many major principles of dynamics and therapy. Defense mechanisms, for example, he viewed as organizational devices serving either health or neurosis; each system uses them to complete and maintain itself and thereby prevents the alter system from gaining dominance. Thus, both the neurotic and the healthy trends can be repressed by the opposite organization. Therapy aims at reinstating to dominance the latent system of health, thus reversing an earlier shift from health to neurosis, but the self-perpetuating neurotic pattern is not easily overcome. Angyal advocated the use of holistic interpretations that uncover the patient's persisting broad attitudes, but he emphatically stated that neurosis is not overcome by mere insight. If the patient is to take a chance on a new unfamiliar way of life, he must have experienced in a vital way, even to the point of despair, the destructive effects of his neurotic attitudes; he must also have obtained at least a glimpse of his "real self," i.e., his individual pattern of health. Successful therapy requires a careful unearthing and fostering of this repressed healthy pattern; this reconstructive aspect of therapy is too often neglected.

Angyal supplemented his general theory of neurosis with an elaboration of its main dimensions, or patterns. Of particular interest to social scientists is his conception of the hysterical pattern as based on a near-suicidal obliteration of the person's genuine self and the substitution of an artificial personality fashioned largely from the reactions of others. This method of "vicarious living" results in emptiness and, at its extreme, in feelings of non-existence; some patients struggle against this state by fighting the agents of external suppression. Angyal believed this condition to be the "neurosis of our time"; he felt that the hysterical pattern, in both its conformist and its rebellious variants, was much better understood and more effectively treated than the obsessive—compulsive type of character neurosis. The latter he viewed as originating in inconsistent treatment of the child; this results in lasting confusion and in ambivalence toward the "good—bad" world. A careful analysis of the paradoxical inner maneuvers of persons who develop the life-style of "noncommitment" shows that these behavior patterns and symptoms express both the patient's abiding confusion and his persistent, if ineffective, search for clarity and for an unambiguous emotional orientation.

As a European, Angyal shared in the phenomological tradition, and some of his thinking on the nature of man, on illness and health, resembles the views of existential writers. He was also keenly interested in the perspectives on human existence revealed by various religions. Yet his concepts and his methods were firmly anchored in the empirical scientific tradition.

EUGENIA HANFMANN

[For the context of Angyal's work, see GESTALT THEORY; PHENOMENOLOGY; PSYCHOLOGY, article on existential psychology; and the biographies of KOFFKA; KÖHLER; STERN; WERTHEIMER.]
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THE FIELD

Anthropology, in consonance with the etymology of its name, "study of man," is the most compre-
hensive of the academic disciplines dealing with mankind. This comprehensiveness is displayed in its concern with the full geographical and chronological sweep of human societies, the breadth of its topical interest, which embraces such diverse areas as language, social structure, aesthetic expression, and belief systems, and in the fact that it alone among the sciences of man treats him both in his physical and sociocultural aspects. In addition to these fundamental biological and social scientific components, anthropology has a significant humanistic aspect, as shown, for example, in its empathetic search for the bases of aesthetic valuation in the arts of alien people.

Although anthropology is thus in principle all-inclusive, it is in fact but one of a number of disciplines that study man. Indeed, the very richness and variety of its interests lead inevitably to fragmentation into a number of semiautonomous subdisciplines, practically all of which, moreover, must share their subject matter with some other well-established and independent field of study. Thus anthropology may easily appear to be a study whose definitional and programmatic claims of vast scope mask a factually disjunctive accumulation of relicts.

This apparent contradiction can be at least partially resolved; in terms of problems and methodology there are certain basic themes that provide a focus of distinctive interests and mark off anthropology from other disciplines. Even where it overlaps some other field of study in subject matter, it tends to approach the specific data somewhat differently and in terms of problems posed within the general frame of anthropological theory. One particular set of interconnected problems may be singled out as historically the core of anthropological interest—namely, the description and explanation of similarities and differences among human ethnic groups. This has been a central problem only in anthropology and thus serves to distinguish it from the other social sciences. Moreover, in the history of the subject it has not so much been superseded by other problems as subject to successive restatement in ever broader terms.

Since ethnic groups differ both in physical type and in sociocultural characteristics, anthropology has been concerned with both in its physical and sociocultural branches respectively. To explore the full range of human diversity it becomes of great importance to take into consideration precisely those societies whose isolation from the well-documented historical traditions guarantees the maximum divergence from those institutions with which we are most familiar. Further, their presumed isolation from each other ensures that these societies provide the maximum number of historically independent examples of the many types of human societal organization. Although in principle anthropology has always had an equal interest in societies of all types, in practice it has involved a concentration on primitive, or preliterate, peoples, most frequently defined as those that did not have writing at the time of first contact with the West. Many of the characteristics of cultural anthropological methodology and theory have resulted from this preoccupation. The basic descriptive technique is field study by observation and participation and verbal interview of relatively small groups typically organized on a tribal basis. The emphasis tends to become qualitative rather than quantitative. The ethnographer seeks to construct a coherent over-all picture of the institutions of the people being studied by a complex and not explicitly verbalized procedure of inference from the raw data of observation.

In analogous fashion, in order to recover the basic facts concerning past societies in regions and for periods in which the written records that constitute the basic materials of conventional historians are lacking, the skills of archeology are combined with other inferential methods, such as the use of oral traditions, ethnological trait distributions, and comparative linguistics.

The distinction between physical anthropology and allied biological sciences can also be understood in terms of this interest in human ethnic diversity. What is common physically to all human beings has been the concern of human biology as a specialized branch of general biology, while the traditional task of physical anthropology has been the description and explanation of human physical variation. In its historical dimension this connotes an interest in the reconstruction of past human forms from fossil evidence (human paleontology), just as archeology seeks to discover the facts regarding the cultures of the past.

Not only subject matter and methodology but the broader characteristics of anthropological theorizing can be largely understood in terms of this central problem. Thus the basic method of anthropology has been the comparative method, and such basic approaches as cultural evolutionism and environmentalism were attempts to account for cultural similarities and differences by some single variable.

An important shift in anthropological interests may be detected in the more recent period, the beginnings of which may be roughly dated to the third decade of the twentieth century. Attention
turned to the internal organization of each culture, and while this interest was to a great extent a particularistic attempt to discover the peculiar "genius" of each culture, the comparative framework was not completely abandoned. It eventually became integrated in a broader framework, which tended to be taken for granted by anthropologists: features common to all cultures were investigated in order to throw into relief the basic over-all characteristics that may be presumed to make up common human nature. Problems of this order can be exemplified by a theoretical assumption that in all societies individuals become socialized in conformity with prevailing norms and that public order is maintained. The investigation of such assumptions regarding the internal functioning of societies was instrumental in the development of an interest in the relation between personality and culture, a field which previously was virtually unexplored.

To the extent that such questions had long been a focus of theoretical interest in sociology and psychology, this broadening of traditional anthropological interests involved the utilization of theoretical concepts developed in these other disciplines and interdisciplinary collaboration on a far wider scale than heretofore.

Even more recently, a contributing factor to this interdisciplinary emphasis has been the extension of anthropological interests, largely in connection with applied problems, to urban situations and literate societies. As a result, anthropology both in certain areas of object matter (e.g., community studies) and theory (e.g., functional theory) has become virtually indistinguishable from sociology. The persistence, however, of such traditional interests as prehistoric archeology, the study of unwritten languages, and the ethnographic description of tribal societies has ensured the continued existence and uniqueness of anthropology.

Subdivisions and interrelation of disciplines

In traditional American practice anthropology is often divided into four basic subdivisions—physical anthropology, cultural anthropology, archeology, and linguistics. Social anthropology is commonly added to these as a distinct branch under the influence of the social functionalism of Radcliffe-Brown and his followers, who draw a sharp line between a science of social structure and function (social anthropology) and a descriptive, historically oriented study of culture (ethnology, or cultural anthropology). In either form this division has, in certain respects, more of a practical than a theoretical basis and is oriented toward the problems of training students in graduate doctoral programs. Thus, language is part of the culture of a people, and therefore its study is logically a subdivision of cultural anthropology. Archeology seeks to recreate as far as possible the culture of former peoples from the evidence of their material remains and to reconstruct the historical interrelations of such cultures, so that it also may be considered an aspect of cultural anthropology. However, both linguistics and archeology require considerable training in highly specialized techniques; this is the fundamental reason in practice for their separation from other aspects of cultural and social anthropology. The separation of cultural and social anthropology is rather that of two different approaches to what is basically the same objective phenomenon of group behavior. Indeed, the distinction falls away for those who would not accept as theoretical doctrine the separation of social structure and culture as distinct fields of study.

From these considerations it follows that the truly fundamental division within anthropology as practiced in the United States is between the physical study of man (physical anthropology) and the sociocultural study of man (the remaining branches). The basic nature of this division is reflected in the fact that outside of the United States the term "anthropology" or its translational equivalents (e.g., German Anthropologie) corresponds to American "physical anthropology," while "ethnology" designates the sociocultural study of mankind. The significance of this division, along with a recognition of a special relationship between the two is reflected in the organization of the periodic international congress called the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences.

The fact that man is the only species that has developed culture introduces new factors of great significance from the purely biological point of view. In most general terms, the key adaptive mechanism of man as a species is culture itself. This has many practical consequences for the physical anthropologist. For example, mating in a human population takes place within a socially determined matrix. Such considerations render fruitful the integral association of the physical and sociocultural branches of anthropology.

More circumscribed bases of specialization either crosscut or subdivide the fundamental divisions just enumerated and bring into relief the complexity of the relationships between anthropology and a variety of other disciplines or fields of specialization. These are of two main types, areal and topical.
For example, the average anthropologist, while almost always a specialist in one of the major branches, tends to be restricted in his actual work to a specific world area. Thus an archeologist will normally have a predominant interest in some particular major geographical area, e.g., North America, and often within this area will have a regional specialty, such as the American southwest. Such specialization segments anthropology in the geographical dimension but tends to bring together the basic fields in terms of a common areal interest. Thus our hypothetical southwestern archeologist will feel the need to have at least an elementary control of the basic facts regarding the ethnographic and linguistic distributions of his area in order to interpret his own results. In certain cases this will lead to consultative discussion with his colleagues in these other branches or even to full-fledged collaborative research.

Anthropology is in principle concerned with all world areas, just as it is concerned with all types of society—primitive, literate, or industrialized. But here again in practice anthropology in all its branches has tended to concentrate its interest in areas such as Oceania or aboriginal America, where the societies have been exclusively or at least predominantly preliterate. However, anthropologists have come to realize more and more that societies of all types must be considered within the scope of the discipline’s possible generalizations and that it is as dangerous to omit industrialized societies and the literate civilizations of the Near or Far East as it is to disregard preliterals. In extending its interest to geographical areas that include literate civilizations with extensively documented histories, anthropology necessarily treads on ground already occupied by traditional area-oriented specializations, e.g., Indology, Sinology, and Near Eastern studies. The approach of the expert in these latter fields is likely to differ from that of the anthropologist by its philological, humanistic, historical, and particularizing emphases. The cultural or social anthropologist is typically synchronic in his interest, thinks in terms of general social-theoretical problems, and is likely to study communities at the local level, since such objects of study as villages are the most closely adapted to the methods developed in the study of tribal society. There is thus room for both types of specialists. Moreover, increasingly each has incorporated interests and techniques from the other so that the differences have tended to become minimized.

The same basic criterion of writing forms the main line of demarcation between the anthropological archeologist, who concentrates on prehistory, and the classical and Near Eastern archeologist, who is concerned with literate cultures. Likewise, the anthropological linguist specializes in the study of hitherto unwritten languages. This carries with it an interest in linguistic field method and synchronic description and a lack of involvement with traditional philological techniques of textual analysis.

The other major basis for specialization within social and cultural anthropology is topical. Most anthropologists tend to confine their interests very largely to such specific aspects of culture as economic life, politics, religion, or music. Here once again anthropology encounters well-established disciplines, such as economics, political science, and musicology. All of these in practice, however, pay most attention to their object of study in the Western tradition and treat the relatively neglected branches of their subject which have to do with non-Western cultures under such rubrics as comparative politics or comparative economics. Anthropology, in turn, in spite of claims to universal interests, tends to focus its attention on non-Western, particularly preliterate, societies.

Anthropology also differs from the standard disciplines in another respect. It studies not only the comparable phenomenon in non-Western cultural settings but also the corresponding cognitive and valutational aspects of the culture with regard to the subject matter. This latter class of studies may well involve topics outside of the social sciences. For example, the anthropological specialty known as ethnobotany investigates the botanical knowledge of indigenous peoples. Applied interests supply a strong point of articulation for these two aspects. Thus, the medical anthropologist involved in medical action programs considers the varying incidence of diseases in specific ethnic groups as the result of biological and social factors but also studies native theories of diagnosis and treatment, since they constitute the cultural setting into which the new methods are to be introduced.

Another type of division particularly prominent in social and cultural anthropology is that between ethnography, the gathering and organization of observational data from the field, and ethnology, the theoretical subdiscipline that utilizes such information as its basic data. Analogous divisions exist in the other major branches of the subject, e.g., descriptive as against theoretical linguistics. Such divisions are not comparable to those described earlier, since virtually every individual scientist has both descriptive and theoretical interests that interact. However, there are individual predilections for one or the other aspect.
Finally, anthropology may be divided into theoretical and applied branches. Anthropologists have always maintained that a basic motive for the scientific study of man is the greater understanding and control it gives us of ourselves and of our society. On the other hand, unlike its sister science sociology, it has not been involved on the theoretical level in problems of societal reform. Yet an interest in the welfare of the people it studies has also been a part of the anthropological tradition. Further, in Western nations with colonial possessions, a form of applied anthropology was developed but was practiced for the most part by administrators with anthropological training rather than by professional anthropologists as such.

After World War II there developed a far deeper involvement in the form of schemes of local and national development, particularly in newly independent countries and often involving the collaboration of Western powers or international agencies. Such activities to a certain extent modified the exclusively observational method of anthropology in the direction of experimental methodology, though under the necessarily limiting conditions of policies not usually formulated by anthropologists.

History

Anthropology in its modern form is a product of the nineteenth century. Such organizational landmarks as the founding of the first anthropological society and the first academic chair in the subject date from this period, but its historical roots are, of course, much deeper. In its specifically nineteenth-century form it is dominated by the idea of the regular and progressive development of human society from a precultural state in which man did not differ essentially from other animals. This doctrine of cultural evolution received a great impetus from the scientific success of Darwinism, dating from the appearance of the Origin of Species, but it is clear that the basic components of nineteenth-century anthropology developed at a substantially earlier date and in essential independence of biological theory. Among these fundamental ideas are the notion of the possibility of applying the scientific method to the study of man; the abstract conception of culture—or the totality of socially acquired habits distinct from physical inheritance—as itself a possible object of scientific inquiry; and the notion of culture as undergoing cumulative and progressive change over a long time span.

As in other fields of endeavor, the first substantial contributions were made by the Greeks, but the classical heritage in anthropology is not to be compared to that in such fields as history and political science. The ancients developed a model of ethnographic description as the local setting for historical narrative. Geographical works also included facts and observations concerning physical anthropology and local customs. These figured in a general but rather vaguely developed theory concerning the influence of climate on culture and biological types, which foreshadowed the geographical determinism of the modern period. The ethnographic observation of cultural differences raised the question of the naturalness versus the conventionality of human custom and the existence of universally valid legal and moral regulations, a peculiarly anthropological philosophical problem. Finally, various theories regarding the over-all development of human culture were discussed, such as the traditional religious doctrine of a former golden age, the cyclical theories of the Stoics, and the progressive development of man's heritage by his own efforts as a corollary to the Democritean atomic theory, particularly as set forth in the famous poem of Lucretius, On the Nature of Things. This latter doctrine may be considered a distant precursor of cultural evolution, and it is of interest to discern here the same fundamental opposition between a theological theory of degeneration and a scientifically oriented belief in progressive development, which reasserted itself in the nineteenth century.

The next significant developments date from the period of Renaissance humanism and the geographical explorations of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. These contributed in new and important ways to the intellectual climate in which modern anthropology was ultimately to develop. The Renaissance struck a modern note of secularism with the notion that man's earthly career was of interest for its own sake and not merely as a preparation for an eternal hereafter. The attempt of humanists to recreate the world of Greece and Rome through the study of original documents rather than through inherited medieval spectacles gave them a kind of anthropological overview of cultural differences. The voyages of exploration broadened spatial perspectives even as humanism widened the chronological one. Whole continents of peoples unknown to the ancient world were revealed. This not only produced an accumulation of facts on a new scale but also raised theoretical questions of great import. Were the novel populations revealed by exploration of the same species as Western man and therefore the possessors of souls worth saving? That they were was the orthodox answer but one difficult to justify from the
genealogical tables of Genesis. The theory explaining the existence of the American Indians as remnants of the ten lost tribes provided a welcome refuge, but other bolder spirits speculated on the possibility of other populations not descended from Adam (the pre-Adamites). So arose the rival theories of monogenetic and polygenetic human origins, theories in continued conflict for several centuries thereafter. Further, were the non-Western peoples who were at a simple stage of technological development representative of the state of nature posited by various theorists as prior to the contractual origin of political and legal institutions? Did they represent, perhaps, something like what our own ancestors were like before the rise of literate civilization? This latter view was eventually to gain considerable currency and provide an essential component in a theory of progressive development.

But before the idea of progressive development could gain ground the prevailing notion of the superiority of the classical world over the modern had to be overcome. This was accomplished in the course of the seventeenth century. In the great achievements of the physical sciences, which culminated in the Newtonian synthesis, the modern world clearly exhibited, at least in one respect, a superiority over the ancients. Under the apparent triviality of the "battle of the ancients and the moderns," satirized by Swift in his Battle of the Books, lies a serious point. Bernard Fontenelle, in his Digression sur les anciens et les modernes, distinguishes between noncumulative aspects of culture, such as literature, and cumulative aspects, such as science. In the latter, modern man is superior. Indeed mankind, in a favorite figure, is compared to an individual developing through the ages and now in his prime. But, according to Fontenelle, this man will have no old age, and infinite perfectibility is possible.

Newtonianism makes yet another contribution. In a universe ruled by law in its physical aspect, man cannot be an exception. It remains then to follow the path blazed by Newton; and indeed, literal application of such concepts as gravitational attraction were not lacking in the eighteenth century and after.

To depict a complete course of progressive development, all that was needful was to consider contemporary savages as representative of a stage preceding that of the ancient East and the classical world. This step was taken by Turgot in his "Plan de deux discours sur l'histoire universelle" (1844), a work that states for the first time the concept of three successive economic stages—hunting, pastoral, and agricultural—as well as the basic form of Comte's later law of the three stages of conceptual development—the theological, the metaphysical, and the scientific.

Another noteworthy work of the eighteenth century is Christoph Meiners’ Grundriss der Geschichte der Menschheit, in which, quite in the spirit of modern cultural anthropology, he proposes a new science, which will take as its subject matter the customs of all peoples and will pay particular attention to the study of nonliterate peoples.

But certain methodological and intellectual advances that occurred only in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries were indispensable for the founding of a science embodying the already developed philosophical views and general programs. From this period date the first systematic racial classifications, those of Linnaeus and Johann Blumenbach, and the initiation of techniques of anthropometric measurements by Pieter Camper. It was also during this period that modern linguistics came into existence. The basic notion that dominated linguistics in the nineteenth century was that languages could be classified into families and that languages in the same family were divergent developments over time from an earlier single language. This idea had already been expressed quite clearly by a number of writers in the late eighteenth century, but by the efforts of Franz Bopp, Rasmus C. Rask, Jakob Grimm, and others in the first half of the nineteenth century it developed systematic methods of comparison to reconstruct the ancestral language. The important recognition of the regularity of sound correspondences in related languages was first pointed out by Rask; it was popularized by Grimm in 1822 and helped to establish the general idea of regularities in human cultural change.

During this period there were also notable discoveries that radically extended the time perspective regarding human development and thus added an essential note of plausibility to the concept of gradual cultural advance. The decipherment of Egyptian writing by Jean-François Champollion in 1821 and, even more dramatically, the description of the basic archeological ages of stone and metal (e.g., by V. Thomsen in 1819) drastically altered traditional ideas regarding the age of man. But it was not until 1859 that the eminent geologist Charles Lyell recognized the validity of Boucher de Perthes’ discovery of human implements of the Old Stone Age contemporaneous with extinct mammals. Thus archeology and Darwinism combined to present a picture of man firmly anchored among other animal species of the past, developing from a
cultureless anthropoid over more than a million years of the Pleistocene. It was during the first half of the nineteenth century that anthropology began to emerge as a distinct discipline. In England, France, and Germany anthropological or ethnological societies were founded. In Germany *Kultur* became a technical term with practically its modern connotation, and it was taken over into English by E. B. Tylor in his classic work *Primitive Culture*, published in 1871. In its detailed overview of human cultural evolution in one major aspect (religion) and its clear statement of the theoretical perspectives of a science of culture, Tylor's book is a true landmark. [See Tylor.]

Tylor's work is representative of the anthropological approach that was dominant in the English-speaking world in the latter part of the nineteenth century, that of cultural evolutionism. The basic procedure, nowhere explicitly described, was known as the comparative method. Cultural evolution took place, in any domain, in a series of stages, the earlier ones being documented through ethnographic data, the later through historical data leading up to European institutions of the nineteenth century. The earliest stage was often hypothetically deduced, as in the case of those who proposed that primitive promiscuity was the earliest form of marital institution. A prominent role was played by the methodological device of survivals, that is, the persistence of institutions in a later stage which gave some evidence of their origin at an earlier stage. Thus L. H. Morgan deduced that because in Hawaii the kinship term glossed as “father” was used for father's brother and mother's brother as well as for father, at a former stage all of these men were potential fathers of an individual [see Morgan, Lewis Henry]. Another basic assumption was that of the psychic unity of mankind. The basic similarity of human nature explained the fact that even peoples geographically distant might agree in details of custom that were symptomatic of a particular stage of development. The tendency, therefore, particularly in later members of the school, was to interpret cultural similarities in terms of independent parallel development rather than through the historical process of diffusion.

In Germany during this period the leading anthropological figure was Adolf Bastian. In his doctrine there was little notice of “stages” as actual chronological periods and no systematic employment of the comparative method. The key concept of *Elementargedanke* played a role similar to that of psychic unity. The work of Bastian's leading disciple, Richard Andree, consisted in the documenting of such cultural parallels. [See Bastian.]

Beginning in the 1880s powerful reactions against these ruling tendencies began to appear, and by 1910 they were largely dominant. Both in the German and English-speaking worlds the comparative method was called into question as deductive, question-begging, and leading to conflicting results. In place of the schematism of stages illustrated by customs from diverse parts of the world, the emphasis was on the reconstruction of a presumably more realistic culture history in which different areas had undergone different developments and in which the historical processes of diffusion and migration were called upon to explain cultural similarities. In Germany and Austria a systematic methodology was developed, that of the culture-historical school (*Kulturkreislehre*) under the leadership of Fritz Graebner and later of Wilhelm Schmidt [see Graebner; Schmidt]. By application of criteria of similarity in culture traits it was believed that there could be constructed a number of distinct original cultures that succeeded one another in time of origin and that spread by migration all over the world. During this period of the first two or three decades of the twentieth century even more extreme theories of single cultural origins arose and had a certain vogue, as for example, pan-Egyptianism and pan-Babylonianism.

In the United States as well, under the influence of Franz Boas, the virtual founder of American academic anthropology, a critical reaction to cultural evolutionism was the dominant theme [see Boas]. The emphasis was also on the reconstruction of cultural history but on a much more limited scale. Originally intended as a means of classifying cultures for descriptive purposes, the culture area was soon used as a device for historical reconstruction. Cultural similarities involving restricted and continuous distribution were interpreted in terms of diffusion. In this way histories of certain specific cultural complexes in circumscribed areas were reconstructed, often tending to show that, contrary to evolutionary doctrine, institutions had developed in different chronological orders in different areas. Methodologically, Boas' own approach was still more drastic, in that he raised fundamental questions regarding the validity of assumptions concerning the equatability of traits in different cultures. Thus under his stimulus, Alexander Goldenweiser sought to show that the label “totemism” had been applied to diverse phenomena, among which it was unlikely that there was either a real psychological or historical connection [see Goldenweiser].
Such investigations as Goldenweiser's involved an analysis of the particular phenomena in each culture and as a part of that culture. In diffusion studies the questions that began to be asked were not so much where and when a particular culture trait had spread, but why it was accepted by one people and rejected by another and how it was reinterpreted and integrated into the borrowing culture. Such studies inevitably raised questions of the internal organizing principles of each culture. One type of answer receives its classic exposition in Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*, in which the integrative factor is described in psychological terminology [see BENEDICT]. This line of interest led to the development of the interrelation between personality and culture as a field of study.

These general tendencies were reinforced during this same period of the 1920s and 1930s by the rise of functionalism. The leading exponents of this point of view, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, agreed in emphasizing the importance of functional interrelationship among cultural traits and in disparaging the historical types of explanation of cultural phenomena that had characterized all previous schools. The functionalism of Malinowski views culture as consisting of organized institutions related functionally to the biological and derived needs of human beings. That of Radcliffe-Brown and his followers, which derives ultimately from the writings of the great French sociologist Émile Durkheim, has been called structural functionalism. It interprets function as contributing to the survival of the existing social structure and eschews psychological explanation of social facts. Also in contrast to Malinowskian functionalism, it has an important place for the application of the comparative method, because it contends that laws can be discovered by comparisons of structure. [See DURKHEIM; MALINOWSKI; RADCLIFFE-BROWN.]

**Current trends**

The years following World War II have witnessed, along with an almost explosive material expansion of anthropology, a diversity of new interests, though for the most part these no longer express themselves in over-all systems of the kind that characterized the "schools" of the past. In fact, most anthropologists are eclectics in terms of the traditional doctrines. Moreover, partly through the influence of sociology, there is a much more sophisticated interest in the philosophy of science. This is evident in an emphasis on the methodology of theory construction that has replaced the earlier characteristically informal and semi-intuitive approach of anthropologists.

A number of developments may be noted in the period following World War II. Most basic has been the extension of anthropological interests into areas with nontribal societies and to newly urban or otherwise Western-acculturated groups in non-Western societies. One characteristic form this has taken is in the expansion of community studies. This extension has been strongly interdisciplinary and in close connection with applied interests. In moving outside the confines of tribal societies, anthropologists have not avoided consideration of larger units such as national states. Thus the notion of *basic personality*, which was a central concept in earlier culture and personality studies, was taken over in the form of national character in the studies of Margaret Mead and her associates. [See CULTURE AND PERSONALITY; NATIONAL CHARACTER.]

Another trend has been the revival of interest in cultural evolution, chiefly under the stimulus of Leslie White. Emphasis was placed on those aspects of culture that were in fact cumulative, e.g., technological control of environment, and on the compatibility of historically known facts of the diffusion of custom with such over-all technological advance. [See EVOLUTION, article on CULTURAL EVOLUTION.]

Another interest has been social or cultural ecology. Older oversimplified forms of environmental determinism had generally been superseded by more realistic doctrines of possibilism. The aim was now, following the lead of the plant and animal ecologists, to examine in detail the interrelations of man and his physical environment and the mutual adjustments of sociocultural institutions within an over-all environmental situation. [See ECOLOGY, article on CULTURAL ECOLOGY.]

In the work of Julian Steward cultural ecological analysis leads to a typology of societies in terms of levels of sociocultural integration, ultimately based on levels of ecological adjustment to environment. This involves an interest in parallel, or so-called multilinear, evolution in the form of historically independent cases of like sequences of development from lower to higher levels of integration.

The method of making cross-cultural comparisons in order to discover lawlike associations of cultural phenomena, frequently of a statistical sort, was initiated by Tylor in his classic paper of 1889, "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, Applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent." This method has been greatly extended and systematized in the postwar period through the Human Relations Area Files at Yale University.
G. P. Murdock uses such data in his *Social Structure* (1949) to enunciate a series of statistical generalizations among variables in kinship and other aspects of social organization. Murdock's approach also involves a dynamic aspect, in that only certain transitions among types of kinship systems are postulated as being at all frequent and causal mechanisms are posited for such changes. Hypotheses of this order are employed in reconstructing the history of social institutions. Another example of a significant application of this methodology is the study by J. W. M. Whiting and I. L. Child, *Child Training and Personality: A Cross-cultural Study* (Whiting & Child 1953), in which various hypotheses in the field of culture and personality studies are tested cross-culturally. Among these hypotheses are some concerning connections between child-rearing practices, personality, and certain cultural institutions, derived from the Freudian-oriented theories of Ralph Linton and Abram Kardiner. [See Anthropology; article on the comparative method in Anthropology; Ethnology; Socialization.]

These cross-cultural and other systematic comparative approaches highlight an interest in universal aspects of culture rather than cultural diversity. Given the complexity of human institutions, it is not surprising that little of a specific nature can be stated as true for all cultures. More typically, then, statements of a generalizing sort about human societies involve absolute or statistically based invariance among certain variables. An interest in such relationships in linguistics was pioneered by R. Jakobson. The volume of papers edited by J. H. Greenberg, *Universals of Language* (Conference on Language Universals 1963), gives evidence of the growing interest in the investigation of such cross-linguistic constancies.

Along with the continued flourishing of variant forms of functionalism, there is a strong trend toward structuralism proper, largely owing to the growing influence of Claude Lévi-Strauss. At least partly inspired by structural linguistics, the basic notion is to analyze social institutions in terms of highly abstract structural relationships. This is analogous to structural analysis of sound systems, which are accounted for in terms of opposition and contrast. Also of linguistic inspiration are the semantic analysis of kinship systems initiated in its modern form by Floyd Lounsbury and Ward Goodenough and the analysis of the semantics of folk taxonomy by Harold C. Conklin, Charles Frake, and others. These approaches presumably bring to light underlying factors that figure in the semantic structure and give deeper structural insights into the systems being investigated. [See Componential analysis.]

In linguistics itself it is evident that a new development of revolutionary proportions occurred in the form of transformational theory, initiated by Chomsky in his book *Syntactic Structures* (1957). The basic idea is the generation of the grammatical sentences of a language by the successive applications of a set of underlying rules. The test of a grammar is not merely the conformity of the sentences generated with the intuition of the native speaker regarding the grammatically acceptable set of sentences but also, through the subset of transformational rules, the explicit relations between whole sets of sentences whose relations are intuitively recognized by native users of the language (e.g., active with corresponding passive). Previous descriptive linguistics is criticized as "taxonomic," in that it operates with an empirically given body (corpus) of linguistic behavior, which it seeks to describe (it is claimed, unsuccessfully) in terms of only operationally defined procedures. The influence of transformational linguistics is already evident in psychology and is likely to have a considerable impact on anthropology also. [See Cognitive theory.]

Trends in archeology and even more in physical anthropology also involve shifts in interest and methodology of very considerable proportions. Although archeology is, and by its very nature must remain, historical, it has not escaped the newer functional and ecological influences. Definition of the chronological succession of cultures characterized only by implement types is radically altered as archeological materials are being used as a source of inference regarding demographic patterns, for the relation of culture to environment, and for the reconstruction of the nonmaterial aspects of culture, as far as this is possible. An attempt is being made to arrive at broader interpretive historical syntheses and even at lawlike regularities of historical process [see, for example, Urban revolution].

In physical anthropology, the older anthropology sought chiefly to unravel the racial history of mankind in terms of migration and mixture of relatively static types defined by anthropometric traits, ideally supposed to be fixed, nonadaptive, and not subject to major environmental modification, even though the genetic basis of such metrical traits was admittedly unknown. The reconstruction of racial history has become less important than the study of the dynamic processes of change in the genetic composition of populations. Human physical evolution has likewise been reinterpreted through the same
mechanisms of genetic change and through a study of anatomical form in relation to physiological functioning in the context of developing human cultural and social organization. A significant broadening of the basis for such investigations is being provided by the burgeoning interest in comparative primatology, with specific attention to the nonhuman analogues of human social organization and communication. [See Ethology; Evolution; Genetics; Social behavior, Animal.]

Thus the initial period of system building in anthropology in the nineteenth century was succeeded by a critical epoch in which emphasis lay in the natural history type of observation and in the uniqueness of individual cultures and local historical sequences. The present period, by contrast, is characterized by a richness and diversity of constructive theoretical endeavors and is distinguished by a revival of interest in generalization, both on a synchronic foundation and in reference to diachronic processes of change. The time would seem to be approaching in which some new synthetic type of theory will be required to integrate and unify these diverse theoretical strands.

JOSEPH H. GREENBERG
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II

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Cultural anthropology is that main part of anthropology in which human culture is studied. It thus takes in all branches of anthropology except those that are more directly concerned with human biology and with the interplay of biological and cultural factors. Its key concept is that of culture, and in the definition of culture are implied the scope and the principal methods of cultural anthropology.

Culture is all that a man learns to do as a member of his society. It includes all the knowledge, common understandings, and expectations that the people of a group share and that their children learn.

Seen in broadest perspective, culture refers to the main behavioral characteristics of the human species. Culture distinguishes mankind from the rest of the animal world. Only man has language, uses a variety of other symbols, and makes consistent use of tools. Thus, man alone can transmit to his fellows vast quantities of information and accumulated experience. Moreover, all men, of whatever kind and circumstances, have the capacity for using and developing culture. The continuities in biological evolution between mankind and other species have long been recognized, and more recently anthropologists have come to see that culture has been a factor in human biological evolution. There is no doubt that only mankind uses and transmits the capacities we summarize under the concept of culture.

Human culture is actually manifested in a great variety of particular cultures; that is, in the special ways of life of main groups of people. A culture, as contrasted with culture in general, comprises the selective modes of acting, thinking, feeling, and communicating which are used by people of one group and which distinguish their behavior from that of other groups. The participants in each culture not only use characteristic tools, values, ideas, words, but also maintain a distinctive arrangement of the component parts of their culture.

The central task of cultural anthropology, then, is to study the similarities and differences in behavior among human groups, to depict the character of the various cultures and the processes of stability, change, and development that are characteristic to them. Each main group of people has produced a different set of answers to the same questions which all groups must face; these questions are raised not only by the biological structure of men but also by the requirements of being the bearers and users of culture.
Scope and methods

The scope and the methods of cultural anthropology are implied in the definition of generic culture and distinctive cultures. It takes in all of human social behavior from the beginnings of man's career to the great movements of the present time. Cultural anthropologists study all cultures, whether carried on in tribal societies or in complex civilized nations. Every type of behavior is examined, whether rational, nonrational, or irrational. All aspects of a culture are considered, including the technical and economic means of dealing with the natural environment, the ways of relating to other people, the special experiences of religion and art. Not only are the activities within the several aspects studied but the interplay among them is of special interest, as the relation between family structure and economic forces or between religious practices and social groupings. Daily life no less than high achievement, the ordinary villager as well as the elite leaders, are taken within the cultural anthropologist’s purview.

Given this scope, the basic methods of cultural anthropology follow. These entail a holistic view, field study, comparative analysis, and a particular kind of molecular-molar theorizing.

The holistic view. This view assumes that one is free to study any kind of human behavior relevant to the problem being examined. Thus, an anthropologist studying economic development in an African locale may find that he must look into the ceremonial cycle and into family relations if he is to depict fully the processes of economic change there. Or, in tracing the development of ancient civilizations, pottery styles as well as settlement patterns, trade routes, and subsistence techniques have to be taken into account. Any one book cannot show all of the culture of even a small and simple society, but through the combined efforts of cultural anthropologists, many cultures have been explored, many parts of particular cultures have been closely examined, and the characteristics of human culture have been outlined.

Field work. Cultural anthropologists typically gather their scientific evidence at first hand by direct observation. If it is evidence on an ancient culture, the data come mainly from excavations carried on by those anthropologists who specialize in the archeological side of the subject. The cultural anthropologists who study the ways of living peoples go to stay among them and learn about their society and culture by participating, interviewing, observing. It is in the first instance an observational rather than experimental method; the data are taken from the context of reality rather than from the more controllable confines of a laboratory. One consequence of such field work is that the cultural anthropologist becomes aware of the inside view of a culture, of how it looks to those who use it, what rewards and problems they see, as well as how that way of life appears to an outside observer. His analysis thus is able to take into account the inner forces as well as external forces and influences. Another consequence of intensive field work is that the anthropologist focuses on patterns of behavior that are meaningful in the culture, rather than on bits of behavior that may be convenient units for measurement. He looks for regular sequences of action and notes how they are changed in various contexts. He observes how patterns are distinguished from one another by the participants as well as in the eyes of the observer. Although a cultural anthropologist may use questionnaires and other techniques to elicit statistical data, his primary interest usually is to ascertain the regularities of behavior and the principal discontinuities among them. After he grasps these configurations he is better able to judge which numerical measurements are likely to be significant and how best to get them.

Comparative method. The comparative perspective is brought into play at every level of analysis. When, for example, a cultural anthropologist studies social organization in a village in India, he finds out how the villagers organize themselves and then compares the various groups of the village in order to ascertain the similarities and differences among them. Since the villagers rank themselves in a hierarchy of caste groups, one comparative task is to see which patterns of conduct are similar in all caste ranks and which differ among them. Armed with an understanding of the similarities as well as of the differences, the fieldworker can compare the organization of the village as a whole with that of other villages of the vicinity. Such comparison again enables him to delineate similarities and differences among villages or types of villages and so to explain some of the past behavior of the villagers and to say something about their probable responses to some future circumstances. Further, a comparison of village organization in the various regions in India may lead to some formulation of general features shared widely in Indian civilization. This, in turn, may permit a cross-cultural comparison of caste stratification in village India with types of social stratification in, say, parts of Japan or the United States. At the widest horizon of analysis these comparisons raise...
the question of social stratification as a general attribute of human culture and society.

This comparative approach is utilized at all levels of analysis. Thus, if the problem being considered is whether the earliest civilizations rose out of similar conditions of ecology and technology, the several early civilizations are compared to see if any similar conditions prevailed. If so, we may add to our understanding of the grand processes of human development. If no similarities appear, the process of comparison may still suggest useful ideas to be tested in the same comparative manner. To take another example, to understand the transition from more isolated or dependent economies to a modern, industrialized nation-state, we examine the record of national development—including societal and religious as well as economic changes—in a number of developing countries.

Development of concepts. There is, finally, a way of developing generalizations that is characteristic of the work of cultural anthropologists. They tend to begin theorizing from the empirical evidence, to build their concepts from what they see people doing or hear them saying or from the material remains of past cultures which they uncover from the earth. In selecting certain parts of reality for observation, in asking certain kinds of questions of the people and the data, cultural anthropologists, like other scientists, are informed and guided by accumulated theory. But the cultural anthropologist is less likely than are other social scientists to begin with a model or a set of abstract propositions and direct his field work to the testing of the model or the propositions. He is apt to shape his concepts more from the ground up than from the abstract formula down.

Similarly, the theoretical problems selected for analysis are likely to be suggested by the circumstances and problems of the people being studied. The cultural anthropologist does not typically observe people in order to shed light on a concept, but rather he marshals whatever concepts he can in order to understand a people—and people. Hence, when he finds previous concepts inadequate to explain important processes of behavior which he has observed, he tries to generate and test a new concept. In so doing he has the advantage of sharing common human qualities with the subjects of his study. Robert Redfield once wrote, "To be able to find out what it is that a Zuñi Indian is ashamed of, one must first know what it is to be ashamed" (1962–1963, vol. 1, p. 54).

There is a fundamentally humanistic component in much of cultural anthropology. It is not only that the arts of a people are studied, and these at the humblest levels as well as at the pinnacles of aesthetic achievement. It is also, as we have noted, that an anthropologist tries to see a culture from the inside as well as from the outside. As a participant observer, he experiences some part of the life he observes, and his personal experience finds expression in his studies, so that they entail humanistic insight as well as scientific objectivity. Having lived among the people whose culture he analyzes, the anthropologist is likely to depict the strains and conflicts they feel and to discuss the rewards and pleasures for which they strive. In working with his informants, he should ideally have a balanced attitude of both compassion and reserve, of attachment and detachment, of involvement and objectivity. Too great involvement will bias his account; too rigid objectivity may blind him to the realities of the society. Moreover, attachment and insight into other cultures does not mean that the anthropologist totally sheds the values of his own culture. He generally is able to view them in larger and wider perspective and so may be emancipated from the more parochial and intolerant pressures of the moment, but he does not necessarily reject wholesale the values of his own group or even remain indifferent to them. Anthropologists, for example, are as passionately attached to the values of science as they understand them as are any other toilers in the vineyard of science.

In appreciating the inside view of a culture, an anthropologist comes to appreciate the importance of the position of the observer in the analysis of culture and society. He gets different views from persons of different status, and their appraisal of his status may influence their responses; he finds that the same person may alter his view in the passage of time and through change of circumstance. This holds true in some measure for the observers as well as the observed. Yet there is also the constant of objective reality to be discerned within the shifting perspectives. Hence, he grasps that he must be able to change the angle of his vision—now seeing the village as the main unit, now as only one part of a larger social entity. He must describe village life as a stable ongoing system at this moment of time and then analyze the same behavior as continually in process of change, as part of the stream of history. Most important, he must try to reconcile the differing perspectives, so that he may draw from the study of continuous change in time some generalizations that may hold true across time, so that in his analysis of a larger system he may illumine the meaning of its component groups as smaller systems.

Such tasks require generalization at different
levels of analysis. At the more immediate level, an anthropologist studying a particular society abstracts the general form and functions of its activities, for example, in marriage ceremonies, using his observations and participants’ accounts. He is aided by the fact that the subjects of his inquiry also generalize—though not necessarily with reliable accuracy—and can give him an already abstracted account by which they guide their behavior. At another level of analysis, he compares the patterns of marriage rites within a civilization to see whether the various versions together reflect some leading ideas and behavior patterns shared widely by the people of that civilization. At still more abstract levels he formulates concepts about the place of such rituals in society and tests these concepts against the widest available range of comparative evidence.

Problems of method. There are disadvantages as well as benefits in following the principles of method. The free-ranging holistic approach avoids arbitrary barriers to inquiry, but it also requires continual resetting of the framework of inquiry. Being unfettered brings on its own trammels. The emphasis on pattern, on the contours of thought and behavior, has made for less precision in measurement and in detailed specification than is now needed to advance anthropological concepts. As Clyde Kluckhohn pointed out, cultural anthropologists have frequently been cavalier about numbers (1959, pp. 259–261). They have not regularly given adequate information about the number and kinds of observations on which their generalizations are based. They have tended to assume more homogeneity in nonliterate cultures than may exist, emphasizing the dominant modalities of behavior and glossing over the variant as well as the deviant expressions.

The gains from field work have entailed certain losses as well. The natural history procedure, in which the observer maps what is there and follows the flow of events as he finds them, may lead more to description than to analysis, more to imparting disparate blocks of information than to constructing coherent and comparable accounts. In using this procedure, one may overlook significant underlying forces because they do not appear as such in a descriptive mapping of the culture. The very attempt to cover many facets of a culture during a stay of a year or so among a people necessarily makes an anthropologist’s account of their farming or their music less detailed and perhaps less penetrating than a year’s study by an agricultural specialist or a musicologist would yield. Some improvement in this has been brought about by repeated field trips to the same people by the same anthropologist, through restudies by other observers, and through team research; yet a cultural anthropologist remains more of a jack-of-all-trades and less of a specialist-master of one field of research than are most other social scientists.

In the making of cultural comparisons, there are similar defects that are inherent in the methodological virtues. When the frame of inquiry and of reference differs somewhat from study to study, when profile rather than precise measurement defines pattern, it is not always easy to judge whether two accounts of presumably comparable behavior are really comparable. The inclination to build theoretical concepts from the observed data through successive levels of abstraction entails other difficulties. There is a temptation to leap too quickly from the immediate to the highest level of abstraction. It has been said that anthropologists are the astronomers of the social sciences. This role is complicated by the fact that insofar as they themselves go to far-off places to collect data on the universe of man, they take it upon themselves to be the astronauts as well.

Aware of these difficulties, anthropologists have worked steadily at improving their methods, yet are mindful that any method has cost as well as yield. Thus, the loss of rigor which comes from studying behavior in the context of real experience rather than in the controlled situation of the laboratory is more than made up for, they believe, by the relevance of field observation toward the explanation of significant problems. The results of laboratory research are essential for an understanding of some aspects of human behavior, but laboratory methods, too, have their limitations. Similarly, statistical data are imperative for some types of analysis but are not directly relevant for others. A sample poll of buying preferences can be used to forecast certain limited economic trends with considerable accuracy, but a poll of the same sample on theological matters would hardly be very enlightening about the structure of religious belief and practice in the culture. On such questions it is the pattern of religious allegiance and behavior that is significant; it is the relation of a part of religious practice to other parts and to other institutions that requires examination before one attempts precise measurement of a particular point of belief.

Just as each discipline of the social sciences is both the master and the captive of its prevailing methodology, so the work of cultural anthropologists is in some ways limited as well as advanced by their chief methods. The use of these methods
does contribute fruitful results not characteristically provided by the other behavioral sciences, and in that contribution to the common enterprise of understanding human behavior the cultural anthropologist finds the basic justification for his methods.

Results of cultural anthropology

From the several fields of cultural anthropology have come a number of significant results. One simple outcome is that the outlines of most of the principal cultures of the world have been charted. For many of these, it is only a preliminary kind of mapping; there are large societies for which we have only quite meager data and little of that is from the observations of social scientists. Yet the main dimensions of human culture can be discerned. Universal components as different from one another as incest prohibitions and art forms have been noted and the range of variation within each general component has been recognized. Thus, incest taboos in one culture may be applied to only a few relationships, in another they may involve scores of social positions. Art forms may be expressed in a huge variety of media, but what is selected by the people of one culture as a proper vehicle for aesthetic enjoyment, say elaborate skin tattooing, is disdained by or unknown to others.

Even such preliminary mapping of culture, in itself, can have an impact on students. Once it is recognized that each culture is worthy of serious study and that there are many potential variations, then differences from one’s own patterns need not be seen, as they often naively are, as threatening one’s own values. Even this first step in the use of the concept of culture can convey important meanings. These, in turn, foster further explorations, which then carry a student into realms of knowledge and research opened up by the broad concept of culture and for which the broad concept must be developed in much more specific ways.

That development of anthropological ideas has yielded two main kinds of results: those dealing with cultures seen as systems, that is, as organized, interrelated patterns of activities and of people; and those dealing with the growth of cultures, the regular ways by which culture systems are changed, are adapted, and evolve. Social anthropologists whose main efforts are in the systemic, synchronic mode of analysis have produced studies of such matters as the processes of kinship and marriage, the relation of conflict to solidarity, the interchange between religious and societal activities. Much of this kind of analysis has been based on observations of small-scale, tribal societies of Africa, Oceania, the Americas. The testing of these findings in complex cultures carried on by millions of people and the consequent refinement of the concepts are promising but difficult challenges for synchronic studies.

One approach to the broadening of analysis is that of cultural ecology, in which the system of a particular culture and society is seen as being in constant interchange with larger systems, both of man and of nature (Steward 1955; Sahlins & Service 1960). Another approach follows the model of linguistic analysis to study the categories of thought used within a culture as expressed, for example, in kin terms, myth, rituals. Comparative studies of a selected aspect in different cultures, as in cross-cultural studies of religion or technology, have long been undertaken to ascertain the constants of behavior and the potential variations; added to these research pursuits more recently has been the comparative study of values, that is, the effort to state the basic outlook and choices taken by the people of a culture and to compare the syndromes of values among cultures (Kluckhohn 1959).

Studies in psychological anthropology (also called culture-personality studies) are relevant to the analysis of a culture both as a maintained system and as a changing, evolving life-tool. Culture institutions are maintained by people; that maintenance is shaped by the cognitive perceptions and the personality dimensions common to those people. Hence, two societies may maintain the same cultural form, say, of parliamentary democracy yet carry it on with quite different results if each group has differing attitudes toward authority or differing values about egalitarianism. The institutions, in turn, notably those of education, mold the developing personalities of the children. Both kinds of influences operate; both should be taken into account in a full analysis of a culture. Further, culture change comes about through changes in the day-to-day behavior of individuals and groups of individuals. The reasons why people select certain changes and not others are not unconnected with their personality characteristics. And when a major change in one part of a culture is made, as when a people shift to a new level of technology, the reverberations of that change not only touch other aspects of the culture, often giving a new context to kinship or a new emphasis in religion, but are also likely to affect the manner in which personalities typically take shape in that society.

To turn to studies of culture growth, all time spans in the human range are included, from small, limited shifts to a view of all of the human
career considered as one course of biological and cultural evolution. When cultural anthropologists began to examine how a particular culture came to be, they were impressed by how little of it had originated within the one society. There has been a constant borrowing of culture elements by one group from another, even among peoples who were bitter enemies and across formidable geographical barriers. This process, called “diffusion,” occurred in the earliest eras of culture history and has vastly accelerated in recent times. Yet there are limits and resistances to diffusion. The analysis of the conditions that favor culture transfer and those that impede it is a central problem in the study of culture change. Coupled with this study are questions about the conditions for innovation and creativity within a culture, how inventions arise and how they become accepted.

The rates of culture change are another facet of this inquiry. The findings of archeological anthropology demonstrate that there has been an accelerating pace of change, at least in certain phases of culture. Although the accelerating development of human command of energy can be demonstrated, not all parts of a culture change at the same rate, nor is there clear evidence for cumulative development in such matters as forms of marriage, kinship, or ritual.

In the perspective of human evolution, culture growth began while biological evolution was still going on, before the human organism had evolved to its present state. When the biological precursors of man began to acquire the rudiments of culture, according to recent findings, this capacity advanced their physical evolution in the human direction. Hence, man is the product of culture as well as the producer of it. Culture patterns are best seen not as constraints imposed for the common good but as integral elements of human life and as the means of developing and realizing man’s potential.

In certain respects, man’s potential has risen successively as new thresholds of culture have been reached, as with the development of the Neolithic inventions, of civilization, of science. Once a society attains such a threshold, many new cultural opportunities become open to its people. Not all societies necessarily cross that threshold at the same period, nor do all exploit the potentials in the same way, but the attainment of a cultural divide by one people makes it possible for all mankind eventually to share in its consequences. Thus the current press for economic development in new nations can be seen as an episode of contemporary cultural evolution.

The idea of cultural evolution was salient in the nineteenth-century beginnings of cultural anthropology, but it was chiefly propounded as a series of a few stages through which each people had to pass. The validity of these stages was challenged, especially by those who became aware of the importance of diffusion. They demonstrated that not every society had to go through the same developmental stages and, moreover, that the critical features postulated for the respective stages did not hold true when tested against the ethnological evidence. The diffusionists took as their main task the reconstruction of particular culture histories, especially of primitive peoples. Their efforts, in turn, were criticized by those who saw the primary task for anthropology not as that of formulating conjectural history but as depicting the functional interrelations and social rationale within a culture. The pioneering functionalists, in their turn, are now criticized as overdogmatic in their restriction of the focus of inquiry and in their assumption of a close, organic interrelation among all parts of a culture. Each of these trends of thought has made positive contributions, although the proponents of each, in their critiques of their predecessors, now appear to have provided oversimplified refutations of too simple concepts.

Trends

Since World War II there has been a great spurt of activity in almost every part of cultural anthropology. Peoples not much noted by anthropologists before, especially those of complex societies, have been described in intensive studies of particular villages and neighborhoods. Topics little examined anthropologically, such as law or leadership, have been better explored, and our knowledge of such standard anthropological topics as kinship has been deepened.

There has also been development of the basic precepts underlying all parts of cultural anthropology. Eric Wolf (1964) has noted that there is a greater emphasis on constructing systems of general propositions and that there has been a lessening of the fluidity and ambiguity of the more romantic approach. There is also growing interest in the peoples of civilization and the characteristic features of civilization, an interest that was never absent from cultural anthropology but one that had been second to the concentration on small, primitive (i.e., nonliterate) societies. There is a re-emphasis on the constant features of human psyche and society, on the limitations to change at any one time, and on the inevitable requirements of social life. Human potentiality is seen as flexible but not quite as open and unbounded as some cul-
tural anthropologists used to hold. Cultural relativism remains a necessary condition for gathering data; one cannot observe objectively if one's own ethical judgments about the way of life being observed intrude into and color the observations. But the suspension of value judgment is not indefinite; complete moral relativism is not defended. Each person and society has to take some moral stand in order to function.

There is also a freshening challenge to cultural anthropology as a valid, unified field of study. It is a challenge raised previously by the founders of the functionalist approach and not abandoned by some of the social anthropologists who have ably carried forward this approach. The challenge is simply that no one discipline can usefully cover so vast a scope as cultural anthropology claims, that so ambitious a reach inevitably impairs one's grasp of any worthy topic and defeats the kind of intensive investigation essential for scientifically useful results. These challengers do not question the scientific validity of linguistic or archeological or evolutionary studies, but they find no special advantage and considerable disadvantage in trying to maintain closer nexus with these fields than with others in the social sciences. Those who express this doubt find the study of contemporary, small-scale societies, with concentration on social relations, to be ample enough field for research efforts.

Yet, although it is true that the immense scope of cultural anthropology does sometimes impede more intensive studies, cultural anthropologists do not feel at all precluded from doing intensive studies or from utilizing the results of social anthropological work. They believe that there are times and occasions when the narrower range is needed and others when the broad strategy is suitable. They do not want to abandon the broad policy which enables them to shift from one level of analysis to another and from one field of investigation to another. This may prejudice their mastery of a particular subject, but it keeps open their intellectual mobility. It is this mobility—feeling free to ask such questions as whether a cultural process discerned in one era or civilization holds true in another, how the findings from the microscopic examination of a culture fit into macroscopic understanding of culture—that has yielded useful results for cultural anthropology.

DAVID G. MANDELBAUM

[Directly related are the entries ARCHEOLOGY; ETHNOGRAPHY; ETHNOLOGY; LINGUISTICS. Other relevant material may be found in CULTURE, article on CULTUREOLOGY; DIFFUSION, article on CULTURAL EVOLUTION; ECOLOGY; EVOLUTION, article on CULTURAL EVOLUTION; FIELD WORK; OBSERVATION.]
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III
SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Social anthropology aims at understanding and explaining the diversity of human behavior by a comparative study of social relationships and processes over as wide a range of societies as possible. The social relationships studied are primarily those that are standardized or institutionalized, that is, in which people are regularly concerned as members of particular social groups or categories. Typically, these institutions are the family, marriage, and kinship; complexes of economic and political organization; social control (including law); morality, ritual, and religion. No "explanation" of social relationships can be final in any social discipline; the findings of social anthropology must be supplemented by other data, for example, demographic and psychological data. But a social anthropologist provides understanding of social relationships in his field by precisely defining and describing behavioral connections. An exotic custom such as a "joking relationship," whereby certain named categories of kin not only may engage in horseplay and other privileged familiarities but also are expected so to behave, is "explained" to a degree, i.e., made more intelligible, when contrasted with customs of "avoidance" that show other categories of kin treated with the greatest respect, even to the point of shunning all contact. These parallel but opposite ways of behaving "make sense" (especially when compared over a range of societies) as methods of symbolic treatment of categories of kin who may stand in different but equally important structural and operational relationships. Polarization of behavior patterns gives a strong delineation to the kinship structure and provides a relatively simple framework for canalization of conflicting interests, thus allowing for more effective performance of social tasks.

The general conceptual apparatus of the social anthropologist and his theoretical approach are broadly similar to those used by his colleagues in other social sciences, especially sociology. Conventionally, the anthropologist has been concerned with the "primitive," or non-Western, societies.) His method is differentiated to some extent, however, by a more holistic approach. Social anthropology explicitly recognizes that behavior is intrinsic to a relatively systematized pattern of interrelated institutions. This notion of functional interrelatedness, while shared by other social sciences, has been more forcibly presented to the working social anthropologist by his field experience in relatively small-scale societies—in some of which every member has been personally known to the observer.

History. The comparative study of institutionalized social relations can be traced far back in the history of intellectual exploration. The theoretical content of Herodotus may be overestimated, but Montesquieu, Jens Kraft, Izaak Iselin, and Adam Ferguson are examples of early forceful thinkers about society to whom social anthropologists still turn. An early descriptive ethnographic tradition—exemplified in the work of J. F. LaFitte (1724) on the Huron, Garcilaso de la Vega (b.1539–d.1616) on the Inca, and James Cook (1768–1775) on the peoples of the central and western Pacific—has also contributed to the making of social anthropology. Many of the ideas of social anthropology derived from the theoretical work of H. Maine, J. J. Bachofen, and especially L. H. Morgan. Later, the work of J. F. McLennan and C. N. Starcke on family and kinship, and of E. B. Tylor, W. Robertson Smith, and J. G. Frazer on religion, conceptually and analytically influenced the emerging discipline, and a fundamental contribution came from E. Durkheim and his "school" of followers who write for the journal L'année sociologique. Much of the interest lay in the search for evolutionary and historical sequences in human custom, but the converging ethnographic and theoretical influences gave rise to more realistic studies. F. Boas in the United States and A. C. Haddon in Britain initiated systematically planned field expeditions. In the early twentieth century ethnographic studies contributed to our understanding of age-grades and men's associations, kinship and marriage, and primitive law. Missionaries and government officials also added materially to the ethnographic record and drew upon and stimulated the comparative theorists. The book that for the first time drew together much of the material on social anthropology in a systematic, theoretical way was R. H. Lowie's Primitive Society (1920). Meanwhile, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (1922) and B. Malinowski (1922), who had combined extensive field work with a high degree of theoretical training and insight, were beginning to set the conceptual framework for the intensive study of contemporary institutions which, largely under their influence, has come to be known as social anthropology.

Modern social anthropology has passed through several phases, beginning with a major emphasis on functionalism. A noticeable contrast here was between Malinowski's insistence upon the ultimate biological basis of human behavior, radically transmuted though it is by culture, and Radcliffe-
Brown's emphasis upon the comprehension of function as it related to the requirements of society rather than to those of individual members (Radcliffe-Brown 1952). Linked with his emphasis upon social structure was his stress on the concepts of social integration and social equilibrium. The latter assumption has been criticized inasmuch as it tends to negate the social potential for change (Leach 1961). Moreover, Radcliffe-Brown's insistence upon the primacy of institutional factors in controlling individual behavior has seemed like a too rigid structural determinism. Even apart from frontal attacks launched upon such functional and structural assumptions, recent studies in social anthropology have shown more awareness of the methodological problems involved.

**Modern interest in models.** Modern interest in structure has taken the form of the explicit construction of models. Interest in this development was probably influenced by mathematical practice, for example, in mechanics, and perhaps by contemporary usage among economists. It was demonstrated for kinship studies by E. R. Leach (1954) in a study of Jinghpaw kinship terminology, in which he constructed a hypothetical society organized in accordance with seven structural principles, and then demonstrated that the highly complex Jinghpaw empirical system could be seen as a modification of the formal simplicity of this theoretical scheme. He called this essay an experiment in ethnographic algebra, possibly with the memory of a gibe that Malinowski leveled at Radcliffe-Brown's Australian kinship diagrams. Social anthropologists were especially stimulated, however, by the massive analysis of C. Lévi-Strauss (1949), in particular by his models of restricted and generalized exchange applied to the field of kinship and marriage. Model-building in the developed manner involves a high degree of abstraction and the articulation of a set of abstract propositions for heuristic purposes. The logical inferences proceeding from such a method have been very illuminating, especially in the field of kinship, which lends itself particularly to such treatment. A variation of model treatment, the "theory of games," has been applied with more limited effect by F. Barth (1959) to the political organization of Pathan society. Barth points out that the crucial step in a transformation from real life to a theory-of-games model depends upon the formulation of the rules by which the members of the society govern their actions. This involves highly significant levels of abstraction. In the selection and formulation of elements for manipulation in the model, the specific choices made by the analyst himself are of prime importance for the final interpretation. This method was invented in terms of economic problems that depend upon the operations of only a few "players." When one applies it to social problems, extreme reductionism is required.

Use of the model concept by social anthropologists has covered a wide range (Association of Social Anthropologists 1965a); it has even been applied, with rather dubious accuracy and significance, to the recognition of personal bias in the analyst's choice of material for examination. A feature of modern social anthropology is its self-consciousness. Obviously, personal elements in the situation of the observer are recognized as affecting the collection of his data, including the possibility that he may influence to some degree the behavior of the people whom he is studying. The idiosyncratic role of the analyst in handling this material and his personal involvement with the people may condition the form that he attributes to the society he studies.

**Analyses of social process.** Side by side with the more precise conceptualization of structural studies there has developed a more definite interest in the analysis of social process. Argument still proceeds as to the degree to which the behavior of members of a society is to be understood in terms of the jural rules of the society or in terms of their individual choice and decision. There is also difference of view as to whether the concept of social structure should be applied primarily to a summation of rules or to a summation of behavior, whether it should refer to ideal or statistical norms. But whichever is the emphasis in definition, in practice both are studied. Studies of social process in kinship and marriage have focused on such problems as the developmental cycle in domestic groups, the operation of prescriptive marriage rules, the stability of marriage, the relations between residence and descent. Variant and changing relations between kin in matrilineal systems have been given much comparative study (Eggan 1950; Schneider & Gough 1961), and the structure of unilineal descent groups has been elaborately examined (Fortes 1953). There has been much concern with the definition of descent groups that recognize membership by optative rather than by definitive criteria (Firth 1957). Whether such units are patrilineal descent groups admitting of many exceptions to the unilineal membership rule or whether they are nonunilineal groups with a patrilineal descent emphasis is still a matter of argument. But until the concept of descent itself is further clarified this issue is unlikely to be solved by field research.
In the field of political organization, many analyses have demonstrated the dynamic social, economic, and ritual relationships involved in the struggle for power and its exercise. There has been an interest in the theory of conflict, which questions the degree to which conflict of a sectional order strengthens the over-all structure (Gluckman 1956). Such conflict theory may owe something to Marxist emphases and perhaps also to psychological views about the cathartic effects of aggression. In sociojuridical analysis, issues of a legal character—including problems connected with suicide and homicide—have been refined, while clarity has emerged from the study of such economic institutions as market processes and allied operations. Other functional analyses of this order have been done in the field of ritual and myth. Interest in relating millenarian movements to economic and political conditions has been helped and stimulated by historians and social scientists in other disciplines.

Undoubtedly, much of the orientation in recent studies of social process has been due to the large-scale, irreversible changes that have occurred in the African, Asian, Oceanic, and American societies, which have been the concern of social anthropologists. But whereas earlier “social change” tended to be isolated as a separate field of study, it is now realized that changing conditions are an integral part of the data field of the anthropologist. There has been a renewal, in more sophisticated form, of claims for the study of history as a legitimate and indeed necessary aspect of the work of the social anthropologist.

The philosophical problems involved in explanations of causality have not been ignored (Nadel 1951). Some social anthropologists, especially in the United States, have not been content with the indication of correlates or concomitant variations in institutional patterns. The search for antecedent conditions to existing phenomena and the posing of questions in the form of why as well as how institutions exist and work have resulted in increasingly precise formulations. Apart from the indication of historical antecedents from documentary materials and oral tradition, attempts have been made to indicate the significance of ecological factors as conditions for institutional development. Generalizations have usually been cautious, for instance, of the order of suggesting broad correlation between the political system and mode of subsistence (Schapera 1956, p. 219). However, in terms of cultural evolution more dynamic relationships have also been suggested. An example of this is the proposition that the patrilineage of Nuer type is a unit of predatory expansion (Sahlins 1961). Problems of how to handle the historical dimension in the absence of written records have still, however, to be adequately solved, and various assumptions about plausibility of tribal traditions must be tested more fully before being completely acceptable in interpretation.

**Studies of symbolic forms.** A very important part of the work of social anthropologists in recent years has been in the study of symbolic forms. Particular attention to the need for the study of symbolic behavior was drawn by S. F. Nadel (1951, pp. 261–264). Description and analysis have proceeded particularly within the area of several related major topics. For example, analyses of witchcraft accusations have indicated symbolic correspondences with structural tensions in a given society. This is clearly seen when it appears among affinal kin. Studies of totemism have indicated some of the formal qualities of thought beneath apparently bizarre and inconsequent selection of objects as emblems. The symbolism of myth has been explored, especially by Lévi-Strauss, who by a comparative analysis of the constituent elements in all available versions of a myth, and of their interrelatedness, has gone far to demonstrate significant modes of human thinking (1955). E. R. Leach (1954) has argued that ritual is a form of symbolic, nonverbal behavior equivalent to verbal statements about the structure and values of the society concerned. A. I. Richards (1956) has demonstrated the complexity of the symbolism that may be expressed in girls’ initiation rites.

Anthropological studies of “primitive” religious systems are now numerous, and analyses of such actions as sacrifice and of such concepts as god and spirit have contributed much to our understanding of their complexity and sophistication (for example, Evans-Pritchard 1956). The study of religious systems has revealed more clearly than in most other fields the differences of basic philosophical assumptions in the work of social anthropologists. Some have adopted a rationalist or humanist standpoint, regarding the religious concepts and behavior of the people studied as being essentially human constructs, responsive to both general and specific issues of their social and economic existence (Firth 1951). Other anthropologists have proceeded from the standpoint of believers in the separate, absolute character of religious phenomena and have regarded the institutions of the people they have studied as special instances of general truth (Evans-Pritchard 1956).

**Method of social anthropology.** The hallmark
of a social anthropologist tends to be the pursuit of field investigations of an intensive character. Commonly using the vernacular of the people studied, he combines some participation in affairs of members of the society with the collection of data by inquiry and observation. By none of these criteria can a social anthropologist be separated absolutely from his colleagues in other social sciences, but the combination of them has given him a characteristic "grass roots" approach and a closely personal experience of societies different from his own.

The intensive field methods of the social anthropologist carry with them certain difficulties. The relative shortness of the period of observation has sometimes resulted in a lack of historical sensitivity. Institutions have been described as permanent when they may have been only contingent upon the operation of demographic or ecological factors of relatively brief duration. Perception of trends of change in social forms has been difficult and subject to considerable error. Partly to meet such problems and partly from a wish to repeat experiences of considerable scientific and aesthetic interest, some social anthropologists have returned after a considerable period of years to the societies they formerly studied. A variant procedure has been for a different social anthropologist to make a restudy of a community investigated earlier. This "replication analysis" presents such theoretical issues as the length of time that should be allowed to elapse before the restudy, the criteria that should be used to establish identity and difference over the period, and the relation of these "dual synchronic" studies to a full diachronic analysis. Replication studies have yielded valuable data on the pace of social change and the most sensitive areas of influence.

The necessity of securing rapport has meant an emphasis on personal, intimate contact with members of the society under study. This has made it difficult to ensure the representativeness of the sample of people selected for close inquiry. In societies of tiny population such lack of adequate sampling has probably resulted in minimal distortion. But in societies with a membership of several hundred thousand, such as some African tribes, anthropological study has had to assume homogeneity rather than to prove representativeness, although some efforts at crude sampling have been made. Available evidence does not suggest any great bias, nor would simple methods of random sampling necessarily have yielded more accurate data, given the intricate and sensitive character of much of the material required. Linked with this problem is that of the use of quantitative data. Ever since W. H. R. Rivers (1910), social anthropologists have freely used a genealogical method of inquiry to obtain data about kinship structure and terminology, marriage patterns, and so on. This has yielded much numerical information. Until recently, social anthropologists were content to express roles and behavior patterns of members of the society in general terms, on the basis of very few instances or indeed without specifying the range of instances at all. Now, in such fields as patterns of household composition and residence, exchange, landholding, and political allegiance, generalizations are commonly supported by figures of distribution. One widely used technique for such a purpose is a sociological census.

Areas of needed research. To specify areas of most needed research in social anthropology is difficult because of the relative novelty of the study among the social sciences and the need for development in every field. But certain areas seem to need special attention. The rapid cultural—in some cases physical—disappearance of "primitive" peoples demands that energetic efforts be applied to map the social systems of those as yet relatively unexamined. (The UNESCO Committee for Urgent Anthropological Research has been engaged in drawing up regional programs for such study.)

Sophisticated comparative analyses of kinship institutions, patterns of domestic grouping, residence, and landholding are still needed. This field is pre-eminently that of the social anthropologist; no other social scientist has his skills in the study of comparative kinship. In religion a vast body of ethnographic data still awaits more rigorous theoretical analysis. Not only is more intensive study of the religious systems of particular primitive societies required, but also closer contact with philosophers, psychologists, and modern theologians, so that the very difficult and delicate problems of interpretation that arise may be handled more effectively.

In political anthropology, with which is linked the anthropological study of law and social control, solid advance has taken place over the last decades (Association of Social Anthropologists 1965b), especially in studies of the less highly centralized systems. More extensive studies must be made of political and administrative processes as distinct from governmental structures. Collaboration with political scientists is advisable, particularly in the study of the structure and activities of political parties and of relations between central and local government. The rapidity with which traditional political systems are being superseded in favor of
or combined with those of more complex societies makes this all the more urgent.

Collaboration is also necessary in economic anthropology. Here the body of general theory, derived largely from the parent discipline of economics, must be applied and interpreted by people trained in empirical field work as well as in the theoretical discipline of social anthropology. The significance of the study of incentives to production, of exchange as a social as well as an economic process, and of the uses of capital and credit in peasant conditions is beginning to be appreciated in the work of economic anthropologists. The results have a practical as well as theoretical relevance in connection with the demands of economists for provision of acceptable generalizations about economic growth.

The modern social sciences, although not necessarily called upon to justify themselves simply by their practical application, have increasingly shown their utility in such directions. Cooperation of anthropologists with public health administrators is particularly promising. Social anthropology has contributed to a broader understanding of many types of social relationships, the nature of family structure and roles, and the significance of kinship in industrial as well as in nonindustrial societies. Its general diagnostic and productive value may be fairly limited, but when applied to the analysis of small communities in any type of society, it has been able to demonstrate and illustrate the need for a more sensitive, more holistic approach to the study of social relations. This does raise a basic problem as to how the microanalysis of the social anthropologist can be translated into macroanalytical terms. In this respect a movement of social anthropology in the direction of the adoption of more adequate statistical procedures as now used by sociologists may be necessary.

Raymond Firth
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IV
APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

The studies that are given the name of applied sciences are concerned with techniques based on the recognition of scientific principles. The best-known examples are engineering, which applies the principles of physics, and medicine, which applies the principles of physiology. The student of engineering learns to apply scientific principles so as to construct works that will stand up against the strains to which they are likely to be exposed; the student of medicine learns to apply scientific principles to the relief of disease in the human body. Each is concerned with the attainment of limited, agreed objectives; and each has his objective chosen for him. The engineer is employed to build a dam or a bridge that somebody else has decided is needed in a particular place; he does not have to ask whether it is desirable, on some scale of values, to create an artificial lake or to link the two sides of a river. The doctor is consulted by a patient who thinks he is ill. The doctor does not—indeed, must not—debate whether it is right or wrong to cure the patient; he must just consider what is the best way.

Social anthropology is concerned with the whole field of social relationships. The analogy between it and engineering would suggest that it should prescribe techniques for constructing societies that would be in some sense desirable; the analogy between it and medicine would suggest that it should provide prescriptions for the cure of pathological states of society. But there is no such consensus in social anthropology as there is in engineering and medicine about what is to be considered desirable or pathological.

Definitions of the field. Some social anthropologists have sought to establish indexes of community health. It has been suggested that a scientifically relevant concept of the healthy community may be stated in terms of an optimum balance of interrelated factors. In this context whole evolving human beings will be considered as they relate to one another and to an organized community. The community may be viewed as an entity that responds to an effective changing environmental setting (Thompson 1960, p. 773). This is a formula for asking questions, not for answering them.

Moreover, a different point of view, which has as much support, considers any study of change in social institutions as a study in applied anthropology. According to Eliot D. Chapple, "Applied anthropology is regarded as that aspect of anthropology which deals with the description of changes in human relations and in the isolation of the principles that control them" and includes "an examination of those factors which restrict the possibility of change in human organization" (Chapple 1953, p. 819).

The field of applied anthropology has, in practice, been taken to be any context in which it may be useful for people taking community decisions to know something about the population for which they are responsible. In this sense it has been applied to any kind of inquiry into the customs of non-European peoples subject to the rule of Europeans.

The first attempt of British anthropologists to turn their knowledge to practical use came at the close of the South African War of 1899–1902. The Royal Anthropological Institute addressed to the secretary of state for the colonies a proposal that the laws and institutions of the different south African tribes be recorded in order to provide the basis for an enlightened policy of administration. It was believed that this might mitigate the disintegration commonly caused by primitive institutions coming into contact with more advanced civilizations. (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain replied that the officials of the new south African colonies were too busy with "numerous questions of pressing practical importance.")

Anthropology in colonial administration. During the period between the two world wars the appropriate field for the application of anthropology was thought to be the administration of colonial peoples. Although the different colonial governments held different views about the speed with which the subject populations could be westernized and the degree of westernization that was desirable, they all found it necessary to have some regard for traditional customs regulating social status and interpersonal relations.

After 1926 some study of anthropology was included in the training of administrative officials for the British colonies in tropical Africa. Nigeria and the Gold Coast seconded officials from this service to posts as government anthropologists. Similar posts were created in Papua, the Australian territory in southeastern New Guinea, and in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. In Tanganyika a deliberate experiment in applied anthropology was made in which an anthropologist directed his inquiries to answering specific questions formulated by an administrative official; the results were published in Anthropology in Action (Brown & Hutt 1935).

Research interests. In the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Meyer Fortes, at the request of
the government, produced an account of Tallensi marriage law (1937). We owe to R. S. Rattray, the government anthropologist of the Gold Coast, some valuable volumes on the ethnography of Ashanti and the territories to the north of it (1923; 1932) and to C. K. Meek, who held the corresponding post in Nigeria, studies of the Jukun (1931a), the Ibo, and some of the smaller tribes of northern Nigeria (1925; 1931b). F. E. Williams published some studies of Papuan peoples, including an account of a "nativistic" movement (1928; 1940). This study did not simply describe native institutions but also sought to explain a disturbance that had caused concern to the authorities and to suggest remedial measures. In this manner it came near to the concept of applied anthropology held today.

With the above exception, the work of these men was confined to describing indigenous institutions, particularly political institutions. It can be called applied anthropology because the researchers were employed by governments whose policy was to preserve native institutions as far as possible. The British governments of Nigeria and the Gold Coast at that time believed that persons holding authority by virtue of their traditional status were the best local agents of government policy and were anxious to know who would be the right person, or persons, to recognize as "native authority."

A Belgian writer on applied anthropology has described the policy of relying on traditional authorities as being inspired by motives "predominantly of a sociological order." He wrote that indirect rule attempts to avoid the disintegration of native society by influencing it through the medium of its own institutions and its own leaders (Nicaise 1960, p. 112).

In the training given to entrants into the colonial services of Belgium and Holland more time was devoted to the study of ethnography and customary law than in Britain. On the whole, however, it was concerned more with traditional institutions than with contemporary processes of change.

The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures (now the International African Institute) was founded in 1926 in order to promote anthropological and linguistic research. Its founders were impressed by the rapidity of social change in Africa and considered that this should be made the subject of scientific study by trained observers.

When the institute received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1932 for the expansion of its research program, the object of this program was defined as "bringing about a better understanding of the factors of social cohesion in original African society, the ways in which these are being affected by the new influences, tendencies towards new groupings and the formation of new social bonds, and forms of cooperation between African societies and western civilization" (International . . . 1932, p. 1).

"These questions," the institute stated, "are of the first importance to the African peoples themselves, to the administrator, to the educator, to the missionary, and to the settler and trader" (1932, p. 1). The understanding gained would enable the administrator "to foster the growth of a healthy, progressive, organic society" (1932, p. 2), and all the other persons mentioned would find in such a society the environment most favorable to the pursuit of their aims. At this time, then, applied anthropology did mean the use of anthropological knowledge to produce a healthy condition of society. The institute offered to put at the disposal of all persons with specific aims in Africa, including "the native leaders of African society," knowledge that would "assist them in determining the right relations between the institutions of African society and alien systems of government, education, and religion, in preserving what is vital in the former and in eliminating unnecessary conflict between the latter and African tradition, custom, and mentality" (1932, p. 3). In other words, it hoped to offer recipes for what Malinowski a few years later was to call "successful cultural change" (1945, p. 56). Topics to be studied would include the social consequences of the demand for wage labor, the effect on political institutions of subjecting to a foreign overlord, and the relation of school education to traditional values.

Although the International African Institute as a body did not advocate specific policies, the general line taken in its publications was that the understanding of traditional institutions should make it possible to introduce necessary changes without causing unnecessary disintegration.

One of the recommendations with which Lord Hailey concluded his monumental survey of Africa was that the British government provide funds for research into all the sciences, natural and social, that were relevant to African problems. Shortly after the publication of his African Survey (1938), the report of the West India Royal Commission (Great Britain . . . 1940) urged that funds be made available from the United Kingdom Treasury for the stimulation of economic development and the provision of social services that were beyond
the resources of the colonial territories. The Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, of 1940 and later years, earmarked funds for the two purposes just mentioned. Committees of experts, including social scientists, were set up to advise on the allocation of grants from the research fund. Applicants for grants were expected to be able to argue that their research would be of value to the government of the territory where they proposed to work; some, however, argued successfully that any addition to knowledge of the social structure of the people subject to its authority is of value to a government.

At the same time surveys were made of the major geographical areas with the aim of evaluating the existing state of knowledge and the areas in which further information was most urgently needed. These surveys encouraged a certain concentration of research in directions that could be expected to throw light on administrative problems.

**Government sociologists.** At this period some appointments of anthropologists to government service were made in Kenya and Tanganyika. These men were frequently given the title “government sociologist,” which did not imply that their training or theoretical interests differed from those of social anthropologists but simply recognized the unpopularity in African circles of the word “anthropology,” a term thought of as meaning the study of “primitive peoples.” This generation of government anthropologists was expected to be able to turn its attention to limited questions on which answers were thought to be urgently needed. Thus Philip Mayer in Kenya made an exhaustive study of Gusii marriage law and a shorter examination of the difficulty of limiting the amount of bridewealth payment and discussed the neighborhood cooperative farming groups from the point of view of their suitability to undertake new economic activities (1950; 1951). Philip Gulliver examined the effects of migratory labor and other social changes among a people (the Nyakyusa) who had been largely unaffected by commercial influences up to the period of World War II (1955; 1958). In Australia Ian Hogbin was commissioned to estimate the damage suffered by the New Guinea peoples during the Japanese occupation and Camilla Wedgwood to estimate their educational needs.

**Research institutes.** Research with a practical bearing was also undertaken by the research institutes sponsored or assisted by the Colonial Office. Such institutes exist in east, west, and central Africa, in the West Indies, and in Malaya. The East African Institute studied the social consequences of the immigration of labor, the reasons for the ineffectiveness of African village headmen as agents of government policy, and the changing position of African chiefs. Later it embarked on a large-scale five-year study of urbanization. The Rhodes–Livingstone Institute has carried out intensive studies of urbanization in the copper belt of central Africa. The West African Institute sponsored a study of the mixed population employed on the agricultural estates of the Cameroons Development Corporation and the relations between immigrants and people of local origin. Studies of family structure have been conspicuous in the work of the West Indian Institute.

**Belgian Congo.** Increased attention was paid to anthropological research by Belgium in the period between World War II and the independence of the Congo. A center for the study of social problems (CEPSI), founded at Elisabethville in 1948, has concentrated on problems associated with urbanization. The Solvay Sociological Institute in Brussels created a Congo section, which paid special attention to social problems of the labor force—absenteeism, instability in employment, and unemployment. Studies were made of crime and juvenile delinquency, of new leadership in urban areas, and of the new elective institutions that had been created in preparation for independence. The Institute of Research in Economics and Sociology of the Lovanium University in Leopoldville, founded in 1956, has an ethnoscological division. It has organized a detailed analysis of the population of Leopoldville, taking different sections—primary school teachers, laborers, unemployed—and examining in each the characteristics of marriage and family life, religion, and recreational activities.

**Applied anthropology in America.** In the United States the employment of government anthropologists may be said to date from 1934, when at the request of John Collier, commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Unit of Applied Anthropology was created. The anthropologists’ first task closely resembled that of the government anthropologist who had been appointed a few years earlier in Nigeria: to investigate Indian political institutions with a view toward utilizing them as agencies of local government. Other anthropologists were attached as advisers to a technical cooperative unit in which the Department of Agriculture cooperated with the Bureau of Indian Affairs on schemes for the improvement of land-use methods.

Private enterprise also employed anthropologists
as consultants. The first such venture was the study carried out at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works in Chicago from 1927 to 1932 (Roethlisberger & Dickson 1939). Anthropologists recognized that a pattern of social relationships develops among any body of people who regularly work together and that unexpected resistance to disturbances of this structure may affect attempts to increase their efficiency or welfare. In Britain, after 1960, similar studies were sponsored by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

The Society for Applied Anthropology was founded in the United States in 1941; it published a journal, Applied Anthropology, the name of which was changed in 1949 to Human Organization. The society described as its primary object "the promotion of scientific investigation of the principles controlling the relations of human beings to one another, and the encouragement of the wide application of these principles to practical problems." It had three main fields of interest: mental health, the study of industrial organizations, and the relation of economic development to cultural change. Economic Development and Cultural Change, a specialist journal for the last-named subject, was founded in 1951.

During World War II a number of anthropologists were employed in America by the United States government in connection with the relocation of Japanese populations. They also attempted to explain the culture of occupied areas to those members of the armed forces who required that natives cooperate as laborers, messengers, etc. In America, as in Australia (but not Britain), training courses for officers to be engaged in military government in occupied territories included instruction in anthropology. In its administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the United States from 1951 employed seven anthropologists, one at headquarters and one in each administrative district. They were to advise on the means of implementing government projects, interpret them to the native populations and evaluate their progress. These projects included health improvement, labor policies, education, legislative measures, and judicial procedures. The anthropologists were also expected to carry on the fundamental research on which their advice must ultimately be based.

Applied anthropology since World War II. Since the end of World War II the new political balance of power that has resulted in the almost complete liquidation of colonial rule has brought about a change in the emphasis of applied anthropology in the economically underdeveloped countries. The colonial powers, and many anthropologists who were not their nationals, were concerned primarily with stability, with gradual change, and therefore with the preservation of indigenous institutions. Their successors are determined on rapid change and have the support of world powers who, whatever may be their ideologies, value technical progress more than social stability. Politically uncommitted anthropologists have been forced to recognize the pressing problems that are created by increasing populations in territories where resources are limited and productivity is low. Technical specialists of all kinds are seeking to devise ways of improving standards of living. When the collaboration of anthropologists is invited, it is for them to show where traditional values and institutions are hindering the adoption of improvements.

Anthropologists have been employed as consultants in a number of technical-assistance projects undertaken by the United States and also by the specialized agencies of the United Nations, notably the World Health Organization. They have most to offer to public health projects, agricultural extension, and community development.

In the United States and the United Kingdom, since World War II, there has been increasing cooperation between anthropologists and medical specialists. For example in the United States, the Harvard School of Public Health has carried out a study of social reactions to proposals for the fluoridation of water supplies. In Britain an anthropologist has been included in a team studying the epidemiology of mental disease in South Wales.

Goals of applied anthropology. The change in the directions in which the application of anthropology is sought has had some influence on the anthropologists' interpretation of their role. Those who hesitated to make themselves responsible for deciding what an ideal society would be like have less hesitation in suggesting what approach would give the best chances of success for public health programs. Those who held that any help they might give to a colonial government must be a kind of treachery to its subjects need have no such inhibitions about independent territories.

Nevertheless, there has been much discussion of the question whether anthropologists should join in development projects or should simply present their facts and let administrative authorities do with them as they wish. This extreme view would stultify all attempts at applying anthropological knowledge, since the theoretical work of anthropologists is not focused on administrative
problems, and its implications for action would be recognized only by other professionals. The opposite viewpoint is that anthropologists must themselves make policy recommendations. This is expressed in the code of ethics of the American Society for Applied Anthropology, which says, *inter alia*:

To his fellow men he [the anthropologist] owes respect for his dignity and general well-being. He may not recommend any course of action on behalf of his client's interests, when the lives, well-being, dignity, and self-respect of others are likely to be adversely affected, without adequate provisions being made to insure that there will be a minimum of such effect and that the net effect will in the long run be more beneficial than if no action were taken at all. He must take the greatest care to protect his informants, especially in the aspects of confidence which his informants may not be able to stipulate for themselves.

To his clients he must make no promises nor may he encourage any expectations that he cannot reasonably hope to fulfill. He must give them the best of his scientific knowledge and skill. He must consider their specific goals in the light of their general interests and welfare. He must establish a clear understanding with each client as to the nature of his responsibilities to his client, to science, and to his fellow men. (Statement on Ethics . . . 1963–1964, p. 237)

Nadel (1953) urged that if anthropologists did not claim the right to contribute directly to the framing of policy, the data provided by them could be used, in ways that he did not specify, to damage the societies that they described. The same attitude is implied in Barnett's statement that anthropology "exposes people who are powerless to state their own case" (1956, p. 80). Beals has urged that applied anthropology be concerned with finding out what inarticulate people want and then helping them to get it (1953, p. 188), an argument also put forward by Tax (1958, pp. 17–19).

All these interpretations of the anthropologist's role reject the idea that his advice is technically oriented and thus value-free. Of course, there is a sense in which no application of theoretical knowledge is value-free; if people seek to use knowledge, it is to attain ends that they value. But the question of values in applied anthropology had a special significance during the colonial era because of the type of situation in which the advice of anthropologists was sometimes sought and sometimes offered. Colonial governments interpreted their "civilizing mission" to mean, among other things, a process of moral improvement; anthropologists did not always see as moral improvement the kind of change that governments sought to bring about. On their side anthropologists were concerned that the processes of social change to which the governments were committed be beneficial rather than harmful to the subject societies, an aim that entailed the introduction of value judgments at every turn. Those who believed that the changes being imposed on the simpler societies would of necessity be harmful could not expect the governments to share their view but nevertheless claimed a hearing. Obviously the difference between their values and those of the governments made it very difficult for them to offer advice of a kind that would facilitate the execution of government policies.

It is no accident that the focus of interest of applied anthropology has shifted with the withdrawal of colonial rule. The new independent governments see their functions as the older independent nations do: not to make over alien societies but to raise standards of living and to spread welfare. They are quite certain about the kind of society they want to create, and they are not asking anybody's advice about this. When they do seek advice, it is in fields where there is a consensus on values; all are agreed that health is good and that the pursuit of physical comfort and material wealth is at any rate permissible for those people who like it. Anthropologists are still not invited to pass judgment on the merits of the projects in which their cooperation is sought, but these are in practice congenial to most of them in a way that moral-improvement policies often were not. They are not asked, nor do they now seek, to advise on the total process of social change; their role is now to indicate where existing social structures and idea systems may present obstacles to specific projects.

LUCY MAIR

[Directly related are the entries Acculturation; Field work; Observation.]
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V THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF MODERN SOCIETY

The anthropological study of modern society has two forms: one, the utilization of anthropological techniques in the study of the current scene; the other, the application of anthropological understandings to the behavioral sciences in general. Although these two are inevitably intertwined, it is useful to treat them separately.

Historical background. Research in anthropology had been so overwhelmingly concerned with primitive and preliterate societies that it was viewed as a radical departure when in the 1930s students began to make ethnological investigations of modern European and American communities. Yet, early anthropological discussion did not confine itself to primitive peoples but regularly used relevant data from classical antiquity, Asiatic civilizations, European peasant communities, and even urban social phenomena. E. B. Tylor, for example, cited animistic concepts of his contemporaries (1871) 1958, especially vol. 2, chapter 11), chided Blackstone for misconstruing in his Commentaries the nature of kinship regulations and thereby reformulating them in legal practice. In his discussion of survivals he used children's games and idioms as data (ibid., vol. 1). Similarly, Sir Henry Maine, whose interest was comparative law, very naturally demonstrated his theses with current local usages as well as data on those more exotic peoples who are the usual subjects of anthropological discourse. In that era, although those concerned with anthropology rarely had personal contact with the native peoples that were the chief
subject of their theoretical treatises, Frédéric Le Play (1855) initiated field studies of the economic and social life of European peasants, craftsmen, and laborers; this work is an unusual example of an early effort to illuminate current social life at least partially within the anthropological frame of reference.

It is also worthwhile to note that anthropological generalizations were applied to current problems. Tylor, in a Victorian idiom and outmoded theoretical framework, concludes his *Primitive Culture* thus:

To the promoters of what is sound and reformers of what is faulty in modern culture, ethnography has double help to give. To impress men's minds with a doctrine of development, will lead them in all honour to their ancestors to continue the progressive work of past ages, to continue it the more vigorously because light has increased in the world, and where barbaric hordes groped blindly, cultured men can often move onward with clear view. It is a harsher, and at times even painful, office of ethnography to expose the remains of crude old culture which have passed into harmful superstition, and to mark these out for destruction. Yet this work, if less genial, is not less urgently needful for the good of mankind. Thus, active at once in aiding progress and in removing hindrance, the science of culture is essentially a reformer's science. ([1871] 1958, vol. 2, p. 539)

Tylor was justified in calling anthropology a "reformer's science," for anthropologists have repeatedly concerned themselves with the moral and practical implications of their special knowledge. Franz Boas, the empiricist who was so insistent on work among preliterate peoples, wrote as early as 1911 of the implications of anthropological study for an understanding of our own cultural milieu; in this latter summary he refuted the assumptions of moral progress implicit in nineteenth-century evolutionism. Robert H. Lowie (1929) endeavored not so much to show that primitive man had the same virtues and capacities as modern man as to demonstrate that modern man engages in follies and vices similar to those found among primitive peoples. Lowie later tried to construct an ethnography of the Germans (1945), based upon his personal experience and his wide reading in German literature. Anthropologists in England and on the Continent have not, in recent years, shown as much interest in modern culture, although a major exception prior to World War II is represented by the program called Mass Observation, which endeavored to elicit popular attitudes and behavior patterns in England by means of informal interviews and observation of large-scale but nonrandom population samples. Some interest in modern peasantry has recently developed, and the anthropological study of modern society in England is reported in Klein (1965).

By the early 1940s a professional association (the Society for Applied Anthropology), with its own journal (*Human Organization*, originally called *Applied Anthropology*), was created in response to growing interest in such subjects as factory organization, community life, and problems of native peoples in the modern world. In 1954 the American Anthropological Association held a symposium on the United States, which was subsequently published as a special issue of the *American Anthropologist* (Lantis 1955).

The empirical study of modern society

Although in the study of primitive customs and tribal life anthropologists had until recently a virtually *de facto* monopoly, in the study of modern society they came into competition (and frequent collaboration) with representatives of other fields and were constrained to justify their methods and approaches in the face of those already being employed. Anthropological studies of modern society have taken many forms but may be grouped into the following classes: (1) the study of the modern American community, (2) the study of peasant communities throughout the world, (3) the study of specific institutions of modern society, (4) the study of "national character," and (5) the study of modern adaptations of tribal cultures.

Studies of American communities. The study of American community life was initiated under Franklin H. Giddings as an investigation into the evolution of rural communities (for example, Williams 1906). Such studies came to be the special province of rural sociology; they were generally unsophisticated surveys but some, for example, Nelson's study of Mormon communities (1952), do have anthropological insights. Urban studies developed by the Chicago school, such as Zorbaugh's *Gold Coast and Slum* (1929), are also forerunners of an anthropology of modern life. It is, however, the Lynds' investigation of "Middletown" (*Lynd & Lynd 1929; 1937*)—the very name conjures up the notion of the normative for American culture—that has an explicit anthropological approach, and, significantly, the Foreword to *Middletown* was written by Clark Wissler, an anthropologist. This investigation of Muncie, Indiana, had a wide impact (both public and academic), in part because it revitalized the muckraker tradition but more because it succeeded in presenting a cultural view of ordinary modern life—a picture of middle-class tribalism in America. It proved to be the first
and most successful of a long line of anthropological studies of the American community.

The most elaborate and extended of these were initiated by W. Lloyd Warner, who turned from field work among the Australian aborigines to field work in Newburyport, Massachusetts, and, subsequently, with the aid of numerous students, to other towns throughout the United States. The Newburyport study involved not only detailed interviews with a sample of the city's population but also analyses of its institutions. Several volumes have been published under the general title "The Yankee City Series." The first (Warner & Lunt 1941) presented the general social framework, namely, a sixfold class structure based upon identification, social interaction, and social attributes. Other volumes concerned themselves with particular aspects of social life, for example, the factory (Warner & Low 1947) and ethnic relations (Warner & Strole 1945). Among works on American community life for which Warner was directly responsible are the analysis of a southern city (Davis et al. 1941), of an urban Negro community (Drake & Cayton 1945), and of a midwestern town (Warner et al. 1949). Warner has summarized and generalized his class approach in *Social Class in America* (Warner, Meeker, and Eells 1949), in which he defines social classes and the measures he has developed for their determination. To Warner, social class is not economic class but refers, rather, to recognizable levels in a social hierarchy, based upon self-identification, divergent life-styles, and, particularly, differential prestige. Warner (1952) has also examined the status system and institutional behavior in terms of the symbol system and ritual (collective representations) of American life. Whatever the epistemological reality of the Warnerian social classes may be, the schema has offered a context for interpreting observed differences in child-rearing practices (Davis & Dollard 1940; Ericson 1947), in sexual attitudes and behavior (Kinsey et al. 1948), and in the classroom performances of children (Warner et al. 1944; Hollingshead 1949).

Meanwhile, many other anthropologists turned to an examination of the American community: Carl Withers (1945) focused on the life-cycle patterns as they varied according to social status groups in an Ozark rural community he called Plainville, U.S.A.; Hortense Powdermaker (1939) directed her attention chiefly to the mode of life of different status groups in a southern Negro community and the distinction between the reality of that society and the image the white people had of it; Walter Goldschmidt (1946; 1947) demonstrated the social cleavage between farm labor and the "nuclear group" in a California town and analyzed the effect of industrialized agriculture on community life. Studies investigating rural life were initiated at the University of North Carolina, and from this program emerged an analysis of plantation life by Morton Rubin (1951) and of Negro society by Hylan Lewis (1955). Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman (1958) analyzed the values and attitudes of persons in an upper New York State town and the discontinuity between the public image and reality in community life; William F. Whyte (1943) studied a community of slum youths. Governmental studies of rural community life were made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (Culture of a Contemporary Community series), and the Japanese Relocation Authority studied World War II internment camps.

Although anthropologists have regularly found a "class system" in the American community, characterized by differentials in economic roles, financial status, life-style, material conditions, power, and prestige, the specific class systems are not comparable. Thus, while Warner found six social classes in Newburyport, other students found diverse numbers ranging from two to seven, and Withers (1945) showed that persons of different standing see the "class structure" of Plainville quite differently. One might conclude that each community defines its own class system; however, Goldschmidt (1955) has pointed out that although there are great differentials in social status related to income, occupation, and life-style and that persons at different levels in the social hierarchy have different attitudes, values, and orientations to society, the important dynamic in American society is status mobility and anxiety, rather than fixity and class identification.

The description of social class (or the dynamics of status) is common to American community studies, but the more significant contribution of these studies has been to provide a rich ethnography of modern social life not only in its formal aspects but in an informal, intensely personal, intimate manner. They err in reflecting both the mood of the time and the predilections of the ethnographers, yet they are a remarkable reportage on the customs of modern America. They err, too, in their frequent tact assumptions that the community represents the nation in microcosm, for modern America is a network of social communication in which the towns are merely at the termini. But they give the necessary matrix in which American life—as analyzed by other social scientists—can be understood [see Field Work; Observation].
Study of peasant communities. Anthropologists more or less concurrently began to study modern peasant communities in diverse parts of the world. Few had examined village life among farmers of literate, politically oriented societies until Redfield studied Tepoztlán, Mexico, in 1928 (Redfield 1930). Redfield’s close association with the Chicago sociologists and the then important dichotomy between rural and urban in sociological theory must have influenced this choice. However, Redfield never abandoned his essentially anthropological perspective and until quite late in his career continued to discuss peasant and primitive societies under the single term “folk.” Village studies claimed increasing attention of anthropologists (and sociologists)—for example, Ireland (Arensberg 1937; Arensberg & Kimball 1940), Japan (Embree 1939), China (Fei 1939; Yang 1945), and, under the sponsorship of the Smithsonian Institution’s Institute of Social Anthropology, many Latin American communities (Beals 1946; Brand 1951; Foster 1948; Gillin 1947; Pierson 1948; Tax 1953)—so that representative studies are now available for most countries where peasant farming is found. These studies usually concentrate on single local communities, carrying into the study of peasant life the methods and assumptions of tribal ethnography: reliance on informants rather than questionnaires or other instruments, the implicit assumption of cultural homogeneity, the focus on customary usages rather than on behavioral diversity. They also tend to treat communities as isolates, focusing upon the internal structure of community life rather than interrelationships with the broader society and assuming that the village is a microcosm of the whole. Redfield (1956, especially chapter 3) conceptualized the distinction between the little (peasant or local community) tradition and the great (national or intellectualized) tradition and discussed the interdependence between them. There have been no consistent efforts either to define the general characteristics of peasantry or to show the essential uniformities and diversities of peasant communities as they exist within a single country or culture area.

Like the study of the American community, the ethnography of peasant life has given us an understanding of the everyday life of the peoples it describes. We are much better able now to understand behavior of the people of India, for instance, than when we had merely the formal accounts and histories of the caste system and the teachings of Indian scholars. Furthermore, the inclusion of these different examples of customary social systems has enriched the literature of anthropology for purposes of comparative studies [see Redfield; Peasantry; Village].

Institutional studies. A third line of inquiry in the study of modern society may be called the ethnography of modern institutions. The classic studies made at the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric under the aegis of Elton Mayo (Roethlisberger & Dickson 1939) are an early example. The essence of this work was to demonstrate that the status system and the structuring of social relationships were essential ingredients in work satisfactions and factory output. There has flowed from this initial source a body of literature analyzing various work situations—increasingly for the practical aims of employers in the maintenance of orderly production—and institutions, for instance, the motion picture industry (Powdermaker 1950) and the restaurant industry (Whyte 1948). Harding (1955) has summarized the anthropological study of industrial enterprises, pointing out that the factory—or an entire industry—is a social system, that it operates on the assumption of communication among its component elements, that this involves not only the formal system but also the informal, and that the latter is a major consideration in the daily operations of the work routine.

Another example of institutional ethnology is Caudill’s study (1958) of a psychiatric hospital, in which he analyzes the day-to-day personal relations of doctors, ward personnel, and patients, treating the hospital as a small society whose functions affect the behavior of its personnel in many subtle ways outside the awareness of the participants themselves. Among the elements that Caudill discovered were (1) that there is a hierarchical structure in the hospital, (2) that direct communication between levels is faulty, (3) that actions by persons are symbolic (communicative) expressions, (4) that these actions or events are disregarded or misunderstood, and (5) that an anthropological investigation can interpret these events and lead to a restructuring of action beneficial to the institution and hence to the patients. Although the hospital may be viewed as a community, it is not sealed off from the society around it; events in the homes of patients affect those in the hospital and vice versa; furthermore, the patterning of events in the hospital setting reflects generic American culture patterns, as a comparison with behavior in Japanese hospitals confirms.

American schools have been subjected to anthropological investigation. Early studies emphasized the role of social class, pointing out that the
teachers have largely been of upwardly mobile lower-middle-class origin, strongly attached to the values of thrift, industry, cleanliness, competitiveness, and the virtues of success. This setting gives advantage to middle-class children and reinforces these values in the society at large. They not only appear in the formal structuring of class work and grades but also in the informal extracurricular activities and the interpersonal relations among the pupils. Jules Henry (1963) has shown the transmission of values and attitudes in the latent content of classroom discourse and their relationship to the domestic problems of the children: the reinforcement of materialistic over intellectual and moralistic values, the inculcation of attitudes of hostility and competitiveness in classroom rectation, and the continuity between the classroom events and problems in out-of-school relationships.

National character studies. Historians and men of letters have often depicted the character of a people or an epoch—a culture—as, for example, Burckhardt on the Italian Renaissance, Hamilton on classical Greece, and Toqueville on America. Anthropology has contributed substantially to this literature and has endeavored to formulate both method and rationale for this enterprise. The anthropological investigation of national cultures was initiated during World War II to contribute to military decisions through better understanding of enemy cultures and has continued into the cold war period.

The study of national character is concerned with generalizations regarding the psychological attitudes and orientation of a population sharing a culture: a nation, a region, an ethnic group, such as east European Jews. It is therefore concerned with psychodynamics and has been much influenced by neo-Freudian thought. National character studies have attempted to substitute cultural explanations of manifest differences in personality attributes for racial or environmental explanations. The idea of national character is that these psychological attributes are formed early in an infant's life by the experiences it undergoes as a result of culturally established child-training practices. The theoretical basis has been set forth by Gorer (in Mead & Métraux 1953) and by Mead (1953).

National character studies attempt to trace the way in which the identified cultural behavior is represented in the intra-psychic structure of the individual members of the culture, combining cultural theory and psychological theory (principally learning theory, Gestalt psychology, Freudian psychology, and child development studies) into a new psychocultural theory to explain how human beings embody the culture, learn it, and live it. (Mead 1953, p. 651)

The first full-length anthropological national character study was Mead's book (1942) on the United States; the most widely referenced, Benedict's on Japan (1946). Others include Gorer on America (1948), Gorer and Rickman on Russia (1949), and Métraux and Mead on France (1954). The Columbia University research project in contemporary cultures gathered scholars from different disciplines to "study culture at a distance," that is, to investigate societies to which scholars did not have direct access. This involved not only the interviewing of immigrants, refugees, and prisoners of war but also the detailed analysis of current literature, humor, motion pictures, and other expressions of the current popular culture (Mead & Métraux 1953).

These studies have been much criticized for their lack of methodological rigor and for their involvement with psychodynamic theory. The study of national character cannot explain the origin of diverse forms of behavior, but it can describe them in an ethnographic sense and discuss the internal dynamics of how generic cultural practices engender in infants those attributes of character which, although not within the awareness of the people, are nevertheless an essential part of their culture. The culturally established common modes of handling children, the nature of cultural rewards and punishments, and the affect patterns between parents and children are seen as the mediating—not the causative—forces in transmitting and preserving the national character. Mead (1953, p. 652) is quite clear on this point, although such clarity is not displayed by all other students of national character [see National character].

Acculturation of tribal cultures. The unlettered peoples and tribal societies have in ever-increasing degree felt the impact of the modern world and the universalization of technology. Indeed, the opportunity to examine primitive society in its pristine state rapidly waned during the first half of the twentieth century, and even the pockets of tribal cultures still to be found are not entirely innocent of elements from more advanced economic systems. Furthermore, research has disclosed that many of the tribal cultures appearing in the ethnographic literature had been in varying degrees influenced by Europeanization, either through direct acquisitions, such as the horse on the American plains, or indirectly, such as by opportunities to engage in the fur trade or involvements with the slave trade. Malinowski (1945) despaired of finding a pristine condition—a point of departure—for the study of the acculturative process. But
as native peoples became increasingly involved in modern society, and particularly as their adjustment to new conditions presented both theoretical and practical problems, anthropologists came to study the processes and products of acculturation. Acculturation studies constitute a large corpus of literature, but little systematic generalization on these data has been made; the fact is that very little generalization can be sustained. The most important of the recognized regularities in acculturation situations are the quick assimilation of certain kinds of material goods, the undermining of native systems of authority and social values, the recurrent tendency to develop millenarian or nativistic religious cults, and the greater resistance to change of religious beliefs and psychological sets or attitudes. But the most apparent conclusion regarding the entry of tribal peoples into modern society is that no generalization is universally applicable. Some peoples, notably the Masai in Africa and most Pueblos in the American southwest, show a high retention of native culture despite long and continuous contact with the West, whereas other peoples, for example, the Maori of New Zealand, readily adopt Western patterns of behavior [see ACCULTURATION; CULTURE, article on CULTURE CHANGE].

**General theory and practice**

Until recently, ethnographic fieldwork meant that an investigator, armed with such minimal tools as notebook and camera, went alone (later with his spouse) to study an as yet professionally unstudied tribe and to describe to the degree he saw fit all those departments of tribal life—economy, daily round, domestic life, social organization, theology, language—he found of interest and relevance. His studies were at first more concerned with rules and expectancies than with frequencies and contradictions, and for this purpose he sought out elderly informants who could verbalize these matters, while observing as much of the traditional events as were retained in the community. By internal checks and ever-increasing detail he established what was “true” for the culture under scrutiny. He neither bothered about nor expected statistical validation or replication and rarely had any documents to worry about. But as each fieldworker returned with new insights resulting from deeper investigation of particular aspects of culture, anthropology became increasingly aware of the intricacies, the subtleties, and the underlying unities of cultural behavior, so that his successors were able to penetrate still more deeply into tribal life.

Such practices do not make for sophistication in research design, statistical manipulation, validity control, or replication. In the present era of increased identification of research methods with the statistical handling of data, the anthropological study of modern society is often disparaged. However, it emphasizes features increasingly neglected by other social disciplines. First, the holistic approach, which examines each phenomenon in the context of the totality, avoids (or at least minimizes) the error of treating each cultural department, for example, economics, politics, religion, as if it had a separate and at best only internally consistent meaning. Closely related is the capacity for finding patterns or integrative elements in cultural systems. Third, recognition that cultural features have deep psychological involvements for the individual participants makes it possible to see the interplay between individual sentiments and cultural institutions. Fourth, the anthropologist’s very naiveté makes him willing to examine aspects of life not amenable to counting and statistical manipulation and thus to utilize evidence other scholars avoid as “methodologically unsound.” On the whole, what the anthropological approach brings to the study of modern society is the use of insight, introspection, close attention to detail, validation through internal consistency, and the capacity to deal at the same time with all levels of behavior—from material artifacts to psychic life. If the results sometimes seem impressionistic, if there is a novelistic quality, nevertheless there is a closer sense of human reality than is generally provided by those social sciences traditionally concerned with modern society. Writing with particular reference to the community study, but more generally applicable to the anthropological approach, Vidich, Bensman, and Stein say:

The survival of the community study perhaps can be explained precisely because it has not absorbed too completely the major techniques of the more “advanced” social sciences. . . . [Community studies] have always shown, no matter how imperfectly, the interrelationship between the various segments of community life. As a result the “totality” has neither been neglected nor shattered into unrelated segments. . . . As a consequence of the unwillingness of most community researchers to forsake direct observation and direct reporting of the community life, we still have coherent images of the community and social life which are unattainable by other methodologies. . . .

In spite of the grandiose elaboration of research methodologies and abstract theories, it appears that the ear and the eye are still important instruments for gathering data, and that the brain is not always an inefficient mechanism for analyzing them. Because these ancient instruments are still effective, sociologists of all methodological persuasions as well as lay-
men have come to rely on the community study as a source for their over-all images of society. They use these studies for building their substantive theories of society, and they use them as reference points in doing other research and for their commentaries on the society at large. (1964, p. xi)

Culture theory and the other social sciences

Anthropology has made a contribution to the study of modern society that goes deeper than the mere building up of a corpus of empirically derived information. The concept of culture has had a pervasive influence on the other disciplines devoted to human behavior. So long as students of society are limited in their considerations to a single culture or closely related cultures, they are not able to see the force of culture at all, and their analysis is deprived of the major dynamic in the events their discipline is designed to illuminate. It is true that history provides some of the cultural diversity with which theoretical models of behavior may be tested, but history lacks the detailed data, especially of intimate and informal events, that is not recorded in historic documents. Furthermore, historical societies tend to be rather similar in their general character and hence provide only a narrow cross-cultural perspective; and, above all, the historians did not develop theories of culture which could serve as a basis for understanding the phenomena in question. A few scholars, notably the sociologist Max Weber, transcended these limitations, but the cultural point of view is fundamentally the contribution of anthropology.

The clearest illustration of the role of anthropology is provided by linguistics. Prior to the twentieth century, linguists had formulated taxonomic and philological relationships among the diverse tongues of the globe, but their grammatical analyses were based upon the model of Indo-European forms, especially Latin. It was the anthropologically oriented linguists, such as Boas, Bloomfield, and Sapir, who forced the linguists to examine each language in terms of its own grammatical structure and to discover that grammar, syntax, and semantic categories varied from one language to another. This enabled them to develop those general concepts by which to understand the phenomenon of speech and, through a "cultural" understanding, to arrive at a true comparison of linguistic phenomena and thereby at valid generalizations about verbal communication as a process. Significantly, these understandings returned to the linguist a better comprehension of the processes inherent in his own language, not only for purposes of understanding the nature of communication in his own society but even for such practical purposes as the teaching of language.

The influence of anthropology on psychoanalytic thought has also been dramatic. Until after World War I the psychology of human behavior was dominated by a fundamentally biological metaphysics—whether Watsonian behaviorism or Freudian psychodynamics. Anthropological study cast serious doubts on the simple biological models that such theories engendered and gave increasing emphasis to the essential element of culture as a formative force in determining the character of human responses. Thus, when Malinowski pointed out that in the Trobriand Islands the conflicts characteristic of the Oedipal relationship in Western society attach not to the father but to the mother's brother, though he has no sexual liaison with the mother and indeed stands in strict avoidance relation to her, some of the "instinctual" assumptions of Freudian dynamics were undermined. Again, when Mead reported the absence in Samoa of those puberty crises characteristic of middle-class Western girls, or the failure of the sexes in some New Guinea tribes to display the personality characteristics that we associate with sex roles, the physiological basis for such behavioral elements had to be seriously questioned. If men behave differently in different societies, then some situational aspect must be sought as explanatory hypothesis. This all the more so since other sources of data showed that genetic differences between peoples could not account for the manifest differences in their behavior, character, or ability.

The investigation of child training and growth in different cultural environments demonstrated that the psychology of everyday life varies in terms of culture context, with the result that psychoanalytic thought has divested itself of its uniform biological model and has reformulated its understandings in terms of cultural context—the human and symbolic environment in which the child grows up. This is found particularly in the works of Sullivan, Horney, Fromm, and especially Erikson (who has had intensive ethnographic experience with primitive peoples). Although the manner of transmission of attitudes and sentiments from generation to generation is not yet fully comprehended, there is no doubt that the cultural patterning of infantile experience is a crucial element in the formation of adult character. The social psychologists have also come to recognize the cultural dimension and to seek cross-cultural controls within which to test their hypotheses [see CULTURE AND PERSONALITY; LIFE CYCLE; see also Doob 1960].

Most of the social sciences have in varying degrees been influenced by anthropological understanding. Political scientists working with Western
society may remain unconcerned with cultural forces, but political analysis in emerging nations of Africa and Asia requires recognition of the local cultural forces. An example of cultural continuities is documented for the ancient Buganda kingdom and modern Uganda (Apter 1961; Fallers 1964). Least influenced has been economics, which, largely holding to a dichotomy between market and nonmarket societies, finds no need to expand its explanatory system to the world of primitive man and hence remains relatively uninfluenced by the data of anthropology and the role of culture in the operations of the market place.

Policy implications

The infusion of anthropological thought into the scholarly understanding of modern society has had wide-ranging practical applications. The influence upon linguistics was noted in passing, and a comparable influence may be seen in changing attitudes toward child care. In the realm of business, anthropological consultants help management understand the practical problems of coping with informal social relations and culturally induced desires of its personnel. In government the earliest use of anthropological talent was, as might be expected, in the administration of Indian affairs, where John Collier, commissioner of Indian affairs under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, used anthropological understanding of native values and attitudes to help reconstitute internal tribal governments and reformulate school programs. Anthropological knowledge has long (but inconsistently) been applied in colonial administration. Recognition of the cultural dimensions in international relationships is widespread but not universal, and textbooks are available on the practical uses of anthropology for cultural relationships (for example, Foster 1962; Spicer 1952; Erasmus 1961).

Many governmental agencies are now seeking anthropologists’ advice in dealing with foreign countries. The awareness that cultural factors are responsible for the differential behavior of ethnic and racial groups has influenced policy in the United States. Not only do we recognize that members of various ethnic groups and social classes are raised in environments which foster different social outlooks and cultural values but we have also endeavored to ameliorate racial and ethnic relations through altering the cultural environment.

Anthropology has forced upon both scholars concerned with modern society and men of practical affairs a new metaphysics concerning the nature of man. This cultural viewpoint has the following features: (1) those behavior patterns which differentiate one community from another are not responses to differing genetically transmitted characteristics; (2) they are, instead, a product of cultural tradition; (3) this cultural tradition is transmitted in part unwittingly through the human and symbolic environment in which a community nurtures its children; and (4) modern society is not, in such matters, different from primitive societies, even though it has its peculiar complexities. By and large, the intellectual community and the policy-formulating elite in most technologically advanced societies accept and act on these basic anthropological tenets. Tylor’s assertion that anthropology is a policy science and should be used for the improvement of the human condition is thus sustained, although the nature of the changes wrought by the anthropological understanding of modern society is not what Tylor anticipated.

WALTER GOLDSCHMIDT
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VI
THE COMPARATIVE METHOD IN ANTHROPOLOGY

Social and cultural anthropologists concern themselves with three main types of problems: (1) the description of ethnographic facts, (2) inductive reconstruction of long-term cultural history, and (3) the development of general propositions about culturally regulated human behavior. Cross-cultural comparison is an essential element in any form of either the second or third problem. Since anthropological theory building begins with inductive inferences from loosely associated ethnographic facts, the argument can always be illustrated by cross-cultural comparison. Some believe that, properly manipulated, this combination of induction plus exemplification can lead to the discovery of true sociological "laws," analogous to the "law" of gravitation or the "principle" of the conservation of energy. They claim that these regularities can be demonstrated, either as universal truths or as statistical probabilities. In this article some of the common variations of this doctrine will be examined.

Scientific explanation

The natural science analogy. In the natural sciences it is taken for granted that the behavior of all materials under observation is governed by laws of nature. Every experiment is repeatable, and inconsistencies in results imply either faulty technique or faulty understanding. Inconsistency can never lie in the behavior of the subject matter because the material of the experiment does not have a will of its own.

With this basic assumption underlying all theoretical formulations, exact descriptions and rigidly controlled experiment will always lead to an understanding of the mechanisms of natural process. This understanding should enable the scientist to predict with confidence the statistical probability of future events. An essential part of this scientific procedure is the development of precisely defined concepts (such as species, elements, molecules, atoms, elementary particles, mass, energy, pressure, spatial dimension, temperature), which together provide an internationally agreed upon frame of reference in terms of which the particular phenomena observed by different investigators may be described. Scientific progress is possible only because all the specialists in a given discipline use units of description that are commonly understood and have precisely defined meaning. The philosophy underlying all such science is atomistic, and the "model of reality" is that of a system of relationships between unit entities which are deemed, for the arbitrary purposes of the discussion, to be isolate and impermeable.

These characteristics of natural science have been consciously imitated by leading theorists of the social sciences, but they have been reluctant to admit that the two fields are analogous rather than homologous. Unfortunately there are several characteristics inherent in the data of social science that cast serious doubts as to how far a natural science methodology is really justifiable.

Human subject matter cannot be presumed to have a neutral attitude. At certain levels of organization human material does have a will of its own, and consequently all prediction based on the analysis of past experience must be subject to qualification. The question whether social phenomena consist of events which are governed by individual wills or of processes unaffected by individual intentions is the basic issue which distinguishes the method of history from the method of sociology. The sociologist searches for social facts which correspond to natural phenomena, in that they are predictable and resistant to manipulation by individual human wills. Durkheim believed that there were three main classes of social fact, namely: (1) language and other codes of communication by which the members of a society communicate with one another; (2) statistical facts of a demographic or economic kind, which are measures of...
the condition of society rather than of the will of individuals—e.g., the suicide rate or the unemployment rate, which have respectively been used as measures of the psychological health and the economic health of society as a whole; (3) "customs" and "jural rules." It is with this last category that there are the greatest difficulties. How far does it really refer to phenomena which are external to the individual? What is a custom? Is it a description of how people behave or of how they are supposed to behave? Consider the following examples. We can learn from the pages of a standard work of ethnography that it is customary among the Kurds for a man to marry his father's brother's daughter. We can also learn that in one particular Kurdish community in 1951, 45 per cent of all marriages conformed to this customary pattern (Barth 1954). On the other hand, whereas the standard ethnographic account of the Trobriand Islands says that it is customary for a man to marry his father's sister's daughter, a very detailed demographic survey carried out in 1951 recorded only one such marriage among several hundred (Powell 1957). What are we to make of such discrepancies? If customs are to be compared cross-culturally, what is it that we should compare? In the natural sciences this kind of difficulty does not arise. The sequence of research procedure is quite standardized: in any one experiment the individual observations are interpreted as exemplifying a regularity of nature, a normal event. From a series of such inferred normalities the observer deduces a principle of regularity or "law." But in anthropology, customs and jural rules are normative, not normal; although their natures can often be discovered directly by question and answer they cannot be discovered at all by averaging out the details of actual behavior. The raw material of ethnography can be assembled either as a set of individually observed events or as a set of normal events (average actual occurrences), or as a set of normative ideal patterns (verbalized customs). But the last class is not a derivative of the other two. It is not at all obvious why customs—i.e., normative ideal patterns of behavior—should have any characteristics comparable to those regularities we encounter in natural law. Natural law regularities are summaries of events which actually occur; customs are mere mental configurations.

Most social scientists, but especially anthropologists, feel that their concern is with people living in "ordinary" rather than "artificial" social conditions. Social anthropologists are precluded from laboratory experiment. However, it has sometimes been suggested that if an anthropologist compares "ordinary" phenomena in two or more different cultural contexts the procedure is equivalent to that of making repeated observations in a controlled laboratory experiment (see, for example, Ackerknecht 1954, p. 125). This is held to justify the statistical comparison of data derived from quite distinct cultural situations. For example, in many societies a rule of matrilineal descent is found to be associated with a kinship terminology in which the father's sister and the father's sister's daughter are placed in a single category. Some writers treat this association as a kind of natural law such that if the correlation were checked for all known matrilineal systems the statistical probability of it occurring in any newly discovered case could be specified. Thus, when in a sample of fifty societies with "exclusive matrilineal descent with exogamy" only 42 per cent conformed to the expected pattern, Murdock nevertheless claims that this correlation "tends to occur" and the theorem is thereby "conclusively validated" (Murdock 1949, pp. 166–167). A statistic of this kind seems to be devoid of any meaning. It does not tell us whether the correlation will or will not hold for any particular future case. Moreover, the resemblance between such a finding and a genuine scientific discovery is quite specious. The link between matrilineal descent and this particular kin-term usage is a matter of logic. The correlation can be directly inferred from the operations necessary to produce a satisfactory definition of the expression "matrilineal descent group." What is surprising is not the empirical association of facts but the lack of it. The circumstance that Murdock's statistic does not work out at 100 per cent provides us with the useful but scientifically disconcerting information that cultural data are not always consistent, and this in itself invalidates the whole methodology. Similar destructive criticism can be leveled against all attempts to show that correlations of custom conform cross-culturally to statistical probabilities (Köbben 1952).

Cultural facts are not readily discriminated into ultimate units which can be given precise taxonomic description. A generation ago it was quite common for anthropologists to write as if "a culture" was a simple assemblage of elementary particles or traits, the nature of which could be exactly specified. Social reality could then be described as a system of relationships between unit traits which recur in different cultural contexts, just as unit atoms of particular elements recur in different chemical contexts. This orientation to cultural data is untenable. The units of ordinary anthropological
description—expressions like “patrilineal descent,” “uxorilocal residence,” “matrilateral cross-cousin marriage,” “ancestor worship,” “bride price,” “shift-
ing cultivation,” etc.—which are still used as the discriminating traits in even the most sophisticated forms of cross-cultural analysis—are not in any way comparable to the precisely defined diagnostic elements which form the units of discourse in natural science. This is the heart of the whole matter. Those who claim to formulate “scientific” generalizations on the basis of cross-cultural comparison are asserting that they can recognize by inspection that a characteristic \( x \) found in culture A belongs or does not belong to the same subclass of social facts as a characteristic \( y \) found in culture B. The following is a case in point. The inhabitants of the tiny Polynesian island of Tikopia recognize that their social system is composed of social groups called \( \textit{patto} \); the Nuer of the Sudan recognize groups called \( \textit{thok dwiel} \); the Kachin of northern Burma recognize groups called \( \textit{amyu} \); the Chinese recognize groups called \( \textit{tsung-tsu} \); and so on. In the jargon of contemporary social anthropology all these entities are to be classed as patrilineal descent groups; they are examples of “the same thing.” Such propositions clearly leave plenty of room for skepticism. To assert of even one particular that the Tikopia and the Chinese have “the same kind of social structure” must invite caution. What could such a proposition really mean? It is rather like pointing to the undoubted resemblance between a clock face and the stars of the zodiac. It is obvious yet utterly irrelevant. However, such comparisons are orthodox in anthropology.

The communication system analogy. Malinow-
ski sought to evade the difficulties raised by simple trait comparisons by blandly affirming that every social event is uniquely defined by its total social context (Malinowski 1944; see also Goldschmidt 1966). If this were the case, all cross-cultural comparison would be futile. The thesis advanced by Malinowski has yielded little fruit. One trouble is the anthropologists’ insistence that their generalizations are \textit{scientific}. But if we frame our objectives with greater modesty, if we simply try to under-
stand how human beings behave, the outlook need not be so depressing. In practice, despite the theo-
retical difficulties, all anthropologists, Malinowski included, have resorted to cross-cultural compar-
ison to generate ideas. Such comparison may not prove anything, but it gives insight. We may need to get away from the natural science analogy and place stress on the fact that all customs and rules of behavior are human inventions. It is true that we do not ordinarily observe an individual invent-
ing a custom, but customs can be described by individuals, and in this form they represent mental configurations of which all human minds are capable. Human beings do not all think alike, but they need not all think differently. Patterns of social behavior can and do recur in widely different contexts. That being so, our problem can be turned inside out. The issue should not be: How can we discover the social laws which govern cultural behavior? For in fact we have no valid ground for supposing that there are any such social laws. Instead, we can start with the observable fact that at different levels of abstraction similar configurations of cultural phenomena recur in different contexts. What significance should be attached to such recurrence?

This line of argument leads back to a position close to that adopted by the social evolutionists of the late nineteenth century. At that time it was assumed that cultural traits from different primitive contexts were comparable because they were products of human minds “at the same stage of development.” Today the comparative structuralism of Lévi-Strauss implies a rather similar attitude. Cultures are not to be thought of as assemblages of social facts which exist \textit{sui generis} but rather as systems of communication. We can compare cul-
tures just as we can compare spoken languages, but if we do so, the similarities which emerge result from the fact that all human brains operate in the same way. We are not discovering truths of nature which are independent of human actors but rather the possibilities of human action as such. Such an orientation leads to a shift in view about the pur-
pose for which cross-cultural comparison may be conducted. Instead of demonstrating that a par-
ticular correlation of cultural traits \( p, q, r, \ldots \) is repeated in different cultural contexts A, B, C, \ldots, which is the ultimate objective in all indexing pro-
cedures such as the Human Relations Area Files, we are led to other considerations. First, what is the structural–functional logic which brings features \( p, q, r, \ldots \) into association in context \( A \)? Sec-
ond, what variations of this concatenation \( p, q, r, \ldots \) are conceptually possible? Third, which of these variations actually occur and in what circum-
stances? The outcome of such a procedure is a comparison of contrasts rather than a comparison of similarities, and the objective of the exercise is to discover what is humanly feasible rather than to demonstrate what is statistically probable. Cross-
cultural comparison here becomes a means of understanding the humanity of human beings. It is
not a question of demonstrating that culture is like nature, but of showing how culture differs from nature.

Cross-cultural analysis

The following are some of the more distinctive types of cross-cultural comparison which have been adopted by anthropologists.

The British social evolutionists. The phrase "the comparative method" in English-language anthropological writings usually refers to a specific style of demonstration employed by a wide variety of authors from about 1860 onward. Outstanding exponents of the method during the period before 1914 were H. Spencer, E. B. Tylor, J. G. Frazer, E. S. Hartland, E. Westermarck, E. Crawley, and L. T. Hobhouse. More recent scholars who have employed similar procedures include R. Briffault, M. Eliade, and E. O. James. The technique rests on the notion that the development of human society has been analogous to the development of a human individual; primitive societies correspond to human infants, sophisticated societies to human adults. Whether a particular society is to be rated primitive or sophisticated can be judged by inspection. Just as human adults retain in their psychological make-up features which derive from childish experience, so also sophisticated societies retain "survivals" of primitive features. It is assumed that the objective of anthropology is to reconstruct a convincing picture of the early state of human society. Evidence for this primeval condition of mankind can be drawn either directly, from the observation of existing primitive societies, or indirectly, from the study of survivals persisting in contemporary sophisticated society. Since the anthropologist himself is the judge of what is primitive or sophisticated, and since no clear distinction is drawn between myth and legend, on the one hand, and customary practice, on the other, almost any kind of ethnographic evidence can serve as illustrative evidence of hypothetical past social conditions.

Certain features are characteristic of all exponents of the comparative method among the earlier evolutionists. The practitioners displayed a prodigious range of erudition in that they were familiar with an extraordinary variety of ethnographic facts. This knowledge was derived exclusively from books. Very few of the writers concerned had first-hand knowledge of any particular primitive society. (Edward Westermarck, who had detailed knowledge of Morocco, is here the exception.) Each item of illustrative evidence was detached from its context and treated as directly comparable to any other. All varieties of evidence were considered uncritically: a detail mentioned by a classical author of the third century B.C. was given the same credibility as an item attributed to a sixteenth-century traveler, an eighteenth-century missionary, or a late nineteenth-century ethnographer. Evidence from myth was treated as the equivalent of fact.

The comparative method took no cognizance of quantitative factors or variations of scale. As Hartland put it, the objective was to "illustrate a great body of traditional philosophy, confined not to one race or country but common to mankind." Also, the ethnographic evidence was always used to exemplify general propositions with the implication that such propositions are validated by an accumulation of positive evidence. Neutral or negative evidence was never considered. This procedure is logically fallacious. The exponents of the "comparative method" did not in fact prove anything by their comparisons, and if some of the works in question—such as Frazer's Golden Bough—retain a certain residual attractiveness it is because of the exotic quality of the data rather than because of any intrinsic merit in the argument.

Culture history

From about 1890 onward the doctrines of the social evolutionists were gradually superseded by various forms of diffusionism. Evolutionists supposed that all human societies follow the same course of development: the occurrence of similar cultural features in different contexts of time and space was evidence for the standardization of human minds and a uniform capacity for invention. Diffusionists were disinclined to recognize invention at all; the geographical distribution of cultural traits was evidence for historical contact and dispersal by borrowing from a single original source. Historical reconstructions were elaborated from skilled exploitation of the theory of "survivals," which had originated among the evolutionists. Work of this kind ranges from the grandiose world histories of the Kulturkreislehre (see e.g., Montandon 1934, p. 97) to the reconstructions of Californian Indian history developed by Kroeber and Driver (Culture . . . 1937-1950) on the basis of meticulous statistical analysis of trait distributions. The works of the Kulturkreislehre suffer from the same defects as those of the social evolutionists. A formidable apparatus of comparative ethnographic evidence was marshaled so as to illustrate a thesis developed a priori. Negative evidence was not usually considered, and there was little discrimination concerning the quality or context of evidential sources. As was to be expected, trait
distribution studies have become increasingly sophisticated with the passage of time, and distinction now needs to be drawn between arguments about the diffusion of artifacts and those in which the traits under discussion are such ephemeral things as customs, rules, and items of belief. The relative plausibility of some of the diffusionist historical reconstructions advanced by prehistoric archeologists depends on the fact that since material objects are part of nature as well as part of culture we can reasonably expect them to conform to "natural" regularities. By contrast, if we treat the abstract aspects of culture as natural we shall merely deceive ourselves.

**Statistical analysis of nonmaterial cultural data**

Tylor (1889) was among the first to attempt a statistical correlation of social institutions based on cross-cultural data—in this case between mother-in-law avoidance and certain other social conventions. A much more ambitious enterprise was that of Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg (1915), which endeavored to establish an empirical correlation between basic modes of subsistence and the forms of social organization. These scholars classified 552 societies into lower hunters, higher hunters, dependent hunters, agricultural or pastoral on the first level, agricultural or pastoral on the second level, and agricultural on level three. They then developed a cross-cultural index that recorded for each "people" the presence or absence of such characteristics as types of legal sanction, mode of descent, patterns of residence, sexual conventions, treatment of women, modes of warfare, degree of social stratification. The Yale cross-cultural survey initiated by Murdock in 1937, which later developed into the Human Relations Area Files (Yale University . . . 1938; Moore 1961) and the Ethnographic Atlas of Ethnology, has greatly refined the procedures adopted by Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, but it remains a work of essentially the same kind and suffers from the same intrinsic defects, some of which have been pointed out in earlier sections of this article. The basic units of comparison, which are variously described as tribes, peoples, cultures, or societies, are treated as if they were naturally bounded and self-discriminating. They are investigated as if they were zoological pseudo species. The purpose of the analysis is to establish a taxonomy of culture species on Linnaean principles. Just as the classification of plants and animals throws light upon the sequences of evolution, so also a classification of societies according to their morphological characteristics will demonstrate laws of social evolutionary change.

To accept this thesis it is necessary to believe not only that "societies" ("cultures" etc.) exist in nature just as "species," but that the distinctive features of anthropological description (e.g., the contrast between the presence or absence of unilineal descent groups) are comparable to the distinctive features of biological description (e.g., the contrast between vertebrates and invertebrates). Those who reject this homology are likely to view the development of the Ethnographic Atlas with some dismay. The information recorded in this index is being coded to a numerical taxonomy, which will eventually make the whole apparatus directly accessible to computer analysis. This may seem splendidly up to date, but if the information which is being stored is defective in the first place the later application of statistical analysis, computerized or otherwise, will compound the confusion (e.g., Coult & Habenstein 1965).

**Structural comparison (Radclifff-Brown)**

The classical comparative method, the diffusionist reconstructions of the cultural historians, and the various styles in cross-cultural statistical analysis all rested on the proposition that "a culture" ("a society," etc.) is to be conceived of as an assemblage of traits which can be separately compared. Functionalist social evolutionists rejects this view. Societies are systems which can be compared only as wholes. In Malinowski's version of functionalism this wholeness was so comprehensive that all cross-cultural comparison became meaningless, but Radcliff-Brown sought to discover universal sociological laws and was prepared to recognize that, for comparative purposes, the notion of functional totality could be raised to a somewhat abstract level. In this he followed Durkheim. A society must be analyzed as a system, not as a set of component parts, but the analyst may reduce his problem to manageable proportions by considering only one frame of reference at a time. It then becomes legitimate to compare the political system of society A with the political system of society B, or the kinship system of society A with the kinship system of society B, and so on. From this there might emerge certain general principles which can be applied to the analysis of politics or kinship elsewhere. Although early work of this genre showed exaggerated optimism, it has achieved some notable successes. The procedure has not yielded general sociological laws, but close attention to details and patient step-by-step testing of limited hypotheses have led to genuinely increased insight into some particular aspects of human behavior. This style of comparison is most fruitful.
when all the societies under consideration share a common geographical environment and are broadly similar in scale and general culture (e.g., Radcliffe-Brown 1931; Eggan 1950; Schapera 1953).

Despite Radcliffe-Brown's emphasis on the notion of system and occasions when he invoked comparison as a means to solving problems of philosophy and psychology (e.g., 1951), he remained firmly attached to the natural science analogy. He thought of social structure as part of the social system in much the same sense as the bony skeleton is part of the living mammal, and he supposed that anthropologists might compare whole societies just as zoologists can compare mammalian species. But a skeleton is a tangible reality; a social structure is not.

**Structural comparison (Lévi-Strauss)**

If we think of society as a communication system rather than as a natural phenomenon we are led to think of the products of culture as structured, just as the sentences of the language, if they are to be comprehensible, must conform to certain transformational rules but are not predetermined as to content. Two expressions which exemplify the same principles of grammar and syntax may not resemble each other at all in their overt form. If this analogy is exact, it should be possible and rewarding to compare the structure of cultural systems at a more abstract level. Lévi-Strauss insists that cultural systems are in fact used like languages; it is through culture that men are able to recognize the world of nature and the world of society as an ordered place with which they can come to terms. Kinship systems, political systems, and mythological systems are systems of classification invented by men. The structures they embody are logical structures which correspond to ordinary human faculties. The regularities which we may expect to find in them are not a part of nature outside man but a part of nature inside man. Linguistics and psychology rather than biology are the proper models for the inquiring anthropologist. Although an appreciation of existentialist philosophy may be necessary to understand Lévi-Strauss's position, the idea which has been recurrent in all his work—that cultural systems may be comparable not merely because they are palpably similar but because they represent logical transformations of a common structural theme—is one which has added an important new dimension to contemporary anthropological thinking.

When anthropologists generalize they do so on the basis of cross-cultural comparison, but the rationale of their use of comparative data seldom bears close examination. Two main styles of argument may be distinguished. On the one hand, there are theories which presuppose a psychological unity among all mankind. Similarities of culture accordingly illustrate the fact that human beings faced with similar situations will react in the same way. On the other hand, there are theories which presume the existence of social facts lying outside human control, even though they are governed by natural regularities as are the ordinary facts of physical experience. Here the point of cross-cultural comparison is to reach the autonomous world of social truth by eliminating the human variable. The present writer is inclined to share the skepticism voiced by Evans-Pritchard (1963). Cross-cultural comparison is an essential device for the exposition of anthropological argument, but it is not, and cannot be, a disguised form of scientific experiment leading to explanation. As Montesquieu once put it, "Man, as a physical being, is like other bodies, governed by invariant laws. As an intelligent being, he incessantly transgresses the laws established by God, and changes those which he himself has established" (Montesquieu [1750] 1949, p. 3).

**EDMUND R. LEACH**

[For different viewpoints, see Ethnology; Evolution, Introduction and Article on Cultural Evolution; History, Article on Culture History. Directly related are the entries Culture; Diffusion; Functional Analysis; Systems Analysis.]
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ANTI-SEMITISM

Anti-Semitism, literally referring to hatred of Semites but commonly understood as hatred of Jews, is a late nineteenth-century term for a phenomenon almost as old as human history. One of the earliest recorded instances of anti-Semitism occurred more than four hundred years before the birth of Christ, when a Jewish temple on an island in the Nile was wantonly destroyed by a group of Egyptian priests. The Egyptians are still at war with the Jews, or at least that portion of Jewry that inhabits the state of Israel; but the modern Egyptians are hardly alone in disliking Jews and in believing that the Israelis are less a Middle Eastern people than an alien army of occupation. The entire Arab world is anti-Zionist, and so are Arab sympathizers in Latin America, Africa, Europe, and the United States. The Russians also dislike Zionists and/or Jews—it is not always easy to distinguish between the anti-Semite and the anti-Zionist, since they tend to behave in similar fashion. In short, despite the fact that the conscience of much of the civilized world was scarred by the Nazi murder of more than six million Jews, anti-Semitism retains its power in several countries and is everywhere a force to be reckoned with.

There are important differences, however, between modern forms of anti-Semitism and the older varieties. Modern versions, of which Nazi racism is the archetype, are both more ideological and more virulent than ancient types. The early Greek anti-Semites, for example, like all anti-Semites ever since, saw Jews as “different,” but the differences they stressed were not those of the later Christian era. They could make little sense of either the theory or practice of Judaism, and what little they understood they disliked. Their own polytheism, with its numerous gods and attendant cults, festivals, feast days, and ceremonial rituals, seemed to the Greeks preferable to monotheism, which, in the Jewish version, called for fasting, days of atonement, dietary and sexual restrictions, and other chastisements. Functioning, in effect, as the Puritans of the pagan world, Jews were regarded with curiosity and barely concealed dislike. Even the great Roman historian Tacitus could not refrain from observing, in connection with the belief that the Jews worshiped Bacchus, that the “cult [of Bacchus] would be most inappop-

brius. Bacchus instituted gay and cheerful rites, could not refrain from observing, in connection with the belief that the Jews worshiped Bacchus, that the “cult [of Bacchus] would be most inappropriate. Bacchus instituted gay and cheerful rites, but the Jewish ritual is preposterous and morbid.” It also appeared to Tacitus that Jewish customs in general were “impious and abominable, and owe their prevalence to their [the Jews’] depravity.” Jewish “prosperity,” Tacitus continued, is largely due to the fact that “... they are obstinately loyal to each other, and always ready to show compassion, whereas they feel nothing but hatred and enmity for the rest of the world” (Tacitus, The Histories, vol. 2, pp. 202–208, 211–218).

Tacitus was not alone in believing that Jewish religious practices were an abomination. Plutarch, the Greek biographer, thought it possible that Jews abstained from pork because the pig was an object of veneration, whereas Strabo, the geographer, attributed such abstemiousness, along with “circum-cisions and excisions,” to “superstition.” Apion, the most dedicated anti-Semite of the ancient