

# Review of: "Social-Cultural Anthropology in the Oldest Department of Anthropology in India: Writing History or the Suppression of Records?"

Peter Schröder<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal de Pernambuco

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read Prof. Guha's article with great interest since my research focus of the last fifteen years has been the history of anthropology, although I know almost nothing about the history of anthropology in India. Fortunately, I didn't become disappointed – much on the contrary! The article is very well written and structured, and its reason is evident.

The hook is a lecture by Prof. Partha Chatterjee which offers a kind of narrative of the history of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Calcutta focusing Physical Anthropology and Archaeology but assigning a minor role to Social Anthropology. This kind of narrative is accused Prof. Guha of being biased showing convincingly that it lacks empirical evidence by presenting detailed information about the long history of Social Anthropology at CU.

As we know, the history of anthropology is never uninterested as, by the way, any kind of history isn't. So, I became intrigued by the question what could have been Prof. Chatterjee's motive for his choice to present his version of the history of anthropology at Calcutta that way. I think it could be interesting to add this information to the article if there is any possibility to get access to it, because this could be another answer to the subtitle which Prof. Raj initially considered a little harsh.

The article contains many valuable information, above all for readers not familiar with the department's history and with the history of Indian anthropology as well. So, I think it could be even longer, since this wouldn't prejudice the line of argumentation.