ed. Cahiers des Sciences Humaines "Anthropologie et santé publiques" 28, 1 1992, Paris, ORSTOM.
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