

Chapter 1 : The Biological Basis of Human Behavior

Being a student of Boas, Mead extended the school's knowledge in culture and personality as she focused from the American culture to the whole Western World. She travelled to Samoa and she found out that the societies there have uniform value systems, and thus, they share common personality traits.

Additionally he wished to rekindle the notion that although difficult to understand, this issue was of utmost importance Dreyfus To be human is to be fixed, embedded and immersed in the physical, literal, tangible day to day world Steiner Heidegger was concerned that philosophy should be capable of telling us the meaning of Being, of the where and what Dasein is. For Heidegger the world is here, now and everywhere around us. Furthermore, Dasein is an entity which in each case I myself am. Mineness belongs to any existent Dasein, and belongs to it as the condition which makes authenticity and inauthenticity possible. However, Heidegger was aware that the expression had several components to its structure. To be at all is to be worldly. The everyday is the enveloping wholeness of being. The multiplicity of these is indicated by the following examples: Concern is the temporal meaning which Being-in-the-world has for human beings and it is the time configuration of human life which is the identical concern which human beings have for the world. If human beings had no concept of time they would have no reason to be engaged or implicated in the world in a human way. It is the awareness of temporality which establishes that the relationship that human beings have with the world is through concern Warnock Not everything is possible for every human being. Choices are made in the world in which humans exist surrounded by other humans. Human beings are characterised by uniqueness, one from another, and this uniqueness gives rise to a set of possibilities for each individual. All human beings are continually oriented towards their own potential, among which are the possibilities of authentic and inauthentic existence. If, whilst moving forward, the standards and beliefs and prejudices of society are embraced, individuals may fail to differentiate themselves from the masses. For Heidegger, Authentic existence can only come into being when individuals arrive at the realisation of who they are and grasp the fact that each human being is a distinctive entity. But subject and Object do not coincide with Dasein and the world. Knowing is the possession of those human-Things which are able to know and is an internal characteristic of those entities. In fact for Heidegger, even forgetting modifies the primordial Being-in and even as knowledge did not create the world nor forgetting destroy it, it follows that Dasein only realises itself when it grasps reality Steiner To Heidegger this concept is a primordial banality which had long been overlooked by metaphysical conjecture. Humans beings are thrown with neither prior knowledge nor individual option into a world that was there before and will remain there after they are gone Steiner Neither do we know toward what end our existence has been projected, apart from our position in relation to death. The world into which our Dasein is thrown has others in it, and the existence of others is totally indispensable to its facticity of Being-there. Understanding of others in the world and the association of the ontological status of others with our own Dasein is, in itself, a form of Being. Heidegger said that Being-in-the-world is a being-with, and that the understanding of the presentness of others is to exist. However, being-with presents the possibility of comprehending our own Dasein as an everyday Being-with-one-another where we may come to exist not on our own terms, but only in reference to others. This crucial distinction was important for Heidegger as it is the distinction between an authentic and an inauthentic human existence Steiner In fact, for Heidegger, it barely exists at all and it exists in a state of fear [Furcht] Steiner This fear is distinct from anxiety [Angst]. Fear could be experienced when a threat to our life, signifying our situation is recognised, but anxiety is experienced in the face of nothing in particular in our situation Warnock According to Warnock , anxiety is that which drives us to swamp ourselves in the insignificant, the common and in all of the elements of an inauthentic existence. Angst is one of the primary instruments through which the ontic character and context of everyday existence is made inescapably aware of, is rendered naked to, the pressures of the ontological. Heidegger wrote that an understanding of Being belongs to the ontological structure of Dasein, and he proposed that there is an understanding state of mind in which Dasein is disclosed to itself. Heidegger sought a simplified way of disclosure to bring the structural totality of Being to light and he hypothesized that

the state of mind that would satisfy his requirements, was the state of anxiety. Dasein-with-others takes place in an echo chamber of nonstop bogus interaction, with no cognition as to what is being communicated Steiner Not-Being-its-self [Das Nicht-es-selbst-sein] functions as a positive possibility of that entity which, in its essential concern, is absorbed in a world. This kind of not-Being has to be conceived as that kind of Being which is closest to Dasein and in which Dasein maintains itself for the most part. Rather they are essential components of existence, because Dasein is always Dasein-with and a Being-in-the-world into which we have been thrown. Acceding to the enticement of living a mundane existence is simply a part of existing itself. Dasein is committed to searching out the authentic via the inauthenticity of its Being-in-the-world and Heidegger said that authentic existence is not something which floats above everyday fallingness. It is uncanniness that declares the pivotal moments in which Angst brings Dasein face to face with the terrible freedom of deciding whether to remain in inauthenticity or to endeavor to attain self-possession. These things include a concern for others, a care for the ready-to-hand, but in principle Sorge is a caring for the presentness and obscurity of Being itself Steiner With death, Dasein stands before itself in its ownmost potentiality-for-Being. Its death is the possibility of no-longer being-able-to-be-there. If Dasein stands before itself as this possibility, it has been fully assigned to its ownmost potentiality-for-Being. When it stands before itself in this way, all its relations to any other Dasein have been undone. This ownmost non-relational possibility is at the same time the uttermost one. For Heidegger, human beings are never directly in the world except by way of being in some particular circumstance; it is Dasein that is Being-in-the-world Dreyfus

Chapter 2 : BBC - Future - How human culture influences our genetics

The relationship between biology and culture in shaping human behavior is the human biology sets limits and provides the capacities for different types of behavior. Culture includes articles and images, the significance given to those items and images, and the standards, qualities, and convictions that plague social life.

Scientific evidence shows that the physical and behavioral traits shared by all people originated from apelike ancestors and evolved over a period of approximately six million years. One of the earliest defining human traits, bipedalism -- the ability to walk on two legs -- evolved over 4 million years ago. Other important human characteristics -- such as a large and complex brain, the ability to make and use tools, and the capacity for language -- developed more recently. Many advanced traits -- including complex symbolic expression, art, and elaborate cultural diversity -- emerged mainly during the past , years. Physical and genetic similarities show that the modern human species , *Homo sapiens*, has a very close relationship to another group of primate species, the apes. Humans first evolved in Africa, and much of human evolution occurred on that continent. The fossils of early humans who lived between 6 and 2 million years ago come entirely from Africa. Most scientists currently recognize some 15 to 20 different species of early humans. Scientists do not all agree, however, about how these species are related or which ones simply died out. Many early human species -- certainly the majority of them -- left no living descendants. Scientists also debate over how to identify and classify particular species of early humans, and about what factors influenced the evolution and extinction of each species. Early humans first migrated out of Africa into Asia probably between 2 million and 1. They entered Europe somewhat later, between 1. Species of modern humans populated many parts of the world much later. For instance, people first came to Australia probably within the past 60, years and to the Americas within the past 30, years or so. The beginnings of agriculture and the rise of the first civilizations occurred within the past 12, years. Paleontology Paleontology is the scientific study of human evolution. Paleontology is a subfield of anthropology, the study of human culture, society, and biology. The field involves an understanding of the similarities and differences between humans and other species in their genes, body form, physiology, and behavior. Paleontologists search for the roots of human physical traits and behavior. They seek to discover how evolution has shaped the potentials, tendencies, and limitations of all people. For many people, paleontology is an exciting scientific field because it investigates the origin, over millions of years, of the universal and defining traits of our species. However, some people find the concept of human evolution troubling because it can seem not to fit with religious and other traditional beliefs about how people, other living things, and the world came to be. Nevertheless, many people have come to reconcile their beliefs with the scientific evidence. Early human fossils and archeological remains offer the most important clues about this ancient past. These remains include bones, tools and any other evidence such as footprints, evidence of hearths, or butchery marks on animal bones left by earlier people. Usually, the remains were buried and preserved naturally. They are then found either on the surface exposed by rain, rivers, and wind erosion or by digging in the ground. By studying fossilized bones, scientists learn about the physical appearance of earlier humans and how it changed. Bone size, shape, and markings left by muscles tell us how those predecessors moved around, held tools, and how the size of their brains changed over a long time. Archeological evidence refers to the things earlier people made and the places where scientists find them. By studying this type of evidence, archeologists can understand how early humans made and used tools and lived in their environments. The process of evolution The process of evolution involves a series of natural changes that cause species populations of different organisms to arise, adapt to the environment, and become extinct. All species or organisms have originated through the process of biological evolution. In animals that reproduce sexually, including humans, the term species refers to a group whose adult members regularly interbreed, resulting in fertile offspring -- that is, offspring themselves capable of reproducing. Scientists classify each species with a unique, two-part scientific name. In this system, modern humans are classified as *Homo sapiens*. Evolution occurs when there is change in the genetic material -- the chemical molecule, DNA -- which is inherited from the parents, and especially in the proportions of different genes in a population.

Genes represent the segments of DNA that provide the chemical code for producing proteins. Information contained in the DNA can change by a process known as mutation. The way particular genes are expressed -- that is, how they influence the body or behavior of an organism -- can also change. Evolution does not change any single individual. Instead, it changes the inherited means of growth and development that typify a population a group of individuals of the same species living in a particular habitat. Parents pass adaptive genetic changes to their offspring, and ultimately these changes become common throughout a population. As a result, the offspring inherit those genetic characteristics that enhance their chances of survival and ability to give birth, which may work well until the environment changes. Human evolution took place as new genetic variations in early ancestor populations favored new abilities to adapt to environmental change and so altered the human way of life. Rick Potts provides a video short introduction to some of the evidence for human evolution , in the form of fossils and artifacts.

Chapter 3 : On the Human Being and Being Human

SEX, CULTURE, AND THE BIOLOGY OF RAPE Sex, Culture, and the Biology of Rape: Toward Explanation and Prevention Owen D. Jones For all that has been written about rape, its multiple causes remain.

It is only in the last 9, years that human adults have gained that ability without becoming ill. Children could manage it, but it was only when we turned to dairy farming that adults acquired the ability to properly digest milk. Drinking milk is just one of example of the way that traditions and cultural practices can influence the path of our evolution. Culture and genetics are traditionally thought of as two separate processes, but researchers are increasingly realising that they are intimately connected, each influencing the natural progression of the other. Scientists call it "gene-culture co-evolution. If we can pin down how culture influences our genetic makeup" and how the same processes apply to other creatures too" then we can be better understand how the way we act as a society today could influence our future. Another example of how culture influences our genes is the relationship between yam farming and malaria resistance. Throughout much of Africa, people are in constant battle with malaria. According to the CDC , in there were some million cases of malaria reported worldwide, and , were fatal. SPL But there are some people who seem to have a natural defense force. Their red blood cells, normally shaped like flattened disks, are shaped instead like a crescent or sickle. Because of the odd shaped blood cells, sickle-cell disease can lead to blockages in blood vessels , which in turn cause pain and organ damage. Under normal circumstances, evolution keeps sickle-cell disease to a minimum because it can be so harmful and can reduce life expectancy. But because of a biological quirk, the sickle-cell gene can actually protect against malaria. So in parts of the world where malaria infection rates are extremely high, like Africa, natural selection may actually favour the sickle-shaped cells. In the gamble of life, protection against malaria may be preferable, even at the potential cost of suffering from sickle-cell disease. In order to cultivate yams, trees had to be chopped down. More mosquitos mean more malaria, creating the conditions for sickle-shaped cells to become adaptive. Not all examples of gene-culture co-evolution are quite as beneficial. Polynesians, for example, have a uniquely high prevalence of type II diabetes. One group of researchers has discovered that the Polynesians have a particularly high frequency of a variant of a gene called PPARGC1A , and that may be responsible for their high frequency of type II diabetes, at least in part. View image of SPL Credit: SPL Why are they so uniquely afflicted by this disease? As the Polynesians settled the islands of the Pacific, they endured long voyages across the open ocean, and faced the stresses of cold and starvation. Those conditions may have encouraged "thrifty metabolism", which allows people to build up fat deposits more quickly when food is available. Natural selection may have increased the frequency of associated gene variants among them. However the sort of metabolism that would have been useful to explorers can lead to obesity and type II diabetes for individuals in modern cultures with consistent sources of nourishment. So modern Polynesians may have inherited a susceptibility to type II diabetes not because they lead a sedentary lifestyle, but because their ancestors decided to climb into some canoes and explore their planet. While these examples are perhaps the best understood examples of gene-culture co-evolution, researchers have identified scores of others. Our domestication of plants may have given a leg up to the genes that allow us to detoxify certain chemical compounds found in the plants we eat. Our history of exploring new territories and unfamiliar climates may have acted upon genes that allow us to tolerate more extreme heat or cold than our ancestors. The invention of cooking may have altered the evolution of our jaw muscles and our tooth enamel. The emergence of language and complex social cognition may have prompted natural selection to further guide the development of our brains and nervous systems. SPL It would be easy to assume that cultural influences are unique to humans. It might be happening among the dolphins of Shark Bay, Australia. A group of researchers led by University of New South Wales biologist Anna Kopps has been studying the bottlenose dolphins of the western part of the bay. A well known form of foraging among these dolphins is "sponging," a behavior that involves carrying a conical sponge to protect their faces as they root around the seafloor looking for food. The behavior, as Kopps points out, is "almost exclusively transmitted from mothers to their offspring through social learning". This link does not necessarily provide us with

evidence that a cultural behavior has caused alterations in the genetic material, unlike the lactose tolerance, malaria resistance, and thrifty metabolism examples in humans. View image of Could wearing robot prosthetics influence our future evolution? Thinkstock Cultural influence on our own evolution continues apace, but it is currently nearly impossible to predict just how it will happen. What sorts of genetic adaptations will we see as a result of our technological culture? Will those adaptations apply universally, or only among some of us? How will human-machine interfaces, such as robotic prostheses or neural implants, affect our gene pools? Will the propensity for violent sports in some cultures lead to adaptations to protect against head trauma? It no longer makes sense to think of genetics and culture as two separate uninteracting monoliths. The difficulty is identifying how and if one is influencing the other.

Chapter 4 : Does culture affect our personality? - Individual Traits and Culture

A fascinating thesis and a timely synthesis. Becker urges the reader to view certain arcane cultural rituals as being in the mainstream of spiritual development and argues that the resulting trance-like states may relate to the basic fabric of emotions and consciousness, which are our ancestral, animalian heritage.

Think back to when humans first got the capacity for cumulative cultural evolution—and by this I mean the ability for ideas to accumulate over generations, to get an increasingly complex tool starting from something simple. The two systems begin interacting over time, and the most important selection pressures over the course of human evolution are the things that culture creates—like tools. Compared to chimpanzees, we have high levels of manual dexterity. We can thread a needle. Another example here is fire and cooking. We have no innate fire-making ability. But once you got this idea for cooking and making fires to be culturally transmitted, then it created a whole new selection pressure that made our stomachs smaller, our teeth smaller, our gapes or holdings of our mouth smaller, it altered the length of our intestines. It had a whole bunch of downstream effects. Early work on human status just took humans to have a kind of status that stems from non-human status. Chimps, other primates, have dominant status. The assumption for a long time was that status in humans was just a kind of human version of this dominant status, but if you apply this gene-culture co-evolutionary thinking, the idea that culture is one of the major selection pressures in human evolution, you come up with this idea that there might be a second kind of status. We call this status prestige. You have information resources that can be tapped, and then you want to isolate the members of your group who are most likely to have a lot of this resources, meaning a lot of the knowledge or information that could be useful to you in the future. This causes you to focus on those individuals, differentially attend to them, preferentially listen to them and give them deference in exchange for knowledge that you get back, for copying opportunities in the future. Subordinates in dominance hierarchies are afraid. They look away, where as prestige hierarchies are quite the opposite. You want to be near them. You want to look at them, watch them, listen to them, and interact with them. There may be even specific hormonal profiles with the two kinds of status. Of course, the evidence available in the Paleolithic record is pretty sparse, so another possibility is that it emerged about , years ago. If you look at the paleo-climatic record, you can see that the environment starts to fluctuate a lot starting about , years ago and going to about six or five hundred thousand years ago. This would have created a selection pressure for lots of cultural learning for lots of focusing on other members of your group, and taking advantage of that cumulative body of non-genetic knowledge. This would have created a selection pressure for lots of cultural learning. Another signature of cultural learning is regional differentiation and material culture, and you see that by about , years ago. So, you could have a kind of late emergence at , years ago. A middle guess would be , years ago based on the climate, and then the early guess would be, say, the origin of genus, 1. We know that humans share a common ancestry with chimpanzees about five or six million years ago with chimpanzees and bonobos, and the question is, what kind of ape was that? One possibility, and the typical assumption, is that the ape was more like a chimpanzee or a bonobo. You want a number of individuals in your social environment to be trying out different techniques—say different techniques for getting nuts or for finding food or for tracking animals. Then you need to pay attention to them so you can take advantage of the variation between them. We seem to have long distance running adaptations. Our feet have a particular anatomy. We have sweat glands and we can run really far. Hunter-gatherers can chase down game by just running the antelope down until it collapses. We seem generally attracted to running, and the question is, how did we become such long distance runners? First you have to get the culturally transmitted knowledge about animal behavior and tracking and spore knowledge and the ability to identify individuals, which is something you need to practice, and only after that can you begin to take advantage of long distance running techniques and being able to run animals down. The same idea follows from cooking and fire. Since we know that those are culturally transmitted now, when we begin to see evidence that that affected our anatomy, that gives us clues to the origins of our capacities for culture. This is the emergence of complex societies that happens after the origins of agriculture, when societies begin to get big and complex and you

have lots of interactions among strangers, large-scale cooperation, market exchange, militaries, division of labor, substantial division of labor. What are the causal processes that bring these things about? Then you get intense competition amongst the early farming groups, and this is going to favor those groups who have the abilities to expand. You need to be precise about what you mean by these cultural traits and norms. The emergence of high-moralizing gods is an important example of this. In small-scale hunter-gatherer religions, the gods are typically whimsical. These are the kinds of things you need to make a market run to have a successful division of labor. We also think that ritual plays a role in this in that rituals seem to be sets of practices engineered by cultural evolution to be effective at transmitting belief and transmitting faith. By attending a ritual, you elevate the degree of belief in the high-moralizing gods or the priests of the religion by the ritual practice. If you break down rituals common in many religions, they put the words in the mouths of a prestigious member of the group, someone everyone respects. That makes it more likely to transmit and be believed. People also engage in what we call credibility-enhancing displays [during rituals]. These are costly things. It might be an animal sacrifice or the giving of a large sum of money or some kind of painful initiation rite like circumcision, which one would only engage in if one actually believed in it. Speaking in unison, large congregations saying the same thing, this all taps our capacity for conformist transmission; the fact that we weight what everybody believes in deciding in what we believe. These seem to want to tap our cultural transmission abilities to deepen the faith, and one of the interesting kind of ways that this has developed is that high-moralizing gods will often require rituals of this kind, and then by forcing people to routinely do the rituals, they then guarantee that the next generation acquires a deepened faith in the god, and then the whole thing perpetuates itself. It creates a self-perpetuating cycle. We think religions are just one element, one way in which culture has figured out ways to expand the sphere of cooperation and allow markets to form and people to exchange and to maintain the substantial division of labor. Markets require a great deal of trust and a great deal of cooperation to work. Sometimes you get the impression from economics that markets are for self-interested individuals. In developing this line of thought, one of the things you need to be clear about is what you mean by culture and culture evolution. Culture is one of those terms that has lots of different meanings, and people have used it lots of different ways. You might get tips that are transmitted verbally as you go along. The case in which the cultural transmission is high enough fidelity that you can learn one thing from one generation, and that begins to accumulate in subsequent generations. One possible exception to that is bird song. Bird songs accumulate in such that birds from large continents have more complex songs than birds from islands. It turns out humans from smaller islands have less complex material culture than humans from larger islands, at least until recently, until communication was opened up. I began this investigation by looking at a case study in Tasmania. Up until about 10, years ago, 12, years ago, the archeology of Tasmania looks the same as Australia. It seems to be moving along together. It becomes less complex. The ability to make fire is probably lost. Bone tools are lost. Boats are probably lost. You start out with two genetically well-intermixed peoples. If your number of minds working on the problem gets small enough, you can actually begin to lose information. It also depends on the innovativeness of your individuals, but that has a relatively small effect compared to the effect of being well interconnected and having a large population. There have been a number of tests of this recently, the best of which is this study by Rob Boyd and Michelle Kline in which they took the fishing technologies of different Oceanic islands from the time when Europeans first arrived, and they looked at how the population size of the island relates to the tool complexity, and larger islands had much bigger and more complex fishing technologies, and you can even show an effective contact. If you follow this idea a little bit further, then it does give you a sense that rates of innovation should continue to increase, especially with the emergence of communication technologies, because these allow ideas to flow very rapidly from place to place. Embedded in this whole information-sharing thing is a constant cooperative dilemma in which individuals have to be willing to share for the good of the group. It reduces male-male competition. We have a sort of human nature that pushes us towards polygyny whenever there are sufficient resources. But in the modern world, of course, monogamy is normative, and people who have too many wives are thought poorly of by the larger society. The question is, how did this ever get in place? And of course, it traces back through Europe. One of the things that distinguished Europe from the rest of the world was

something called the European Marriage Pattern, and part of that was normative monogamy, the idea that taking a second wife was wrong as long as you still had the first wife, and this actually traces back to Rome and eventually to Athens. Athens legislates the first rules about monogamous marriage just before the Classical period. This was an example of a case where people are ready to moralize it, and I like to view it as the evolution of this marriage system of monogamy. Depending on what your value systems are, if you think freedom is really important, then you might be for polygyny, but if you want to trade freedom off against other social ills like high crime, then you might favor the laws that prohibit polygamy. Societies that have this are better able to maintain a harmonious population, increase trade and exchange, and have economic growth more than societies that allow polygamy, especially if you have a society with widely varying amounts of wealth, especially among males. They have harems and stuff like that. Norms of modern society prevent that. It depends on what your views are about freedom versus societal level benefits. Culture is part of our biology. Part of my program of research is to convince people that they should stop distinguishing cultural and biological evolution as separate in that way. We want to think of it all as biological evolution. We want to distinguish genetic evolution and cultural evolution, and then at some point we may have epigenetic evolution, and there are other kinds of inheritance systems. Culture is deep in our biology. We have people with different cultural backgrounds that have different hormonal reactions as well as having different brains on the MRI scan. A good example of this is the placebos. Placebos are something that depend on your cultural beliefs.

Another example of how culture influences our genes is the relationship between yam farming and malaria resistance. Throughout much of Africa, people are in constant battle with malaria.

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. Modern science and the demotion of mind A much more powerful ground of opposition to the ethos of idealism , as well as to many of its principal themes, was the fact that it was simply too much at odds with the rising tide of scientific progress in the late 19th century. Furthermore, naturalism dominated the thought of the 20th century and showed little interest in the traditional themes of philosophical anthropology and even less in the mind-centred conception of human nature with which philosophical anthropology was identified. The most powerful and influential opposition to these ideas came from scientific developments that appeared to show conclusively that the exceptional status accorded to human nature had been invalidated. Three such movements of thought had an especially significant effect on the way human nature was coming to be conceived: What is important here is the fact that, however different these three movements may have been, they shared a strong inclination toward demoting the conscious mind from its privileged position within human self-understanding and assigning a determining role to some very different part of human nature. Evolution In the first instance, the theory of evolution claimed that the various species of living things have a natural rather than a divine origin. These species evolve through random changes that occur in their members, though these changes themselves are not per se inheritable, as the French biologist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck had supposed. In this way, a process of natural selection takes place from which the human species itself emerged. As a theory of human nature, evolution had a humbling effect on the pride associated with claims that humans held a privileged status among living things. Yet it did not have any direct bearing on the traditionally held distinction between the body and the mind. It was, in fact, hard to imagine what further influence evolution could have in the human case without appealing to changes that in one way or another would be of a mental character. All of this made evolutionary thought more of a threat to religious beliefs than to philosophical accounts of human nature, because the latter did not require any special assumptions regarding how the human species was formed. Yet when evolutionary theory joined forces with genetics , as it did in the 20th century, it became possible to point to something within the human bodyâ€” genes â€”that accounted for the heritable traits and mutations that occur in humans and in all living things. The inference has been widely drawn that human genetic makeup determines matters that had previously been thought to be controlled by rational thought and moral decision making. Now that the human genome has been completely sequenced, it may appear as though all the categories that have defined moral personality have been displaced by DNA , the organic chemical in which genetic information is encoded. This at least has been the popular understanding of these developments, and apparently that of some professional students of these matters as well. These developments have been carried further by the emergence of evolutionary psychology , which equates the mind with the brain and views it as progressively modified by the same kinds of evolutionary changes that occur in all living things. Psychoanalysis Psychoanalytic theory has had a similarly displacing effect on human self-understanding. Although Freud originally conceived psychological processes in terms of energy exchanges within a physiological system, his mature theory was couched in a language of mind and consciousness that he modified for his own purposes. Freud, SigmundSigmund Freud, But it would be a mistake to deny on a priori grounds the reality of the facts to which Freud was calling attention. The issue is rather one of finding an appropriate way of conceptualizing the kinds of facts that have been described in this wayâ€”a way that does not entail these incongruities. Neither Freud nor his followers appear to have been interested in conceptual issues of this kind. As a result, a rather crude picture established itself of the conscious mind operating under the control of an external agency. Artificial intelligence Originating in the work of the British mathematician and logician Alan Turing , artificial intelligence involves the effort to produce machines in most cases, computers that are capable of executing tasks formerly thought to require human intelligence and thus mind. The distinction between computer hardware the actual physical makeup of these machines and software the

sets of instructions or programs by which computers perform these tasks has become the effective replacement for the old philosophical distinction between body and mind. Of the three scientific movements reviewed here, AI represents the most ambitious challenge to traditional conceptions of the soul-mind, because it is the one most explicitly associated with a materialist account of human beings. Thus far, however, the accomplishments of AI have been meagre. It has produced a chess-playing machine that has defeated the reigning world champion, but in areas such as language translation, where context is far more nuanced than it is in chess, the results have been uneven. It is evident that the highest aspiration of supporters of AI is the production of an artificial human being. What goes missing in all this is any attempt to characterize the broader human context from which these capabilities have been abstracted and to determine whether there is anythingâ€”emotions, for exampleâ€”that cannot be assimilated to the computational model. However, because the only general conception that is available to them of what a human being is like seems to them to be hopelessly outdated and ineptly philosophical, they conclude that the picture they are constructing is the only possible scientific one. They therefore maintain that science is necessarily materialist and that every departure from materialism is without cognitive legitimacy. Phenomenology as a response to materialism All this raises a question as to what resources may be available to any philosophical anthropology that proposes to represent that broader human context. In the English-speaking world there appears to be a widely shared disposition to assume that philosophy can be accommodated within a materialist framework, provided that the issues it deals with are couched in linguistic or broadly scientific terms rather than in purely mentalistic ones. The only large movement of thought that has not joined in this consensus, in fact, is phenomenology. Thus, if philosophical anthropology has affinities anywhere in contemporary philosophy, it is reasonable to assume that they are with the thought of some of the principal representatives of that movement. On closer inspection, however, it may seem doubtful that this is the case, since most phenomenologists have opposed the conception of the human subject as a soul or a mind. The history of this opposition thus deserves further attention.

Foundations of phenomenology The phenomenological movement was founded by the German philosopher Edmund Husserl, whose influence on other philosophers drawn to phenomenology was both positive and negative. In order to block all such false assimilations, Husserl held that it was necessary to set aside the very existence of the natural worldâ€”not in the sense of denying it outright but rather in the sense of not assuming it as a given or counting on it for the purpose of describing consciousness. What would be left to work with would be states of pure consciousnessâ€”states that, under normal conditions, are largely directed toward what exists in the world but which for these purposes must be taken simply as what is thoughtâ€”that is, as meanings. It has been purged of everything that tends to confuse it with the body or anything else that is physical in character. The transcendental self is also the form of consciousness that registers whatever truths are accessible to humans about the world and about themselves. As such, it cannot be subject to any external or causal influence, because such influence would itself be registered by this transcendental consciousness. Although Husserl insisted that his reduction of the world to its role in consciousness was purely methodological, he never canceled the suspension of belief that this reduction required. As a result, no status ever accrued to natural reality other than that to which it had been reducedâ€”the status, namely, of something meant by pure consciousness. Without doubt, the most original and influential among them was Martin Heidegger. Any temptation to classify him as sympathetic to humanistic or anthropological concerns, however, was negated by his *Letter on Humanism*, which he wrote in response to a lecture by the French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre. Sartre had argued that existential philosophy of the kind he had appropriated in good part from Heidegger had a humanistic character. Heidegger repudiated this suggestion by identifying humanism with a seriously deficient account of human being that reduces humankind to the status of an entity of a special kind. Heidegger also made it very clear that his own work should not be confused with philosophical anthropology. Yet, at the same time and in the same essay, he appeared willing to reinstate the honorifics that he believed the proponents of humanism had improperly applied to a misconceived human nature, provided that that nature was correctly understood in the terms he was himself proposing. With it went the assumption that specific mental states were needed to mediate the relation of the mind to everything outside it. The human subject was not a mind that was capable only of representing the world to itself and

whose linkage with its body was merely a contingent one. This strongly pragmatic strain later yielded to a conception of the access to being as a kind of gift that humans are privileged to receive. No traditional humanism, however, could endorse his conception of the near-complete passivity of humans in their commerce with being, and in this light it may be the case that not Heidegger but Sartre was closer to the authentic spirit of humanism. The primary significance of this unitary treatment of human being is that it does not sequester the principal functions of a human being in a rather mysteriously conceived part thereof. This represents a genuine alternative to both the body-cum-soul conception of human being and to the straightforward identification of human beings with their bodies, which is the approach taken by most contemporary philosophers. The Heideggerian alternative If the Heideggerian alternative were ever to be widely understood and accepted, it would amount to a great transformation of both the philosophical anthropology that Heidegger rejected and, it may be surmised, of philosophy as well. The essential thesis that defines this alternative is that a human being is a unitary entity and that, as such, it is neither a material nor a mental thing. This thesis does not entail that there must be something wrong with what the natural sciences say in their own idiom about the human organism or anything else; it simply means that the materialist approach does not constitute an exhaustive account of human nature, and it misses altogether when it does not positively obscure what a human being is. They do so, moreover, as active beings for whom there is always something that can either be done or not done at any given point in their lives. These actions and nonactions generate an order of fact that is distinctively different from natural reality and that has a moral dimension that the latter altogether lacks. As such, they set the context within which the more ontologically restricted processes of the so-called natural world take place. Another way of saying this is to point out that the term nature, as conceived and delimited by a materialist ontology, cannot contain human beings, because it strips them of precisely the characteristics by which they are able to disclose the world instead of being mere pieces of it. As a result, the theory of the world that natural scientists elaborate stands alone as though it had no human author. What is clear is that the materialist picture of the world, considering all that it leaves out, is extremely rickety and correspondingly vulnerable. If philosophical anthropology is indeed an authentic form of humanism, it now has a great opportunity to propose another version of the way things are, one in which humans can recognize themselves better than they can through any strictly materialist approach.

nettle: Culture is a part of human biology, as much a part as bipedal locomotion or thick enamel on our molars. Because of culture people can do many weird and wonderful things.

Gestures and Pantomimic Actions. Sex, Diet, and the Politics of Nationalism.. University of Pennsylvania Press. Anthropology and Social Imagery. Aspects of Ancient Uterine Magic. Greek Roman Byzantine Stud. Discusses the ways in which human and supernatural interventions were thought capable of interfering with the natural process of reproduction. Rabelais and his world, tr. People write about bodies as grotesque low, coarse, vulgar, and profane or classical closed, complete, smooth, sealed, etherealized , influencing the experience of readers. The propriety of etherealized discourse is threatened by what Bakhtin calls carnivalesque inversions. Written in dense jargon. Barker locates the invention of the bourgeois body in 17C. It was privatized and etherealized. The self, external earlier [? Henry Holt and Company. Cross-cultural ideas of death and the body. Barnes, Barry; Steven Shapin, editors. Historical Studies of Scientific Culture. Cooter, "The Power of the Body. Astrology, Physiognomics and Medicine under the Roman Empire. Histories of cultural materialism. Steps to an ecology of mind. The self as part of a cybernetic system whose boundaries are wider than the skin. Mind is not peculiar to the individual but immanent in an ecosystem. The Body, in Theory: Histories of Cultural Materialism, tr. University of Michigan Press. Largely postmodern comment on a great variety of topics, some contemporary. Body, Self, and Society: The View from Fiji. Eleven case studies examining "the embodiment of culture in and through image. University of Chicago Press. The Unconscious Significance of Hair. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Examination of hair-activities in dreams, anthropology, folklore, symptoms, and perversions as expression of instinct-driven tensions and conflicts. Coming to Our Senses: Body and Spirit in the Hidden History of the West. Birdwhistell formulates a technical system for codifying body movement. He understands the body to be invested in a communication system, part of which is organized internally, part of which is displayed externally, and part of which is elaborated contextually. The Anthropology of the Body. Wombs and Alien Spirits: Examines spirit possession cults in Sudan and how they function in terms of gender relations, explanations of mental and physical illness, and misfortune. Illness and Death in a Maritime City: Gdansk in the 17th Century. Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body. University of California Press. Attitudes to the Body in Western Christendom. Outline of an theory of practice. Culture is embodied and fabricated from the body. Literal and symbolic properties form the social body. Boyd, Robert; Silk, Joan B. The Body and Society: Lectures on the History of Religions, n. Training the Body for China. Sex, Gender and Citizenship in the Early Republic. On body images etc. Holy Feast and Holy Fast: Johns Hopkins University Press. Reconsidering the Stigma of Physical Disability: Wheelchair Use and Public Kindness. The Sociological Quarterly, Magic, Myth, and Medicine. Written on the Body. The Tattoo in European and American History. Matter, Morals, and Medicine: Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 7: The Sadien Woman and the Ideology of Pornography. In Pursuit of the Perfect Appearance: In Journal of Applied Social Psychology, v24 n5. The American Image of Beauty: A Journal of Research, v29 n Medicine Is The Law. The University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu. The Body, Identity, and Self: Examines stages to adapting to serious chronic illness. Introduction to Ayurvedic Medicine in a very Americanized form. A Contemporary Introduction to the Philosophy of the Mind. The newly born woman. Account of a southern Italian ritual dance, the tarantella, in which women "cure" themselves of what moderns perceive as a psychosexual disease. Clarke, Bruce; Wendell Aycock, editors. The Body and the Text. Comparative Essays in Literature and Medicine. Studies in Comparative Literature, In Psychological Reports, Celebrates the blonde past, present, and future. The Early Nineteenth Century. On popular physiology in 18C Edinburgh. Summary in file, s. Prostitution and Sexuality in France After Cambridge: Control, Release, and Social Body. The Existential Ground of Culture and Self. Cambridge Studies in Medical Anthropology. A Corpus for the Body. Journal of Modern History, March, Clumsily written essay review of Feher etc. A History of Sexuality in America. Dwarfism in Egypt and Classical Antiquity: Iconography and Medical History. A Cross Cultural Perspective on Personhood.

Chapter 7 : Deaf Gain – University of Minnesota Press

Quarks to Culture is a must-read. It weaves the myriad patterns of universe, life, and consciousness into a wonderful new tapestry. It weaves the myriad patterns of universe, life, and consciousness into a wonderful new tapestry.

Anthropology , Human evolution , and Timeline of human evolution The genus Homo evolved and diverged from other hominins in Africa, after the human clade split from the chimpanzee lineage of the hominids great apes branch of the primates. Modern humans, defined as the species Homo sapiens or specifically to the single extant subspecies Homo sapiens sapiens, proceeded to colonize all the continents and larger islands, arriving in Eurasia ,60, years ago, [19] [20] Australia around 40, years ago, the Americas around 15, years ago, and remote islands such as Hawaii, Easter Island , Madagascar , and New Zealand between the years and The gibbons family Hylobatidae and orangutans genus Pongo were the first groups to split from the line leading to the humans, then gorillas genus Gorilla followed by the chimpanzees genus Pan. The splitting date between human and chimpanzee lineages is placed around 48 million years ago during the late Miocene epoch. Each of these species has been argued to be a bipedal ancestor of later hominins, but all such claims are contested. It is also possible that any one of the three is an ancestor of another branch of African apes, or is an ancestor shared between hominins and other African Hominoidea apes. The question of the relation between these early fossil species and the hominin lineage is still to be resolved. More recently, however, in , stone tools , perhaps predating Homo habilis, have been discovered in northwestern Kenya that have been dated to 3. During the next million years a process of encephalization began, and with the arrival of Homo erectus in the fossil record, cranial capacity had doubled. Homo erectus were the first of the hominina to leave Africa, and these species spread through Africa, Asia, and Europe between 1. One population of H. It is believed that these species were the first to use fire and complex tools. The earliest transitional fossils between H. These descendants of African H. The earliest fossils of anatomically modern humans are from the Middle Paleolithic , about , years ago such as the Omo remains of Ethiopia and the fossils of Herto sometimes classified as Homo sapiens idaltu. The most significant of these adaptations are 1. The relationship between all these changes is the subject of ongoing debate. The earliest bipedal hominin is considered to be either Sahelanthropus [39] or Orrorin , with Ardipithecus , a full bipedal, [40] coming somewhat later. It is possible that bipedalism was favored because it freed up the hands for reaching and carrying food, because it saved energy during locomotion, because it enabled long distance running and hunting, or as a strategy for avoiding hyperthermia by reducing the surface exposed to direct sun. However, the differences between the structure of human brains and those of other apes may be even more significant than differences in size. The reduced degree of sexual dimorphism is primarily visible in the reduction of the male canine tooth relative to other ape species except gibbons. Another important physiological change related to sexuality in humans was the evolution of hidden estrus. Humans are the only ape in which the female is fertile year round, and in which no special signals of fertility are produced by the body such as genital swelling during estrus. These changes taken together have been interpreted as a result of an increased emphasis on pair bonding as a possible solution to the requirement for increased parental investment due to the prolonged infancy of offspring. Archaic human admixture with modern humans , Early human migrations , Multiregional origin of modern humans , Prehistoric autopsy , and Recent African origin of modern humans By the beginning of the Upper Paleolithic period 50, BP , full behavioral modernity , including language , music and other cultural universals had developed. Since , evidence for gene flow between archaic and modern humans during the period of roughly , to 30, years ago has been discovered. This includes modern human admixture in Neanderthals, Neanderthal admixture in modern humans, [53] [54] Denisova hominin admixture in Melanesians [55] as well as repeated admixture from unnamed archaic humans to Sub-Saharan African populations. They inhabited Eurasia and Oceania by 40, years ago, and the Americas at least 14, years ago.

Chapter 8 : Human - Wikipedia

A characteristic of the anthropological perspective that describes, at the highest and most inclusive level, how anthropology tries to integrate all that is known about human beings and their activities.

Author bio Description Different cultures and the specific culture manifested within them are intrinsically linked to addiction in a complex fashion which has a long history. For important thinkers, such as Nietzsche, addiction actually embodies human culture, rendering addiction and culture inseparable. Utopia has often become dystopia. Not only is an understanding of addiction key to understanding culture but to an understanding of the very act thinking itself and the way of being in the world. Addiction raises key philosophical questions, such as: Is it biology or environment is it the external world or the internal that drives addiction, or a complex combination of both? In a contemporary context the media frenzy around celebrity addiction continually fuels public debate in this area, and this book deepens the understanding of addiction within this contentious context. This book addresses a key concern over how addiction became the norm, and it seeks to understand its dominance comprehensively. How did it come to pass that not being an addict was a transgressive act and way of being? While there has been a great deal of debate about addiction utilizing the discourse of individual and often competing disciplines such as biology and psychology, little attention has been paid to the cultural aspects of addiction. The innovative approach taken by this book is to offer insights into this complex area through a contemporary methodology that covers diverse interrelated areas. Academic analysis is also given to the discourse on celebrity culture and addiction. A contemporary fusion of the humanities and the social sciences is the best way forward to tackle this subject and move the debate on. The focus of this study is an innovative interdisciplinary and intercultural approach to addiction, from the social sciences to the humanities, including cultural studies, film and media studies, and literary studies. This edited collection is the first study to provide such a comprehensive analysis of the cultures of addiction. Traversing cultures across the globe, including Asia, Central America, as well as Europe and America, this book opens up the debate in addiction studies and cultural studies. The important insights the book delivers helps to answer questions such as: In what way can Deleuze further the understanding of addiction through the analysis of rock lyrics? How does anthropology improve the understanding of AA groups? These are just some of the vast array of areas this book covers. No other book has such depth and contemporary breadth. Cultures of Addiction is an important book for those taking cultural studies courses across a range of interrelated disciplines, including English and literary studies, history, American studies, and film and media studies. This will be invaluable to library collections in these fields and beyond in the social sciences, and specifically in addiction studies and psychology.

Chapter 9 : Culture (disambiguation) - Wikipedia

So culture is just part of our biology, and we shouldn't take this dualistic view that there's this realm of ideas that somehow are separate from this realm of biology, and you're either talking about the realm of ideas or the realm of biology.

Biological Evolution Human beings are animals. This is not a reference to our behavior although, of course, some people do act like animals. It is a reference to the fact that humans are biological creatures, as much as crocodiles, cougars, and capybara. We are the product of millions of years of evolution, our physical make-up changing to make us fitter to survive and reproduce. However, although humans are animals, we also have something that no other animal has: We gather in families, tribes, clans, nations. We have an incredibly sophisticated method of interacting -- speech. We can communicate over time and distance through printing and broadcasting. Our memories are the longest, our interactions the most intricate, our perception of the world simultaneously the broadest and most detailed. The combination of biology and society is what makes us what we are and do what we do. Biology guides our responses to stimuli, based on thousands of generations of ancestors surviving because of their responses. Our social structures dictate restrictions on and alterations in how we carry out our biological responses. Neither biology nor society stands without the other. For some people, this is a contradiction -- either nature biology controls people, or nurture society does. But in fact we filter everything through both to determine how we react to stimuli. The following is a discussion of the two sides of human nature: I will discuss each in turn. The latter includes mentally or economically healthy. Since human beings are very social creatures, we may also apply self-preservation to other people, such as our families. However, I will discuss that in the next chapter. A doe, unaware of the danger lurking in the grass, separates slightly from the herd. With a rush, the lioness bursts into a run to take down the doe. The startled doe bounds away, running and swerving, trying to escape. The lioness, unable to keep up the pace, gives up, and the doe escapes back into the herd. A zebra is not so lucky, and the pride feasts. The Donner Party was a group of settlers trekking to California in Trapped by snow in the Sierra Nevada Mountains , they survived as best they could. This included resorting to cannibalism when they ran out of food, eating the bodies of those who had died. To be successful as a species, the members of that species must have a desire to survive long enough to pass on their genes to offspring. A species with a death-wish dies out rather quickly. It is from those individuals and therefore species that all living things are descended. The desire to stay alive is an instinctive one, built into the psyche of the organism. The organism will seek those elements of its environment that will enhance its chances for survival. These include food, water, oxygen, and periods of rest to allow the body to repair any wear and tear on the tissues. Alternately, it will avoid or evade those elements that might reduce its chances for survival. Such dangers include predators, starvation, dehydration, asphyxiation, and situations that can cause damage to the body. These seek or avoid drives influence the behavior of organisms: The desire to stay alive is also a selfish instinct, since it is personal survival that the organism is seeking. Survival Through Evolution A phrase that has often been misquoted, "Survival of the Fittest," actually means survival of the fit. By fit, I mean an organism has those attributes that allow it to get the most out of its environment: The better it is at doing this, the more fit it is. At this point I should discuss the niche. A niche is a position within an environment that calls for certain attributes to exploit that environment. An environment can contain any of a variety of elements: It can also contain animal life, from the tiniest insects to blue whales and everything in between. It is the combination and degree of each of these elements that create niches. Say there are many small animals, like mice, in an area. A small carnivore like a wildcat could find a lot of food. Thus, it would fit into this niche and thrive. However, when the number of mice decreases, the wildcat can find less food, and has a lesser chance of survival. If the wildcat has competition from other small carnivores, like foxes, the one that is particularly good as a predator, through cunning or speed or some other attribute, will catch more food. This lessens the amount of food available for the competition, and thus drives the competition out. If the fox is better at catching mice that is, more fit than the wildcat, the wildcat will either die or have to move to another niche in which it will be the better predator. On the other hand, if there are no small animals but many big

animals, like antelope, neither a fox nor a wildcat would have much success preying on them. However, large carnivores such as lions would. Of course, nothing stays the same forever. Niches alter through geologic, climatic and, in the present day, man-made changes in land, water and air. A volcano can create a new island. An ice age can lock up huge quantities of water in ice caps and glaciers, creating areas of land where oceans once rolled. Continental drift can push seabeds to the tops of mountains. Humans can chop down forests and build cities. All these changes alter the niches, the environmental conditions under which the life in those niches live. Of course, this means the life has to change as well, to match the new conditions. An example is a moth in England. It was originally a mottled white, which allowed it to blend into the light bark of the trees in its area. However, in the 19th century factories in this area began to belch out soot from their chimneys that settled on the trees, changing the tree bark from mottled white to mottled black. The moth could no longer blend in and thus was easy prey to birds. However, some of the moths were darker and thus less noticeable. After a few generations of these darker moths surviving and passing on their genes, the standard color changed to mottled black, and the moth, now blending into the dark bark, survives. Note that such changes are not conscious decisions made by the organism: Some of those variations are detrimental: However, as the conditions in a niche change, those same variations can become advantageous, enhancing rather than weakening chances for survival. If no variations exist in a species that contribute to survival when conditions change, or if conditions change too quickly for advantageous variations to be passed on to enough descendants, the species can die out.

Survival Through Strategy Other changes in an organism can develop over time. For example, some animals have perfected the technique of hibernating during periods when the food supply is low. Marmots have developed a social structure that provides lookouts who watch for predators and sound a warning when one appears. Prairie dogs dig their burrows with multiple entrances and exits so if a predator comes in one door, the dogs can leave through another. These survival strategies are adaptations to niche conditions, but unlike physical changes are not necessarily genetic changes. However, some survival strategies are learned behaviors. That is, the young learn them from older animals that learned them from their ancestors. For example, most predators teach their young the techniques of successful hunting. In general, it appears the higher the complexity of the nervous system of the animal, the more likely strategies are learned rather than instinctive. Sharks, with a relatively simple nervous system, hunt by instinct and need no instruction on how to go about it. Lions, with a complex system, must learn the techniques of stealth, stalk, and attack. Again, in most animals, the strategies are not conscious decisions, but responses to stimuli such as hunger, thirst, asphyxiation, fear, or exhaustion. If conditions change so the instinctive strategy is dangerous rather than beneficial, the animal can die. The musk ox strategy is to form a stationary circle with the young in the center and the older members facing outward, rather than running away. This is excellent against wolves, but deadly when faced with spears and guns perfect, however, for the human survival strategy of group hunting with weapons. For example, the genetically dictated instinctive reaction to a threat to self-preservation is the "fight or flight" syndrome. The changes include an increased rate of respiration to provide more oxygen to the muscles, an accelerated heart beat to speed up the blood flow, a lessening in sensitivity to pain, and changes in the blood stream, including an injection of adrenalin and diversion away from the organs to the muscles. These physiological changes prepare the animal to either fight for survival or run away from danger. For example, an amoeba will avoid an electric field automatically -- an instinctive reaction unmitigated by a survival strategy. A starving rat, however, will run across an electrified grid that gives it painful shocks if there is food on the other side. Humans are subject to the same stimuli and reactions as any other animal. Hunger, thirst, asphyxiation, fear, and exhaustion are physical sensations that cause instinctive physical reactions. Thus you eat when hungry, drink when thirsty, fight for air, run from dangerous situations, sleep. These responses are instinctive, and we have no more control over them than we do over our eye color. Actually, we do have control over our eye color. The reason we do is why our approach to self-preservation is different from all other creatures.