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2.0  OBJECTIVE

After reading this Unit you will be able to:

• know how different theories attempt to explain ethnicity and identity;
• understand how these theories have attempted to take account of the consequences of interaction between different groups and communities; and
• explain how the process of formation of human identity is very different from the biological process of evolution.

2.1  INTRODUCTION

In this Unit, we will try discuss some of the major theories that have attempted to explain how identities get formed in societies. Philosophers have said that human beings are a social animal. This entails that every individual belongs to a collectivity larger than his or her personal being. These collectives could be of different kinds, it could be a family, a religion, a club etc. These collectives provide the individual with a sense of belonging and also at the same time distinguishes this individual from others who belong to different collectives. This could be the most rudimentary and general working definition of identity. Based on this we can say that identity is what distinguishes and identifies an individual or a community. This criterion of sameness and difference is based on some material markers such as dress, food habits, rituals, faith, language, culture etc. or what an anthropologist would call ethnic traits.

Defined in these terms, identity not only becomes universal but also infinite, since there is a possibility of multitudes of collectives to exist across time and space. However, it ought to be noted that all identities are not of the same order. Even if an individual may be a member of different collectives enumerated above some are more salient than the others in the sense that they become the operative and dominant form of identification. For instance, ethnic and political identities
may be more salient than membership to a hobby group. Further more some identities such as ethnic identity may be trans-historical but certain other identities such modern nation states are a product of definite historical period.

Furthermore, as we know that it is given historical experience that no ethnic community exists in isolation. It is always surrounded by and relates to different communities that it identifies as its other. But even though these communities are different from each other they always relate or trespass on each other. What are the myriad ways in which various identities relate? What impact does it have on the construction of identities? These are the questions that various theories of identity seek to address and unravel. In this unit we will endeavour to discuss some of these theories viz., the diffusionist, the primordialist, the modernists/ constructionist and finally the dialectical. In the appendix, you will find a brief note on identity and territory in this regard.

2.2 DIFFUSSIONIST THEORY

Let us now discuss the first theory, viz. the diffusionist theory. This theory is a very specific anthropological school of thought that rose to prominence in the mid 19th century. This period of the 19th century is significant since for the first time in the history of modern social science, culture of non-literate people were made the object of academic study. This inclusion of non-elite cultures in academic inquiry provided the anthropologist with a diverse range of cultures. As per the norms prevailing at that time the anthropologist attempted not only to classify and order the existent cultures on a scale of relative development but also to make sense how humans progressed from primeval conditions to superior states. Among the major questions about this issue was whether human culture had evolved in a manner similar to biological evolution or whether culture spread from innovation centers by diffusion.

Diffusionism, as an anthropological school of thought, was an attempt to understand the nature of culture in terms of the origin of culture traits and their spread from one society to another. Adherents of this theory believe that ethnic communities develop not so much through invention as through imitation i.e. diffusion. An extreme example of this view is the work of Smith and W. J. Perry, who hypothesized that the entire cultural inventory of the world had diffused from Egypt. The development began in Egypt, according to them, about 6,000 years ago. This form of diffusion is known as heliocentrism. They believed that “Natural Man” inhabited the world before development began and that he had no clothing, houses, agriculture, domesticated animals, religion, social organization, formal laws, ceremonies, or hereditary chiefs. The discovery of barley in 4,000 B. C. enabled people to settle in one location. From that point invention in culture exploded and was spread during Egyptian migrations by land and sea.

However, all diffusionists do not agree with such a direct causal analysis of diffusion. Boas emphasized that culture traits should not be viewed casually, but in terms of a relatively unique historical process that proceeds from the first introduction of a trait until its origin becomes obscure. He sought to understand culture traits in terms of two historical processes, diffusion and modification. Boas used these key concepts to explain culture and interpret the meaning of culture. He believed that the cultural inventory of a people was basically the
cumulative result of diffusion. He viewed culture as consisting of countless loose threads, most of foreign origin, but which were woven together to fit into their new cultural context. Discrete elements become interrelated as time passes. Boas was a pioneering anthropological field worker and based many of his concepts on experiences gained while working in the field. He insisted that the fieldworker collect detailed cultural data, learn as much of the native language as possible, and become a part of the native society in order to interpret native life “from within.” Boas hoped to document accurately aboriginal life and to alleviate the bias of “romantic outsiders.” He used the technique of recording the reminiscences of informants as a valuable supplement to ethnography.

By World War I, diffusionism was being challenged primarily on two grounds. The first ground was that in analysing diffusion this school give too much importance in identifying the individual units of cultural traits or artefacts but under analyses how different elements that go on to constitute a culture or an identity relate with each other. Pointing out this analytical weakness, scholars argued that even if one could produce evidence of imported aspects of culture in a society, the original culture trait might be so changed that it served a completely different function than the society from which it diffused.

The second ground for their criticism was that their analysis overemphasised assimilationist argument of social development. However, there is enough historical evidence to show that ethnic boundaries persist despite interchange and intermingling, and cultural differences persist despite interethnic contact and interdependence.
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### 2.3 PRIMORDIAL THEORY

In the previous section, we saw how the diffusionist theorists argue that development of culture and identity is essentially a process of diffusion of traits and inventions from a ‘higher’ culture to a ‘lower’ culture. The primodialists do not agree with this interpretation of genesis and development of cultures, identity
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and society. For them this conclusion is symptomatic of a less than correct understanding of the constitution of ethnic groups. According to the primordial theorists the existing constitution of ethnicity determines how identities will develop, evolve or change. Ethnicity predates all contemporary processes since the members of human groups have an “innate” propensity to distinguish between insiders and outsiders, to delineate social boundaries and to develop stereotypes about “the other” in order to sustain and justify these boundaries. If this is indeed the case, ethnicity can be conceived of as being a universal characteristic of humanity.

One of the most prominent scholars in this school is Frederick Barth. Barth attempted to define ethnic groups and differentiate them from culture of race. For Barth ethnicity unlike race is not a biological category. Instead he defines ethnic groups as culture-bearing units with very specific organizational structure. He argues that ethnic groups in any region or geographical area are not groups formed on the basis of a shared culture, but rather the groups are formed on the basis of cultural differences. These cultural differences are a result of the principals of the internal constitution of an ethnic group that, as it were, constitute the boundaries between ethnic groups. Barth states, “It is the everyday actions, choices, situations and conditions in which each individual finds himself or herself, and with which they choose to identify, which makes a difference in how ethnic groups are made up.” Barth also created a model on how to analyze complex everyday situations by dividing them up by micro, median, and macro levels with each model acting as a feedback mechanism on the other. By connecting the levels he saw how a group has a sense of itself based on it how it interacts with others in the world community.

The concept of ethnicity developed by Barth could roughly be labelled a naturalist one. Although a main original contribution of his essay consisted in stressing that ethnic identities are created from within and not by virtue of “objective” cultural differences, thereby giving him the label “subjectivist” in some quarters, he also makes it clear, if implicitly, that ethnic phenomena are endemic to humanity and not to any particular kind of society. More specifically, Barth locates the emergence of ethnic distinctions to differentiation within a society and the concomitant development of divergent standards of evaluation and constraints on interaction. He shows that societies may be poly-ethnic and thus contain delineated and distinctive groups, that the boundaries of societies may be not only relative but also “permeable” in the sense that people may permanently cross into another society (i.e. another ethnic group), and finally, that the members of an ethnic group need not share all the characteristics deemed as defining of the group (a polythetic “family resemblance” is sufficient).

Thus, the primordialists give analytical priority to the internal rules of ethnic boundaries in understanding how individuals and communities will react and respond to outside world. However, in doing so, they overemphasize the role of traditionally available ethnicity in the formation of contemporary identity. While it is correct that some traits that constitute identity have their origins in tradition and past (these are the etic aspects of identity), there are aspects of identity that are constituted in contemporary times (these are the emic aspects of identity). Regrettably in primordialist theory there is a considerable analytical confusion in the classification of the emic and etic aspects of identity. Furthermore, there are several instances available to us historically that demonstrate that identities
and traits that claim the status of tradition and antiquity are in reality constructs of fairly recent times. E. J. Hobsbawm and Ranger have cogently demonstrated that what passes for tradition is frequently invented and of recent date, and that its validation antiquity is often spurious. Similarly, Wim van Binsbergen in his anthropological study of the Nakoya tribe of Zambia demonstrates that even though the tribes claims its existence since antiquity, in reality even the name of the tribe is the creation of the colonial period.
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2.4 MODERNIST/CONSTRUCTIONIST THEORY

Let us now discuss the modernist/constructionist theory of identity. The modernist/constructionist theory of identity view ethnic identities as more or less emic constructs that are responses to increase of political scale and creation of new political arena. They do not negate the possibility of existence of traditional traits and practices. Ernest Gellner, one of the most extreme and thorough modernist, states, “...a certain style of doing things may have an astonishing tenacity, and survive radical reorganisation.” However, for the modernist/constructionist theorists even when pre-modern traits, elements or traces do survive the change in organisational structure they undergo a fundamental change in form and function.

The view of ethnicity presented in Abner Cohen’s “Essay on the Anthropology of Power and Symbolism”, as well as in his important “Introduction” to his edited ASA monograph on Urban Ethnicity, identifies ethnicity with the processes whereby “some interest groups exploit parts of their traditional culture in order to articulate informal organisational functions that are used in the struggle of these groups for power” (1974a, p. 91). A few pages on, he elaborates the notion by adding, among other things, that ethnicity “involves a dynamic rearrangement of relations and of customs and is not the result of cultural conservatism or continuity” (1974a, p. 97). In Cohen’s analysis, ethnicity appears as neither more nor less than a form of corporate traditionalism, and is as such confined to modern circumstances - presumably presupposing institutional differentiation, literacy
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and the state. However, this becomes a bit too functionalist and fails to identify the emotive aspects of ethnicity, or to put it in other words Cohen fails to analyze and explain the spell of identity. Precisely because of this all modernist/constructionist theorists do not accept this analysis.

Arnold Epstein’s *Ethos and Identity* marked a decisive shift in focus of the modernists/constructionist study of ethnicity. Epstein calls attention to the identity dimension of ethnicity rather than the political dimension, and draws heavily on social psychology, notably Erik H. Erikson’s work, in arguing that “we need to supplement conventional sociological perspectives by paying greater attention to the nature of ethnic identity”. However, contrary to what one might fear from Epstein’s programmatic statement at the outset of his three studies, he does not leave “conventional sociological perspectives” out. Instead Epstein combines a cognitive concern with symbolic meaning and a foundation in sociological. In spite of these differences Epstein, like Cohen, considers ethnicity largely as the creation of modernity. His cases, from the Copperbelt, Melanesia and contemporary Jewish diaspora, indicate that the formation of ethnic identities, and that socially organised and orchestrated communication of cultural distinctiveness which constitutes ethnicity, belong to situations of rapid and uncontrollable social change - in a word, the impact of the modern world. Epstein’s social psychological approach could be seen as complementary to Cohen’s sociological view, in that it looks into the non-utilitarian and nonfunctional aspects of individual meaning creation in the process of ethnogenesis, but deals with essentially the same kind of social situation. Epstein’s view of ethnicity resonates with this perspective on humanity. He regards the search for, and psychological need for, a sound, secure and more or less bounded social identity as fundamental, and connects this need - under particular historical circumstances - to the formation of ethnic identities.

For the modernist/constructionist theory thus ascribe absolute generative power to the modern period in manipulating the past to construct identity for political or psychological needs. However, this reduces the historical materiality and anchorage of past and tradition, it is doubtful if traits and elements rooted in history will permit themselves to be moulded any anyway. Furthermore the modernists theorists do not provide a satisfactory answer to the question whether the elements which constitute an identity are given or chosen.
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2.5 DIALECTICAL THEORY

Finally, we will discuss the dialectical theory of identity. This theory of identity is generally adhered to by Marxist theoreticians and anthropologists. Adherents of this school reject the analytical practice of the primordialists and the modernists to grant absolute generative power to past or present in the constitution and development of identity. For the practitioners of dialectical theory identity is always constituted through a dialectical exchange between past and the present. It is not entirely accidental that one of the subtitles in the study of Nakoya tribe by Win van Binsbergen is “Nakoya ethnicity, articulation of modes of production, and the dialectics of consciousness”.

The formulation of the concept of dialectical exchange between past and the present in the constitution of identity poses a serious problem for theory. In effect what this theory argues is a process of exchange between two different orders of reality - the past and the present. What is more both the orders have there own specific weight, thus one cannot to be reduced to the other or be dictated unilaterally by the concerns of either. The analytical problem that is then posed is that how and why the two orders of reality should relate. Since both the instances being articulated have their own specific weight, the articulation can not be seamless. In fact, there are important constraints and limits imposed upon it. Not every past or traditional formation allows articulation with the present or to put it in other words the trespass of the present into its domain. A selection has to be made among the available situations which imposes a limit on the extent of articulation. Articulation occurs only if the situation produces certain affinities between the two orders of reality attempting to articulate. It follows that the articulation of the past or traditional formation with the present is never pre-given or general, in fact it is always selective -constitutive, subject to the constraints defined by the contexts involved.

How do affinities between the two orders of reality develop? Dialectical theoreticians have elaborated certain instances via their studies that can shed some light on this question. Analysing the re-emergence of the Nakoya ethnic identity Wim van Binsbergen points out that this was possible because of the specific articulation of capitalism with the precapitalist modes of production. This articulation was carried out in such a way that the precapitalist even though mutated and hemmed in by the capitalist modes of production continues to survive. This results in two different orders of inequality, first that of subjugation of the precapitalist modes of production by capitalism and second the unequal access provided to the ethnic communities sharing the regional space with the Nakoya to the commodities and services provided by capitalism. It is this dual bind of inequality triggers contradictions with the state and capitalism, as well as conflict and competition between ethnic communities. Potentially, therefore, these struggles can throw up a variety of identities such as class, gender, etc., as well as ethnic. However, which of these identities will get constituted/consolidated depend on the multitudes of subjective and objective factors that the conjuncture and its struggles throw up.

Construction of identity, therefore, follows the parameters of resistance or alternative mobilization required to combat the extent and scale of exploitation being faced by the community. Construction of this identity requires the use of elements made available to the communities along the fault lines of the past and...
the present. In the case of ethnic identity, where the competition with neighbouring communities provides the prime constitutive principal, cultural markers such as language, culture, pattern of work, leisure and consumption may not be the significant distinguishing traits. Indeed, an ethnic community might share these with adjacent communities. For instance Binsbergen demonstrates that the Nakoya share many of these traits with their adjacent and competitor communities. Similarly in the north-eastern states of India a tribe such as that of the Nagas share many cultural markers with their neighbouring communities with which they are in conflict and competition. Instead of these cultural markers the trait that unites the community and distinguishes it from its neighbouring communities is the particular conception that it has of their past. Defined so ethnicity is no longer viewed as a culture bearing unit, on the contrary ethnicity is above all a reconfigured past. The act of reconfiguration is the way present negotiates with the past in order to have a future.
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2.6 LET US SUM UP

In this Unit, we have discussed in detail some of the major theories that have tried to explain the processes of identity formation and its transformation. We have seen that theories have explained the process of identity formation in different ways. The diffusionist theory argued that identity formation takes place as a result of diffusion from one social group to another. It argues that the diffusion generally takes place from ‘higher’ culture to ‘lower’ culture. The primordial theory however argues that each identity is a result of intrinsic developments within a community rather than factors being borrowed from other identities. The modernist theory, in contrast to the above two theories argues that identities are political constructs. For example, nation, as an identity is a political construct. What leads to such processes of identity construction is political or economic or socio-cultural factors that lie in the present rather than long back in the past. Lastly, we had discussed the dialectical theory of identity formation. It argues that both the past and the present play an important role in the specificities that
an identity comes to assume in a given historical context. In that, the theory disagrees with all the above theories but also takes the major points from them to formulate its own distinct interpretation.

2.7 APPENDIX

A brief note on identity and territory

Till now, we have seen that every identity has a sense of time (temporal matrix) and a sense of community (social matrix). However, one can take this argument further and argue that since no community exists in an abstract space but instead are grounded in concrete locales, i.e. territory, therefore, every identity has a territorial matrix. I could not take this argumentative direction since all theories of identity do not give equal analytical import to territory in understanding the dynamics of identity and identity formation. For instance, Frederick Barth, one of the most prominent theoreticians on identity, gives far more weight to the inner organisational structure of an ethnic unit than on territory.

Even though Barth’s theory of ethnic groups and boundaries does take into account ecological perspectives, yet in his theory ethnicity developed more from criterion internal to the community than to any objective impact of external culture or territory. More specifically, Barth locates the emergence of ethnic distinctions to differentiation within a society and the concomitant development of divergent standards of evaluation and constraints on interaction. Consequently, territory does not play any significant role in determining identity.

Other theories such as the diffusionist and dialectical theories give considerable analytical weight to territory in understanding the dynamics of identity formation. Both the theories accept that communities do not exist in an abstract space but are rooted in a concrete territory. They further argue that this location of the community in a concrete space has a significant impact on how the identity of the community will be constituted and evolve. It will appear, therefore, that identity indeed has three matrices; since every identity claims historical origins it has a temporal matrix, since every identity is manifested in a community it has a societal matrix and finally, since every community inheres a concrete space it has a territorial matrix.

In spite of these agreements, however, there is a significant difference in the manner in which the two theories take account of the impact of territory on identity. The diffusionists view territory as the external parameters within which, as it were, identities unravel themselves. The dialectical theoreticians on the contrary argue that the processes of that constitute the territory in very significant ways determine how identities will be constituted in concrete historical conjunctures. In this Unit we shall try to briefly elucidate how the diffusionist and dialectical theoreticians seek to take account of the impact of territory in the formation and transformation of identities.

Diffusionist theory

The impact of territory on identity formation has been taken note of by certain type of diffusionist theoreticians. Advocates of two reflexes within this theory have been especially concerned with the spatial aspect of identity formation the ‘culture-area’ theorists and the ‘culture-centre’ theoreticians. Both these reflexes
developed in different countries while the pioneering culture-area theoreticians were American anthropologists the initial culture-centre theoreticians were based in Vienna. However, there was a common theoretical goal that both these set of scholars set for themselves, that was to understand the underlying processes where by cultures that evolved in specific histories and environment diffused outward. It was also demonstrated in the works of these scholars that by focusing on geographical aspects of identity formation one identify the original areas where the cultural trait in question developed and also the direction and various stages of the diffusion of the said trait.

Culture area theory: This theory was developed by Otis T. Mason in his path breaking article “Influence of Environment upon Human Industries or Arts,”. This article identified eighteen American Indian “culture areas.” It was a simple concept, in that tribal entities were grouped on an ethnographic map and related to a geographical aspect of the environment. The “culture area” concept was refined by G. Holmes.

These initial theorisations became the basis for the work of American anthropologist Clark Wissler. Wissler created a “landmark treatment” of American Indian ethnoology which identified eighteen American Indian culture areas. He expanded the idea of “culture center” by proposing a “law of diffusion,” which stated that “... traits tend to diffuse in all directions from their center of origin.” The law constituted that basis of the “age-area principle” which could determine the relative age of a culture trait by measuring the extent of its geographical distribution.

Culture circle: The “culture circle” concept was inspired by Friedrich Ratzel and expanded by Leo Frobenius in his Vienna based Kulturkreise or “Culture Circle” approach. This concept provided the criteria by which Graebner could study Oceania at first and two years later cultures on a world-wide basis.

The “culture circle” concept proposed that a cluster of functionally-related culture traits specific to a historical time and geographical area diffused out of a region in which they evolved. Graebner and Schmidt claimed that they had reconstructed a “limited number of original culture circles”.

Thus, the above mentioned diffusionist theoreticians restore territory as a crucial component of identity formation and transformation. However, even when they do so they have a very reductive notion of the impact of territory on identity. In their treatment territory appears as a canvas on which identities work themselves out. Thus, even when communities are based on concrete territories, the territories do little more than providing the base in the production of identities. However, we have numerous examples to show that territory has a much deeper and pro-active role in formation of identities.

As an example we can take anthropological studies on Bhil tribes in Madhya Pradesh. Several anthropological works testify to the role of location as a determinant for the internal classification of the Bhil tribes. Erskine has classified the Bhils into three categories: 1. The village Bhils (those residing in the plains); 2. The cultivating Bhils (those residing on the fertile foothill and slopes) and 3. The wild mountain Bhils. Lok Nath Soni demonstrates how the place of residence determined the social status of the different sections of the Bhil tribes. The
importance of Lok Nath Soni’s data is two fold, first that it is based on fieldwork and second it is based on the self-perception of the Bhils. Soni informs, “Bhils of Bhilkhera call themselves as Tadvi Bhil and differentiate themselves from Dhankas by saying that there are two types of Bhils: 1. Bade Jati ka Bhil i.e. Tadvi; and 2. Dhanka (bowman). The other types of Bhil are Ujale, Pitale, Langotiya, Mama, Malwi etc… (They) have received their names through their association with areas, dress, colour and ornament worn by them. The Malwi Bhils claim to be superior to other Bhils because they are enlightened due to contact with the city people and living in the plains. They wear dhoti and shirt like the city people. They have no marital relations with the Bhils of Rath (Rath forms the greater part of Alirajpur and Jobat tehsils in Jhabua district of M.P. The whole of Jhabua district lies in the mountainous region of Malwa).”

The diffusionist theoreticians fail to take account of this pro-active role of territory in determining identities, however, this is the subject matter of dialectical theoreticians such as Vim van Binsbergen.

**Dialectical theory**

Jhon Saul, Joel Kahn, Binsbergen and his colleagues from the Amsterdam Workgroup of Marxist Anthropologist have sought to shift the focus of anthropology from tribes to more comprehensive regional approaches. They advocate this shift because according to them tribes in modern era have never existed as isolated units. On the contrary they are confronted with political incorporation and penetration of capitalism. This process of incorporation and penetration of capitalism place tribes in relationships and process that is totally alien to the world of the tribal. Furthermore, the processes of political incorporation and penetration of capitalism require a level of abstraction that cannot be provided by making tribe as the unit of study. And yet, ironically, these are the processes that do not only redefine the world of the tribal but also their ethnic identity. Binsbergen has demonstrated that ethnic identity of a tribe is a consciousness emerging from the dialectic between on the one hand political incorporation and penetration of capitalism and on the other the struggles emerging from the resultant marginalisation, stagnation and poverty of local communities.

Binsbergen argues that this complex process can only be studied through an interdisciplinary approach that sits at the cross roads of anthropology, history and political economy. Perhaps to this we can add the disciplines of sociology and geography. Such an approach argues that units and objects of research are not already worked out nascent entities existing out there for a researcher to discover. They are on the contrary complex entities that can be elaborated on by a situational application of the tools of the different disciplines of social science to solve the questions that field work throws up.

For instance Binsbergen was confronted with twin problems; the first was the problem of the extreme marginalisation and poverty of the people who identified themselves as Nakoya, the second problem was that even though Nakoya identity claimed a historical pedigree it was of a fairly recent origin. The resolution of these problems could not obviously be derived from a research that focused on tribe as a unit of study. Binsbergen thus chose to focus on process that impoverished and marginalised western Zambia. This process was imperialism which imposed capitalism in this region. It was the major factor in the articulation of capitalism with the local pre-capitalist modes of production. Here, following
Rey, Terray and Meillassoux, he argues that the concerns of transfer of surplus from pre-capitalist to capitalist modes of production under articulation is best served if local modes of production retain their own distinct existence—albeit in an encapsulated and subservient form. A neo-traditional expression of this continued but subservient existence of the local assumes the form of ethnicity.

Indicating how this approach rescues anthropology from all kind of reductionism and also brings it closer to a more correct understanding of the present situation of tribal identity Binsbergen writes:

The analysis of Nakoya identity in terms of the articulation of modes of production brings out both the limitations of ethnicity and its power. In their ideology of ethnicity Nakoya express a partial interpretation of historical developments: they identify the Lozi as their superiors but fail to recognize the forces of capitalism and colonialism that lie behind Lozi domination. In this respect there would be some reason to consider ethnicity, with Mafeje, as ‘false consciousness’. Yet such a characterisation would be less adequate in so far as it underestimates the very real power of ethnicity—its emotional appeal. In the perspective of the articulation of modes of production we have the beginning of an explanation of why ethnicity can take such a powerful hold on people: ethnicity is revealed as an ideological reaction not to phantasms of the imagination but to very real conditions—the uprootedness resulting from capitalist penetration.
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