

Dokundari, Bazari, Behbehuni etc Arabi Kargari, Hamami, Doulati, Luri, Babadi, Osiwandi, Garmsiri etc. In past lectures I have halfheartedly worked on this and in the earlier writings on space, place and time. N.B. *Shakati - new form of association.*

Need to write a paper on Modes of Identification. - Modes of production of Identity. For the nomads there is a multiplicity of ways of identity formation. How important is the movement one.

Note that in different contexts, identity marker, or point of reference will change in definite ways. The inside/outside marker becomes relevant here. There can be and often is a reversal of value on name used. e.g. Tribal is a term of denigration in one context and of respect in another. e.g. Luri. cf. the funny stories about tricking, play on names and on understanding in the stories of the thickhead Lur peasant in Isafahan who tries to get a free meal. How people take different meaning out of this story.

Also the Abruh quality of the inner man. Reputation /illname face etc.

So indeed inside Shahr Kurd, or Osiwand etc there can be many categorical distinctions by means of which people identify themselves, and distinguish themselves from each other. Geertz mentions 12 for his Sefrouis.

Think of Lali here, and all the social categories, from nafti to cousinship, trading partnerships - e.g. nimsudi, shepherds. Analysis what criteria are used - and how others see them. e.g. Babadi/Osiwands mutual dislike. Role of insult this. The manoeuvring of identity labels to produce and to avoid friction. cf Mash Barat's arbitrations. Fixed and relative status, and how different evaluations now being used. Contrast visiting Shahri Bakhtiaris at Nowruz in Lali Hajipur household, and in Seifabad household. Note the spread of marriages, the multiplicity of links in directional and wider contexts brings with it multiplicity of Nisbas.

Contrast and analyse what criteria, what Nisbas, Jafar Qoli, Mash Barat, Seifullah, Sultan Qandali all use. Tabaqeh: goats marry goats. Cf. composition of Zarraswands, with scribes etc. Wealth and status - e.g. wealthy Kalantars lower status than poor Khans. Class analysis reveals a similar contextual labelling.

Individuals are known by different Nisbas by different people - i.e. a person is and has a lot of nisbas. Not the same as Role at all because the Nisba is exclusively relational. What happens when people live in contexts when they have explicitly conflicting Nisbas. Embody contradictions. Two opposite perceptions of obligations pertaining to a role labelled by a Nisba which has outside/inside contrasting meaning. e.g. tribal leadership. Khan, Kalantar ? Rish Sefid. As one ascends the leadership hierarchy, the proportionate weighting of identity from inside, below on hierarchy, ascribed (heredity and legitimacy) plus perceived achievement (i.e. ability to define contexts in own terms) --- and identity outside, public, ratified from higher up the hierarchy, from above. The lower the scale of leadership, the more constricted, the narrower and more uniform and undifferentiated mode of production etc, the area, and political arena. i.e. less conflict between inside and outside perception of role and thus greater balance. The emphasis at lower levels has to be qualitatively more inner oriented, the Nisba, the relational identity therefore will reflect and confirm this. Indeed this turns out to be the case. Rish sefid - grey or white beard is a term which carries connotations of wisdom - i.e. inner knowledge. This term is qualitatively very different from the alien terms used higher up the scale. Kadkhoda, more so Kalantar, both of which are terms from outside, and have to do increasingly with power. e.g. Kalantari is word for police, control. Khan, and Ikhan are of course Mongol terms. - of recent introduction.

There are some parallels here, though one would need to look at all the other tribes for confirmation. But note the term for leaders in Luristan - Tushmal. Seen in Zarraswand's. The term is ambiguous and can mean despised musicians. There are a variety of terms for leadership which need to be carefully examined in semantic terms - cf. Bakhtiarwand terminology - the Mowri etc. The ambiguity of whether Babadi, Aurek had Khans, the area of settlement in the south such as Deh Diz, not to mention the Chahr Langs. The fact that the term Khan is recent and has now been devalued, as has Kalantar drained of its meaning, but not Kadkhoda, and definitely not Rish Sefid.

Leadership is not only very varied among Bakhtiari, but is relatively and very contextually defined, has always to be constantly redefined, constantly must be achieved. Ambiguity.

Intensification of conflict as one ascends hierarchy, because the leader is over an increasingly diverse area and population. There appears to be a maximum to this - mode of production - agric / animals stable leadership, or stability over time appears to be connected with land, constant flow of assets, accumulation of surplus wealth which in turn is re-distributed within and without.

Balance of inside/outside appears to be crucial where inside is Unity, communality, kinship and outside is a multiplicity, a diversity. The further outside you go the greater the diversity of claims on one. Use Khawanin family as perfect example of rupture between Inside/outside and Old/young. Get necessary increased div. of labour. Cell division into two (IK/HIK faction) replication of family tensions. Unequal inheritance - equal in terms of quantity, though note Garthwaites primogeniture, concentration of power makes rewards less easy to divide because of differential multiplicity. Get admin. division of labour - significantly into 'Foreign affairs' and Interior. Differently perceived. Follow the Yaghi Khans.

Power, oppression leadership, empty inside. Bakhtiari Khans like Shah. Real parallels between Ilkhani - admired enormously (retrospectively) and later leaders who were hated. Perception of illegitimacy. Came to power "be zur". Reversal, gradual reversal of values as one ascends - almost a suspicion of community values - fratricide and patricide - cf. Mohammed Taki Khan, and Ilkhan himself. Denial of kinship, of descent - family murder - meant over emphasis on affinity.

Use of history

Thus crucial to follow variations in marriage strategy - for which one needs always widest possible context, situation. One can infer thus from present data, to looking at marriage data of the past, and reverse the perception. One can read the situation by proper reading of marriage strategy.

In other words here I am proposing a method for historians/and anthropologists to make use fruitfully of each others perspectives and use of the data of each other. Expand this hugely.

By developing an analysis of the present from a dynamic, diachronic approach, helps to isolate not just the variables, but the perception and weighting of these variables, which when applied to the past should be illuminating. Historian and Anthropologist have a mirror perspective

Anthropologist can read from situation/ indiv, interaction in a sense in space, and apply to the past, to analyse genealogies, marriage patterns (where we have it) to read off the situation. Must be multi perspective. Thus in examining things, events from many points of view from many positions we can enhance our understanding of the thing.

Thus processual analysis.

Again this comes back to a calibration of time and space. The study of meaning, of use of language, is one of the most powerful methods of seeing through the surface, the appearance of things, of seeing dynamically into the past.

This obviously needs very careful working out, and much more thought to make it workable but it certainly makes sense to me.

An exercise in controlled interpretation, and learning to read the available sources of information we actually have.

A cultural, and symbolic analysis best of all.

See my earlier work on constructing group histories - the fortunes of various Oulads, Tirehs, Taifehs, families etc, - i.e. not only their political history although that is what it comes to primarily. Movements in territory, and correlating them with genealogical information. It is the alliance data, the marriage data which is the most informative, and can correlate degree of in/out marriage or better, the changing spread of marriages to political fortunes.

Alliance Histories are really only known by the women.

The history of marriages is crucial in this sort of system, because it CREATES the real potential-i.e. future, differences, and differentiation WITHIN family, oulad, lineage etc. The patterning in a synchronic sense can only be a pattern of accomplished marriages and does not reveal the underlying, and in a real sense explanatory level - the choices which were not brought to fruition. i.e. the marriages which did not take place.

It is here, that a study of the use of terminology, as labels for relationship reveals the NISBA sense of relational identity, in a very specific way. Not just the logical relationships revealed in an analysis of kinship terminology, of marriageable and non marriageable categories, and preferences, but the way these terms (relational labels) can be contextually manipulated, and is situationally defined.

How this is done tends to be patterned, balanced between the over riding concepts of outside/inside; of descent/affinity; male/female, Kin/in-laws; Agnates/affines, where the latter term in each case is covered, disguised, hidden, by the former. Also in terms of distant/close, and perhaps better general/particular.

The action of the latter on the former, is to animate, or bring closer together, to unify, or minimise the fissive elements in the former. The latter, particularises the former, which continues in the same guise, but more densely unified, the negative sides transformed. In other words these are not polar opposites, or alternatives, but act upon, interact with each other in different ways. Nor is just a matter of degree. It is something quite different, and to try to catch this dynamic, a active difference I have turned to enclosing circles to illustrate it. Quantity/quality would be another way.

However it is expressed, and the essential elements of this structure, which has been revealed in a multiplicity of ways in other domains, written about earlier, is that it is capable of a multitude of 'expressions', and moreover its structure, structures the situation to a degree determined by the relationships actualised in any situation. Perception, and interaction thus is both framed and filtered through this structure, which can also be characterised as explicit/implicit

The structure also is a particular variant of form/content, where each is transformed by and through the other. In terms of information theory we have noise/message - real message

Geertz's point about relativity squared applied even more to, or is virtually the same as ambiguity squared. This would perhaps explain or illuminate why public life is ritualised to such a degree, the rituals of Ta'aruf allow for the exchange or interpenetration of messages a chance to find a mutually accomodating level.

The action of affinity, alliance on descent, and it is important to note that these can not be considered as alternatives, or even as alternative strategies, although this is nearer the truth, but as mutually refining and interacting, - is to particularize agnates within the general group of agnates, and agnation as a principle, to highlight, literally energize, magnify, vitalize particular agnatic links. It has different effects on different kinds of agnates close/distant. For distant agnates - and the paradigm for them might in fact be strangers, outsiders, marriage alliance, transforms a weak descent relationship, a weak identity and cooperation, into a strong, vital one by the fact of marriage. i.e. alliance, affinity "creates" or rather brings closer, unites the particular units, i.e. individual families involved. But unless there is a multitude of such ties, it does not necessarily bring obligations of agnation with it. If a subsequent marriage takes place, then the marriage is an affinal link, with a MB- da'i group. Close affinity outweighing distant agnation. Such a marriage can be for many different reasons, and the many reasons leading up to such a choice determine the perception of the marriage - it is remember both an agnatic and affinal marriage.

One can have one-off marriages of this sort, in this case the major reason is likely to be political - i.e. a marriage exclusively in the hands of men, and male negotiations. This is an extraordinary political marriage (Bourdieu's terms). It may be a marriage of defensive necessity, so we need to know whether it is a male marrying an out female, or an out male taking an in female; or it may be a last ditch negative marriage imposed from outside. The women involved in such cases can be defined in terms of variable status - either age of the girls, or their mother's status.

OR it may be an aggressive outward looking alliance with a high status, or politically important outsider. In other words, the same type of marriage, the same structure, does not tell us anything about the effects of the marriage, or the reasons why it was conducted.

A structural analysis is thus likely, more than likely not to be very useful, but will give rise to "apparent contradictions", which as far as I can see are contradictions in the theoretical approach used. A structural type analysis can only be misleading, because it over stresses form, and groups (Murphy and Kasden) while ignoring the actual content. cf. Peters analysis of the feud likewise. The analytic methods of almost all anthropology in the Middle East can not penetrate the 'appearance' of things at all - because it ignores the essential element of the production or the organisation of the social environment in such a way as to maximise one's active participation in this environment. We are dealing here with a self defining environment. Identity is crucially contextual, relativistic situational, and apparently maleable individualism. What I am suggesting is that success, survival, mode of operation is to interact with the situation, context in such a way as the individual defines the context in his terms. i.e. the relational forms of identity reveal the essentially interacting creating becoming mode of life - i.e. continuous movement which the environment demands for optimum use. Flexible community, flexible sociality essential and within it a protected individualism, which publically postures and parades under a multitude of public persona, public faces, relational identities, contextually relative and situationally relative. We have thus a system defined exclusively through fluid dynamic interaction where everything is patterned in a pettening potentiality. The emerging pattern is a product of interaction, maskering as its own successful future, so the language of expression is always impression-istic, impressing personalities, rugged individualism, proactive honour on these relative ill defined contexts. Success is a matter of IMPRESSING one's own definitions, identity on a situation. Opportunistic leadership - brigands, heroes, successful rule breakers/definers

Leadership : the varieties of, and qualities of would appear to have much to do with IMPRESSING their personalities, their point of view on opposition and on followers. cf. the Battle of 1000 - emergence of Duraki power against all comers, not to mention the stories of Haidar Kur. The element of trickery, manipulating appearance - i.e. other peoples perception, the art of deception. farib -deceit, from this word get enamour, charming etc... The form farib khardan is used - to be deceived, literally to eat deceit, to incorporate it into one's understanding. Suggestive. Since leadership is, to a considerable degree achieved, is dependent on qualities of those with calims or who aspire to leadership. Personality loading of these positions is great - varies of course and interacts with ascription/appointed by Khans or Government.

Effectiveness of leader depends on his ability to sustain a command over, and consent of those who follow. cf. Barth for the Basseri situation - dyadic relats. Very different in Bakhtiari because more complex. This could be tackled at all levels illustrating very localised leaders, contrasting different Kadkhodas, different Kalantars (Osiwand history) Jafar Qoli's personal career etc. Choose different Khans - perfect example is Morteza Qoli and the change in perception of him by different people. Could select those Khans who were admired, hated etc.. Always increase of OUTSIDE support.

Examine the exercise of power; what are the basés of power How is support maintained over time. Alliance, marriage etc. Credibility? Payment. See the multiplicity of retainers. Lorimer's short paper.

Legitimate leadership and brigandage are part of the same TYPE opposite ends of the continuum. Brigand exhibits the qualities of leadership necessary, but can not stabilise legitimacy. Can not convert without force. cf. Shah and the arguments against him. Hero - successful. Brigand - failure. Bakhtiari heroes are the brigands in the eyes of the government. Government heroes, rewarded by government are regarded by Bakhtiari as traitors - "Nangi". Hero - pahlavan - Gard shoja' - a successful brigand. cf. Ali Merdun who was Yaghi as far as government were concerned. Qualities of abruh important here - the inner man, and here abruh is on behalf of other people as well - i.e. relational to his context. Jangi's father - a man of respect.

Khans seen as 'outsiders' - as in fact they were originally. Khan's seal - mohr - for documents and safe passage is important. Mohrmahr. - a seal is a sign, a mark, literally an IMPRESSION - in stone. cf. footprints, carvings, inscriptions etc are all IMPRESSIONS and impressive

Leadership - extra-ordinary human. More of than others. superhuman and is opposite/equivalent of beggar. Insider, who represents to outside, to wider world from which he originally came. cf. this theme runs significantly through Bakhtiari history. We are here also dealing with a sphere of influence Khans were autocratic, absolute rulers for 80 years, but not on the periferaries of their territory. Fine balance between legit. rule and oppression. Problem of consent. Hero - willing consent, freely given, because earned in situations. Brigand - unwilling consent given under duress (be zur) Not legit. Note religious connotations, mentioned by Simin on property not willingly given away by Landlords and thus polluting. Idea of consent, freely given - i.e. intention becomes very important, and needs to be pursued.

Issue of right, and rights to power, property. Note chaos of conflicting and legitimate claims to land stemming from different times - sealed by Khan's signatures

Another aspect of leadership I have alluded to concerns the nature of the "situation". The givens of any situation include location i.e. territory, which includes summer/winter pastures and rights to use migration route inbetween.

Location, i.e. control of land, of an area, is something I have never quite figured out. Chahr Lang, then Bakhtiarwand, then Duraki, then changes in Duraki ownership/use can be seen in a number of places. So again we are discussing politics.

At least till half way through 19th century, an area that could be defended, even if only a castle, or rocky Diz, meant protection in the last resort. This meant agriculture and water. Control of agricultural land would possibly be the prerogative of power, leaders, and grazing land that of bulk of nomads. A division of labour here - leaders always less nomadic; tribesmen - nomads. These different modes of production involving different social relationships - anti-thetical possibly. i.e. differentiation of modes of production, of economy paralleled with differentiation of power, and leadership. Least differentiated the most vulnerable - i.e. animal wealth and the productive regime of animals that goes with it - pack animals etc. The least vulnerable is a combination of animals and agriculture, which thus requires development of social relations. Leadership- agric plus animals, thus involves a greater proportion of clientship relationships - agric. with kin, descent relationships in animal sector.

Different and separated principles govern a leaders relations with both these sectors. The reality of descent - for leader means his major political competitors are his closest agnates, brothers, cousins Distant agnates - weak descent, become his clients, settle round him they provide leader with labour force, leaving him free for administration - i.e. protecting his position.

Is their a difference in giving/taking women to both these sectors

Position of a leader - achieved his position by his extra-ordinary individuality, which EXPOSES him, detaches him from his peers from the community of "equals", entails re-attaching himself to that community - Marriage. Leader family, thus impelled to reduce competitive agnation by affinity transformation FBD marriage But at same time, his more differentiated position requires shoring up - again marriage to stabilise economic and political links with wider community, and more differentiated arena. Only answer is marriage.

Here we can see how this dual oriented - outside/inside system logically produces an increasingly patriarchal system seen at its most intense in leadership positions. The wider range of kin which a leader controls the more resources he has - marriageable young, M&F at his disposal. He maximises his political position by utilising a wider and wider marriage strategy, and he maximises his control over marriages through his successful acquisition of power.

It becomes both imperative and inevitable then, that marriage contracts become a major tool for political enhancement, stability continuity if a patriarch can make a wider and wider range of kin contract marriages for his ends. Thus marriages serve the political aspirations and strategies of the leader, the head of the family, taifeh etc. These leaders give their approval or not of all marriages within their group. So it his ends which are served best of all.

He can thus monopolize access to a group's major resource, its major productive resource - its women. The decision lies with him and he can thus diminish the future as well as present competition by a selective policy of not allowing his major rivals free choice in his own, their own personal strategies. In maximising his own position, he can not but effect the continuity of his power considerable because he would have to set up a chosen successor as his nearest effective rival.

The variability in fortunes of ALL groups over time - and we see the Khans collapsing in two generations, is that the very success achieved by one man ensures failure in the next. Every son, is a part of his father's strategy. These are his givens. Chance thus plays a significant part in the time of life to be played. Primogeniture inevitably becomes increasingly an issue. Status of mother is important and confers differential status. Demography thus plays a part - e.g. full bros - via half bros. Unpredictable alliances - Khans are ideal for this reason and very careful analysis is necessary. But the configuration of demographic givens is important in terms of amount of support/conflict one starts with. Need to examine the different life histories of the Khans and their sons.

So to inside the Bakhtiari - set off different careers and over time - with all the shifts in strategy, in situations which this entails.

The time element is important, so the PART element of a son is part of the events which his father's strategy helped to bring about i.e. RELATIONAL & RELATIVE contextually.

This is revealed in the marriages contracted by different leaders at different stages in their careers, and of their immediate family.

Start - may be high status wife, close kin, and later wives be of lower status. i.e. advantage to elder sons at expense of younger sons.

Start - low status towards higher status. So younger sons of higher status than elder sons. I need examples of this and how it might work. - hypergamy?

Each individual thus must be seen to be embedded in a wider network of densely textured kin and marriage relationships, which can be activated, transformed in various ways.

The net effect of this is that it produces tension within any community, group, because everyone is pitted against everyone else - unequal competition for female resources. Marriage thus becomes the nodal point of tension - it creates and dissipates tension always. Hence the necessity of seeing unsuccessful negotiations.

The tensions are patterned and over time are relatively systematic, but MUST thus operate under the veil of patriliney.

The whole system operates in terms of concealing and thus containing tension - at least temporarily. Like sitting on a permanently explosive situation, which many observers have commented on. When the veil gets torn, when social distance is reduced to the point of naked visibility then explosions are inevitable in the very nature of things. Peoples anti-other strategies are cruelly exposed as the epitome of individualism and thus anti other individuals - cloaked in turn as anti the community.

Men are thus impelled to active participation in an extreme way, they are forced into the public square, and the guest house, into politics. They are condemned to their public personas in order to ensure the continuity of their private personas - i.e. their lives.

Thus to are women condemned to the private world, to the truth which must never be revealed, because then men could have no room to manoeuvre - conflict inevitable. Tensions of this sort increase under settled conditions - the violence of the peasant and now the political violence of the city. We have the vibrant and constant threat of imminent implosion/explosion. Middle East society is thus best seen as a web of tensions pulling and pushing, expanding and contracting, and if both done to extreme you get a collapse inwards or an almighty explosion.

It is the capacity of the nisba system to do this - to create a Framework (lattice - cf. Bakhtiari carpets and rug blankets -squared within which persons can be identified in terms of supposedly immanent characteristics (speech, blood, faith, provenance etc) and yet to minimize the impact of those characteristics in determining the practical relationships among such persons in markets, shops, bureaus, fields, cafes, baths and roadways - that makes it so central to the Moroccan idea of the self.

Bakhtiari;

This can be applied fruitfully to lattice windows, squared carpets- chahr Mahali and Bakhtiari etc. To appearance hiding the personal presence within or behind. Mosaic patterns in mosques, to style and decoration. Iran contrasts with morocco in its very elaborat tyle work.

Apply to costume, to face.

The implications of substantive content of categories being hidden - classification as framework and a public framework at that is crucial in understanding Iranian social forms and the categories used to describe them - e.g. tribe. Even further it relates to the manifest latent in Iran ; appearance /reality; lie/truth.

" Pesar amo" is a Nisba with the ~~seman~~ substantive content hidden -i.e. alliance, affinity. It regulates the meaningful perception by other of substantive content. cf. Khan's illusion of Unity. Political aspects - i.e. public aspects of TRIBE - a ~~redational~~ adjective-"Tribal" etc is a frame of categories none of which reveal their substantive content. Note in Boyle and Lambton's Grammar.

Nisba-type categorization leads paradoxically, to a hyperindividuali in public relationships because by providing only a vacant sketch (and that shifting) of who the actors are (Doulati, sherkayi, Sharietc) it leaves the rest, that is , almost everything, to be filled in by the process of interaction itself. (this is exactly my lectures)

What makes the mosaic work is the confidence that one can be as totally pragmatic, adaptive, opportunistic, and generally ad hoc in one's relations with others - a fox among ~~ereediles~~; among foxes, a crocodile among crocodiles - as one wants without any risk of losing one's sense of who one is.

Selfhood is never in danger because, outside the immediacies of procreation and prayer only its coordinates are asserted.

Bakhtiari

This opportunism is a central element in tribal leadership. In the necessary strategic 'corporation' of Khans, marriage thus takes on a particularly opportunistic and hyper individualistic style because these marriages are explicitly political in nature - i.e. the details are filled in by actual marriages (interaction itself). In the complex environment of Khan's political arena - see lectures for details Ilkhan deploys his resources in specific ways, - thus creating a specific MOSAIC pattern reflecting the Ilkhan's Aspirations and creating a potential for future interaction defined by the Khan's strategy. Such marriages are statements of intent, and thus represent a mutual balancing of interests for the future - can be defensive, ensuring cooperation, threatening etc. minimising potential threats, disruptive of, fracturing of an area of opposition, an oblique attack against a powerful rival - e.g. Qashqa'i marriages - an attempt to support the potential rival of Qashqa'i leader etc. Marriage use to ally factions against other factions outside.

What thus strategy does - i.e. most marriages is to organise the fluid environment (the way symbols do - Sperber) in a way perceived to be most beneficial in long /short term for the actor in this case the Ilkhan or Khawanin family. To make a strategy work through time, such links contracted in one situation to improve the potential for success is to multiply such links again. -da'i marriages. EXPAND THIS.

This dispersal of personnel, serving the political aims, and helping make transformations in the role Khans played, i.e. in creating in part the political climate, requires a differentiation of labour which has the effect of diminishing the corporate interests of the descent group - the wider and more variegated the spread of potential links, the wider is the political arena which is "converted", transformed into KINSHIP style. - i.e. Nisba of alliance relationship becomes a referential mode of exerting pressures, speaking about relationships etc. A structural type analysis, not sufficient, precisely because kinship, descent and alliance are both activities. They activate each other but asymmetrically. Descent is the given the Nisba par excellence which disguises the actual substantive content - which is activated, brought about by alliance, marriage.

Multiplicity of devices which keep 'truth' or substantive content as far from public eye and anthropological investigation as possible. To a considerable degree it is not available to the people themselves, because of the constant process of converting in a qualitative sense descent (time) by situations, events (space) ?

Thus what varies in time is the qualitative elements of descent - i.e. its substantive content, its meaning, better its significance and potential. Descent is a given in tribal social life, but in no sense an absolute given. The rights, duties, obligations, which all come from descent, are embodied by descent. Descent and the extensive principle of agnation is the framework of categories within which people operate, and from which social interaction operates; in terms of which they interact. BUT - descent is, through endogamy, through inner orientation and the reasons for it, is ALWAYS qualified by alliance, by affinity - i.e. agnation and affinity interpenetrate each other. Descent is activated, by affinity. What endogamy does, marriage with an agnate is to highlight particular links of agnation within generalised agnation. It separates particular agnates from range of agnates. In other words it UNITES particular agnates, and thus SEPARATES them from other agnates. Marriage thus differentiates within the descent structured community.

The substantive content, the REAL principle of social differentiation is thus alliance, not descent. Descent merely fills in the outlines, a silhouette. Descent is thus a principle of gross public classification, and as an idiom of expression distances the operators from each other in real terms. So Geertz's comments about the self not being engaged and threatened in public interaction can be extended very fundamentally to TRUTH. The mode of public expression thus is always in terms of categories which all function in maintaining a qualitative separation within the categories themselves. Descent is a LANGUAGE OF UNITY, a LANGUAGE OF APPEARANCES, a LANGUAGE OF IMPENETRABILITY, a VEIL OF APPARENT TRUTH, disguising REALITY. The language of public discourse is symbolised by ABRUH. The concern with face, appearance, thus takes on a powerful and resonant significance, and can be understood in social terms, in terms of promiscuous interaction which is quite unlike that of caste. It is nothing like cast in fact, because FACE is revealed under constant redefinition. FACE is same as PURITY, must be constantly defended. It is an active mode arising out of interaction. To have face one must have a VISIBLE face. Men are thus impelled by definition of manhood into the PUBLIC arena. FACE is a social commodity which must be constantly displayed - flaunted in fact. The PUBLIC arena - the guest house, the cafe, the square is thus fraught with danger.

The confrontation thus of PURITY - FACE with IMPURITY - other faces where the outcome, like barter is indeterminate. Note all the idioms of expression. - Ta'aruf. Thus we can explain the FORMALITY of public relationships, the incessant ritualization of social public life.

This is intimated very clearly in the patterning and quality of abusive behaviour. Certain types of abuse are used almost as idioms of affection between 'friends' - e.g. pedar sag, pedar sukhte. This is often said forexample by a father to a son. Note the conjunct. of terms. Male human, male animal ; male human consumed by fire. If real father is dead, then this affectionate abuse becomes abusive. - again context determines meaning, how it is interpreted.

Madar Kos. - this is deadly insult - referse to mothers cunt.- i.e. female(social) inside and physiological most private. Casts doubt as to paternity, and thus attacks male control of sexuality of own women. A deadly insult.- because it attacks the inside, the substantive content - i.e. REALITY, wheras the pedar sag is merely an attack on outside, on APPEARANCE and is not so threatening.

Another form of abuse/respect is to use animal categories from the wild. Shihr - respect, hero, Shir Mard. Goraz - wild pig, doubly unclean - outside made negative by selecting unclean animal in its wild state. There is a definite structuring in all this which requires careful semantic analysis. Note also the confounding category of Shirzan. All these terms, in fact all N isbas, all language is a subtly resonant system of double interpretations. This is seen at its most refined/grotesque in Ta'aruf system which requires careful analysis - both structure of relations expressed but the ART is in its USE - i.e. praxis.

Important in USE of language is the cadence and rhythm, sequence etc, i.e. the qualitative aspects of language, of messages is a sort of dance of words which minimise conflict? e.g. repetitions of sequence escalation of flowery Ta'aruf - is a real balance between insult and respect. Functions to disguise intent - i.e. meaning, and message through use of irony, figures of speach etc, by polishing up appearance. The decoration of language seen at its most ornate in poetic forms and in particular in Sufi poems where the message is completely disguised - Hafez.

Thus one gets the whole issue of vigilant reinterpretation in Ijتهاد; in Tawid etc. This needs very careful following up.

Language of discourse thus functions as a vast apparatus of disguise, of veiling the truth, so the study of language use becomes imperative, the study of style supremely important in Iran.

In other words anthropological understanding is forced to stand INSIDE, to be able to interpret the categories of public life. This becomes crucial when one notes that politics, and power, the perspective ofr the state, of history in effect is condemned to an examination of public statements of power, of appearances which are designed to be very persuasive. Note the conjunction between Folk model of agnation and the abstract distanced concepts of anthropology - descent etc.

The reason why the fit so neatly, in such an illusory way is very revealing - because the OUTSIDER persepective of thr anthropologist ANALYTICALLY coincides with the public strategy of language categories. in the Middle East whose purpose is to DEFLECT, reflect perception back on the observer. The very success of this strategy is shown by the marked failure of empiricist anthropologists, looking at events to develope any understanding of how these events can be interpreted.

He has failed to see the important fact that Middle East operates from these categories, or better through these disguised categories from the PRIVATE world of the home - hence WOMEN. The categories are deliberately meaningless in themselves. Thier meaning comes from something wuite different. Anthropologists looking literally in the right place, but from the wrong point of view - the outside. i.e. the right place is visible, massively so overterminedly so

and ITS VERY VISIBILITY proves to be its most effective DISGUISE. Like the stone lions, visible, and Shrines- invisible; Mosques visible, no, hidden in Market and bazaar.

Visibility is the perfect mask- where the overdetermination of public culture provides such an onslaught on the senses it blinds the truth. The subtlety of this is sometimes quite staggering. People see, not what they want to see, but what they can not avoid seeing - FACE, and are thus deflected, from truly seeing what is literally being presented to them. The art is in seeing through. PENETRATION. The penetrating glance - hence all the fuss and emphasis on LOOKING, and SAYING, the evil eye, dust in one's eye, the left eye, the salt eye, eye as source, sight, insight, foresight, protection of eyes, pervasiveness of glaucoma and full or partial blindness - facts - all devolve on the importance of SIGHT- i.e. INSIGHT. Eyes are dangerous. Mirrors, ainikari work etc etc... Sewins, devices of deflecting, of moving away from of getting out from eye of god, evil star, forces which penetrate. Absorbing/repelling are all crucial idioms to deflect away from BECAUSE anything that penetrates through is on the right track

The appearance of things therefore must provide the major defence against penetration of how things truly are. (Lies again)

CRUCIAL

The best defense against this is to present SELF as its total OPPOSITE. The conjunction of opposites is thus the major cultural mode. Appearance, surface, outside/ thus is literally the opposite of Reality, contained, inside. They operate in opposite directions.

This means all social forms have the structure of SACREDNESS and this may be why the entire area is so TENSE. The tension is set up by the necessity of conjunction of opposites. In other words separation is fatal. For one to be separated from the other brings disaster. It is in their conjunction that life is found.

Thus to separate objective/subjective, outside/inside, religion/politics is fatal to our understanding.

But the subtlety does not stop there. We have here a system of vibrating, resonating chinese boxes, reality infolded in illusion infolded in reality infolded in illusion - all is movement. Truth will never be attained - REVELATION thus becomes crucial for sourcing one's knowledge of the world FAITH, not knowledge.

UNITY IN MULTIPLICITY? MULTIPLICITY IN UNITY thus becomes the truth. Multi-perspectives - no, constant movement between both and therefore MOVEMENT is spiral. TIME dominates SPACE. Truth, i.e. the really real unfolds in time and we, bounded in time and space can only grasp at it, hence we must grasp through it to the centre or we MISS THE POINT OF EXISTENCE, LIFE ITSELF. ISLAM?

Perhaps this can go some way to explaining aspects of the current situation in Iran. Komeini and Shah are condemned to their own particular stances which the circumstances of the past 15 years now work to keep apart. Khomeini's problem is maintaining credibility now that he has the invitation to return. Since 1964 his voice has been authentic and been able to be so in its opposition to the Shah because he was outside the Shah's control - literally outside Iran.

He has been able to maintain a stance of total non-compromise but if he returned to Iran now, he runs the risk of being interpreted negatively, as having finally compromised with the Shah. How he did it, if he did would be crucial. In other words the particular way this unlikely amalgamation would be perceived depends on the FAITH in the moral strength of Khomeini not to be corrupted.