

Anthropology is the study of humans and human behavior and societies in the past and present. Social anthropology and cultural anthropology study the norms and values of societies.

Methods[edit] Modern cultural anthropology has its origins in, and developed in reaction to, 19th century ethnology , which involves the organized comparison of human societies. Frazer in England worked mostly with materials collected by others – usually missionaries, traders, explorers, or colonial officials – earning them the moniker of "arm-chair anthropologists". Participant observation Participant observation is one of the principle research methods of cultural anthropology. It relies on the assumption that the best way to understand a group of people is to interact with them closely over a long period of time. Historically, the group of people being studied was a small, non-Western society. However, today it may be a specific corporation, a church group, a sports team, or a small town. This allows the anthropologist to develop trusting relationships with the subjects of study and receive an inside perspective on the culture, which helps him or her to give a richer description when writing about the culture later. To establish connections that will eventually lead to a better understanding of the cultural context of a situation, an anthropologist must be open to becoming part of the group, and willing to develop meaningful relationships with its members. Before participant observation can begin, an anthropologist must choose both a location and a focus of study. This allows the anthropologist to become better established in the community. The lack of need for a translator makes communication more direct, and allows the anthropologist to give a richer, more contextualized representation of what they witness. In addition, participant observation often requires permits from governments and research institutions in the area of study, and always needs some form of funding. This can take the form of casual, friendly dialogue, or can also be a series of more structured interviews. A combination of the two is often used, sometimes along with photography, mapping, artifact collection, and various other methods. This helps to standardize the method of study when ethnographic data is being compared across several groups or is needed to fulfill a specific purpose, such as research for a governmental policy decision. One common criticism of participant observation is its lack of objectivity. Who the ethnographer is has a lot to do with what he or she will eventually write about a culture, because each researcher is influenced by his or her own perspective. However, these approaches have not generally been successful, and modern ethnographers often choose to include their personal experiences and possible biases in their writing instead. In terms of representation, an anthropologist has greater power than his or her subjects of study, and this has drawn criticism of participant observation in general. Simply by being present, a researcher causes changes in a culture, and anthropologists continue to question whether or not it is appropriate to influence the cultures they study, or possible to avoid having influence. Ethnography In the 20th century, most cultural and social anthropologists turned to the crafting of ethnographies. An ethnography is a piece of writing about a people, at a particular place and time. Typically, the anthropologist lives among people in another society for a period of time, simultaneously participating in and observing the social and cultural life of the group. Numerous other ethnographic techniques have resulted in ethnographic writing or details being preserved, as cultural anthropologists also curate materials, spend long hours in libraries, churches and schools poring over records, investigate graveyards, and decipher ancient scripts. A typical ethnography will also include information about physical geography, climate and habitat. It is meant to be a holistic piece of writing about the people in question, and today often includes the longest possible timeline of past events that the ethnographer can obtain through primary and secondary research. Kroeber , Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead drew on his conception of culture and cultural relativism to develop cultural anthropology in the United States. Simultaneously, Malinowski and A. Whereas cultural anthropology focused on symbols and values, social anthropology focused on social groups and institutions. Today socio-cultural anthropologists attend to all these elements. In the early 20th century, socio-cultural anthropology developed in different forms in Europe and in the United States. European " social anthropologists " focused on observed social behaviors and on "social structure", that is, on relationships among social roles for example, husband and wife, or parent and child and social

institutions for example, religion , economy , and politics. American "cultural anthropologists" focused on the ways people expressed their view of themselves and their world, especially in symbolic forms, such as art and myths. These two approaches frequently converged and generally complemented one another. For example, kinship and leadership function both as symbolic systems and as social institutions. Today almost all socio-cultural anthropologists refer to the work of both sets of predecessors, and have an equal interest in what people do and in what people say. Cross-cultural comparison[edit] One means by which anthropologists combat ethnocentrism is to engage in the process of cross-cultural comparison. It is important to test so-called "human universals" against the ethnographic record. Monogamy, for example, is frequently touted as a universal human trait, yet comparative study shows that it is not. Since , its mission has been to encourage and facilitate worldwide comparative studies of human culture, society, and behavior in the past and present. The second database, eHRAF Archaeology, covers major archaeological traditions and many more sub-traditions and sites around the world. Comparison across cultures includes the industrialized or de-industrialized West. Cultures in the more traditional standard cross-cultural sample of small scale societies are: Nevertheless, many contemporary socio-cultural anthropologists have rejected earlier models of ethnography as treating local cultures as bounded and isolated. These anthropologists continue to concern themselves with the distinct ways people in different locales experience and understand their lives , but they often argue that one cannot understand these particular ways of life solely from a local perspective; they instead combine a focus on the local with an effort to grasp larger political, economic, and cultural frameworks that impact local lived realities. Looking at culture as embedded in macro-constructions of a global social order, multi-sited ethnography uses traditional methodology in various locations both spatially and temporally. Through this methodology, greater insight can be gained when examining the impact of world-systems on local and global communities. Also emerging in multi-sited ethnography are greater interdisciplinary approaches to fieldwork, bringing in methods from cultural studies, media studies, science and technology studies, and others. In multi-sited ethnography, research tracks a subject across spatial and temporal boundaries. For example, a multi-sited ethnography may follow a "thing," such as a particular commodity, as it is transported through the networks of global capitalism. Multi-sited ethnography may also follow ethnic groups in diaspora.

Chapter 2 : Study Skills: Learn How To Study Anthropology

Anthropology is the study of humanity. Anthropology has origins in the natural sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences. Since the work of Franz Boas and BronisÅ,aw Malinowski in the late.

An Introduction to Christian Belief: Other areas of concern include human dignity, freedom, depravity, culture, and society. Thus it concerns the biblical doctrine of sin including its origin, nature, transmission, effects, and judgment. The Creation of Man There are several points that can be made from the Genesis narrative regarding the creation of man Gen These ideas are expanded upon and developed in the rest of Scripture. First, the origin of man is not in naturalistic evolution, but in the mind of God. Man was not an afterthought of some kind, or the result of blind evolutionary forces, but was created according to the purpose, plan, and good pleasure of God. Nothing else, including the angels, is said to be made in the image of God. Thus we are, in this sense, unique in the created order, with the result that we are both privileged and responsible cf. Both men and women together reflect the image of God. More about this in a minute. Third, we bear a special relationship to God. In our original creation, coming from the hand of God, we were holy, upright, and perfect and there was no hostility between God and us. Fourth, we have a certain role in creation. According to Genesis 2: Thus some have said that it refers to certain particular qualities in man such as his rational nature, morality, or religious capacity. Others, such as the Mormons, have claimed that the image of God is physical. Each of these views has a contribution to make, though it is doubtful whether the relational or functional view really answers the question as to what the image actually is not does. It is rather all of these and anything else that makes us like God, maintaining, of course, the necessary and Biblical Creator-creature distinctions contra Mormonism. The Constitutional Nature of Man The question has come up in theology as to the constitutional nature of man. Most naturalists would argue that man is monistic, that is, that he is purely physical and that he has no soul or immaterial substance to his being. There are many conservative theologians who would also argue along similar lines, though they nonetheless regard man as a special creation of God with a special destiny at least for the saved. But, there are several good, scriptural reasons for rejecting the monist account of human constitution. First, since God is a person and he does not have a body, but is spirit, we can safely argue that possessing a body is not the sine qua non of being a person. Further, God could be considered a paradigm case of personhood and if this is so, then only those beings that bear a similarity i. Second, the OT term nephesh, while it can refer to a body or parts of a body, nonetheless often identifies a person after death. Third, the OT portrays man as created of both material and immaterial substances Gen 2: Fourth, Jesus continued to exist after his death and before his resurrection which seems to imply that there was some immaterial aspect to his human being. Fifth, human beings are regarded as living spirits in the disembodied state Heb Sixth, the future resurrection of all people indicates that there is an intermediate state as departed souls await this resurrection. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are still alive Matt Moses and Elijah are alive as well Matt The story of Lazarus and the rich man seems to imply conscious life after physical death Luke Finally, Jesus made a clear distinction between the soul and body in Matthew Rather, be afraid of the one who can destroy both soul and body in hell. Many Christian theologians have argued for a trichotomous view of man, that he is body, soul, and spirit, where each term refers to separate substances. This view has often been advanced on the basis of passages such as 1 Thess 5: Are we to regard each of these as constituting a different substance? The point in 1 Thess 5: Thus it is tenuous at best to infer from these two texts specific details about our immaterial nature. Taking all the Biblical evidence into consideration, it appears that the best view is some form of dichotomy. In any view of man, however, two things need to be held in tension: In fact, both appear to be involved in everything we do. This view of man relates him well to his Creator in heaven and his commission here on earth. It also reads the Biblical data in a manner a little more consistent with the use of terms in Scripture where two or more terms can refer to the same immaterial substance. The Fall of Man and the Image of God Genesis 3 describes for us one of the most diabolical and saddest points in our very early history. Adam had been commanded by God not eat from the fruit of the tree which was in the middle of the garden. The command was concise, yet clear, and the consequence of disobedience was lucidly and

emphatically delineated: But with the entrance of the Serpent, who we now realize was Satan himself 2 Cor He was more crafty than all the wild animals the Lord God had made, and he said to the womanâ€ Gen 3: Well, you know the rest of the story: We ate the forbidden fruit, died spiritually something the Devil forgot [neglected? From our first parents we receive both the guilt of sin as well as a corrupt nature Rom 5: The image of God, as a result of the fall, is effaced but not erased. The Noahic covenant, instituting a measure of authority among men for dealing with murder Gen 9: Finally, when the saints reside in heaven, the image of God will be completely restored in them. In short, God has chosen us to be holy in his sight and to be conformed totally to the image of His Son Eph 1: The Doctrine of Sin A brief review of the fall of man leads us naturally into a discussion of the essential nature of sin, as well as its origin, transmission, effects, and punishment. Many theologians rightly define sin as any want of conformityâ€in nature, disposition, or actâ€to the moral law of God. Again, this is an accurate definition as far as it goes cf. The one shortcoming, however, is that it does not really capture the heinous, aggressive, and vile nature of sin as such. It is ethical in nature, not ontological in that it is not an essential privation of some kind. Even after the fall, man still has all the faculties with which he was created, but his moral nature is twisted by sin. There are many key terms in the Old Testament which nuance the idea of sin in some way. In the New Testament there are several terms as well. Some of the more frequently used and important ones include: The origin of sin in the cosmos is to be found in the disobedience of Satan and certain angels. Though there is debate about Isa In any case, when Satan arrives on the scene in Genesis 3 cf. But as far as the entrance of sin into the human race is concerned, this occurred at the fall of man, also described in Genesis 3. There ought to be no doubt among Christians regarding the scriptural teaching that all men are sinful, though it is obviously true that not all men have expressed or will express their sinfulness to the same degree. But how did our first parents pass on sin to us? If it is true that sin entered the human race through the sin of Adam, how was it communicated to his offspring and thus to the race as a whole, given that we all descended from the one man cf. For it is said there, at least five times, that sin entered the human race through one man transgression and that the entire race was affectedâ€not by sinning themselves, but rather through the sin of Adam. Thus, there is a direct connection between the sin of Adam and the fallenness of the entire race. Some say this direct connection is realistic while others argue along legal lines. The first group argues that the race as a whole was present seminally in Adam and thus sinned when he sinned. Perhaps the best view is to understand Adam as the federal head of the race and as such his sin was imputed i. This seems to make the most sense out of the direct connections expressed in Romans 5: Now the idea that there exists a legal, not just biological, relationship between a man and his posterity is not unheard of in scripture. Some refer to it as corporate solidarity. Perhaps the best known example illustrating this concept is the sin of Achan Joshua 7. In a similar way but it is strictly speaking not identical , we often see today how the sin of one person directly affects others. When a person hijacks an airplane with people on board and then crashes it, all on board suffer because of the decision of one person. Now, some have objected to this doctrine on the grounds that we are blamed for something we did not do. This can be responded to in several ways, but in the end it must be realized that all men, including you and me, are sinners and will be judged for our willful and personal rebellion. Is it fair that God imputes the righteousness of Christ to us when we simply believe in His Son? If the issue were really one of fairness, viewed humanly, who of us could stand in His presence? But not only are we in a state of guilt before God, we also received at birth a sinful nature and so we are polluted by sin as wellâ€hence our willful and personal rebellion. We prove the fact that we have a sinful nature each and every day cf. Denial of sin, neurosis, estrangement from loved ones, enemies in the work force, inability to love and receive love from others, lying, stealing, cheating, as well as a host of other sins beset us daily. We were born, i. The Christian and Sin The question often comes up as to the effects of sin on the life of the Christian. We cannot go into this in great detail here, but will cover it more thoroughly under soteriology. But the Christian stands in a posture of being justified once and for all Rom 5: His standing or position before the Lord is immutable but his personal fellowship with the Lord and His people will be disrupted by sin, sometimes severely. At some point the Lord will probably chasten him, and in certain cases, ultimately shorten his life because of sin 1 Cor When the Christian does sin, however, he is to immediately confess it to the Lord, and repent from it, knowing that God is faithful to forgive and cleanse 1

John 1: And, in many circumstances he will need to confess his sin to another offended person and make restitution.

Chapter 3 : Study Anthropology | Study Sociology in the US

Study of Humankind. The word anthropology itself tells the basic story. From the Greek anthropos ("human") and logia ("study"), it is the study of humankind.

The study of anthropology also helps students develop critical thinking skills that will prepare them for a variety of job opportunities and career paths. There are four major areas of study within the field of anthropology: Two of the most critical skills you should focus on developing, if you want to excel in your studies of anthropology, or earn a degree in this field, are reading and writing. Reading and writing skills are essential to the study of anthropology. New students often struggle to read anthropological articles and essays for two reasons. First, anthropologic texts tend to be full of ethnographic details that students can get lost in. Second, anthropological texts often use a style of presenting arguments in an unfamiliar way that employs theoretical language. The following are some reading tips and strategies for the study of anthropology. Read actively, not passively. They simply want to get through the assigned pages. Active reading is KEY to the study of anthropology. Pick a good time to read. Reading social science texts and articles requires concentration. Anthropological essays, articles and other texts should be read when you are most alert and energetic, as they require concentration and attention. As already mentioned, active reading is key to the effective study of anthropology. The most important element of active reading is engagement in the text. As you read, attempt to answer the following questions: What evidence is presented? Answering these question often requires going back and forth and re-reading parts of the text again. Social science articles are rarely linear. Unlike novels or stories which are structured around a single plot, anthropological texts and articles rarely employ a linear narrative. You often have to jump around and read the individual parts to make sense of how they fit together. Skimming a text allows you to quickly develop a structure for the article, identify its key components, and develop an overall idea of what the article is about. Start by reading the title. Then proceed to the introductory paragraphs, subtitles, section titles and any questions presented. Also, find out when the article was written to help develop context. As you skim, try to identify the general themes the article is presenting. Then paraphrase the main arguments the author is making. Why does the author feel his or her argument is important and valid? Do you agree or disagree with the author? Write down your position with respect to the main ideas established in the article, supported by your own evidence and conclusions. Writing Writing is a big component of the study of anthropology. There are also nuances to writing style and conventions that are unique to the study of anthropology that students need to know and employ in their own writing. Three of the most common include: This form of writing is less focused on mechanics and more focused on authentic engagement in the topic. Short Essay Short essays may ask you to analyze information and concepts introduced from classroom discussion, lectures, or assigned readings. Mechanics of writing are very important in the development of short essays. Strong organization and good development of ideas is essential. Research Paper Research papers are common type of writing that anthropology students are required to tackle. Research papers address a topic chosen by the student or the instructor. Organization is key in developing an effective research paper. Each section of your paper should build on other sections and support the main argument of the paper. Book reviews are not the same thing as book reports. Book reviews are critical essays that evaluate the effectiveness of the author in achieving their intended goal in writing the book. Use of first-person "I" While not as common in other forms of writing, the use of the first-person "I" is often acceptable when writing anthropology papers. The use of the first-person "I" allows the writer to make himself or herself more visible to the reader. However, use the first-person "I" judiciously. The first-person "I" is most commonly used in the development of ethnographic analyses. Verb Tense There is no set rule for which verb tense you should use in anthropologic writing. The most important thing is that you remain consistent. You also want to avoid creating a false sense of authority through using the present tense. However, many good anthropological papers include both active and passive voices. The big benefit of writing using the active voice is that it positions the subject of your paper front and center "which is what you want. Style recommendations Anthropologic writing should be beautiful. It should be elegant and evoke emotion in the

reader. At the same time it must be clear. Effective anthropological papers include a combination of both complex evocative sentences along and shorter direct sentences. Ethnographic analyses in particular should be rich and full of vivid description. Avoid Generalizations An seasoned anthropologist or anthropology student should recognize that cultural contexts and perspectives vary across the world. They also vary across time. The world is ever changing and cultures adapt and mold to their environment. Instead of stating "Culture A is always This is referred to as "othering", or the "us" vs "them" mentality. They should avoid "othering" in all its forms. It is true the discipline of anthropology got its start by studying "exotic" or "native" cultures i. However, the discipline of anthropology today is no longer the study of the "unique", "exotic", "primitive", or "dying" cultures of the world. These terms are no longer relevant, or appropriate, within the study of anthropology. Anthropology attempts to study ALL world cultures and recognizes that cultural diversity and continuity exist across the globe. Any language that suggests a moral hierarchy, marginalizes, or suggests "othering" should be avoided in anthropological writing. Avoid "Proving" Anthropology is about exploring and embracing human diversity. It is not about judging, condemning, or cataloguing it. Your writing should be aimed at arguing your views, and your thesis, with the end goal of contributing to a larger framework of understanding within the discipline and acceptance outside the field. As you conduct research to produce anthropological knowledge to support your writing, make sure the thesis you develop, and arguments you craft, are aimed at contributing to a comparative anthropological framework. Never, attempt to "prove" your views, or your thesis. Trying to prove, suggests that anthropology, and the cultures it examines, are static, absolute, and never changing. Additional guides and tutorials for studying anthropology:

Chapter 4 : Anthropology | University of Northern Iowa

The branches that study the social and cultural constructions of human groups are variously recognized as belonging to cultural anthropology (or ethnology), social anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and psychological anthropology (see below).

In the 19th century, anthropology also attained clear identity as a discipline. Strictly defined as the science of humankind, it could be seen as superseding other specialized disciplines such as economics and political science. In practice and from the beginning, however, anthropology concerned itself with the intersection of natural science and humanities. The biological evolution of *Homo sapiens* and the evolution of the capacity for culture that distinguishes humans from all other species are indistinguishable from one another. While the evolution of the human species is a biological development like the processes that gave rise to the other species, the historical appearance of the capacity for culture initiates a qualitative departure from other forms of adaptation, based on an extraordinarily variable creativity not directly linked to survival and ecological adaptation. The historical patterns and processes associated with culture as a medium for growth and change, and the diversification and convergence of cultures through history, are thus major foci of anthropological research. By the middle of the 20th century, many American universities also included psychological anthropology, emphasizing the relationships among culture, social structure, and the human being as a person. The concept of culture as the entire way of life or system of meaning for a human community was a specialized idea shared mainly by anthropologists until the latter half of the 20th century. However, it had become a commonplace by the beginning of the 21st century. The study of anthropology as an academic subject had expanded steadily through those 50 years, and the number of professional anthropologists had increased with it. The range and specificity of anthropological research and the involvement of anthropologists in work outside of academic life have also grown, leading to the existence of many specialized fields within the discipline. Field research was established as the hallmark of all the branches of anthropology. These finely detailed studies of everyday life of people in a broad range of social, cultural, historical, and material circumstances were among the major accomplishments of anthropologists in the second half of the 20th century. Beginning in the 1950s, and especially in the post-World War II period, anthropology was established in a number of countries outside western Europe and North America. The world scope of anthropology, together with the dramatic expansion of social and cultural phenomena that transcend national and cultural boundaries, has led to a shift in anthropological work in North America and Europe. Research by Western anthropologists is increasingly focused on their own societies, and there have been some studies of Western societies by non-Western anthropologists.

History of anthropology The modern discourse of anthropology crystallized in the 19th century, fired by advances in biology, philology, and prehistoric archaeology. In *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin affirmed that all forms of life share a common ancestry. Fossils began to be reliably associated with particular geologic strata, and fossils of recent human ancestors were discovered, most famously the first Neanderthal specimen, unearthed in 1868. In 1871 Darwin published *The Descent of Man*, which argued that human beings shared a recent common ancestor with the great African apes. He identified the defining characteristic of the human species as their relatively large brain size and deduced that the evolutionary advantage of the human species was intelligence, which yielded language and technology. The pioneering anthropologist Edward Burnett Tylor concluded that as intelligence increased, so civilization advanced. All past and present societies could be arranged in an evolutionary sequence. They bore witness to early stages of human development, while the industrial societies of northern Europe and the United States represented the pinnacle of human achievement. It was assumed that technological progress was constant and that it was matched by developments in the understanding of the world and in social forms. Tylor advanced the view that all religions had a common origin, in the belief in spirits. The original religious rite was sacrifice, which was a way of feeding these spirits. Modern religions retained some of these primitive features, but as human beings became more intelligent, and so more rational, primitive superstitions were gradually refined and would eventually be

abandoned. James George Frazer posited a progressive and universal progress from faith in magic through to belief in religion and, finally, to the understanding of science. John Ferguson McLennan, Lewis Henry Morgan, and other writers argued that there was a parallel development of social institutions. The first humans were promiscuous like, it was thought, the African apes, but at some stage blood ties were recognized between mother and children and incest between mother and son was forbidden. In time more restrictive forms of mating were introduced and paternity was recognized. Blood ties began to be distinguished from territorial relationships, and distinctive political structures developed beyond the family circle. At last monogamous marriage evolved. Paralleling these developments, technological advances produced increasing wealth, and arrangements guaranteeing property ownership and regulating inheritance became more significant. Eventually the modern institutions of private property and territorially based political systems developed, together with the nuclear family. Its scientific roots were in geography and philology, and it was concerned with the study of cultural traditions and with adaptations to local ecological constraints rather than with universal human histories. This more particularistic and historical approach was spread to the United States at the end of the 19th century by the German-trained scholar Franz Boas. Rather than graduating through a fixed series of intellectual, moral, and technological stages, societies or cultures changed unpredictably, as a consequence of migration and borrowing.

Fieldwork The first generation of anthropologists had tended to rely on others—locally based missionaries, colonial administrators, and so on—to collect ethnographic information, often guided by questionnaires that were issued by metropolitan theorists. In the late 19th century, several ethnographic expeditions were organized, often by museums. As reports on customs came in from these various sources, the theorists would collate the findings in comparative frameworks to illustrate the course of evolutionary development or to trace local historical relationships. The first generation of professionally trained anthropologists began to undertake intensive fieldwork on their own account in the early 20th century. As theoretically trained investigators began to spend long periods alone in the field, on a single island or in a particular tribal community, the object of investigation shifted. The aim was no longer to establish and list traditional customs. Field-workers began to record the activities of flesh-and-blood human beings going about their daily business. To get this sort of material, it was no longer enough to interview local authority figures. The field-worker had to observe people in action, off guard, to listen to what they said to each other, to participate in their daily activities. These new field studies reflected and accelerated a change of theoretical focus from the evolutionary and historical interests of the 19th century. Malinowski explained that Trobriand magic was not simply poor science. Mauss argued that apparently irrational forms of economic consumption made sense when they were properly understood, as modes of social competition regulated by strict and universal rules of reciprocity. It was associated with the social sciences and linguistics, rather than with human biology and archaeology. Some African societies e. Finally, there were territorially based states e. Kin-based bands lived by foraging, lineage-based societies were often pastoralists, and the states combined agriculture, pastoralism, and trade. In effect, this was a transformation of the evolutionist stages into a synchronic classification of types. Though speculations about origins were discouraged, it was apparent that the types could easily be rearranged in a chronological sequence from the most primitive to the most sophisticated. In he presented a classification of marriage systems from diverse localities, again within the framework of an implicit evolutionary series. The crucial evolutionary moment was the introduction of the incest taboo, which obliged men to exchange their sisters and daughters with other men in order to acquire wives for themselves and their sons. These marriage exchanges in turn bound family groups together into societies. He represented the Australian Aboriginals as the most fully realized example of an elementary system, while most of the societies with complex kinship systems were to be found in the modern world, in complex civilizations. Later developments in the social sciences resulted in the emergence of a positivist cross-cultural project, associated with George P. Murdock at Yale University, which applied statistical methods to a sample of world cultures and attempted to establish universal functionalist relationships between forms of marriage, descent systems, property relationships, and other variables. Under the influence of the American social theorist Talcott Parsons, the anthropologists at Harvard University were drawn into team projects with sociologists and psychologists. Some of the new evolutionists led by Leslie White reclaimed the

abandoned territory of Victorian social theory, arguing for a coherent world history of human development, through a succession of stages, from a common primitive base. The more developed a society, the more complex its organization and the more energy it consumed. White believed that energy consumption was the gauge of cultural advance. Another tendency, led by Julian Steward, argued rather for an evolutionism that was more directly Darwinian in inspiration. Cultural practices were to be treated as modes of adaptation to specific environmental challenges. More skeptical than White about traditional models of unilineal evolution, Steward urged the study of particular evolutionary processes within enduring culture areas, in which societies with a common origin were exposed to similar ecological constraints. Students of White and Steward, including Marshall Sahlins, revived classic evolutionist questions about the origins of the state and the consequences of technological progress. The institutional development of anthropology in Europe was strongly influenced by the existence of overseas empires, and in the aftermath of World War II anthropologists were drawn into development programs in the so-called Third World. In the United States, anthropologists had traditionally studied the native peoples of North and Central America. During World War II, however, they were called upon to apply their expertise to assist the war effort, along with other social scientists. As the United States became increasingly influential in the world, in the aftermath of the war, the profession grew explosively. In the view of some critics, social and cultural anthropology was becoming, in effect, a Western social science that specialized in the study of colonial and postcolonial societies. The war in Vietnam fueled criticism of American engagement in the Third World and precipitated a radical shift in American anthropology. American anthropology divided between two intellectual tendencies. One school, inspired by modern developments in genetics, looked for biological determinants of human cultures and sought to revive the traditional alliance between cultural anthropology and biological anthropology. Another school insisted that cultural anthropology should aim to interpret other cultures rather than to seek laws of cultural development or cultural integration and that it should therefore situate itself within the humanities rather than in the biological sciences or the social sciences. This represented a movement away from biological frameworks of explanation and a rejection of sociological or psychological preoccupations. The ethnographer was to focus on symbolic communications, and so rituals and other cultural performances became the main focus of research. Sociological and psychological explanations were left to other disciplines. It was argued that cultural consensus is rare and that interpretations are therefore always partial. Cultural boundaries are provisional and uncertain, identities fragile and fabricated. Consequently ethnographers should represent a variety of discordant voices, not try to identify a supposedly normative cultural view. In short, it was an illusion that objective ethnographic studies could be produced and reliable comparisons undertaken. European anthropology since the 1950s In Europe the social science program remained dominant, though it was revitalized by a new concern with social history. Elsewhere, particularly in some formerly colonial countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, local traditions of anthropology established themselves. While anthropologists in these countries were responsive to theoretical developments in the traditional centres of the discipline, they were also open to other intellectual currents, because they were typically engaged in debates with specialists from other fields about developments in their own countries. Empirical research flourished despite the theoretical diversity. Long-term fieldwork was now commonly backed up by historical investigations, and ethnography came to be regarded by many practitioners as the core activity of social and cultural anthropology. In the second half of the 20th century, the ethnographic focus of anthropologists changed decisively. Later, ethnographers specialized in the study of Third World societies, including the complex villages and towns of Asia. From the 1970s fieldwork began increasingly to be carried out in European societies and among ethnic minorities, church communities, and other groups in the United States. In the formerly colonized societies, local anthropologists began to dominate ethnographic research, and community leaders increasingly insisted on controlling the agenda of field-workers. The liveliest intellectual developments were perhaps to be found beyond the mainstream. Fresh specializations emerged, notably the anthropology of women in the 1970s and, in the following decades, medical anthropology, psychological anthropology, visual anthropology, the anthropology of music and dance, and demographic anthropology. The anthropology of the 21st century is polycentric and cosmopolitan, and it is not entirely at home among the biological or social

sciences or in the humanities.

Chapter 5 : What is Anthropology? » Anthropology » Boston University

Biological Anthropology. Biological (or physical) anthropologists carry out systematic studies of the non-cultural aspects of humans and near-humans. Non-cultural refers to all of those biological characteristics that are genetically inherited in contrast to learned.

There is a nugget of truth in that. Anthropologists do tend to be an adventuresome lot. Some field work can also be quite remote, and conditions can be difficult. But this is not the whole story and our subject matter varies greatly. While some anthropologists do look for vanished civilizations in jungles, many of us work closer to home. Anthropology compares human societies across the globe and across time. We compare present and past forms of government or legal and religious belief systems, for example. We compare social structures, like family dynamics, and study transnational corporations. We spend time reading against the grains of colonial documents. We explore social movements and the root of social inequalities linked to race and gender. Wherever there are or were humans or other primates, there are opportunities for anthropological study. In different colleges and universities, different departments may teach these subfields. Socio-cultural Anthropology is the study of the social and political dimensions of living peoples. Such study often involves the method called participant observation and other tools. The range of topics studied by socio-cultural anthropologists is limitless. In our department, topics range from migration to barber shops! There is also research around food: Archaeologists address the same questions posed by socio-cultural anthropologists. But, they focus heavily on the materiality of social life. They use creative approaches to document and interpret the material remains of human activities. They also investigate spatial distribution and patterns of development through time. Historical archaeologists also use written records and oral histories to complement the findings they unearth. Biological Anthropologists study the biological and biocultural evolution of humans. They compare populations of nonhuman primates, extinct human ancestors, and modern humans. This type of study may shed light on human culture, communication, society, and behavior. Some biological anthropologists use computers to model the evolution of technology and language. Others research diseases observed in human skeletal remains. Genetic studies allow us to infer how populations may have diverged and merged through time. Many biological anthropologists explore the relationship among genes, behavior, and environment. They want to understand the consequences - both historically and in the present day - of genetic determinist theories. Linguistics studies one of the most fundamental aspects of human society: Some linguists use techniques associated with socio-cultural approaches, like participant observation, to explore forms of communication. Others look at the human capacity to create and understand language and other modes of communication. As with most classifications, these four subfields are a bit of a simplification and research agendas often cross-cut the subfields. Some anthropologists call themselves "applied anthropologists" since they directly relate anthropological research to specific problems.

Chapter 6 : Department of Sociology and Anthropology | Why Study Anthropology?

Anthropology definition is - the science of human beings; especially: the study of human beings and their ancestors through time and space and in relation to physical character, environmental and social relations, and culture.

Various short-lived organizations of anthropologists had already been formed. Its members were primarily anti-slavery activists. They maintained international connections. Anthropology and many other current fields are the intellectual results of the comparative methods developed in the earlier 19th century. Theorists in such diverse fields as anatomy, linguistics, and Ethnology, making feature-by-feature comparisons of their subject matters, were beginning to suspect that similarities between animals, languages, and folkways were the result of processes or laws unknown to them then. Darwin himself arrived at his conclusions through comparison of species he had seen in agronomy and in the wild. Darwin and Wallace unveiled evolution in the late 1800s. There was an immediate rush to bring it into the social sciences. He wanted to localize the difference between man and the other animals, which appeared to reside in speech. The title was soon translated as "The Anthropology of Primitive Peoples". The last two volumes were published posthumously. Waitz defined anthropology as "the science of the nature of man". By nature he meant matter animated by "the Divine breath"; [13] i. He stresses that the data of comparison must be empirical, gathered by experimentation. It is to be presumed fundamentally that the species, man, is a unity, and that "the same laws of thought are applicable to all men". In the explorer Richard Francis Burton and the speech therapist James Hunt broke away from the Ethnological Society of London to form the Anthropological Society of London, which henceforward would follow the path of the new anthropology rather than just ethnology. It was the 2nd society dedicated to general anthropology in existence. In his keynote address, printed in the first volume of its new publication, *The Anthropological Review*, Hunt stressed the work of Waitz, adopting his definitions as a standard. Previously Edward had referred to himself as an ethnologist; subsequently, an anthropologist. Similar organizations in other countries followed: The majority of these were evolutionist. One notable exception was the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory founded by Rudolph Virchow, known for his vituperative attacks on the evolutionists. During the last three decades of the 19th century, a proliferation of anthropological societies and associations occurred, most independent, most publishing their own journals, and all international in membership and association. The major theorists belonged to these organizations. They supported the gradual osmosis of anthropology curricula into the major institutions of higher learning. By the American Association for the Advancement of Science was able to report that 48 educational institutions in 13 countries had some curriculum in anthropology. None of the 75 faculty members were under a department named anthropology. Anthropology has diversified from a few major subdivisions to dozens more. Practical Anthropology, the use of anthropological knowledge and technique to solve specific problems, has arrived; for example, the presence of buried victims might stimulate the use of a forensic archaeologist to recreate the final scene. The organization has reached global level. For example, the World Council of Anthropological Associations WCAA, "a network of national, regional and international associations that aims to promote worldwide communication and cooperation in anthropology", currently contains members from about three dozen nations. Cultural anthropology, in particular, has emphasized cultural relativism, holism, and the use of findings to frame cultural critiques. Ethnography is one of its primary research designs as well as the text that is generated from anthropological fieldwork. In the United States, anthropology has traditionally been divided into the four field approach developed by Franz Boas in the early 20th century: These fields frequently overlap but tend to use different methodologies and techniques. European countries with overseas colonies tended to practice more ethnology a term coined and defined by Adam F. It is sometimes referred to as sociocultural anthropology in the parts of the world that were influenced by the European tradition. American anthropology Anthropology is a global discipline involving humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. Anthropology builds upon knowledge from natural sciences, including the discoveries about the origin and evolution of *Homo sapiens*, human physical traits, human behavior, the variations among different groups of humans, how the evolutionary past of *Homo sapiens* has influenced its social organization and culture, and

from social sciences , including the organization of human social and cultural relations, institutions, social conflicts, etc. According to Clifford Geertz , "anthropology is perhaps the last of the great nineteenth-century conglomerate disciplines still for the most part organizationally intact. Long after natural history, moral philosophy, philology, and political economy have dissolved into their specialized successors, it has remained a diffuse assemblage of ethnology, human biology, comparative linguistics, and prehistory, held together mainly by the vested interests, sunk costs, and administrative habits of academia, and by a romantic image of comprehensive scholarship. During the s and s, there was an epistemological shift away from the positivist traditions that had largely informed the discipline. In contrast, archaeology and biological anthropology remained largely positivist. Due to this difference in epistemology, the four sub-fields of anthropology have lacked cohesion over the last several decades. Cultural anthropology , Social anthropology , and Sociocultural anthropology Sociocultural anthropology draws together the principle axes of cultural anthropology and social anthropology. Cultural anthropology is the comparative study of the manifold ways in which people make sense of the world around them, while social anthropology is the study of the relationships among individuals and groups. There is no hard-and-fast distinction between them, and these categories overlap to a considerable degree. Inquiry in sociocultural anthropology is guided in part by cultural relativism , the attempt to understand other societies in terms of their own cultural symbols and values. Ethnography can refer to both a methodology and the product of ethnographic research, i. As a methodology, ethnography is based upon long-term fieldwork within a community or other research site. Participant observation is one of the foundational methods of social and cultural anthropology. The process of participant-observation can be especially helpful to understanding a culture from an emic conceptual, vs. The study of kinship and social organization is a central focus of sociocultural anthropology, as kinship is a human universal. Sociocultural anthropology also covers economic and political organization , law and conflict resolution, patterns of consumption and exchange, material culture, technology, infrastructure, gender relations, ethnicity, childrearing and socialization, religion, myth, symbols, values, etiquette, worldview, sports, music, nutrition, recreation, games, food, festivals, and language which is also the object of study in linguistic anthropology. Comparison across cultures is a key element of method in sociocultural anthropology, including the industrialized and de-industrialized West.

Chapter 7 : What Is Cultural Anthropology? - Cultural Anthropology Program (U.S. National Park Service)

Anthropology is the study of humans, early hominids and primates, such as chimpanzees. Anthropologists study human language, culture, societies, biological and material remains, the biology and.

The word itself tells the basic story—“from the Greek *anthropos* human being and *logia* science, it is nothing less than the scientific study of humankind, from its beginnings, millions of years ago, to the present day. Nothing human is alien to anthropology and of the many sciences that study certain aspects of our species, only anthropology attempts to understand the whole panorama, in time and space, of the human condition. Anthropology is, at once both easy to define but difficult to describe; its subject matter both exotic marriage practices among Australian aborigines and commonplace the structure of the human hand; its focus both sweeping and microscopic. Anthropologists may study the language of a tribe of Brazilian Native Americans, the social life of apes in an African rain forest, or the remains of a long-vanished civilization in their own backyard—but there is always a common thread linking these vastly different projects, and always the common goal of advancing our understanding of who we are and how we came to be that way. Everyday, as we look around us, we all ask anthropological questions: Do men and women have different abilities? Is it human nature to be warlike? After all, all societies have explanations for why their ways of life are the way they are, and our society is no exception. The science of anthropology begins with a simple, but enormously powerful, idea: This is the comparative perspective, the attempt to explain both the similarities and differences among people in the context of humanity as a whole. Anthropology seeks to uncover the principles governing human behavior that are applicable to all human communities, not just to a select few of them. To the anthropologist, the sometimes bewildering variety of humanity—in body size and shape, social customs, language, religious belief, skin color, economic system—provides the basic frame of reference for the understanding of any single aspect of human life in any particular community. The power of the comparative perspective can be illustrated by imagining that you have lived your whole life in a world with only one color—all your food, all objects, all plants and animals, all a single shade of, say, red. In such a world, you will obviously have no understanding of any other colors: One branch of anthropology—social or cultural anthropology—applies this comparative perspective to the study of human culture: Cultural anthropologists study human behavior by means of first-hand observation and interviewing within particular communities, and interpret that behavior by comparison with the results of similar studies in other communities. They may focus on particular aspects of life or institutions such as kinship, religion, art, or economics, or they may try to characterize a way of life as a whole. We can look at our everyday surroundings with the same sense of wonder and discovery that we derive from looking at alien cultures. In fact, while most people picture anthropologists thousands of miles from home in the midst of a circle of thatched houses, more and more anthropologists are training their sights on American society and applying the anthropological perspective to the study of our own culture. As the science of cultural anthropology has developed, specialized branches, focusing on some particular aspect of human culture, have emerged: In addition, linguistic anthropologists are concerned with the nature of language itself and the relationships between language, thought, and behavior; that is, the ways in which language and all the other aspects of human culture interrelate. But the human story begins even further back in time than this, back several million years ago with a population of ape-like creatures starting down a unique evolutionary road. Physical, or biological, anthropology looks at *Homo sapiens* as a biological species—its origins, evolutionary development, and the biological diversity of modern human populations. Biological anthropologists study the natural history of the human species and attempt to understand the biological bases for human nature and our remarkable behavioral abilities. Man, with all his noble quantities, with sympathy that feels for the debased, with his god-like intellect which has penetrated into the movements and constitution of the solar system—with all these exalted powers—still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of lowly origins. Traditionally, archaeologists have excavated and analyzed the tools, weapons, pottery, and other artifacts that were left behind by prehistoric societies in order to reconstruct their ancient cultures. Today, archaeologists no longer limit themselves to the study of prehistoric peoples but

also investigate more recent cultures, adding their insights to the information available to the historian through the written record. These, then, are the four branches making up anthropology as a whole: Anthropology asks what may be the most difficult and most important question of all: Anthropology will never lose its hold on us because its subject matter, humankind, is ever-changing and endlessly fascinating.

Chapter 8 : Cultural anthropology - Wikipedia

Study cultural anthropology, archaeology, and biology, and become an asset to any industry that requires an understanding of cultural differences.

Cultural anthropology is that major division of anthropology that explains culture in its many aspects. It is anchored in the collection, analysis, and explanation or interpretation of the primary data of extended ethnographic field research. This discipline, both in America and in Europe, is defined and scope Etymologically, anthropology is the science of humans. In fact, however, it is only one of the sciences of humans, bringing together those disciplines the common aims of which are to describe human beings and explain them on the basis of the biological and cultural characteristics of the populations among which they are distributed and to emphasize, through time, the differences and variations of these populations. Anthropology, which is concerned with the study of human differences, was born after the Age of Discovery had opened up societies that had remained outside the technological civilization of the modern West. In fact, the field of research was at first restricted to those societies that had been given one unsatisfactory label after another: Their research extends not only to village communities within modern societies but also to cities, even to industrial enterprises. If, in particular, it is concerned with generalizing about patterns of human behaviour seen in all their dimensions and with achieving a total description of social and cultural phenomena, this is because anthropology has observed small-scale societies, which are simpler or at least more homogeneous than modern societies and which change at a slower pace. Thus they are easier to see whole. What has just been said refers especially to the branch of anthropology concerned with the cultural characteristics of man. Anthropology has, in fact, gradually divided itself into two major spheres: The reasons for this split are manifold, one being the rejection of the initial mistakes regarding correlations between race and culture. More generally speaking, the vast field of 19th-century anthropology was subdivided into a series of increasingly specialized disciplines, using their own methods and techniques, that were given different labels according to national traditions. The Table shows the terminology current in North America and in continental Europe. Distinction between physical anthropology and cultural anthropology Thus two large disciplines—physical anthropology and cultural anthropology—and such related disciplines as prehistory and linguistics now cover the program that originally was set up for a single study of anthropology. The two fields are largely autonomous, having their own relations with disciplines outside anthropology; and it is unlikely that any researchers today work simultaneously in the fields of physical and cultural anthropology. The generalist has become rare. On the other hand, the fields have not been cut off from one another. Specialists in the two fields still cooperate in specific genetic or demographic problems and other matters. Prehistoric archaeology and linguistics also have notable links with cultural anthropology. In posing the problem of the evolution of mankind in an inductive way, archaeology contributed to the creation of the first concepts of anthropology, and archaeology is still indispensable in uncovering the past of societies under observation. In many areas, when it is a question of interpreting the use of rudimentary tools or of certain elementary religious phenomena, prehistory and cultural anthropology are mutually helpful. Relations between linguistics and cultural anthropology are numerous. On a purely practical level the cultural anthropologist has to serve a linguistic apprenticeship. He cannot do without a knowledge of the language of the people he is studying, and often he has had to make the first survey of it. One of his essential tasks, moreover, has been to collect the various forms of oral expression, including myths, folk tales, proverbs, and so forth. On the theoretical level, cultural anthropology has often used concepts developed in the field of linguistics: Cultural anthropology maintains relations with a great number of other sciences. It has been said of sociology, for instance, that it was almost the twin sister of anthropology. The two are presumably differentiated by their field of study modern societies versus traditional societies. But the contrast is forced. These two social sciences often meet. Thus, the study of colonial societies borrows as much from sociology as from cultural anthropology. And it has already been remarked how cultural anthropology intervenes more and more frequently in urban and industrial fields classically the domain of sociology. There have also been

fruitful exchanges with other disciplines quite distinct from cultural anthropology. In political science the discussion of the concept of the state and of its origin has been nourished by cultural anthropology. Cultural anthropology has brought to psychology new bases on which to reflect on concepts of personality and the formation of personality. It has permitted psychology to develop a system of cross-cultural psychiatry, or so-called ethnopsychiatry. Conversely, the psychological sciences, particularly psychoanalysis, have offered cultural anthropology new hypotheses for an interpretation of the concept of culture. The link with history has long been a vital one because cultural anthropology was originally based on an evolutionist point of view and because it has striven to reconstruct the cultural history of societies about which, for lack of written documents, no historical record could be determined. Cultural anthropology has more recently suggested to historians new techniques of research based on the analysis and criticism of oral tradition. Finally, cultural anthropology has close links with human geography. Both of them place great importance on man either as he uses space or acts to transform the natural environment. It is not without significance that some early anthropologists were originally geographers. Historical development of cultural anthropology All human societies have been curious about how their customs originated and what the differences between their own culture and that of neighbouring societies might mean. Thus, in a sense they have all constructed their own anthropologies. But the interpretations put forward, even when they were founded partly on accurate observation, most often remained on the level of myth. Embryonic scientific thought began to appear in only a limited number of centres of civilization: Only in the West, however, did various ideas converge to bring about the birth of scientific anthropology in the 19th century. A characteristic common to all these centres of civilization was the control that they exercised over vast areas and the opportunity that they enjoyedâ€”through their soldiers, merchants, pilgrims, and missionariesâ€”to gather observations on a wide variety of populations. Such a gathering of data was necessary in order even to begin to understand how men adapted to their environments, how they used their various economic, social, and political institutions, and how mankind evolved from simple to complex societies. Historians and philosophers among the ancient Greeks, Arabs, and Chinese all asked such questions. To take only the example of western Europe, many pertinent questions were posed by the French philosophers Jean Bodin and Michel de Montaigne as early as the 16th century, by the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the 17th, and by the French philosophers Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire in the 18th, to mention only those who are often placed among the precursors of modern anthropology. The last great phase of the discovery of the world had begun at the end of the 18th century. At the same time, political and intellectual revolutions had facilitated the questioning of certain religious dogmas, thus opening the way to the discussion of hitherto half-forbidden subjects. The 19th century, therefore, soon saw a revival of interest in and study of the origin of man, the unity or plurality of the human species, and the fixity or mutability of animal species. Finally, about 1869, a principle for the study of human facts was proposed: This was even before Charles Darwin had published his celebrated *Origin of Species*. This concept, arising in strong debates, provided the starting point for anthropology. Evolutionism Almost to the end of the 19th century, evolutionism determined the complexion of the new science. A major task of cultural anthropology was thought to be that of classifying different societies and cultures and defining the phases and states through which all human groups passâ€”the linear interpretation of history. Some groups progress more slowly, some faster, as they advance from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the irrational to the rational. It suffices to quote an American anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan: As it is undeniable that portions of the human family have existed in a state of savagery, other portions in a state of barbarism, and still other portions in a state of civilization, it seems equally so that these three distinct conditions are connected with each other in a natural as well as necessary sequence of progress. Other quotations from a Scotsman, John F. MacLennan, or an Englishman, Edward B. Tylor, would take the same position. Cultural anthropology, then, set out to analyze the totality of human culture in time and space. But by assuming a linear conception of history, it too often neglected the discontinuities and interferences of concrete history. Marxism and the collectors At the same time, in the second half of the 19th century another kind of evolutionism developed, that of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. A society was defined by its mode of production, on which its

political, juridical, and ideological superstructures were allegedly based. These superstructures continued to exist after the mode of production had changed; and in the conflict that followed, this contradiction opened the way to a new type of society. Numerous anthropologists have taken the Marxist analysis into account, even if only to retain its historical view and to reject its economic determinism. These rather encyclopaedic collections of customs, religious and magical practices, and other curious data were read with relish by the intellectual community; the theories that accompanied the collections were equally appreciated by evolutionary-minded anthropologists, as the theories were meant to establish an evolutionary sequence of magical, religious, and scientific thought, using the data as evidence. To account for the variety of societies and cultures and the broadening of the differences that separated them, they suggested taking the total circumstances of each human group into account by considering the whole of its history, the contacts that it had had with other groups, and the favourable or unfavourable circumstances that had weighed on its development. Such a view was distinguished by a marked relativism: Boas and the culture history school

Cultural anthropology was also diversifying its concepts and its areas of research without losing its unity. Kroeber, Margaret Mead, and Edward Sapir "to go out and seek evidence of human behaviour among people in their natural environs, to venture into the field to gather facts and artifacts and record observable cultural processes. Consequently he is known as the founder of the so-called culture history school, which for much of the 20th century dominated American cultural anthropology. Beyond this emphasis on field work and first-hand observation, it may also be said that Boas inclined toward what was called functionalism or the functional approach—an approach based on sociological theories of the late 19th and early 20th centuries that tended to liken societies to living organisms or machines, with interdependent parts. In the words of Melville J. Its object is essentially to achieve some expression of the unities in culture by indicating how trait and complex and pattern, however separable they may be, intermesh, as the gears of some machine, to constitute a smoothly running, effectively functioning whole from Man and His Works, Boas insisted upon this method of considering any single culture as a whole. Finally, by emphasizing the importance of collecting life histories, he drew attention to the problems posed by connections between culture and personality. In general it may be said that Mauss, like Boas, was insistent upon studying social phenomena as a system—but in a slightly different fashion. Like many others of his time he conceived of systems as self-regulating or equilibrium-seeking, composed of elements that operate to maintain the integration or adaptation of the system. Like Boas, Mauss also tried to twin culture and personality—that is, cultural anthropology and psychology. These latter, too, rejected classical 19th-century evolutionism, but they were nevertheless inclined toward painting grand theories—principally the theory that out of a few ancient cultural centres or civilizations, born quite separately, there had developed the array of cultures existing today. Diffusion, or the spreading of culture traits, in their view, was the prime force of human development, and all cultural development could be traced to a few inventive centres. This kind of pseudo-history was carried to even greater lengths by a British group of diffusionists, led by Grafton Elliot Smith and William J. Perry, who even named a single fountainhead of all cultural development—Egypt. Functionalism and structuralism

Some schools of research that began to develop between the two world wars more or less vigorously rejected the historical approaches, sometimes denying any interest in them whatever. According to the cultural functionalists, including the followers of Malinowski, the only way to explain facts was to define the function that they performed currently in a given culture. The aim of all cultural anthropological research, they held, should be to perceive the totality of a culture and the organic connection of all its parts. Consequently, comparison did not make sense: History, moreover, made no more sense; a culture was to be interpreted at one point in time, as if the age and the origin of the elements composing it were without importance. The only thing that counted was the function the elements performed now. Whereas the name of Malinowski is supremely associated with the school of functionalism, the name of Radcliffe-Brown is known as one of the most important proponents of present-day structuralism. This exacting approach has proved particularly useful in studying kinship and marriage relations as well as myths.

Chapter 9 : Cultural anthropology | www.nxgvision.com

Then there's cultural anthropology, which is the study of the commonalities and differences of both past and present cultures. This one focuses more on social things, like class structure.

The Department of Anthropology offers the following undergraduate programs: Department Admission Requirements Students in good academic standing may declare this major at any time. Major Requirements 55 credits as follows: Core courses 20 credits: The following AIS courses may apply toward this requirement: There is no limit on the number of AIS courses that may apply to this requirement. Minimum 15 upper-division credits in anthropology completed through the UW. Students may pursue either the general anthropology major or one of the four options shown below. A list of approved courses is available at the department advising office or on the department website. Anthropology of Globalization AG Option: Archaeological Sciences ASc Option: A list of approved courses is available on the department website or at the department advising office. ANTH may be applied to the minor but is not required. Certain AIS courses may apply toward this requirement. See departmental adviser for list. The study of anthropology develops skills in critical thinking, research, and writing, as well as technical skills specific to the different subfields ethnographic field techniques, interpretation of data, statistical analysis, archaeological methods of data collection and interpretation. An undergraduate degree prepares students for many positions that involve working with people, as well as for academic studies in a variety of fields. Careers in anthropology can be developed through employment with government agencies, museums, teaching and research, private consulting firms, and nongovernmental organizations. Instructional and Research Facilities: Undergraduate students have access to the following facilities for classroom training in laboratory methods and for research experiences subject to faculty approval and supervision: In addition, the department has a writing center offering undergraduate writing support for anthropology classes. See adviser for requirements. Research, Internships, and Service Learning: The Department of Anthropology supports students who undertake community-based internships under faculty supervision. Four awards are given each year, one in each sub-discipline for the best essay in an undergraduate anthropology class, and one for the best senior honors thesis. The Anthropology Club is run by and for students in the department.