

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON HUMAN SOCIETY, RELEVANCE AND SIGNIFICANCE

Objectives

- _ The classification of men & animals.
- _ Evidence of kinship among animals.
- _ Evidence of evolution.
- _ Primitive & advanced animals: Specialization & generalized forms M a n , society & culture.
- _ Man meets his needs through culture

Introduction

What is essential thing for human nature? This question is often debated in social science & Anthropologists have attempted to study the essential nature of human beings, and "much more than anthropologist. psychologist & philosophers have thrown light on the essential aspects of human nature.

This section highlights more on man, society & culture as part of nature. The origin of man, origin of society & culture are perceived as being Inextricably linked, as having developed together from outside No one of them could have evolved alone, & none could continue to exist Without others.

The classification men & animal

As a first step towards understanding of man's physical structure we shall study the problem of mans relationships to the other animals that inhabit the earth. Is man a separate creation who has always been distinct from the animals? Or are Owe similarities between men and animal% which point to their common origin? Has man always possessed his present day physical form? If not how did he look in prehistoric times? Was prehistoric man more, or less, similar to the animals than the men of modern times?

Zoologists and anatomists have described and-classified animals, whereas physical anthropologists have done the same for man. The problem that now arises is as follows: are there two systems of classification, one restricted to animals, the other to man? Or may the various human types be included in that of the animal kingdom taken as a whole?

2

All comparative research in zoology, anatomy, and physical anthropology demonstrates unmistakably that man is, bone for bone and organ for organ, fundamentally like the animals. To some animals, such as the chimpanzee and the gorilla, man has numerous and obvious resemblances, to other, like the frog and the fish, his resemblances are fewer and not so easy to see. But all the animals in the great classes of fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals, up to and including man himself, are definitely interrelated. Further it is almost equally clear that this relationship extends also to all living forms.

Relationships among members of the animal kingdom are based upon homologies, structural similarities in the organs of animals concerned. These must not be confused with analogies, which are resemblances between organs brought about by a common function or use. This is a difficult question. There is no agreed answer to this question. Some include man in the animal kingdom. To which the organs are put. Careful comparison reveals that the arms of men, the wings of birds, and the flippers of the sea] are basically alike in structure, though widely different in function. These organs are thus homologous: the fact that arms, wings, and flippers are put to different uses may obscure their fundamental similarities in structure but does not deny it. Similarly, it may be observed that the chimpanzee's foot is used much as a man's hand may be: the chimpanzee can, for example, grasp a limb or other object with his foot in much the same way, it not as efficiently, as man grasps objects with his hand. Man's foot, on the other hand, is normally employed as a supporting and locomotory organ: man rests his weight on and walks by means of his feet. He can only rarely use them to grasp or pick up objects. But a careful comparison of the structure of the feet of men and chimpanzees shows them to be basically alike, despite their differing functions, and quite different structurally; in both men and chimpanzees, from the hands.

The wings of bats and birds may exemplify analogous organs. Superficially these appear to be alike, in impression gained largely from the fact that in both animals the wings serve the function of flying. When however, we come to examine these organs carefully, we find that the wings of birds consist of feathers supported by tissues attached to the forelimbs alone, while those of bats are composed of thin membranes stretched between the fore and hind limbs. In structure, then, the two organs are wholly different and cannot be taken as homologous points of resemblance between the two animals.

It is evident of course that there is not the same degree of resemblance between animals. Men resemble one another far more than they resemble any other animal. Men, apes, and monkeys have a great many more homologies in common than any of them has with birds, reptiles, or fish. Therefore, though all members of the animal kingdom have a few homologies in common, it is clearly evident that the kingdom as a whole can be broken down into many divisions and subdivisions. This breakdown is usually given in the following terms:

1. Kingdom The classification, which includes all animals and men, as opposed to plants and other non-animal organisms. There are relatively few homologous traits shared by all the animals; their number increases as the subdivisions (listed below) become smaller.

3

2. Grade.- A major subdivision of a kingdom. Two grades are usually recognized: the Protozoa or one-celled animals and the Metazoa or many celled animals. Man obviously belongs to the grade Metazoa.
3. Phylum (plural: Phyla) A subdivision of a grade. Many phyla are recognized within the Metazoa and man belongs to the phylum Chordata.
4. Class A major subdivision of a phylum. Classes are often further divided into subclasses. Man belongs to the class of Mammals and to the subclass Eutheria or placental mammals.
5. Order. A major subdivision of a class or subclass, often further divided into suborders. Man, together with the apes, monkeys, lemurs and tarsiers, belongs to the order or Primates. All but the lemurs and tarsiers, which belong to separate suborders, are grouped in the suborder Anthroidea.
6. Family A subdivision of an order or suborder. All men, ancient and modern, belong to one family, called Hominidae. No other animals are included in this group.
7. Genus (plural.- genera) A subdivision of a family. There is some dispute as to the number of genera to be found in the family Hominidae. It is agreed, however, that all modern men belongs to one genus, called Homo, which also includes a number of prehistoric forms
8. Species. A subdivision of genus; again there is difference of opinion as to the number of species to be recognized among men, but all modern men and some of the prehistoric types are usually placed in a single species, called sapiens.
9. Race or variety : smallest grouping generally recognized within the animal kingdom. A race or variety includes Organisms possessing, the greatest number of homologous traits in common A large number of races are recognized among modern men, but there is considerable differences of opinion, both with respect to the procedure of classifying mankind into races and the content of such classifications.

Embryological evidences of kinship among animals.

structural homologies are not the only evidences of interrelationships within the animal kingdom Further evidences may be found in the processes whereby the fertilized egg cell develops into an independent organism. Comparative embryology, which is the study of these processes between both animals and men, provides us with many other points of resemblance between the members of the animal Kingdom.

The processes of reproduction are in general most similar in animals, which are closely related. So for example, all (or nearly all) mammals give birth to their young

alive, all stages in the development of the embryo taking place within the body of the mother. Furthermore, the young, at birth are in a more or less helpless condition and must be fed and otherwise taken care of until they are able to fend for themselves.

The process of embryological development as a whole is fundamentally the same in all animals. All sexually reproduced forms begin as single cells which through a series of more or less complex processes become fully formed organisms.

In the earliest stages of their development, the embryos of most animals are very much alike- in this period of growth it is often very difficult to distinguish forms which are later quite different. As the embryo continues to grow, its distinguishing features slowly appear until at birth the offspring normally has the features which characterize its species and variety.

Here, then, we not only gain evidence confirming the essential kinship of all animal forms, but we also gain further verification of the classification we have set up on the basis of homologous structures.

Direct evidence of evolution.

Our classification of animals and men, as we have seen, is based upon homologies and is confirmed in many details by the data of comparative embryology. Homologies, it will be recalled, are fundamental similarities in structure. These similarities are not due to common function or environment and are too numerous and far-reaching to be merely fortuitous. The conclusions arrived at by some anthropologists is the assumption that homologies are the result of a common ancestry. Animals which can be grouped in the same species are thus descended from a common ancestor, those belonging to a single genus are derived from a more remote common ancestor, those belonging to a single family are derived from a more remote common ancestor, and so on until it is evident that all animals are ultimately from one primeval source. The appearance in the embryo of atavistic survivals and the fact that the process of embryological development is fundamentally the same in all animals further confirm this conclusion.

The following questions may now be raised: Is there any direct evidence that all animals are so interrelated that they represent modern descendants of a single earlier species? What data have we to show that species change?

Data offering a partial answer to these and related questions may be found in paleontology (the study of ancient animals) and in the branch of physical anthropology, which deals with the prehistoric forms of man. Prehistoric men and animals are known from skeletal materials found in the crust of the earth, from imprints of bodily structures made in soft materials which have turned to stone or fossilized, from footprints, and other traces of prehistoric forms which have similarly become fossilized, and less often, from whole animals imbedded, and so preserved more or less intact, in the ice sheets of Arctic regions. All such finds provide us with first-hand knowledge of older human and animal species. Moreover, since these evidences of prehistoric men and animals can often be dated relative to one another and to modern forms, we can sometimes provide direct evidence of the derivation of one species from another.

Primitive and advanced animals specialized and generalized forms

Before we go on to describe the principal events in the evolution of man we must define one or two notions necessary to an understanding of this process. Certain animals are said to be "advanced" or "higher" forms. The difference here is simply one of structural complexity. Lower or primitive animals are those, which possess a structural form characteristic of an earlier period in the history of the earth, even though such animals may actually be alive today and contemporaneous with advanced forms. The fish species *Latimeria* just mentioned is obviously more primitive than most have the modern fish, and present-day fish, taken as a whole, have a much simpler bodily structure than modern man. For one reason or another the fish have evolved more slowly and along certain specialized lines, while man, a relatively generalized animal has developed a greater structural complexity. Hoofed animals have acquired a special kind of foot adapted to running and walking. Numbers of other animals have color specializations, which enable them to blend with the environment and so escape detection by their enemies. A generalized animal is one that has few specialized organs but has developed instead along broad fundamental lines. Man's brains, hands, and eyes for example, are generalized features, even though they have developed enormously in complexity.

Unlike the neck of the giraffe, the hoofs of the horse, and the long snout of the anteater, all of which are specialized organs, the brains, eyes, and hands of man do not give him advantages in terms of any specific environment. Man is one of the few animals that are more or less generalized throughout and this may be one of the most important reasons for his survival and eventual domination over all other animals. The trend of evolution is in general from simple generalized animals to more complex specialized forms. In only a few instances have highly complex animals retained the generalized form of their simpler forebears. Man is outstandingly, such an exception, for though he is certainly the most complexly structured of any of the primates, he has fewer specialized organs than either the apes or the monkeys.

Man, society, and culture.

Anthropologists regard man, society, and culture as parts of nature. The origins of man and the origins of society and culture are perceived as being inextricably linked, as having developed together from the outset. No one of them could have evolved alone, and none could continue to exist without the others. The origin of culture is still shrouded in mystery. But, gradually, man's adaptation through culture became more and more complex. The use of culture had a limiting effect on the physical aspects of their further evolution. Those who were best able physically and intellectually to use culture - to live in society, to team, to store, speculate upon, and transmit their learning, to cooperate and communicate with others - had the best chances of surviving and passing on this unique ability. Those constitutionally less well equipped to make use of culture finally lost out and ultimately became extinct. Like man himself culture has also evolved. All men share with animals a common set of fundamental needs derived from their common biological determined requirement for survival. Among these are the need for nourishment and shelter, for the reduction of sexual tension, and for economic and social cooperation. Man's status as the most adaptable of the animals derives from his reliance upon culture

rather than upon genetically determined responses or structural changes to meet his needs. Their adjustment to a shifting circumstances was neither dependent upon discrete genetically determined changes in physique

The growth of a heavier shelf, stronger teeth, or a keener sense of smell - nor upon constitutionally dictated "instincts." Rather, it was dependent upon their ability to think and to alter their behavior accordingly to learn, unlearn, and relearn behaviors necessary to their survival under changing condition

The fact that man meets his needs by cultural means created for the student of man a paradox, for Homo Sapiens is extraordinarily flexible, capable of more adaptive valuable than any other animal. Yet once he is conditioned by his culture to meet his needs in particular culturally approved ways, "he often becomes so set in these ways that he would literally rather die than change them. Man's need for nourishment is universal. What differs is the ways he meets them. The need for shelter, for protection from weather and from predators, is similarly universal. The forms of shelter vary from the simplest windbreaks of sticks, waves, and dried skins.

Man meets his needs through culture

Man's fundamental needs can be met through reliance on cultural means, all cultures, however apparently varied, must fulfill certain common functions- The aspect of culture can be categorized as systems, as particularly organized ways of fulfilling requirements common to all men. These categories will be referred to as technological economic organization, ideology, art, and language. Culture as a single entity can be perceived as an integrated whole comprised of these categorically separable systems all meaningfully related and having as their principal reason for being the fulfillment of men's needs.

Technology The term technology refers to the system of tools-, artifacts and techniques used by the particular people to modify conditions and resources in their environment to meet their basic needs. (the need for food)

Economic organisation This term used here encompasses the techniques utilized in organizing the production and allocation of the goods and service required to meet their material -needs.

Social organisation. Man survives within some framework of social relations to provide a basis for relating to and relying upon other individuals and other groups for cooperation **Political organization** In every society some means must be provided for making decisions on matters that affect the group member's survival. There must be some way of controlling conflict within the society and some way of regulating its relation with other society.

Ideology Some guiding set of beliefs explaining the nature of the world and of man's relation to it and to the cosmos, always accompanied by some system of observances that symbolically reinforce these beliefs and sanction the actions they require, is still another universal aspect of culture. Among most of the world's people a major component of the ideological system is based on the concept of supernatu-

ralism that usually entails beliefs in one or more beings endowed with miraculous power gods, spirits, angels, demons, prophets, and so on.

Arts: Some systems of techniques of the exaltation of human experiences through manipulation of the senses are another universal aspect of culture..

Language It is the last of the major categories of culture to be considered here. The universality of language and its integral relation to the processes by which culture is learned, used, changed, & passed on are obvious.

Summary

The trend of evolution is in general from simple generalized animals to more complex specialized forms. In only a few instances have highly complex animals retained the general form of their simpler forebears. Man is outstandingly such an exception, for though he is certainly the most complexly structured of any of the primates, he has fewer specialized organs than either the apes or the monkeys. Specialization has both advantages and disadvantages. So long as the specialized form continues to live in the environment for which it is specialized, it is of course better fitted to survive than relatively generalized forms that have not the same equipment for adaptation. Under changing environmental circumstances, however, the generalized form can often hold its own and survive where the more specialized animal will die out. During one early period of earth's history, there existed a large number of highly specialized reptiles -the dinosaurs -, which were admirably fitted to live in the warm, swampy forests of that era. Along with them were a number of generalized mammalian species, relatively small in number and size as compared to the giant reptiles- Gradually however, the climate changed. As it grew slowly colder and dryer, the warm, swampy forests disappeared and with them the giant reptiles who depended upon them for food. Too well adapted to survive drastic change, the giant reptiles gradually became extinct, while the more generalized mammals were able to adjust, as a group, to the changed conditions and so survive. Man's origin is still shrouded in mystery. One of the most impressive explanation given for the origin of man is 'evolution". Man differs from other animals because of his culture.

Questions

- 1 . Bring out the quintessential feature of man?
2. What is the role of culture in human behavior?

Suggested Readings

In addition to other standard introductory texts that deal with the subject of cultural and social anthropology, such as Beals and Hoijer's. An introduction to Anthropology and Hoebe's Anthropology, the Study of Man, there are several fairly recent,

8

smaller books that take a different but essentially complementary approach to the one taken here. Among the best of these are Cultural Things, and Wolt's Anthropology.

For an idea of the essentially social anthropological approach by Beattie's Other Culture" Aims Methods, and Achievements in Social Anthropology. Bohannan's social Anthropology, Lienhardt's Social Anthropology, or Mair's An introduction to Social Anthropology.

The Anthropological Tradition - The Enlightenments Legacy : The Growth and Development of Anthropology in the 19th & 21th Century

Objectives

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ The Early Beginnings
- ❖ The Enlightenment Tradition
- ❖ The Idea of Progress
- ❖ Latter Theoretical Developments
- ❖ Summary

Introduction :

Anthropology is the systematic study of the nature of human beings. This term is derived from two greek words - "anthropos" meaning man and "Logos" meaning to study or science. The scope of anthropology is very vast. Ranging from subjects like supernatural beliefs of people eating habits, the differences between the physical structure of tribes, this social behavior, languages used in different society. Position of woman social structure of different groups.

Anthropology may be separated into two major divisions. Physical and cultural. The understanding of human behavior in a total context has been a constant commitment of anthropologist and is often referred to as a holistic approach. The origin of anthropology can be traced back to the civilization of Europe and the middle east. The Greeks and Romans are said to have laid the foundation for anthropology as they did for "aesthetics", "Natural physics", "logic", "history" etc.

The Early Beginnings :

The earliest statement of anthropology perspective is said, to be made by Xenophanes in the 5th century B.C. He was a Greek, who was credited with being the first philosopher. Who stressed that society is created by human beings themselves. Another Greek who is said to have contributed to the early beginning is Herodotus. The beginnings of anthropology among ancient writers is based on their interest in history and their curiosity about natural science. The writings of Herodotus described the life-style of about fifty different peoples whose he visited during his travels. His methods were crude but his

perspective was broad enough to satisfy modern standards. He described the environment systematically and gave a detailed account of people, their physical characteristics and language. Socrates and Plato put both a fairly advanced social political and cultural analysis. So much so that their commentaries are still useful. The nature of human society continued to be a matter of concern throughout the classical period but anthropology did not develop as a identifiable social science for many centuries.

The Enlightenment Tradition :

The disintegration of Roman society by the 5th century A. D. saw the beginnings of a new perspective broadening understanding of the nature of man and society. As the Roman Empire gradually collapsed, the progressive and positive views of the classical civilization faded away by the time St. Augustine in the 4th century to a new idea arose especially that human beings are inherently alienated from divine perfection and order. The medieval period was dominated by religious orthodoxy but did throw up interest in the social environment. The adventures of traveling merchants and Christian missionaries encouraged an interest in history and specially in non-European peoples. Thus this age produced works describing wide variety of foreign people, their customs and way of life as well as serious attempts to analyze their political organization, legal system and other social phenomena; the later renaissance also witnessed new advances in the natural sciences, especially astronomy and biology. During this period Europe also began to widen its horizon. Voyages of discovery and conquest brought language of unrecorded people to challenge the traditional interpretation. A divine history accounts of new lands and people became popular and these accounts provided descriptions of physical appearance, dress, customs, food, habits. Political systems and religions of strange and remote people who were being discovered by an expanding European civilization. The information which they had wasn't accurate but it still formed the basis for comparison by social theorists of primitive society with European society in order to study and understand basic social processes.

This period is known as Enlightenment. (18th cent A.D.) that is the hundred years or so between Locke's essay on human understanding to the French revolution is said to have given rise to modern anthropological theory. This period in western civilization marks a watershed in the development of new and revolutionary ideas especially in the social sciences. The enlightenment period encouraged different views and debates regarding the nature of human beings and societies. The arguments were wide ranging from Hobbes hypothesis about the natural state of man to liberal philosophers such as Locke who advocated democratic institutions in the belief that the human species had great potential. By the eighteenth century Montesquieu and Vico had begun to describe evolution and progress as the guiding force of human societies. They attempted to describe evolutionary stages, stages of social development and natural law governing society.

The Idea of Progress :

The idea of progress, focusing towards releasing man's full potential and his human nature, as he is the one who creates civilized society. The idea of

progressive advancement in humans knowledge was carried by the French by Fontanelle in 1688 (Buy 1920). The scientific and technological revolutions of the eighteenth century and social, political revolution had accompanied wide change. Which eventually resulted in difference a ideas; then later on due to scientific orientation and the age of reason promoted a view of universality where in Natural law” In this stage man was first as subject to these laws as all other things were universal as organic a ignorance. A focus an ideas directed more attention; towards group achievement rather than to doings of individual kings etc.

(1) Later Theoretical Development :

In the second half of the 19th century, anthropology became a separate academic discipline. Along with colonization. Another event lead to the increased interest in primitive people of the world. Scholars began to look for accurate data regarding remote people having simple technologies as these could be used to provide a base for the study of social evolution. As a result several scholar began comparative studies covering wide-ranging subjects like kinship system. Religion different elements of culture etc. Lewis Morgan (1818-1881) showed almost more than fifteen stages of development of marriage and family beginning with promiscuity and ending with monogamy. Edward Tylor (1832-1917) showed about the religious beliefs and culture which has been developed from certain observation of phenomena such as dreams, trances, vision, diseases, waking and sleeping his and death. Thus the influence of the evolution is evident is the works of the scholars of the 19th century.

Two major approaches to the comparative perspective emerged in the 19th century. One was the school of classical evaluation. Who processed on the concept of progress it made an attempt to reconstruct the hypothetical cause of development of societies and tried to show that evolution of societies followed a universal pattern. The idea of nonlinear evaluation was supported by scholars like Tylor, Morgan, Engels 2 others. According to them, cultural developments everywhere fallow certain definite laws.

The other major comparative trend dressed the development of cultural traits over geographical areas. This was concerned with life appearance and distribution of cultural phenomena in different-regions the importance of natural environment in development of culture. Cultural similarity in different societies reflected from a discussion and migration of culture. These two approaches had their own limitation and in the meantime Franz Boas (1858-1942) emphasized the importance of gathering concrete data, ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological and biological and called for a pause in the building of grand theories.

(2) The Twentieth Century :

The evolutionary theories of the 19th century were attacked by the diffusionists and the functionalists. The criticism of the diffusionists was based on the fact that culture is give borrowed and does not necessarily emerge in similar norms in different societies by spontaneous growth; the social life was explained in times of its past. The evolutionary approach does not explain like functioning

of society, only its history and its past development. The 19th century anthropologist were criticised for reconstructing history without adequate material for doing so and seeking to establish laws by a method which cannot had to their establishment this brought a separation of social anthropology ethnology.

The 20th century began to be dimidiated by functional orientation. Two scholars who directed social anthropology towards functionalism were Spencer and Durkheim. Spender stressed that at every stage in social evolution there is a necessary functional interdependence between the institutions of a society which must always tend towards a state of equilibrium of it is to persist. Durkheim said that social facts exist outseck and apart from individual menial can be understand only is its relation to after facts of the same order. Durkheim has a direct influence as social anthropology and his importance in history is because of his influence on Radcliffe Brown and Malinowski, who have shaped modern social anthropology. The functionalists insisted on the relatedness of things which has been partly responsible to and partly the product of modern field studies. Thus, it became necessary to have comprehensive studies of primitive societies. The functional approach changed the nature and object, research from speculative reconstruction a culture to the study of particular societies.

During the 20th century anthropology has developed into an increasingly complex and segmental academic discipline. Many theories and many law have emerged so much of anthropology is rooted into broad perspective of earliest giants.

Summary :

The earliest beginnings of the anthropological perspective can be traced to the Greek travelers Xenophanes and Herodotus. They described in detail the complete way of life of the people they visited. Social thought flourished during the Greek city - states too: Socrates and Plato put forth fairly advanced political commentaries, which are relevant even today. Social thought during the Medieval period was dominated by religious orthodoxy and the Church, Classical works of early civilizations were discovered by European scholars after the 13th century. With the Renaissance new advances began to be made in natural sciences and social and political thought. Explorers, voyagers and missionaries began to provide detailed descriptions of strange and remote peoples being discovered by expanding European civilization. This period, known as the Enlightenment brought into existence, modern anthropological theory. Thinkers such as Hobbes put new revolutionary ideas forth. Locke and Rousseau. The fathers of modern social science, Montesquieu and Vico described evolution and progress as the guiding force of human societies.

The late eighteenth and first half of nineteenth century saw important events in Western society such as the revolutions in America and Europe. This period saw the emergence of Saint-Simon and August Comte was propounded a new science of man to be created through positivism based on the scientific method. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels follow them with the class analysis of society.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, anthropology became a separate discipline, Darwin's evolutionary theory evinced new interest in simple peoples and comparative studies regarding a wide range of subjects such as kinship, religion etc. Were undertaken by scholars such as Morgan, Maine and Tylor.

Two major approaches emerged - the classical evolutionists and the diffusionists. Soon after, Franz Boas, who stressed the importance of gathering concrete data ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological and biological, gave a new emphasis to anthropological studies.

The twentieth century saw yet another movement in anthropology, the functional orientation. This trend was started by Durkheim and Spencer and continued by Radcliffe - Brown and Malinowski; Functional anthropology emphasized the concept of the social system and the need for systematic studies of primitive people.

Questions :

1. Trace the origins of anthropological perspective in the ancient and medieval period.
2. Explain the contribution of the Enlightenment to the growth of anthropology.
3. Discuss the development of a professional and scientific approach to anthropology in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

References :

Fried, Morton : Readings in Anthropology.

Honigmann, J. J. : Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.

Beals, R. I. & Hoijer, H : An introduction to Anthropology.

Hunter, D. & Whiten, P. : The Study of Anthropology.

Lewis I. M. : Social Anthropology in Perspective.

Keesing, R. Cultural Anthropology.

Peter Hanumond 'An introduction to cultural a social anthropology.

Robert Layton 1997 "An introduction to theory in Anthropology."

"An introduction to Anthropology by Ralph L. Beals Harry Hoijer and Alan & Beals.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

Objectives

To introduce students to the methods used in anthropology.

To familiarize them with the methods widely used in Anthropology.

Concept

- ❖ Fieldwork
- ❖ Ethnography
- ❖ Comparative Method
- ❖ Objectivity
- ❖ Subjectivity
- ❖ Cultural Relativism
- ❖ Ethnointism
- ❖ Text
- ❖ Context
- ❖ Ethic approach
- ❖ Ethroscience
- ❖ Diachronic
- ❖ Synchronic
- ❖ Nature anthropology
- ❖ Empiricism

Social anthropology like any social science, true to lean about social phenomena. Social anthropology has a will developed methodology for learning about society. This methodology has not developed overnight, but evolved through several decades.

What distinguishes social anthropology from other social science is its fieldwork methodology. If we make a survey of the tradition of social anthropological methods, we find that fieldwork and empirical tradition have been its contact characteristics. It can nit survivor without fieldwork even for a moment. The present section will focus or the various methods employed in anthropology to focus or the gather authentic data.

The Comparative Method :

The comparative method involves use of ethnographic data from many different kinds of society as a basis for constructing as evolutionary typology that can be presented to represent an actual historical sequence through which the different kinds of society moved. The comparative method in social anthropol-

ogy is the method of those who have been called armchair anthropologies since they work in libraries. Their first task is to look for what used to be called parallels, similar social features appearing in different societies, in the present, or in the past. Until the middle of the (19th, the great majority of comparative studies were carried out without reference to first hand investigation in the field, or even a critical marooning of the data available in the library. But during 1840's Lewis Morgan began a study of the Iroquois Indian which was to lead to an expansion of the comparative method in new direction.

When a social anthropologist makes a comparative study, he has three levels of comparison. First, he compares a single society with other societies, secondary, he compares one or two institutions of a society with similar institutions of other societies, and third, he compares the institutions within a single society. The history of the use of comparison as a method of study in social anthropology goes back to the (19th Cent). It was a period of strongly influenced by evolution. The use of comparison begins with Durkheim to Evans-Pritchard in British social anthropology. The early researches had the following objects is employing comparison, as a depends method for data generation.

- a) It is through this method that social anthropologists reconstruct the past and discover the laws governing social processes. As a matter of fact, comparison of particular features of social life for the purpose of historical construction has great value.
- b) It is through this that we make classification of the social system in different categories such as caste, class and groups.

Thus the comparative method is employed for discovering the laws of social focuses and to classify the social system of all the societies of the world as well. The comparative method used by anthropologist may be said to have two dimensions, synchronies and diachronic.

Synchronies is the systematic study of ethnographic data across a wide range of cultures at a particular given point of time. It doesn't take into consideration the past of society. This synchronic approach was adopted by functionalists, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown.

Diachronic on the other hand is the comparative study of culture society as they change through time in a specific geographical area. According to this approach, a historical dimension is a pre-requisite for understanding all human societies. Diachronic emphasizes the old historical traditions of a society and includes the use of oral traditions of people as sources for reconstructing their pasts. From diachronic studies, we can learn about evolution for human beings and their culture. The diachronic study is important because evolution is an essential element of anthropology. It shows the relationship between a particular way of life and the developments that led to it.

In the Indian context a number of inter-cultural and or non-cultural comparative study have been conducted. Anthropologists like J. Karve, N.K. Bose, Srinivas etc. undertook explicit comparison, combining the results of their field works with library resources. At a later stage with the coming of

Deenwnt and Pocock, the comparative method fell to disrupt. In the tradition of levi Stralls & Evans-Pritchard, Draw it is reluctant to accept the comparative perspective instead, he has adopted the structure approach. As a method of fact, amount, in his homo hierarchies, has takes ideology as a major perspective for studying Indian society. He compares Indian ideology which is holistic and hierarchical with the Western individualistic and egalitarian ideology.

The major attack on complaints method came from Franz Boas. He believed that laws exist which govern the development of the society but that the assumption which the evolutionists made also their basis was far too simple. In the limitations of the comparative method of anthropology (1896), he pointed out that the "anthropological research which compares similar cultural phenomena from various parts of the world in order to discover, the uniform history of their development, make the assumption that the same ethnological phenomena has everywhere developed in the same manner. Here lies the flaw in the argument of the new method, for a such proof can be given" (1940). Boas therefore rejected the grand evolution of the society as of doubtful value, and proposed that comparison be limited to the reconstruction of cultural history within small cultural area, in the 1st instance. Once histories of particular cultures have been worked out they in turn can be compared, general laws may be found.

Field Work

Social anthropology has a rich tradition of conducting field work. The nature of field work has changed from time to time. There are large number of social anthropologists who have conducted prolonged fieldwork among the tribals Evans-priterard lived several months among the Azande tribals of southern sudan, the Nuers of South Africa. In India, S. C. Dube conducted fieldwork in framerpet of Andhra Pradesh; M. N. Srinivas worked in Rampura village of Southern India. Fieldwork is a dependable source for generating data and therefore a dependable method of social anthropology.

The form of fieldwork, which came to be termed participant observation, eventually became the standard mode of ethnographic research. In particular, the British short of social anthropology exploited the potential of this method and produced a series of classic ethnographies that may prove to be the most enduring achievement of (20th century social and cultural anthropology).

Field work is the practical work done by a researcher in a specific area of knowledge. It is the study of people and of their culture in their natural habitat. It has been characterized by the prolonged residence of the investigator, his participation in and observation of the society and his attempt to understand the inside view of the native peoples and to achieve the wholistic view of social scientist.

Anthropologists began to do field work towards the end of the (19th cent.) but wear the middle of (18th cent) and middle of (19th cent) knowledge of primitive people and of the people of far East was greatly increased. The European colorization of America had been widely expanded, British rule had

been established in India, and Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa had been settled by European emigrants. The character of ethnographic description of the people of these regions began to change from travelers take to detailed study by missionaries and administrators who not only had better opportunities to observe but were also men of greater culture than the gentlemen of fortune of earlier times.

The publication of Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* in 1922 revealed the great potentialities of fieldwork. This study of Irokn and Islanders, among whom Malinowski had lived for three years, set new standards for field workers which continue to operate. Fieldwork came to mean immersion in a tribal society learning, as far as possible, to speech, think, see, feel and act as a member of its culture. It is significant that this method was forged in the study of small, homogeneous tribal societies in which it would have been difficult for the investigation to have avoided face to face relations.

In recent years, the range is type and size of societies studied by anthropologists have been extended. With this extension, new problems and new methods have developed, but certain other have remained same.

The anthropologist chooses the geographical area and cultural area for his filled project, studies the literature, and if the language has been recorded, learns as much of it as possible before going into the field. To understand a person's thought one has to think is their symbols. Also, in learning the language one learns the culture and the social system which are conceptualized in the language. Every kind of social relationship, every belief, every technological process, everything in social life of the native is expressed in words as well as in action, and when one has fully understood the meaning of all the words of their language is all their situations of reference we has finished one's study of the society.

Obviously in the first place the fieldwork must have had a academic training in social anthropology. He must have good knowledge both of general theory and of the ethnography of the region in which he is to work. He then has to consider whether he gives to the field alone, with his family, or as part of team. Whether he goes alone or with his family or as a member of a team, approval for the project and, it possible, cooperation must be secured from those who have authority in the society. The note from approval from these in power is only the first step. The field worker must this gain the good will of the people he wishes to study. He has to explain his presence to them, as he did to those in authority, as simply and honestly as possible. The anthropologist must from the beginning differentiate himself from other alives of his race of culture, such as missionary, government official etc, whom the indigenou, people must have behavior. It is extremely important that they have opportunities to observe and to know the fieldworker. The nearer his house is to the bus of activities, the easier it is for reciprocal observations and for easy social relations.

Gradually the fieldworkers role evolves. It the fieldworker may begin by rendering certain services. In a tribal society he often brings material goods ranging from ornaments to useful knives and spades. He may disperse simple remedies, such as aspirin and artionalarial medienes to those meeting them. He is

not only being helpful but is making it easy for people to see and know him.

During the first month or so the fieldworker process very slowly, making use of all his sensory impressions and interactions. He may get overwhelmed by the difficulties of really getting "inside" on alien culture and of learning an unrecorded or others strange language. He may wonder whether he should is tends into the privacy of people's lives by asking them questions. Sooner or later, when the fieldworker has established a support with the people and has learned how to handle his own anxieties, he establishes a routine of work.

Participating and observing become an ever more important part of the routine. The fieldworks observers and notes whatever comes within his range, even though he may not always know the relevance of all his observation. He follow long, devious sequences, such as those involved in initiation, marriage, death rituals which may be six more months in preparation and at the same time also observes the daily life in which they occur. He all companies the people on their economic tasks-hunting, fishing, planting, cooking and others. He listens to them converse and gossip when they are at ease and picks up new due which he later follows up. The intensity of field worker's participation varies from one situation to another and between investigators. Among the Nuer, Evare Pritchard was given little choice. The Nuer were "persistent and tireless visitors in and around his camp all the time, and he suffered from lack of privacy. Some anthropologists participate is ritual dances, feasts and similar social events; others limit themselves to taking notes. The field workers sense of the social situation and his personal desires & limitations dictate how much and when he will participate. Whatever the degree of the fieldworkers participation in the whole society friendships with a few people develop, and they help him to find a rich in the community. It is three friends who often become his best informants.

When the fieldworker has become familiar with the social customs and feels more or less accepted, he begins to work systematically on such anthropological problems as kinship; Forms of marriage and residence, economic and political organization, which craft and magical beliefs and practices, or any other aspect of life which is significant in the society and interesting to him. He asks questions in structural and unstructural interviews and roles the measure of agreement or disagreement between the pattern that emerge from the answers and the actual behaviours he observes. Another method is the tape recording of long interviews with different members of one family, resulting a significant humanistic account, whoever the anthropologist is interviewing or however he is participating there must be a high degree of reciprocal communication between him and the people studies.

The theoretical situation of the fieldworkers is significant from the beginning. Historical reconstruction, functionalism, a structural or cultural approach and psychological anthropology are among the major frames of reference. Each influences the fill developers voice of problems, the type of collection of data, the kinds of class he picks up, his techniques hypothesis and his interpretation.

The above points are relatively constant in all anthropological fieldwork. Among the new trends are an emphasis on specify problems rather than

wholistic studies working in larger and more complex societies, a greater concern with sampling, the use of sociological surveys along with traditional participation, observation and interviewing. A team has advantages in working on complex problems and in large societies, namely those societies which have deal power structures representing different ideologies. There is also the problem of centricity than ethnocentricity. Training enables as anthropologist to study carribalism, which craft, and other tribal customs with relative, objectivity. It is use easy to be objective on issues which threaten strong political or other social commitments. On the other hand, a person who has no commitments would not be able to understand those of others.

A quite new development not yet strong enough to be called a trend, the recognition that the field worker is himself on inherent part of the situation studied and that his personal as well as his scientific reactions are as important part of the research process. But there has been a reluctance to recognize the scientific significance of the fieldworkers personality and his all to human characteristics. Relatively little space is given in publication to his mistakes, to his trial and error nature of some os his procedures, to the role of chance, to the influence of his reaction on strange people and their culture, and other such important personal factors. The field is a laboratory in which the role of the investigator is significant and relevant to the study of the people and their culture, and obviously the more revealing the fieldworker is about his work, his role, the most scientific is the report and the more helpful it is to other investigations. The recognition of the significance of the personal characteristics of the fieldworker to his research confirms the point that fieldwork is an art as well as a science.

Objectivity and Subjectivity

Objectivity refers to a lack of bias, pre conceptions or prejudice. It is a central term. However scientists are not exactly agreed over threat it means to be objective. Some claim that following the procedures of the scientific method, objectivity will follow. Other argue that the scientists are subject to values and prejudices need to be declared publicly. It is often argued that the replication of scientific work acts as a self-righting mechanism which eliminates researcher and the values and attitudes brought to the research process and also to the methods used and to the extent to which they are neutral themselves.

Subjectivity on the other hand refers to the personal point of view seen to be partial and distorted. It is also defined as a lack of objectivity, that is, where the individual own view influences the approach taken to as issue. It is only the subjectivity of the individual that gives meaning to the social world.

However in the midst of all the distractions pressures and problem of personal adjustment, the anthropologist must always remember that the basic necessity in fieldwork is the exercise of scientific detachment. Of course, complete detachment is hard to imagine, but without moving himself from a position

of judging another culture, the anthropologists work is worthless. The best solution for the anthropologist would be to remind himself constantly that there are two cultures working at the same time the culture of the observer, which links in the back of his mind, and the cutting of the observed which hic before him. The anthropologist must always make a conscious effort to keep these two words separate, and to take any cultural bias he might have when writing about the others. In addition, the anthropological must avoid going into the field with preconceived ideas of what he will find. It takes an open mind and a willingness to other the research design on the basis of the situation at hand to yield a timely valid result.

The reason of this scientific detachment and objectivity can be seen in an important controversy between two famous anthropologist, who studied the same community. In the 1920's Robert Redfield went to the Mexican village of Tepoztlan, where the conducted field resource. Seventeen years late, Oscar Lewis, an anthropologist also went to Inpozthan to study the same community. Redfield description of life in Zepozuar is one of a idyllic rural setting where people were happy, healthy and well integrated. When Oscar Lewis studied to same community he found exactly, the opposites. His study showed that Zepozthan was characterized by constant suspicion and tension, there was no cooperation among the villagers and social relations were typically weak and stifled.

The differences between the anthropologists was mainly due to the outlook of the two different observers. Redfield's personal outlook was are which favoured the rural life style over treat of the city. Redfield had a predetermined preference for rural life and while living and working in Zepoztha's he was not able to overcome his bias, whereas Lewis left the opposite, that is, the peasant life was one of suffering, that poor people were disadvantaged, and that Redfield's notion about the relative values of country versus city life was backwards. Thus in his work in Zepoztha's he looked for and found suspicion and distinct where Redfield had described harmony and cooperation. Their result called into question the objectivity of anthropological research. We do not have to change in order to be good anthropologists, but we do have to suppress some of our stronger feelings for the duration of our research in order to insure that our observation will be objective.

Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is formally defined as that views of things in which one's own group is the center of everything and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. (summer, 1906) Stated less formally it is the habit of every group of taking for granted the superiority of its culture. It makes our culture into a yard stick with which to measure all other cultures. All known societies are ethnocentric. The "backward" native peoples, to whom to we feel so superiors, have a similar feeling of superiority to us. The attitude of ethnocentrism often leads to subjectivity in the study of other culture. If often distorts the comparative study of custom. Every cultural group tends to be influenced, in its evalu-

ation of other groups, by ethnocentrism. Sociologists postulates what anthropological observations confirm, namely, a universal tendency for any people to put it over culture and society is a central position of priority and worth. Many cultural traditions carry ethnocentrism to a point where the group concerned looks upon itself to a superior or even a "chosen" people. Racial prejudice, religious fundamentalism, communalism, and their inhuman, violent destructive consequences for human life and culture are all products of ethnocentrism. For an anthropologist doing fieldwork each culture has its own integrity, its own system of values and its own areas of complexity is custom. For objectivity in anthropology it becomes essential for the professional anthropologist to be free of ethnocentrism.

Cultural Relativism

Anthropologists in the last few decades have led a vigorous action against the points of ethnocentrism. As cultural anthropologists began to conduct empirical fieldwork among different cultures of the world, they recognized a need to provide dispassionate and objective descriptions of the people they were studying. According to Franz Boas, the father of modern anthropology in the United States, the way in which anthropologists are to strive for that level of detachment is through the practice of cultural relativism. This is the notion that other cultures can be evaluated and understood only in accordance with their own standards, not from the cultural perspective of the observer. For Boas, cultural relativism involved strict neutrality when describing and contrasting culturally different populations. The anthropologist was to avoid making value judgments about the relative merits of one culture over another: In function and meaning of a trait is a relative to its cultural setting. Take for eg:- An anthropologist conducting fieldwork among the Eskimos may find their "igloo" to be a primitive sort of dwelling when compared to the concepts building in cities. However from the Eskimo point of view it would be the ideal dwelling which protects them from the extreme climate. An anthropologist following cultural relativism would both at the "igloo" not from his own viewpoint but objectively from the Eskimo as point of view.

Thus cultural relativity would enable the anthropologist to study the culture objectively without his own bias for any particular culture.

New Ethnography

New ethnography is an Emic approach to the description of a culture that focuses on the body of knowledge and the culture bound rules that define and influence appropriate behavior for a speech community. An emic approach is the one where anthropologists concentrate on describing the indigenous values of a particular society. The emic approach became popular in the late 1960's as part of the movement towards cultural relativism.

The group of cognitive anthropologists began to assert that to describe the content of such a body of knowledge is to describe a community. Culture and proposed questions such as "what does a person need to have learned if he is to understand events in a strange community as its members understand them and if he is to conduct himself in ways that they would accept as conforming to their expectations of one another?"

Attempting to bring linguistic rigors into the description of cultures, the new ethnography was influenced first by structural linguists such as Kenneth Pike and then by Noam Chomsky. Based on an emic perspective focused on explication of the culture bound rules that account for the behaviours of a people by describing the socially acquired and shared knowledge, or culture, that guides members of the society to behaviours ways deemed by their fellows, the new Ethnography was expected to represent its host cultures with widely good enough that the natives are able to recognize in it familiar features of their own culture. This would allow the ethnographers "to break through Euro American Ethnocentrism and try to see other cultures as natives see them. Defining culture cognitively as knowledge systems, the New Ethnographers developed a set of methods known as ethno science that allowed them to record topical domains within a culture such as ethnolinguistics and ethnocentrism. The ultimate aim was to describe explicitly methods and question frames so the ethnographic description could be replaced with others.

Although the new Ethnographer was criticized by behaviourally oriented anthropologists as not being new and for not adequately addressing variability and complexity within cultural knowledge, the basic principles of and methods of the new Ethnography of the 1960's are now regarded as standard features of contemporary ethnography.

Summary

The discipline of anthropology uses several methods in order to arrive at data regarding social phenomena. The methodology of social anthropology is mainly field work. It is empirical and empirical work is experience. No fieldwork can be done without empiricism. However to arrive at this empiricism anthropology also makes use of comparative methods. There are certain attributes which characterize field work like knowledge of local language, familiarity with peoples cultural and social life, stress on cultural relativism as opposed to ethnocentrism, study society from insight, and physical productivity where he should be morally a part of the community and impartial study to comparative method involves use of ethnographic data from many different kinds of society as a basis for constructing an evolutionary typology. There is often a debate between objectivity and subjectivity in anthropology. It is often impossible for the anthropologist to completely remain detached from his own culture which interpreting and analyzing other cultures. Often the anthropologist tends to become ethnocentric while evaluating other cultures. At the same time subjectivity or the bias may possibly distort the validity, thus preventing to give a true picture of the community under investigation.

Questions

1. Fieldwork methodology is the guiding of anthropology. Discuss.
2. Discuss the comparative method and its uses in anthropology.
3. Explain the concepts of Ethnocentrism and cultural relativity.
4. Bring out the problem of subjectivity and objectivity in anthropological Resources.
5. Write short note of new Anthropology.

Additional Leading / Bibliography

- ❖ Cultural Anthropology. M. J. Herakovits, Oxford and IBH Publishing Company. 1955.
- ❖ Method in Social Anthropology - selected Essay of R. Brown, edited by M. N. Srinivas, As a Publishing House, 1958.
- ❖ Context (and meaning in cultural Anthropology, edited by M. E. Spiers), Free Press, 1965.
- ❖ Social Anthropology, E. E. Evans Prit Crard, Routledge and kegan Baul Limited, London, 1972.
- ❖ Cultural Anthropology, Frt Friedl. J, Harper college press, 1976.
- ❖ Writing Cultures - the politics and politics of ethnography, James Clifford and G. E. Masmus (ed). OUP, 1990.
- ❖ Social Anthropology, P. C. Jain and S. Ravat Publications, 2001.

Anthropology & Others Disciplines : The Natural Science, Social Science & Humanities

Objectives :

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 What is Anthropology?
- 4.3 Its historical background
- 4.4 The relation of anthropology to other science.
- 4.5 Uses of Anthropology
- 4.6 Summary

Introduction :

The objective of this course is to examine the key concepts, methods & theoretical orientation used by anthropologist. We will explore in a unique manner about various issues related to anthropology. Its historical background, which is concern with the nature of humanity & with the variety of human cultures which seems almost universal among human begins. Which is often expressed in myths & legends describing the creation of human beings. The relation of anthropology with other disciplines. Modern anthropologists such as Kroeber have portrayed anthropology as an integrated discipline. This discipline is known widely for intellectual development, its therefore moving towards diversification & specialization resulting in new areas of study.

What is Anthropology? :

The word anthropology is a combined form derived from the Greek terms “Anthropos” (human begin) and “logos” (word) and can be translated as the study of humanity. Through the systematic analysis and comparison of all that can be discovered about humanity. Anthropology seeks to develop increasingly profound and useful knowledge about the human condition. Anthropology is the study of man, it is the study of the origin development & nature of the human species. It is the most comprehensive of academics disciplines dealing with mankind. Its wide ranging nature can be seen in its concern with the complete geographical & chronological sweep of human societies, the breath of its interests covers such diverse areas such as language, social structure & belief systems. In fact it is singular in that it alone among the societies of man studies him in his physical and socio-culture aspects. The subject matter of anthropology then includes the earliest fossilized bones of human like creatures the artifacts & material remnants left in the earth by our ancestors & all of the living or historically describes peoples on the earth.

Anthropology seeks a deep understanding of the human species by the systematic analysis & comparison of different groups of human beings. Since ethnic groups differ both in physical type and socio-cultural characteristics, anthropology has been concerned with its physical and socio-cultural branches. Broadly, anthropology has four major branches. The four major branches of anthropology are biological anthropology, cultural-social anthropology, archeology and linguistics. Biological anthropologists use the techniques of the biological sciences in the study of fossil and living human beings. Cultural-social anthropology uses techniques of historical research, observation and interviews in the study of recent and living peoples. Archaeology uses techniques of excavation and historical research to reconstruct the ways of life of vanished peoples. Linguistics uses the same techniques as cultural-social anthropology for the analysis of human languages. Although the four branches of anthropology use different techniques and examine somewhat different subject matters. They all share the goal of understanding humanity and they all make use of a single theoretical concept, the idea of culture. The ideal of culture, which represents one of the great scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is that human behavior, unlike that of any other animal species, is uniquely influenced and determined by cultural traditions that are transmitted among groups of human beings primarily by means of language. Each of the peoples of the earth possesses its own distinctive way of life including its own ways of doing things and its own ways of speaking. In a word, each people has its own culture. Anthropology is not just the study of human beings. It is the study of human beings living in societies and following distinctive way of life labeled "Culture". Even the study of human biological evolution requires understanding of relationships between biological processes and emerging cultural forms.

This introduction to anthropology weaves together the findings of biological anthropology, cultural-social anthropology, archaeology and linguistics to provide an explanation of the development and nature of human cultures. Because any general statements about human beings are relevant to living peoples, the principal emphasis of this book is upon cultural-social anthropology. We rely upon biological Anthropology for understanding of the biological evolution of humanity and for understandings of the biological foundations that underline all human cultures.

History of the Development of Anthropology :

For many thousands of years, travel, trade and exploration have brought people of different languages and cultures into contact. These contacts generated tales of strange and exotic people and their customs. The Greek historian Herodotus might thus be seen as an early kind of anthropologist. In the fifth century BC he traveled around the Greek colonies of the Mediterranean and North Africa and described in considerable detail the indigenous peoples of those regions and their ways of life.

Herodotus' writings could be described as one of the earliest ethnographic descriptions but if we are to talk of anthropology as a discipline rather than a loose collection traveler's tales, we must move forward to the nineteenth century when the scholarly study of human cultural and biological diversity began to take shape. At this time the western world was in the throes of some rapid and far-reaching developments. Across Europe and North America the expansion of new industries, mass migration from the countryside to the cities and the

development of new systems of communication and transport had profound impacts on social life and the organization of society and economy. This was also a time when western colonial expansion and domination were at their height. Social commentators and philosophers were keen to understand the changes that were happening around them. The foundations of the major academic disciplines as we know them today were laid down during this period.

One of the major questions asked during the nineteenth century was ‘how did we get to where we are today?’ Charles Darwin wrote an account of the way species develop through natural selection; this was his theory of evolution which first appeared in 1859. Darwin suggested that all life forms had developed gradually over long periods of time, with the more successful species displacing ones less well adapted to their environment. These ideas had a profound impact on scientific enquiry in the biological sciences and also had wider cultural repercussions. Many of the most influential social theorists of the nineteenth century adapted Darwin’s model of biological evolution to understand changes that were happening at a social and cultural level.

One of the major questions asked during the nineteenth century was ‘how did we get to where we are today?’ Charles Darwin wrote an account of the way species develop through natural selection; this was his theory of evolution which first appeared in 1859. Darwin suggested that all life forms had developed gradually over long periods of time, with the more successful species displacing ones less well adapted to their environment. These ideas had a profound impact on scientific enquiry in the biological sciences and also had wider cultural repercussions. Many of the most influential social theorists of the nineteenth century adapted Darwin’s model of biological evolution to understand changes that were happening at a social and cultural level.

Two important disciplines concerned with the study of humanity emerged at this time, namely anthropology and sociology. The branch of scholarship, which was later to become sociology, turned its attention to changes in the West. The branch of Scholarship, which was later to develop into anthropology, established its focus on the ‘Primitive’ and began a search for the precursors of modern civilization. Societies, which were non-literate, technologically simple and small-scale in terms of their economic and political organization and usually far removed from Western Europe became the focus of the emerging discipline of anthropology. Nineteenth century anthropologists believed that such societies provided a glimpse of humanity at an earlier stage of social evolution and that in time they too would develop modern ways of life. Such views, widespread in society at that time, have since been rejected as knowledge about our common humanity has developed.

By the early decades of the twenties century ideas of social evolution were beginning to be questioned and so called ‘Primitive’ societies began to be studied not simply as evidence of earlier stages of social development but as societies in their own right. The job of the anthropologist was thus not to arrange such societies on a scale from high civilization to technological simplicity but rather to understand each society according to its own particular logic. Strange myths, rituals, art forms, marriage practices and ways of living were treated as legitimate topics of study. Each society represented a unique expression of human cultural variation and physical adaptation. The attempts to understand non-western peoples on their own terms came to be known as cultural relativism. This approach to the study of cultural variation became a

distinctive feature of North American cultural anthropology associated with such influential figures as Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict.

Anthropology and Other Discipline :

Anthropology is commonly classified as a social science, related to such disciplines as sociology, psychology, geography, economics and political science. Through biological anthropology, it is closely connected to such fields as anatomy, physiology, embryology and genetics. Biological anthropology, archaeology and cultural anthropology, all exchange points of view with the more general biological sciences of ecology and ethnology. Archaeologists seeking new methods of dating or new ways of analyzing archaeological sites and their contents, are often closely linked to geologists, paleontologists, soil chemists and physicists. Linguists, archaeologists and cultural anthropologists maintain a close liaison with such humanistic disciplines; anthropology provides a view of the past and a constant remembrance of human diversity.

The principal contribution of anthropology to other disciplines stems from its role in the development of the concept of "culture". Of particular importance here, are the facts that culture is learned, that the parts of any culture tend to be reflect human endeavor rather than natural or divine law, and that perceptions of truth, beauty, goodness and wisdom are deeply influenced by the cultural tradition to which the individual has been exposed.

For the humanistic disciplines the concept of culture carries the implication that styles of art, music and literature are based upon arbitrary criteria characteristic of individual cultural traditions. Although particular kinds of images or particular kinds of sounds may have a universal appeal among human beings, the findings of anthropology demonstrate that there is no kind of song, picture or story that everyone must automatically consider beautiful or worthy of attention. Because anthropologists are the only academic specialists who are routinely trained in the art of studying the understanding cultures other than their own, anthropologists have willy-nilly become authorities on the art, music and literature of most of the peoples of the world, because anthropologists rarely possess the specialized knowledge acquired by specialists in the humanities, anthropologists, for their part must turn to the humanities for information about the methods to be used in describing and analyzing art styles or literary and philosophical traditions.

Specialists trained in the social science, like specialists in the humanities, tend to emphasize the study of their own or closely related cultures. If they are to make wide-ranging generalizations about human psychology, politics or economics, social scientists must depend upon anthropologists and the data they have collected in order to demonstrate the general importances of their findings. The psychologist discovers interesting, differences in ability or personality between male and female. Within anthropology specializations such as social anthropology, psychological anthropology, economic anthropology and political anthropology have the task of maintaining liaison with other social science fields and of testing the general applicability of their finding. Anthropologists also borrow research methods

and theoretical approaches from the more specialized disciplines.

Biologists who are directly concerned with the study of human beings must depend upon anthropology for much of their information about human beings living in different cultures. In the field of nutrition, information about the requirements of the human animal can often be verified by consideration of the varied diets characteristics of people living in different cultures. The anthropologist often approaches physical scientist, biologist and mathematical with due humility hoping for answers concerning the age of some particular archaeological site etc.

Anthropology has an important role to play in integrating the findings of more specialized disciplines into more general and holistic explanations of human behavior.

(a) Physical Anthropology :

Physical Anthropology is linked by tradition & academic usage with the behavioral science, but basically it is a biological science. It is the anthropology counterpart of the various biological science that deal with human beings, it is therefore concerned with human beings living in diverse culture & the role of culture in the evolution of human species, it differs from the disciplines that regards human beings strictly in biological terms. The subject matter of physical anthropology falls into two major interrelated categories - (i) Human paleontology which studies human fossil & their meaning in terms of long-range human evolution. (ii) Human, population biology & human genetics which studies the adaptation to differing environments, the heredity characteristic of living population ranging in size from regional stocks & races to local groups such as religion, groups or castes. The physical anthropology differs from the biologists study of man in that he is mainly concerned with human variation such as ageing, sexual differences, growth patterns, physical & psychological differences between human groups, current & past & the geographical distribution of physical characterizes. The main sub-fields of physical anthropology are (i) The study of primates. (Is concerned with the similarities & the differences between humans & the primates). (ii) The study of human fossils. (It studies mainly with bone material that have survived the normal processes of decay & transformation). (iii) The study of living human population. (It mainly observes the processes of evolution 'which' are taking place with in human groups at the present times e.g. the genetic composition of human population which direct affect by adaptation in climatic conditions).

(b) Cultural Anthropology :

Cultural Anthropology deals with culture, the word culture in anthropological sense mean all the behavior & believe which people learn & share with others. It includes religion, social & political organization, economies, technologies, arts, narrative forms & language. Cultural anthropology is interested in the description & comparison of all human cultures. They study cultures, which are completely diverse & located in remote areas or even densely populated towns & cities. Cultural anthropology has many sub-fields Ethnology, archaeology and linguistics & ecological anthropology.

(b.1) Ethnolinguistics :

Linguistics is the study of languages across space & time. It is significant study of languages; it had developed independently mainly because much of the structure of language can be analyzed quite independently from the rest of the culture of which it forms a part. At the same time the knowledge of linguistics is essential for anthropology since language is an important part of culture. Linguistics has two major subdivisions - descriptive & historical or comparative linguistics. Descriptive linguistics is concerned with the analysis of languages at a given point of time. It studies the sound system, grammar & vocabulary of languages. It attempts to describe formally the basic elements of language & the rules by which they are ordered into intelligent speech. Linguistics are concerned with the spoken language & it derives their material for analysis by listening to & writing down special symbols, spoken words of people who use the language for communication. Comparative or historical anthropology attempts to trace the course of linguistic evolution & to reconstruct ancestral language forms. It deals with historical relationship between languages whose history can be traced through written records. These techniques have now been advanced so that they can be reliably used for establishing the relationship between different languages & also for reconstructing the history of unwritten languages. Ethnolinguistics has been important in the contribution it has made by studying a large number of families. It has increased the range of possible comparison & has contributed to the development of understanding in general.

(b.2) Ethnology :

Ethnology is the study of culture of living people as well as extinct culture, which have some written records. Ethnology is historically oriented from the beginning & it tries to explain the races, languages & culture of people in terms of their movement & other historical processes such as diffusion & so on. The dominant trend in the 19th century ethnology was an evolutionary explanation of how things came into existence. In the 20th century it studied the whole culture of such societies, which includes the study of social political organization, religion, tradition. Folklore, knowledge, technology, economics, music dance & others. It covers more aspects of culture than in case of history of sociology. The comparison between cultures aim at arriving valid general laws of human customs & human nature & the classification of individual culture in terms of culture types or historical connections.

(b.3) Archaeology Anthropology :

Archaeology is of great importance in understanding the early man & the study of anthropology. It is based on the study of inferences from culture products & substances remains recovered by excavation. Archaeology is the sub field of anthropology that deals with man's past. It includes the culture history of man i.e. tracing changes over time & the reconstruction of daily life & interests of pre-historical people. The pre-historical studies the very long preliterate periods of the major civilization of the world. It also involves the study of the earlier pasts of non-literate people. Archaeology has been responsible for providing knowledge & understanding in human culture during most of periods on human existence, an archaeologist obtains his information from the surviving material remains of human activities. He has highly developed technique for excavation & observing

the remains & many aspects of culture of recovered. It aims to reconstruct the past culture as completely as possible & then to study their movements, changes, contacts & influences on each other's. culture types or historical connections.

(b.4) Ecological Anthropology :

Ecological Anthropology is a relatively new area of study. Ecological anthropology has arisen out of the view that anthropology is an integrated discipline; it developed as an integrated approach known as the systems approach, which provides a holistic view of nature, recognition of reciprocal relations among the various systems of an organism & of interaction physical environment, which together constitute integrated systems. Ecology is not exactly an anthropological sub-discipline. Nor is it a standardized approach in anthropology. For most anthropologists, it is at the most on all pervasive point of view. Commonly, studies that deal in any way with the relations between man & environment & called ecological studies, it can be defined as the study of entire groups of living organism & their physical environment which together constitute integrated systems.

(c) Ethnography :

Ethnography is the description of the social & cultural system of a particular group. The data of cultural anthropology is collected from direct observation of customary behavior in particular societies. Making observation & then reporting & evaluating such observations are the task of ethnography. The scope & definition of ethnography have varied considerably & there are many different opinions regarding the subject matter. Ethnographer tries to record & describe the culturally significant behavior of a particular society, this makes it necessary for the ethnographer to have a long period of intimate & first-hand study of the society concerned residence within the community, knowledge of the spoken language & use of wide range of observational techniques including prolonged face to face contacts with in the members of the local groups. Broadly ethnography refers to the discipline concern with producing cultural description.

(d) Medical Anthropology :

The effectiveness with which human groups combining biological & cultural resources adapt to their environment is indicated by the measures of health & disease in the group. The relationship of health & disease to culture & biological factors is the meeting factor in medical & cultural anthropology. Although modern medicine has had a biological orientation, medical history shows that it always was concerned with social & cultural aspects of the maintenance of health & cause of diseases. Ever since the earlier medical system known history, variation in health has been connected with variation in social circumstances & habit patterns. Interest industrial revolution with its associated public health problems led to a period of impressive development of social medicine. Medicine was conceived of as a social science, both in a basic & applied sense. The emphasis was made on the scientific investigation on the impact of social & economical conditions on health & disease. It was also stressed that society

had they obligation to assure the health of its members & social intervention was advocated to promote health & combat diseases. Towards the latter part of the 19th century, modern medicine became extremely concerned with the cause of the disease & interest in social & cultural context declined. The need for medically related research in anthropology & other science has increased due to change in nature of threats to health.

The Uses of Anthropology :

Like physics, anthropology has generally regarded itself as a basic science dedicated to the discovery of basic principles that might later find application. Even today the practical value of anthropology lays not so much in the general principles it has discovered as in the data it collects and in the methods it has developed for collecting such data. Through the lens of the archaeologist or cultural anthropologist it is possible to see one's own society as a mere episode in the millions of years of human history and as a mere episode in the millions of years of human history and as a simple instance, no better and no worse, of the many different societies that exist today or have existed in the past. In coming to understand the Eskimo, the Hopi Indians or the Arunta of Australia as they really are or recently were, the individual discovers a kinship with humanity. If these other peoples believe and act as they do because they have learned some particular cultural tradition, then we, ourselves, can perceive the they have learned some particular cultural tradition, then we, ourselves, can perceive the impact of our own cultural tradition upon the things that we believe in and act upon. Anthropology provides the means of discovering new ways of doing things and new ways of seeing things.

Although practical persons have argued that education should be limited to that special training which will enable the individual to find a job and pay taxes, anthropology remains a stronghold of liberal education. Course in linguistics, anthropology and biological anthropology provide more than a taste of scientific method, while courses in the art, literature and religion of other peoples provide background in the humanities. On the whole, anthropology is not so much a means of preparing for life as a means of enjoying and understanding it.

Most of the jobs available to anthropologists are teaching jobs in universities. Such jobs require a Ph. D. and the Ph. D. requires five or six years of graduate training. A master's degree in anthropology, although it may sometimes be useful in obtaining job in junior colleges or museums, is mainly useful in conjunction with other more practical disciplines. A bachelor's degree in anthropology, combined with an appropriate selection of other courses, may sometimes be useful in securing admission to schools of laws, social welfare, education or business administration. Some knowledge of anthropology is likely to be useful in almost any career in the teaching or helping professions or in the humanities or social science.

One of the problems in the development of an applied cultural anthropology is that those in government or industry who can afford to support to support applied anthropologists are often concerned with the manipulated of subject peoples, employees or client groups in ways that individual anthropologists consider unethical. The fact that "he who pays the piper calls the tune" is a

problem common to all sciences, from the physicists who build atomic bombs to the marine biologists who discover more effective ways of killing fish. Nevertheless the emergence of anthropology was in part based on the need of colonial governments to discover ways of governing or controlling their sometimes unwillingly subjects. French British, Dutch and other colonial governments at one time made extensive use of anthropology as a means of understanding tribal peoples who had come under their control. At best such anthropological collaboration with governmental agencies produced vast improvement in otherwise intolerable situations. Jams Mooney, who was asked by the United States government to investigate the ghost dance of the American Indians and the circumstances surrounding the massacre of the Sioux Indians at Wounded Knee Creek brought in a ringing condemnation of American policy toward the Sioux which may, in fact, have influenced government policy.

In recent years cultural anthropologists interested in applying their knowledge in practical situations have become increasingly cautious and the main thrust of their interest now centers upon four fields: community development, urban anthropology, medical anthropology and educational anthropology. Anthropologist's work with medical personnel in a variety of ways the main thrust of their efforts has to do with understanding, folk categories of disease and methods of diagnosis and proposing ways of improving the delivery of medical care. In educational anthropology the impact of anthropology is generally in the direction of modifying teaching methods and bureaucratic policies in ways that will make education more generally available to members of minority ethnic groups or to populations that are being offered or having forced upon them, a modern educational system. The usefulness of cultural anthropology in the preparation of environmental impact studies or in the solution of other pressing social problems has only been sporadically recognized.

Surprising, as it may seem the practical utility of archaeology is far more widely recognized than is that of cultural anthropology. In the United States, law generally recognizes many states subsidizing the recovery and exhibition of archaeological remains and the importance of preserving archaeological sites from careless excavation or ruthless bulldozing. In countries like Mexico Italy, Egypt and India substantial tourist income is derived from the exhibition of archaeological sites that are preserved and maintained by large and influential government departments.

Linguistics, perhaps the most developed of the four sub disciplines of anthropology, has for years served the practical purpose of improving instruction in language. Linguistic research into the special dialects spoken by various ethnic groups.

Biological anthropology from its beginnings as a methods of measuring human bodily dimensions, has contributed to the better design of machines, furniture, clothing, artificial limbs and other equipment that must be closely matched to human bodily dimension. It contributes to the solution of many medical and legal problems ranging from the identification of bone materials to genetic counseling for those who fear their children may inherit possible genetic defects.

Despite the highly specific and practical value of particular specializations in archaeology, linguistics and biological anthropology, it seems probable

that the true use of anthropology will always arise out of the understandings of cultural similarities and differences that it provides. A knowledge of the ways in which other peoples have planned their buildings, educated their children developed new art styles, handled their population problems or settled their conflicts will always be of value to those who are concerned with the improvement of the human condition.

Summary :

Anthropology is the study of the origin, development and nature of the human species through the use of specialized methods employed by four closely cooperating sub fields: biological anthropology, cultural-social anthropology, archaeology and linguistics. The central concept linking the four sub fields is the idea of culture. Research in anthropology involves a concern with all human beings, past and present and with all of their works and activities. Although there are many disciplines that deal with human beings, anthropology occupies a special role because it involves a combination of holistic, historical and comparative methods. The ultimate goal of anthropology research is the explanation of the similarities and differences among all of the past and present peoples of the earth. Anthropology requires the use of special research methods, not used in the study of other animal species because human beings differ in a number of important ways from other animals. These differences are most notable in the development of tools, language and culture among human beings. Although most distinctively human characteristics exist in one form or another among other species of animals, they are all found together only among human beings. Human adaptations to the environment have been made largely in terms of culture. This has permitted human beings to remain relatively unspecialized from a biological point of view and therefore adaptable to a wide range of environments. The human culture building capacity is closely associated with the ability to invent and use language and therefore to develop an ever-growing heritage of traditional knowledge.

Although the archaeological record demonstrates the development of a human or human like tradition of tool manufacture and use over a period of a least five millions years, there is little evidence concerning. The development language or the non-material aspects of culture. A conservative guess is that language and culture were well, if not fully, developed with the emergences of *Homo erectus* some one million years ago. The presence of tools and probably of rudimentary forms of language and culture, during the several million years of evolution in the human direction suggested that human biological evolution was in art a reflex of human cultural evolution. The presence of culture, then is a part of the human conditions and it follows that an explanation of humanity involves an explanation of culture. The basic research questions in anthropology have to do with culture and its relationship to human evolution to environmental relationships and to the human personalities who paradoxically create cultures, yet are themselves created by culture.

Among the sub disciplines of anthropology, biological anthropology is most concerned with the biological nature of humanity. It differs from other

biological sciences dealing with humanity because it uses the concept of culture to define the groups that it studies and as a means of development of the biological evolution. Although the recent and explosive development of the biological sciences has created a variety of specialized sub fields with physical anthropology, the main sub fields continue to be defined in terms of the study of primates, of fossil remains and of living populations.

The goals of cultural anthropology include the description of the entire range of human behavior and the development of explanations of the similarities and differences among cultures. Cultural anthropologists tend to emphasize selected aspects of culture and this has led to the emergence of a wide variety of sub fields ranging from ecological and economic anthropology to the anthropology of art.

In a sense archaeologists are cultural anthropologists who work under the handicap of dealing only with the material remains of former cultures, but with the advantage of being able to consider variation and change over periods of thousands of years. Archaeology, is the means by which the human past is reconstructed and the major outlines of cultural evolutions described. Like the archaeologist, the linguist can be regarded as a specialized kind of cultural anthropologist. The linguist, using a highly sophisticated set of methods, prepares description of existing or surviving languages. These descriptions are used to establish historical relationship among languages and to elucidate the processes involved in the origin and development of language. They also permit the development of understandings of human thought and communication and of the relationship among language and other aspects of culture.

Anthropology provides a wide range of scholarly disciplines with the cross cultural information required for the development of truly universal interpretations of human being and the world about them. Anthropology, in turn, relies upon more specialized disciplines or the methods needed for the understanding of particular aspects of culture & providing a fresh means for the reevaluation of traditional ways of doing things.

Questions :

1. Explain the nature & scope of physical anthropology? Write a note on medical anthropology? its relationship between physical & medical anthropology?
2. What is ethnology? Write a note on it?
3. What is ecological anthropology? Write a note on ecological anthropology?
4. Discuss the contribution of archaeology to anthropology?
5. What is Ethno linguistics? Its importance to anthropology?

References :

Boas, Franz, "Anthropology", Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. II New York : Macmillan Publishing Co. inc., 1930, pp 73-110.

Friend, Morton H. The study of Anthropology New York : Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1972 Frantz Charies, The Student Anthropologist's Handbook : A guide

to Research, Training and Career Cambridge, Mass. : Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

Hallowell, A. I. "The Beginnings of Anthropology in America : Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1888-1920 ed. Frederica deLaguna. Evanston, III : Row Peterson & Company Inc. 1960.

Hays, Hoffiman Reynolds From Ape to Angel : An Informal History of Anthropology New York : Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1958.

Kardiner, Abram and Edward Preble. They Studied Man New York : New American Library of World Literature, Inc. 1963 Informal sketches of early anthropologists and their work.

Langness, L. L. The Study of Culture, San Francisco : Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Inc. 1974. A concise discussion of major anthropological points of view in historical perspective.



Human Nature in Comparative Perspective

Objectives :

1. To introduce student to the subject matter of physical Anthropology.
2. To understand the characteristic that set man apart from other species of animals.

Physical or biological anthropological deals with the human biological diversity. The physical anthropologist concern with the change that has occurred in the human physical form, over time. The physical anthropologist is interested in the behaviour of primates as well as their anatomy. In recent year a number of anthropologist have turned their attention to the study of primates which includes apes, gorillas, chimpanzees etc. We are able to learn what is uniquely other primate. The physical anthropologist is interested in the behaviour of primate as well as their anatomy.

The question of human nature is taken for granted, is there in the philosophy at the level of reflection. The question of human nature is important in anthropology because human beings share some characteristic with animals. Here it becomes important to know in what way, man is different from animal kingdom. All human being share the same basic human nature. Man has reflected upon the nature and universe and even in relationship between human and universe because man is self-conscious. Self-awareness or conscious awareness or mind is by far the most important of the characteristics which make man human, consciousness is something which many species of animals have. It is different from sensation. Most of the animals they are aware of dangers, how to cook in the environment, sources of environment survival but that is at the level of perception self-consciousness is only found in human beings. Man is conscious i.e. self-conscious of the fact that he exists apart from nature universe that he has his own values, understanding he can make moral judgement of things. Similarly man is capable of looking at himself as though he were as somebody else detaching from himself and judging quite independently to what kind of person he is and what it is that he wants to do and become. Man alone is capable of reflection of self-consciousness of thinking of himself as an object. Anthropologist and philosopher describe this ability as self-objectification e.g. "when we feel guilty of some things values like truth, honour, justice these are held to be absolute to us. We judge our self in these absolute moral values we feel shameful of us criticize us.

Another aspect of self-awareness not only in the content of the present but also in relation to future and this happen with memory. Memory being us close to the past. There is always a comparison between present and past. We transform mentally for future. In our mind we are striving towards the future this is indicated by the ideals what we have. These goals and ideals

point us towards the future. Future is not imagination. It is a dimension of reality because we have oriented our life towards this. Another characteristics of human no matter where the human is born which philosophers define as Transcendence i.e. the ability to go beyond the environment of which we are a part, we go beyond the biological organism. Human beings not only adapt the environment. The winds, occurs, mineral resources have been utilized for his own benefit. He has successfully contracted the environment so that the historians make a difference with the biosphere and techno sphere. Biosphere is a natural environment in which human being live techno sphere in the form of cities, huge organization, dams, infrastructure. As a man has moved from one stage of life, the techno sphere has dominated his life than biosphere. Then by the formation of techno sphere environment like formation of dams to other infrastructure leads to the cut down of forests which resulted into natural calamities like earth-quakes. These natural calamities have been try to controlled by human being. We are much more in techno sphere, which is a qualitative difference between animals and humans. Eg fasting of human beings for certain days where as animal don't. So human being transcend their physical environment in accordance with certain values eg sexual gratification what they share in common with animal, but in case of Sadhus they can go beyond the physical environment through the process of meditation. They are all in accordance with certain values. Moral values emphasize tremendous influence on human behaviour. Adaptation of environment, satisfying basic biological needs which is determined by instincts. For human beings all this cores are secondary they live by moral values which they have inculcated in their lives rather than this. They have the ability to transcend in a variety of ways, through their imagination the unpleasantness of physical environment of which they are a part. Human beings live in a different conditions eg Artic and Africa human beings create ab unafubart world who are held so be real, Gods, Fairies and Ghosts. That provide an escape from the harsh reality of environment. An imagination creates avenues religious scripture myth in which human beings interact that provides a source of entertainment for humans. This capabilities of human beings such as conscious transcend to use one's imaginative it helps him to realize what his destiny is and the relation with universe.

The "creationist" Religious explanation draws from a literal reading of the Biblical book of Genesis, which was originally an old Hebraic creation myth, interpreted through the theology of later Christian church; The time scale is claustrophobically short. Creation came about through the activity of a single super natural entity, "God", who created universe and Igo in six 24 hours day about 6000 or 10,000 years ago. Man did not descend from the apes, but was created personally by God, and thus the only "creature" to have soul- There is no evolution or transformation; the whole cosmos in static.

One of the greatest thinker of nineteenth century science, and a man whose legacy of ideas has so shaped the understanding of the world in which we live, Darwin replacing the static Judeo Christian caroms with a dynamic scientific - materialistic one Darwin made contribution to human knowledge in his theory of evolution. He said that species had evolved from simple to very complex form Le man was not created in present form but he was product of evolution.

In 1738, taxonomist who not only applies a name to an organism, but, by ranking those organism into hierarchies of name, attempts to portray evolutionary relationship have used the system of Linnaeus gave each organism a binomial genus and species which are ranked in higher and higher groupings. In this man was classified together with primates including gorilla and chimpanzee,

In 1859 Charles Darwin supplied a mechanism, namely natural selection that could explain how evolution has occurred. His theory of evolution by natural selection originated during a five-year voyage around the world as a naturalist on board HMS Beagle on 16th Sept 1835 the Beagle, reached the Galapagos Archipelago, cluster of islands he found finches. Darwin's study of the characteristics of species on isolated islands such as these Galapagos finches, and of fossil animals led him to conclude that evolution had occurred. Finches played an important role in helping him recognize the reality of evolutionary process. Finches share similar size coloration and habits. Their salient difference is in the size and shape of their beak. Finches must be a symbol of evolution in Galapagos on November 4, 1859 his classic work "Origin of species" was published. "The origin of species by means of natural selection" did two things. It summarized all the evidence in favour of the idea that all organisms have descended with modification from a common ancestor and this built on a strong case of evolution. In addition Darwin advocated natural selection as mechanism of evolution.

Charles Darwin suggested the mechanism for evolution was through natural selection, which involves the following premises

- 1) Individuals that make up a population are not all identical (Variability)
- 2) This variation can be inherited (Heritable variation in population)
- 3) Organisms have the potential to increase in numbers greatly in excess of ability for their environment to support them (limits on reproductive success)
- 4) Variation leads to differential rates in survival and reproductive success among the variations. Therefore those individuals with inheritable traits that increase their chances of successful reproduction will have more offspring (natural selection)
- 5) Differential survival and reproduction leads to a shift in the frequency of characters. If this process goes on long enough, parent and daughter species can no longer interbreed, and there results a new species.

Therefore the environment "selects" which individuals successfully have offspring for the next generation (survival of the fittest). Even very small variations that provide even very small advantages in reproductive success will be favoured, while small variations that decrease reproductive success will be eliminated. Over thousands of generations these changes can produce even very large changes. Such as biological diversity of different organisms. Darwin and his fellow naturalist Alfred Wallace independently came to the conclusion that geologically older species of life gave rise to the geologically younger and different species through the process of natural selection.

But although Darwin explained the process of evolution, he was not able to describe the biological mechanism on which natural selection was based. But it was clear that present form of man is product of long process of evolution. In course the evidence came from sources like paleontology which in study of prehistoric animals and plant life through the analysis of fossil remains. The study of these remains enables scientists to trace the evolutionary history of extinct as well as living organisms.

Similarly evidences came from sources like comparative anatomy, fields of biography, taxonomy, embryology and so on.

Towards the end of 19th century G. J. Mendel, he conducted experiment on Garden peas Mendel observed that there are a number of ways in which peas differ: in some the seeds are round in other they are wrinkled; in some they are green, in other yellow. The flowers of some peas are axial in position in others terminal. Mendel picked pure bred strains which differed from each other in one characteristic and cross-fertilized them the new plant grow he found that all the peas were round, none were wrinkled. All were yellow, none were green. All the flowers were axial, none were terminals in their position. It did not matter whether he had pollinated green by yellow or yellow by green: every one of the peas were yellow. Then Mendel fertilized the seed of each plant of this generation with its own pollen; this is called self fertilized And through several experiment Mendel proved that hereditary potentiality are clearly inherited as discrete units, which may be hidden in the presence of contrasting ones but are not lost and which may appear untarnished in later generation. So Mendel found that certain physical characteristic repeated over several generation and off spring which come show the -certain physical characteristic of both male and female i.e. from parents these physical characteristic were transmitted to offspring.

In 1957, these scientist Watson, crick, wilkins through series of experiment discover the principal of heredity, they cracked the genetic code. The gene are the carrier of arbitrary characteristic which is transformed from generation to generation in man Various species differ in numbers of chromosomes or sex cell. In human there is 46 chromosomes. In sex cell of man there is x and y. in female it is XX. When we look at the chromosomes of human and the living great apes (orangutan, gorilla and chimpanzee) there is great deal of similarities between numbers and overall appearance of chromosomes across the four different species. The four species have similar number of chromosomes with ape all having 24 pairs, and human having 23 pairs. Chimpanzee and human share 98% of our DNA. DNA is made up of proteins the proteins are made up of amino acid chains. Proteins of human and chimpanzee are about 99% identical.

Anatomy of brain of man and chimpanzee are quite same. Ethologist who study the chimpanzee found that chimpanzees are very social and they spend time in groups.

Ethologist such as Konrad Lorenz was awarded noble prize in 1973 for research in ethology on domesticated ducks. 60 or 70 years ago it was commonly belief that man is different from other animal in counting ability, making and using of tool ability to conceptualize musical ability and so on. But when several experiment conducted on birds which shows that they

have counting ability. Migrating birds are often capable of solving the most intricate and unpredictable problem of solid geometry similarly making of tool is common in animals.

Man is the only species which is physically, mentally depend upon the mother, kinship bond, human are much more allies.

Active cerebrai cortex of human brain has untapped properties, qualities, characteristic which are responsible. Quality such as his ability for symbol, communication, imagination, creativity etc. human bran has developed in highly specialized area in regard to organization of experience, regard to speech and communication. During the first part of this century the incorporation of genetic and population biology into studies led to a Neo-Darwinian theory of evolution that recognize the importance of mutation and variation within a population. Natural selection then became a process that altered the frequency of genes in a population and this defined evolution. This point of view held sway for many decades but more recently the classic Neo - Darwinian view has been replaced by a new concept which includes several other mechanism in in addition to natural selection. Current ideas on evolution are usually referred to as the Modem synthesis which is described by futuyma; "The major tenets of the evolutionary synthesis, then, were that populations contain genetic variation that arises by random mutation and recombination that populations evolve by changes in gene frequency brought about by random genetic drift, gene flow, and especially natural selection. This discription would be incomprehensible to Darwin since he was unaware of genes and genetic drift. The modem theory of mechanism of evolution differs from Darwinism in three important respects:

- 1) It recognize several mechanisms of evolution in addition to natural selection One of these, random genetic drift, may be important as natural selection.
- 2) It recognizes that characteristics are inherited as discrete entities called genes. Variation within population is due to the presence of multiple allies of gene.
- 3) It posulates that speciation is due to the gradual accumulation of small genetic changes. This is equivalent to saying that macroevolution is simply a lot of micro-evolution.

The process of evolution is determined by adaptation and Genetic mutation. Genetic mutation are sudden changes in genetic structure which effect whole population. So far as animal kingdom is concern the evolutionary process is blind. The animal species do riot play any role in their evolution. When we address human evolution in mid the picture radically changes. When we come to human evolution unlike other species human being play an important role in his own evolution And this takes place through cultural innovations, such as discovery and use of iron. Domestication of plant and animal on which human being survive. Domestication of animal i.e. domesticated animal used by human being for helping them. The adaptation of human to environment was made it possible by tool making. Man could use huge variety of tool which would protect from dangerous animal and climatic condition. Chimpanzee do use tool aside from man, they are the most skillful tool users in primates. Chimpanzee use tool for a[wide variety of reason chimpanzees in a their natural habitats break off suitable sticks, clean them of leaves, and use them to extract terminates from their nests to eat. They put sticks into bees' nests to got honey they get ants and terminates with different kinds of tool. But

chimpanzees uses his tools and throw away. But in human tools are drafted for other persons even for the future. When we enter into human evolution man play active role and this takes place through use of fire, iron domestication of plant and human co-operation, culture has played a very important role. All animals can survive only in very limited numbers of specialized diets in specialized tropical condition while the species Homo is just reverse. It is constantly increasing in numbers and finding new ways to live off all kinds of foodstuff in all kinds of environments. Most of adaptability depend upon cultural invention but, in a limited fashion, Homo also seems to undergo quite rapid genetic adaptation to specialized local conditions. There are human being in bushman of Kalhari desert and even multiplying. Similarly in case of Eskimo it is culture help him to survive. Culture facilitate man remarkable ability to the environment, age of vocalization and the unique neuro-physical brain in responsible for this language. The sound system serves the purpose of communication. In some species of animal sound is ultrasonic, it covers miles in ocean eg whales. But when we consider the nature of sound in human language as carry signification. These sound is every language has a particular meaning, it has multiple meaning depending on the context. It is associated with facial gesture. The sound we emit has a lot of meaning. The transmission and sharing of certain sound is decided by human beings. But in case of animals it is not like that inspite of genetic make up. Chimpanzee communicate through vocalization, facial expression, posture touch and movement and the facial musculature can express a Wide range of emotions. A numbers of experiment show that chimps can even team to use sign language or other language based on picture or symbol but this does not constitute an understanding or use of words. Noam chomsky who has pointed out that, although children have to learn the meaning of individual " words from their elders, they seem to know how to string words together so as to distinguish sense from nonsense long before they have acquired any substantial vocabulary.

The Fallacy of Reductionism and Determinism:

Reductionism I Determinism - It is a tendency to explain the dynamics, the variety, the complexity of human nature in terms of single causative principle. Since human life is multidimensional. In order to understand uniqueness of human personality all factors are to be considered. It can not be explain in terms of a social causative factors Reductionism distort the human reality related to biology environment genetics. So a variety of factors such as biology, genetics and environment all this has to be taken into consideration. According to Montesquie environment played a decisive role that social institution and cultural values can be explained in terms of environmental conditions. The environment appears for Montesquieu a key determining influence on human behaviour. This is to be rejected because human behaviour and social institution cannot be explain in single factors. We have to take variety of factors to understand human behaviour. In classical psychoanalysis Freud makes difference between conscious mind and unconscious mind. Freud considered the unconscious process the basic process. The unconscious inhibit the primary ego. So the total infantile personality fell into unconscious with development of secondary ego When secondary ego develops the childhood ego has not only builds up a system of wants and needs, it has also associated these

wants and need with specific objects. So according to Freud unconsciousness is dominant factor in mental event, There is a strong element of Reductionism and determinism in psycho- Biological determinism is a tendency to explain all behaviour including animal behaviour and human behaviour in terms of biological process.

Behaviourism

The response of the organism is determined by the nature of stimulates which means the organism responses to external stimuli. The organism does not respond itself. It is neutral in state. The theory of blank state and impressions are formed on this blank state through environment which activate human mind; It implies, that human organism by itself does not take the initiative in analyzing, in Judging, it is always with interaction, and capabilities are activated in interaction with root factor including family and social institutions. So behaviourism is a fundamentally reductionist theory of mind that attempt to explain mental events in terms of observable physical events.

Sociologism

Sociologism is a tendency to explain human behaviour only in terms of single causative factor Le society. Durkheim, he saw the domain of sociology as the study of social facts and not individual. Durkheim's social facts 'they are external to individual and cannot be explain in terms of biology and psychology cannot be explained at any other reality. He believe' that society had their own reality which could not simply reduce to the action and motives of

individual, and that individual moulded and constrained by their social environment.

In suicide (1897), he explained how even apparently individual decision to commit suicide could be understand as being affected by the different form of social solidarity in different social settings. Bid the fact in that our behaviour in that merely the outcome of social process, it is a complex interplay between two set of factor one is social institution and other set is individual decision. Our individual perception plays a important role in shaping our personality.

Biological Determinism

A distinguished biologist Jacques Manood in his book "Chance and Necessity" he argue that our whole life is product of biological process. He says what we are is the entirely because of our unique genetic structure. We have discussed earlier as man as hornabpiens and distinguished from other species of animal But as an individual is different from other human being in 4 different, ways out of which 2 are visible and 2 are invisible. Sensual repro- duction-creates; so great variety of hereditary endowments genotypes that no one of them is likely to arise repeatedlu. Identical or Mona zygotic, twins in man also have similar genotypes, because they arise by asexual multiplication of single fertilized egg cell. Brothers or sisters who are product of Mona zygotic multiple birth are, evidently, separate Individual. This difference arises because of different life

experience. These are - invisible features. But there are & things as a part Which can be seen face and fingers. Many biologist says that genes determines our behaviour. Fully are genes don't determines our behaviour. Our experiences a complex interplay with a variety of factors including such factors as nutrition, our genes, social environment our interaction with the members of family is also responsible. Biological determinism like environment determinism is unexpected,

Ethology

Ethology is Zoological study of animal behaviour, Ethologists have a special interest in genetically programmed behaviour known as instincts. The predictable behaviour programs are inherited by animals through their parents and portion of the programs are open to natural selection and modification. Thus, these behaviours are phylogenetic: adaptations that have an evolutionary history. In the case of animals the ethologists further maintain that aggression is a predominant drive in animal behaviour including man- Famous German ethologists Konrad Lorenz he wrote on his best selling book on aggression. He conducted experiment shows that aggressive behaviour is phylogenetically in all the species. It is a part of genetic make up. it is innate in them. They can't escape from this other ethologist William holding he came out with a significant manifestation that in all the animals in to possess and defend territory. All animals are phylogenetically programmed to defend their territory. Robert Ardrey maintain in his famous book "The Territorial Imperative" that aggressive behaviour results in animals to possess and defend exclusive ter". Aggressive, drive explain all dimension of human behaviour, this genetic drive is present in all species of animal and human. He said that Indo - China war is fight between two groups of birds. Fights within nations groups are imbedded it can't be rooted out. If it is as it is said that biologically rooted then it should be in animal also but aggressive behaviour is rare among chimpanzees. They do aggressive behaviour in two conditions when there is favourite food and other when the given place is overcrowded. It shows it is not genetically determined. Ethologists make a difference between predatory aggression and non-predatory aggression eg A lion jumping on a buffalo in order to eat the flesh. The most common type among the animals is non-predatory aggression. In human societies is all common in human. It is motivated at certain factors.

Sociobiology

They believe in the application of evolutionary principles to the behaviour of animals as well as human. It -explains the behaviour of man and animal such as maternal and the other altruism. They talk in terms of infanticide. They speak of homosexuality, prostitution among some species and even rape and incest and these kind of behaviour it is biologically determinants No scientific explanation in terms of any of these. They imply values institutionalized ideas which is found only in human society. There is no question of existence of cultural norms in animal society. Hence the argument is unjustified and unscientific. 2 major problem with sociobiologist. They have tendency to reduce all dimension of behaviour in animal as well as in human either in terms of biology or genetic. E. O. Wilson, is the founder of sociobiology. He says that all level of reality from human mind to human behaviour can be explained in terms of universal biological process. They define culture as an instinctive mode of adaptation to the environment. Social biologist made no distinction between

human behaviour and animal behaviour. They considered it as a part of process of the same spectrum. It does not take into consideration the most important fact in human behaviour i.e. self-consciousness. Sociobiologist is guilty of biological determinism, as an explanation of human behaviour. Because human behaviour is product of multiplicity of factors including some extend biology some extend environment self-consciousness and many other factors.

Questions

Discuss the characteristics that set man apart from the other species of animal

or

Write an essay on the uniqueness of man

or

Discuss the anthropological perspective on human nature

Reference,

John D. Marksman: The uniqueness of man J. Bronowski: The Ascent of Man. W. H. Thorpe: Animal nature and human nature. Edmund Leach: Social anthropology (Chapt on Humanity and Animality).

The Anthropological Tradition - The Enlightenments Legacy : The Growth and Development of Anthropology in the 19th & 21th Century

Objectives

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ The Early Beginnings
- ❖ The Enlightenment Tradition
- ❖ The Idea of Progress
- ❖ Latter Theoretical Developments
- ❖ Summary

Introduction :

Anthropology is the systematic study of the nature of human beings. This term is derived from two Greek words - "anthropos" meaning man and "Logos" meaning to study or science. The scope of anthropology is very vast. Ranging from subjects like supernatural beliefs of people, eating habits, the differences between the physical structure of tribes, their social behavior, languages used in different societies. Position of woman, social structure of different groups.

Anthropology may be separated into two major divisions. Physical and cultural. The understanding of human behavior in a total context has been a constant commitment of anthropologists and is often referred to as a holistic approach. The origin of anthropology can be traced back to the civilization of Europe and the middle east. The Greeks and Romans are said to have laid the foundation for anthropology as they did for "aesthetics", "natural physics", "logic", "history" etc.

The Early Beginnings :

The earliest statement of anthropology perspective is said to be made by Xenophanes in the 5th century B.C. He was a Greek, who was credited with being the first philosopher. Who stressed that society is created by human beings themselves. Another Greek who is said to have contributed to the early beginning is Herodotus. The beginnings of anthropology among ancient writers is based on their interest in history and their curiosity about natural science. The writings of Herodotus described the life-style of about fifty different peoples whom he visited during his travels. His methods were crude but his

perspective was broad enough to satisfy modern standards. He described the environment systematically and gave a detailed account of people, their physical characteristics and language. Socrates and Plato put both a fairly advanced social political and cultural analysis. So much so that their commentaries are still useful. The nature of human society continued to be a matter of concern throughout the classical period but anthropology did not develop as a identifiable social science for many centuries.

The Enlightenment Tradition :

The disintegration of Roman society by the 5th century A. D. saw the beginnings of a new perspective broadening understanding of the nature of man and society. As the Roman Empire gradually collapsed, the progressive and positive views of the classical civilization faded away by the time St. Augustine in the 4th century to a new idea arose especially that human beings are inherently alienated from divine perfection and order. The medieval period was dominated by religious orthodoxy but did throw up interest in the social environment. The adventures of traveling merchants and Christian missionaries encouraged an interest in history and especially in non-European peoples. Thus this age produced works describing wide variety of foreign people, their customs and way of life as well as serious attempts to analyze their political organization, legal system and other social phenomena; the later renaissance also witnessed new advances in the natural sciences, especially astronomy and biology. During this period Europe also began to widen its horizon. Voyages of discovery and conquest brought knowledge of unrecorded people to challenge the traditional interpretation. A divine history accounts of new lands and people became popular and these accounts provided descriptions of physical appearance, dress, customs, food, habits. Political systems and religions of strange and remote people who were being discovered by an expanding European civilization. The information which they had wasn't accurate but it still formed the basis for comparison by social theorists of primitive society with European society in order to study and understand basic social processes.

This period is known as Enlightenment. (18th cent A.D.) that is the hundred years or so between Locke's essay on human understanding and the French revolution is said to have given rise to modern anthropological theory. This period in western civilization marks a watershed in the development of new and revolutionary ideas especially in the social sciences. The enlightenment period encouraged different views and debates regarding the nature of human beings and societies. The arguments were wide ranging from Hobbes hypothesis about the natural state of man to liberal philosophers such as Locke who advocated democratic institutions in the belief that the human species had great potential. By the eighteenth century Montesquieu and Vico had begun to describe evolution and progress as the guiding force of human societies. They attempted to describe evolutionary stages, stages of social development and natural law governing society.

The Idea of Progress :

The idea of progress, focusing towards releasing man's full potential and his human nature, as he is the one who creates civilized society. The idea of

progressive advancement in humans knowledge was carried by the French by Fontanelle in 1688 (Buy 1920). The scientific and technological revolutions of the eighteenth century and social, political revolution had accompanied wide change. Which eventually resulted in difference a ideas; then later on due to scientific orientation and the age of reason promoted a view of universality where in Natural law” In this stage man was first as subject to these laws as all other things were universal as organic a ignorance. A focus an ideas directed more attention; towards group achievement rather than to doings of individual kings etc.

(1) Later Theoretical Development :

In the second half of the 19th century, anthropology became a separate academic discipline. Along with colonization. Another event lead to the increased interest in primitive people of the world. Scholars began to look for accurate data regarding remote people having simple technologies as these could be used to provide a base for the study of social evolution. As a result several scholar began comparative studies covering wide-ranging subjects like kinship system. Religion different elements of culture etc. Lewis Morgan (1818-1881) showed almost more than fifteen stages of development of marriage and family beginning with promiscuity and ending with monogamy. Edward Tylor (1832-1917) showed about the religious beliefs and culture which has been developed from certain observation of phenomena such as dreams, trances, vision, diseases, waking and sleeping his and death. Thus the influence of the evolution is evident is the works of the scholars of the 19th century.

Two major approaches to the comparative perspective emerged in the 19th century. One was the school of classical evaluation. Who processed on the concept of progress it made an attempt to reconstruct the hypothetical cause of development of societies and tried to show that evolution of societies followed a universal pattern. The idea of nonlinear evaluation was supported by scholars like Tylor, Morgan, Engels 2 others. According to them, cultural developments everywhere fallow certain definite laws.

The other major comparative trend dressed the development of cultural traits over geographical areas. This was concerned with life appearance and distribution of cultural phenomena in different-regions the importance of natural environment in development of culture. Cultural similarity in different societies reflected from a discussion and migration of culture. These two approaches had their own limitation and in the meantime Franz Boas (1858-1942) emphasized the importance of gathering concrete data, ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological and biological and called for a pause in the building of grand theories.

(2) The Twentieth Century :

The evolutionary theories of the 19th century were attacked by the diffusionists and the functionalists. The criticism of the diffusionists was based on the fact that culture is give borrowed and does not necessarily emerge in similar norms in different societies by spontaneous growth; the social life was explained in times of its past. The evolutionary approach does not explain like functioning

of society, only its history and its past development. The 19th century anthropologist were criticised for reconstructing history without adequate material for doing so and seeking to establish laws by a method which cannot had to their establishment this brought a separation of social anthropology ethnology.

The 20th century began to be dimidiated by functional orientation. Two scholars who directed social anthropology towards functionalism were Spencer and Durkheim. Spender stressed that at every stage in social evolution there is a necessary functional interdependence between the institutions of a society which must always tend towards a state of equilibrium of it is to persist. Durkheim said that social facts exist outseck and apart from individual menial can be understand only is its relation to after facts of the same order. Durkheim has a direct influence as social anthropology and his importance in history is because of his influence on Radcliffe Brown and Malinowski, who have shaped modern social anthropology. The functionalists insisted on the relatedness of things which has been partly responsible to and partly the product of modern field studies. Thus, it became necessary to have comprehensive studies of primitive societies. The functional approach changed the nature and object, research from speculative reconstruction a culture to the study of particular societies.

During the 20th century anthropology has developed into an increasingly complex and segmental academic discipline. Many theories and many law have emerged so much of anthropology is rooted into broad perspective of earliest giants.

Summary :

The earliest beginnings of the anthropological perspective can be traced to the Greek travelers Xenophanes and Herodotus. They described in detail the complete way of life of the people they visited. Social thought flourished during the Greek city - states too: Socrates and Plato put forth fairly advanced political commentaries, which are relevant even today. Social thought during the Medieval period was dominated by religious orthodoxy and the Church, Classical works of early civilizations were discovered by European scholars after the 13th century. With the Renaissance new advances began to be made in natural sciences and social and political thought. Explorers, voyagers and missionaries began to provide detailed descriptions of strange and remote peoples being discovered by expanding European civilization. This period, known as the Enlightenment brought into existence, modern anthropological theory. Thinkers such as Hobbes put new revolutionary ideas forth. Locke and Rousseau. The fathers of modern social science, Montesquieu and Vico described evolution and progress as the guiding force of human societies.

The late eighteenth and first half of nineteenth century saw important events in Western society such as the revolutions in America and Europe. This period saw the emergence of Saint-Simon and August Comte was propounded a new science of man to be created through positivism based on the scientific method. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels follow them with the class analysis of society.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, anthropology became a separate discipline, Darwin's evolutionary theory evinced new interest in simple peoples and comparative studies regarding a wide range of subjects such as kinship, religion etc. Were undertaken by scholars such as Morgan, Maine and Tylor.

Two major approaches emerged - the classical evolutionists and the diffusionists. Soon after, Franz Boas, who stressed the importance of gathering concrete data ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological and biological, gave a new emphasis to anthropological studies.

The twentieth century saw yet another movement in anthropology, the functional orientation. This trend was started by Durkheim and Spencer and continued by Radcliffe - Brown and Malinowski; Functional anthropology emphasized the concept of the social system and the need for systematic studies of primitive people.

Questions :

1. Trace the origins of anthropological perspective in the ancient and medieval period.
2. Explain the contribution of the Enlightenment to the growth of anthropology.
3. Discuss the development of a professional and scientific approach to anthropology in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

References :

Fried, Morton : Readings in Anthropology.

Honigmann, J. J. : Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.

Beals, R. I. & Hoijer, H : An introduction to Anthropology.

Hunter, D. & Whiten, P. : The Study of Anthropology.

Lewis I. M. : Social Anthropology in Perspective.

Keesing, R. Cultural Anthropology.

Peter Hanumond 'An introduction to cultural a social anthropology.

Robert Layton 1997 "An introduction to theory in Anthropology."

"An introduction to Anthropology by Ralph L. Beals Harry Hoijer and Alan & Beals.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

Objectives

To introduce students to the methods used in anthropology.

To familiarize them with the methods widely used in Anthropology.

Concept

- ❖ Fieldwork
- ❖ Ethnography
- ❖ Comparative Method
- ❖ Objectivity
- ❖ Subjectivity
- ❖ Cultural Relativism
- ❖ Ethnointism
- ❖ Text
- ❖ Context
- ❖ Ethic approach
- ❖ Ethroscience
- ❖ Diachronic
- ❖ Synchronic
- ❖ Nature anthropology
- ❖ Empiricism

Social anthropology like any social science, true to lean about social phenomena. Social anthropology has a will developed methodology for learning about society. This methodology has not developed overnight, but evolved through several decades.

What distinguishes social anthropology from other social science is its fieldwork methodology. If we make a survey of the tradition of social anthropological methods, we find that fieldwork and empirical tradition have been its contact characteristics. It can nit survivor without fieldwork even for a moment. The present section will focus or the various methods employed in anthropology to focus or the gather authentic data.

The Comparative Method :

The comparative method involves use of ethnographic data from many different kinds of society as a basis for constructing as evolutionary typology that can be presented to represent an actual historical sequence through which the different kinds of society moved. The comparative method in social anthropol-

ogy is the method of those who have been called armchair anthropologies since they work in libraries. Their first task is to look for what used to be called parallels, similar social features appearing in different societies, in the present, or in the past. Until the middle of the (19th, the great majority of comparative studies were carried out without reference to first hand investigation in the field, or even a critical marooning of the data available in the library. But during 1840's Lewis Morgan began a study of the Iroquois Indian which was to lead to an expansion of the comparative method in new direction.

When a social anthropologist makes a comparative study, he has three levels of comparison. First, he compares a single society with other societies, secondary, he compares one or two institutions of a society with similar institution of other societies, and third, he compares the institutions within a single society. The history of the use of comparison as a method of study in social anthropology goes back to the (19th Cent). It was a period of strongly influenced by evolution. The use of compares begins with Durkheim to Evans integrand in British social anthropology. The early researches had the following objects is employing companies, as a depends method for data generation.

- a) It is through this method that social anthropologists reconstruct the past and discover the laws governing social processes. As a matter of fact, comparison of particular features of social life for the purpose of historical construction has great value.
- b) It is through this that we make classification of the social system in different categories such as caste, class and groups.

Thus the comparative method is employed for discovering the laws of social focuses and to classify the social system of all the societies of the world as well. The comparative method used by anthropologist may be said to have two dimensions, synchronies and diachronic.

Synchronies is the systematic study of ethnographic data guess a wide range of cultures at a particular given point of time. It doesn't take into consideration the past of society. This synchronic approach was adopted by functionalists, Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown.

Diachronic on the other hand is the comparative study of culture society as they change through time in a specific geographical area. According to this approach, a historical dimension is a pre-requisite for understanding all human societies. Diachronic emphasizes the old historical traditions of a society and includes the use of oral traditions of people as sources for reconstructing their pasts. From diachronic studies, we can learn about evolution for human beings and their culture. The diachronic study is important because evolution is an essential element of anthropology. It shows the relationship between a particular way of life and the developments that led to it.

In the Indian context a number of inter-cultural and or non-cultural comparative study have been conducted. Anthropologists like J. Karve, N.K. Bose, Srinivas etc. undertook explicit comparison, combining the results of their field works with library resources. At a later stage with the coming of

Deenwnt and Pocock, the comparative method fell to disrupt. In the tradition of levi Stralls & Evans-Pritchard, Draw it is reluctant to accept the comparative perspective instead, he has adopted the structure approach. As a method of fact, amount, in his homo hierarchies, has takes ideology as a major perspective for studying Indian society. He compares Indian ideology which is holistic and hierarchical with the Western individualistic and egalitarian ideology.

The major attack on complaints method came from Franz Boas. He believed that laws exist which govern the development of the society but that the assumption which the evolutionists made also their basis was far too simple. In the limitations of the comparative method of anthropology (1896), he pointed out that the "anthropological research which compares similar cultural phenomena from various parts of the world in order to discover, the uniform history of their development, make the assumption that the same ethnological phenomena has everywhere developed in the same manner. Here lies the flaw in the argument of the new method, for a such proof can be given" (1940). Boas therefore rejected the grand evolution of the society as of doubtful value, and proposed that comparison be limited to the reconstruction of cultural history within small cultural area, in the 1st instance. Once histories of particular cultures have been worked out they in turn can be compared, general laws may be found.

Field Work

Social anthropology has a rich tradition of conducting field work. The nature of field work has changed from time to time. There are large number of social anthropologists who have conducted prolonged fieldwork among the tribals Evans-priterard lived several months among the Azande tribals of southern sudan, the Nuers of South Africa. In India, S. C. Dube conducted fieldwork in framerpet of Andhra Pradesh; M. N. Srinivas worked in Rampura village of Southern India. Fieldwork is a dependable source for generating data and therefore a dependable method of social anthropology.

The form of fieldwork, which came to be termed participant observation, eventually became the standard mode of ethnographic research. In particular, the British short of social anthropology exploited the potential of this method and produced a series of classic ethnographies that may prove to be the most enduring achievement of (20th century social and cultural anthropology).

Field work is the practical work done by a researcher in a specific area of knowledge. It is the study of people and of their culture in their natural habitat. It has been characterized by the prolonged residence of the investigator, his participation in and observation of the society and his attempt to understand the inside view of the native peoples and to achieve the wholistic view of social scientist.

Anthropologists began to do field work towards the end of the (19th cent.) but wear the middle of (18th cent) and middle of (19th cent) knowledge of primitive people and of the people of far East was greatly increased. The European colorization of America had been widely expanded, British rule had

been established in India, and Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa had been settled by European emigrants. The character of ethnographic description of the people of these regions began to change from travelers take to detailed study by missionaries and administrators who not only had better opportunities to observe but were also men of greater culture than the gentlemen of fortune of earlier times.

The publication of Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* in 1922 revealed the great potentialities of fieldwork. This study of Irokn and Islanders, among whom Malinowski had lived for three years, set new standards for field workers which continue to operate. Fieldwork came to mean immersion in a tribal society learning, as far as possible, to speech, think, see, feel and act as a member of its culture. It is significant that this method was forged in the study of small, homogeneous tribal societies in which it would have been difficult for the investigation to have avoided face to face relations.

In recent years, the range is type and size of societies studied by anthropologists have been extended. With this extension, new problems and new methods have developed, but certain other have remained same.

The anthropologist chooses the geographical area and cultural area for his filled project, studies the literature, and if the language has been recorded, learns as much of it as possible before going into the field. To understand a person's thought one has to think is their symbols. Also, in learning the language one learns the culture and the social system which are conceptualized in the language. Every kind of social relationship, every belief, every technological process, everything in social life of the native is expressed in words as well as in action, and when one has fully understood the meaning of all the words of their language is all their situations of reference we has finished one's study of the society.

Obviously in the first place the fieldwork must have had a academic training in social anthropology. He must have good knowledge both of general theory and of the ethnography of the region in which he is to work. He then has to consider whether he gives to the field alone, with his family, or as part of team. Whether he goes alone or with his family or as a member of a team, approval for the project and, it possible, cooperation must be secured from those who have authority in the society. The note from approval from these in power is only the first step. The field worker must this gain the good will of the people he wishes to study. He has to explain his presence to them, as he did to those in authority, as simply and honestly as possible. The anthropologist must from the beginning differentiate himself from other alives of his race of culture, such as missionary, government official etc, whom the indigenou, people must have behavior. It is extremely important that they have opportunities to observe and to know the fieldworker. The nearer his house is to the bus of activities, the easier it is for reciprocal observations and for easy social relations.

Gradually the fieldworkers role evolves. It the fieldworker may begin by rendering certain services. In a tribal society he often brings material goods ranging from ornaments to useful knives and spades. He may disperse simple remedies, such as aspirin and artionalarial medienes to those meeting them. He is

not only being helpful but is making it easy for people to see and know him.

During the first month or so the fieldworker process very slowly, making use of all his sensory impressions and interactions. He may get overwhelmed by the difficulties of really getting "inside" on alien culture and of learning an unrecorded or others strange language. He may wonder whether he should is tends into the privacy of people's lives by asking them questions. Sooner or later, when the fieldworker has established a support with the people and has learned how to handle his own anxieties, he establishes a routine of work.

Participating and observing become an ever more important part of the routine. The fieldworks observers and notes whatever comes within his range, even though he may not always know the relevance of all his observation. He follow long, devious sequences, such as those involved in initiation, marriage, death rituals which may be six more months in preparation and at the same time also observes the daily life in which they occur. He all companies the people on their economic tasks-hunting, fishing, planting, cooking and others. He listens to them converse and gossip when they are at ease and picks up new due which he later follows up. The intensity of field worker's participation varies from one situation to another and between investigators. Among the Nuer, Evare Pritchard was given little choice. The Nuer were "persistent and tireless visitors in and around his camp all the time, and he suffered from lack of privacy. Some anthropologists participate is ritual dances, feasts and similar social events; others limit themselves to taking notes. The field workers sense of the social situation and his personal desires & limitations dictate how much and when he will participate. Whatever the degree of the fieldworkers participation in the whole society friendships with a few people develop, and they help him to find a rich in the community. It is three friends who often become his best informants.

When the fieldworker has become familiar with the social customs and feels more or less accepted, he begins to work systematically on such anthropological problems as kinship; Forms of marriage and residence, economic and political organization, which craft and magical beliefs and practices, or any other aspect of life which is significant in the society and interesting to him. He asks questions in structural and unstructural interviews and roles the measure of agreement or disagreement between the pattern that emerge from the answers and the actual behaviours he observes. Another method is the tape recording of long interviews with different members of one family, resulting a significant humanistic account, whoever the anthropologist is interviewing or however he is participating there must be a high degree of reciprocal communication between him and the people studies.

The theoretical situation of the fieldworkers is significant from the beginning. Historical reconstruction, functionalism, a structural or cultural approach and psychological anthropology are among the major frames of reference. Each influences the fill developers voice of problems, the type of collection of data, the kinds of class he picks up, his techniques hypothesis and his interpretation.

The above points are relatively constant in all anthropological fieldwork. Among the new trends are an emphasis on specify problems rather than

wholistic studies working in larger and more complex societies, a greater concern with sampling, the use of sociological surveys along with traditional participation, observation and interviewing. A team has advantages in working on complex problems and in large societies, namely those societies which have deal power structures representing different ideologies. There is also the problem of centricity than ethnocentricity. Training enables as anthropologist to study carribalism, which craft, and other tribal customs with relative, objectivity. It is use easy to be objective on issues which threaten strong political or other social commitments. On the other hand, a person who has no commitments would not be able to understand those of others.

A quite new development not yet strong enough to be called a trend, the recognition that the field worker is himself on inherent part of the situation studied and that his personal as well as his scientific reactions are as important part of the research process. But there has been a reluctance to recognize the scientific significance of the fieldworkers personality and his all to human characteristics. Relatively little space is given in publication to his mistakes, to his trial and error nature of some os his procedures, to the role of chance, to the influence of his reaction on strange people and their culture, and other such important personal factors. The field is a laboratory in which the role of the investigator is significant and relevant to the study of the people and their culture, and obviously the more revealing the fieldworker is about his work, his role, the most scientific is the report and the more helpful it is to other investigations. The recognition of the significance of the personal characteristics of the fieldworker to his research confirms the point that fieldwork is an art as well as a science.

Objectivity and Subjectivity

Objectivity refers to a lack of bias, pre conceptions or prejudice. It is a central term. However scientists are not exactly agreed over threat it means to be objective. Some claim that following the procedures of the scientific method, objectivity will follow. Other argue that the scientists are subject to values and prejudices need to be declared publicly. It is often argued that the replication of scientific work acts as a self-righting mechanism which eliminates researcher and the values and attitudes brought to the research process and also to the methods used and to the extent to which they are neutral themselves.

Subjectivity on the other hand refers to the personal point of view seen to be partial and distorted. It is also defined as a lack of objectivity, that is, where the individual own view influences the approach taken to as issue. It is only the subjectivity of the individual that gives meaning to the social world.

However in the midst of all the distractions pressures and problem of personal adjustment, the anthropologist must always remember that the basic necessity in fieldwork is the exercise of scientific detachment. Of course, complete detachment is hard to imagine, but without moving himself from a position

of judging another culture, the anthropologists work is worthless. The best solution for the anthropologist would be to remind himself constantly that there are two cultures working at the same time the culture of the observer, which links in the back of his mind, and the cutting of the observed which hic before him. The anthropologist must always make a conscious effort to keep these two words separate, and to take any cultural bias he might have when writing about the others. In addition, the anthropological must avoid going into the field with preconceived ideas of what he will find. It takes an open mind and a willingness to other the research design on the basis of the situation at hand to yield a timely valid result.

The reason of this scientific detachment and objectivity can be seen in an important controversy between two famous anthropologist, who studied the same community. In the 1920's Robert Redfield went to the Mexican village of Tepoztlan, where the conducted field resource. Seventeen years late, Oscar Lewis, an anthropologist also went to Inpozthan to study the same community. Redfield description of life in Zepozuar is one of a idyllic rural setting where people were happy, healthy and well integrated. When Oscar Lewis studied to same community he found exactly, the opposites. His study showed that Zepozthan was characterized by constant suspicion and tension, there was no cooperation among the villagers and social relations were typically weak and stifled.

The differences between the anthropologists was mainly due to the outlook of the two different observers. Redfield's personal outlook was are which favoured the rural life style over treat of the city. Redfield had a predetermined preference for rural life and while living and working in Zepoztha's he was not able to overcome his bias, whereas Lewis left the opposite, that is, the peasant life was one of suffering, that poor people were disadvantaged, and that Redfield's notion about the relative values of country versus city life was backwards. Thus in his work in Zepoztha's he looked for and found suspicion and distinct where Redfield had described harmony and cooperation. Their result called into question the objectivity of anthropological research. We do not have to change in order to be good anthropologists, but we do have to suppress some of our stronger feelings for the duration of our research in order to insure that our observation will be objective.

Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is formally defined as that views of things in which one's own group is the center of everything and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. (summer, 1906) Stated less formally it is the habit of every group of taking for granted the superiority of its culture. It makes our culture into a yard stick with which to measure all other cultures. All known societies are ethnocentric. The "backward" native peoples, to whom to we feel so superiors, have a similar feeling of superiority to us. The attitude of ethnocentrism often leads to subjectivity in the study of other culture. If often distorts the comparative study of custom. Every cultural group tends to be influenced, in its evalu-

ation of other groups, by ethnocentrism. Sociologists postulates what anthropological observations confirm, namely, a universal tendency for any people to put it over culture and society is a central position of priority and worth. Many cultural traditions carry ethnocentrism to a point where the group concerned looks upon itself to a superior or even a "chosen" people. Racial prejudice, religious fundamentalism, communalism, and their inhuman, violent destructive consequences for human life and culture are all products of ethnocentrism. For an anthropologist doing fieldwork each culture has its own integrity, its own system of values and its own areas of complexity is custom. For objectivity in anthropology it becomes essential for the professional anthropologist to be free of ethnocentrism.

Cultural Relativism

Anthropologists in the last few decades have led a vigorous action against the points of ethnocentrism. As cultural anthropologists began to conduct empirical fieldwork among different cultures of the world, they recognized a need to provide dispassionate and objective descriptions of the people they were studying. According to Franz Boas, the father of modern anthropology in the United States, the way in which anthropologists are to strive for that level of detachment is through the practice of cultural relativism. This is the notion that other cultures can be evaluated and understood only in accordance with their own standards, not from the cultural perspective of the observer. For Boas, cultural relativism involved strict neutrality when describing and contrasting culturally different populations. The anthropologist was to avoid making value judgments about the relative merits of one culture over another: In function and meaning of a trait is a relative to its cultural setting. Take for eg:- An anthropologist conducting fieldwork among the Eskimos may find their "igloo" to be a primitive sort of dwelling when compared to the concepts building in cities. However from the Eskimo point of view it would be the ideal dwelling which protects them from the extreme climate. An anthropologist following cultural relativism would both at the "igloo" not from his own viewpoint but objectively from the Eskimo as point of view.

Thus cultural relativity would enable the anthropologist to study the culture objectively without his own bias for any particular culture.

New Ethnography

New ethnography is an Emic approach to the description of a culture that focuses on the body of knowledge and the culture bound rules that define and influence appropriate behavior for a speech community. An emic approach is the one where anthropologists concentrate on describing the indigenous values of a particular society. The emic approach became popular in the late 1960's as part of the movement towards cultural relativism.

The group of cognitive anthropologists began to assert that to describe the content of such a body of knowledge is to describe a community. Culture and proposed questions such as "what does a person need to have learned if he is to understand events in a strange community as its members understand them and if he is to conduct himself in ways that they would accept as conforming to their expectations of one another?"

Attempting to bring linguistic rigors into the description of cultures, the new ethnography was influenced first by structural linguists such as Kenneth Pike and then by Noam Chomsky. Based on an emic perspective focused on explication of the culture bound rules that account for the behaviours of a people by describing the socially acquired and shared knowledge, or culture, that guides members of the society to behaviours ways deemed by their fellows, the new Ethnography was expected to represent its host cultures with widely good enough that the natives are able to recognize in it familiar features of their own culture. This would allow the ethnographers "to break through Euro American Ethnocentrism and try to see other cultures as natives see them. Defining culture cognitively as knowledge systems, the New Ethnographers developed a set of methods known as ethno science that allowed them to record topical domains within a culture such as ethnolinguistics and ethnocentrism. The ultimate aim was to describe explicitly methods and question frames so the ethnographic description could be replaced with others.

Although the new Ethnographer was criticized by behaviourally oriented anthropologists as not being new and for not adequately addressing variability and complexity within cultural knowledge, the basic principles of and methods of the new Ethnography of the 1960's are now regarded as standard features of contemporary ethnography.

Summary

The discipline of anthropology uses several methods in order to arrive at data regarding social phenomena. The methodology of social anthropology is mainly field work. It is empirical and empirical work is experience. No field-work can be done without empiricism. However to arrive at this empiricism anthropology also makes use of comparative methods. There are certain attributes which characterize field work like knowledge of local language, familiarity with peoples cultural and social life, stress on cultural relativism as opposed to ethnocentrism, study society from insight, and physical productivity where he should be morally a part of the community and impartial study to comparative method involves use of ethnographic data from many different kinds of society as a basis for constructing an evolutionary typology. There is often a debate between objectivity and subjectivity in anthropology. It is often impossible for the anthropologist to completely remain detached from his own culture which interpreting and analyzing other cultures. Often the anthropologist tends to become ethnocentric while evaluating other cultures. At the same time subjectivity or the bias may possibly distort the validity, thus preventing to give a true picture of the community under investigation.

Questions

1. Fieldwork methodology is the guiding of anthropology. Discuss.
2. Discuss the comparative method and its uses in anthropology.
3. Explain the concepts of Ethnocentrism and cultural relativity.
4. Bring out the problem of subjectivity and objectivity in anthropological Resources.
5. Write short note of new Anthropology.

Additional Leading / Bibliography

- ❖ Cultural Anthropology. M. J. Herakovits, Oxford and IBH Publishing Company. 1955.
- ❖ Method in Social Anthropology - selected Essay of R. Brown, edited by M. N. Srinivas, As a Publishing House, 1958.
- ❖ Context (and meaning in cultural Anthropology, edited by M. E. Spiers), Free Press, 1965.
- ❖ Social Anthropology, E. E. Evans Prit Crard, Routledge and kegan Baul Limited, London, 1972.
- ❖ Cultural Anthropology, Frt Friedl. J, Harper college press, 1976.
- ❖ Writing Cultures - the politics and politics of ethnography, James Clifford and G. E. Masmus (ed). OUP, 1990.
- ❖ Social Anthropology, P. C. Jain and S. Ravat Publications, 2001.

Anthropology & Others Disciplines : The Natural Science, Social Science & Humanities

Objectives :

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 What is Anthropology?
- 4.3 Its historical background
- 4.4 The relation of anthropology to other science.
- 4.5 Uses of Anthropology
- 4.6 Summary

Introduction :

The objective of this course is to examine the key concepts, methods & theoretical orientation used by anthropologist. We will explore in a unique manner about various issues related to anthropology. Its historical background, which is concern with the nature of humanity & with the variety of human cultures which seems almost universal among human begins. Which is often expressed in myths & legends describing the creation of human beings. The relation of anthropology with other disciplines. Modern anthropologists such as Krober have portrayed anthropology as an integrated discipline. This discipline is known widely for intellectual development, its therefore moving towards diversification & specialization resulting in new areas of study.

What is Anthropology? :

The word anthropology is a combined form derived from the Greek terms “Anthropos” (human begin) and “logos” (word) and can be translated as the study of humanity. Through the systematic analysis and comparison of all that can be discovered about humanity. Anthropology seeks to develop increasingly profound and useful knowledge about the human condition. Anthropology is the study of man, it is the study of the origin development & nature of the human species. It is the most comprehensive of academics disciplines dealing with mankind. Its wide ranging nature can be seen in its concern with the complete geographical & chronological sweep of human societies, the breath of its interests covers such diverse areas such as language, social structure & belief systems. In fact it is singular in that it alone among the societies of man studies him in his physical and socio-culture aspects. The subject matter of anthropology then includes the earliest fossilized bones of human like creatures the artifacts &

material remnants left in the earth by our ancestors & all of the living or historically describes peoples on the earth.

Anthropology seeks a deep understanding of the human species by the systematic analysis & comparison of different groups of human beings. Since ethnic groups differ both in physical type and socio-cultural characteristics, anthropology has been concerned with its physical and socio-cultural branches. Broadly, anthropology has four major branches. The four major branches of anthropology are biological anthropology cultural-social anthropology, archeology and linguistics. Biological anthropologists use the techniques of the biological sciences in the study of fossil and living human beings. Cultural-social anthropology uses techniques of historical research, observation and interviews in the study of recent and living peoples. Archaeology uses techniques of excavation and historical research to reconstruct the ways of life of vanished peoples. Linguistics uses the same techniques as cultural-social anthropology for the analysis of human languages. Although the four branches of anthropology use different techniques and examine somewhat different subject matters. They all share the goal of understanding humanity and they all make use of a single theoretical concept, the idea of culture. The ideal of culture, which represents one of the great scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is that human behavior, unlike that of any other animal species, is uniquely influenced and determined by cultural traditions that are transmitted among groups of human beings primarily by means of language. Each of the peoples of the earth possesses its own distinctive way of life including its own ways of doing things and its own ways of speaking. In a word, each people has its own culture. Anthropology is not just the study of human beings. It is the study of human beings living in societies and following distinctive way of life labeled "Culture". Even the study of human biological evolution requires understanding of relationships between biological processes and emerging cultural forms.

This introduction to anthropology weaves together the findings of biological anthropology, cultural-social anthropology, archaeology and linguistics to provide an explanation of the development and nature of human cultures. Because any general statements about human beings are relevant to living peoples, the principal emphasis of this book is upon cultural-social anthropology. We rely upon biological Anthropology for understanding of the biological evolution of humanity and for understandings of the biological foundations that underline all human cultures.

History of the Development of Anthropology :

For many thousands of years, travel, trade and exploration have brought people of different languages and cultures into contact. These contacts generated tales of strange and exotic people and their customs. The Greek historian Herodotus might thus be seen as an early kind of anthropologist. In the fifth century BC he traveled around the Greek colonies of the Mediterranean and North Africa and described in considerable detail the indigenous peoples of those regions and their ways of life.

Herodotus' writings could be described as one of the earliest ethnographic descriptions but if we are to talk of anthropology as a discipline rather than a loose collection traveler's tales, we must move forward to the nineteenth century when the scholarly study of human cultural and biological diversity began to take shape. At this time the western world was in the throes of some rapid

and far-reaching developments. Across Europe and North America the expansion of new industries, mass migration from the countryside to the cities and the development of new systems of communication and transport had profound impacts on social life and the organization of society and economy. This was also a time when western colonial expansion and domination were at their height. Social commentators and philosophers were keen to understand the changes that were happening around them. The foundations of the major academic disciplines as we know them today were laid down during this period.

One of the major questions asked during the nineteenth century was 'how did we get to where we are today?' Charles Darwin wrote an account of the way species develop through natural selection; this was his theory of evolution which first appeared in 1859. Darwin suggested that all life forms had developed gradually over long periods of time, with the more successful species displacing ones less well adapted to their environment. These ideas had a profound impact on scientific enquiry in the biological sciences and also had wider cultural repercussions. Many of the most influential social theorists of the nineteenth century adapted Darwin's model of biological evolution to understand changes that were happening at a social and cultural level.

One of the major questions asked during the nineteenth century was 'how did we get to where we are today?' Charles Darwin wrote an account of the way species develop through natural selection; this was his theory of evolution which first appeared in 1859. Darwin suggested that all life forms had developed gradually over long periods of time, with the more successful species displacing ones less well adapted to their environment. These ideas had a profound impact on scientific enquiry in the biological sciences and also had wider cultural repercussions. Many of the most influential social theorists of the nineteenth century adapted Darwin's model of biological evolution to understand changes that were happening at a social and cultural level.

Two important disciplines concerned with the study of humanity emerged at this time, namely anthropology and sociology. The branch of scholarship, which was later to become sociology, turned its attention to changes in the West. The branch of Scholarship, which was later to develop into anthropology, established its focus on the 'Primitive' and began a search for the precursors of modern civilization. Societies, which were non-literate, technologically simple and small-scale in terms of their economic and political organization and usually far removed from Western Europe became the focus of the emerging discipline of anthropology. Nineteenth century anthropologists believed that such societies provided a glimpse of humanity at an earlier stage of social evolution and that in time they too would develop modern ways of life. Such views, widespread in society at that time, have since been rejected as knowledge about our common humanity has developed.

By the early decades of the twenties century ideas of social evolution were beginning to be questioned and so called 'Primitive' societies began to be studied not simply as evidence of earlier stages of social development but as societies in their own right. The job of the anthropologist was thus not to arrange such societies on a scale from high civilization to technological simplicity but rather to understand each society according to its own particular logic. Strange myths, rituals, art forms, marriage practices and ways of living were treated as legitimate topics of study. Each society represented a unique expression of human cultural variation and physical adaptation. The attempts to

understand non-western peoples on their own terms came to be known as cultural relativism. This approach to the study of cultural variation became a distinctive feature of North American cultural anthropology associated with such influential figures as Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict.

Anthropology and Other Discipline :

Anthropology is commonly classified as a social science, related to such disciplines as sociology, psychology, geography, economics and political science. Through biological anthropology, it is closely connected to such fields as anatomy, physiology, embryology and genetics. Biological anthropology, archaeology and cultural anthropology, all exchange points of view with the more general biological sciences of ecology and ethnology. Archaeologists seeking new methods of dating or new ways of analyzing archaeological sites and their contents, are often closely linked to geologists, paleontologists, soil chemists and physicists. Linguists, archaeologists and cultural anthropologists maintain a close liaison with such humanistic disciplines; anthropology provides a view of the past and a constant remembrance of human diversity.

The principal contribution of anthropology to other disciplines stems from its role in the development of the concept of "culture". Of particular importance here, are the facts that culture is learned, that the parts of any culture tend to reflect human endeavor rather than natural or divine law, and that perceptions of truth, beauty, goodness and wisdom are deeply influenced by the cultural tradition to which the individual has been exposed.

For the humanistic disciplines the concept of culture carries the implication that styles of art, music and literature are based upon arbitrary criteria characteristic of individual cultural traditions. Although particular kinds of images or particular kinds of sounds may have a universal appeal among human beings, the findings of anthropology demonstrate that there is no kind of song, picture or story that everyone must automatically consider beautiful or worthy of attention. Because anthropologists are the only academic specialists who are routinely trained in the art of studying the understanding cultures other than their own, anthropologists have willy-nilly become authorities on the art, music and literature of most of the peoples of the world, because anthropologists rarely possess the specialized knowledge acquired by specialists in the humanities, anthropologists, for their part must turn to the humanities for information about the methods to be used in describing and analyzing art styles or literary and philosophical traditions.

Specialists trained in the social science, like specialists in the humanities, tend to emphasize the study of their own or closely related cultures. If they are to make wide-ranging generalizations about human psychology, politics or economics, social scientists must depend upon anthropologists and the data they have collected in order to demonstrate the general importances of their findings. The psychologist discovers interesting differences in ability or personality between male and female. Within anthropology specializations such as social anthropology, psychological anthropology, economic anthropology and political anthropology have

the task of maintaining liaison with other social science fields and of testing the general applicability of their findings. Anthropologists also borrow research methods and theoretical approaches from the more specialized disciplines.

Biologists who are directly concerned with the study of human beings must depend upon anthropology for much of their information about human beings living in different cultures. In the field of nutrition, information about the requirements of the human animal can often be verified by consideration of the varied diets characteristic of people living in different cultures. The anthropologist often approaches physical scientist, biologist and mathematicians with due humility hoping for answers concerning the age of some particular archaeological site etc.

Anthropology has an important role to play in integrating the findings of more specialized disciplines into more general and holistic explanations of human behavior.

(a) Physical Anthropology :

Physical Anthropology is linked by tradition & academic usage with the behavioral science, but basically it is a biological science. It is the anthropology counterpart of the various biological sciences that deal with human beings, it is therefore concerned with human beings living in diverse culture & the role of culture in the evolution of human species, it differs from the disciplines that regard human beings strictly in biological terms. The subject matter of physical anthropology falls into two major interrelated categories - (i) Human paleontology which studies human fossils & their meaning in terms of long-range human evolution. (ii) Human, population biology & human genetics which studies the adaptation to differing environments, the hereditary characteristics of living populations ranging in size from regional stocks & races to local groups such as religions, groups or castes. The physical anthropology differs from the biologists' study of man in that he is mainly concerned with human variation such as ageing, sexual differences, growth patterns, physical & psychological differences between human groups, current & past & the geographical distribution of physical characteristics. The main sub-fields of physical anthropology are (i) The study of primates. (It is concerned with the similarities & the differences between humans & the primates). (ii) The study of human fossils. (It studies mainly with bone material that have survived the normal processes of decay & transformation). (iii) The study of living human population. (It mainly observes the processes of evolution 'which' are taking place within human groups at the present times e.g. the genetic composition of human population which directly affect by adaptation in climatic conditions).

(b) Cultural Anthropology :

Cultural Anthropology deals with culture, the word culture in anthropological sense means all the behavior & beliefs which people learn & share with others. It includes religion, social & political organization, economies, technologies, arts, narrative forms & language. Cultural anthropology is interested in the description & comparison of all human cultures. They study cultures, which are completely diverse & located in remote areas or even densely populated towns & cities. Cultural anthropology has many sub-fields: Ethnology, archaeology and linguistics & eco-

logical anthropology.

(b.1) Ethnolinguistics :

Linguistics is the study of languages across space & time. It is significant study of languages; it had developed independently mainly because much of the structure of language can be analyzed quite independently from the rest of the culture of which it forms a part. At the same time the knowledge of linguistics is essential for anthropology since language is an important part of culture. Linguistics has two major subdivisions - descriptive & historical or comparative linguistics. Descriptive linguistic is concern with the analysis of languages at a given point of time. It studies the sound system, grammar & vocabulary of languages. It attempts to describes formally the basic elements of language & the rules by which they are ordered into intelligent speech. Linguistics are concerned with the spoken language & it derives their material for analysis by listening to & writing down special symbols, spoken words of people who use the language for communication. Comparative or historical anthropology attempts to trace the course of linguistic evolution & to reconstruct ancestral language forms. It deals with historical relationship between languages whose history can be traces through written records. These techniques have now been advances so that they can be reliably used for establishing the relationship between different languages & also for reconstructing the history of unwritten languages. Ethnolinguistics has been important in the contribution it has made by studying a large number of families. It has increased the range of possible comparison & has contributed to the development of understanding in general.

(b.2) Ethnology :

Ethnology is the study of culture of living people as well as extinct culture, which have some written records. Ethnology is historically oriented from the begging & it tries to explain the races, languages & culture of people in terms of their movement & other historical processes such as diffusion & so on. The dominant trend in the 19th century ethnology was an evolutionary explanation of how things came into existence. In the 20th century it studied the whole culture of such societies, which includes the study of social political organization, religion, tradition. Folklore, knowledge, technology, economics, music dance & others. It covers more aspects of culture than in case of history of sociology. The comparison between cultures aim at arriving valid general laws of human customs & human nature & the classification of individual culture in terms of culture types or historical connections.

(b.3) Archaeology Anthropology :

Archaeology is of great importance in understanding the early man & the study of anthropology. It is based on the study of inferences from culture products & substances remains recovered by excavation. Archaeology is the sub field of anthropology that deals with man's past. It includes the culture history of man i.e. tracing changes over time & the reconstruction of daily life & interests of pre-historical people. The pre-historical studies the very long preliterate periods of the major civilization of the world. It also involves the study of the earlier pasts of non-literate people. Archaeology has been responsible for providing knowledge & understanding in human culture during most of periods on human existence,

an archaeologist obtains his information from the surviving material remains of human activities. He has highly developed technique for excavation & observing the remains & many aspects of culture of recovered. It aims to reconstruct the past culture as completely as possible & then to study their movements, changes, contacts & influences on each other's. culture types or historical connections.

(b.4) Ecological Anthropology :

Ecological Anthropology is a relatively new area of study. Ecological anthropology has arisen out of the view that anthropology is an integrated discipline; it developed as an integrated approach known as the systems approach, which provides a holistic view of nature, recognition of reciprocal relations among the various systems of an organism & of interaction physical environment, which together constitute integrated systems. Ecology is not exactly an anthropological sub-discipline. Nor is it a standardized approach in anthropology. For most anthropologists, it is at the most on all pervasive point of view. Commonly, studies that deal in any way with the relations between man & environment & called ecological studies, it can be defined as the study of entire groups of living organism & their physical environment which together constitute integrated systems.

(c) Ethnography :

Ethnography is the description of the social & cultural system of a particular group. The data of cultural anthropology is collected from direct observation of customary behavior in particular societies. Making observation & then reporting & evaluating such observations are the task of ethnography. The scope & definition of ethnography have varied considerably & there are many different opinions regarding the subject matter. Ethnographer tries to record & describe the culturally significant behavior of a particular society, this makes it necessary for the ethnographer to have a long period of intimate & first-hand study of the society concerned residence within the community, knowledge of the spoken language & use of wide range of observational techniques including prolonged face to face contacts with in the members of the local groups. Broadly ethnography refers to the discipline concern with producing cultural description.

(d) Medical Anthropology :

The effectiveness with which human groups combining biological & cultural resources adapt to their environment is indicated by the measures of health & disease in the group. The relationship of health & disease to culture & biological factors is the meeting factor in medical & cultural anthropology. Although modern medicine has had a biological orientation, medical history shows that it always was concerned with social & cultural aspects of the maintenance of health & cause of diseases. Ever since the earlier medical system known history, variation in health has been connected with variation in social circumstances & habit patterns. Interest industrial revolution with its associated public health problems led to a period of impressive development of social medicine. Medicine was conceived of as a social science, both in a basic & applied sense.

The emphasis was made on the scientific investigation on the impact of social & economical conditions on health & disease. It was also stressed that society had their obligation to assure the health of its members & social intervention was advocated to promote health & combat diseases. Towards the latter part of the 19th century, modern medicine became extremely concerned with the cause of the disease & interest in social & cultural context declined. The need for medically related research in anthropology & other science has increased due to change in nature of threats to health.

The Uses of Anthropology :

Like physics, anthropology has generally regarded itself as a basic science dedicated to the discovery of basic principles that might later find application. Even today the practical value of anthropology lays not so much in the general principles it has discovered as in the data it collects and in the methods it has developed for collecting such data. Through the lens of the archaeologist or cultural anthropologist it is possible to see one's own society as a mere episode in the millions of years of human history and as a mere episode in the millions of years of human history and as a simple instance, no better and no worse, of the many different societies that exist today or have existed in the past. In coming to understand the Eskimo, the Hopi Indians or the Arunta of Australia as they really are or recently were, the individual discovers a kinship with humanity. If these other peoples believe and act as they do because they have learned some particular cultural tradition, then we, ourselves, can perceive the they have learned some particular cultural tradition, then we, ourselves, can perceive the impact of our own cultural tradition upon the things that we believe in and act upon. Anthropology provides the means of discovering new ways of doing things and new ways of seeing things.

Although practical persons have argued that education should be limited to that special training which will enable the individual to find a job and pay taxes, anthropology remains a stronghold of liberal education. Course in linguistics, anthropology and biological anthropology provide more than a taste of scientific method, while courses in the art, literature and religion of other peoples provide background in the humanities. On the whole, anthropology is not so much a means of preparing for life as a means of enjoying and understanding it.

Most of the jobs available to anthropologists are teaching jobs in universities. Such jobs require a Ph. D. and the Ph. D. requires five or six years of graduate training. A master's degree in anthropology, although it may sometimes be useful in obtaining job in junior colleges or museums, is mainly useful in conjunction with other more practical disciplines. A bachelor's degree in anthropology, combined with an appropriate selection of other courses, may sometimes be useful in securing admission to schools of laws, social welfare, education or business administration. Some knowledge of anthropology is likely to be useful in almost any career in the teaching or helping professions or in the humanities or social science.

One of the problems in the development of an applied cultural anthropology is that those in government or industry who can afford to support support applied anthropologists are often concerned with the manipulated of

subject peoples, employees or client groups in ways that individual anthropologists consider unethical. The fact that "he who pays the piper calls the tune" is a problem common to all sciences, from the physicists who build atomic bombs to the marine biologists who discover more effective ways of killing fish. Nevertheless the emergence of anthropology was in part based on the need of colonial governments to discover ways of governing or controlling their sometimes unwillingly subjects. French British, Dutch and other colonial governments at one time made extensive use of anthropology as a means of understanding tribal peoples who had come under their control. At best such anthropological collaboration with governmental agencies produced vast improvement in otherwise intolerable situations. Jams Mooney, who was asked by the United States government to investigate the ghost dance of the American Indians and the circumstances surrounding the massacre of the Sioux Indians at Wounded Knee Creek brought in a ringing condemnation of American policy toward the Sioux which may, in fact, have influenced government policy.

In recent years cultural anthropologists interested in applying their knowledge in practical situations have become increasingly cautious and the main thrust of their interest now centers upon four fields: community development, urban anthropology, medical anthropology and educational anthropology. Anthropologist's work with medical personnel in a variety of ways the main thrust of their efforts has to do with understanding, folk categories of disease and methods of diagnosis and proposing ways of improving the delivery of medical care. In educational anthropology the impact of anthropology is generally in the direction of modifying teaching methods and bureaucratic policies in ways that will make education more generally available to members of minority ethnic groups or to populations that are being offered or having forced upon them, a modern educational system. The usefulness of cultural anthropology in the preparation of environmental impact studies or in the solution of other pressing social problems has only been sporadically recognized.

Surprising, as it may seem the practical utility of archaeology is far more widely recognized than is that of cultural anthropology. In the United States, law generally recognizes many states subsidizing the recovery and exhibition of archaeological remains and the importance of preserving archaeological sites from careless excavation or ruthless bulldozing. In countries like Mexico Italy, Egypt and India substantial tourist income is derived from the exhibition of archaeological sites that are preserved and maintained by large and influential government departments.

Linguistics, perhaps the most developed of the four sub disciplines of anthropology, has for years served the practical purpose of improving instruction in language. Linguistic research into the special dialects spoken by various ethnic groups.

Biological anthropology from its beginnings as a methods of measuring human bodily dimensions, has contributed to the better design of machines, furniture, clothing, artificial limbs and other equipment that must be closely matched to human bodily dimension. It contributes to the solution of many medical and legal problems ranging from the identification of bone materials to genetic counseling for those who fear their children may inherit possible genetic defects.

Despite the highly specific and practical value of particular specializations in archaeology, linguistics and biological anthropology, it seems probable that the true use of anthropology will always arise out of the understandings of cultural similarities and differences that it provides. A knowledge of the ways in which other peoples have planned their buildings, educated their children developed new art styles, handled their population problems or settled their conflicts will always be of value to those who are concerned with the improvement of the human condition.

Summary :

Anthropology is the study of the origin, development and nature of the human species through the use of specialized methods employed by four closely cooperating sub fields: biological anthropology, cultural-social anthropology, archaeology and linguistics. The central concept linking the four sub fields is the idea of culture. Research in anthropology involves a concern with all human beings, past and present and with all of their works and activities. Although there are many disciplines that deal with human beings, anthropology occupies a special role because it involves a combination of holistic, historical and comparative methods. The ultimate goal of anthropology research is the explanation of the similarities and differences among all of the past and present peoples of the earth. Anthropology requires the use of special research methods, not used in the study of other animal species because human beings differ in a number of important ways from other animals. These differences are most notable in the development of tools, language and culture among human beings. Although most distinctively human characteristics exist in one form or another among other species of animals, they are all found together only among human beings. Human adaptations to the environment have been made largely in terms of culture. This has permitted human beings to remain relatively unspecialized from a biological point of view and therefore adaptable to a wide range of environments. The human culture building capacity is closely associated with the ability to invent and use language and therefore to develop an ever-growing heritage of traditional knowledge.

Although the archaeological record demonstrates the development of a human or human like tradition of tool manufacture and use over a period of a least five millions years, there is little evidence concerning the development of language or the non-material aspects of culture. A conservative guess is that language and culture were well, if not fully, developed with the emergences of *Homo erectus* some one million years ago. The presence of tools and probably of rudimentary forms of language and culture, during the several million years of evolution in the human direction suggested that human biological evolution was in part a reflex of human cultural evolution. The presence of culture, then is a part of the human conditions and it follows that an explanation of humanity involves an explanation of culture. The basic research questions in anthropology have to do with culture and its relationship to human evolution to environmental relationships and to the human personalities who paradoxically create cultures, yet are themselves created by culture.

Among the sub disciplines of anthropology, biological anthropology is most concerned with the biological nature of humanity. It differs from other biological sciences dealing with humanity because it uses the concept of culture to define the groups that it studies and as a means of development of the biological evolution. Although the recent and explosive development of the biological sciences has created a variety of specialized sub fields with physical anthropology, the main sub fields continue to be defined in terms of the study of primates, of fossil remains and of living populations.

The goals of cultural anthropology include the description of the entire range of human behavior and the development of explanations of the similarities and differences among cultures. Cultural anthropologists tend to emphasize selected aspects of culture and this has led to the emergence of a wide variety of sub fields ranging from ecological and economic anthropology to the anthropology of art.

In a sense archaeologists are cultural anthropologists who work under the handicap of dealing only with the material remains of former cultures, but with the advantage of being able to consider variation and change over periods of thousands of years. Archaeology, is the means by which the human past is reconstructed and the major outlines of cultural evolutions described. Like the archaeologist, the linguist can be regarded as a specialized kind of cultural anthropologist. The linguist, using a highly sophisticated set of methods, prepares description of existing or surviving languages. These descriptions are used to establish historical relationship among languages and to elucidate the processes involved in the origin and development of language. They also permit the development of understandings of human thought and communication and of the relationship among language and other aspects of culture.

Anthropology provides a wide range of scholarly disciplines with the cross cultural information required for the development of truly universal interpretations of human being and the world about them. Anthropology, in turn, relies upon more specialized disciplines or the methods as needed for the understanding of particular aspects of culture & providing a fresh means for the reevaluation of traditional ways of doing things.

Questions :

1. Explain the nature & scope of physical anthropology? Write a note on medical anthropology? its relationship between physical & medical anthropology?
2. What is ethnology? Write a note on it?
3. What is ecological anthropology? Write a note on ecological anthropology?
4. Discuss the contribution of archaeology to anthropology?
5. What is Ethno linguistics? Its importance to anthropology?

References :

Boas, Franz, "Anthropology", Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. II New York : Macmillan Publishing Co. inc., 1930, pp 73-110.

Friend, Morton H. *The study of Anthropology* New York : Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1972
Frantz Charies, *The Student Anthropologist's Handbook : A guide to Research, Training and Career* Cambridge, Mass. : Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

Hallowell, A. I. "The Beginnings of Anthropology in America : Selected Papers from the *American Anthropologist*, 1888-1920 ed. Frederica deLaguna. Evanston, III : Row Peterson & Company Inc. 1960.

Hays, Hoffiman Reynolds *From Ape to Angel : An Informal History of Anthropology* New York : Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1958.

Kardiner, Abram and Edward Preble. *They Studied Man* New York : New American Library of World Literature, Inc. 1963
Informal sketches of early anthropologists and their work.

Langness, L. L. *The Study of Culture*, San Francisco : Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Inc. 1974. A concise discussion of major anthropological points of view in historical perspective.



Human Nature in Comparative Perspective

Objectives :

1. To introduce student to the subject matter of physical Anthropology.
2. To understand the characteristic that set man apart from other species of animals.

Physical or biological anthropological deals with the human biological diversity. The physical anthropologist concern with the change that has occurred in the human physical form, over time. The physical anthropologist is interested in the behaviour of primates as well as their anatomy. In recent year a number of anthropologist have turned their attention to the study of primates which includes apes, gorillas, chimpanzees etc. We are able to learn what is uniquely other primate. The physical anthropologist is interested in the behaviour of primate as well as their anatomy.

The question of human nature is taken for granted, is there in the philosophy at the level of reflection. The question of human nature is important in anthropology because human beings share some characteristic with animals. Here it becomes important to know in what way, man is different from animal kingdom. All human being share the same basic human nature. Man has reflected upon the nature and universe and even in relationship between human and universe because man is self-conscious. Self-awareness or conscious awareness or mind is by far the most important of the characteristics which make man human, consciousness is something which many species of animals have. It is different from sensation. Most of the animals they are aware of dangers, how to cook in the environment, sources of environment survival but that is at the level of perception self-consciousness is only found in human beings. Man is conscious i.e. self-conscious of the fact that he exists apart from nature universe that he has his own values, understanding he can make moral judgement of things. Similarly man is capable of looking at himself as though he were as somebody else detaching from himself and judging quite independently to what kind of person he is and what it is that he wants to do and become. Man alone is capable of reflection of self-consciousness of thinking of himself as an object. Anthropologist and philosopher describe this ability as self-objectification e.g. “when we feel guilty of some things values like truth, honour, justice these are held to be absolute to us. We judge our self in these absolute moral values we feel shameful of us criticize us.

Another aspect of self-awareness not only in the content of the present but also in relation to future and this happen with memory. Memory being us close to the past. There is always a comparison between present and past. We transform mentally for future. In our mind we are striving towards the future this is indicated by the ideals what we have. These goals and ideals

point us towards the future. Future is not imagination. It is a dimension of reality because we have oriented our life towards this. Another characteristic of human no matter where the human is born which philosophers define as Transcendence i.e. the ability to go beyond the environment of which we are a part, we go beyond the biological organism. Human beings not only adapt the environment. The winds, occurs, mineral resources have been utilized for his own benefit. He has successfully contracted the environment so that the historians make a difference with the biosphere and techno sphere. Biosphere is a natural environment in which human being live techno sphere in the form of cities, huge organization, dams, infrastructure. As a man has moved from one stage of life, the techno sphere has dominated his life than biosphere. Then by the formation of techno sphere environment like formation of dams to other infrastructure leads to the cut down of forests which resulted into natural calamities like earth-quakes. These natural calamities have been try to controlled by human being. We are much more in techno sphere, which is a qualitative difference between animals and humans. Eg fasting of human beings for certain days where as animal don't. So human being transcend their physical environment in accordance with certain values eg sexual gratification what they share in common with animal, but in case of Sadhus they can go beyond the physical environment through the process of meditation. They are all in accordance with certain values. Moral values emphasize tremendous influence on human behaviour. Adaptation of environment, satisfying basic biological needs which is determined by instincts. For human beings all this cores are secondary they live by moral values which they have inculcated in their lives rather than this. They have the ability to transcend in a variety of ways, through their imagination the unpleasantness of physical environment of which they are a part. Human beings live in a different conditions eg Artic and Africa human beings create an unfabart world who are held so be real, Gods, Fairies and Ghosts. That provide an escape from the harsh reality of environment. An imagination creates avenues religious scripture myth in which human beings interact that provides a source of entertainment for humans. This capabilities of human beings such as conscious transcend to use one's imaginative it helps him to realize what his destiny is and the relation with universe.

The "creationist" Religious explanation draws from a literal reading of the Biblical book of Genesis, which was originally an old Hebraic creation myth, interpreted through the theology of later Christian church; The time scale is claustrophobically short. Creation came about through the activity of a single super natural entity, "God", who created universe and Igo in six 24 hours day about 6000 or 10,000 years ago. Man did not descend from the apes, but was created personally by God, and thus the only "creature" to have soul- There is no evolution or transformation; the whole cosmos in static.

One of the greatest thinker of nineteenth century science, and a man whose legacy of ideas has so shaped the understanding of the world in which we live, Darwin replacing the static Judeo Christian caroms with a dynamic scientific - materialistic one Darwin made contribution to human knowledge in his theory of evolution. He said that species had evolved from simple to very complex form Le man was not created in present form but he was product of evolution.

In 1738, taxonomist who not only applies a name to an organism, but, by ranking those organism into hierarchies of name, attempts to portray evolutionary relationship have used the system of Linnaeus gave each organism a binomial genus and species which are ranked in higher and higher groupings. In this man was classified together with primates including gorilla and chimpanzee,

In 1859 Charles Darwin supplied a mechanism, namely natural selection that could explain how evolution has occurred. His theory of evolution by natural selection originated during a five-year voyage around the world as a naturalist on board HMS Beagle on 16th Sept 1835 the Beagle, reached the Galapagos Archipelago, cluster of islands he found finches. Darwin's study of the characteristics of species on isolated islands such as these Galapagos finches, and of fossil animals led him to conclude that evolution had occurred. Finches played an important role in helping him recognize the reality of evolutionary process. Finches share similar size coloration and habits. Their salient difference is in the size and shape of their beak. Finches must be a symbol of evolution in Galapagos. On November 4, 1859 his classic work "Origin of species" was published. "The origin of species by means of natural selection" did two things. It summarized all the evidence in favour of the idea that all organisms have descended with modification from a common ancestor and this built on a strong case of evolution. In addition Darwin advocated natural selection as mechanism of evolution.

Charles Darwin suggested the mechanism for evolution was through natural selection, which involves the following premises

- 1) Individuals that make up a population are not all identical (Variability)
- 2) This variation can be inherited (Heritable variation in population)
- 3) Organisms have the potential to increase in numbers greatly in excess of ability for their environment to support them (limits on reproductive success)
- 4) Variation leads to differential rates in survival and reproductive success among the variations. Therefore those individuals with inheritable traits that increase their chances of successful reproduction will have more offspring (natural selection)
- 5) Differential survival and reproduction leads to a shift in the frequency of characters. If this process goes on long enough, parent and daughter species can no longer interbreed, and there results a new species.

Therefore the environment "selects" which individuals successfully have offspring for the next generation (survival of the fittest). Even very small variations that provide even very small advantages in reproductive success will be favoured, while small variations that decrease reproductive success will be eliminated. Over thousands of generations these changes can produce even very large changes. Such as biological diversity of different organisms. Darwin and his fellow naturalist Alfred Wallace independently came to the conclusion that geologically older species of life gave rise to the geologically younger and different species through the process of natural selection.

But although Darwin explained the process of evolution, he was not able to describe the biological mechanism on which natural selection was based. But it was clear that present form of man is product of long process of evolution. In course the evidence came from sources like paleontology which in study of prehistoric animals and plant life through the analysis of fossil remains. The study of these remains enables scientists to trace the evolutionary history of extinct as well as living organisms.

Similarly evidences came from sources like comparative anatomy, fields of biography, taxonomy, embryology and so on.

Towards the end of 19th century G. J. Mendel, he conducted experiment on Garden peas Mendel observed that there are a number of ways in which peas differ: in some the seeds are round in other they are wrinkled; in some they are green, in other yellow. The flowers of some peas are axial in position in others terminal. Mendel picked pure bred strains which differed from each other in one characteristic and cross-fertilized them the new plant grow he found that all the peas were round, none were wrinkled. All were yellow, none were green. All the flowers were axial, none were terminals in their position. It did not matter whether he had pollinated green by yellow or yellow by green: every one of the peas were yellow. Then Mendel fertilized the seed of each plant of this generation with its own pollen; this is called self fertilized And through several experiment Mendel proved that hereditary potentiality are clearly inherited as discrete units, which may be hidden in the presence of contrasting ones but are not lost and which may appear untarnished in later generation. So Mendel found that certain physical characteristic repeated over several generation and off spring which come show the -certain physical characteristic of both male and female i.e. from parents these physical characteristic were transmitted to offspring.

In 1953, these scientist Watson, crick, wilkins through series of experiment discover the principal of heredity, they cracked the genetic code. The gene are the carrier of arbitrary characteristic which is transformed from generation to generation in man Various species differ in numbers of chromosomes or sex cell. In human there is 46 chromosomes. In sex cell of man there is x and y. in female it is XX. When we look at the chromosomes of human and the living great apes (orangutan, gorilla and chimpanzee) there is great deal of similarities between numbers and overall appearance of chromosomes across the four different species. The four species have similar number of chromosomes with ape all having 24 pairs, and human having 23 pairs. Chimpanzee and human share 98% of our DNA. DNA is made up of proteins the proteins are made up of amino acid chains. Proteins of human and chimpanzee are about 99% identical.

Anatomy of brain of man and chimpanzee are quite same. Ethologist who study the chimpanzee found that chimpanzees are very social and they spend time in groups.

Ethologist such as Konrad Lorenz was awarded noble prize in 1973 for research in ethology on domesticated ducks. 60 or 70 years ago it was commonly belief that man is different from other animal in counting ability, making and using of tool ability to conceptualize musical ability and so on. But when several experiment conducted on birds which shows that they

have counting ability. Migrating birds are often capable of solving the most intricate and unpredictable problem of solid geometry similarly making of tool is common in animals.

Man is the only species which is physically, mentally depend upon the mother, kinship bond, human are much more allies.

Active cerebrai cortex of human brain has untapped properties, qualities, characteristic which are responsible. Quality such as his ability for symbol, communication, imagination, creativity etc. human bran has developed in highly specialized area in regard to organization of experience, regard to speech and communication. During the first part of this century the incorporation of genetic and population biology into studies led to a Neo-Darwinian theory of evolution that recognize the importance of mutation and variation within a population. Natural selection then became a process that altered the frequency of genes in a population and this defined evolution. This point of view held sway for many decades but more recently the classic Neo - Darwinian view has been replaced by a new concept which includes several other mechanism in in addition to natural selection. Current ideas on evolution are usually referred to as the Modem synthesis which is described by futuyma; 'The major tenets of the evolutionary synthesis, then, were that populations contain genetic variation that arises by random mutation and recombination that populations evolve by changes in gene frequency brought about by random genetic drift, gene flow, and especially natural selection. This discription would be incomprehensible to Darwin since he was unaware of genes and genetic drift. The modem theory of mechanism of evolution differs from Darwinism in three important respects:

- 1) It recognize several mechanisms of evolution in addition to natural selection One of these, random genetic drift, may be important as natural selection.
- 2) It recognizes that characteristics are inherited as discrete entities called genes. Variation within population is due to the presence of multiple allies of gene.
- 3) It posulates that speciation is due to the gradual accumulation of small genetic changes. This is equivalent to saying that macroevolution is simply a lot of micro-evolution.

The process of evolution is determined by adaptation and Genetic mutation. Genetic mutation are sudden changes in genetic structure which effect whole population. So far as animal kingdom is concern the evolutionary process is blind. The animal species do riot play any role in their evolution. When we address human evolution in mid the picture radically changes. When we come to human evolution unlike other species human being play an important role in his own evolution And this takes place through cultural innovations, such as discovery and use of iron. Domestication of plant and animal on which human being survive. Domestication of animal i.e. domesticated animal used by human being for helping them. The adaptation of human to environment was made it possible by tool making. Man could use huge variety of tool which would protect from dangerous animal and climatic condition. Chimpanzee do use tool aside from man, they are the most skillful tool users in primates. Chimpanzee use tool for a[wide variety of reason chimpanzees in a their natural habitats break off suitable sticks, clean them of leaves, and use them to extract terminates from their nests to eat. They put sticks into bees' nests to got honey they get ants and terminates with different kinds of tool. But

chimpanzees uses his tools and throw away. But in human tools are drafted for other persons even for the future. When we enter into human evolution man play active role and this takes place through use of fire, iron domestication of plant and human co-operation, culture has played a very important role. All animals can survive only in very limited numbers of specialized diets in specialized tropical condition while the species Homo is just reverse. It is constantly increasing in numbers and finding new ways to live off all kinds of foodstuff in all kinds of environments. Most of adaptability depend upon cultural invention but, in a limited fashion, Homo also seems to undergo quite rapid genetic adaptation to specialized local conditions. There are human being in bushman of Kalhari desert and even multiplying. Similarly in case of Eskimo it is culture help him to survive. Culture facilitate man remarkable ability to the environment, age of vocalization and the unique neuro-physical brain in responsible for this language. The sound system serves the purpose of communication. In some species of animal sound is ultrasonic, it covers miles in ocean eg whales. But when we consider the nature of sound in human language as carry signification. These sound is every language has a particular meaning, it has multiple meaning depending on the context. It is associated with facial gesture. The sound we emit has a lot of meaning. The transmission and sharing of certain sound is decided by human beings. But in case of animals it is not like that inspite of genetic make up. Chimpanzee communicate through vocalization, facial expression, posture touch and movement and the facial musculature can express a Wide range of emotions. A numbers of experiment show that chimps can even team to use sign language or other language based on picture or symbol but this does not constitute an understanding or use of words. Noam chomsky who has pointed out that, although children have to learn the meaning of individual " words from their elders, they seem to know how to string words together so as to distinguish sense from nonsense long before they have acquired any substantial vocabulary.

The Fallacy of Reductionism and Determinism:

Reductionism I Determinism - It is a tendency to explain the dynamics, the variety, the complexity of human nature in terms of single causative principle. Since human life is multidimensional. In order to understand uniqueness of human personality all factors are to be considered. It can not be explain in terms of a social causative factors Reductionism distort the human reality related to biology environment genetics. So a variety of factors such as biology, genetics and environment all this has to be taken into consideration. According to Montesquie environment played a decisive role that social institution and cultural values can be explained in terms of environmental conditions. The environment appears for Montesquieu a key determining influence on human behaviour. This is to be rejected because human behaviour and social institution cannot be explain in single factors. We have to take variety of factors to understand human behaviour. In classical psychoanalysis Freud makes difference between conscious mind and unconscious mind. Freud considered the unconscious process the basic process. The unconscious inhibit the primary ego. So the total infantile personality fell into unconscious with development of secondary ego When secondary ego develops the childhood ego has not only builds up a system of wants and needs, it has also associated these

wants and need with specific objects. So according to Freud unconsciousness is dominant factor in mental event, There is a strong element of Reductionism and determinism in psycho- Biological determinism is a tendency to explain all behaviour including animal behaviour and human behaviour in terms of biological process.

Behaviourism

The response of the organism is determined by the nature of stimulates which means the organism responses to external stimuli. The organism does not respond itself. It is neutral in state. The theory of blank state and impressions are formed on this blank state through environment which activate human mind; It implies, that human organism by itself does not take the initiative in analyzing, in Judging, it is always with interaction, and capabilities are activated in interaction with root factor including family and social institutions. So behaviourism is a fundamentally reductionist theory of mind that attempt to explain mental events in terms of observable physical events.

Sociologism

Sociologism is a tendency to explain human behaviour only in terms of single causative factor Le society. Durkheim, he saw the domain of sociology as the study of social facts and not individual. Durkheim's social facts 'they are external to individual and cannot be explain in terms of biology and psychology cannot be explained at any other reality. He believe' that society had their own reality which could not simply reduce to the action and motives of

individual, and that individual moulded and constrained by their social environment.

In suicide (1897), he explained how even apparently individual decision to commit suicide could be understand as being affected by the different form of social solidarity in different social settings. Bid the fact in that our behaviour in that merely the outcome of social process, it is a complex interplay between two set of factor one is social institution and other set is individual decision. Our individual perception plays a important role in shaping our personality.

Biological Determinism

A distinguished biologist Jacques Manood in his book "Chance and Necessity" he argue that our whole life is product of biological process. He says what we are is the entirely because of our unique genetic structure. We have discussed earlier as man as hornabpiens and distinguished from other species of animal But as an individual is different from other human being in 4 different, ways out of which 2 are visible and 2 are invisible. Sensual repro- duction-creates; so great variety of hereditary endowments genotypes that no one of them is likely to arise repeatedlu. Identical or Mona zygotic, twins in man also have similar genotypes, because they arise by asexual multiplication of single fertilized egg cell. Brothers or sisters who are product of Mona zygotic multiple birth are, evidently, separate Individual. This difference arises because of different life

experience. These are - invisible features. But there are & things as a part Which can be seen face and fingers. Many biologist says that genes determines our behaviour. Fully are genes don't determines our behaviour. Our experiences a complex interplay with a variety of factors including such factors as nutrition, our genes, social environment our interaction with the members of family is also responsible. Biological determinism like environment determinism is unexpected,

Ethology

Ethology is Zoological study of animal behaviour, Ethologists have a special interest in genetically programmed behaviour known as instincts. The predictable behaviour programs are inherited by animals through their parents and portion of the programs are open to natural selection and modification. Thus, these behaviours are phylogenetic: adaptations that have an evolutionary history. In the case of animals the ethologists further maintain that aggression is a predominant drive in animal behaviour including man- Famous German ethologists Konrad Lorenz he wrote on his best selling book on aggression. He conducted experiment shows that aggressive behaviour is phylogenetically in all the species. It is a part of genetic make up. it is innate in them. They can't escape from this other ethologist William holding he came out with a significant manifestation that in all the animals in to possess and defend territory. All animals are phylogenetically programmed to defend their territory. Robert Ardrey maintain in his famous book "The Territorial Imperative" that aggressive behaviour results in animals to possess and defend exclusive ter". Aggressive, drive explain all dimension of human behaviour, this genetic drive is present in all species of animal and human. He said that Indo - China war is fight between two groups of birds. Fights within nations groups are imbedded it can't be rooted out. If it is as it is said that biologically rooted then it should be in animal also but aggressive behaviour is rare among chimpanzees. They do aggressive behaviour in two conditions when there is favourite food and other when the given place is overcrowded. It shows it is not genetically determined. Ethologists make a difference between predatory aggression and non-predatory aggression eg A lion jumping on a buffalo in order to eat the flesh. The most common type among the animals is non-predatory aggression. In human societies is all common in human. It is motivated at certain factors.

Sociobiology

They believe in the application of evolutionary principles to the behaviour of animals as well as human. It -explains the behaviour of man and animal such as maternal and the other altruism. They talk in terms of infanticide. They speak of homosexuality, prostitution among some species and even rape and incest and these kind of behaviour it is biologically determinants No scientific explanation in terms of any of these. They imply values institutionalized ideas which is found only in human society. There is no question of existence of cultural norms in animal society. Hence the argument is unjustified and unscientific. 2 major problem with sociobiologist. They have tendency to reduce all dimension of behaviour in animal as well as in human either in terms of biology or genetic. E. O. Wilson, is the founder of sociobiology. He says that all level of reality from human mind to human behaviour can be explained in terms of universal biological process. They define culture as an instinctive mode of adaptation to the environment. Social biologist made no distinction between

human behaviour and animal behaviour. They considered it as a part of process of the same spectrum. It does not take into consideration the most important fact in human behaviour i.e. self-consciousness. Sociobiologist is guilty of biological determinism, as an explanation of human behaviour. Because human behaviour is product of multiplicity of factors including some extend biology some extend environment self-consciousness and many other factors.

Questions

Discuss the characteristics that set man apart from the other species of animal

or

Write an essay on the uniqueness of man

or

Discuss the anthropological perspective on human nature

Reference,

John D. Marksman: The uniqueness of man J. Bronowski: The Ascent of Man. W. H. Thorpe: Animal nature and human nature. Edmund Leach: Social anthropology (Chapt on Humanity and Animality).

THE CONCEPT OF CULTURE

Objectives

- ❖ (1) To make students aware of importance and functions of culture.
- ❖ (2) To develop understanding about human quality of culture.
- ❖ (3) To focus on biological evolution of culture.
- ❖ (4) To enumerate the process of cultural conditioning.
- ❖ (5) To focus relationship between culture and environment.

Key Concepts :-

1. Cultural Anthropology :-

The study of the entire range of culture and societies in the world.

2. Habitate : -

The physical features of the regions inhabited by a group of people; its natural resources, actually or potentially available to them, its climate, attitude, and other geographical features to which they have adapted themselves.

3. Environment :-

The aggregate of all the external conditions and influences affecting the life and development of an organism". In this case, man in his natural and cultural setting.

4. Ethnology :-

Scientific study of culture phenomena by comparing and contrasting many cultures.

What is culture ?

The term culture has originated from the Latin word 'colere', which means "to cultivate". In social anthropology, the word 'culture' means "knowledge", that is, knowledge about those aspects of humanity which are not natural, but which are related to that which is acquired. In other words, culture refers to "those abilities, notions and forms of behaviour which are acquired by persons as members of society". Eriksen writes that it is very difficult to define the concept of culture, as it is a very comprehensive term.

Culture is a way of life of a group of people. Each society possesses a way of life or culture, that defines carried ways of thinking, feeling and acting. Culture is a product of society, and inter-related and dependent on society. Culture is important because it provides the knowledge and technology

that helps man to survive. Man is only animal to poses culture and it is this unique feature.which distinguishes man from animal.

Anthropological Notion of Culture

The concept of culture has been central to the distinction between anthropology and other disciplines notably, sociology. It was also used at the beginning of anthropological studies in the 18th century to denote a state of refinement and polish equated with civilization. Culture has been defined differently. There are some anthropologists who view it from an evolutionary point of view. For them, culture is super organic and super-individual. The functionalists, on the other hand, define it from the organic perspective. They argue that culture is like an organism, where in one part is related to another part. Then there are anthropologists who look at culture from a dialectical point of view.

Nineteenth century anthropologists casting around for term to cover all of human customs, fixed upon the term “culture”. From anthropology the concept has spread to other social sciences. Anthropologists were the first to develop clearly the concept of “culture”.

Definition of Culture :

The above-mentioned notion of culture insist on defining culture from varying perspective.

Perhaps, the oldest definition of culture is that of Edward B Tyror. It has often quoted and has thus been classical. Tylor says:

“Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs,arts, morals, laws, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as member of society”:

Tylor makes one important qualification of culture and that is “acquired”. Second, it is capability which forms the content of culture. A similar definition is given by Ralph hinten:

“Culture in social heredity.”

In traditional terms, biologically, heredity give, the characteristics of a set of genes to the coming generalization. In the case of culture, the social characteristics are acquired by the present generation from the pceeding generation. Thus culture is asocial inheritance.

Kulckhohn and Kelly (1950) define culture as something which guide the behaviourof hmnan beings:

All the historically created designs for living explicit and implicit, rational, irrational and non-rational which exists at any given time as potential guides for the behaviour of man”.

The evolutionary anthropologists have defined culture in terms of its super organic and super individual terms. When we say super organic, we mean

simply that which we consider culture we are dealing with something that is organic, but which must also be viewed as something more than organic if it is to be fully intelligible to us.

The term 'super-individual' means that culture is above the individual. For instance, the food habits are determined by the society, quite the same way as rituals are determined by the society. These are super-individual above the individuals. The evolutionary anthropologists, thus, have defined culture in terms of super organic and super-individuals.

Quintessential feature of culture.

Characteristics of Culture :

If we carefully examine the traditions of sociology and anthropology, we find that culture has remained, all through last hundred years. a major theme of discussion. The reality is that both the disciplines consider culture as a care theme through their methods of interpretation differ. One very essential characteristic of culture is that it is related to society. There can not be culture without society; neither there can be society without culture some of the quintessential features of culture are as follows.

(i) Culture is a process :-

Culture of any society is not sterile, it is a process. Tradition changes, new traditions emerge. In other words, the structure of culture goes from one generation to another and each generation adds or subtracts from inherited culture. This continuity and change shows that it is a process.

(ii) Culture is a social heritage: -

Whatever we get in culture is transmitted and communicated. The individual is thought of as being born into a man-made world of artifacts, symbols and social institutions which he acquires from his ancestors. The culture moulds the individual to conform to the prevailing culture patterns.

Among tribal and Villagers of our country there are some well-known cultural practices which constitute the heritage of the people. This heritage is manifest in festival fairs and rituals.

(iii) It is an abstraction: -

Kroeber and Kukkhohnw, in their discussion of culture have concluded that culture is an abstraction of the study of behaviour and behavioural products. Culture, as we know it, is an abstraction of concrete behavior for instance, if India as a nation pays its aspect to the national flag, the flag, itself is not a culture. The abstraction is then a nation has some symbol which indicate its nationalism-

(iv) Culture is integral: -

Functionalists, despite their variability in approach, have a consensus that culture is all inclusive, it contains all aspects of human society including beliefs,

law, art, literature, norms, values, traditions etc. the parts of culture together make up a complete whole. This integrative factor can easily be seen in a simple and isolated society. In such societies there are no outside influence and the different parts of culture remain together as a complete whole. This holistic view of culture has been popularized by functionalist and evolutionist. The integral aspect of culture is advocated by anthropologists.

(v) Culture is traditions :-

True, culture is integral. It is comprehensive. It is holistic. But, in all this tradition is its dominant part. Each tribal group has its traditions which die a very slow death. Indian traditions are good example of culture.

(VI) Culture is acquireci send learnt : -

Culture is totally learnt by the member of a group. The individual human being is not born with any culture. He learns and acquires the culture of the group in which he grows and develops. The individual learns his culture through socialization and personality development. Culture is learnt through language and social communication. The culture gives away to survival if it is not acquired.

(vii) Culture is shared: -

Culture is shared by the members of a given community. All members of a group have a common culture i.e. a common way of life shared by all members of the group.

(viii) Culture is two-faceted: -

According to Erikson, culture has two sides. There are some aspects of culture which are basic to all the cultures. e.g marriage, kinship, family and polity. But, there are also some aspects of culture which are different from others; Social anthropologists try to bring out both similarities and differences in the culture of various societies.

(ix) Culture is symbolic : -

Only human beings have culture because only man is capable of creating symbols. Without symbols there could only be very basic communication as found among animals. A symbol may be defined as any thing that stands for something else. Meanings are attached to symbols by those who use it. It is because man can create symbols that he also has language and culture.

(x) Culture is adaptive :

Culture adapts itself to its environment. The most common example of this adaptive ness is the way in which culture adapts to the geographical surrounding. The geography that is climate, soil, type, of territory determines culture of the people who live in such surrounding.

(xi) Culture is cumulative: -

Culture is never constructed overnight. It evolves over a period of time.

Because of its evolutionary nature it has a tendency of accumulation. Indian culture is a product of hundreds of years of evolution. It is this cumulative nature which provides continuity to culture.

(xii) Distinctness of Culture: -

Culture *is* conditioned by several factors. It is this aspect of culture which gives it an undifferentiated identity. If we look at the world's civilization, we find that these civilizations have been the product of certain geographical, ecological, political and historical conditions.

(xiii) Culture as standard of Society: -

Each culture provides some standards of behavior to its people. These standards constitute norms and values and the members of the society are expected to take these standards as ideals. However these standards are never rigid.

(xiv) Culture is ideal: -

Culture is ideal because it provides ideal pattern of behavior to its members. This ideal pattern is common to all members and therefore provides uniformity of behavior within the group. E.g. honesty truthfulness are ideal behavior.

In Conclusion, we observe that openness is one of the general characteristics of culture. The culture of today is largely received from yesterday continuity is an inherent part of any culture and the survival of a culture depends on its continuity. The receptivity and assimilativeness of a culture makes the totality of culture a continuum.

Development of Concept of Culture is Modern Ethnology

One concept that is predominant in the contemporary social thought is that of custom. Both sociologists and anthropologists have accepted that culture is acquired by human being and is communicated through symbolism of language. But they disagree on the definition, scope, function and interpretation of culture. From the philosophical point of view there are two approaches to define culture. Idealistic and Realistic. Realistic approach define culture as acquired habit, custom and institutions. However those propagating Realistic approach differ within themselves as whether to define culture in terms of social, neglect of men or to consider individual variation. Idealistic approach defines culture as stearn of ideas, conventional understanding, communicable intelligenc etc.

Culture and human nature

Recently anthropologist have began to question whether culture is a uniquely human phenomena, or whether some non-human behavior might also be considered cultural. Culture is a product of human social interactions. However in certain respects man is similar to animals. His physiological and biological processes are commonly shared with animals. In the course of human evolution, human being have become more dependent upon our sense of sight, at the expenses of other senses, particularly hearing and smell. The human species is characterized by fewer off spring and a prolonged childhood, leaving the infant

relatively defenseless. compare a five-year old child be a five-year-old horse. for e.g. which is fully nature and able to take care of itself.

We used to think that tool using was the dividing line between human being and other animals. Lately, however, we have discovered that chimpanzees are capable not only of using tool, but of actually manufacturing tools themselves.

For sometimes we assumed that while human beings learned their culture, other animals could not be taught such behavior or even if they could learn, they wouldn't teach one another in the way human beings do. This too has proven to be wrong.

Despite all the similarities there is a very importance difference between men and animal. And this difference is because man has culture animals do not have the capacity to produce culture. They also do not have the ability to communicate symbolically. Man alone is able to produce culture and have symbiotic communication. Language is the instrument of symbolic communication which is unique to man language helps in transmission and development of culture.

Culture is a cumulative creation of human individuals and as system of communication and are shaped and constrained by how individuals learn, think and understand. Hence culture is by structure of mind and brain. Culture is an ordered system of meaning and of symbols in terms of which social interaction takes place.

A culture is the way of life of a people, while a society is an organized interacting aggregate of individuals who follow a given way of life. In simple terms a society is composed of people; the way they behave is their culture.

A culture emerges when a set of individuals come together to form a group consciously or unconsciously make decision affecting some sort of common enterprise. Culture is most visible as the characteristic behavior of some particular group of people, but it also exists in the form of the ideas, plans and common understanding that are acknowledged by the membership.

In very general terms the concept of culture has to do with human capacity to use language and with related capacities for learning and for the transmission of ideas and ways of behaving.

The essential nature of culture must resolve a series of seeming paradoxes; which may be stated here as follows.

1. Culture is universal in man's experience, yet each local or regional manifestation of it is unique:-

The concept of man as the only organism that is a “cultural building animal,” recognize that culture is universal. In reality then our first paradox is to be resolved by accepting both of its terms. The universality of culture is an attribute of human existence on the other hand, that no two cultures are the same is equally susceptible of objective proof. It means that every culture has had a unique development.

2. Culture is stable, yet is also dynamic and manifests continuous and constant change:-

Evidence shows that culture is dynamic culture is both stable and ever changing Cultural change can be studied only as a part of the problem of cultural stability. Cultural stability can be understood only when change is measured against conservation.

3. Culture fills and largely determines the course of our lives. Yet rarely intrudes in to conscious thought:-

Culture fills our lives, yet we are largely unconscious of it. We must seek to understand the psychological problem of how human beings learn their cultures and functions as members of a society and we find an answer to the philosophical question that asks whether culture is thus a function of human mentality.

Cultural Conditioning

Cultural conditioning can be understood as influence of natural setting in molding culture or way of life of people. A large number of study reveal that the geographical environment of a particular region plays an important role in determining the life style, food habit, dress patterns, economic and political activities and religious and social institutions.

Habitat of people couldn't be neglected in arising those influences that play on the formation and functioning of culture. Thus it is natural for people in the Arctic and deserts regions to be hunters and non-vegetarian as it is impossible for them to cultivate any vegetables or food stuff due to unsuitable temperature. Even the shape and the material use for construction of the houses in different regions of the world is influenced by the geographical environment and availability of construction material.

Whatever we study man or any other living creature. the dimension of space is no more to be disregarded than that of time. Recognition of this has given rise to the discipline of ecology, which studies the relationship between animals and their habitat.

The word “environment”, in its specialized usages, refers to the natural setting and is so used by geographers whose primary interest is in this aspects

of the physical world. This is the meaning it holds in the phrases "environmental determinism," wherein the position is taken that the natural environment of a culture not sets the cultural stage but determines the action that takes place on this stage.

Man can not exist unless he meets the challenge of his habitat. When culture of relatively simple technologies and limited economic resources are considered from the point of view of their relationship to their habitat, this challenge seems to be powerful and the influence of the natural setting so pervasive that the conclusion appears almost inescapable that habitat exercises a decisive influence in shaping ways of life. This holds especially when we take as our examples peoples whose habitat as harsh, those who live in the Arctic or in desert regions. No one can fail to be impressed with the struggle to sustain life such surroundings. Descriptions of the cultures of such group, of necessity, place considerable stress on the means by which they achieve their adaptation.

The aboriginal Australian offer an excellent example of such a people. Little seems to be paneled over by them in the way of edible foodstuff. In northwest central Queensland they find seeds, roots, fruits and vegetables, flowers-and honey, insects and crustaceans, frogs, lizards, fish and crocodiles (where there are streams), turkey-bastards, pigeons, emus, bandicoots, opiums, and Kangaroos. They have no horses, do no agriculture; their weapons are rudimentary. Their hunting techniques show great resourcefulness. When a kangaroo is sighted, the native sets out after it on the run. Though the animal easily out distance him, he keeps after it all the day. At night, both he and his prey settle down to sleep where they find themselves. But the next morning, the muscles of the Kangaroo are so stiff from the un a costumed steady pace he has been forced to keep that the hunter soon catches up with him. It is then a question of closing in for the kill with the clubs that in the weapon the native uses in haunting this animal-a feat calling for bravery - and then waiting for the rest of the group, who have been following the trail left by hunter and hunted, to come up for the feast.

Nowhere in the world, it can be said, is a finer adaptation of culture to habitat revealed than that of the Eskimos, which has deservedly become classic for anthropologists. Their dome shaped snow houses, called igloos, are models of the exercise of effective engineering technique on the material that are at hand: This is evidenced by the ease with which an igloo can be constructed, its durability, and the manner in which it fulfils its function of providing shelter and comfort in the Savage cold of the Arctic winter. The use of walrus-ivory for sled-runners, or for eye-shields to protect against the driving blizzards, or against the glare of the sun on the snow, one other instances of this adaptation .

The detachable heads of the spears used in hunting walrus or whale allow the precious wooden handles to float away unharmed once a strike has been made, to be recovered by the hunter later, or we may cite the blown up walrus bladders that are attached to a spearhead to irritate a struck whale when it dives, and thus, always weaker from the loss of blood, force it to the surface

for the kill. Even such an implement as a snow-beater has been thought of to ensure that for clothing will be free of snow so as not to deteriorate from moisture when taken into the warm igloo.

It is evident that the technological and economic element in the life of a people are far more responsive to the habitat than the form of the dance, or religious rituals, or decorative art.

The fact that the total environment provides men with the raw stuff of experience and that habitat is an integral and constant element in this environment, must thus never be lost sight of we must also, however, understand that the degree of latitude in possible variations is greater in art or religion or story-telling than in agriculture or herding. The symbolism of decorative art may draw on the habitat; the gods are customarily related in some way to the forces of nature; stories about animals rarely refer to creatures found outside the habitat of the teller, Yet in the play of the imagination, the permitted variation is undeniably greater in such cultural phenomena than where the seasons dictate the agricultural cycle, or the habitat restricts the crops that may be planted, or a limited supply of grass makes it necessary for a herding people to be constantly on the move. Habitat, then, is a limiting factor, but it selectively limits behavior.

Culture and Biology

Early social evolutionists assumed that the human race completed its biological evolution at some moment in the past, possibly 100,000 years ago, and then began its cultural evolution. We know today that culture has a far longer history - that people were using rude stone tools at least 500,000 years ago, while the age of such items of culture as language, customs, or kinship systems cannot even be estimated. It appears that cultural evolution began before our present level of biological evolution was reached. For instance, the early hominids, whose cultural development was extremely limited, had a cranial capacity in the range of 425 to 725 cubic centimeters, comparable to that of the larger apes today while the beginnings of culture date back to this period, acceleration in cultural progress did not take place until the appearance of Neanderthals about 150,000 years ago. Neanderthals had a cranial capacity similar to that of modern human beings, averaging 1,500 cubic centimeters and ranging between 1,300 and 1,600 cubic centimeters (Larsen, 1970). Thus both biological and cultural change moved together and presumably, are still evolving together.

As *Homo sapiens* evolved, several biological characteristics favourable to the development of culture appeared. These included: erect posture, a favourable brain structure; stereoscopic vision; the structure of the hand; a flexible shoulder; and year round female sexual receptivity.

While human beings were developing the capacity for creating culture, they were also developing a need for culture. The need was weakness, there was no other way of survival. The evolving species did not have the speed to

run from predators, or to climb trees and escape from them. Its sense of smell was not keen enough to detect the presence of enemies, food, or potential mates. Thus, human beings were ill equipped to survive unless they could develop and use other means.

The earliest tools cannot be dated precisely, but *Australopithecus* may have used stones as weapons as long as 5 million years ago. The first definite stone tools, however, trace back some 500,000 to 600,000 years (Weaver 1960).

The use of fire dates back from 200,000 to 300,000 years. Tools of bone had evolved by 100,000 B. C. the Neanderthal age. The Neanderthals also apparently had some form of language and may have used religious ceremonies to bury their dead.

Cro-Magnon, dating from 35,000 years ago, was biologically superior and had a more elaborate culture. In addition to their cave painting, they made jewellery of shells and teeth and carved statuettes of women that emphasized pregnancy and fertility. They carved weapons of bone, horn and ivory, and used needles to make clothes.

Thus, the evolution of *Homo sapiens* parallels the development of culture. But the parallel between biological and cultural evolution should not be overdrawn. Cro-Magnon's brain capacity, for e.g. was large, but culture itself grew slowly. This prevented any quantum leap in the development of learned behavior.

Through selective breeding, the human race has produced in non human species "the most rapid evolutionary changes ever recorded." [Weaver, 1969]. Recent discoveries in genetics suggest the eventual possibility of producing evolutionary changes through direct modification of the genetic pattern. Thus giving us great control over heredity, including our own.

We used to assume that people might control their environment but that their heredity was fixed. Thus one who stressed the influence of biological heredity might be regarded as a "racist" because he or she emphasized a type of difference between peoples which seemed beyond human control. By contrast, the "liberal" was one who played down the importance of heredity and interpreted human differences in terms of varied social environments. It is possible that these statements will be reversed. It was proved difficult to change human conduct by manipulating the environment, but we seem to be on the threshold of a day when human beings can make drastic changes in their biological heredity by manipulating the genes. It is conceivable that, in the near future, the "liberal" may be one who stresses possible changes in biological heredity, while the reactionary "racist" may be one who stresses the extent to which human nature is shaped by an often recalcitrant social environment.

Our ability to develop culture may be matched by our ability to control the heredity potential with which we tackle the culture in the prehistoric period, both our biological capacity and our cultural storehouse were so limited that

changes was slow and difficult. In the modern era, the accumulation of culture and the prospect of controlling genetic quality set the stage for a period when human beings will have greater possibilities for controlling the world - for good or ill - than have ever before existed.

Culture and Environment

In recent years anthropologists have renewed their interest in the relationship between culture and ecology. At one time or another anthropologists have explained human behavior with references to current topics in biology, ecology, history, evolution, diffusion and independent invention. The way in which "environment" is used in anthropology explanation, is referred to as "ecological anthropology."

I. Environmental Determinism

The most pervasive theme is the belief that the physical environment plays the role of "prime mover" in human affairs. Personality, mortality; politics and government, religion, material culture, biology all of these and more have at one time or another been subject to explanation by environmental determinism.

The human theory of Hippocrates was probably the single, most important foundation for environmental determinism until the 19th C.

Hippocrates saw the human body as housing four kinds of "humors"- yellow bile, black bile, phlegm and blood, representing fire, earth, water and blood respectively. The relative properties of the four humors caused variation in individual physique and personality, as well as in sickness and health. Climate was believed to be responsible for the balance of the humors and therefore, for geographic differences in physical form and personality.

Thus people living in hot climate were passionate, lazy, short lived. light and agile because of an excess of hot air and lack of water.

The effect of climate on personality and intelligence determined other human affairs, particularly government and religion. Both Plato and Aristotle associated climate with government, viewing temperate Greece as the ideal climate for democratic government and for producing people fit to rule others. Despotic government, on the other hand, were best suited for hot climate because the people lacked the spirit and love for liberty and were given to passionate excesses, Cold climate had no real form of government because people lacked skills and intelligence and were strongly given to a love of individual liberty.

The 18th century Frenchman Montesquieu continued this line of reasoning and applied it to religion. Hot climate creates lethargy, according to him, and are apt to be associated with passive religion. Buddhism in India was given as a classic example. By contrast, religion in cold climates, are dominated by aggressiveness to match the love of individual liberty.

The geographer Ellsworth Huntington carried this thinking well into the 20th century by arguing, in *The Main Springs of Civilization*, that the highest forms of religions are found in the temperate regions of the world. His basic

argument was that temperate climates are more conducive to intellectual thinking.

The 19th century and early 20th century brought a decline in the popularity of human theory but no less vigorous apologists for environmental determinism.

The developing method of science was marked by the search for simple, linear, cause and effect relationships that is, A causes B causes C, and so forth. There was no recognition of the complex interactions and feedback processes that make today's science. Anthropologists and geographers searched for simple cause of geographical distribution of culture traits. Some proposed environment while others favour diffusion. Both offered simple, straightforward explanations that were consistent with linear science. Therefore it is not surprising to see the resurgence of environmental determinism at this time. The rise of "technological determinism" as exposed by Marxist social Philosophy, also contributed to the resurgence. Environmental determinism was a rebuttal to the anti-environmental position of Marxist writers. Finally an explanatory model of this kind was a simple way to categorize and explain the mass of data on human diversity being accumulated as a result of world exploration, in much the same way that "three-age system" helped clarify ancient artifacts. The "culture areas" concept was particularly suitable for this purpose, allowing diverse cultures within large geographical areas to be classified into a single type because some traits are held in common. Some early geographers and anthropologists quickly noted the general correspondence between culture areas and natural areas and argued that environment caused the occurrence of distinct cultural areas.

Material culture and technology was believed to be most affected by the environment. For e.g. in a discussion of the pre-history of the American Southwest, William H. Holmes, a turn-of-the-century anthropologist, states that it is here made manifest that it is not so much the capabilities and cultural heritage of the particular stock of people that determines the form of material culture as it is their local environment. Non-material culture was also explained environmentally by F. W. Hodge.

II. Environmentalism and Possibilism.

The necessity to view man within the framework of habitat tended toward the adoption of two fruitless positions that long dominated the thought of anthropologists. With some simplification these positions can be seen as extremes on a continuum, one pole being environmental determinism and other cultural determinism.

Their less extreme versions are known by the term "environment" and "possibilism". These views tend to separate man and his culture from his environment.

At one extreme of the continuum culture is viewed as passive and the environment as an active force molding culture into its pattern. At the other extreme, culture is viewed as the active force reshaping the passive environment. A relatively clear division thus developed between those who viewed environment as dominant in the relationship and those who viewed culture as dominant.

Today the theme of environmental determinism has been largely replaced by the emergence of man-environmental model that assigns environment

a “limiting” but creative or that recognize complex mutual interaction. However, the explanation of biological diversity in human continues to have a strong, deterministic orientation. Models of genetic change in human populations, for instance are still dominated by the theory of natural selection, a theory assign to environment a strong and active role in shaping gene pools. Thus the most popular belief explanation for the distribution of skin color is based upon “selection” for pig net graduals that help block out excessive ultraviolet radiation from the sun, on the other hand, a number of recent investigators have suggested models that greatly limit the role of environment as an agent of biological change. “Genetic drift”, that is, vagaries due to sampling errors in small populations, is an important part of most of these models. The role of natural selection is particularly being questioned because of the recognition that genes are not isolated entities subject to easy manipulation by environmental factors but are part of complex systems of interactions.

III. **Possibilism**

The general orientation of environmental explanation in anthropology shifted away from determinism and towards possibilism in the 1920’s and 1930’s

a) **Historical Particularism**

Much of this stuff was due to the personal influence of Franz Boas who showed that the origin of specific cultural features and patterns was generally to be found in historical particularism tradition rather than in environment. Boas emphasis on specific cultural explanation gave rise to the so called school of “historical particularism”, a school that has often been chided for its ant environmentalism.

However Boas did not completely ignore environment. He did consider it irrelevant for explaining the origin of culture traits. Environment than, played an important role in explaining why some features of culture did not occur but not in explaining why they did occur. This belief is hallmark of possibilism.

b) **Cultural Determinism**

Possibilism made significant contribution to the “culture area” concept. As early as 1896, Otis T. Mason suggested that the geographical distribution of material culture and technology is “molded” by the environment but is not caused by it. He defined 12 “ethnic” environments or culture areas based upon this assumption. Masons work was elaborated by Clark Winsler (1926) and A. L. Kroeber (1939).

Both recognized a general co-relation in terms of what culture features a natural area would or would not permit. Thus forming was diagnostic of the eastern United States, not because the temperate climate caused it but because it pennitted the necessary growing season.

Finally, the limited cultural development in the great Basin and other “marginar” areas was attributed to environmental limitations while the “cultural florescence-” in the south east United States was attributed to the absence of environmental limitations.

Environment however can not be used to explain why one culture area was marked by matrilineal inheritance and another by matrilineal inheritance.

This could only be explained by culture history.

Thus Kroeber remarked that while it is true that cultures are rooted in nature and can therefore never be completely understood except with reference to that piece of nature which they occur, they are no more produced by that nature than a plant is produced or caused by the soil in which it is rooted. The immediate causes of cultural phenomena are other cultural phenomena.

The cultural area concept, therefore, developed into a kind of compromise between determinism and the extreme diffusionist views of the "Kulturkreis", and related schools.

c) **Environmental limitations on the Development of Culture**

The role of environment in culture evolution is particularly clear in possibilist thought: Environment places stringent limitations upon the level of cultural development perhaps the most frequently cited example of this position is that taken by the archaeologist, Betty Mingers. In her 1945 paper "environmental limitations on the Development of culture", she suggested that farming is necessary for advanced stages of cultural evolution and that an area's suitability for farming is an accurate measure of its "potential" for cultural evolution.

The reason cultural Determinism gave to undermine ecology is because:

1. Similar cultures were often found in different physical environments.
2. In very similar environments different cultures are found. For e.g. 1) Agriculture was not determined by ecology 2) In Arctic regions Eskimos live by hunting.
3. Culture may change but geographic conditions may be the same.
4. Man's ability to control environment is related to ideas and technology.

Question

1. Write an essay on human quality of culture.
2. Discuss in detail the quintessential features of culture focusing on human quality of culture.
3. Describe the interplay between culture and biology.
4. Elaborate on how cultural conditioning is an important aspect of human life.
5. Briefly examine the role of culture and environment.

References and further reading

1. J. D. Rostlansky - The Uniqueness of man.
2. J. J. Honigman (ed). Handbook of social and cultural Anthropology.
3. J. J. Honigman - Understanding culture..
4. W. H. Thorpe - Animal Nature and Human Nature.
5. Marshall Sahlins - The Use and Abuse of Biology
6. M. J. Herskovits - Man and His work.
7. S. L. Doshi and P. C. Jain - Social Anthropology.
8. John Friedl - Cultural Anthropology.

**CULTURAL DIVERSITY:
PLURALISM AND MULTICULTIURALISM,
CULTURAL UNIVERSALS, CULTURAL RELATIVISM**

Objective

- 1) To view society from diverse perspectives.
- 2) To understand the idea of pluralism and multiculturalism in modern content.
- 3) To get an insight into the universal nature of human society and culture.
- 4) To broaden one's vision of others' culture.

Key Terms

1. Culture

The shared values, beliefs, norms, ideologies, customs, and technological knowledge of a social group.

2. Subculture:

The culture of a subgroup that has much in common with the culture of the larger society but that also has its own set of norms, beliefs, and values.

3. Pluralism:

The maintenance of social equality and respect for the cultures and peoples of different ethnic groups living in the same society.

4. Culture Relativism:

Refers to an attitude that one should avoid judging the ways of other people without first understanding their culture.

5. Ethnocentrism:

Is an attitude that the values, beliefs, and norms of one's own culture are superior to those of other cultures and can be used to evaluate the cultures and behaviors of other peoples.

6. Ethnography:

The study of the culture of a social group.

7. Cultural Universal:

Common cultural traits shared by societies all over the world.

Culture Diversity

Today there is no longer any question that all humankind belong to the same species. While physical differences persist between human groups, cultural differences are

after were striking. An interest in the differences in customs of various societies, as well as a concern with the origin of the customs, led to the development of the cultural anthropology.

There is more diversity within cultures than ever comes through in anthropological writings. Anthropological statements about a particular culture are abstractions: they are approximations to some of the general understandings the people share. This is of course unavoidable. Every individual's life history is different, and each person has a unique personality and approach to life. But to attempt to reproduce all that diversity and then to compare different cultures with each other exceeds our capabilities completely.

One of the most fascinating aspects of human life is the great variety in the solutions people of different societies develop for the problems of life. Descriptive anthropologists, or ethnographers have studied the cultural patterns of hundreds of societies living in all parts of the globe, and this literature has made possible a great many exact cultural comparisons. No two societies have independently approached in identical ways for satisfaction of their needs for food, shelter and clothing. Endless differences exist not only in the forms of technology societies use to satisfy basic needs but in their system of courtship, family organization, kinship, structures, inheritance rules, value commitments, religious concepts, health practices, political processes and all other forms of organized social activity.

There are also significant differences between cultures of relatively small groups and these of large and highly differentiated one. In the latter, not only do the individual differences persist, but geographically separated sub groups or class or occupational groups) all tend to be somewhat different from other parts of the total population united in single political and economic system. Often these are referred to as subcultures, but the term does not really solve the problem, it merely names it.

Thus if one has to precisely document all the differences between individuals and subgroups, one would never get on with the job of the comparison of different cultures. One must remember that human realities are extremely complex; we simplify them enormously in order to make cultural comparison. In spite of all these what is admirable is that in spite of all the variations and differences, all cultures seem to "work". They provide the means by which the members of a society can cope with their environment and co-ordinate their lives.

The concept of cultural diversity can be better understood in relation to some of its key concepts:

- 1) Multiculturalism and Pluralism
- 2) Cultural Universalism
- 3) Cultural Relativism.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism has become an indispensable starting point for the scholars who are trying to understand and analyse the question of communal harmony,

stability, social justice and national integration. The study of multiculturalism is considered to be important for the reasons that firstly, this category has acquired importance in the context in which Marxist categories are no more considered to be relevant in understanding the social reality, both of national and international and global level. Secondly, the categories that belong to liberal framework are either treated to be inadequate or have lost complete relevance in understanding the social, political and cultural reality. The phenomenon of migration gripping the world in an ethnical communal strife, has led the scholars to work out, an alternative categories like multi-culturalism. Third, as far as India is concerned, the Hindutava homogenization has made the idea of communalism and multiculturalism popular among the intellectual circles. Finally, the study of multiculturalism has acquired importance in the context of the global over all homogenisation of the people and the different social group with different cultural landscape.

Multiculturalism is best understood neither as a political doctrine with a programmatic content nor a philosophical school with a distinct theory of man's place in the world but as a perspective on or a way of viewing human life.

From multiculturalism perspective the good society cherishes the diversity of and encourages a creative dialogue between different cultures and their moral visions. Such a society not only respects its member's rights to their culture and increase their range of choices but also cultivates their power of self-criticism self-determination, imagination, intellectual and moral sympathy, and contributes to their development and well being.

Cultural Pluralism

The term "Pluralism" in social science has been used in two different senses which overlap sufficiently. The older tradition traces its ancestry to Alexis de Tocqueville. To this school pluralism is first and foremost a property of the political system and more specifically a necessary condition for democracy in highly complex and differentiated polities. The pluralistic democracies are characterized by division of effective decision-making power among a wide variety of autonomous group and institutions in competition with each other. On the other hand in the more autocratic regimes of which modern totalitarianism of right or left represents the purest form, power is centralized in the hands of a small ruling class and exercised over a mass of impotent citizens who may be "mobilized" in a political party or in party - controlled organizations, but who are not allowed to develop. Any source of power that may rival the monolithic state.

This usage of pluralism can be criticized as it is based on extremely narrow range of societies especially on western states of 18th, 19th and 20th century with heavy emphasis on United States.

The second tradition of "pluralism" goes back only some thirty years to Furnivall and Burke and the concept gained widespread currency only in 1960's pluralism refers to a property or set of properties of societies wherein several

distinct social and/or cultural groups coexist within the boundaries of a single polity and share a common economic system that makes them interdependent, yet maintain a great degree of autonomy and a set of institutional structures in other spheres of social life notably the family, recreation and religions. Even today the use of this tradition is still mostly limited to anthropologists and to Sociologists specializing in non-western and non-industrial societies. Pluralism is nothing more than a set of basic characteristics common to a great many of world's societies. Pluralism is simply a sensitizing concept, calling attention to an important and hitherto neglected aspect of societies.

Historically the concept of pluralism grew out of growing unease, both within and outside the anthropological profession, with anthropology's conventional focus on the "society- culture" as a relatively homogeneous, integrated, independent self regulated whole; in short, as what functionalists have called a "closed system". The conventional analytical boundaries of the system under study were culturally determined, with special emphasis on a mutually understandable language a common system of religious and secular values, common principles of kinship organizations and marriage, a consensual system of legal norms, common educational principles, and so on.

Social evolution, unlike biological evolution was not primarily a divergent and intra specific process of selective adaptation of an external environment, but in good part a process of limitless cross-fertilization by which even today totally unrelated cultures could and did give rise to perfectly viable hybrids.

Early theories of diffusionism and nonlinear evolution gave way in the 1930's to the theory of acculturation as a model for the analysis of culture change. Associated with eminent names like Malinowski, Wintson, Herskovits, and Redfield, the theory represented the most systematic attempt to date to deal with the dynamics of exogenous change resulting from contact between different "culture groups". The questions asked were aimed at discovering what was happening to the cultures of group X as a consequence of contact with group Y. Cultural contact was viewed largely as an exogenous process disturbing the integration or equilibrium of the cultural system.

By the 1940's and 1950's an ever growing number of social scientists became increasingly concerned about the special properties of multiethnic societies, and began to use a variety of labels to describe them. For e.g. Redcliff Brown (1940) spoke of South Africa as a "composite society". The Dutch economist Boeke (1953) spoke of Indonesia as a dual society" etc.

More recently the Mexican Sociologist Pablo Casanova (1963) applied the concept of pluralism to Latin America. The main intellectual source of modern school of pluralism is Furnivall (1938, 1948) who was among the first to use the term. Cultural pluralism by itself, consists solely in institutional differences without any corporate social distinctions. Cultural pluralism is compatible with "Uniform incorporation".

A society is called pluralistic if it possesses the following two basic features

- 1) Segmentation into functionally similar corporate groups, whose members frequently, though not necessarily, belong to different cultures or subcultures and
- 2) A social structure compartmentalized into duplicatory, parallel, non-complementary, but distinguishable sets of institutions.

When we look at societies from the standpoint of degree of standard segmentation a wide range of pluralism is observable. The more pluralistic societies, will exhibit such phenomena as complete ascription of group members and a corresponding lack of mobility from one group to another. Strict perspective group endogamy a rigid inter group relations and sometimes, when the more symbolic and social times of cleavage failed or are breaking down, sharp spatial segregation as well. By contrast minimally pluralistic or non-plural societies will have situations approximately the "open class" models with considerable lack of consensus as to who belong to which group, a good deal of social mobility, and an absence of any rule of prescriptive endogamy and of any overt norms of differential interaction.

Shifting the standpoint analysis from, the structural to the cultural aspect of pluralism, one may distinguish several degrees of objective cultural pluralism i.e. of observable cultural differences between groups. Groups can show minimal cultural pluralism when they come from unrelated traditions, they can exhibit intermediate pluralism by belonging to well differentiated but related ethnic groups; or they can be minimally pluralistic by showing only minor sub cultural variants of the same tradition.

M. G. Smith goes on to distinguish three associated levels of pluralism. Cultural pluralism, by itself, consists solely in institutional differences without any corporate social distinctions. Cultural pluralism is compatible with "uniform incorporation" (individual citizens are incorporated directly into the public domain without references to any sectional identification that may or may not exist). Social pluralism is present if institutional differences coincide with the sharp division of a society into closed reported ones corporate groups. Finally structural pluralism prevails in plural societies, that is in differentially incorporated ones (the political domination of one group over the others). Structural pluralism presupposes both social and cultural pluralism and social pluralism presupposes cultural pluralism.

The pluralistic approach is not a theory of social change but a set of sensitizing concepts to aid us in studying the complex reality of multi-ethnic system; and to steer us away from our concern with the "society culture" as a closed system. The pluralistic framework is presented as a step toward the

understanding of change and conflict in a great many of the world's large scale societies. Furthermore, the concept of pluralism deals with the macroscopic level of analysis, which has the most for reaching relevance to ourselves as a species.

Cultural Universals

A major contribution of cultural anthropology during the 20th century has been its descriptive documentation of the thousands of cultures that inhabit the face of the earth. Again, following the Boasian tradition of ideal descriptive ethnography, hundreds of cultural anthropologists have set out since the turn of century to describe the wide variety of cultures found in the contemporary world. As a result, the discipline of anthropology has been for more effective at documenting cultural differences than showing similarities among cultures. This preoccupation with different forms of behavior and different ways of meeting human need was the result, at least in part, of wanting to move away from the premature generalizing about "human nature" that was so prevalent around the turn of the century.

This vast documentation of culturally different ways of behaving has been extraordinary important for our understanding of the human condition. The significant number of cultural differences illustrate how flexible and adaptable humans are compared to other animals: each culture has developed a different set of solution to the universal human problem facing all societies. For example, every society, if it is to survive as an entity, needs a system of communication enabling its members to send and receive messages. That there are thousands of mutually unintelligible languages in the world today certainly attests to human flexibility. When viewed from a somewhat higher level of abstraction, however all of these different linguistic communities display an important common denominator, i.e. they all have developed some form of language. This example reminds us that, despite the many differences, all cultures of the world share a number of common features, called cultural universals in that they have all worked out solutions to the problems facing all human societies.

We can gain a clear picture of cultural universal by looking in greater detail at the universal needs that give rise to them.

The most elaborate attempt to account for the universality of certain aspects of culture appears in a posthumous work of B. Malinowski. Here he set forth the function which each of the cultural responses is held to fulfill in satisfying what are termed the basic needs of men. His scheme is as follows.

Basic Needs	Cultural Responses
1. Metabolism	1. Commissariat
2. Reproduction	2. Kinship
3. Bodily comfort.	3. Shelter
4. Safety	4. Protection
5. Liberty	5. Activities
6. Growth	6. Training
7. Health	7. Hygiene

This list has to be read with each plan of horizontal entries regarded as linked up in separately. Basic human needs, manifest in cultural activities of men, in turn set up a series of “derived needs”. Which mean that “culture supplies man with derived potentiats, abilities and powers”. From the derived needs came a series of “cultural imperatives” which give form to the institutions of a culture. In the following table Malinowki indicates how these are built up.

Imperatives	Responses
1. The culturai apparatus of implements and consumers good must be produced, used, maintain and replaced by new production.	Economics
2. Human behavior. as regards its technical customary. legal or moral prescription must be codified, regulated in action and sanction.	Social Control
3. The human material by which every institution is maintained must be renewed, formed, drilled and provided with full knowledge of tribal tradition.	Education
4. Authority with each institution must be defined. equipped with powers, and endowed with means of forceful execution of its order.	

Malinowski defines culture as essential an instrumental apparatus by which man is put in a position the better to cope with the concrete specific problem that face him in his environment in the course of statisfaction of his needs.”

Anthropologists George Peter Murdock has compiled a list of what he calls cultural universals, basic solutions to the problems of living that are found in are form or another in all cultures. This list gives us an intuitive feeling for the humanness of our species by pointing out how many different kind of behavior are shared by all human beings no matter where they come from.

Age grading	Ethno botany	Inheritance	Populating poficy
Athletics	Etiquette	Joking	Postnatal care
Bodily adomment	Faith healing	Kin groups	Pregnancy usage
Calendar	Family	Kin terminology	Property rights
Cleaning training	Feasting	Language	Propitiation of super natural being
Community organization	Fire making	Law	Puberty customs
Cooking	Falk lore	Luck superstitions	Religious rituals
Cooperative	Food taboos	Magic	Residence rules

Cosmology	Funeral rites	Maniage	Sexual restrictions
Courtship	Gaines	Mealtimes	Soul concepts
Dancing	Gestures	Medicine	Status differentiation
Decorative art	Gift giving	Modesty	Surgery
Divination	Government	Mouming	Took making
Division of labour	Greetings	Music	Trade
Dream interpretation	Hair styles	Mythology	Visiting
Education	Hospitality	Nurnerals	Weaning
Eschatology	Housing	Obstetrics	Weather control
Ethics	Hygiene	Penal sanctions	
	Incest taboos	Personal names	

One of the most fundamental requirements of all societies is to see to it that the basic physiological need of its people are met. Clearly, people cannot live unless they receive a minimum amount of food, Water, and protection from the elements; since a society will not last without living people, every society needs to work out systematic ways of producing (or producing from environment) those absolutely essential commodities and then distributing what it sees as necessary to its members. In the United States, goods and services are distributed according to the capitalistic principal of “each according to his or her own capacity to pay”. In socialist countries such as Cuba as china, distribution takes place according to the principle of “each according to his or her need.’ The Hazda of Tanzania distribute meat according to how an individual is related to the person who killed the animal. The Pygmies of Central Africa engage in a system of distribution called “silent barter”, whereby they avoid face-to-face interaction with trading partners. Many societies distribute valuable commodities as part of marriage system, sending considerable qualities of livestock from the family of the groom to the family of the bride. Even though the details of each of these systems of distribution varies greatly each society has worked out a patterned way of ensuring that people get what they need for survival. As a result we can say that every society has an economic system.

In addition to the need to produce and distribute vital commodities to its members, all societies face a number of other universal needs. For e.g. all societies need to make provision for orderly mating and child rearing, this need gives rise to patterned systems of marriages and family. If a society is to endure, it win need to develop a systematic way of a passing on its culture from one generation to the next. This universal societal need for cultural transmission tends to some form of educational system in all societies. A prerequisite for the Longevity of any society is the maintenance of social order. That is, most of the people must obey most of the rules most of the time. This universal societal need to avoid destruction through anarchy leads to a set of mechanism that

coerce people to obey the social norms, which we refer to as a social control system since people in all societies are faced with life occurrences that defy explanation or prediction, all societies have developed system for explaining the unexplainable, most of which rely on same form of super natural beliefs such as religion, witchcraft, magic, or sorcery. Thus all societies have developed a system supernatural belief that serve to explain otherwise inexplicable phenomena. And since all societies, if they are of function, need for their members to be able to send and receive messages with relative efficiency, they all have developed system of communications, both verbal and non verbal.

Despite what may appear to be an overwhelming amount of cultural variety found in the world today, all cultures, owing to the fact that they must meet certain universal needs, share a number of traits in common.

Cultural Relativism

Cultural Relativism expresses the idea that the belief and practices of others are best understood in the light of the particular culture in which they are found. The idea is predicated on the degree to which human behavior is held to be culturally determined, a basic tenet of American cultural anthropology. This is often joined with the argument that because all extant cultures are viable adaptations are equally deserving of respect, they should not be subjected to invidious judgments of worth or value by outsiders. Alternatively, some argued that since all norms are specific to the culture in which they were formulated, there can be no universal standards of judgement.

In opposition to ethnocentrism of 19th century anthropology, Franz Boas arrived at a position best described as cultural relativism. By this he meant that while studying other's culture strict neutrality must be maintained in describing and comparing other cultures and make no judgement concerning the merit of one culture over the other. It is an ethical position, by which all cultures were taken as equal, each as a separate unit with its own integrity, none of which should be compared to our own culture in terms of how they measure up to our standards.

Cultural relativism was a logical outcome of Boas's work in showing that the history of each group was distinct. Thus whatever a culture is like today, it became that way because of its own development and therefore can not be ranked v/s other cultures with a different history. Each culture has developed over time, some more than others in particular areas, some as a response to certain pressure that others did and face. The point of Boas's was that because each culture has its own independent history, all groups couldn't be compared on a scale of excellence that conformed to any particular group.

Every culture proposes solutions to the problems of people face. If the anthropologist is to look at these solutions - then he must consider it from the point of view of those people, in the context of their culture. For example,

Americans tend to be critical of people in other societies who have high birth rates, yet who suffer from periodic famine and a high death rate through starvation and malnutrition. It seems "irrational" to us to have more children when there is not enough food to feed the people already alive. We make a value judgement based on our calculation of situation without considering their opinion where they know that the chances of infant surviving is low due to high rate of disease and poor medical facilities available.

We may be studying a society where infanticide the killing of young children - is practiced in order to maintain control over population. Among some traditional Eskimos groups when a person became too old to contribute his share of the workload, he or she was left out in the ice to die. This may be considered as uncivilized practice but it should be considered in the light of ecological situation in which Eskimos live. Making a living in Arctic is difficult at best. It is not a question of Eskimos not liking old people, but rather a question of what is best for the entire group.

The Canadian Mounties are occasionally called to go into the arctic region to apprehend Eskimos who have committed a murder. This action in terms of our culture is crime, and the individual has violated the mores. In the culture of many Eskimos, however; the killing may have been justified, since their mores demand that a man avenge an injury committed upon a kinsman. This type of revenge is not considered unruly or deviant but is the only kind of action which an honorable man could take.

Few cultural traits are so disturbing to the most westerners as the primitive practices of head hunting an apparently useless and blood thirsty pastime. However this trait nearly everywhere has a fairly complex meaning. The Marindese of New Guinea, a quite gentle and affectionate people, hunted head in order to provide names for their children (van der Kroef. 1952) since they firmly believed that the only way a child could get a name and a separate identity was to take it from a living person. The head was given to a child when it was named and, like the name, the head was something that child carried around for the rest of its life.

Or let us take the example of a young man who works as a day laborer. He doesn't work every day, but only a few days a month, and earns as much as he has to in order to support his family at a minimal level of survival. We might be inclined to think him lazy but within a cultural context one will find that in his society it is customary for a man to open up his house to his relatives, and never to refuse them his hospitality. If he lives at a bare subsistence, he has nothing leftover to offer his relatives, and they will probably leave him alone. He knows this, and his decision to work only as much as is necessary is very rational.

Another example is use of igloo for housing among American Eskimos.

At first glance, the igloo appears to be a primitive uncomfortable, inferior type of dwelling. The anthropologist who understands the concept of cultural relativity, however, interpret it this way. .

It can be constructed quickly out of the only materials, immediately available, due to its design it is extremely strong but the individual blocks of snow are quite light and the melting and refreezing of the interior surface provides a perfect seal against the wind.

These illustrations show what we mean by cultural relativism - that the function and meaning of a trait are relative to its cultural setting.

The concept of cultural relativism doesn't mean that all customs are equally valuable nor does it imply that no customs are harmful. Some patterns of behavior may be injurious in an milieu, but even such patterns serve some purpose in the culture, and the society will suffer unless a substitute is provided.

Sociologists are sometimes accused of undermining morality with their concept of cultural relativism, and their claim that almost "everything's right somewhere."

According to Franz Boas, the father of modern anthropology in the United States, the way in which anthropologists are to strive for the level of detachment is through the practice of cultural relativism. For him, cultural relativism involved maintaining strict neutrality when describing and contrasting culturally different populations. The anthropologist was to avoid making value judgments about the relative merit of one culture over another. Since each culture was thought to have its own integrity, the anthropologist was expected to resist all temptation to see how other cultures measured up to his or her own."

For Boas cultural relativism was an ethical mandate as well as a strategic methodology for understanding other cultures. In his attempt to counter the methodological abuses of people like Mead and to set anthropology on a more scientific footing, Boas perhaps overemphasized the importance of cultural relativism. If cultural relativism is taken to its logical extreme, we arrive at two indefensible positions. First from the methodological perspective, if every society is a unique entity that can be evaluated only in terms of its own standards, then any type of cross-cultural comparison would be virtually impossible. Clearly, however, if cultural anthropology is to accomplish its major objective that is, "scientifically describing and comparing the world's cultures it needs some basis for comparison.

A second difficulty with, taking the notion of cultural relativism too literally, is that, from an ethical standpoint, we would have to conclude that absolutely no behavior found in the world would be immoral provided the people who practice it concur that it is morally acceptable or that it performs a

function for the well-being of the society. To practise cultural relativity however, does not require that we view all cultures as morally equivalent. That is, not all cultural practices are equally worthy of tolerance and respect. To be certain, some cultural practices are morally indefensible within any cultural context. And as Bagash reminds, if we refuse to acknowledge our own values and compare, evaluate and judge other cultures, we may be paralyzed in coping with every-day world.

Yet, if our goal is to understand human behaviour in its myriad forms, then cultural relativism can help us identify the inherent logic behind certain ideas and customs.

Question

1. Discuss in detail various approaches to cultural diversity.
2. Elaborate on the concepts of multiculturalism and pluralism in understanding cultural diversity.
3. Show how cultural universals are shared by all human beings.
4. Critically analyze the importance of cultural relativism in anthropology.

References and Further Readings

1. Macgill Frank. M. - Encyclopedia of Sociology.
2. J. J. Honigmann (ed). -Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.
3. Horton and Hunt -Sociology
4. Michael D. Qlien -The Human Myth
5. Friedi John - Cultural Anthropology.

INTERPRETATION OF CULTURE: CULTURE, MEANINGS,. SYMBOLS

Objective

1. To make students familiar to the concept of culture and symbol.
2. To enhance their knowledge about how culture can be interpreted in various forms.
3. To make if students understand importance and wage of symbols in social life.

Key Concepts

1. Interpretative approach.
2. Native
3. Semiotic
4. Symbolic anthropology
5. Ethnography.

Interpretation of culture: culture, meaning symbols.

Introduction

Cultural anthropology, studies the ways man has devised to cope with his natural setting and his social million; and how bodies of customs are lenrned, retained and harided down from one generation to the next. Students of culture seek to understand how and why various traits and aspects of culture such as making a fish-trap, organizing family relationship, greeting, worship very from one person to another. They seek to determines how established forms of tradition change with the passage of time, whether due to innovation, internal development or contact with other culture.

Interpretative Approach

Humanistic or interpretive anthropology seeks to redirect cultural anthropology from a strategy of finding casual explanation for human behavior by seeking interpretations and meaning in human action. It is a strategy, which seeks to humanities rather than science as the model for anthropology, if seeks analogies based on theatre, play, drama and literature rather than those based on crafts, mechanics and organic structure.

Interpretative anthropology is mentalist in into orientation, seeking culture as a system of ideas, values and meanings. If differs from other mentalist approaches which seek causes for human behavior. Interpretive or humanistic anthropology

eschews the search for casual explanation in favour of her menentic approach which seek meaning through interpretations of behaviors or texts.

Interpretive anthropology takes an ideographic approach, that is the study of the single case which can yield insight and meanings. In the study of the individual case, a particular society, for example, interpretive anthropology doesn't look at how people behave as much as the meaning which persons living in the society give to their action and behavior. These meanings are conveyed through the use of symbols which stand for values, codes and rules. This viewpoint does not deny the material workd, but believes that the material and social world of humans can be best understood by listening to the way persons living in the society explain and understand their 'interpretations' of the 'native'.

Cliffard Geertz

Greets is the theoretical leader if not the founder, of the approach to anthropology called "nterpretive." .He believes that anthropology must be based on concrete reality, but, from this reality, one drives meaning rather than precditions based on empirical data. Anthropology should base itself on the humanistic disciplines, utilizing description, poetics, literature, myths, symbols and features of human beings which differentiates them from other species.

German philosophers believed that since human beings had the mental capacity for language and learned knowledge, the study of human society required methods, techniques and orientations different from the study of often natural phenomena. Geertz and other humanistic anthmpologists shared this view.

Geertz sees the cultural context, not as a set of general propositions, but webs of significance, which human spin and in which they operate as they go about their daily activities. In his view, to reduce the world to a cause and effect perspective is to miss the human mode of being.

Geertz's orientation to seek meanings based on the "native" view in fankly relativistic. It is designed to make the .anthropologists sensitive to view other than his or her own. But it does not accept wihilism or an "anything goes" attitude Rather what Geertz seeks in self knowlegde, self perception, self-understanding that sorts out who the observer is and who the people are that he is trying to understand. In his book "local knowledge Geetz's interest in the individual case, seeks knowledge by starling from the base of native knowledge and combining if that of the observer.

Geertz's perspective in anthropology can be called humanistic as well as interpretive, in the sense that he aims for expositions which retain the individuality and complexity of human behavior usually found in literature and art. He argued that a work of fiction, a play, a painting as a poem captures and provides insights into the human condition missed by abstract theorizing.

Symbols and Meanings

Symbols are object, event, speech, sound or written forms to which human attribute meaning. The primary form of symbolizing by human being is through language. But humans also communicate by using signs and symbols in art, dance, music, architecture, facial expression, gesture, body posture, ornaments, clothing, ritual, religion, kinship, nationality, space arrangement, and material possessions, among many other things. Human being attribute meanings to any event, action or object which can evoke thought, idea and emotions. The perception of use of symbols as a significant human feature has become an important object of study in anthropology and other discipline.

Edward Tylor wrote:

The power of using words as a sign to express thought with which their sound doesn't directly connect them, in fact as arbitrary symbols, in the highest grade of the special human faculty in language, the presence of which bind together all races of mankind in substantial mental unity.

Ernest Cassirer argue that without a complex of symbols, rational thought wouldn't be possible. He explained the symbolic nature of human being as follows:

No longer in a merely physical universe, man lives in a symbolic universe. Language, myth art and religion are part of this universe. They are varied thread which weave the symbolic net, the tangled web of human experience. All humans progress in thought and experience and strengthen this net.

As anthropology began to develop a perspective of culture as a system of symbols, meaning and values, various disciplines of anthropology came into being. Two of these are as follows.

1. Semiotic (the study of sign)
2. Symbolic anthropology.

A symbol stimulates or conveys a message which stimulates thought or action

1. An Iconic Sign resembles its object in some aspects (the cross in the icon sign, evoking the idea and meaning of Christianity).
2. An indexical sign is physically related to its object (a weathervane is an e.g. as if a flag flying at half must denote that an important public person had died.)
3. symbols like language stands for its object because it is interpreted by connection and usage.

Some symbols and sign system studies concentrate on the internal logic, others, usually those not linked with linguistic, then the social action and social

content of sign and symbol as they relate to the behavioral and value system of a culture or society.

Symbolic anthropology views man as the carriers and products, as subject and object, of a system of sign and symbols which serves as a means of communication to impart knowledge and message. These provides the foundation for action and behaviour as well as ideas and values.

Symbolic theory of culture is a model of human being as a symbolizing species, as compared with a materialistic theory of culture which views humans as primarily a producing species. Both mode recognize existence of material, but each views other from its own perspective.

Symbolic definition of culture is a part of a trend which views culture as a science of meanings. Symbolic anthropology study the system of codes and message received by human being through their interaction with other human beings and with natural world. Characteristic shows that the entire world is prefused with language and sign. Given this fact and the fact that are human beings communicate with some form of sign and symbol, symbolic anthropology is engaged in research which is universal in scope.

Most of the knowledge, thoughts, feelings and perception of human being is wrapped in language a symbol system. Words convey meaning and names and classify object and thoughts. Word symbols, language and appropriate to a society at a particular time and place. The word planet meant something different in the first century than it does in 20th century.

Development of language provides foundation for symbolic view of culture. Linguistic has given the symbolic anthropologists the techniques of univav codes to represent complex of motives, experience and knowledge which shape and express belief and actions. Linguistic is historic forerunner of anthmtology.

Language is not the only form in which symbolic interaction takes place. Symbols, can take forms of public events, parade, funeral, tournament holiday and even way ender stand on a podium. Symbolizing sis a metal activity can draw upon any type of object or gesture.

Interpretation of Culture

The concept of culture is essentially a semantic one. Believing with Max Weber that man is an animal suspended in web of significance he himself has spun, culture implies those webs. Its analysis therefore is not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning.

If you want to understand what a science is you should look in the first instance not at its theories or its findings and certainly not at what its

apologist say about it; you should look at it what the practitioners of it do. In anthropology or social anthropology, what the practitioners do is 'ethnography'. Doirig ethnography is establishing rapport, selecting informants, transcribing texts, taking genealogies, mapping friends, keeping a diary and so on. It is a kind of intellectual effort, an elaborate venture, to borrow a notion from Gilbert Ryle, "thick description". Ryle explains it by an illustration of two boys rapidly contracting the eyelids of their right eyes. In one, this is an involuntary twitch; in the other, a conspiratorial signal to a friend. The difference between a twitch and a wink is vast. As Ryle points out, the Twitcher has only contracted his eyelid, that too without any conscious will or design; whereas the winker has done two things, he has not only contracted his eyelid but has winked, has precisely communicated a definite message to a friend, according to socially established codes, without cognizance of others. Thus a speck of behavior, a fleck of culture, a gesture may be interpreted differently by different people and in different cultural contexts.

The same kind of behavior may be engaged in by number of others, for instance, a third boy may parody by a laughable attempt at winking to make others laugh. A fourth may stand before a mirror and rehearse winking. These different variations in a given piece of behaviour are beyond the preview or comprehensive of an anthropologist. Even if he notices them, he may not comprehend the implicit meanings and functions of these variations. Hence his interpretations may not always be true to reality.

Ethnography is thick description. The ethnographer pursues the more automatized routines of data collection: he interviews informants, observes rituals, elicits kin terms, traces property lines, censuses households and writes his journal. Doing ethnography is like trying to read a manuscript - foreign, faded, full of incoherences and therefore an enormously difficult task.

The response of an individual to an action of another is fully dependent on interpretation. For example, if an individual sees another person smiling, trying or waving his hand, he will put himself in that person's position in order to interpret his action and meaning. On the basis of this interpretation he will respect the culture's action. Therefore, if he sees someone shaking his fist, he may interpret this gesture as one of aggression but his interpretation will not automatically lead to a particular response. He may ignore the gesture, try to make a joke of it or even wish to fight back. The person with whom he is interacting will then take his role, interpret his response and either continue the action or close the interaction on the basis of interpretation.

Anthropological works are themselves interpretations of the second or third order. It is only a 'native' who makes first order interpretation of his culture, because it is his culture. Anthropological works based on another anthropological work (Levi-Strauss, for e.g.) may be fourth order interpretation. Anthropologists have not always been as aware of this fact. To become aware of it is to realize that the line between mode of representation and substantive content is as understandable in culture analysis as it is in painting; and that fact in turn seems to threaten the objective status of anthropological knowledge by suggesting that its source is not social reality but scholarly artifice.

In anthropological interpretation is constructing a reading of what happens, then to divorce it from its applications and render it vacant. A good interpretation of anything a poem, a person, a history, a ritual, an institution, a society - takes us into the heart of that of which it is interpretation.

How theory functions in an interpretive science suggests that the distinction that appears in the experimental or observational sciences between "description" and "explanation" also appears between "inscriptions" (thick description of Ryle) and "specification" ("Diagnosis") between setting down the meaning particular social actions have for the actor and stating what the knowledge thus attained demonstrates about the society in which it is found. A repertoire of very general concepts like "integrative", "symbols", "ideology", "structure", "function", "Sacred" and "culture" itself is woven into the body of thick description ethnography in the hope of rendering mere occurrences scientifically eloquent. The aim is to draw large conclusions from small, but very densely textured facts; to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective life by engaging them exactly with complex specifications.

Conclusion

Thus it is not only interpretation that goes all the way down to the most observational level; the theory upon which such interpretations conceptually depend does so also. It is an argument that to remark the patterns of social relationship is to rearrange the coordinates of the experienced world. Society forms are culture's substances. Cultural analysis is intrinsically incomplete. The more deeply it goes the less complete it is. Anthropology, or at least interpretive anthropology is a science whose progress is marked less by perfection of consensus than by a refinement of debate.

To look at the symbolic dimensions of social action-art, religion, ideology, science, law, morality, common sense - is not to turn away from the existential dilemmas of life. The essential vocation of interpretive anthropology is not to answer our deepest question, but to make available to us answers that others have given and thus to include them in the consultable record or what man has said.

References and further readings

1. Victor Tumer, Symbolic Action in Human Society, Cornell University press. 1974.
2. Mary Douglas, Symbolism
3. H. Applebaum, Symbolic and Humanistic Anthropology
4. Clifford Geertz, Interpretative Anthropology.
5. Melville Herskovits, Man and his work, 1967.

Question

1. Can a culture be fully and truly interpreted: give examples.
2. Examine the nature of symbolic anthropology
3. Explain the interpretative approach focusing on interpretation of culture symbols.

CULTURAL STUDIES

Objective

1. To enhance students understanding of various perspective on cultural studies.
2. To acquaint them with the need and importance of cultural studies.
3. To develop a futuristic nation of cultural studies.

Key Terms

- Interpretative approach: an approach which regard meaning and action as the prime objective
- Transdisciplinary approach: an approach which involves border crossing across disciplines from text to context, and thus from text to culture and society.
- Multicultural: A society characterized by cultural pluralism and diversity
- Folk Culture: art, literature and other symbolic products created by and primarily consumed by the common people on working class.
- Frankfurt school: a group of 1930's German theorists and critics who developed the Marxist cultural critique.
- High culture: the symbolic products preferred and designed for the well educated elite; also refers to the style and feelings of the elite who choose these products.

Introduction

The new "interpretive" social scientific perspective has led to emergence of a new interdisciplinary field called "cultural studies" In its most strict sense, cultural studies refers to a tradition, that emerged in Britain during the 1960's and 1970's. Often called "British cultural studies," this type of cultural studies can be traced to the founding of the Birmingham center for contemporary cultural studies in 1964 as a research grouping within the English Department at the University of Birmingham in UK. British cultural studies blends seminal work by European structuralist. Such as Levi Struss and Barthes, with the work of certain European Marxist, most importantly Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusan (Turner 1996).

In a broader sense, cultural studies refers to any type of work on the relationship between culture and society. In this sense, cultural studies includes both literary "essays" about culture and society that fall well within the traditional boundaries of the humanities, and more theoretically and methodologically grounded works on culture that fall well within the traditional boundaries of sociology. In this broader sense, "cultural studies" is practiced by linguists, geographers, essayists, historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists, among others.

The Frankfurt School, Cultural studies, and Regimes of capital

To a large extent, the Frankfurt school inaugurated critical studies of man communication and culture, and thus produced an early model of cultural studies. During the 1930's the Frankfurt school developed a critical and transdisciplinary approach to cultural and communication studies combining critique of political economy of the media, analysis of texts, and audience reception studies of the social and ideological affects of man culture and communication. They coined the term 'culture industries' to signify the process of industrialization of man-produced culture and the commercial imperatives which drove the system. The critical theorists analyzed all man-mediated cultural artifacts within the context of industrial production, in which the commodities of the cultural industries exhibited the same features as other products of man production: commodification, standardization, and magnification.

Adorno's analyses of popular music (1978) Lowenthal's studies of popular literature and magazines (1984), Herzog's studies of radio soap operas (1941), and the perspectives and critiques of man culture developed in the Horkheimer and Adorno's famous study of the culture industries (1972) provides many examples of the value of the Frankfurt school approach. Moreover, they were the first to systematically analyze and criticize man-mediated culture and communication within critical social theory. Furthermore, they investigated the cultural industries in a political context as a form of integration of the working class into capitalist societies.

The Frankfurt school focused intently on technology and culture, indicating how technology was becoming both a major force of production and formative mode of social organization and control. It worked as articulation of a theory of the stage of state and monopoly capitalism which became dominant during the 1930s. It was an era of man production and consumption characterized by uniformity and homogeneity of need, thought, and behavior producing a 'man society' and what the Frankfurt school described as 'the end of the individual.'

During this period, mass culture and communication were instrumental in generating the modes of thought and behavior appropriate to a highly organized and unified social order. Thus, the Frankfurt school theory of 'the culture industries' articulated a major historical shift to an era in which mass consumption and culture was indispensable to producing a consumer society based on homogeneous need and desires for mass-produced products and a man society based on social organization and homogeneity. It is culturally the era of highly controlled network radio and television, inspired top forty pop music, glory Hollywood films national magazines and other mass-produced cultural artifacts.

British Cultural Studies

British cultural studies, from a historic perspective emerges in a late era of capital and a more variegated and conflicted cultural formation. The focus of culture described by the earliest phase of British culture studies in the 1950s

and early 1960's articulated conditions in an era in which there were still significant tensions in England and much of Europe between an older working class-based culture and the newer mass-produced culture. The initial projects of cultural studies developed by Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, and E. P. Thompson attempted to preserve working class culture against onslaught of mass culture produced by the cultural industries.

The Trajectories of Cultural Studies

It is thought that the second stage of the development of British cultural studies started with the founding of the University of Birmingham center for contemporary cultural studies in 1963/64 by Hoggart and Stuart Hall. The Birmingham group came to focus on the interplay of representations and ideologies of class, gender, race, ethnicity, and nationality in cultural texts, including media culture. They were among the first to study the effects of newspapers, radio, television, film, and other Popular cultural forms on audiences. They also focused on how various audiences interpreted and used media culture in varied and different ways and contexts, analyzing the factors that made audiences respond in contrasting way to media text

The Frankfurt school, British cultural studies observed the integration of the working class and its decline of revolutionary consciousness, and studied the conditions of this catastrophe for the Marxian project of revolution. Like the Frankfurt school, British cultural studies concluded that mass culture was playing an important role in integrating the working class into existing capitalist societies and that a new consumer and media culture was forming a new mode of mode capitalist hegemony.

British cultural studies turned to youth cultures as providing potentially new forms of opposition and social change. Through studies of youth subcultures, British cultural studies demonstrated how culture came to constitute distinct forms of identity and group membership and appraised the oppositional potential of various youth subcultures. Cultural studies came to focus on how sub cultural groups resist dominant forms of culture and identity, creating their own style and identities. Individuals who conform to dominant dress and fashion codes, behavior and political ideologies thus produce their identities within mainstream groups, as members of specific social groupings (such as white, middle-class conservative Americans.) individuals who identify with subcultures like punk culture, or black nationalist subcultures, look and act differently from those in the mainstream and thus create oppositional identities, defining themselves against standard models.

British cultural studies, unlike the Frankfurt School, has not adequately engaged modernist and avant-garde aesthetic movement, limiting its focus by and large to products of media culture and 'the popular' which has become an immense focus of its efforts. It appears that in its anxiety to legitimate study of the popular and to engage the artifacts of media culture, British cultural Studies has turned away from so called 'high' culture in favor of the popular.

But such a turn sacrifices the possible insights into all forms of culture and replicates the bifurcation of the field of culture into a 'popular' and 'elite'.

British cultural studies like the Frankfurt school insists that culture must be studied within the social relations and system through which culture is produced and consumed, and that thus study of culture is intimately bound up with the study of society, politics, and economics. The key Gramscian concept of hegemony led British cultural studies to investigate how media culture articulates a set of dominant values, political ideologies, and cultural forms into a hegemonic project that incorporates individuals into a shared consensus, as individuals became integrated into the consumer society and political projects like Reaganism or Thatcherism.

Some earlier authoritative presentations of British cultural studies stressed the importance of a trans disciplinary approach to the study of culture that analyzed its political economy, process of production and distribution textual products, and reception by the audience positions remarkably similar to the Frankfurt school.

In more recent cultural studies, later, there has been a turn throughout the English speaking world to what might be called a post modern problematic which emphasize pleasure, consumption, and the individual construction of identities in terms of what McGuigan (1992) has called a 'cultural populism'. Media culture from this perspective produced material for identities, pleasure, and empowerment, and thus audiences constitute the 'popular' through their consumption of cultural products. During the phase-roughly from the mid-1980's to the present - cultural studies in Britain and North America turned to postmodern forms of identity politics and less critical perspective on media and consumer culture.

Thus it is right to say that post modern cultural studies is a response to a new era of global capitalism. What is described as the 'new revolutionism' (McGuigan 1992).

The post modernist cultural studies articulates experience and phenomena within a new mode of social organization. The forms of hybrid culture and identities described by postmodern cultural studies correspond to a globalized capitalism with an intense flow of product, culture, people, and identities with new co-figuration of the global and local and new forms of struggles and resistance (Appadurai 1977). Corresponding to the structure of a globalized and hybridized global culture, are new forms of cultural studies which combine traditions from throughout the world. Cultural studies has indeed become globalized during the past decade with proliferation of artifacts, books, conferences, and internet sites and discussions throughout the world.

Border crossing, Trans Disciplinarily, and Cultural Studies

The major traditions of cultural studies combine at their best social theory, cultural critique, history, philosophical analyses and specific political interventions, thus overcoming the standard academic division of labor by surmounting specialization arbitrarily produced by an artificial academic division of labor. Cultural studies thus operates with a trans disciplinary conception that draws on social theory economic, politics, history, communication studies, literary

and cultural theory, philosophy, and other theoretical discourse an approach shared by the Frankfurt School, British cultural studies, and French post *modern* theory. Trans disciplinary approaches to culture and society transgress borders between various academic disciplines. In regard to cultural studies, such approaches suggest that one should not stop at the border of a text, but should see how it fits into systems of textual production, and how various text are thus part of systems of genres or type of production, and have an inter textual construction as well as articulating discourses in a given socio-historical conjuncture.

Trans disciplinary approaches thus involve border crossing across disciplines from text to context, and thus from texts to culture and society. Raymond Williams was especially important for cultural studies because of his stress on borders and border crossing (1961, 1962 and 1964) like looking towards entertainment are cannot fully grasp the Madonna phenomena without analyzing her marketing strategies, her political environment, the cultural artifacts, and then affects (Kellner 1995).

Furthermore in an era of globalization one must be aware of the global network that produce and distribute cultural in the interest of profit and corporate hegemony. Yet political economy doesn't hold the key to cultural studies and important as it is. it was limitations as a single approach.

Textual Analysis

The product of media culture require multi dimensionnl close textual reading to and use their various forms of discourse. The textual analysis of cultural studies combines formalist analysis with critique of how cultural meaning convey specific ideologies of gender, race, class sexuality, nation and other ideological dimensions. Ideological textual analysis shoulddeploy a wide range of methods to fully explicae each dimension and to show how they fit into textual system. Each critical method focuses on certain features of a text from a specific perspective: the perspective spotlights, as illuminates, some features of a text while ignoring others. Marxist methods tend to focus on class, for instance, while feminist approaches will highlight-gender, critical race theory spotlight race and ethnicity, and gay and lesbian theories explicate sexuality. Because there is a spilt between textual encoding and audience decoding, there is a always the possibility of multiplicity of readings of any teat of media culture.

Audience Reception and Use of Media Culture

All texts are subject of multiple reading depending on the perspectives and subject positions of the readers. Members of distinct gender classes races, nations, regions, sexual preferences, and political ideologies are going to read text differently, and cultural studies can illustrate why diverse audience interpret teat in various, sometimes, conflicting ways. It is indeed one of the merits of cultural studies to have focused on audience reception in recent years and this focus provides one of its major contribution, through there are also some limitations and problems with the standard cultural studies approaches to the audience.

This emphasis of cultural studies on audience, reception and

appropriation helps to overcome the previous one-sided textualist orientalist, to culture. It also directs focus on the actual political effects that texts have and how audience use texts.

Towards a Cultural Studies, that is Critical, Multicultural, and Multiperspectival

To avoid the one-sidedness of textual analysis, approaches, or audience and reception studies, cultural studies should be multiperspectival, getting at culture from the perspectives of political economy, text analyses, and audience reception, as outlined above. Textual analysis should utilize a multiplicity of perspectives and critical methods, and audience reception studies should delineate the wide range of subject positions or perspectives, through which audience appropriate culture. This requires a multicultural approach that sees that the importance of analyzing the dimensions of class, race and ethnicity, and gender and sexual preference within the texts of media culture, while studying as well their impact on how audience read and interpret media culture.

Conclusion

In short, a cultural studies that is critical and multicultural provides comprehensive approaches to culture that can be applied to a wide variety of artifacts from pornography to Madonna, from MTV to TV news, or to specific events like the 2000 U. S. presidential election, or media representations of 2001 terrorist attacks on the U.S and the U.S response. Its comprehensive perspective encompass political economy, textual analysis, and audience research and provide critical and political perspectives that enables individuals to dissect the meanings, messages, and effects of dominant cultural forms. Cultural studies is thus a part of a critical media pedagogy that enables individuals to resist media manipulation and to increase their freedom and individuality. It can empower people to gain sovereignty over their culture and to be able to struggle for alternative cultures and political change. Cultural studies is thus not just another academic fad; but can be part of a struggle for a better society and a better life.

References and Further Readings

1. Kellner Douglas - Cultural Studies and FS:McGuigan reader. (1997).
2. Kellner Douglas -. Cultural Studies, Multiculturalism, and Media Culture.
3. Kellner Douglas - Cultural Studies and Social Theory: A Critical Intervention.
4. Laura Derfor Edles (2001) cultural Sociology in Practice, Blackwell publishers.
5. Diana Crane (1994) The Sociology of Culture, Blackwell publishers.

Questions

1. Critically examine Origin of cultural studies.
2. Elucidate the potential Contribution of Cultural studies.
3. Write a detailed essay on cultural studies.
4. Examine trans disciplinary and multicultural perspective on cultural studies.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES: EVOLUTIONISM

Outline

1. Objectives
2. Introduction
3. Brief Explanation of Evolutionism
4. Early Evolutionists
5. Critique of Early Evolutionary Theory
6. Later Evolutionists
7. Evaluation of Later Evolutionary Theory
8. Development in the 60s, 70s and 80s
9. Neo Evolutionism & Talcott Parsons (Modernisation)
10. Conclusion

Objectives

The student shall be introduced to one of Anthropology's earliest approaches. This module will first examine the rise of evolutionism in Anthropology. It will then briefly survey theories of early evolutionists. After which it will delve into the reasons that lead to its decline at the end of the 19th century. It will later look into the subsequent revival of evolutionism in the 1930s and examine some of the more important neo evolutionary theories.

Concepts

Enlightenment a term used to describe the trends in thought and letters in Europe and the American colonies during the 18th century prior to the French Revolution. Ethnocentrism is a belief in the superiority of one's 'own ethnic group.

Introduction

God said. "Let us make man in our
Image, to *our likeness. Let them rule*
Over the *fish of the sea, over the birds of*
The air, *over the cattle, over the wild*
Animals, *and over all creeping things* ,
That crawl along the ground" 1

God saw all that he had made, and it was very good.

Human beings have always been fascinated and, if one may say, "obsessed" with their origins. Who am I? Where have I come from? The Catholic Bible stands out as one of the earliest and the most famous organized philosophies to answer that question. The two verses quoted above are perhaps the most repeated and believed across the Catholic & Jewish Religions.

1. Genesis 1:26
2. Genesis 1:31

Simple answers to seemingly simple question; man was fashioned from the soil of the earth by God himself. The earth was created in 7 steps that,

according to the Holy Bible (and other popular belief), culminated in the creation of man. And therefore man seemed to be the most important of all the created.

Note the authority given to human beings, “Let them rule” from these statements alone the “white” colonial world seems to have taken the decree very seriously.

And yet, this was not the main tool to assist them in their colonization. Along came Darwin and his revolutionary idea of “evolution”. Human beings did not descend from the sky, he refuted, human beings, like all other “animals”, EVOLVED!

Darwin was not the first to propose this, but the fact that he waited a good thirty years to publish his work tells you a little of the anticipated response he eventually got. His work stood out because of the research he did and the facts presented and for the fact that his proof was “Physical”. He wasn’t spouting theories in the air. He stated that species of plant and animal responded to their physical environment and the challenges that it presented by adapting themselves to the situation. Those species that did not ‘adapt’ enough eventually died out. It was therefore the *Survival of the Better Adapted Species*.

So how did Darwin earn the dubious reputation of having the life “Survival of the Fittest” attributed to his fame? What turned ‘better adapted’ to “fitter”. The answer lies not in “what”, but in “who”.

The answer lies in one man - Herbert Spencer. Famous for his “organismic Analogy”, Spencer is often dismissed into the textbooks as a has been whose theories have been refuted time and again. And yet, it was Spender who changed the face of the study of society with one statement - *Survival of the Fittest*.

Fascinated with the theory of evolution in the sphere of the pure sciences Spencer sought to draw parallels to the social world as well. This aim of his is better understood when one realizes that he was trying to establish the study of Society as a “science” with its basis in facts and not conjecture.

One must remember here that the Biological Evolutionists were talking of Human Evolution in terms of the physical world - walking upright with bipedal motion, the gradual power of speech (more complex as human evolution persisted) and the evolution of the brain among other traits.

Spencer felt therefore that just as other animals adapt to the surroundings and grow in complexity, which in turn helps them with additional adaptations as the situation would demand, so also with human beings who traveled along the unilinear evolutionary path from simple to complex - “evolving” as they went along from the “simple” or “savage” to the complex” or the civilized.

It gains in value when we see how this is applied to the social world. Spencer felt he had found proof in the “savage” tribes of the world. Their very existence, for Spencer, justified and proved his views without his having to undertake much research.

If the physical parts in the biology of human beings evolved from simple to complex, why not the social?

It “savages” used tools like the axe to hunt deer and the European “civilizations” used the gun what did it tell you about human society? His conclusion Human Social Evolution was a fact of life.

This notion of evolutionary progress was widely accepted as far back as the enlightenment. Both French and Scottish social and moral philosophers were using evolutionary schemes during the 18th Century. By the 19th century, the cycle of European conquest, exploration and colonization had yielded vast possessions with a variety of peoples culturally alien to European existence. This posed problems that were both political and scientific in nature.

The discipline of Anthropology arose largely in response to this encounter between cultures. Cultural Evolution, Anthropology’s first systematic ethnological theory, was intended to help explain this diversity among the people of the world.

Brief Explanation of Evolutionism

The condition of culture among various societies of mankind is a subject apt for the study of laws of Human thought and action. On the one hand, the uniformity, which so largely pervades human civilization, may be ascribed, in great measure to the uniform action of uniform causes; while on the other hand, its various grades may be regarded as stages of development or evolution, each the outcome of previous history, and about to do its proper part in shaping the history of the future.

EDWARD BRUNETT TYLOR(1871)

In the early years of Anthropology, the prevailing view was that culture generally develops (or evolves) in a uniform and progressive manner. It was thought that most societies pass through the same series of stages, - to arrive at a common end. The sources of culture change were generally assumed to be embedded within cultures from the beginning and therefore, the ultimate course of development was thought to be internally determined.

Theorists like Montesquieu proposed an evolutionary scheme consisting of three stages:

- A. Hunting or Savagery,
- B. Herding or Barbarism; and
- C. Civilization

This division became popular among 19th century theorists particularly *Tylor and Morgan* who adopted this scheme. These theorists developed rural schemes of overall social and cultural progress, as well as the origins of specific institutions such as religion, marriage and the family.

The term ‘evolutionism’ is crucial to Development Anthropology. It is a process of cultural change that is qualitative in nature. Development Anthropology, in its earlier stages has thus been occupied with the scholarly activity of describing and studying this process here.

EARLY EVOLUTIONISTS

1. Johann Jacob Bachofan (*Das Mutterrecht, 1861*)

He developed a theory of evolution of kinship systems, where he believed that primitive promiscuity was first characterized by Matriarchy and later by Patrilineality, which, in turn, developed along with the notion of private property.

2. Sir James George Frazer (*The Golden Bough, 1871*)

An encyclopaedic collector of data, Frazer summed up the study of magic and religion by stating that magic came first in men's minds, then religion, then science, each giving way slowly and incompletely to the other.

3. Sir John Lubbock

A botanist and staunch pupil of Darwin, he observed that certain stone implements were cruder than others, and seemed, as they lay on the bottom of deposits, to be older. He coined the terms "Paleolithic" and "Neolithic".

4. Sir Henry James Sumner Maine (*Ancient Law, 1861*)

He focused on the development of legal systems. His scheme traces society from systems based on kinship to those based on territoriality from status to contract and from civil to criminal law.

Maine differed from the other evolutionists since he argued that most primitive societies were patriarchal which contrasted with the general evolutionary view that most primitive societies were matriarchal. In addition he also contrasted with other evolutionists in that he was not a proponent of unitinear evolution.

5. Sir Edward Brunett Tyler (*Primitive Culture, 1871*)

This was an attempt to analyse the describe the development of religion. This work is the first lengthy consideration of the concept of culture. In fact, Tylor is famous for giving us the first widely accepted definition of the term "Culture".

6. Lewis Henry Morgan (*Ancient society, 1877*)

One of the most influential evolutionary theorists of the 19th century, Morgan has been frequently referred to as the father of American Anthropology.

In League of the Iriquois (1851), he considered ceremonial, religion and political aspects and also initiated his study of kinship and marriage which he was to develop into a comparative theory in Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity (1871).

This work is a milestone in the development of Anthropology, establishing kinship and marriage as central ideas of Anthropological enquiry.

His Ancient Society (1861), is the most influential statement of the 19th century evolutionary position. It was an elaborated scheme to embrace the whole spectrum of institutions within one framework.

6 CRITIQUE OF EARLY EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Morgan believed that family units became progressively smaller and more self contained as human society developed. His evolutionary sequence, however, is not supported by ethnographic data collected since.

Tylor McLellan and others used Recurrence to help in reconstructing human history. The great drawback of this method was that data came from unreliable sources and amateur observers.

Early evolutionary theory, today has been rejected for a number of reasons:

- A. Such theories can not satisfactorily account for cultural variation
- B. The *psychic unity of mankind or germs of thought* that were put forth to account for *parallel evolution also* account for differences.
- C. Early Evolutions cannot explain why some societies have regressed or become extinct.
- D. Also, although some may have progressed to “civilization”, they may not necessarily pass through the same ‘uniform’ stages.
- E. The early evolutionists were highly Ethnocentric and *Eurocentric assuming* that Victorian England or its European equivalent represented the highest achievement of Mankind.

However, one cannot wholly dismiss early evolutionary theory and its theory. They have left us with a legacy of at least 3 basic assumptions which have become an integral part of Anthropological thought and research methodology.

- A. The dictum that cultural phenomena are to be studied in a naturalistic fashion.
- B. The premise that cultural differences between groups are not due to differences in the psychological equipment, but to differences in socio cultural experience.
- C. The use of the comparative method as a surrogate for the experimental and lab techniques of the physical sciences.

Later Evolutionists

1. Leslie A. White and Julian Stewart

By the 1930s, these two anthropologists began to revive interest in evolution. White held that culture changes according to its laws and that it needs energy to do so. (*Energy and the Evolution of Culture*, 1913). Thus he establishes a link between consumption of energy and the “development” of culture.

Stewart (*The Patrilineal Bond*, 1955), preferred a more limited multi-linear theory of evolutionism. He tried to demonstrate that under specific conditions cultural phenomenon are repeatable.

2. Marshall D. Sahlins and Elman R. Service.

They tried to combine the views of Stewart and White by distinguishing between general and specific evolution. *General* evolution was characterized by growing complexity and unilinearity, with cultures leaping from one societal form to another. Specific evolution was introduced by Sahlins to account for the great diversity in historical development.

3. Robert Carneiro (1973):

Demonstrated that there is no difference between general/specific evolution, or for that matter between unilinear or multi-linear evolution.

Evaluation of the later Evolutionists

There are many indications that human cultures evolved from simple to the complex, But it is inappropriate to make growing complexity the fundamental principal or cornerstone of differences in human society:

- A. Stagnation is a real process. It may occur that societies do not wish to “develop” further and thus consciously/ unconsciously fight against such change agents.
- B. Most civilization have declined and fallen.
- C. The growth of human groups often leads to simplification in order to achieve efficiency.

Development in the 60s, 70s AND 80s .

In the 1960s, evolutionary theory got an impetus because of the scholarship of Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels, who talk of the state as developin under certain conditions of population growth and increasing production.

In the 1970s, theorists found that the development Of the early states was always the result of decision taken in the long forgotten past. A number of mono causal and multi causal explanations came up. Several mono causal explanations have evolutionary consequences only under certain circumstances. No single cause can be pointed out as the prime cause/ aspect in the evolution of culture. Rather a multi causal explanation, with a variety of factors, will incite people to act fn a particular way.

In the 1980s, Claessen and Van de Valde (1985) proposed the COMPLEX JNTERACTION MODEL. In what seems to be a reflection of Darwin, they claim that most evolutionary changes took place unintended and without any specific plan. Thus “development” of society became more complex and this complexity is only achieved when a complex interaction of a number of factors is found.

To sum up, human beings have the capacity for adaptation or development and therefore there is a tendency to reach for higher levels of development.

The neo-evolutionary Approach

The neo-evolutionary approach evolved in the middle or later half of the 20th century. It is an adaptation of the early 20th century or late 19th century view of evolutionism.

The main proponents of this view include TALCOTT PARSONS who views society as a system. What is interesting is that this view evolved inspite of earlier criticisms of the evolutionary point of view and drew its source and its base from it. It also provided the foundation for the Modemisation Theory.

Parsons, born in the United States, did undergraduate work in the London School of Economics & Political Science, and later at Heidelberg. Germany. He became a professor at Harward in 1927, and stated there until his death in 1979.

INLUENCES OF TALCOTT PARSONS

The contribution of Durkheim to Parsons’ Theory is clear. Concepts such as order, solidarity and integration, as well as some aspects of the family and sex roles are similar towhat is found in Durkheim.

Weber was concerned with the analysis of social structures as a whole and social action. Parsons referred to his own theory as ACTION THEORY. He was also concerned with the same issues as Weber. He developed many concepts and elaborate conceptual schemes that could be considered "Ideal Types" of the Weberian Tradition.

ACTION SYSTEM

For Parsons, there are many systems of action or action systems. A SYSTEM is something that has a boundary, so that there is an inside and an outside to the environment comprising the system. Systems have interdependent parts, order and a tendency to maintain equilibrium of the parts to the whole.

Parsons was concerned with the social system, viewing it as the preserve of Sociology and examining social interaction and the relationship among individuals. Above all the social system is the cultural system; the system of patterned and ordered symbols. Symbols are interpreted by individual actors in different situations so that they react differently to them. Because it is composed of Symbols, the cultural system can move easily between systems and thus strongly affect other systems.

THEORY OF ACTION

Parsons begins with an actor -an individual or collectivity. Parsons sees the actor as MOTIVATED to spend ENERGY to reach a desirable GOAL or end, as defined by that cultural system. The actor operates in a situation with means and conditions, but with a certain normative framework. The norms have been internalized so that the actor is "motivated to act appropriately".

PATTERNED VARIABLES

Parsons constructed a set of variables that can be used to analyse the various systems. All norms, values, roles, institutions and sub-systems and even society as a whole can be classified and examined on the basis of this system.

These variables were set up as POLAR OPPOSITES that give the range of possible decision and modes of operation. For Parsons, these provided an ideal type conceptual scheme that allowed analysis of various systems or parts of systems. The five patterned variables are as follows:

1. Affectivity vs. Affective Neutrality

Neutrality refers to the amount of emotion that is appropriate or expected in any form of interaction. While Affectivity is immediate gratification, Affective Neutrality may refer to self discipline and the deferment of gratification for a greater good.

Tribal societies seem to choose Affectivity whereas Affective Neutrality seems to characterize modern industrial societies.

2. Collectivity vs. Self-Orientation

This emphasizes the extent of self interest as opposed to collective or shared interest associated with any action. Self-orientation deals with individualism, whereas collectivity signifies a communitarian way of life.

Traditional societies are communitarian whereas Industrial societies are individualistic.

3. Particularism vs. Universalism

A particular relation is one with a specific individual. Parent-child or friendship relationships tend to be of this sort, where the relationship is very particular. In contrast, a bureaucracy is characterized by universal forms of relationship where everyone is treated impartially and much the same. No favoritism (particularism) is extended to anyone, even to a close friend or family members.

4. Ascription vs. Achievement

Ascription refers to qualities of individuals often inborn qualities such as sex, ethnicity, race, age, family status or characteristics of the household or origin. Achievement refers to performance and emphasizes individual achievement.

5 Diffusiveness vs. Specificity

These refer to the nature of social contacts and how extensive or narrow are the obligations in any interaction. In a Bureaucracy social relations are very specific, where contact is made with a person only for a particular reason associated with their status and position.

In contrast, Friendship or Parent-child relations are examples of more diffused forms of contact. We rely on family and friends for a broad range of support activities. While, very obviously, there may be limits on such contacts, these can have the potential of dealing with almost any set of interests or problems.

PARSON'S EVOLUTIONISM

TRADITIONAL

Affectivity
Collectivity
Particularism
Ascription
Diffusiveness

MODERN

Affective Neutrality
Self - Orientation
Universalism
Achievement
Specificity

Parsons held the view that there was, at its very basic, two kinds of societies traditional and modern; and that there should ideally be a shift from traditional to the modern. In his theory of pattern variables, Parsons divides his variables between modern and traditional (as above) as characteristic of the two kinds of societies. Traditional and Modern.

Parsons believed that the shift from traditional to modern, societies would shed their traditional pattern variables in favour of the modern ones, a process referred to as SHIFT IN PATTERN VARIABLES. The higher the complexity or specialization, the higher the shift from one pattern variable to another.

In this later work Parsons used the comparative and evolutionary perspective to analyse societies ranging from small-scale “primitive” societies to supranational societies of the US and USSR.

In this type of evolution, the enhanced adaptive capacity entails differentiation. This upgrading requires specialized functional capacities to be cultivated along with the establishment of a new pattern of values, appropriate to the new society.

Also, Social evolutionism is not inevitable. Societies which fail to develop new universals can still continue to exist as they are without becoming extinct. They can remain special riches in a symbolic relationship with more developed societies. He postulates that these people are significantly similar to “our own pre-historical “antecedence”.

CRIYIQUE OF PARSONS

1. Talcott Parsons paid very little attention to contemporary, non-industrial society, claiming instead, to use a historical approach. The relevant technical procedures for using this historical approach, however, had not yet been developed.
2. There is an obvious **ETHNOCENTRISM** in his portrayal of the United States as the most Developed of all societies. It is ironic however, that this “ultra developed” society is a storehouse of racial discrimination, riots, protests, wars and at its very worst, shootouts in high school classrooms.
3. Gouldner points out that Parsons presents us with a “sequential order of structural types”, which suggests a Historical Sequel. This is never properly backed by research.
4. Weber cautioned against confusing his concept of ideal Types with reality, a warning Parsons seems to have ignored

Thus there is no reason to suppose that “external penetration” was good for the so called 3rd World. If the truth be told, colonialism is responsible for putting the “3rd” into the “3rd World”.

Conclusion

Criticism, they say is good for the soul-it helps us improve and “evolve”, both in our work and lives. And yet the wise would, caution us - forgetting, history is a sure recipe for repeating the faults of the past. From the early 19th century evolutionists to the modernization theorists, the concept of “evolution seems to have undergone a metamorphosis from answering the question “*Where have we come from*” to answering “*What is the status quo of society today*”.

The number of times this concept has crept up in the application of the social sciences throughout the ages is in itself, a tribute to the popularity of the concept - a proof of how ingrained in our thinking is the concept of a linear progression from simple to complex, and yet a warning not to forget the mistakes of the past.

And yet now, after all the rumbling warnings of history, I offer a well deserved vote of thanks. For all the criticism leveled at the evolutionary theorists and theory, they were an important step in the “evolution” of Development studies and Anthropology..

Their theories caused a new wave of thinking by people who agreed and changed their views and also by those who disagreed and came up with new theories to replace those of the evolutionists.

Summary

Evolutionism is the scholarly activity of describing understanding and explaining the process of evolution. In cultural and social anthropology the gradual, structural change of human culture is the subject study of evolutionists. Interest in evolution goes back to the beginning of 19th Century. This notion of evolutionary progress of society was widely accepted during the Enlightenment. Drawing upon Enlightenment thought, Darwin’s work, and new cross-cultural, historical, and archaeological evidence, a whole generation of social evolutionary theorists emerged with Tylor and Morgan. These theorists developed rival schemes of overall social and cultural progress, as well as the origins of different specific institutions such as religion, marriage, and the family. Later Evolutionary theory, fell into disfavour among anthropologists. Its leading opponent was Franz Boas, whose main disagreement with the evolutionists involved their assumption that universal laws governed all human culture however in the 1930s Leslie A. White and Julian H. Steward started to revive interest in evolutionism and later they were followed by Marshall Sahlins and Elman Service. later on many others also in one way or the other applied the idea of progress in their theories eg. Marx and Parsons.

Additional Reading

1. Harris, Marvin 1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. Thomas Y. Crowell, New York. _
2. Kuper, Adam 1996 *Anthropology and Anthropologists* Routledge, New York

Question

- 1 Trace the development of evolutionary theory in Anthropology.
- 2 Critically evaluate early evolutionary theory in Anthropology.
- 3 Assess the revival of evolutionary theory in the 20th Century.

DIFFUSIONISM (ELLIOT SMITH AND BOAS)

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the diffusionists, like the evolutionists, addressed the question of cultural differences in the world. They came up with a radically different answer to that question. The evolutionists may have overestimated human inventiveness by claiming that cultural features have arisen in different parts of the world independently of one another, due in large measure to the psychic unity of humankind. At the other extreme, diffusionists held that humans were essentially uninventive, claiming that certain cultural features were invented originally in one or several parts of the world and then spread, through the process of diffusion, to other cultures.

The first stage of postevolutionistic anthropology was represented by scholars who because of their particular interest in the problem of the diffusion of culture came to be known as “diffusionists” even though they did not use the term themselves. Diffusionism was rather poor in its theoretical aspect and it is its research strategy that deserves attention. Diffusionists, were in fact, much more antiorganically minded than antievolutionistically minded as they exerted themselves much more to refute the conception of culture as a spontaneously developing whole than to overcome the idea of development. The diffusionists enriched the body of anthropological data even though the data were often not only wrongly interpreted but also marked by a characteristic one sidedness. The diffusionists were almost exclusively concerned with material civilization and had little to say on social organization.

Diffusionists did not form any uniform school and the term is used as a general label with respect to many different conceptions. Diffusionism assumes a specific anthropological meaning according to which man has a limited ability to discover new things and usually rests satisfied with imitating that which is known and tested. The diffusionists tended to understand culture as a set of elements and not as an organic whole or an internally interconnected system. They did not think of culture as an attribute of all human communities that distinguishes human communities from the animal world.

The British and German /Austrian groups of diffusionism

The British group included, by all accounts, the most extreme proponents of the notion of diffusionism. The main proponents of this position were Sir Grafton Eliot Smith (1871-1937) and W. J. Perry (1887-1949). They held that people were so incredibly uninventive that virtually all culture traits

found any where in the world were first invented in Egypt, and subsequently spread to other parts of the world. For Smith and Perry, the parallel evolution of a particular culture trait in two different parts of the world would be most unlikely, if not impossible. We must bear in mind that neither Smith nor Perry was a professional ethnologist. What Smith (an Australian anatomist and surgeon) and Perry (a school headmaster) had in common was that both were uncritically enamoured with early Egyptian civilization. In fact, Smith Perry dogmas included premises about an overweening importance of technological and sociocultural stimuli which radiated around the world from ancient Egypt; Craft, paddlers, conquerors, colonizers, and the like were specifically indicated for a few districts and epochs. According to the over simplified (and inaccurate) scheme, the people of Egypt first developed agriculture and then shortly thereafter invented an elaborate complex of cultural features which then diffused to other parts of the world.

Despite the fact that this theory was supported by no acceptable body of data, Smith and Perry's brand of diffusionism found a popular audience. This extreme diffusionist position was never widely accepted in cultural anthropology, its limited credibility was very short lived, and today it has been totally rejected.

Fritz Graebner (1877-1934) and Father Willelim Schmidt (1868-1954), the driving forces behind the Gennan-Austrian group, had a far more scholarly approach to the subject of diffusion than Smith and Perry. Whereas the British were concerned with the spread of individual culture traits, the German Austrians concentrated on the diffusion of entire complexes of cultures. Unlike the British, who assumed that all culture traits, were invented in one place (Egypt), Graebner and Schmidt suggested that there was a small number of different cultural complexes called culture circles (Kulturkreise), which served as sources of cultural diffusion. This group devoted its energies to reconstructing these culture circles and demonstrating how they were responsible for worldwide patterns of cultural diffusion.

The diffusionists eventually ran their course after the first several decades of this century. To be certain, they started off with a particularly sound ethnological concept that is cultural diffusion and either took it to its illogical extreme or left too many questions unanswered. Few cultural anthropologists today would deny the central role that diffusion plays in the process of culture change, but some of the early diffusionists, particularly Smith and Perry, took this essentially valid concept ad absurdum by suggesting that everything found in the world could ultimately be traced back to the early Egyptians. Moreover, despite the collection of considerable quantities of historical data, the diffusionists were not able to prove primary centers of invention. Nor were the diffusionists able to answer a number of important questions concerning the process of cultural diffusion. For example, when cultures come into contact with one another, what accounts for the diffusion of some cultural items but not others? What are the conditions required to being about *diffusion* of a cultural item? What determines the rate at which a cultural item spreads throughout a geographic region? Then there are some questions that the diffusionists failed to even raise, such as why certain traits arise in the first place. In spite of these limitations, however, the diffusionists did make a major contribution to the study of comparative cultures - that is they were the first to point out the need to develop

theories dealing with contact and interaction between cultures.

As we have seen, the nineteenth century evolutionists and the diffusionists tried to explain why the world was inhabited by large numbers of highly diverse cultures. The evolutionists invoked the principle of evolution as the major explanatory variable. That is, the world's cultural diversity, according to Tylor and Morgan, resulted from different cultures being at different stages of evolutionary development. The diffusionists proposed a different causal variable to explain the diversity, namely, differential levels of cultural borrowing between societies. Even though both of these nineteenth-century "schools" offered different explanations for the diversity, what they had in common was their deductive approach to the discipline (reasoning from the general to the specific). They started off with a general principle (either evolution or diffusion) and then proceeded to use that principle to explain specific cases. The evolutionists and diffusionists based *their* theories on inadequate data at best. They seemed to be more interested in universal history than in discovering how different people of the world actually lived their lives. This type of genteel armchair speculation was poignantly illustrated by the evolutionist Sir James Frazer.

American Historicism - Franz Boas

Around the turn of the century, a reaction to this deductive approach was being led primarily by Franz Boas (1858-1942). He was convinced that every culture always forms a spiritual unity. His approach to culture was both atomizing and integrating. He himself called it the historical approach as he strove to reconstruct the actual development of a given culture as a unique phenomena. This is why classifying Boas as a diffusionist would clearly be misleading especially as he did engage in the criticism of diffusionism.

Boas sought a kind of a third path which he called the actual history of culture and which in his opinion was missing in both evolutionism and diffusionism. That actual history was supposed to consist not only of studying given cultures determined partially and temporally as more or less, integrated wholes. The whole culture must be a compact unit,

During the 1890s, Boas and, much later, his followers, from Clark Wissler to a considerable number of contemporary anthropologists, supplemented their new micro- and macro-units with a simplistic as well as dry formulations about a principal cause of sociocultural change. They thought it the most important, dynamic process in the history of prehistory of nonliterate peoples. It was borrowing, dissemination, diffusion of culture traits. They indicated that such spreads also featured remodeling of traits rather than unchanged borrowings. Here is a hypothesis not about units or classes of units but about process which introduces and shapes all units: there is repetitive regularity in change, it is consequent upon sociocultural diffusion, and nothing which is diffused remains wholly unaltered when borrowers accept transmission to them.

The studies of diffusionism initiated by Boas form a bridge to our consideration of acculturation. Early in his career, Boas recognized that the fundamental question toward which the study of culture should point was not so much the contact between peoples as the dynamic effects of such contact in making for cultural change. He was concerned with answering the questions "what" but only as far as the answer led to

that comprehension of process that is implied in the question "why". It is therefore in terms of the insistence on dynamics rather than on the recovery of descriptive facts that the position of the American' diffusionists and their colleagues in other countries may be characterized.

If we go through Boas's writings, we can see that his' position may be distinguished from that of Smith, Graebner, Schmidt and other more extreme diffusionists in the emphases he laid on the following points.

- 1) The descriptive study of diffusion is a preliminary to the analytical study of the process.
- 2) The study of diffusion must be inductive in that associated traits of cultures (culture - complexes) held diffused must be considered in terms of their inner relations rather than as groupings arbitrarily classified by students.
- 3) The study of diffusion must work from the particular to the general plotting distributions of traits in restricted areas before proceeding to the mapping of their distribution on a continental to say nothing of a world - wide basis.
- 4) The approach to the study of the dynamic processes of which diffusion is but one expression, must be psychological and reach back to the individual for the comprehension of the realities of cultural change.

Over the years diffusion has come to mean the analysis of similarities and differences between existing non-literate and non-historic cultures. Boas and only borrowed the formulation about diffusion from various writers before him. After it had made its impact upon anthropologists, there was never a doubt that well over 95 percent of a non-literate group's sociocultural heritage, it could be split into minute units such as culture elements and macro-units such as culture complexes, was traceable to, although never exactly identical with, features found in each of its immediately adjacent neighbours. Therefore somebody must have borrowed from somebody. Direction of acquisition, dating of it too, remained to be ascertained. One of many troubles with this process hypothesis was that psychological or any other kinds of causes for failures of traits to diffuse - for some to diffuse slowly, for other to diffuse rapidly, for many to receive drastic reshaping after their dissemination, for many of spread together in bundles of items, and so on were as much in the dark as ever. Obviously, citation and highlighting of a process of culture element dispersion was a valuable contribution in the-1890's and right after that because it unveiled the absurdity of some evolutionist's persuasion that most of a group's heritage had bubbled up within that group. The hypothesis also implied a need to explore the many processes of creative change that remained hidden under an exceedingly generalized concept represented by the caption of diffusion.

Although need to identify distinctive processes was quickly perceived by more perceptive diffusionists during the first decades of the century, the subject of socio-cultural change among nonliterate peoples received extremely little serious examination until mid-century some of the anthropologists who were

diffusionists offered lip service to correlated concepts which were not really indicative of processes because they lacked exacting detail and psychological formulation. One among the few descriptive concepts which enclosed a hint about mechanisms of process and which subsumed a vast class of culture traits under it had emerged early in writings of socio-cultural evolutionists like Tylor, decades before 1900. This was the concept of Survivals, borrowed from evolutionist biology, which during the 1920's merged into cultural sociologists' concept to which they assigned the term lag. Diffusionists respected the validity of a concept of survivals or lag when it was torn from its earlier context of evolutionary stages. They pointed out ad nauseam that socio-cultural survivals were not evidences of evolutionary stages as wholes, unlike the vestigial left from earlier stages of biological evolution. Vestigia line up in extremely different classes and roles; social and biological each comprise their own Classes of items. Diffusionists did not indicate the sufficient causes responsible for an apparent lag and for psychological services still provided by a vestigial feature. Again, diffusionists retained a ticket for a class of phenomena, sociocultural survivals, but did not interest themselves in developing a subsystem of theory which stated multiple socio-cultural processes very likely involved in the class, and their striking differences from biological processes and survivals.

Boasian diffusionism did emphasize the cumulative importance of processes that consisted centrally of spreads, with remodelings, of innumerable traits from nonliterate group to immediately adjacent group. Such diffusion was paralleled by several varieties of claimed diffusionist processes which Boas and his followers rejected as untenable.

Conclusion

In anthropology, diffusionism was the most-radical refutation of the naturalistic conception of social sciences and a specific implementation of the requirement that the social sciences should be concerned not with discovering universal laws but with acquiring the knowledge of concrete processes and events. Many diffusionists referred directly to the results of the anti positivist revolution in humanities thus straining for ethnology as an idiographic humanistic discipline. An assessment of diffusionism in the history of social sciences is rather difficult to make. On the one hand, it was a school whose influence did not extend beyond ethnology and whose radical formulations encountered sharp criticisms. On the other hand, the crucial interest of that school has not been abandoned and can be found even in the present day neo-evolutionism. Diffusionism proved to be a poor theory, but it took up essential research problems that had not been paid sufficient attention to by evolutionists.

Summary

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the diffusionists like the evolutionists, addressed the question of cultural differences in the world. They held that humans were uninventive. Certain features were invented in one or several parts of the world and then spread through the process of diffusion to other

cultures. The British school with Eliot Smith and W. J. Perry believed that all cultural traits found every where in the world were first invented in Egypt and then spread to other parts of the world. The Austrian German group with Graebner and Schmidt had a more scholarly approach than Smith and perry and suggested that there were a small number of different cultural complmexes called culture circles or kulturkriese which served as sources of cultural diffusion. Franz Boas, the first ethnological “guru” in the United States, who trained virtually the entire first generation of American ethnologists sought a third path or the actual history of culture which was to consist not only of studying given cultures as more or less integrated wholes but the whole culture must be a compact unit. The spread of culture traits also involves an alteration. The studies of diffusionism initiated by him form a bridge to our consideration of accutturation.

Question

1. What do you understand by the term “diffusionism”?
2. Discuss the contributions of Eliot Smith and Franz Boas to Diffusionism.

Reference

- 1 Ferraro, Henry

STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONALISM

Objective

- * To introduce to students to the Structural Functionalism about of thought in Anthropology.
- * To discuss the theoretical contribution made by B. Malin and R. Brown.

Important Concepts

- * Function
- * Functionalism
- * Structural functionalism
- * Social structure
- * Reid work
- * Needs
- * Kula Ring
- * Ethnography

The important school of anthropology, which arose in opposition to the extreme evolutionist and diffusionist position was known as functionalism. Although the functionalist shared Boas emphasis on intensive field work and detailed collection of data, their approach differed from that of Boas and diffusionist in one very significant respect. The functionalists were not concerned with the historical approach to the study of culture. Unlike the evolutionists and diffusionists who offered far fetched, reconstructions of the past, members of the functionalist school emphasized the study of contemporary cultures without drawing any analogies to the past.

Functionalism is a broad term including both functionalism and structural functionalism. Functionalism is the perspective concerned with actions among individuals and relation between the needs of as individuals and the satisfaction of those needs through cultural and social frame works, the constraint imposed by social institution or individuals. Structural functionalism is more concerned with the place of the individual in the social order rather than with individual action or needs. Functionalists maintain that each of the traits within the culture has a specific function which serves to hold the social system together and that the structure of the society is determined by the way it fulfills those functions. The work of anthropologists according to this school was to study the ways in which various cultural institution function to solve the problem of maintaining the system. Although the evolutionists had also recognized the interrelationship between culture traits, they focused primarily on tracing the origin and development of those traits. The functionalist desired the importance of historical and concentrated more on the study of (20th cultures.)

In the early part of (20th, functionalism became widely accepted as a new and important anthropological method. It was new as it encompassed a systematic study, however the notion of function itself was quite old. In creating new sciences of positivism, function was used as a major methodological tool by Comte and Auguste Comte. though the concept function was never directly elaborated in their writings. In the writings of Durkheim (1858-1917) the concept of 'function' took a greater methodological significance. Both Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown were influenced by Durkheim's functionalism and who later became the champions of functional and structural functionalism and school of thoughts respectively.

As attempt is made in the following chapter to discuss the different aspects of functional school of thought with special reference, to Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown's works.

Bromislawe Malinowski (1884-1942)

Malinowski's position in British anthropology is similar to that of Boas in American anthropology. Malinowski was a Central European Natural Scientist brought by peculiar circumstances to anthropology and to the English speaking world. He objected to arm chair evolutionism and invested a field work tradition based on the use of native language is participant observation.

Malinowski was born in Gracow, Poland, where he studied. His Ph. D. (Completed in 1908 through the Jagellonian University) was in physics and mathematics but he was influenced by Frazer's Golden Bough and began to study language and folklore. He also became interested in the work of the Finnish anthropologist, Edward Watermark, who studied sexual taboos and marriages in particular, the function of incest taboo. In 1910, Malinowski joined London School of Economics with the in fashion of doing field work on the culture of Australian Aborigines.

He was one of the first anthropologists to insist that every student should do as intensive fieldwork study as part of their a requirement that became standard, but controversial at the time. The significance of Malinowski was a combination of his efforts to professionalize anthropological fieldwork method, his ethnographic observations in the West Pacific, his reflection on the discipline of anthropology and his interdisciplinary work on the relationship between anthropology and psychology, religion and ethics.

He obtained funding to do fieldwork on the Mailu in the West Pacific & Trobriand islands, which has been considered as a turning point in the history of field expedition in world anthropology. The 1st trip from Sept. 1914 to March 1915, was suggested by Seligman, a famous British Economist. During the 1st round of fieldwork, he mainly concentrated his work among the Mailu of Joulau Island. He made a 2nd visit to the Trobriand Islands from June 1915. to May 1916. His 3rd visit to the Trobriand Islanders lasted from Oct. 1917 to Oct. 1918.

The most favours of Malinowski's works is the 'Argonauts of the Western Pacific' (1922). Argonauts begins with a statement on subject method and scope, then described the Geography of the Irobarians and his arrival in the islands. He moves on to the rules of 'Kula exchange', facts about canoes, sailing and canoe magics and ceremony. He then gives a detailed and specific accounts of aspects touched or earlier including canoe journeys, the kula and the magic. He ends with a reflexive chapter or 'the meaning of the Kula.'

The functionalist text of all cultures having a function and that they are interrelated is no better illustrated than in Malinowski's own description of the kula ring found among the Irobarian Islanders while performing function of distribution goods within the society, the kula is related to many other areas of Irobarian cultures. including, among others, political structure, magic, technology, kinship social status, myth and social control. To illustrate, the kula involved the exchange of both ceremonial necklaces and bracelets and everyday commodities between trading partners as a large number of islands. Ever through the exchange are based on principle of reciprocity, there are usually long periods of time between repayments between trading partners. Gouldner has suggested that during these periods debtors are morally obligated to maintain peaceful relationship with their benefactors. If this is, in fact, the case, we can see how kula ring maintain peace thereby functions as a mechanism of social control as well as a mechanism of material exchange. Thus, as we examine cultural features (like the kula ring) in greater depth, the ethnographers, according to the functionalist perspective. well beings to see how it is related to many other aspects of the culture and what it contributes to both individual and society as a whole.

Malinowski's Theory of Need

Malinowski described in detail his Theory of Need in his book 'A scientific Theory of Culture' (1944) which was published posthumously. He however had been talking about his theory of need since his return from the Irobarian Islanders in 1918.

He argued that people everywhere share certain biological and psychological needs that the ultimate function of all cultural institutions, is to fulfill those needs. He outlined three fundamental levels of needs which he claimed had to be resolved by all cultures.

- 1) A culture must provide for 'biological needs such as need for procreation and food.
- 2) A culture must provide for instrumental needs or derivative needs, such as need for law and education. .
- 3) A culture must provide for 'integrate needs such as religion and art

Malinowski defined needs as a system of conditions in the human organism. in the cultural setting and in the relation of both to the natural environment, which are sufficient and necessary for the survival of group and organism. The system of conditions in the human organism which involves the satisfaction of certain biologicaliy determined impulses is a series of vital consequences.

According to Malinowski these vital sequences may be demonstrated as follows:-

A) Impulse	B Act	C Satisfaction
Drive to breathe; Gasping ror air	Intake of oxygen	Simination of CO2
Hunger	Ingestion of food	Satisfaction.
Thirst	Absorbtionof liquid.	Questing
Sex appetite	Conjugation	detumescerce
Fatigue.	Rest	Restoration of muscular and nervous energy.
Somnalexe	Sleep	Awakening with resisted Energy .
Bladder pressure	Micturition	Removal of tension
Fright	Escape from danger	Relaxation.
Pain	Avoidance by effective act	Returns to normal stage

The above table refers to the dynamic basis of human nature conceived as pertaining to as individual organism. This list of impulses correspond only directly to the basic needs of non as an animal species, because at this level the concept of individual and group survival is added to that of individual impulse.

He finally constructed another table of basic needs, which laid stress on the total condition necessary to individual and group of survival and not merely as individual impulses.

(A) Basic Needs	(B) Cullural Responses
Metabolism .	Commissariat
Reproduction	Kinhip
Bodily Comforts	Shetter
Safety	Protection
Movement	Activities
Growth	Training
Health	Hygiene

Thus Malirowski's needs i.e. biological, derived and integrative, emphasize at all levels the biological determinants of cultural activities and so provide a principle of analysis and comparison of universal validity .

A criticism is often leveled against the theory of need is this that Malinowski never provided hierarchy of basic/biological, derived and integrative needs. Unfortunately the Theory of Need was published posthumously and therefore a pointed explanation about its hierarchy could not be sought from him. Another criticism is his failure to state clearly the relation of certain needs to the biological survival of individual and groups. In case of primary needs it is understandable however in case of instrumental needs, he points out that the description of any of the balanced systems of organization found in human culture militates against survival. Finally the relevance of his Theory of Need for contemporary anthropology has been raised. The first is the operational difficulty and concerns the problem of field work. No ethnographer attempts to study culture as a whole rather simply highlights the specific problem against the total cultural background. However, in anthropology, the concept of need is quite Significant, for the biological, psychological as well as sociological facets of culture are revealed through it. Again, the theory of need may also help to preserve what was the value in the original conception of 'anthropology' as distinct from the specialized branches into what it is today classified.

The Theory of Need, thus, is essential to a broad conception of the biological and cultural determinants of human behaviour and to certain phases of ethnographic research as well as to the adequate development of social anthropology as a distinct subject of teaching. Further it provides an avenue by which some of the vital needs, social problem facing the humanity may be approached and answered.

Critical Evaluation of Malinowski's Theory of Functionalism:

1. Malinowski it seems to be confused psychologically and pragmatic social function with temporal historic origin. The fact remains that one cultural function may be subscribed by various cultural mean a psychological need may also be satisfied in a variety of ways. E.g. food satisfies biological need, but the need does not prescribe how the food is to be prepared and consumed. Again, culture forms have a history of their own, which cannot be deduced from their functional utility and consequences.

Secondly, according to Malinowski, survival in the sense of functionless cultural fossils simply don't exist. The concept of survival is a fiction introduced by Zylor and the cultural evolutionists to bolster their theory of primitive origins and stages of development. The function of these so-called survivals is at present negative the theory of cultural survivals is itself a survival of an outmoded ethnological theory.

He emphasized upon primary of function over form, a position which does not permit any independent states to culture forms apart from the context of gives cultural institutions. On this ground malinowski has been severely

criticized by various anthropologists.

According to Kroeber the implicit assumption of most modern anthropologists has been that all traits can occur independently of each other and that trait can be isolated as realities and made comparable. However for Malinowski the ultimate ethnographic unit is the institution, and he, therefore, regards any attempt to study culture traits apart from their function in a given institutional context as non-scientific.

Malinowski does not treat culture as undifferentiated. He does not directly or indirectly pay primary attention to the kinds of analysis, which would be involved in a discrimination of the three types of system viz:

a) material culture b) customs and c) constitutional cultures for various social groupings beliefs, which does not belong to the organism in physical sense.

However, apart from certain limitations the functional method, we find a distinctive feature of function. Its emphasis upon the steady of culture as a functional whole and the correlation of cultural forms with biological, psychological and societal needs and imperatives were constructive. Often original insights which focused attention upon problem of cultural dynamics.

To conclude it can be said that Malinowski's approach to fieldwork was characterized both by his genuine interest in primitive cultures but also his linguistic abilities which enabled him to get close to his subjects in the field. He was among the first to live among the people he was studying. By advocating the strategy of living among natives and learning their language, he pioneered the method of participant observation. Which became a standard ethnographic technique. His best known work, 'Argonauts of the Western Pacific', related the structure of institutions, customs and codes to the cultural tapestry of the community. Malinowski's analysis of Trobriand society was based on his explanation of Kula, system of exchange. In 'Coral Gardens and Their Magic' his focus was on the role of magic as a way of dealing with the chaos of facts. This was regarded as his most sophisticated and self-critical work. Subsequent work pursued the themes of anthropology and psychology by taking ethnographic material as evidence for his generalization.

Malinowski's contribution to anthropology has been the subject of debate. Undoubtedly he was part of the emergence of the discipline of British anthropology as a distinctive and professional school, particularly through his emphasis on methodology & his insights on providing functional explanation of social phenomena. But his ideas were complex and changing as opposed to that of Radcliffe-Brown and his influence on anthropological thinking was more his breath of vision of his challenges to accepted wisdom. Above all, his efforts to work from the data of intensive fieldwork to make sense of culture by distilling information into explanation of cultural behaviour contributed to his legacy as one of the founders of modern anthropology.

Radcliffe - Brown (1881-1955)

Another form of functionalism was developed by the British theoretician A. R. Brown (1881-1955). Like Malinowski, Radcliffe Brown posited that the various aspects of a society should be studied in terms of the functions they perform. However, while Malinowski viewed functions mostly as meeting the needs of the individual, Radcliffe Brown saw them in terms of how they contributed to the well being of the society. Because of this emphasis on social function rather than individual functions, R. Brown's theory has taken the name of structural functionalism.

Early Training of A. R. Brown

After studying anthropology at Cambridge University under W.H.R. Rivers, Brown conducted field work among the Andaman Islanders (a group of islands south of Burma), from 1906 to 1908, and then in Australia from 1910 to 1912. Nevertheless, being somewhat reserved and aloof his temperament was not particularly well suited for being a fieldworker. The only complete description of a tribe he has attempted is based on his Maier trip, which he undertook to the Andaman Islands (1906-1908). He was a widely traveled scholar who is at the heart of an armchair anthropologist, who formulates problems in the study to be solved by his followers doing fieldwork. His major contributions were more as a theorist and a teacher. During much of his career he was a scholar teaching at universities in Chicago, Cape Town and Oxford.

Brown's Theory of Social Structure

Brown used the concept of social structure as early as in 1914 while delivering a lecture on 'Social Anthropology' in Birmingham. However, the concept of social structure was highlighted in detail in 1940 while delivering his Presidential Address to the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain. According to Brown the concept of structure refers to an arrangement of parts or components related to one another in some sort of larger unity. In social structure the ultimate components are individual human beings or persons as structure consists of the arrangement of persons in relation to each other. Eg. In a village we find an arrangement of persons into family households, which is again a structure feature. In looking for the structural features of social life we first look for the existence of social groups of all kinds and also the internal structural system of those groups in addition to the arrangement of persons into groups and within those groups we find also an arrangement into social classes and categories. Social distinctions between men and women, between Brahmins and Shudras or untouchables are important structural features.

Radcliffe Brown illustrated the concept of social structure by citing an example from the tribes of Western Australia. He said the tribes are divided into a number of territories and men, thus, connected with a particular territory formed

a distinct social group, which we may speak of as a clan, this was a unit of fundamental importance in the social structure. Among the Australian tribes, class is known as horde. The internal structure of the Horde was a division into families, each composed of a man with his wife or wives & their young children. There is a continuous existence of a Horde, as the members of the Horde are replaced from time to time by the death of the old one the newly born members enter the Horde. Thus, the continuity of the social group is an important factor for the existence of the social structure.

He was of the opinion that as social structure is an arrangement of persons in institutionalized roles and relationships structural continuity is the continuity of such arrangement. According to Radcliffe Brown social structure, therefore, is to be defined as the continuity arrangement of persons in relationship defined or controlled by institutions i.e. socially established or patterns of behaviours.

To conclude, Radcliffe Brown's social anthropology is best described by separating two main elements - a general theory and a central one. The general theory produced 3 connected sets of questions. The 1st set deals with static or morphological problems. What kind of societies are there? What are their similarities and differences? How are they classified and compared?

The 2nd set deals with dynamic problems, how do societies function? How do they persist?

The 3rd set deals with the development problems - how do societies change their types? How do new types come into existence? What general laws relate to the changes? The general theory dealing with these problems bore a heavily Spencerian cast in its emphasis on 3 aspects of adaptation; ecological adaptation to physical environment; social adaptation. i.e. the institution of persons.

The central theory deals with the determinants of social relations of all kinds. The two theories are articulated in the idea that the life of a society can be conceived and studied as a system of relations or association that a particular social structure is an arrangement of relations in which the interests or values of different individuals and groups are co-opted within "social values expressed as institutional norms,

While Radcliffe Brown did not regard the study of social structure as the whole of anthropology; he did consider it to be its most important branch, but he asserted that "the study of social structure leads immediately to the study of interest or values as the determinants of social relations and that a social system can be conceived and studied as a system of values".

Influence of Malinowski and A. Brown

Both Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown persuaded virtually every anthropologist in the British Commonwealth that the old interests of anthropology - evolutionism and diffusionism were no longer appropriate for major research. Most anthropologists in Britain and many in the U.S. followed Brown's lead. They conceived of anthropology as being about filling in the details of ethnography generalizing about particular societies and comparing them to other societies, working out how the social system functions without conjecturing about the past, de-emphasizing individual action and seeking the broader pattern, and above all fitting the pieces together to see how elements of the social structure functioned in relation to each other.

Malinowski's greatest influence was in Britain, especially in the establishment of his tradition of Participant Observation and Brown's influence was predominant in South Africa and Australia. Brown's spell also reached India. Indian anthropologist M.N. Srinivas did not graduate

work with Radcliffe Brown and E. V. Rieuwerts, then taught for 3 years at Oxford. In 1951, Srinivas returned to his own country and helped establish there an empirical but essentially structural functionalist social science tradition.

Comparison between functionalism of Malinowski and structural functionalism of Radcliffe Brown.

Malinowski's functionalism is often termed as individualistic because of its treatment of social and cultural systems as collective responses to fundamental biological needs of individuals modified by cultural values. Social structures and processes, institutions and values, are all regarded as functional responses to individual physiological needs. He also viewed culture as a totally integrated way of life, as an organic whole, homogeneous in response to a variety of individual needs whose fulfillment led to the development of numerous cultural patterns and social usages.

Radcliffe Brown rejected Malinowski's individualistic functionalism and, following Durkheim as a transition, emphasized structural social relationships. But he substituted Durkheim's terms 'needs' by necessary conditions of existence. Having rejected Malinowski's emphasis on stated motives of individual participants, Brown chose social structure as the unit of analysis. It is sought to explain numerous interpersonal relationships and socially patterned ways of minimizing built-in strains inherent in such relationships. Brown focused primarily on the function of each element in the maintenance of specific elements for differentiated parts of the whole and for the individual components.

Summary

Functionalism had its beginnings in evolutionist thought. It came into its own

as in anthropological perspective, partly though the influence of Durkheim, but more through writing of Malinowski and Brown. Functionalism is based on 2 important principles: - 1) the notion of 'functional unity' which states that a culture is an integrated whole comprising a number of interrelated parts. Malinowski (1884-1942) was the originator of the functionalist approach. In his view functionalism was a user's tool, it permitted the study of aspects of culture and analysis of culture in depth. His theory of culture tested on three types of needs: basic needs, instrumentals and integrative needs. He saw these as individual and not group needs. For Malinowski, culture was the instrument by which these human needs were met. Radcliffe Brown (1881-1955) emphasized more on social function rather than individual function. His essential theoretical position was that social structures could be understood as a system of relations of association in which social values were encoded in institutional arrangements.

Bibliography / Additional Reading

- * Gluckman, Max - analysis of the sociological Theories of B. Malinowski, OCP, 1947.
- * Leach, Edmund - Social Anthropology, OUP, 1982.
- * Banard, Alex - History and Theory in Anthropology, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- * Abraham, Francis - Modern Sociological Theory - an introduction, OUP, 1982.
- * Kroeber, A. K. Anthropology, London, 1948.
- * Keesing - Cultural Anthropology - a contemporary perspective, 1935.
- * Honigman, Handbook of social and Cultural Anthropology, McGraw-Hill Rand Company, Chicago, 1973.

Question

- 1 Discuss the contribution made by B. Malinowski to the functional school of thought.
- 2 Discuss the contribution made by R. Brown to the structural functionalism.
- 3 Critically analyze Malinowski's Theory of Needs.
- 4 Compare and contrast the contribution of B. Malinowski and R. Brown to the functionalist school of thought.

STRUCTURALISM AND POST STRUCTURALISM

Objectives

- ❖ Introduction.
- ❖ Levi-Strauss and structural Anthropology
- ❖ Premises of structural Anthropology.
- ❖ Levi-Strauss' contribution to Marxism.
- ❖ Levi-Strauss' on Linguistic Structuralism

Introduction

Structuralism is an intellectually complex, historically evolving and academically successful movement. “Levi-Strauss” work is regarded as ideal-typical of structural anthropology. It therefore takes a brief review of structural anthropology in the intellectual context and examines the contribution of Levi-Strauss to structuralism.

Claude Levi-Strauss was born in 1908, the son of an artist and grandson of a rabbi. His first regular academic post was as a professor of Sociology at the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil. After serving in the French army from 1939, he made his way to New York and taught at the new school. In 1949, after his return to France, his *Elementary Structure of Kinship* first brought him wide recognition. In 1950, he became the Director of studies at the University of Paris and in 1959 was appointed to the chair of Social Anthropology at the Collège de France. Although Levi-Strauss became famous for the analysis of structure, he is today most associated with the analysis of myth. He believes that there are patterns common to all human thought, and these can be found in the myth and classification structures of any tribe or culture. To borrow an analogy from his own work, the myths and structures of different societies resemble a theme in music. Every note may be changed, but it is still the same tune.

Levi-Strauss' intellectual historical background has been the subject of considerable controversy and confusion. Few scholars have tried to reconstruct his background based on Levi-Strauss' own writings. He held Jean Jacques Rousseau, the well known eighteenth century social philosopher in high esteem. He hailed Rousseau as ‘our master and our brother’ and considers him the prophetic founder of cultural anthropology. Rousseau was the first thinker to have posed one of history's most important anthropological problems: the passage from animality to humanity, from instinct to intellect, from nature to culture. Rousseau is credited with ‘an extraordinary modern view’ of his intellectual creations. The attendant social institutions provide cognitive means to understand the fundamental passage from the naturally given to the culturally created.

Among the many “efficient causes” involved in this crucial passage is a psychic quality Rousseau called ‘pity’. He held this uniquely human attribute responsible for

allowing men to make the singular transition to the state of culture. Levi-Strauss draws yet another conclusion from Rousseau's argument. Humility of self and identification with others have ethical or moral consequences. He further echoes Rousseau's demand for the ethnological discovery of an "inshakable basis of human society".

Since the human condition neither predates nor transcends social organization, Levi-Strauss says, "we must construct an ideal model of man's culture' and there in discover what is original to a man what is artificial. To find "nature man" we must seek "the society of nature in order to mediate the nature of society. Though such a pristine society may never have existed and never could exist we can infer some of its ideal-typical characteristics from 'Levi-Strauss' criticisms of contemporary civilization and from his obverse praise of primitive societies. The latter culture in "Levi-Strauss" opinion, are largely democratic and harmless. While civilized societies are generally repressive and exploitative. Most importantly, civilized societies are obsessed with historical progress while primitive culture have resisted temporal change. The so-called progressive outlook has not only led to the exploitation and colonization of native people and territories, it has also proven unproductive, it is not disastrous.

Referring to the modern societies, Levi-Strauss further remarked, "Ninety percent of the progress we make mainly serves to counter-balance the disastrous effects of the remaining ten percent. In fact, civilizations are akin to overheated steam engines. Which generate the infinite waste associated with an entropic technology, primitive societies are by comparison like pendulum clocks. They have generally sustained a measured ecology and delicate balance with nature. Their cultural concepts of reversible time and cyclical change have tended to preserve ideological symmetries and social equilibria. More than any other life style, primitive cultures still exhibit that "crystalline structure". Which corresponds to a "permanent hope for mankind". Anthropology's mission, Levi-Strauss comments, is to preserve these societies from the "cannibal instincts of the historical process" and to recall, if possible "the ring of bygone harmonies."

Only at the point of origin, at the time of the initial transition between nature and culture, was man truly creative and reconciled. But "that indefinable grandeur which is the mark of true beginnings disappeared forever with the Neolithic. Historical and contemporary civilization in choosing time and progress have also chosen violence, exploitation and destruction. "Levi-Strauss' understanding of men's predicament is a tragic and somber one: while socio-historical humanism, we are really incapable of giving it much credence.

Levi-Strauss and structural Anthropology

Levi-Strauss' concept of scientific anthropology was shaped by two other historical predecessors, Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss. Levi-Strauss' indebtedness to them, as to Rousseau, is profound. It is however overlooked sometimes, that there are equally significant differences between Levi-Strauss' structural anthropology and the French Sociological tradition. Both the similarities and divergences can be clarified by textual analysis of Levi-Strauss' writings.

French sociology is praised for its scientific conception of anthropological inquiry but condemned for the remnants of nineteenth-century historicism and idealism that still pervade its theoretical framework. Despite his reservations, Levi-Strauss continues to trace many of his anthropological assumptions to the French school. *Structural Anthropology* (1958) is still dedicated to Durkheim since he, more than anyone else, incarnates the essence of France's contribution to social anthropology.

It is to works of Marcel Mauss (*The newton of ethnology*) that Levi-Strauss, turns for many additional answers. Implicitly or explicitly, wholly or in part, Mauss's notion of the total Social fact and his principle of reciprocity provide him the theoretical and practical keys to a scientific and structural anthropology.

The notion of a total social fact first of all assures the ethnologist of both a concrete and encompassing anthropology. According to Mauss, anthropology is the scientific study of the "concrete universal" Mauss was aware of the importance of such emerging disciplines as structural linguistics and psychoanalysis. Social facts are concrete as well as systematic; that is, "they are live by men. and subjective consciousness is as much a form of their reality as their objective characteristics". As a result, "all valid interpretation must make the objectivity of historical or comparative analysis coincide with the subjectivity of live experience.

1.3 Premises of structural Anthropology.

With the introduction of the concept of the unconscious, we come to one of structural anthropology's most important premises: phenomenal realities, including cultural artifacts are always reducible to a common infrastructure.

What is the nature of this unconscious reality to which Levi-Strauss attaches such importance and to which all anthropological reduction aspires? Its definition is in part derives from Mauss's Concept of reciprocal exchange. Mauss had argued that the exchange of gifts a total social fact - is a synthetic, relational, and systematic process. Levi-Strauss adds that this process is in turn made possible by an mirrors the structure of the unconscious. This infra-structural brain consists of three universal principles.

- * The exigency of the rule as a rule;
- * The notion of reciprocity regarded as the most immediate form of integrating the opposition between the self and others; and finally.
- * The synthetic nature of the gift, i.e. that the agreed transfer of a valuable from one individual to another makes these individuals into partners, and adds a new quality to the value transferred.

These three principles of the unconscious are the a priori assumptions upon which structural anthropology rests. They are latent in all sociocultural phenomena and every culture artifact is explainable in terms of them. Communication, economic and kinship system, for instance, have specific rules which govern their operations; each establishes reciprocal relations between distinct groups and individuals; and each engenders a meaning, values or cohesion not previously present. Each of them in other worlds results from the bears

witness to the 'a priori' structure of the unconscious brain.

In equating the notion of exchange with the structure of the unconscious, Levi-Strauss depart from the French sociological tradition in a significant way. Neither Durkheim nor Mauss had posited the 'a priori' necessity of a regulatory, reciprocation and synthetic unconscious. This shows Levi-Strauss' intellectual heritage lying elsewhere, perhaps with Marx, Hegel, or even Freud.

Levi-Strauss himself has remained relatively indifferent to philosophical issues. In his structuralism, the very neglect of philosopher's bases implies a definite theoretical and positivistic stance. Structuralism should certainly not be considered a philosophical, Rather, it tends to subordinates philosophy to science. There seems to be some affinity between Levi-strauss structuralism and kantianism through he discussed such a relation. The underpinning of structure ethnography is closely akin to a neo-kantian position Levi-Strauss ultimate goal for anthropology a sort of super rationalism which sense perception are integrated into resuming closely resembles kanti's transcendental method." The principle of empathy is present in both idealism and structuralism, but with distinctly different foundation. Unlike the ideas, Levi-Strauss considers the distinction between Natur and Geisteswissenschaften (the substantive result of the epistemology of empathy) irrational and mystical. He prefers to found his own method on naturalistic basis.

Any comparison between Hegel and Levi-Strauss is similarly precarious, since Levi-Strauss never mentions Hegel and prefers to discuss such important issues as dialectical and analytical method, infra and super structure, synchronic system and diachronic event etc. in the context of Marxists or by reference to Satra. Still Levi-Strauss had to confront the Marxist attack that was initiated by Rodney in late 1950's. They characterized structural anthropology as a bourgeois reactionary and intellectually idealist philosophy.

In the case of State, Levi-Strauss' incredibly harsh dismissal of former's belated appeal to the social sciences is devastating. Satra is denied his philosophical, Marxist and historical legitimacy. All this indicates that in France, the entire social and intellectual leadership has change. The prominence has now shifted to structuralists like Althusser, Lacan and Levi-Strauss.

In late sixties, there has emerged what is called 'panstructuralism' (from which Levi-strauss is in [art, excused]), which has become a transcendental metaphysics and disguised ideology. Its premises are anti-Marxist and anti-humanist. Structuralism constitutes the ultimate destruction of existential, historical and political meaning. Levi-Strauss has dismissed any link between. Structuralism and any political system. To trace structural anthropology to a capitalist system is simply untenable.

When Levi-Strauss came to develop his spectacularly successful revitalization of French anthropology, he used different set of terminology. He told his French readers that 'ethnology' embraces both social anthropology; is the study of institutions considered as systems of representations is the study of techniques which implement social life.

Levi-Strauss avoided placing himself in either of these somewhat opaque categories. He claimed that his own brand of anthropology is derivative of that of Boas and Lousie would suggest he considers himself a cultural anthropologist. But on the basis of his own definitions, his study of kinship and his late writing seem to put him among the social anthropologists.

According to Levi-Strauss, anthropology is concerned with the 'unconscious nature of nature phenomena', whereas the historian keeps his eyes fixed on concrete and specific activities.' The anthropologist is, above all, interested in unwritten data, he is principally concerned with those things which differ from everything men ordinarily think of recording on stone or paper. Those social and culture anthropologists following Levi-Strauss distinguish themselves as 'symbolic anthropologists.'

Levi-Strauss' contribution to Marxism:

Levi-Strauss' created a definite place for the human intellect in the explanation of social reality without thereby renouncing a materialistic perspective. This constitutes Levi-Strauss' main contribution to Marxism. When Structuralism is compared with Marxism on the issue of social determinates, Levi-Strauss tends to consider both human mind and the economic substratum in the explanation of human praxis and social reality. Here too we detect a distinctive structuralist's characteristic: the intellectualization of the dialectic.

We rarely find in Levi-Strauss' work the "mere" political and economic analyses of social phenomena for which Marx's later writings are well-known. But even in Levi-Strauss' writings, one can see the genesis and function in exploitative and class-conscious terms. The infra-structural determinate Levi-Strauss invokes is the human brain. He informs us that he is not a Marxist 'in the ordinary sense', of the term. Others might wish to add the question. "can Levi-Strauss' be considered a Marxist in any sense of the term?"

The methodological consequence of Levi-Strauss' intellectualism are important. If social and religious phenomena are the results of cognitive rather than utilitarian interests, if their nature is logical and collective and rather emotional and subjective, then we must replace pragmatic and psychodynamic explanations with logical and structural ones.

Levi-Strauss' on Linguistic Structuralism

There have been intimate ties between cultural anthropology and linguistics in both Anglo-American and French-continental social sciences. Levi-Strauss' is primarily an Americanist and has devoted much of his time and effort to the structural study of North and South American cultures. The influence of the French tradition of structural linguistics has led to the recent work of Levi-Strauss' For whom "linguistics a primary model for a general anthropological theory." His Structuralism may be considered as "part of a semiotic with linguistics at its heart."

Levi-Strauss' explicitly seeks to mirror the methodological principles and substantive

aims of cultural anthropology after those of structural linguistics. To him linguistics and anthropology are virtually identical in method and object of study. Language, Levi-Strauss' says' is "the cultural phenomenon [at excellence]" since it "is the most perfect of all cultural manifestation. If we want to understand art, religion or law. We must imagine them as being codes formed by articulated signs, following the pattern of linguistic communication.

Levi-Strauss' describes his efforts at linguistic structuralism as follow just as the discovery of DNA and the genetic code led biologists to use linguistic model to explain a natural phenomenon, I use a linguistic model to explain cultural phenomena other than language. I try to show that the basic structure of language observed by linguists exists in a great many other activities. Various cultural modalities, such as kinship, totemism and myth are akin to language, precisely because they, like language itself, are the products of "identical unconscious structures."

Although Levi-Strauss' shows intimate relation between anthropology and linguistics his argument is not linguistically reductionist. That is, substance of language does not provide the ultimate explanation for cultural phenomena; rather both language and culture are the products of the unconscious brain. Levi-Strauss' reduction for cultural phenomena; rather both language and culture are the products of the unconscious brain. Reductionism is intellectual rather than linguistic, and cultural modalities are reduced to mental structures rather than to language behaviour.

In sum, "to derive from language a logical model which being more accurate and better known, may aid us in understanding the structure of other forms of communication (and culture) is in no sense equivalent to treating the former as the origins of the latter."

Levi-Strauss reduces neither culture to language nor anthropology to linguistics. He does seek to formulate relations between conscious cultural givens and their unconscious mental infrastructures. He maintains that structural linguistics, like structural anthropology, deals not with terms, but with the relations between them.

The most immediate and important consequence of a relation anthropology is its concern with structures or system. In Levi-Strauss' anthropology, "structure" and "system" are similarly used. Socio-cultural systems can be studied as more or less integrated symbolic structures of language itself, marriage rules, economic relations, and artistic, scientific and religious systems. Here again it is the human brain that is the source of the symbolic function and which provides the pivotal ontological basis for structural anthropology.

Levi-Strauss' structuralism is entitled to make a fundamental assumption: reflection, discourse and historicity are reducible to a universal infrastructure that is objective systematic and synchronic. For Levi-Strauss' though processes are that 'make' us human "All social life," he

"he says, "however elementary, presupposes an intellectual activity in none of which the formal properties cannot be a reflection of the concrete organization of society.

In other words, we must "think" in some sense before we can have any social life therefore, the conceptual scheme underlying social life is fundamental. The bank of Levi-Strauss'

work is an attempt to extract conceptual universal and develop a method for analysing myth in these terms. The current move away from extreme "culturalism" or rejection of all cross-cultural generalization - and towards a search for universals owes much to Levi-Strauss' influence.

Questions

- 1) Explain the terms 'structuralism' and give a brief account of Levi-Strauss' structuralism?
- 2) Elucidate Levi-Strauss' intellectual background and its impact on his thought processes?
- 3) Examine the promises of structural anthropology?
- 4) Levi-Strauss was opposed connected with cultural anthropology? Explain with reference to Levi-Strauss' ideas on linguistic structuralism?

Reference

- * John J. Honigsmann; Handbook of social and cultural Anthropology, vol II, Rawat pub.1997.
- * Ruth Wallace. Alison Wolf: contemporary Sociological Theory, Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- * E. Leach: Social Anthropology, OUP, 1982.

THE MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

Influence of Anthropology on Mark and Engel's

Objective

Influence of anthropology on Marx and Engle's

- * Introduction
- * Anthropology and Marxism
- * Rhetorical use of Anthropology.
- * Importance of I.H. Morgan to Mark and Engel's
- * Criticism of Marxiam Anthropology.

Influence of Marxian of Anthropology: Terray:

- * Marxian ideology.
- * Criticism of Marxist ideology'
- * Modern Anthropology and Marxim.
- * Emmanucl Terray's study of Primitive societies in the context of

Marxism

- * Morgan and contemporay Anthropology
- * Historical Materialisam and Segmentary based societies.
- * Direct Successors of Marx and Engle's
- * Marxism and Soviet Union.
- * Marxism and American Anthropology.
- * Marxism and British and French Anthropology.
- * Some of the latest developments in modern Anthropology.

Introduction

Karl Marx as a social philosopher has been studied by the studets of economics, politics, Philosophy and also sociology. His theory of historical materilism, dilectism, clas struggle, alenation, surplus value and man other social conepts have fascinated all the scholars. Those who agreed with him and saw some points in what he sais and also those who condidered him irrlevant and wrong also admired him for his guts in putting forth absolutely revoutionary ideas.

His father had encouraged him for wide reading on liberalism and to particiate in intellectual activities. He was the student of Hegel who belived that mind (the ideas) was more important than matter (materials) Marx who live between 1864-1920 was exposed to

the new science both natural and social science which had started establishing themeselves in the scientific world. In his early days he read Leibriz, Kant and Voltaire, During his stay in Paris he studied both bature and social theories. In

Paris, he began a life long friendship with Fredrick Engle's was the son of the textile manufacturer. Though Engel's did not have much intellectual caliber as that of Marx he was himself a very talented and versatile intellectual. The two collaborated in such a way in their scholarship that it is sometimes difficult to separated their contribution. It was through Engle's and his work Marx was introduced to an understading of the concert and miseries of working class.

Mark was influenced by English economist like Adam Ferguson, Adam, Smith, David Recardo and Jhon Stuart mill. He accepted Labor theory from Racardo and took the ideas of surplus value from Thompson. Marx's Evolutionary ideas and the ideas of class conflict developed due to Charles Darwin and Herbert Spener. The concept of dialectics and alienation he learnt from his teacher Hegal. French Socilalists like Saint-Simon and Proudhon influenced his ideas of socialism. In his time england was at the peak of indtrialization. His thinking sharted taking place when he was the ground realities of labor.

In his background he developed his theories, which own much to the

- * German idealism especially the Hegelian version,
- * French socialist tradition and
- * British political Economy

Once Marx propounded his theories he stated looking for Anthropological evedence to prove and support his ideas about human avolution. He therefore studied Morgan Frazer and Tylor.

Anthropology and Marxism

Anthropology topics ahve always fad a major place in Marxism. Anthropology ahs traditionaly concertrated on primitive people. Anthropology as an organized discipline goes back to mind 19th century when study of evolution was considered very important. Culture and social anthropology then concertraed on the study evolution of society and culture. To begin with it was parallel to Darwin's Evolutionary theory. The concept of Natural selection was substituted by the concept of social section.

Anthropology plays a central role in the development of Marxism but still Marx and Engle's cannot condedered as anthropologist. They only used and reinterpreted only a part of the wider anthropological work. Mark and Engel's chosen only those topics of anthropology which they found useful to their political writing. Though thee were many anthropologists, they were interested only in certain anthropologist like L.H. Morgan.

Marx and Engel have had a political obejective i.e. they wanted to prove that capitallism was not a nature system in the progress of civilization and that it was not inevitable. And also that it was the product of certain historical

factors and therefore can be changed. And also achieve this political aim it is necessary to examine the historical evidences. Anthropology became important to them because it studied the original human societies and culture. Marx attached great importance to the study of preliterate people which was the traditional field of anthropology. Marx was interested in knowing how the exploitative system of capitalism went from one stage to another. Anthropology had a place in this scheme because it studied the early mankind.

Anthropologists then studied the primitive people of past and present from any source like the archaeological remains and the classic accounts of early institutions, from the reports of the travelers, explorers, colonists, missionaries etc. who described the contemporary primitive. But when Darwin published his "Origin of Species: evolutionary studies in anthropology began. This interested Marx and Engel's because they too were concerned with the history of pre-capitalist societies. Darwinism helped Marx to give a materialist history of society how man was different from animals and therefore social and culture evolution and not be the same lines as biological evolution.

For example, civilized people had monogamy and opposite of this was polygamy permitted in primitive society. Anthropology showed that many primitive societies gave a lot of freedom on matters of sex.

Marx and Engel's got anthropological materials to use for supporting their own theories on Historical Materialism and emergence of capitalism. This is known as 'Rhetorical use of anthropological data. Primitive societies offered illustration of systems totally different from those known to them. They known as rhetorical use of anthropological material to frame history.

Rhetorical use of Anthropology by Marx

In the rhetorical use of anthropology, Marx and Engels were particularly interested in the topics of production, property and family. Marx was not prepared to accept the inevitability of working condition of exploitation because he did not accept the laissez-faire theory of demand and supply ruling the value / price of a commodity the commodity being the labour in this case. According to him the appearance powerlessness of the worker to determine his wage was due to the distribution of the property, i.e. the distribution of the ownership of the means of production, like land, machines tools etc.

This state of affairs i.e. exploitation of labour under capitalism was not created by god but by history. They show that capitalism was a historical product Marx and Engel's turned to history and anthropology. They turned to the available anthropological information of the preliterate people to the most distant period from capitalist period. Here Marx found confirmation to the fact that the social relations were linked to production relations. In the primitive societies kinship relations pre-dominated. The members of the

primitive society were related to each other either by blood or by marriage. According to Marx this was in contrast to capitalist relations between workers and employees, which was impersonal and contractual. Whereas the kinship relations were personal and reciprocal. In capitalism all rights were with the employer and duties only with the workers. Marx and Engels believed that kinship relations were equalitarian and exploitative. Marx and Engels tried to prove that family and kinship (kinship being extension of family in primitive society) were opposite of kinship and family in capitalist society.

In capitalist the nature of property system is such that capitalist exploit workers because the former have control of means of production in their hands. This was not inevitable but the result of the specific historical development. The notion of private property was not an inalienable right but could be changed if production relations changed. To demonstrate this they went again to pre-literate societies and found that there was a link between type of property system and the type of production relations. Marx and Engels stated. They various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of ownership i.e. existing stages of division of labour determines also the relation of individuals to one another with reference to the materials, instrument and the product of the labour.

However the main objective was to find out correlation between private property exploitation. The role of private property is that labour is not paid full value of its work and this surplus is enjoyed by the capitalist and is at their mercy and therefore the workers are exploited.

About private property there were two opinions. One held by John Locke that the security of private property was an essential pre-requisite for the evolutionary progress of the society and increasing human happiness. The other opinion was held by exploitative in nature. Marx agreed with Rousseau that private property equals exploitation. To support this point of view he again looked at primitive societies without any private property. This was once again opposite of exploitative capitalist society. Marx read about some well organized primitive societies without the institution of private property Marx concluded that in early societies the absence of private property only justifies the artificial nature of the relations of production and private property in capitalism.

Marx and Engels' work on pre-capitalist societies is largely taken up to show the link between private property and the type of relationship of production. The demonstration of the evolution and the transformation of types of property is also central to Marxism i.e. evolution types of property -- types of production relations. In this context Marx and Engels asked two things from anthropology. One, they looked to it for confirmation of their general principle of history which they saw as operative in capitalist system. Secondly, they looked to anthropology to support them with contrastive and even opposite

system of institutions to those of 19th century capitalist. They found materials for both.

Both the above purpose was quite legitimate. It stands to reason that one is claiming to have discovered universal historical laws which can be applied to very different societies Marx and Engel's had the intellectual courage to put their laws into test by seeing whether

they proved right in case of early cultures. Moreover It is use data of other cultures to show that each culture is governed by the principle of its own society.

Importance of L.H. Morgan to Marx and Engel's

Morgan was American anthropologist. He studied the American Indians and found that they gave very high importance to kinship relations. His first book was consanguinity and affinity of human family (1870).in 1877 he wrote 'Ancient society in which he established that society passes through a series of stages. These stages are based on productive these stages are based on productive technology. This resembled the evolutionary scheme of Marxism. Then he also explained the mechanism of change from one stage to another. This influenced Marx and Engel's more than anything else because it came close to the central ideas of Marxism.

Morgan was the only one anthropologist in 19th century who was interested in knowing what led to the transformation of one social system to another and in what and lead to the break up of the past system. The answer that Morgan found for break up of the fact that various sub system stop working in harmony and come in conflict with each other. When technology of production system changes the kinship system, property system and political system etc. come in contradiction with each other and then the prevailing stage ends and a new one begins. Morgan says when wealth increase because of domestication of animals and civilization of land man's position in the family became more important. This overthrew matrilineal and patrilineal come in its place. This also change the prevailing inheritance law. It becomes necessary to derecognize descent through mother-right and patriarchy took its place. The new economic system became in compatible more compatible to pastoralism and agriculture.

Marx and Engel's saw in Morgan's ideas of passage from one stage to another a confirmation of their own ideas about the general theory of social change. This is one of the most important reasons why Marx and Engel's the early history of the processes which led to the creation of capitalism. Morgan's work was harnessed by Marx and Engel's to the political task or rewriting history.

Morgans was an expert on kinship system in primitive society which was informal and egalitarian and opposite of capitalist relations. Morgan also mentioned about some primitive societies without the institutions of private property. Morgan asserted that the first stage of human society had no differentiation between its various institutions like marriage, family kinship etc. and above all there was no notion of private property. For Marx and Engle's existence of such a stage seemed useful to show the relationship between mode of production and production relation is capitalism. In other words Morgan's work perfectly fitted in their rhetorical requirement for the demonstration to totally opposite system to that of 19th century capitalism in Europe.

Complementarity of Anthropology to Marxism

When Marx and Engle's collaborated with anthropological work to get and interpret historical data it resulted in two things at the same time. On the one hand it stresses the unity.

of human history and on other it also tried to show the diversity and discontinuity of human history. In the beginning Marx and his friend Engle's used anthropology to get support for their theoretical orientation. In the next lesson we will see how later on, fascinated by Marxian ideology anthropologists used it to understand modern society.

Morgan's work is divided into 4 parts.

- * Growth of intelligence through inventions and discoveries which deals mainly agricultural technology.
- * The growth of the idea of government which is mainly a discussion of decent groups which ultimately gave way to state organization, particularly of Roman State.
- * The Growth of the idea of family, largely a discussion of types of marriage and types of kinship technology.
- * Growth of the idea of property.

Marx in his notes changes this order. He took the discussion of the property first and then of family kinship etc. and the state last. This new Order is more logical to Marxian thinking. This later became the basis for organizing Engle's books "The Origin of the family, Private Property and the state".

Criticism of Marxian Anthropology:

Many scholars have asked, how far is it true in the beginning of human history there were no individual's families, no proper institution of marriage, of state and above all no institution of private property? is it not too simple to hypothesize this? It is very difficult to answer this either way but it is true that the specific forms of marriage, family property, state and gender relations

which existed in Marx's time did not exist in primitive society.

Like the other animals man had to make living for himself and his offspring from the geographical environment but still man was different from animal because he also lived in the world of ideas, concepts, values and norms. These ideas and values came not out of individuals but from their interaction in society. Society worked as a whole system.

According to Marx two different processes go together simultaneously. The first process is the interaction men grouped together in society and engaged in production. This process leads to creation of concepts, ideas values and institutions. The second process is that as man make advancement in history there also develop some kind of exploitation or domination of one group by the other. The relation of classes in a capitalist society is an extreme form of this process. The development of exploitation leads to the formation of ideas, concepts, values and institutions which give legitimacy to exploitation. This is the crux of Marxian, ideology. As primitive societies have no class they do not have class struggle also. According to some scholars rhetoric use of anthropology in history in this manner is wrong. It does not give enough analytical tools for dealing with the issue.

Marx's theory of change was based on the growing contradictions that arose in society between the technological side of production and the corresponding social system with which it was associated. This happened because every new technology introduced resulted in class conflict. That is why Marxian theory of social change did not apply to primitive societies because there were no classes.

The historians have not accepted Marxian approach to history. Marxian materialism is not the denial of the importance of ideas, concepts and values for people but it is an assertion that ideas ultimately have a material origin in the real conditions of existence. Marx and Engels accepted the power of ideas, for example, the ideas that labour can be bought and sold like a commodity is a capitalist idea which is the result of certain economic and technical developments in the feudal period.

Marx though dealt with the European model of production of evolution he was aware of other models also. He spoke of Asiatic mode of production and colonial mode of production but in all modes the elements of exploitation and conflict are there.

Summary

Marx was a great intellectual giant. He dared to put ideas before the world which were revolutionary but very fundamental to human society. All scholars admired him including his critics. In time he was exposed to great many scholars in Germany, France and England. But he was greatly interested

in anthropologist because they studies early mankind, the primitives. Marx and his friend Engel's a very practical person wanted to get evidence for their theoretical orientation of materialist theory in the primitive data.

Among the scholars of anthropology Marx and Engel's found Louis Morgan's work on primitive societies. every useful to support their evolutionary perspective of material history because Morgan in his books "Consanguinity and affinity" 1870, and Ancient society in 1877' has mentioned that society passes through a series of shapes which are based on productive technology. This idea is central to Marxism and therefore Marx and Engel's were interested in collecting information from his study of primitive societies. Anthropology helped Marx to explain the institution of private property and social change through material history. Thus anthropology complemented and supported Marxism.

Marx and Engel's got anthropology material their own theories on historical Materialism and on emergence of capitalism. This is known as 'rhetorical use' of anthropological data proved him right that social relations were linked to production relations. Demonstration of evolution and the transformation of types of property is also central to Marxism anthropology proved this by providing Marx, the information's on the contrastive and even opposite systems of institutions to those of 19th century capitalism.

Marxian anthropology has been criticized as hypothetical and too simple. There has been no study by Marx and Engel's on primitive communities. But there is no doubt that primitive societies were very difficult from the societies of 19th century in Europe.

Secondary all ideas and values in society came from the interaction of individuals in the society which means society act as a whole because the member of the society work together. However while working together one group dominates other and therefore gets a chance to exploit the latter. The social institutions give legitimacy to this exploitation.

According to this in all modes of there is an element of exploitation as long as private property continues. Only in a socialist and communist society where there are no classes, the mode of production is not exploitative and there is equalitarian production relations.

INFLUENCE OF MARXISM ON ANTHROPOLOGY TERRAY

Marxian Ideology

Today's Anthropology has taken due from Marxist ideology. Marxian ideology talks of two things. One that human history passes through certain ordered stages. Second, these stages depend on the material progress that man makes from one period to another. This is evolutionist approach which Anthropologists and Marxist shared. Marx's Historical materialism is to be

understood in historical perspective. Whenever the mode of production changes the production relations also change and then society moves from one stage to another. Marxism shows a link between the type of material production and the type of production relations. Thus the demonstration of the evolution and transformation of types of material property is very much central to Marxism,

Criticism of Marxist Ideology :

The 'evolutionism' of Marx and Engel's and also of Morgan which is a fundamental notion they share is not acceptable to the later anthropologists. Some of them reject the idea of unilinear stages of evolution and some of them like Boss and Evans Pritchard reject the very idea of evolution totally.

When we accept the idea of human history passing through stages then it implies that there is an unavoidable link between technological system, political system, economic system, kinship system and also other systems of society.

Evolutionary theory of societies might have been true in case of the European society but not necessary for other societies. There is example to show how tribal societies have modernized themselves without passing through the intermediary stages. If we use the tern types of society and classify the human societies instead of talking about stages then also there is the problem of in-between types or the borderline cases. Modern Anthropology rejects the idea of stages of evolution but not the idea of evolution itself.

However by and large Marx and Engel's sequence of technological progress is accepted. The important thing to understand patriliney is that primitive people had very simple technology. It does not matter whether patriliney preceded matriliney or vice versa and whether matriliney the status of women. There are many matrilineal societies giving very low status to women. What is important to understand is that when one sub-system of society changes it has effect on the whole system.

Marx and Engel's ideas about pre-capitalist societies have been invalidated by sub-sequent knowledge of the modern anthropologists. But neither Marx nor Engel's considered themselves as historians or anthropologists. They had a different purpose. They only used the work of the anthropologists of their time which was available to them. They used it very individually but in the process they also picked up the short-comings from those. Anthropologists on whom they relied. They very source of information both factual and theoretical had mistakes. Marx and Engel's were interested in the analysis of 'capitalism; rather than in the pre-capitalists societies. Their arguments was that the concept of state property family. Labour capital etc. were not eternal but the product of the history of the system they maintained. They used anthropology to show the relative nature of these concepts. Therefore what mattered to Marx and Engel's was not any specific history which had produced these concepts but the concepts had history behind them, that the concepts depended on the types of society and economy in which they occurred.

Modern anthropology and Marxism :

Modern Anthropologists find Marxism very relevant in modern context. They observe the unavoidable link between technological system and social, political, economic and kinship system. Therefore if there is a change in technological system the other sub-systems also change therefore society as a whole changes. Modern Anthropologists therefore accept Marx's evolutionary approach to explain social change.

Modern Anthropologists do not accept Marxian explanation of society moving from lower stage to higher but their sequence of technological progress is more or less accepted. Modern Anthropologists have observed that society generally moves from a simple technology to a more complex one.

Modern Anthropologists also agree with Marxism that the concepts, the ideas are the product of material experiences of man in a social and historical situation and therefore they are relative. Hence they are subject to change. The Marxian idea that social institutions are temporal and transitory and are the product of a particular social system is accepted by all modern anthropologists.

Modern anthropologists have concluded that such diverse aspects of society as religion, kinship, politics and economics are all linked to each other as a whole. Marx and Engel's were the first to demonstrate this so emphatically. It was by demonstrating this wholeness that they were able to show that when one side of this whole changes, the others would change too. This central point of Marxism has been supported and taken up by modern anthropologists. Modern anthropologists have no doubt about the conclusion that all aspects of society form a whole and none of them is independent from each other. But this system is also changing because all systems are subject to transition. Thus change is an essential feature of society according to Marxism, which modern anthropologists have accepted fully.

Annel Terray's study of primitive societies in the context of Marxism

Emmanuel Terray was a French Social anthropologist who did field work study of primitive societies, to find out how useful is the Marxist view of social development and his theory of Historical materialism. He interpreted evolutionism and materialism in Marxist Framework. He has done this by means of a re-examination of the 19th century American anthropologist Lewis H. Morgan and a presentation of the path breaking work of a modern French anthropologist, Claude Meillassoux.

Terray presents a detailed and searching reconstruction of the social evolutionary view of Morgan as presented in *Ancient Society*. The criticism of Morgan is based on the misunderstanding. Meillassoux's work on the Guro, a primitive society is based on the application of historical materialism to a concrete primitive society.

Marx and Engel have relied on the findings of other anthropologists to use for the theories of Maxism. Terray though it necessary to put to test the principles of Marxism by actual studies, just as Marx did rignonous study in the Capital. He therefore first tested Morgan on whom Marx and Engel's had relied.

Morgan and contemporary anthropology

Prents day anthropologists see Morgan as having dual personality. He was the foreunner of social structure studies and also the founder of social anthropology he gave increasing attention to the study of kinship in his first book "System of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family" in 1871.

But he wrote another book in 1877 "ancient Society" in which he dealt with evolutionism. And for this he is severely criticized by Levy Strauss and others. The asked how can all societies start at one particular point and culminate at another point ? Thus theory of evolution corrppletely ignores the importance of cultural diversity. Evolutionsim can not be the outcome of reality and resoning.

Morgan and himself acknowledged that Darwin had influenced him. This made him adopt the conclusion that man commenced at the bottom of the scale from which he worked himself up to his preent stage. To Morgan human specie is not immutable whether considered in its cultural, social or biologicial aspect. Human specie is subject to evolution, progressing through a series of statesm each of which develops out of the previous state and carries within it the seed of that which is going to follow this state. This is just the same as Derwinism. But for this process of evolutionism man would have remained a savage.

With regard to time Morgan believed in the unity of time and also continuity from savage to civilized men. There was no break. Hisotians see history as the work of men. Morgan saw it as the work of evoluton. Darwin's theory of evolution of species and Morgan's theory of Evolutionary human history went paralle,. Darwin spoke "Natural Selection" for survivial and Morgan spoke of "Social Selction" for the same. Darwin spoke of "Survival of the filtest", Morgan equated it with the "art of subsistence" (for survival). Thus Morgan's genius lies is applying Darwinian concepts to Human Evolution. Marx. Marx and Engle's swa something beyond the social evolution in Morgan's work, i.e. materialist understanding of history" which Marx and Engle's had discovered some years ago. Thougha structuralists Marx was not interested in the real social structure but in the science of Human history, Morgan's generalization was based on the unity oh fuman experience. This unity of human experience is the production of the unity of mankind\, unit of human thought. Human experience is the product of three elements i.e. man's primary needs, his ability to think- his thoughts and the natural logic. Primary needs provide the raw material on which the thoughts and the nature logic. Primary needs provide the raw material on which the thoughts and the nature logic. This results in invetions and creation of institutions. Mans's needs create institutions which are social products.

Lkouis Althusar and Etienne Balibar were the first scholars to demonstrate the decisive importance of the distinction between determination and domination in Marx's thought. When Marx conceived of change and transformation, he meant transformation from one dominant mode to another.

History not only requires a general theory but also a theory of transition from one states to another a theory of continuity and change; both must be there. According to Marx various elements of a coherent whole society are directed to the maintenance of the whole society. Inventions and discoveries mark the beginning and end of a period. Necessity is the mother of inventions and inventions, cause change. The argument is very logical, Marx here picked up the concept of "mode of production" in a social structure.

Concepts and methods used by Morgan were very useful for Marx, Morgan's "Ancient Society" is a starting point in anthropology. His concepts like form, sequence, ethnic group, arts of subsistence, determination, domination, organization, transition etc hence been accepted by modern anthropologists.

Historical materialism and Segmentary based societies

In recent time, there has been Marxist research in primitive societies. A very important scholar among them is Claude Meillassoux who studied the Guro primitive society. He wanted to study their mode of production in pre-colonial and in the colonial period. He described the pre-colonial mode of production as lineage based and Segmentary in nature. Lineage is a group of people who are in fact or in fiction descend/ants of a common ancestor, male or female. A big lineage can be divided into segments under one head.

A mode of production has three parts; an economic base, a political super structure and an ideological super structure. In final analysis economic base is the determining factor. This economic base is a combination of a system of production forces and a system of production relations. This is what Marx had said, the productive forces are the material conditions of production like raw materials, tools machinery forces and production relations are two different things but are inseparable because they are the two sides of the same coin i.e. the production process. The various factors composing the economic base of a mode of production can be characterized in two ways, on the one hand according to their technical effectiveness i.e. their part in the production of social relations. Thus these two together determine a specific mode or production.

The relation of production is very much represented by the ideological and political domination in that society. Sometimes political ideology may directly influence the mode of production like in the feudal society. Sometimes it may be labour intensive and sometimes capital intensive but as Meillassoux writes "Human beings are the sole agents of the economy, the only source of energy, the only means of production and reproduction, and therefore are the axis of all economic relations.

In tribal societies we find elders exploiting the youngsters. By controlling the ownership of goods produced by the young people. Tribute to the king and the chief, enforced work like in slavery and serfdom are just like the free conditions of labour in a capitalist society. In all cases there are dominant and subordinate groups. In all societies there is some form of social stratification based on ascribed and achieving factors.

Claude Lévi-Strauss tried his experiment in a primitive society taking Marxist concepts and analytical method with some working hypothesis. He sought to test their operational value in the field.

He concluded that Historical Materialism is perfectly applicable to the primitive societies a primitive society can be understood only through the concept of mode of production. All other concepts are subordinate to it. But mode of production is the economic base. The political and ideological Superstructure is built on that. Marxist researches are now trying to demonstrate the universal value of theory of Historical Materialism.

Direct successors of Marx and Engel's

The fundamental starting point of Marxist study of society is that human societies are systems of organizing production and reproduction rather than a structure of institutions. Properly, labour and state are the three important areas to explain a social organization. Properly changes from communal to private. This gives foundation to capitalist exploitation, Labour changes from the stage of a social life to a stage of social exploitation, in the form of slavery, serfdom and the free labour of capitalist society exploitation, in the form of Slavery, serfdom and the free labour of capitalist society which is bought and sold like a commodity. State becomes instrumental in class differentiation. State becomes tool for the dominant class to maintain itself.

Marxism and Soviet Union

Soviet Union was directly influenced by Marxian ideology. The history of Marxism from the death of Marx to the soviet revolution saw the growth of a simple theory of technological determinism.

Soviet anthropology from the beginning was set in a fixed course based on Marxism, Lenin was interested in Anthropology because he had to deal with the ethnic diversity of U.S.S.R. and Secondly the Revolution had thrown away the prevailing power relations. Society would move from Primitive communism, to communism finally. It is difficult to make Anthropology of Soviet Union.

Soviet Union is the direct outcome of Marxism, Soviet anthropologists retain the evolutionary framework which western anthropologists had dismissed.

Marxism and American anthropology

Thought Marx has negative influence in American anthropology, paradoxically Marxists and American Anthropologists shared the very important starting point of Anthropology itself. We have seen how Marx and Engel's derived a lot of material from the works of American anthropologist Louis H. Morgan.

However, Americans abandoned the evolutionary approach of Morgan and the Marxist and adopted a new type of Anthropology known as cultural Anthropology. Cultural anthropology which believes in the uniqueness of each culture as a whole came in direct conflict with Marxist evolutionary Anthropology.

After Russian Revolution Manism came to be associated with Soviet Union and anti Marxism with America as America and Soviet Union were rivals.

Leisly White was the lone American between 1918-1950 who spoke of something similar to Marxist evolution. He believed that different societies should be seen in terms of their technological efficiency. This gives a ranking of societies on a quantifiable basis and this ranking has evolutionary basis because the societies with higher efficiency will vanquish those with lower efficiency. While and his students were called neo-evolutionists, because they acknowledged their indebtedness to Darwin, Tylor and Morgan.

However from 1960s, American Anthropology has started taking interest in evolutionism which is known as "Cultural Ecology". Here the belief is that institutions are applicable in terms of their adaptive fitness to the environment, given the available technology. This has been illustrated by Marx and Engel's before. On similar lines Marvin Harris has published a book called "Cultural Materialism."

It was noticed that Marx has studied not just the primitive people. His main contribution was his study on "Capitalism" which has been ignored. The political events like Chinese Revolution brought to the world peasant movements all over the world which showed the involvement of rural areas in wider socio-economic structure. These communities of peasants cannot be isolated from the capitalist system in which they are embedded. The Neo-Marxist Anthropologies are now studying Marxism in his area- especially the significance of capitalism for Latin American and Caribbean peasantries. This time the study is not Marxist theories in relation to pre-capitalist societies but about the place of peasantry in capitalism.

With Socialist Revolution in most of the third world countries the question of peasants has become Central Neo-Marxist study in Anthropology.

Marxism and British and French anthropology

The renewal in interest in Marxism in modern Europe has come from France. But until then the British Anthropology dominated in Europe.

Malinowski criticized evolutionary theory because he proved that in primitive society many old cultural traits continued in spite of social change. Malinowski and Radcliff Brown both agreed with Marx that societies work as living wholes where every aspect fitted with each other and all aspects were geared to the tasks necessary for the survival.

The French and British anthropologists kept away from Marx because of the association of Marxism with bloody revolution in Russia. However their interests were renewed, when they saw the political challenge coming to them from their colonies. Communist political parties were emerging in many countries who adopted Marxism to fight against the ruler's domination over the native people. French communist J. Sarrailh was leading, French communist, who studied Asiatic mode of production and the African mode of production. Only Marxist principle explained why Asiatic mode of production was exploitative and the African mode of production was not. Later on even Levi Strauss accepted this new Marxist approach. This was very forcefully explained by M. Godlied who said that Marx never held a unilinear view of history. He said the task of Marxism was not to go back but to go forward and to come out of European context and apply Marxism to Asian societies. It rejected the five stages of unilinear evolution but at the same time broadened the base of Marxism framework. He also tried to say that Soviet Marxism Anthropology was a contradiction of Marx's ideas. This itself was a very revolutionary step. Godlied tried to show many similarities between the work of Levi-Strauss and Marx. Godlied tried to show many similarities between the work of Levi-Strauss and Marx. Godlied made Marxism respectable in Anthropology and once again gave opportunity to the anthropologists to use Marxist theory in their studies. It also made Marxism more empirical.

French Marxist Philosopher Althusser stated how a "mode of production" could be constructed as an analytical tool to study modern societies. They turned to Marxist analysis of "capital because in capital" they found the general theoretical approach inevitably tied to the specific mode of production, "capitalism" which was mainly under examination. **Some of the latest developments in modern anthropology**

Thus the Anthropology of 1970s was much obvious and transparent and was tied to real world events. Whether it was radical social movements or antiwar movement or women's they were interested in the academic world as well as the world of action. Both were real part of world situation. Marxism gave a theoretical framework to these historical events.

In 1980s another unexpected thing developed in Marxism and that is Liberation theory was developed in Marxism and it was applied in Latin America Marxism, in the original form had a negative attitude. Karl Marx had called it as the opium of people. Some Theologists used Marxism to understand the socio-cultural situation of the country society. These Neo-Marxists came to know about the cultural exploitation of the people who were technologically low and backward. They also concluded that without cultural dominance there can be no economic exploitation. For example, dalit poverty is kept alive by the cultural dominance of upper caste Hindus. This economic disparity is given sanction by the cultural values of the superiority of higher over the lower. Hence there is an ideological super-structure built on the base. This can be shown as follows.

CULTURAL HEGEMONY AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION

THE IDEOLOGY	In terms of religion/caste.
SOCIAL STRUCTURE	Political structure which maintains the economic base
ECONOMIC BASES	Mode of production

Summary

Ideas of Marx and Engle's are found relevant even today by modern scholars. Many modern anthropologists have used Marxist ideas to explain modern social phenomena.

Mode of production and production relations is central to Marxian ideology. The modern anthropology compared pre-colonial and colonial mode of production in [present day primitive society and they found that Marxist ideology proved right. Broadly they also accepted Marx's Evolutionary approach because generally a society moved from a lower stage to higher stage, from a simple technology to a complex technology. Neo-Marxist accepts the change aspect of society through change in technology.

They also agree that a society is a whole system and when the technology changes, other aspects of social system also have to change. Social Institution is therefore temporal.

Emmanuel Terray in his concrete study of modern primitive societies reinterpreted evolutionism and materialism in Marxist framework. He also justified Morgans's evolutionist work.

Louis Althusser demonstrated the difference between dominating and determining factors and he said Marx was right where he said that at a given period of time one mode of production always dominated over the other.

Claude's study of Curo tribe showed that mode of production has 3 parts. At the base there is economy based on technology. Above this is the political super structure and on top the ideological super-structure are there. However human beings are central to all these three parts. He said that primitive societies can be understood only through their mode of production.

Soviet Union was directly influenced by Marxist ideology. Soviet anthropology from the very beginning was based on Marxism. Lenin was interested in anthropology because he had to deal with ethnic diversity of U.S.S.R.

American anthropology from the very beginning opposed Marxism because it created communist Russia which was totally opposed to American Capitalism. Americans associated Marx with communism. He was totally rejected in America though paradoxically the first social anthropologist L.H. Morgan was an American from whose work Marx and Engels got their evolutionary perspective i.e. Historical Materialism.

But from 80's American anthropologists had started taking interest in Marxism. Instead of calling it historical materialism, they are calling it cultural materialism.

With the Soviet revolution in most of the third world countries the question of peasants has become central. Asian and African peasant communities they found Marxism relevant.

In 1970 anthropology came to be linked with the real present-day world. Various social movements and liberation movements took place against exploitation of various forms. Marxist framework became useful to analyze the socio-economic conditions. In due course of time, liberation theory was developed. The theologians in Latin America reversed Marxian opinion in religion. They developed the ideological concept of cultural hegemony without which they said economic exploitation was not possible.

Question

- 1) Which was Marxism criticized for a long time and how did anthropologists start taking interest in it again in modern times ?
- 2) Explain the ground on which modern anthropologists find Marxian analysis useful in explaining modern societies ?
- 3) What are the highlights of Emmanuel Terray's study of primitive societies ?
- 4) Explain Marxism and Russia ?
- 5) Explain Marxism in England and France ?
- 6) Explain Marxism in modern America ?
- 7) What is Marxist anthropology ? Why Marx and Engels did have worked for certain selective topics in anthropology ?
- 8) What is the contribution of anthropology to Marxism especially the anthropological work of L.H. Morgan ?
- 9) What were the important conclusions of Marxism after studying the anthropological data ? Give examples.

Reference

- * Maurice Bloch - Marxism and Anthropology
- * Emmanuel Terray - Marxism and Primitive societies - Tow studies.

INTERPRETATIVE APPROACH : GEERTZ

Objective

- * Introduction
- * Clifford Geertz
- * Criticism on Geertz's interpretive approach
- * Summary

Introduction

Humanistic or interpretive anthropology seeks to redirect cultural anthropology from a strategy of finding causal explanations for human behavior by seeking interpretations and meaning in human action. It is a strategy which seeks the humanities rather than science as the model for anthropology. It seeks analogies based on theatre, play, drama and literature rather than those based on crafts, mechanics and organic structures.

Interpretive anthropology is mentalist in its orientation, seeking culture as a system of ideas, values and meanings. It differs from other mentalist approaches which seek causes for human behavior. Interpretive or humanistic anthropology eschews the search for causal explanation in favour of a hermeneutic approach which seeks emanating through interpretations of behaviors or texts.

Interpretive anthropology takes an ideographic approach that is the study of the single case which can yield insights and meanings. In the study of the individual case, a particular society, for example, interpretive anthropology does not look at how people behave as much as the meanings which persons's living in the society give to their actions and behavior. These meanings are conveyed through the use of symbols which stand for values, codes and rules. This viewpoint does not deny the material world, but believes that the material and social world of humans can be best understood by listening to the way person living in the society explain and understand their institutions and customs. The job of the anthropologists is to interpret the "Interpretations" of the 'natives.

Clifford Geertz

Geertz is the theoretical leader if not founder, of the approach to anthropology called "interpretive". He asserts that anthropology cannot aspire to be a science in the way that the physical sciences are, with law and generalizations based on empirical and verifiable data. Geertz believes that anthropology must be based on concrete reality, but from this reality, it derives meanings rather than predictions based on empirical data. Use of models, Geertz argues strips social analysis of its living qualities for models tend to be too abstract, anthropology

should base itself on the humanistic disciplines, utilizing description, poetics, literature, myths, symbols and features of human beings which differentiate them from other species.

Geertz is not the first to develop the idea that the human sciences are different from the natural sciences. German philosophers, like Rickert and Dilthey (Wilk 1984:276) believed the study of human phenomena should be historical and ideographic. As contrasted with the study of human phenomena which is abstract and generalizing. Ideographic studies are particular unique. They are based on the case study and as such, can capture the totality of life within a society in its complexity and variation. RUTH BENEDICT (1934) stressed the ideographic study, as did her mentor, Franz Boas. Benedict believed there was a discontinuity, in kind, between two whole cultures which as often overlooked in the process of cross cultural comparison and generalization.

German philosopher's believed that since human beings had the mental capacity for language and learned knowledge, that study of human society required method, techniques and orientations different from the study of their natural phenomena. Geertz and other humanistic anthropologists shared this view.

Miles Richardson makes the case for interpretive anthropology as a science of 'humanity. He believes interpretive anthropology combines that concept of culture as social interaction. He states that the search for underlying causes for human behavior oftentimes away the magic of real life.

Geertz sees the cultural context, not as a set of general propositions, but webs of significance, which humans spin and in which they operate as they go about their daily activities. In his view, to reduce the world to a cause and effect perspective is to miss the human mode of being. This is similar to Sartre's existentialist approach which, while edging the materialist basis for existence, insists on the importance of humans' everyday activities in any social analysis.

Geertz's view of the importance of the single case is not a radical break with the past. Boas, Malinowski and Radcliff-Brown used the study of a single culture in depth to derive insights about the functioning of human society. Again Geertz's belief that meaning in a society should be derived from the 'Native' point of view is not a radical departure from anthropologic tradition. The argument against ethnocentrism and the insistence on the integrity of all cultures is part of the perspective that tries to see other cultures from the "native" viewpoint. This was a strong element in Boasian anthropology.

Geertz's orientation to seek meanings based on the "native" view is frankly relativistic. It is designed to make the anthropologists sensitive to views other than his or her own. But it does not accept nihilism or an "anything goes" attitude. Rather, what Geertz seeks is self-knowledge, self-perception, self-understanding that sorts out who the observer is and who the people are that he is trying to understand. In his book "Local Knowledge". Geertz's interest in the individual case, seeks knowledge by starting from the base of native knowledge and combining with that of the observer.

Geertz's perspective in anthropology can be called humanistic as well as interpretive, in the sense that it aims for expositions which retain the individuality and complexity of

human behavior usually found in literature and art. He argues that a work of fiction, a play, a painting, or a poem captures and provides insights into the human conditions often missed by abstruse theorizing. He likens his type of anthropology to a “sort of cultural hermeneutics, semantics of action.”

Criticism on Geertz’s Interpretive approach

Most anthropologists agree with the position that there is room in anthropology from both theorizing and concrete interpretation of a particular. Disagreement arises only when Geertz makes claim for the superiority of his approach. He calls his orientation more human! Shankman counters this claim saying that the test of superiority should be based on whether it provides a better understanding of particular phenomena.

There are two assumptions in Geertz’s interpretive anthropology which could be subject to challenge. One is that a scientific approach is necessarily a dehumanizing one. The second is that people reveal the essence of their culture through symbolic forms. One could argue that scientific theory and data have been employed ‘against’ the dehumanizing phenomena of fascism, sex determination, ethnocentrism and superstition. One could also argue that people are unaware of the symbolic significance of their actions, ideas and values. Therefore, a theory of culture benefits from the interpretive approach using the data of natives, as well as the scientific approach using the models and categories of social scientific observers.

Geertz’s work has stressed that culture and social organization do not exist apart from individual but rather in and through individuals’ Interpretations of events and objects around them. He has thereby asserted the idea that the social order is both subjective and objective, a matter of individual values and motivations, yet bound up in public symbols and communication.

It is interesting to compare Geertz’s ideas with that of Heidegger (1972), trust according to whom is sought through human engagement with the world. For Heidegger, hermeneutics, or interpretive understanding is not a way of knowing the world: it is the way we are. It is the basic form of human existence. Interpretation is not a tool: it is the essence of being human. He believes that there is no way for the subject/observer to separate himself or herself from the object/observed. In this view, the search for knowledge is conditioned by culture, context, and history.

Gadamer (1975) insisted that consciousness is not historically neutral, as thought by Descartes, rather, it is historically built up and is shaped by ways of seeing, by attitudes, and concepts embedded in our language and in our cultural norms and styles. Gadamer does not believe in the possibility of the social sciences carrying humans beyond their culturally shaped context to some standpoint from which they can see the things in themselves. Geertz’s view of anthropology shares these perspectives of Heidegger and Gadamer.

Summary

To summarize interpretive and humanistic anthropology of Geertz, we may say the

problem of meaning is part of the problems of understanding in the social sciences. Positivism, a philosophic approach to understanding the world that dates from the nineteenth century, is an approach to knowledge based on sense perception and logic. The traditional anthropological view is that, if one is to understand the cultures of other people, one must take on the roles of others. Malinowski believed that only by actually doing what the native did could one understand, what it meant to him. Geertz argues for a “native” point of view as one road to anthropological understanding. He went beyond this to add an interpretive approach allied to hermeneutics. In this approach, interpretations are assembled, one set of perceptions compared with one another. The perception and knowledge of the observer are welded to those of the native. The medium for the comparison is a system of symbols which give meaning to individual and social life.

With the compilation of interpretations of texts, actions, symbols, social forms and events, understanding slowly emerges. It is then presented in the form of “thick description”.

Which leads to an understanding of the meaning of one’s own, as well as other cultures. This briefly, is the interpretive and humanistic anthropology. It is based, in part, on new trends in scientific methodologies in the human sciences. These methodologies and perspectives have modified the traditional, empirical epistemologies in favour of interpretive ones.

Yet the significance of Geertz’s interpretive approach is amply borne out by what Edward Tylor, the nineteenth century pioneer in anthropology wrote, “The power of using words as signs to express thought, with which their sound does not directly connect them, in fact as arbitrary symbols, is the highest grade of the special human faculty in language. The presence of which binds together all races of mankind in substantial mental unity.” The perception of the use of symbols as significant human feature has become an important object of study in anthropology. Susanne Langer sees it as a changing trend in modern human intellectual activity.

Questions

- 1) Explain the nature and significance of interpretive approach of Clifford Geertz ? How does it help in understanding any culture ?
- 2) Why and how does Geertz claim superiority of his methodology ? How is he criticized for this claim ?

References

- * Schutz, The Problem of Social Reality
- * H. Applebaum, Symbolic and Humanistic Anthropology
- * Clifford Geertz, Interpretive Anthropology.

POST - MODERNIST ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction

The beginnings of the discipline of anthropology are inextricably bound up with the project of colonialism. It is this context that 'modernist' anthropology began to acquire a specific form and established certain disciplinary conventions. 'Modernism' is a term drawn from the study of literature and art. Applied to anthropology, it broadly refers to the years between the 1920s and the mid-1970s. Modernist anthropology thus evidently survived the demise of the political project of colonialism.

In this section we are going to survey one of the more important recent trends in theoretical anthropology, namely 'post-modernist' anthropology. But in order to do that we need to first clarify the notion of a modernist anthropology. Analysts suggest that some of the attributes of modernist writing in anthropology were 'detachment', "the assumption of a position of scientific neutrality and 'rationalism'".

Post-modernists challenge these assertions. They maintain that claims about the successful application of the above-mentioned attributes, by the discipline of anthropology, are distorted or at best, true in only a very limited sense; they believe that 'objective' 'neutral' knowledge of another culture (or any aspect of the world) is impossible. The post-modernist challenge has led anthropologists to examine the epistemological basis of their discipline.

Lessons From Interpretive Anthropology

The roots of the post-modern approach to anthropology lie, in part, in the growing interest of anthropologists in the field of hermeneutics that gained popularity within the social sciences in the 1970s. Elaborating on the etymological roots of the hermeneutic perspective, Vincent Crapanzano says, "The ethnographer is a little like the Greek god Hermes: a messenger who, presents languages, cultures, and societies in all their opacity, their fireignness, their meaninglessness; then like the magician, the hermeneut, Hemes himself, he clarifies the opaque, renders the foreign familiar and gives meaning to the meaningless. He decodes the message. He interprets."

This perspective does not accept the view that observers can derive neutral and objective knowledge about the world. They challenge the cherished ethnographic stance that there is a clear separation between the observer and the observed. It thus collapses one of the humans cannot have knowledge

about the world that is not tinged by a particular perspective or bias.

Knowledge, they assert, is conditioned by culture, context and history. According to this philosophy, because we cannot separate our ways of knowing from our language and culture, it is impossible for us to interpret the world in a truly detached, objective manner. We all interpret the world around us in our own way, based on our language, cultural background and personal experiences.

They 'Scientific perspective' too, the hermeneutics claim, did not allow humans to see beyond their culturally shaped contexts. In fact the post-modernists (who, in their turn, are quite influenced by the hermeneutic perspective) would point out that in the social sciences there is always a 'privileging', that is, giving special credence to certain types of explanation and discounting others.

They argue that Western social sciences has privileged a particular type of analysis: that which follows the model used in the physical sciences. The closer an explanation is to this model, the more "true" the information it generates, and the higher the prestige of the field that uses it. Thus scientific disciplines are seen not as repositories of a higher and superior knowledge system but merely as yet another articulation of conventional codes - complete with its own set of traditions and dogma.

Finally, post modernists maintain that if a text is an author's interpretation and if that author's work is taken as an authoritative account, then all other voices and interpretations are silenced. Because everything is an interpretation in the post modern view, the only way authors can generate an interpretation that is accepted as true is to "delicense" all other interpretations.

But can one person's interpretation be more valid than another's? Post-modernists maintain that it cannot. They insist that the acceptance of an interpretation is ultimately an issue of power and wealth. Historically, they say, the interpretations voiced by white Protestant males in Western industrialized nations have delicensed all others and silenced them. They claim that deconstructing the work of this mainstream allows other opinions to be expressed. Post-modernists assert that in history, literature and politics, the voices of women, minorities and the poor are finally being heard.

Self-reflexivity in Anthropology

Another important feature of post-modernist anthropology is its almost unrelenting focus on anthropologists themselves and their methods, rather than the product of their work. Paul Rabinow draws our attention to this fact when he observes that, "James Clifford (a post-modern anthropologist) takes as his natives, as well as his informants, anthropologists, who are, in fact, the ones being observed and inscribed". Post-modern anthropology proposes to tell us the significance of the background thoughts and motives of anthropologists to the eventual written "texts" that they produce. There is today an emphasis on 'self-reflexivity' in the anthropological discipline rather than an unproblematic

observation and recording of the ways of life of the Other (people; culture).

The focus on the act of writing itself was first seen in the more revealing style in which some anthropologists began to write ethnographies in the later 1960s and early 1970s. For writers in the post-modern tradition, this self-reflectiveness is not simply a more straight forward form of reportage. The recounting of field experiences can become the narrative device by which anthropological understanding is conveyed.

This navel-gazing has led many anthropologists to ask a variety of new questions about their own work and the work of other (often prominent) anthropologists. Some of the most important of these issues involve 'the conduct of field-work', the literary techniques used in the writings of ethnographies' and 'the validity of the author's interpretations over competing alternatives'.

The Authority of the Anthropologist

Renato Rosaldo in his essay titled 'Grief and a Headhunter's Rage'. give voice to the complex issues that need to be addressed when discussing the validity of an author's interpretation.' He contends that, "If classic ethnography's vice was the slippage from the ideal of detachment to actual indifference, that of present-day reflexivity is the tendency for the self-absorbed self to lose sight altogether of the culturally different Other." The post-modern perspective implies that accounts produced by ethnographers depend upon their 'positioning'. that is, the vantage point from which they view and analyze society. Their positioning is, in turn, contingent on their life experiences rather than being derived from any uniform application of scientific method.

The logical extension of this is that post-modern ethnographies are often highly introspective. They become tales about the ethnographer's experiences. The subject of such work is generally the ethnographer's increasing understanding of himself or herself and the people with whom he or she is living. This self-revelatory or confessional style of anthropological writing has increasingly come to characterize many post-modern ethnographies.

Personal experience serves as a vehicle for making the quality and intensity of a "foreign" cultural practice more readily accessible to readers than certain more detached modes of composition. At the same time, by invoking personal experience as an analytical category the anthropologist risks easy dismissal. Further, rather than writing conventional anthropological reports, post-modernists tend to write about the process of doing field-work.

Lessons from Literary Criticism

One strand of post-modern anthropology takes apart and examines the rhetorical devices that anthropologists use in constructing their ethnographic accounts. At this point it is useful however to acknowledge that, text metaphors for culture and society notwithstanding, the ethnographer has no primary or

independent text that can be read and translated by others, Consequently, despite it's a historical pretense, ethnography is historically determined by the moment of the ethnographer's encounter with whomever he is studying.

Traditional anthropology favour interpretations that equate analytical "depth" with cultural "elaboration". Most ethnographers prefer to study events that have definite locations in space with marked centers and outer edges. Temporality they have middles and endings. Historically, they appear to repeat identical structures by seemingly doing things today as they were done yesterday. Their qualities of fixed definitoin liberate such events from the untidiness of everyday life. Ritual and routine rather than an open-ended human process characterizes the framework of these ethnographies. However by eliminating intense emotions these ethnographies not only distort their descriptions but also remove potentially key variables from their explanations. They thus become ready to be "read" like articles, books or as we now say "texts".

Throughout the history of our discipline, anthropologists have claimed to be authorities on other cultures. They have fortified this claim by emphasizing the mystique of fieldwork and by explaining other cultures to their audience through written descriptions. Most anthropological writing has been built on a scientific model. Essays are written as reports, almost always in the third person. In contrast, post-modern ethnographers prefer a conversational tone, using first and second person narratives.

Writing ethnography is the primary means by which anthropologists convey their interpretations of other cultures and ethnographies have traditionally followed some basic literacy conventions. These typically include literary conventions that claim to represent the native point of view. Another common rhetorical device of Anglo-American ethnography is that writers claim to completely describe other cultures or societies even though anthropologists actually know only the part of a culture that they personally experience. One of the more insidious writing conventions is that of the omniscient narrator, the authoritative third-person observer who replaces the fallible first person. The use of the omniscient narrator heightens the sense of scientific objectivity projected by the text, but it also serves the relationship between what the ethnographer knows and how he or she came to know it.

Vincent Crapanzano in his essay "Hermes" Dilemma' examines the construction of ethnographies as literary texts and deconstructs three different types of ethnographic accounts. The hermeneutic premise behind Crapanzano's work is that while data of themselves are mute, anthropologists construct meaning by writing ethnographies. Because one must write according to certain literary conventions (tense, voice and so on), the act of writing is a literary construction of the writer. Readers in turn impose their own interpretation on the author's text. In other words the writing and reading of ethnographic text involves the piling of layer upon layer of interpretation. In his analysis Crapanzano deconstructs the literary devices (peels back some of the layers used by the authors in order to better understand the biases that influenced their writing.

Anthropology as Cultural Critique

Further, one of the principle motivations for post modern interpretive anthropology is 'culture critique'. For the post-modernist, anthropology allows the opportunity to reflect upon

and analyze the culture of our own society as much as it allows for the analysis of the other. The anthropologist then is conditioned not only by this experiences but by his own culture and in order to examine and explain "foreign" cultural practices, he must also examine and explain his own cultural practices.

Anthropology then becomes a dialogue, a negotiation of interpretation between ethnographers and the cultures they purport to study. By acknowledging that anthropology's methodological caution against the reckless attribution of one's own categories and experiences to the members of another culture (ethnocentrism) can sometimes harden into a prejudicial doctrine: that, "my own group aside, everything human is alien to me", post-modern anthropology hopes to achieve a balance between recognizing wide-ranging human differences and the modest truism that any two human groups must have certain things in common.

The Critique of Field work Methodology

Anthropologists in the 1960s were concerned with the methodology of data collection, Ethnoscience and cognitive anthropologists, reacting to the lack of preparation of most fieldworkers, prescribed very specific types of training and interviewing, such as controlled eliciting, to attempt to produce scientifically valid, replicable results. It, on the other hand, anthropology is about the interpretation of culture, they it is dependent on the life experiences of the anthropologist, and training can never be adequate and can never produce scientific, replicable result. Post-modernists insist on good training in language and ethnography, but they do not believe that such skills will result in a scientific anthropology.

The conduct of fieldwork is critical issue because traditionally most ethnography has contained very little information on the actual process of research. Post-modernists agree that it is precisely this process that is crucial in the creation of ethnographic texts. They believe that anthropologist can never be unbiased observers of all that goes on in a culture. Further, for post-modernists, culture itself is always historically contingent. The actions of individuals and the derivation of meaning within cultures cannot be explained without reference to specific sociohistorical circumstances. Fieldworkers must, of necessity be in specific places at specific times. As a result they see certain things and not others. The particular circumstance of fieldwork, the political context in which it occurs, the investigator's preferences and predilections, and the people met by chance or design- all critically condition the understanding of society that results. Ethnography has traditionally been written as if the

anthropologist was a neutral, omniscient observer. Post-modernists claim however, that because the collection of anthropological data is subjective, it is not possible to analyse the data objectively.

Post-modern Anthropology Critiqued

Post-modernism has been one of the most controversial developments in anthropology, and its critics are also raising telling points. Many scholars vigorously defend anthropology as an empirical science. They argue that although some aspects of ethnographic data collection are subjective it is not impossible to do empirically objective anthropology. Additionally many scholars critical of the post-modernist view agree that his position pursued to its logical extreme, must result in nihilism. It is important to its extreme, post-modernism comes very close to turning anthropology into a sub-field of literature. However it is more useful to see it as a product of the interpretative, tendency in anthropology that goes back to the Boasians. A.L. Kroeber had a Master's degree in Literature and Ruth Benedict was a published poet. Post-modernism has not replaced positivism in anthropology. From culture ecology to neo-Marxism, the positivist tradition is alive and well. Post-modernism can be seen as part of a continuing dialectic between scientific and humanistic approaches to the discipline. It is not the end of anthropology as some of the post-modernists would have us believe, but part of the field's continuing history and offers valuable methods of analysis.

Conclusion

A moderate post-modern position offers significant insights to anthropologists. First as writers of ethnographies should be aware of the crises of representation. The textualisation inherent in the ethnographic craft contained rhetoric and domination, based as it was, on the anthropologists unilateral advantage over the other. Authority thus could not be distinguished from authorship. An awareness of the rhetorical issues can inform and enrich the anthropologists own writing and help them evaluate both their own and other's claims to objectivity. The works of Malinowski and Evans-Pritchard were examined in this perspective and books like Clifford Geertz's 'Lives and works' were written.

Beyond this, hermeneutic philosopher reminds us that ethnographies are literary creations, so it becomes possible to think of cultures as the poetic interplay of voices and performances. Cultures, instead of being read as texts, can be viewed of performances in which the anthropologists participated. Understanding this can allow ethnographers greater insight into the complexities of cultures and invites them to consciously consider their specific effect on those they study. It may thus aid them in seeing individual differences, conflict and fragmentation within cultures. Instead of constructing complete models based on 'holism' and 'final cause' explanations there is a move towards recognizing the surrealistic 'fragment', the 'finality' and 'the pastiche' as guides to ethnographic practice. This is strikingly revealed in the emerging perspectives and forms of analysis referred to as 'creolisation' and 'post-structuralism.' This is most evident in the writing of Leo

Drummond and James Clifford.

Rather than throwing anthropology into a relativistic black hole, the post-modern critique demands that we ask new and challenging questions and thus opens realms for ethnographic research. For example, anthropologists must now ask how new forms of authority and voices other than their own can be included in ethnography. As George Marcus asks, “who is to be included or excluded from having a voice in the development of knowledge about society and culture?” Anthropologists must determine what kind of information can be counted as knowledge. Asking these questions can, for example, lead to a welcome recognition and incorporation of gender and class issues which in turn could revolutionise the anthropological enterprise. This view-point can be substantiated by recalling that the present crises in anthropological theory started with the post-colonial trauma. It is in the rebellion of the practitioners against the heritage of the invisibility and muteness of Third World in anthropological investigation that we can locate the beginnings of one strand of post-modernist anthropology.

The conflict between ‘post modernists’ and those who view anthropology as a science stems largely from their differing opinions of the purpose of anthropology. If we agree that the goal of anthropology is to describe and explain human affairs and teach a reader the subjective meaning of the human experience, then the scientific and post-modern goals of anthropology can be understood as complementary.

Question

1. Elaborate on the critique of traditional anthropology as outlined by the post-modernists.
2. What according to you are the distinctive features of a post-modern anthropology? How would you evaluate its contribution to the debate on “fieldwork methodology?”

POST STRUCTURALISM

Symbolic/Interpretative Aoorach (Victor Turner)

Objective

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ Nature of symbolic anthropology
- ❖ Victor turner's views on symbolic anthropology
- ❖ Interpretive approach
- ❖ Victor turner's views on symbolic anthropology
- ❖ A case study in symbolic anthropology
- ❖ Turner's theory of religion
- ❖ Turner's epistemological perspective
- ❖ Social drama and ritual process
- ❖ Ritual symbols.

Introduction

Edward Taylor, the nineteenth century referred to the power of using words a sign to express thoughts with which their sound does not directly connect them. He also regarded language or symbolic communication to be the highest grade of human faculty, the presence of which binds together all races of mankind in substantial mental unity.

Symbols are objects, events speech sounds or written forms to which humans attribute meaning. The primary form of symbolizing by human beings is through language, but humans also communicate by using signs and symbols in art, dance, music, architecture, facial expressions, gestures, body postures, clothing, ritual, religion, kinship, nationality, space arrangements and material possessions, among many other things.

Human beings can attribute meaning, to any event, action, or object which can evoke thought, idea, and emotion. The perception of the use of symbols as a significant human feature has become an important object of study in anthropology.

Leslie white (1940), in an article on humans as a symbolizing species, pointed to the importance of context in the meaning of symbols. Ernest Cassirer argues that without a complex of symbols, relational thought would be inexpressible. Humans have the capacity to isolate relations and consider them in their abstract meaning. Geometry, for example, conceptuality deals with universals

spatial relationships for which expression there is a symbolic language and a form of representation. Yet, this abstract system can be applied to building problems. Cassirer expresses the symbolic nature of human experience as follows.

“No longer in a merely physical universe man lives in a symbolic universe. Language, myth, art and religion are parts of this universe. They are the varied threads which weave the symbolic net, the tangled web of human progress in thought and experience. All human progress in thought and experience refines upon and strengthens this net.”

Nature of Symbolic Anthropology :

Symbolic anthropology views human beings as the carriers and products, as subjects and objects, of a system of signs and symbols which serve as a means of communication to impart knowledge and messages. These provide the foundation for action and behavior, as well as ideas and values. The symbolic theory of culture is a model of human beings as a symbolizing species, as compared with a materialist theory of culture based on humans as primarily a producing species.

The symbolic definition of culture is part of a trend which sees culture as the science of meanings. Symbolic anthropologists study the system of the codes and message received by human beings through their interaction with other human beings and with the natural world. The entire universe is perfused with signs, says Charles Peirce, who laid the foundations for the discipline of semiotics. The fact that all creatures communicate with some form of sign and symbol, symbolic anthropology is engaged in research which is universal in scope.

Most of the knowledge, thoughts, feelings and perception of human beings are wrapped in language, a symbol system. Words convey meanings or name and classify objects and thoughts. As such, they are conceptual perception of the world, couched in symbol. Word symbol, languages are appropriate to a society at a particular time and place. The world planet meant something different in the first century than it does in the twentieth. Language and its development provide the foundation for the symbolic view of culture. Linguistics, the study of language, has given the symbolic anthropologists the techniques with which to unravel the codes which represent the complex of motives, experiences, and knowledge which shape and express beliefs and actions. Thus, linguistics is the historical forerunner of symbolic anthropology.

The philosophical ideas of Immanuel Kant provide an important base to the orientation of symbolic and semiotic anthropologists, as does the structuralism of Levi-Strauss. Kant developed a general theory of symbolic forms. He argued that there were basic structures of thinking which were independent of the

content of thought. Kant claimed that humans had no direct insight into the real world. It was only certain “pure” intellectual concepts, he believed, like those of possibility, existence, necessity, substance, cause, time and place that enable humans to have the descriptive tools to gain knowledge about the external world. As Kant put it, in knowing, it is not the mind that conforms to things, but things that conform to the mind (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1985, Vol 22:493-194).

Human knowledge is wrapped in language, a symbol system. Words convey knowledge, and knowing is couched in words. Words, which become signs when written, are appropriate to particular societies at particular of person with a historic tradition and a particular system of communication. Symbolic analysis can proceed on an individual or a societal level.

The outside world and the subjective view of it are intertwined. Subject become one in the cognitive and symbolic view. Event, objects, and experiences are embedded in a set of meanings, enmeshed in a system of cultural symbols. Reality exists out there, not as pure experience or as pure events. It the symbolic perspective culture is the meaningful aspect of concert or objective reality and the coming-to-be, the appropriate to consciousness of objective reality.

According to Victor Turner, symbolic anthropology are classified into two groups

The abstract systems groups which includes linguists, system groups which includes linguists, structuralists and cognitive anthropology, (this group concentrates on formal analysis and is less concerned with content than with content with methods and logics)

The symbols and social dynamics group, includes semiotics and symbolic anthropology, sociolinguistic, folklorist and literary critics (this group tries to combine the formal analysis with content and perception and meaning with social action).

Victor Turner’s views on Symbolic Anthropology

Turner points out that signs are deliberate constructs for precise communicative purposes and, as such, play an important role in social action, particularly in technical, political and economic action. In technology, there is the cad/cam computer system to derive machines. In politics, there are posters and pictures of leaders used to foster national support, for leaders and their programmes. In economics, there are indexes which signal the growth or decline of the economy and can stimulate or put a brake on actions in the market place.

Wherever symbol systems are guides to action, they operate within a social context this gives a symbol or a sign its specific meaning, which may vary from one social context to another. The word father has one meaning within a kinship structure, and a different one within the context of the catholic religious structure. Society is the result of the intersecting actions and behaviors

of persons occupying different boundaries and social contexts. Signs and symbols are cues which set humans in motion. In the symbolic view, the combinations of signs, symbols and context give meaning and interpretation to human actions and behavior.

To summarize, 'symbolic anthropology' is based on the notion that members of a society share a system of symbols and meanings called culture'. The system represents the reality in which people live. Symbolic anthropologists stress system, whether it is loosely or tightly integrated, since members of a society must articulate and share to some degree. If communication is the 'since quo non' of human society, symbolizing (Leslie White' term), signing and conveying meaning on thoughts and actions, as what defines a culture. Symbolic anthropology is dedicated to studying and researching the process by which people give 'meaning' to their world and their actions in it.

Interpretive Approach

Humanistic or interpretive anthropology seeks to redirect cultural anthropology from a strategy of finding causal explanations for human behavior to one that seeks the interpretations and meaning in human action. It is a strategy which seeks the humanities rather than science as the model for anthropology. It seeks analogies based on there, play drama and literature rather than those based on crafts, mechanics and organic structures.

Humanistic anthropology is mentalist in its orientation, seeing culture as a system of ideas, values and meaning. Interpretive or humanistic anthropology eschews the search for causal explanation in favour of a hermeneutic approach which seeks meanings through interpretations of behaviors or texts.

Interpretive anthropology does not look at how people behave as the meaning which persons living in the society give to their actions and behavior. These meanings are conveyed through the use of symbols which stand for values, codes and rules. This viewpoint does not deny the material world but believes that the material and social world of human can be best understood by listening to the way persons living in the society explain and understand their institutions and customs. The job of the anthropologists is to interpret the interpretations of the "Natives".

A Case Study in Symbolic Anthropology

Mary Douglas, Professor of anthropology at University College, London writes on 'Social and Religious Symbolism of the Lele'. Like many other primitive peoples, the Lele have no systematic theology, not even any half-systematized body of doctrines through which their religion can be studied. There exists a bewildering variety of prohibitions, falling on certain people all the time. However, we need to appreciate their idea of propriety, their ideals of

womanhood and manhood and of personal cleanliness in order to interpret their rites.

The Lele grow maize, hunt, weave raffia and draw palm wine. Of all their activities, hunting is the highest in their own esteem. It is not surprising that the richest vein of symbolism is derived from reflections on the animal world, on its relation to the human sphere, and on the relations between the different breeds of birds and beasts. They are hunters and yet they feel certain sympathy with other living inhabitants of their land.

The idea of the basic distinction, the opposition between mankind and animal kind, is expressed by the Lele by relating it to one dominant value, the virtue of 'buhonyi', which means shame, shyness or modesty. The most shameless animal according to them is the dog who shares his master's domestic life but never acquires the human virtue of Buhonyi.

Buhonyi is the sense of propriety. It is nothing less than the reaction of the nicely cultivated person to any improper behavior. It provides the standard for all social relations. Infants are not expected to feel it, but the informal training of childhood is directed to awakening a lively sense of buhonyi. If a whole moral code can be summed up in one word, such as honor, or charity, for the Lele it would be 'Buyhonyi'.

Symbolic anthropologists can thus understand and interpret the intricacies of people's behavior only by sharing their language or symbol system. Which conveys specific meanings and influence the process of social interaction and interpersonal relations.

Turner's Theory of Religion

Victor Turner is known to have developed the processual symbolic analysis. His analyses have made a major contribution to our understanding of the interconnections of symbols in the ritual process and the relation which may be observed between ritual and social structure.

Turner has developed symbolic anthropology approach to the study of meaning in religion. He has taken the model of social drama, of ritual performance and symbolic activity as comparative paradigms and applied them to a broader field of religious and cultural analysis in literate societies. The model of social drama has become, for Turner, the processual structure of social action itself.

a. Turner's Epistemological Perspective

Turner's theoretical approach and his description of religious forms and processes are guided by two epistemological relations. One set relates sociocultural forms to a condition of particularity of the individual historical event, it is expressed in Blake's line from Jerusalem 'general forms have their vitality in particulars, and every particular is a man.' The second set of epistemological

relations connects the general forms of the historical event to a “condition of indeterminacy” which Turner relates to liminality and antistructure. This condition of indeterminacy, present below the general form in every particular is, for Turner, the sources of constant change and of social and cultural innovation.

These two epistemological perspectives of Turner have enabled him to observe the social fact as an historical formation within a field of plurality of facts and secondary to connect structure to process and to time. This is a significant possibility for the theory and analysis of religion which are intrinsically dynamic and related to the condition of change and innovation.

b. Social Drama and Ritual Process

At its simplest, the drama consists of a four stage model, proceeding from the breach of some relationship regarded as crucial in the relevant social group through a phase of rapidly mounting crisis in the direction of the group's major dichotomous cleavage, to the application of legal or ritual means of redress or reconciliation between the conflicting parties which compose the action set. The final stage is either the public and symbolic expression of reconciliation or else of irremediable schism. This social process in which normative breaches are redressed and crisis are resolved or recognized in their permanent schematic character “occurs within groups bounded by shared values of persons and interests and having a real or alleged common history.

Social ritual and cultural paradigms are transformed in the social drama into metaphors and symbols which enables the mobilization of political power and which determine a trial of strength between influential paradigm bearers in the socio-cultural setting. When social drama erupts into the normal course or social life, it forces the group to assess its own pattern of behavior and the relation to values enunciated by the group. In other words, ‘drams include and contain reflexive processes and generated cultural frames in which reflexivity can find a legitimate place.’

In Turner's ethnological studies, ritual process appears primarily as a mechanism for the redress of social tension; later, ritual is understood to be a source of innovation. Although the ritual process is related to the phases of crisis resolution in the social drama. It reveals and differentiates in symbolic form, a modality of meaning which cannot be identified as the expression or reflection of social structure, Ritual inverts.

The forms of perception, the dynamics and the order expressed in the structural system; it articulates a vision of reality which becomes the test of legitimation within society.

Ritual has dramatic processual structure and an inherent temporal form which co-ordinates three stages of symbolic performance. The first stage is that of deconstruction, the second is a symbolic and structural condition of liminality; the third consists of a condition of differentiation. These three stages of the

ritual process are correlated into a dramatic unity. This unity is a complex fact which shows a level of formalization and is related to innovation and change.

Turner's approach sharply differentiates ritual from social ceremony which is linked with social status; he shows the modalities by which ritual is a generative structure within the process of life and the condition of existence and experience.

Turner sees social as systematic and systematizing but culture as a mere stock of unconnected items. Symbols are multivocal functions simultaneously combining affectivity and cognition. They have a liminal character which is dynamic and structural and therefore distinguishes them from those forms which are articulated by the social structure.

The work of Victor Turner contains an extensive analysis of the liminal phase in rites of passage. One of the most significant aspects of Turner's contribution to the study of religious forms, is the integration which he is able to make in the analysis of ritual performance, between the historical dimension of 'event and' the character of passage noticed by Van Gennep who discovered a sequential structure in his comparative work on 'rites de passage'. By connecting the tripartite structure of ritual to the development of social drama, Turner extends the understanding of liminality by defining the processual character of its Sociological, symbolic and experiential features. It would seem that Turner understands the ritual symbolic process to be the paradigmatic structure of the religious function.

c. Ritual Symbols

For Turner, symbols are essentially dynamic systems of signifiers which operate in the context of temporal sociocultural processes. The significance of symbols and their dynamic properties as factors in social action becomes evident when ritual performances are viewed as intrinsic to those social processes where by groups adjust to internal change and adapt to their external environment. Turner observes the temporal dimension of symbolic function by correlating the sequence of the symbols in a given ritual process with the relative dominance of particular symbols within the ritual system.

Turner speaks of 'dominant' symbols which refer to "non-empirical" beings, powers or types of efficacy. They appear in the rituals of affliction and those of life crises which Turner studied among the Nidembu. Two types of dominant symbols are distinguished the first (for example a series of specific trees, plants or other natural objects or colours) attain their significance through relative position in the ritual sequence. The second type (for example the shrines at which particular rituals take place or the medicines administered to ritual subjects) acquire meaning from their configuration and integration of several distinct symbolic elements within a single form of symbolic unity.

As indicators of primary values, dominant symbols also possess an

inherent continuity of meaning and therefore some considerable degree of independence from the aims of the particular ritual in which they may appear since symbols are intrinsically related to action, they are understandable only as dynamic structures of meaning within the social drama and which defines the semantic character, both dynamic and cognitive, of the historical event.

d. The individual experience in Ritual Process

Turner has stressed that symbols have an experiential character related to the mental life of the individual, who participate in the ritual process. Symbols are intrinsically related to processes of meaning and interpretation which the individual actors express in the social drama. The symbols do not, however, define individualistic dimensions of experience but, rather, ethos and morality as they are generated and specified with the liminal conditions of the communities.

In this regard, Turner's theoretical position is consonant with that of Durkheim in sustaining that ethos is related to the condition of social bond. Turner however differs radically from Durkheim. For the latter, it is the order and normativity of society which structure value and transmit it to the individual. Social anomie, as absence of norm, is also absence of value and therefore entails destructive consequences for the individual. In contrast to this position of Durkheim, Turner suggests that morality is mediated not primarily by the structures of social normativity but by a condition of liminality and communities elaborated through symbolic processes. For Turner, social actions acquire their form through the metaphors and paradigms which are operative in the mental life of individual actors and not through the external imposition of structure.

e. Mental Character of the Symbolic Performance

A primarily psychological analysis constrains the meaning of symbols to functions of the mental life of individuals. In the anthropological analysis of symbols, it is, however, the public character of symbolic meaning and its functions as the mediating form of public action which is of primary concern. Turner states that "Symbols refer to social facts that have an empirical reality exterior to the psyches of individuals".

Turner conceptualizes dominant symbols as having two poles of meaning, namely ideological and sensory. At the ideological pole, a cluster of connotations is found which refer to the moral and social order. At the sensory or oretic pole, the connotations are usually physiological phenomena and processes which may be expected to have links with the unconscious. In ritual performance, the dominant symbol brings the ethical, moral norms of society into close contact with strong emotional stimuli.

Turner does not hold that symbols are the censored expressions of conflictual dynamics and wishes. Symbols are rather, related to value and creativity. They are not the expressions of dynamic determinism but instead,

forms which are related to freedom and innovation. Symbols are not to be understood as the repressed forms of individual self-interest but, on the contrary, as the public forms which evaluate and re-address the self-interest.

Turner's achievement has been to bring the dimension of time within the concept of social fact and to maintain the connection in an immediate relation to the motivations and action of individual.

Turner's method and concept of ritual process is essential to the understanding of the historical character of religion. As some scholars have noted; the meaning and significance of religious structures can only become apparent from the study of their relation to historical context.

As an expansion of Van Gennep's study of fact coming into being in rites of passage, Turner's temporal model allows for the definition of the relation which exists between social drama as paradigm of social fact and the ritual symbolic process.

To sum up, the symbolic performance in any ritual process refers to the bond of relation in which the object as well as the subject is the inspiration and dynamic source of an international form of life it is this bond which is expressed in the symbolic performance. Through the symbolic articulation, cognition, perception and value - orientation, as mental dimensions of human existence, are historically engaged and qualified by the international relation with the object. Symbols are the forms of such engagement with reality; they are its vision, its dynamics and judgement, in their systemic and processual articulation are the structure of vital relation which forms and sustains intentional life.

Summary

Turner's operative concepts and analytical methods have the advantage for showing how religious meaning as well as the semantics of different cultural forms, far from being a temporal scheme of exclusively the expression of innate structure, are the elaboration and structure of human drama in the social bond.

Questions

- 1) Examine the nature of symbolic anthropology, with particular reference to Victor Turner's views on it.
- 2) Explain Turner's epistemological perspective, focusing on his study of social drama and ritual process.
- 3) Write on the individual experience in a ritual process and symbolic performance.

Reference

- * Victor Turner: Drama, Fields and Metaphors;
- * Symbolic Action in Human Society (Ithaca; Cornell University Press, 1974) (Chicago: Aldine, 1969)
- * Mary Douglas, Symbolism

FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction

Women anthropologists in last two decades have turned their attention from rediscovering women and criticizing the male bias in Anthropology to the more particularistic and historically grounded studies that place gender at the center of analysis. These Feminist Anthropologists do not make broad generalizations. Their study is more in the nature of a dialogue among themselves. However they retain the critical stance with regard to the impact of hierarchy and power on the lives of women in their own and other cultures. They take diverse issues of women and try to give a theoretical explanation for the same.

They are rediscovering women. Their study so far concludes that asymmetry between men and women is a universal fact.

Development of Feminist Anthropology

Studies of women by women have come to the fore in many disciplines and anthropology is not an exception to this. Anthropology has studied communities comprising of men and women both but the experience of woman, the texture of their lives and their perspective on social events have rarely been reported. In the 20th Century some women anthropologists like Margaret Mead, Benedict, Seligman etc. emerged but they also lacked this perspective. Sexism in Anthropology persisted till recently.

In some Anthropological literature women anthropologists have described primitive matriarchies, where women were powerful. Yet they were no absolute matriarchs. At least in the public and political realms there was male dominance. It is a myth when women speak of their past power. It is a universal fact that female subordination exists in different forms and different degrees.

The question then was - is male dominance rooted in human biology and therefore immutable ? Are male female sex roles culturally patterned on biological foundation ? Is it so because nursing and caring mainly remains in the hands of women especially in the formative years ?

Contemporary feminist anthropology developed out of the 'anthropology of women of the 1970s. The modern feminist anthropology takes as its subject, not women but gender relations. It does not purport to speak for women, although it speaks extensively about women.

Feminist anthropology emphasized the importance of distinguishing biological sex from gender. Margaret Mead in 'Sex and Temperament' written

as early as 1935, had argued that considerable cultural variability exists in the definitions of femaleness and maleness. This idea was taken and developed by feminists in 1970s. They gave evidence for variability in what the categories of 'women' and 'men' mean in different cultural contexts. This demonstrates that biological difference between the sexes cannot be said to determine gender constructs. As a result there can be no unitary or essential meaning attributed to the category 'women'.

Anthropology of Women

Anthropology of woman was part of the process of questioning the male bias in the discipline. It was concerned with the visibility of women. This recognition was an important step because it ultimately brought into question many of the 'taken for granted' theoretic frameworks with the discipline 'Anthropology of Women' itself, such as the domestic/public and nature/culture distinctions. In this context Feminist anthropology was able to make significant theoretical advances, for example, breaking down the assumption that 'motherhood is natural to women'. The relationship of Feminist Anthropology is like the relationship of women's movement to Sociology.

Feminist Anthropology

Feminist Anthropology is women's perspective on women in anthropological studies. In the anthropological studies for a long time study on women was neglected, because the anthropologists were men and they could never think of understanding women in the latter's perspective. The male anthropologists referred to women with regard to the areas of marriage, family, inheritance and succession; but their public roles in the economy, polity and religion were never discussed. Women were therefore invisible in their studies.

Moreover in a male dominated patriarchal society women had no say in any matter even in the matters like their marriage and family life. In many cases women were so subjugated that they had no freedom of expression and of movement. Women did not think of themselves as individuals with one's own desires and ambitions, wishes and dreams. Hence there was a need for Feminist Anthropology to explore this area.

Feminist Anthropology is no doubt an offshoot of Feminism. Feminism as an ideology believes that there is universal subjugation of women all over the world for centuries and generation after generation. Since women are biologically different (but not unequal) they are treated socially and culturally lower than men and hence men think it to be their right to dominate women. This patriarchal approach crosses the limit of just the subjugation and domination relationship between women and men, but it goes beyond this. Men hold such positions in the society where by they can exploit, harass women and even be violent against them.

Feminist Anthropology Studies the life of woman in different cultures and tries

to arrive at some universal concepts and theories on women's life. Feminist Anthropology shares the aims of Anthropology but it has also developed in response to many of the insufficiencies and absences in disciplinary theorizing and practice. We should not be surprised therefore to find that Feminist Anthropology both mirrors and parallels the theoretical and conceptual revisions which are occurring within the discipline, as well as actually providing some new theoretical initiatives.

What does Feminist Anthropology do ?

Probably the most outstanding contribution Feminist Anthropology has made to the discipline has been the development of theories relating to gender identity and the cultural construction of gender. This has come to be called the Anthropology of Gender. It is a field of research which did not exist and could not have existed before the advent of a Feminist Anthropology. Now quite a number of male anthropologists are working in the Anthropology of gender. Now there is a growing interest relating to masculine identity and the cultural construction of masculinity.

Difference between Feminist Anthropology and Gender Anthropology

Feminist Anthropology is not the same as Gender Anthropology. Feminist Anthropology studies gender relations and not just the study of women. Gender Anthropology studies gender identity and gender construction. Thus gender becomes a common factor between the two. Both study gender as a principle of human social life. This distinction is important because, although Feminist Anthropology cannot be simply defined as women studying women, it is even more crucial when we come to define it as the 'study of' gender' that this is not taken to mean that Feminist Anthropology is only concerned with the cultural construction of gender and gender identity. Feminist Anthropology is much more than this. However it is equally important to realize that the 'Anthropology of Gender' as a field of inquiry is not strictly speaking a sub-discipline of Feminist Anthropology, because while it shares many of its concerns with Feminist Anthropology, there are those who study the 'Anthropology of Gender' from a non-feminist perspective.

Feminist Anthropology as a discipline

This suggests that while Feminist Anthropology cannot be defined as women studying women, there is some series in which it can and must be distinguished from those frameworks of enquiry which study gender of women from a non-feminist point of view. The difficulty is to answer the question as to what constitutes a feminist point of view ? We generally say that feminism is all about the difference it makes to consider things from a woman's point of view. In other words feminism is all about women's perspective. Here also another question comes. Are we talking about the point of view of the women who are studying or the women who are studied ? Are the point of view of

both identical ? To resolve this dilemma we have to ask another question i.e. Do women from a sociological category like race, class etc ? Is there a unitary woman's perspective women's point of view ? Actually women do not name a separate

universal identity to form a sociological category. There are no universal conditions, attitudes or views ascribed to this (group called) 'woman' but one thing that is common is that universal subordination of women and the oppression of women is found.

The ideas of woman's point of view presupposes some underlying 'sameness'. However there is no empirical evidence of any such sameness. The fact is that gender is always experienced through the media, family, class, race, imperialism etc. That is why it is difficult to isolate feminine identity. Yet Feminist Anthropology believes in the shared identity of women which transcends the existence of other forms of differences.

The problem of Sameness of Women

Anthropology of women was excellent at considering differences based on gender. What difference it made to be a woman, what difference it made to see from woman's point of view ? And what difference it makes to be a woman anthropologist ? The issue of gender difference then was explained in the context of cultural difference. What difference it made to be woman in one culture as apposed to another. The concept of cultural difference has always played a key role in social anthropology because on the basis of such differences that anthropology has historically identified its subjected 'other cultures'. Here too in the cross-cultural analysis it was found that woman's found that woman's subordination is common in culture. This is what is called 'sameness' by the Feminist Anthropologists. It applies to the idea of 'sameness' which underlies the notion of the shared woman's perspective. Black feminists have long argued that feminist politics and academic writing have the necessary assumption that there is a basis for unity and solidarity of 'womanhood'.

The Problem of difference of Women

Feminist Anthropologists are well aware of women's difference on account of cultural and historical variables. They also know that gender itself is cultural construction. In past Feminist Anthropology was concerned with registering only two forms of difference, gender difference and cultural difference. Now they specify the interconnection between gender difference, cultural difference, class difference and historical difference. They discuss things like penetration of capitalism, the impact of colonial domination, changing nature of family and other social institutions. The comparative perspective of feminist anthropology on all these issues and the way in which it has made gender relations central to any critical understanding of the nature of these processes, provides a challenge to many other areas of social science enquiry.

The distinctive contribution of Feminist Anthropology is that they make gender relations central to any sustained analysis of class and other social relations like for example, capitalist relations of production.

Recently Feminist Anthropology has been giving more attention to studying differences based on race, class and gender. Feminists very recently have turned their attention to the analysis of modern state particularly how change in the power structure also changes power relations and gender relations. Breaking down of discipline barriers, with the move towards multi-disciplinary scholarship, has been one of the most outstanding achievements of the feminist critique in the feminist scholarship which has not only radicalized other disciplines by its ‘inter-disciplinary approach’ but it has also set up a new standard of relationship between academic theory and practice.

Its emphasis on differences and on the relationship of gender differences to other forms of differences provides an opportunity to question the sole importance given to cultural difference by social anthropology. It is not to undermine the importance of cultural difference but to suggest that there are also other forms of differences in human life-like gender, class, race, culture, history etc. there are always experiences, constructed and mediated in inter-relations with each other. We cannot give more importance to one factor ignoring the other.

In human society these forms of differences work simultaneously. We cannot say whether a black woman is black first or woman first. How in specific context one form of difference may be more important than the other. The interaction between class, race and gender can be understood only in a historical and cultural context.

Sex and Gender

We know there are two major variables of human beings: male and female. The question is why male and female are treated differently in all cultures and in all societies? Anthropology studies biology, society and culture and therefore it is best to study human nature and human behaviour. Debate on the relative importance of nature versus nurture is of a long standing and unresolved yet.

Feminist Anthropology feels concerned about the questions of nature versus nurture with regard to the discussion of human sex roles and the question of sexuality. There is marked difference between male and female biology. But how far these differences go in determining the nature and behaviour of men and women? Again what role culture plays in determining human behaviour?

Anthropological answer to these questions is that “the biological nature of men and women should be seen not as a narrow enclosure, limiting the human organism but rather as a broad base upon which a variety of structures can be built’ Many of the behavioural and attitudinal differences between sexes emerge from culture rather than biology. Sex differences are biological but gender encompasses all the traits that a culture assigns to and inculcates in males and females. Gender refers to the cultural construction of male and female characteristics. Gender roles vary with environment, economy, adaptive strategy and type of political system.

This distinction between biological sex and social gender has proved very crucial for the development of feminist analysis in the social sciences, because it has enabled scholars to demonstrate that the relations between men and women and the symbolic meaning associated with ‘men’ and ‘women’ are socially constructed and are not determined by biological.

Cross-cultural studies have empirically provided that gender differences and gender relations are culturally and historically variable.

The binary sex differences exist but they do not determine gender and relations. So,

1. This is radical difference between (biological) sex and (cultural) gender.
2. Gender differences are cultural devices to manage sex differences and deal with the problem of biological and social reproduction.
3. In human society sexual intercourse and human reproduction are not just physiological processes but they are also social activities. Therefore even the notion of sex like the concept of gender is constructed within a set of social meanings and practices. Sex is not a pre-social fact and it is not a raw material for gender construction.

According to the above idea gender should be freed from the assumption about the biological base of sex. This idea falls in line with Feminist Anthropology. The fact is that all cultures give meaning to body through their cultural discourses like various rituals, ceremonies, practices dealing with power potency, cosmology, fertility, death etc. that means society understands sex through the discourse of sex and therefore understanding of sex is also socio-cultural. How much more male is a man and female a woman depends on the culture. This is a very new feminist idea.

Gender Inequality

Genetic foundation of personality has a wide range which overlap for men and women. If men and women are not identical then it is also not true that men are aggressive by nature and women are passive.

We find that life cycle and life situation is asymmetrical for men and women which is in favor of men. Their roles are different. The contrast begins with the universal role of women in bearing and raising children within the domestic setting. Daughters will become like their mother but the sons will have to be weaned away from their mother’s emotional bonds and physical dependence and introduced to the world of men. Various ceremonies and rituals at different turning points of life keep reminding the boy that is becoming a

man and the girl that she is becoming a woman. This means there are genetic potentialities for culturally standardized contrasts between women's and men's roles and personalities.

Gender roles are the tasks and activities that a culture assigns to the sexes. Gender stereotypes are related to gender roles which are strongly held ideas about the characteristics of male and female.

Gender stratification describes an unequal distribution of rewards (socially valued resources like power, prestige, personal freedom etc.) between men and women, reflecting their different positions in a social hierarchy. In spite of great variability in gender construction why there is universal subordination of woman to men? The answer is not the biological factor but the socio-cultural one. According to one opinion women work in domestic sphere and men in public sphere which gives them more access to better resources. Marxists also called men productive and women reproductive. Another opinion is that the power depends on the extent to which a person controls his own labour and product of labour. Women lag behind men in these matters. Every society has a prestige structure relating to strong versus weak, rational versus emotional. Men are supposed to be strong and rational and women weak and emotional. Actually gender along with other factors like religion, class, race, ethnicity etc. works in an asymmetrical relation between men and women which goes in favour of men and unfavourable to women.

However there is a lot of change in women's role. Today they have public roles to play, like in the economy and polity of the country, they are participating citizens. They are found in all fields of professions, the institution of family is democratized and there is great flexibility in their roles. Birth control has given women control over their own sexuality and reproductive power. This has repercussions on family and other social relations. But in spite of all this subordination of women is continued on form or the other. Women's liberation is only partial. In fact in countries like India the violence against them has increased. Women's movement is playing an important role for the liberation of women. The third-world countries are trying to synthesise the old and the new culture.

Conclusion

We may conclude by saying that feminist Anthropology has contributed to the mainstream debate about the sexual division of labour, changing status of family. On the one hand it talks of 'similar' problems of women and on the other hand emphasizes differences based on culture, class, race, history etc. Women do share similar difficulties and experiences. At the same time there are important differences among the women. There are 'similarities' but not 'sameness'. Another important contribution is the point of comparison and the importance of acknowledging differences.

Summary

Women anthropologists are paying great attention to the gender studies. They take diverse issues of women and try to give a theoretical explanation for

the same. Contemporary Feminist Anthropology developed in 1970s as an offshoot of Anthropology of women. Anthropology of women started by questioning the male bias in the discipline. Feminist Anthropology is women's perspective on women. They feel concerned about the universal subordination and exploitation of women. And therefore they made a cross-cultural study of women and came to the conclusion that sex and gender are not same. Sex is biological and gender is a socio-cultural construction.

The difference between Gender Anthropology and Feminist Anthropology is that the latter is inevitably 'women's perspective' whereas the former is neutral. Feminist Anthropology studies gender relations. Gender Anthropology studies gender identity and gender construction.

The idea of women's perspective presupposes some underlying 'sameness'. Women may not be same but they are similar, especially in the case that they are treated like second grade citizens universally. But they are different also, 'especially in terms of class, race, culture, history etc. Gender acts through their media and not in isolation.

Sex which is biological is treated as the base for gender construction which is done by society as per the cultural values of that society as per the cultural values of that society. Now there is a new idea that for human beings even the notion of sex is culturally constructed.

The feminist anthropologists have been confused as to why there is universal subordination of women in spite of cultural variations of gender. Inequality is existing in all societies. Gender roles are the tasks assigned to sexes by the culture. Gender stereotype is strong and fixed ideas about gender roles. Gender stratification is unequal distribution of rewards on the basis of sex.

In modern times, women's roles have changed in terms of their freedom to participate publicly in economic and political activities. There is a lot of social amelioration also but still the asymmetrical relations between men and women are continued. What we need is a synthesis of old and new values for a better relations between man and women.

Questions

1. What is the position of Anthropology with regard to the argument that the distinction between men and women are linked to their respective anatomies and genetic make up ?
2. Explain the concept of gender roles, gender stereotypes and gender stratification.
3. How have gender roles changed in modern society ? What are the causes of this change ?

Reference Books

- 1) Perspectives in Cultural Anthropology by Applebaum (dt)
- 2) Companion Encyclopaedia of Anthropology - article by Henryetta Moore. "understanding Sex and Gender"
- 3) Anthropology "The exploitation of Human Diversity" by Conrad Philip Kottak.
- 4) Cultural Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives by Roger M. Keesing.
- 5) Anthropology Carol R. Ember and Melvin Ember.

MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Objectives

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ Medical aspects of social system
- ❖ Medicine and culture change
- ❖ Ecology and social cultural aspects of Epidemiology
- ❖ Ethno Medicine
- ❖ Summary

Introduction

Medical Anthropology deals with relationship between human behavior, social life, and health within an anthropological context. It provides a medium for inquiring into how knowledge, meaning, livelihood, power, and resource distribution are shaped and how, in turn, these phenomena go on to shape patterns of disease, experiences of health, illness, and the organization of treatments. Health and diseases are measures of the effectiveness with which human groups, combining biological and cultural resources, adapt to their environment. The fact remains that health and diseases are related to cultural and biological factors, in fact this remains as the junction for both medical and cultural anthropological interest.

Much of the development of medical anthropology has occurred since World War II. The beginning of major anthropological contribution in medical problems were clearly reviewed by Caudill (1953) in his landmark paper on applied anthropology in medicine, prior to that time description of etiological beliefs and medical practices in simpler societies has been important components of certain ethnography. Caudill wrote in his review that involvement of anthropologist and other social scientist in health programs, medical research and education was still something of a novelty. Since then the situation has changed considerably and there have been a marked increase in work by anthropologists and other social scientists in medicine and medically related areas. A cogent summary and analysis of developments in subsequent years is provided by Fabrega (1972). The rapid appearance of interest in social and cultural aspects of medicine among anthropologists has created an identity of problem based on medical anthropology. The field has been viewed from a range of perspectives.

There are two dimensions of medical anthropology: one is sociology in

medicine (Straus 1957) and the other one is sociology of medicine (Kandall 1963). The two aspects of medical anthropology are broadly conceived, thus the anthropological study of social and cultural influences of health and diseases includes not only subjects of immediate therapeutic relevance, but also the phenomena that have special interest because of their effects on human evolution, therefore medical personnel are not subjected to medical anthropology alone but also society at large, which relates health and medical problems.

Medicine : Aspects of Social System

It's a belief that illness is a punishment for wrong doing and this concept is wide spread in human society. Where this occurs the social order is identified with the moral order of the universe in which health depends on the virtue. The attribution of illness to misconduct may have been a very early form of social control in the development of human society (Hallowell 1963), and in Paul's view perhaps the most important latent purpasa of indigenous concepts of etiology and curing is to provide sanction and support for moral and social system (Pauls's 1963).

Whereas illness is a sanction, etiology is a rigid guide to social expectations. Since the belief in punitive sickness is a traditional sanction of traditional social role, it is frequency a force for conservatism when societies are subjected to pressure for change, in discussing punitive sickness, it is well to point out that victim and transgressor need not be one and the same person. Thus Clark's (1959) study of a Mexican - American community describes how a husband abuses his pregnant wife may be accused of subjecting his urborn child susto by his action. The individual who violates Ojibwa food taboos endangers not only his own health but that of his family as well. These studies provide evidence that there is relative commonness in attribution of illness to magical attack which acts as an indicator to society's capacity as well as to avoid disputes and settle them when they arise through legitimate authority, but existence of such institutionalized authority in itself does not necessarily hinder reliance on megal art, as an explanation for th eillness; its effectiveness of the authority must also be considered. In rural lowland areas of the Phiolippnes, for example, the majority of cases in which illness is ascribed to magical arts involved disputes over the ownership or use of land.

a) Illness as Deviance

Who have seen that when illness is considered a social sanction, its occurrence is a sign that someone has deviated from social norms, but illness can also be seen as a form of deviance in its own right. The eposition in certain respect illness is viewed as a type of deviance subject to social control which is especially associated with the work of Parsons (1951, 1953, 1958, 1964; ad Fox 1952). He points out that a high incidence of illness is dysfunctional for a social system; therefore a society has a functional interest in exercising whatever it can control to minimize illness. This would be true even if illness

were in no sense an expression of motivated behavior, but in fact in various ways motivation is involved in the etiology of numerous illnesses and in receptivity to therapeutic influence.

b) Illness as an indicator of social system performance

The health of the population is one significant test which defects the effectiveness with which a society functions. The use of health as an instrument of society effectiveness in meeting the needs of its members faces major theoretical problems. The World Health Organization (1946) defines health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity". The highly abstract criteria of this definition are difficult to operationalize. More specific, measurable criteria, such as life expectancy or morbidity (not natural and healthy), may be used to determine the state of health in a society, but this does not prevent complex questions of value. Given these difficulties, adequate utilization of health as a social indicator appears to be a complex, long-range objective, but steps in this direction are needed as part of general effort to improve the means of evaluating the performance of social system.

Medical and Cultural Change

Under the impact of the modern technological and the industrial societies profound cultural changes are taking place throughout the world. In the developing areas, modern health and medical practices are the most important changes that have been introduced, yet in spite of the increasing utilization of modern medicine in these areas, with constant reduction in morbidity and mortality, traditional medical systems still persist and exert a significant influence on the state of health and on medical decisions in developing societies. The fact remains that modern medicine which has been established in these societies are not much which could displace indigenous medicine, which could by increasing the medical options made available to their population, that means many individuals in developing societies particularly those belonging to higher socioeconomic level and the educated background may utilize modern medicine more or less exclusively but the rest of the population depend on the native medicine either exclusively or in part. Therefore knowledge for these reasons does not only have practical value to improve local, regional and world health but also can contribute to a general understanding of human behavior in relation to cultural changes.

Ecology and Social Cultural Aspects of Epidemiology

The ecological approach is characterized by broad attention to the mutual relations between organisms and their environment, bringing medicine and public health a concern with multiple causes; it also focuses attention on multiple effects of human action that affect the relationship between people and the environment, which often plays as an important medical consequence. This

is a central contemporary issues in industrializes societies, were various forms of environmental modification threaten health. It also can be a paramount consideration in assessing the net value of economic growth projects in developing societies.

In the study of medical aspects of the adaptation and maladaptation of human groups to their environment, depends critically on the cultural factors, e.g. Jacques May's an epidemiologist (1960) experienced in China before World War II, that some of the villagers, were seriously affected by heavy infection of hookworm, while the others were not, this means one who were affected were the rice cultivators who work in the mud mixed with night soil the whole day, which gave rise to this infection. Here disease boundaries and cultural distinction virtually coincide, as in the above mentioned case; the effects of culture on the occurrence of disease are striking but it is also clear that the hookworm infection was part of complex ecosystem involving relationship between the humans and the nonhumans to their environment.

Epidemiology is essentially devoted to division of diseases and their meanings. Epidemiology units of investigation are population and sample; of population rather than clinical samples; it is both descriptive and logical; its field has become increasingly concern with the close relationship to Ecology. It has been defined as a branch of ecology, as the "Ecology of diseases", as "Medical ecology". in discussing the epidemiology of ailments such as hookworm, kwashiorkor, malaria etc. we have to consider the relationship between the behavior of human groups and their physical and biotic environment, as we have already seen that social and cultural factors play a vital role, and may also help determine disease Etiology and distribution through their influences over human population and natural environment.

Social cultural factors are associated with the following things, viz. differences in age, sex, occupation, class, ethnicity and community; which have significant effect on epidemiology.

Age Difference

The frequency of many acute infections is highest in childhood, indicating that as people grow older they develop immunities that decrease their vulnerability to many diseases. Thus epidemiological patterns reflect biological variation in vulnerability of disease which is associated with age differences.

Sex Difference

Indicates that biological factors play an important role with sex differences in mortality; were female having longer life expectancy rate. Madigan (1957) compared mortality rates among Catholic nuns and monks, whose life style provided an excellent opportunity to minimize the effect of

health, of different life experiences of man and woman in the general population; although biological factors account for part of differences, but do not explain why the differences has increased in recent years.

Occupational Difference

Studies based on occupational diseases has been an important part of epidemiologica literature since 19th century. Snow (1936) investigated the occurrence of cholera in Broad Street pump in London; he found that th effect of cholera was high among workers in a percussion cap factory, whre water from Broad Street pump was drunk; while workers at the Broad Street brawery, where beer was served instead of water not similarly affected. Hughes (1963) says that, there has been considerable research made on occupational related diseases in the epidemiology of industrial societies; but a similar study among primitive groups

has been relatively rare. He points out that how significant this aspect of health can be in simpler societies; by citing the occurrence of “hydatid diseases”, where carrier of diseases is canine feces (S. Lawrence Island Eskimcs). The occupation here was to loosen frozen dogs, tie together by using their teeth, this contributed to transmission of the diseases, for harnesses often have been solied by excreta in which eggs of the minute tapeworm “Echinococcus multilocularis” are found.

Status and Ethnicity Difference

A considerable part of epidemiological research has been devoted to the influence of social stratification and ethic differences on diseases occurrence and ethiology. Differences in disease rates of ethnic groups have been important problem in epidemiology and a number a studies have explored possible relationship between ethnic styles of life and degenerative pathologies. Various forms of cancer have been investigated in this light and inter group difference in occurrence have been found. Graham (1963) points out that when hygienic is poor, uncircumcised males may introduce a substance, smegma in to contact with the cervix and since smegma has been found to be carcinogenic to the cervix of mice, the possible relationship between circumcision, smegma and occurrence rate for cancer of the human carvix have attracted epidemiological interest, he also pointed that there is possibility that a genetic factor may be involved in differential group rates for cervix cancer.

Community Difference

As a part of this interest social correlates of rural-urban distinction and their implications for health has been significant problems for investigation. Scotch (1960, 1963) found that when rural and urban Zulu were compared, high blood pressure was found to occur more frequently to larger frequency and severity of social stress than rural Zuluc; he also sees this stress as an

important factor in the difference of hypertension between two years of population.

Ethnomedicine

The sphere of Ethno medicine is indigenous medical features, Hughes (1968) refers as “not explicitly derived from the conceptual framework of modern medicine”, but this does not mean that traditional medical systems are resistant to the influences of modern medicine, in addition to “Ethnomedicine,” various other terms have been used to refer to this sphere under like “folk medicine”, “Popular medicine”, “Popular health culture”, “ethnoiatry” (Scarpa 1967), “ethnoiatics” (Huard 1969). The first term refers to the institutions, roles, values, and knowledge of highly trained practitioners of the indigenous medical systems of South Asia, as well as practitioners of sophisticated scientific medicine. Popular health cultures include the health values and knowledge, roles and practices of layman, of specialists in folk medicine, and of laymen-specialists such as avocational practitioners of homeopathic; medicine.

Disease Classifications

Modern medicine classifies diseases in terms of a single arrangement of universal categories, from this view point of taxonomic system, a recognized disease retains its identity wherever it occurs, regardless of the cultural context. Therefore, as the use of the system has spread, it has increasingly served as trans cultural reference for diagnosis of disease. There is opinion that this would not hold true for certain mental disorders, which are seen as culturally relative (Wittlower and Fried 1959).

Ethno Medical Thereapy

Thereapy in Ethnomedicine is a huge subject, it includes magic, religious, mechanical and chemical procedures. Laughlin (1963) pointed out that the success of the human species is in no small measure due to the ability to cope with medical problems. An evaluation of indigenous medical systems; including those of non-terate societies, shows a remarkable range of practices that show empirical therapeutic knowledge, including trephining, bonesetting, removal of ovaries, obstetrics, caesarean section, laparotomy, uvulectomy, comparative anatomy, autopsy, cautery, inoculation, baths, poultices, inhalations, laxatives, enemas, ointments, and cupping (Ackerknecht 1942, Simmons 1955, Laughlin 1963, Huard 1969).

Preventive Measures

Preventive medicine has been of less importance in most traditional medical systems, than in modern medicine (Foster 1962), Closan (1969) show how important preventive measures can be in traditional medical system, where as the literature shows that prophylactic practices are widely prevalent in indigenous medicine. These include both mechanical and magic, religious

measure; bathing, massage, and rapid rewarming to prevent hypothermia, dietary restriction, surgery, inoculation, incantations, amulets, and prayers at shrines (Laughlin 1963, Hughes 1963).

Ethnomedical Specialists

When illness occurs, it is often ignored or treated without the help of a specialist (Poglar 1962). If treatment is required from a medical practitioner, various types of specialists may be available, including herbalists, diviners, shamans, midwives, and masseurs (Nurge 1958, Lieban 1962b, MacLan 1969). Therapists may specialize in only one type of skill or they may combine several in their practice (Lieban 1962). There is substantial material available on traditional therapists based on differences in specialization, and relatively little regarding the distinctions made on variation in reputation for therapeutic success. This factor, supposed suitability of the specialization for the illness which has to be treated, plays an important role in determining the choice of therapists. They do not, of course, cover the whole range of misfortune a society may face, but they can reflect its members', misfortune in a general sense (Maclean 1969), most of the reactions an ill person puts forth to his symptoms may express important cultural values of his society.

Summary

The concern here is basically with the distributional problem: factors that facilitate modern medicine. In developing societies the benefits clear-cut lowered morbidity and mortality rates among groups with substandard health, but in areas where modern medicine is highly developed, it has become clear that new technical achievements in medical science make the relationship between the use of modern medicine and the welfare increasingly complex. This complexity is clearly seen in the problem with which physicians increasingly must deal: weighing the prolongation of the life of the aged and ailing or the hopelessly injured against the hardships this may entail for the patient and others. On the one hand, science can eventually solve the technical aspects of almost any medical problem. On the other hand, the application of medical knowledge to the prevention and treatment of disease will be necessarily limited by economic and other social factors. Therefore, it is clear that medicine, in social, cultural, and biological dimensions, will continue to share the central problem of our age: how to use our rapidly expanding knowledge wisely and humanely.

Questions

1. What is medical anthropology? How does culture play a critical role in it?
2. What is ethno medicine? Explain.
3. Ecology and social culture aspects of Epidemiology? Explain.

References

- Honigsmann, J.J.: Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.
 Alan Barnard: Encyclopedia of social and cultural anthropology.
 American anthropologist: Medical anthropology and the study of Biological and cultural adaptation.

ECOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ Ecology: A Definition
- ❖ Basic Premises of Ecological Anthropology.
- ❖ The Ecosystem Concept and Ecology of Man
- ❖ Ecological Anthropology:-Its Perspectives
 - (a) Cultural Ecology.
 - (b) Ethno Ecology
- ❖ Anthropological Problems involving Ecology.

Introduction

Ecological anthropology has arisen out of the view that it is an integrated discipline. According to Kroeber, anthropology aims to bring a co-ordinating science and its ultimate goal is the principle of culture, which gives an enormous range, a center for co-ordination of most phenomena that are related to man. This integrated approach provides holistic relations among various systems of an organism and of interactions among organisms. Ecological anthropology focuses upon the complex relations between people and their environment, which includes land, climate, plant and animal species in the vicinities, and these elements of environment have reciprocal impacts on humans. It also investigates the ways that a population shapes its environment and the subsequent manner in which these relations from the population social, economic and political life. In general sense, it attempts to provide a materialist explanation of human society and culture as products of adaptations to given environmental conditions. So the man's basic bio-cultural adaptations have emerged from the reciprocal relationships with technology and social organization. Thus the biocultural adaptations of human are interrelated with complex characteristics of ecosystem such as population numbers, strategies, institutional orders and even thought processes. This ecology would include whole range anthropological studies.

Ecology : A Definition

The word "Ecology" is derived from the Greek word "Oikos" meaning habitation. Haeckel coined the modern understanding of ecology in 1870, defining it as "the study of the economy of the household, of animal organisms. This includes the relationship of animals with the inorganic and organic environments. But much of the research anthropologists are concerned with the relations of the

group they study with some aspects of the environments such research ranges from natural history description to systematic attempts to explain social phenomena with reference to natural events.

Thus ecology can be defined as the study of entire assemblages of living organisms, which constitute an integrated system. This framework includes the study of all species. Moreover environment is never seen as eternal, but as an internal component of the total system. This definition avoids dualism of the thought- "man versus environment"- that has encouraged man often despoiling intrusions into the world's ecosystem that has hindered adequate conceptualization ecological problems.

Basic Premises of Ecological Anthropology

In the "Origin of Species" (1859) Charles Darwin presents a synthetic theory of evolution based on the idea that in each generation more individuals are produced than they survive (because of limited resources) and then competition between individual arises, Individual with favorable characteristics or variation survive to reproduce. Thomas. R. Malthus had an influence on Darwin's formulation. in his book, "Essay on Population (1798), he argues that population grow exponent, while resources only grow geometrically. So there is competition for survival & the struggle for existence is raised & only certain number of individual will survive.

Influenced from Darwin's theory, some anthropologists eventually turned to Environmental determinism, which mapped cultural features of human population according to environmental information. But the detailed ethnographic account of Boas, Malinowski & others led to the realization that environmental determinism could not sufficiently account for observed realities & a weaker form of determinism began to emerge. At this time, Julian Steward, coined the termed "Cultural ecology" & developed a paradigm & introduced the idea of culture core. In 1955, he advocated "Multilinear evolution" in his seminal book, "Theory of Culture Change"; The methodology of Multilinear evolution. It assumes that certain type of culture may be developed in similar ways under similar conditions but few aspects of culture appear all groups of mankind in regular sequence." He sought the causes of cultural changes & attempted to devise a method for recognizing the ways in which cultural change is induced by adaptations to the environment. This adaptation is called cultural ecology. According to him, the cross cultural which arise from the adaptive processes in same environment are synchronic in nature. The fundamental problem of cultural ecology is to determine whether the adjustments of human societies to environment requires particular modes of behavior or whether they permit certain range of possible behavior. Steward also defines "Culture Core" as the feature of society that are closely connected to the subsistence activities & economic arrangement which includes political, religious & social patterns that are connected to the arrangements.

But by 1960's & 1970's, cultural ecology & environmental determinism

lost favor within anthropology, so these ecological anthropologists formed new school of thought which included ecosystem model, ethnology & historical ecology. They believe that populations are not engaged with the total environment around them but rather are habitat with certain selected aspects & elements. Furthermore, each population has its own way of adapting its culture in that group

The Ecosystem Concept & an Ecology of Man

The ecosystem concept focuses on an organized unit in which transactions of production; distribution, consumption & material recycling are structured. Thus the ecosystem brings together the biology behavior, and organization & functioning of man other animals, plants, inorganic components within a single framework. The structure & functional interrelations in the ecosystem emerges from the exchanges between living & non-living components and it also includes non-circular energy & information transitions. Thus the study of ecosystem which include man should understand the structure & functioning as a whole system which is composed of subsystems.

Ecology includes all aspects of man as a biocultural animal as they are within the structure and functioning of ecosystem. These include human morphology, reproduction, and population genetics, stress physiology, nutritional requirements, the ecology of health and disease and human adaptability. But the holistic concept of ecology includes adaptive ness and non-adaptive ness of human behavior with their environment. It poses the question to what degree is technology, economics, and social, political, ritual aesthetic and ideological organizations are adaptive or maladaptive or whether the feedback of human behavior and institutions on the ecosystem is positive or negative and to what degree ethics, policy and planning are ecologically beneficial or detrimental Anthropologists in this range of factors have included description on the ecosystem is positive or negative and to what degree ethics, policy and planning are ecologically beneficial or detrimental. Anthropologists in this range of factors have included descriptions of the people they study. One of the main contributions to anthropology to knowledge is its holistic descriptions of human diversity and similarity. Anthropology has emphasized both on physical and cultural aspects of man, it has focused on intensive studies of small-localized groups and has also stressed upon the functionally related aspects of culture and humanism. All this should have made anthropology one of the most ecologically oriented social sciences, but its failure is attributed to its not adopting the holistic integrated approach.

Ecological Anthropology :- Its Perspectives

The necessity to view man within the framework of this habitat tended towards the adoption of the two fruitless positions 'environmental determinism' and the other is based 'cultural determinism.' Environmental determinism is based on the assumption that cultural and natural areas are coterminous because culture represents and adaptation to the particular environment. Therefore, environmental, factors determine human and social behavior. But these views tend to separate man and his culture from his environment, so they are treated as opposing entities. Contrast with both these views, the intermediate between them is the reciprocal and interactional phrasing of man-environmental relations,

which exist between men living and behaving in local population with which they interact. Except in the work of few ethnologists and social anthropologists, Kroeber's genuine concern for establishing regular relationships between specific aspects of culture and their environments didn't emerge until he renewed his interest in describing and seeking understanding among local population, its culture and environment and 3 broad subclasses interactional ecology became perceptible. 1) cultural ecology. 2) Ethno ecology. 3) Quasi population.

(a) Cultural Ecology

“Cultural Ecology” is used to denote the interactional analysis of environmental cultural relationships, which is an essentially deterministic position. Marvin Harris (1968) provided a perceptive review of cultural ecological knowledge and is best known for his development of cultural materialism, which centers on the notion that technological and economic features of a society have primary role in shaping its particular characteristics. He assigned research priority to infrastructure over structure and superstructure. The infrastructure is composed of the mode of production, demography and mating patterns. Structure refers to domestic and political economy. Superstructure consists of recreational and aesthetic products and services. Harris' purpose was to demonstrate the adaptive, materialist rationality of all cultural features by relating them to their particular environment.

The definitive characteristics of cultural ecological approach are:-

- 1) Adaptation” is the major process of cultural ecology.
- 2) The analysis of socio cultural environmental adaptations should explain particular cultural features and structure in similar environmental conditions.
- 3) The degree of functional interdependence among the parts of culture are not equal, and the ‘core’ features which are closely interrelated with subsistence activities and economic arrangements must have higher priority over other features.
- 4) The functional relationship with its environment causes organizational relationships which in turn gives rise to other aspects of culture i.e. causation is simple linear and one to one.
- 5) The culture core environmental nexus is usually taken as intercultural and is very little affected by historical and inter societal relationships.
- 6) In the socio environmental systems, the environmental is mostly seen as stable and the result of adaptation is also stable culture core.

(b) Ethnoecology

Ethno ecology emphasizes on the analysis of verbal behavior and assumes that “culture consists of an inventory of percepts and concepts- of ideational forms and a set of principles ordering them” BATES describes the difficulty of studying behavior . It is referred to as organism oriented view. To have an understanding of any behavior, we have to know something about the stimuli and

the ways in which the environment is perceived. Bates goes to define the 'environment' in 3 ways. 1) the elements, perceived by the organism which is called "perceptual environment" of the organism. 2) As elements, perceived or not that affect the organism which is called "effective environment" 3) all the elements that are detectable and inferable which is called "total reality".

The ecologists emphasized on the study of the effective environments of the organism, population and ecosystem. And the behaviorist emphasizes on the perceptual environment of the organism. Both these environments are relevant to the understanding of its behaviour and ecology.

According to VADYA AND RAPPAPORT, ethno ecology is defined as a paradigm that investigates native about environmental phenomena, which focuses on the classification hierarchies referring to particular aspects of the environment for example soil types, plants and animals. Rapp port brought together ecology and structural functionalism and defines it in a paradigm called Neo-functionalism. It assigns importance primarily, to techno-environmental forces especially environment, ecology and population. Within Neo functionalism, culture is reduced to an adaptation and Rapp port sees culture as a currencies such as population density that are related to fitness.

ANDREW VADYA was Rapp port teaches and he wrote on new ecology and believed that the population of species should be the ideal unit of analysis and not its culture. New ecology was the term applicable to a homeostatic model of an anthropogenic ecosystem. Vadya and Rapp port attempted to make new ecology comparable to biological basic ecology whereas old ecology was associated with culture. But some ethno ecologists have also emphasized on the description of perceptual or 'cognitive' environments of specific cultures as their primary research strategy. Their first goal was to describe how people know about nature and second to describe how people use their knowledge to get along in the specific analytically rely basically on verbal techniques to tap the structure of specific analytically discrete cognitive domains. The perceptual environment had been a special importance because it favored culture, but with the understanding of nature and functioning of culture and society lead them away from the examination of effective environment and objective behaviour relations. The other consequences of an ecosystem of cognitive and behavioral regularities are restricted to narrow conception of "niche" and "adaptations". Niche means as a organisms immediate occupation and it leaves aside its functional inter relationships in the ecosystem. Adaptation also emphasizes only on the benefits of the organism or culture and fails to examine on other parts of the system.

The characteristics on ethno ecology are :

- 1) It emphasizes upon perceptual environment and it lacks consideration of interaction between cognitive domains or with the effective environment.
- 2) It aims at adequate description of culture by means of formal semantic

analysis.

- 3) Its analysis is restricted to intra cultural ecological relationships.
- 4) It makes assumptions of a high degree of homogeneity and stability in cultural organization.

2(c) Quasi-Population and System Ecology

Vadya was Rapp port promoted the idea of quasi population and system ecology and advanced the notion of “the possibility and desirability of a single Science of ecology with law asnd principles that apply to man as they do to other species”. The simplistic mechanical transferal of concepts and principles was not accepted and the concepts from general ecology require modification and refinement when it was applied explicitly to human population and systems. So the varieties of all the system ecology had to be synthesized by the various adjectival ecologies in social sciences. So the movement from autonomous ecologies (social, cultural, human) toward system ecology is viewed as a development from analytical toward homological thinking. So the intellectual roots of the system ecology is diverse and complex because it has multiplex lines rather than assignable direct line that provides grounds for ecological synthesis.

The characteristics of human population and system ecology :-

- 1) Human population is an integral part of the ecosystem and ecosystem is present because of its man, his numbers, his varying behaviour and his use of energy.
- 2) The nature and structure of local ecosystem is brought up recently. As man himself provides new niches for parasites and microorganism, his behaviour diverts the flow of energy and creatcs and creates, which are are potential for new niches.
- 3) Men, as individual are involved in profound transactions with the physical environment as well as the biotic ones.
- 4) Human population is more dynamic and manipulative and more dominate than other species in the ecosystem. Mans complex socio cultural behavior adaptation caves him with no time no time for its biological adaptation and permits unparallel explosive adaptation.
- 5) Human population and their complex sociocultural behavior are in constant flux. But if a specific population and its behavior are changing then the rate of change is relative.
- 6) The transaction of the human populations affect the structure of energy flow and the functioning of the control system.
- 7) The critical importance, which includes human populations in the study of ecosystem is the study of mans role in the energy flow. Man drastically alters the energy by simplying the ecosystem for its own use. Man is an efficient capturer, conveyer, utilizer and tranporter of energy and these are interrelated with his symbolic behavior or tool manufacturing ability and these are considered has human property.
- 8) Finally the observer’s presence always has an effect on the objects of the observations within an ecosystem.

Anthropological Problems Involving Ecology

There are some major works focuses on specific kinds of ecological problems with which anthropologist have to deal with. One of the major

problem was put forward by 'Kaplan' which states, "Values enter science as these are the basis of the problem, the order in which they are learnt and the resources which are expended on the solution. Values make for bias, not when they dictate problem but when they prejudice solution. This is reflected in recurrent modes of thought, which is based on unexamined values, which in turn affects the selection and priorities of problems. The second major problem was put forth by Merton, which states, "The experience of scientists is summed up in the adage that it is often more difficult to find and the to formulate a problem than to solve it." This aspect has difficulty in identifying problems and the so-called are little more than the descriptive facts or the correlation between the descriptive facts.

Problems also arise from external contingent factors of socio-culture and biological phenomena. The other relevant factors are demographic, interpersonal transactions and there are also non-human characteristics of environment like the biotic, abiotic and climate factor. There are two preliminaries in which both human and non-human are involved in transactions which population.

- 1) Classification is always arbitrary. The classifier only hopes that this categories, make some sense of events. When the events are ideas, the difficulties is much greater is much greater than the usual especially at the general level at which the outline is depicted.
- 2) The other problem is included in the practical concerns of anthropology those which are of describing, analyzing and explaining similarities and differences among ethnic group.

Summary

Ecological anthropology developed as a result of the integrated approach, which is now known as system approach. This provides a holistic view of nature, recognition of reciprocal relations among the organism. so ecology can be defined as the study of the entire groupings of living organism, and the physical environment, which together constitute integrated systems. The holistic concept of ecology is to bring together the biology, behaviour, organization and functioning of man, other animals, plants and even inorganic components in a single framework. This concept is also concerned with problems of urban-industrial ecosystem, design and planning, government-citizen interaction, environmental law and policy making. Thus ecological of human activity and seek to integrate them in in a single framework.

Reference

- * Honigmann J.J.: Handbook of Social Science
- * International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences
- * Bernal R.I. and Hoijer : An introduction to Anthropology.

LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction

Linguistic Anthropology - is study of language in the context of human social and cultural diversity, past and present and is central to discipline of anthropology as a whole. While there are many disciplines that focus on language - and so participate in some more general endeavour called "linguistics" - and anthropological approach to language emphasis on the various forms of language and its use, about social and cultural systems and practices in the widest range of times and places. Language is a vehicle for cultural transmission, and a means of social action. It is at the nexus of biology, history, culture, cognition, and social life. Linguistic anthropology study the ways in which language provides insights into the nature and evolution of culture and human society. The structural aspects of language that have been the traditional province of linguists understands the diverse conditions of human beings in the world. Linguistic anthropologists seek to understand the social cultural foundations of language. A distinctive focus of Linguistic anthropology is the integration of studying linguistic form with social theory and analysis.

Linguistic has two major subdivisions, descriptive linguistics and historical of comparative linguistics. Descriptive linguistics is concerned with the analyses of languages and it studies the sound systems, grammar and vocabulary of languages. It attempts to describe formally the basic elements of languages and the rules by which they are ordered into intelligible speech. Linguistics are concerned with the spoken language and it derives the material for analysis by listening to and writing down with special symbols the spoken words of people who use the language for communication. The other subdivision of linguistics is historical or comparative linguistic and it attempts to trace the course of linguistics evolution and to reconstruct ancestral language forms. It deals with historical relationships between languages whose history can be traced through written records. These techniques have now advanced so that they can be reliably used for establishing the relationships between different languages and also for reconstructing the history of unwritten languages.

Importance of Language in Anthropology

The most important defining characteristic of human beings may be said to be the use of language. Every language involves the use of phonemes, i.e. units of sound that distinguishes one world from another. These phonemes are combined and arranged in accordance with phonological and grammatical rules of that language. Further, a language has meanings assigned to words and

other units of language, which are arbitrary. Human beings have the capacity to assign arbitrary meanings to language and other things and therefore the study of symbols play a very important part in the understanding of man. Language provides the ability to communicate about things at different times, and in other spaces. It is also able to develop abstractions in which symbols provide definite meanings.

Language differ vastly from one society to another. Some have more complex vocabularies than others but all have well developed grammars and the ability to increase their vocabularies if needed. And, all languages however different they are from each other are equally efficient as means of communication. Speech is graphically represented in a set of techniques, i.e. writing. The early form of writing before word was invented was probably pictographic drawings. Systems of writing can be logographic, i.e. each symbol representing a syllable. Modern writing however is mostly alphabetic with each symbol representing a speech sound. Tracing the history of language has been a concern for ethnolinguistics. This has been done from indirect evidence produced by human fossil and archaeological remains. It is also seen that the chimpanzee possesses some very basic language skills and the earliest human beings also had some early form of language.

The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

In Ethnolinguistics the questions posed are how language affects the way a people perceives and responds to its environment and conversely how culture may influence the content and structure of a person's language. Much of the attention to this interrelationship was centered on a formulation of the problem that has come to be known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, after the linguist Edward Sapir and his famous student and colleague Benjamin Lee Whorf.

The Sapir-Whorf theory, named after the American linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, Sapir's. The Status of Linguistics as a Science, written in 1929 argued in a classic passage that :

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has been become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the real world is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached... We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation."

Sapir used firm language to describe this connection between language and thought. To Sapir, the individual is unconscious to this connection and subject to it without choice. Benjamin Lee Whorf was Sapir's student. Whorf devised the weaker theory of linguistic relativity. "We are thus introduced to a new principle of relativity, which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe. "He also supported, at times, the stronger linguistic determinism. To Whorf, this connection between language and thought was also an obligation not a choice.

From "Science and Linguistics" (1940/1956) :. "We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which had to be organized by our minds - and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way-an argument that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, and implicit and unstated one, but its terms are absolutely obligatory; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees." Both Sapir and Whorf agreed that it is our culture that determines our language, which in turn determines the way that we categorize our thoughts about the world and our experiences in it.

The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis theorizes that thoughts and behaviour are determined by language. They brought attention to the relationship between language, thought, and culture, but through a thorough study of their writings about linguistics, researchers have found two main ideas. First, a theory of linguistic determinism that states that the language you speak determines the way that you will interpret the world around you. Second, a weaker theory of linguistic relativism that states that language merely influences your thoughts about the real world.

On this basis, the Whorfian perspective is that translation between one language to another is very problematic because someone may apply this to the 'translation' of un verbalized thought into language and others suggest that even within a single language any reformulation of words has implications for meaning, however subtle.

Hopi Clouds

Benjamin Whorf picked up the idea of linguistic determinism, which states that language is not simply a way of voicing ideas, but is the very thing, which shapes those ideas. One cannot think outside the confines of their language. The result of this process is many different world views by speakers of different languages.

Whorf fully believed in linguistic determinism; that what one thinks is fully determined by their language. He also supported linguistic relativity, which states that the differences in language reflect the different views of different people. An example of this is the studies Whorf did on the Hopi language. He studied a Hopi speaker who lived in New York City. He concluded that Hopi speakers do not include tense in their sentences, and therefore must have a different sense of time than other groups of people. However, in recent years, the Hopi have been

studied in order to further understand this issue, and it has been discovered that although the Hopi do not include references to the past, present or future in their grammars, they do include two other tenses, manifested and becoming manifested. Manifested includes all that is and ever has been, physically. The included senses and concrete items. Becoming manifested includes anything, which is not physical, has no definite origin and cannot be perceived with the senses. Verbs are always expressed in two tenses. In this way, the Hopi would use a different way than a native English speaker would recognize. Perhaps what Whorf recorded was merely part of that speaker's idiolect, and was not reflective of the entire Hopi community.

Navajo Eventings

Hoijer, a specialist in American — Indian linguistics who has critically explored Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, notes, for example, that verb categories in the languages of the Navaho a traditionally nomadic people who live near the Hopi in the southwest but have a very different culture and language - give marked emphasis to the reporting of events in process, or "eventings". as he terms them. These eventings are divided into "eventings in motion" and "eventings whose stiffness is perceived as the withdrawal of motion so that even the neuter category of verbs. He then relates Navaho experience of this perception of the world as objects filed in the process of becoming and the events occurring as a parallel to the movement, which is basic attribute of the Navahos nomadic life. An interpretation that suggests that the structure of the Navaho language appears to reflect this quality of on going movement that has been a basic part of their experience for centuries.

Hoijer writes, "the Navaho are fundamentally nomadic folk following their folk from one pastorage to another. Myths and legends reflect this, both goals and culture heroes move restly from one holy place to the next. Such example, which strongly suggest that the relation language and culture works both ways, as a the form and content of language, may be shaped by culture. The linkage between "overt behaviour and the numerous human system that men set up between themselves and the objective universe in which they live brings them closer to comprehend and cope with the intermediate role of differences in perception and cognition that are sometimes the real obstacles behind the language barrier. The other aspect concern the way the content of language as opposed to its structure, is affected by the characteristics of the culture of those who speak it, if language is one of the major means by which men adapt to their environment, it is reasonable to expect that men's languages should reflect this as it is most efficient at dealing with those aspects of experiences that are most critical to a particular people's pattern of techno-environmental adaptation and material survival.

Sociolinguistics

The study of Sociolinguistics is significantly different from those of major concerns of both linguistic and cultural Anthropological theory.

Traditionally Linguistics theory was assumed to be uniform, homogenous, or monolithic. It was assumed that one could describe the

speech of a region in a uniform way. Although variation was known to occur in the speech, it was considered of no importance in establishing the linguistics system. Variation within the language or dialect was dealt by explaining it away of as not being a part of the system. Variation in dialect area meant that the dialect had begun to break up into two dialects. No attempts had been made by linguistics theory to explain how or why such variation co-exists in the same area or person. Indeed, such variation could be adequately explained if its function understood by the use of the theory by insists on homogeneity. The extent of such linguistic variation or diversity is one of the major concerns of Sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics are also concerned with the influence of the speech variety on another. In order to understand some of the major concerns and results of Sociolinguistics it is useful to consider first the types of linguistic variation and then to focus on social, cultural and individual concomitance of these variations. What varies linguistically are, phonological, lexical and syntactic, variation and code switching. This focus is included in areas such as, ethno-science, dialectology, language change and more recently rules of speaking. Focus on social, cultural and individual determinants and concomitance of linguistic variation within a speech community. Here the areas included are linguistic socialization, ethnography of communication, language maintenance shift, language planning, linguistic virtuosity and language attitudes.

Summary

Linguistics is the study of languages in the context of human social and cultural diversity and it is central to the discipline of anthropology as a whole. The study of language is an important means of understanding the culture of the people who speak it. According to Harry Hoijer language is a guide to "Social reality" Language conditions all our thinking about social problems and processes. The central idea of Sapir — Whorf Hypothesis is that language functions, not simply as a device for reporting experience, but as a way of defining experience for its speakers. To understand the true inter relationship of language and other cultural systems we need to study not only the product of the language but its pattern, lexical, morphological and syntactic and these relations exist to other patterns in the culture.

Sociolinguistics differs significantly from both linguistics and cultural anthropological theory. The explanation of linguistic variation and diversity is one of the major concerns of Sociolinguistics. They are also concerned with the influence of one speech variety on another.

References

- 1) Honigmann, J.J. : Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.
- 2) International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.
- 3) Beals, R.I. And Hoijer, H.: An Introduction to Anthropology.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Objectives

- ❖ Introduction
- ❖ Behavioral evolution.
- ❖ The psychic unity of mankind and the nature of human nature
- ❖ Comparative studies of perception and cognition.
- ❖ Cross-cultural statistical studies.
- ❖ Personality
- ❖ Child training, socialization enculturation
- ❖ Cultural change.
- ❖ Cross-cultural statistical studies.
- ❖ Summary

Introduction

In its broadest sense, psychological anthropology comprises the entire area of overlapping interest of psychology and anthropology, if culture, the central concept of cultural anthropology is defined in terms of behavior,, and psychology is defined in terms of behavior, the two might appear to the unsuspectingly the same; the area of overlap is broad, ranging from comparative studies of animal behavior, from primates, to developmental studies of children, normal and abnormal personality functioning, individual and collective behavior, studies of perception and cognition, teaming, memory, dreams, altered states of consciousness, and much more. The evolutionary perspective implies that features different from other primates are of necessity and by definition shared by men as a species; some other approaches on anthropological scene stress the fundamental Universalities, although their statements of the problem and their methods of attachment differ widely. Psychological anthropology is usually treated as a separate area of subject matter within cultural anthropology; Psychological dimension of the study of human evolution is generally carried out by physical rather than cultural anthropologists, with respect to language, there is also an evolutionary dimension which has important psychological ramifications. In the synchronic study of material culture, we deal not only with economic and technological issues, but also with questions of motor habits and skills, perception, cognition, and values. In that area of material culture generally labeled art i.e. the plastic and graphic arts - the evolutionary aspects of symbolization, cognition, and perception, of values and attitudes, is even more evident that in the more strictly utilitarian types of objects of human manufacture.

Behavioral Evolution

A concern with the evolution of human behavior was foreshadowed in the writings of A.I.Hallowell (1937), placing culture and personality studies on a firm biological evolutionary footing. Modern anthropologists seemed to have neglected the concern related with "other orders of continuity and differentiation* than those of a strictly morphological nature. In a dozen important paper, Hallowell has outlined with what he has called a "conjunctive approach" that brings together "organic, psychological, social and cultural dimensions of the evolutionary process; as they are related to the underlying conditions that are necessary and sufficient for a human existence" (1963:440).

We may distinguish several types of study relevant to the Study of behavioral evolution. On the one hand, there is the investigation of antecedents of human behavior and the foreshadowing of human institutions in animal behavior, particularly among primates, and on the other, there is the ever more specific definition of the "human level of existence"; by means of primate studies together with the development of psychoanalytic theories, culture and personality studies and the conceptualization of the nature of culture by twentieth century cultural anthropologists. With this more precise definition we strive for a better understanding of the adequate as well as the necessary factors making for such a level of existence.

The psychic unity of mankind and the nature of human nature

The nineteenth-century German anthropologist Adolf Bastian (1881) spoke of a "psychic unity of mankind. On this theoretical unity, " based his opposition to the fashionable theories of broad cultural transmission; by a general law, human beings everywhere must -produce similar fundamental ideas (Elementarge danken), which account for the reappearance of similar inventions and Institutions' Boas (1940- 272-730 phrased this point of view briefly:. Bastian denies that it is possible to discover the ultimate source of inventions, ideas, customs and beliefs which are universal of occurrence but the human mind is so formed that it invents them spontaneously or accepts them whenever they are offered to it, to him the psychic unity of mankind is a hypothetical entity used to account evidently independent inventions. Perhaps the best known example of a disputed psychoanalytic universal is the Oedipus complex. Freud claimed it to be a universal stage in the life of small boys, Malinowski (1927) claimed that among the matrilineal Trobriand Islanders a boy's incest wishes are directed towards his sister; not, as in Freud's mode, toward his mother and his hostility is directed against his mother's brother rather than against his father. Ernest Jones (1925) disputed Malinowski's findings on theoretical grounds. Among other things, Jones pointed out that Malinowski's data did not deal with small children but with adults and adolescents: among the Trobriand Islanders, the father is the mother's lover, and the jealousy underlying the Oedipus hostility would thus be provoked in a matrilineal society as well as in a patriarchal one of the type Freud observed. Erich Fromm (1949), criticized Freud's preoccupation with sex and his neglect of the issue of authority, he has argued that the opposition between sons and fathers that Freud saw was real enough, but it was directed against the father as an authoritarian figure rather than as a sexual rival. This confusion was

possible because in the European case, the father combined two roles that of the authoritarian and that of the mother's lover. We might then suggest that in the Case of the matrilineal Trobriand Islanders these two roles are separated and assigned to two different persons: the mother's brother as the authoritarian, the father as the sexual rival: In this sense, the Torbriand data represented the test case to distinguish between a Freudian (sexual and a Fromm (authority) view of the father-son hostility in the Oedipus complex. Malinowski's work helped to combine personality theory with learning theory, (Campbell and Nroll 1972:437) however this issue of a shift from infancy to adolescence and thus of the possible meaning of the Oedipus complex is not mentioned by Campbell and Nroll. Rohemim 1934:248) has sought the source of the Oedipus complex not in learning as Campbell does, but in biology: in a human development of a genital sexuality that is impulsive in relation to the development of the body as a whole and to the development of #0 individuals.

Comparative studies of perception and cognition

Comparative studies of perception, particularly visual perception begun before the turn of the century with the work of the Cambridge Torres Straits journey. There has been a scattered study in this area but no continuous and truly cumulative effort until recent years. Interest in this area was stimulated in the 1950s and 1960s when a series, of studies was undertaken; (Africa) a number of publications had appeared reviewing this branch of comparative studies in varying detail (French 1963: Triandis 1964: Segall, Campbell, and Herskovits 1966- Price Williams 1968,1970). The neglect of such studies for so many years seem to be due to the fact that comparative research on perception tends to fall between two areas of specialization; they tend to be too technical and laboratory - oriented for the anthropologist and require too much research among interesting groups for the psychologist. In terms of psychological point of view, comparative studies speak directly to the argument between nativists (those who hold that universal laws of sensory perception are governed by the constancy of the human nervous system) and empiricists (those who argue that previous experience influence perceptual responses). In a cross-cultural context the empiricist position would lead to an anticipation of differences in perception among groups with different experiences i.e. different cultures. If we consider - the relationship between cultural factors and perception than it is clear that there is a variety of such factors involved. (Segall, Campbell, and Herskovits 1966) speak of the 'carpentered world", the cultural factor involved here refers to a series of features of material culture, based on inventions of certain types of tools, it is characterized by straight lines and right angles. The ecological factor that they assume operates in the context of cultural adaptation to Such an environment The work of Berry (1965) and Dawson (1967), adds another aspect to studies of visual perception, by introducing as correlates of perceptual performance personality factors and variations in socialization practices these are used to account for these personality differences. On the basis of this work, it appears that certain types of perceptual performance not only am adaptive in some ecological and cultural settings but also have broader psychological and cultural ramifications.

The assumption of connection between perception and personality is basic to the Rorschach 1921) the test has been widely used cross-culturally; it is the

manner of utilizing the perceptual field i.e. the unstructured shapes of the inkblots that is employed as an indicator of personality features. The manner of perception exposed by the subject is of greater importance to the analyst than the content of what is perceived.

When language intervenes as a structuring and ordering agent in the perceptual process, we most probably deal with matters closer to cognition than to perception. Thus the uses of color terms affect performance on tests of color perception (Rivers 1901) through language. It is important to note the difference between the experimental psychologists and cultural anthropological approach to studies of perception. The psychologist develops hypotheses by analyzing the implications of preliminary data based on his theories of human behavior and then constructs experiments designed to confirm or disconfirm these hypotheses, he compares the behavior of two or more samples with regard to the same stimulus materials and attempts to control the behavior of his respondents in the experimental situation. Much of the work on perception by anthropologists is contextual with respect to a single society, rather than a comparison of statistical findings from two or more groups. It is the cultural context the anthropologist attempts to control by investigating its various ramifications. The contextual studies which anthropologist traditionally seeks, not only specific categories and terminologies of classification, but also the relationship of these categories to other aspects of the culture research on systems of classification which has recently been formalized by the work of ethno scientist. In either case, whether contextual or ethno scientific studies of the relativity of behavioral universe tell us about a group's alertness to certain cues and perhaps lack of concern for certain others, they indicate the visible nearness of experiences based on conservative cues and the major system of conventional cues is language.

Personality

Personality in fact opens the central psychological concern of psychological anthropology for the past forty years. Most of these studies had appeared in short-term and their distribution strikingly reflects the geographic interests of American anthropologists, who are the primary contributors to this list, about half the societies listed are in North America and more than a quarter in the Insular Pacific, while only handful are to be found in Africa, South America, and East Eurasia. The "Primitives" involved represents various stages or acculturation and Westernization, and in certain societies, studied of a number of levels of accumulation has been done. Entering into the psychological field anthropologists soon found themselves entangled in certain theoretical and terminological problems. The terminology of personality, explanation which they used whether applied to individual personalities or whole cultures, was largely borrowed from the clinical field.

Much later, the psychiatrist A. H. Leighton (Leighton and Hughes 1961:38) stated that in cross-cultural studies no existing form of diagnosis is usable, furthermore, he urged that one has to get rid of the built-in etiological preconceptions that exist in most diagnostic acts. Where studies are concerned with exploring the etiological influences of cultural factors the psychiatric phenomena for study have to be defined in terms of symptom patterns, The question of whether they are pathological or not should be set aside, in short one has to study the distribution of selected types of human patterns and only

later ask what the functional effect and consequences of these are, the purpose of pathology is the last thing to be done rather than the-first one, latter Benedict and others did speak of normal and abnormal behavior, saying that the abnormal are those who are not supported by the institutions of their civilization.

The central question that has engaged students of culture and personality Can be generalized as follows:

Do members of single society, living within the bounds of a single culture, share a common cognitive course, a common world view, a common basic or modal personality, a social or national character? How is one to discover whether or not this is so?

There are two basic strategies which has been developed to deal with these questions:

- (1) The isomorphism between culture and personality is assumed. (Thus personality can be investigated by analyzing culture).
- (2) Methods must be developed to review personality and independent of cultural analysis to discover, (a) Whether shared personality characteristics do exist among the members of the group under investigation. (b) Whether a vigorous exists between personalities so describe, the culture investigated and which is described in its own terms.

Child training, socialization & enculturation

From birth to maturity a variety of interacting and interdependent process are at work. which may be differentiated for analytic purpose but in fact constitute a single living stream-growth and maturation, personality development, language achievement, leaning aspects of culture, including the learning of social roles; some of these processes may be subsumed under the term education; particularly where formal institutions for the teaching and training of the young exist (Henry 1960: Spindler 1963). Psychologists, sociologists, and sometimes anthropologists have used the term "socialization". Herskovits (1948) coined the terms enculturation, enculturative it as a process, enculturative experience; (1948:381 'the process by means of which an individual is integrated into his society,' and points out that men are not the only animals that are socialized.

The aspects of the learning experience mark off man from other creatures by which he achieves proficiency in his culture called as enculturation. The enculturative process includes the whole aspect of adjustment of the newly - born individual to the group of which he has to become a member.

Culture Change

Culture change can be seen as having a variety of psychological dimension: the psychology of innovation, the motivation to accept innovations, from within a society or from without. In a situation of culture contact or acculturation the teaming process or processes of are-enculturtion"involved is receiving or

rejection (Herskovits 1945, Hallowell 1945, Gillen 1942).

The central problem of the relationship between personality and culture reappears as to; What is the relationship between culture change and personality change? Can culture change while personality remains unchanged? How is adult culture affected by culture change? Is child rearing modified as other aspects of culture are altered? Two studies of situations in which personality is seen as affected by acculturative changes, but with apparently quite different results, e.g. (Hallowell; 1951) Compares three levels of acculturation among Ojibwa Indians on the basis of samples; on one hand he asks whether there is a psychological continuity from the smallest acculturated to the most, and on the other hand whether there are differences in personal and social adjustment among these levels- The three levels are indeed found to be psychologically separate. However where acculturation has proceeded slowly at level 2 there has been a notable personality readjustment to the new situation, at level 3 there is much maladjustment, and what remains of the traditional personality structure is inadequate to cope with the problems of life.

Cross cultural statistical-studies

The major events in psychological anthropology in the recent past were due to the development of comparative studies which was designed to test specific hypotheses by means of statistical techniques. While most of the research reviewed involved, the collection and analysis of primary field data, comparing a handful of cultures; while most anthropological research has been primarily holistic and descriptive, whatever the theoretical framework would be, these studies deal with a small number of variables designed to test one or more hypotheses. Child's study constitutes the pioneering effort in this field, highlighting both the strengths and the weaknesses of this approach. The aim of this study is to relate child training practices to adult personality which indirectly represented by explanations of illness and therapeutic methods, since these elements are considered to reflect the typical personality of each culture. This study utilizes a sample of seventy-five societies from which data on child training and on medical theories, therapies could be located. The major hypotheses symbolize a learning theory summary of psychoanalytic concepts concerning the nature of fixation: they try to compare explanations of illness with severity of socialization (high socialization anxiety) in one of five systems of-child training (oral, anal, sexual, dependence, and aggression); are explained and classified under the same five headings: therapeutic, measure's as well classifies they are expected to confirm the existence of positive fixations, correlations are sought with initial satisfaction in the same five systems of socialization. thus we can say that ten hypotheses are tested, five relating theories of illness to socialization anxiety; and the other five relating therapies to initial satisfaction in a given behavioral system.

In summary it can be started that

- ❖ Statistical studies do not aim to draw psychological description of human societies or to establish causal relation among variables.
- ❖.There are methodological difficulties of varying degree which remains to be over-come.
- ❖ Few relationships have been established but a number of important differences among societies appear to be identified, which have bearing

- on the relationship between a series of psychologically relevant variables.
- ❖ Few studies deal directly with psychological factors, but a large number point inferentially toward confirmation of psychological hypotheses.

With methodological modification the approach hold some promises of developing an organized body of theoretical suggestion which is tested empirically about the functioning of human societies; thus avoiding the frequently unplanned nature of clarification in holistic description studies.

Summary

Benedict's Patterns culture inferred psychological characteristics of persons from the institutions of their societies. The statistical studies discover relations between societal variables and use psychological hypotheses to explanation them. The contrasts between the two approaches are great from humanistic to quantitative, descriptive and intuitive to statistical and empirical; yet the behavior and attitudes of individual actors in their societies are essentially absent in both of these types of studies. Fieldwork and comparison are both essential to the anthropological enterprise. overwhelming and often unexpected variability of culture must not be lost sight of as the pendulum swings toward the search for regularities. Mankind psychologically is both one and many these complementary facts must be kept in mind simultaneously if psychological anthropology is to fulfill its promise.

Questions :

- 1 What is psychology? And how is it related to anthropology?
2. The psychic unity of mankind and the nature of human nature?
 - a Define Child training, socialization & enculturation ?

Reference :

- ❖ Honigmann,, J. J.: Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology.
- ❖ Alan Barnard. Encyclopedia of social and cultural anthropology.
- ❖. D'Andrade, Roy 1961: Anthropological studies of Dreams. In Psychological Anthropology.
