

Model Answer_AS-2299
M.A/ M.Sc. Third Semester
End Semester Examination, 2013
ANTHROPOLOGY
Paper: Third (Principles of Social and Cultural Anthropology)
Time Allowed: Three hours
Section – ‘A’

2x10=20

Note: *Select one of the most appropriate answer from the following objective questions.*
Each question carries 2 mark.

1. (i) Ruth Benedict has written the following book
 - a. Patterns in Culture
 - b. Patterns of Culture**
 - c. Culture patterns
 - d. Culture and Pattern
- (ii) Ancient Society was written by
 - a. Condorect
 - b. L.H. Morgan**
 - c. Fredreich Engles
 - d. Emile Durkheim
- (iii) Kinship terminology was developed in evolutionary theory by
 - a. W.H.R.Rivers
 - b. L.H. Morgan**
 - c. Fred Eggan
 - d. Goodenough
- (iv) When two or more cultural systems in long continued contact work out a mutual accommodation which allows each to sustain
 - (a) Cultural Pluralism**
 - (b) Cultural Relativism
 - (c) Cultural Revitalization
 - (d) All of the above
- (v) A specific and general relationship between culture and language was made by
 - a. Cluade Levistrauss
 - b. Edwar Sapir**
 - c. Benjamin Whorf
 - d. Robert Lowie
- (vi) *The Mind of the Primitive Man* was published in the year 1911 to study tribal ethnography in socio-psychological approach was written by
 - a. Ruth Benedict
 - b. Margaret Mead
 - c. A.L. Kroeber

- d. Franz Boas**
- (vii) Culture centre becomes the core centre in a
- Cultural area**
 - Cultural circle
 - Cultural cradle
 - Cultural similarities
- (viii) Who attempted to study cultural evolution in terms of technological and scientific development
- Julian Steward
 - Leslie White**
 - V. Gordon Childe
 - Grafton Elliot Smith
- (ix) Who is the author of the book 'The Andaman Islands'?
- C. Levi Strauss
 - N.K. Bose
 - A.R. Radcliffe Brown**
 - R. Rivers
- (x) Who has developed the concept 'Mechanical model and Statistical Mode'?
- E.R. Leach
 - C. Levi Strauss**
 - R. Linton
 - E. Durkheim

Section-'B

4x10=40

Note: Write long answer of the following questions. Attempt any **four** questions.
Each question carries 10 marks.

2. Evaluate the principles laid down by Classical Evolutionists?

Answer 2:

Classical Evolutionists

Many views and contributions of the evolutionists are classified from two angles

1. Classical evolutionists and the Neo-evolutionists

2. On the basis of their nationality such as British, American and German.

The first school of thought that emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century along with the founding of anthropology. The Classical Evolutionists build up data about human societies and borrowed the concept of biological evolution and applied both to a concept they defined as culture. The idea of a progressive nature to human society had long been recognized, but with

Charles Darwin's development of a feasible concept of biological evolution this idea was applied to all fields of study.

This school applied these principles with the use of the classical comparative method. The classical comparative method involved the comparison of particular cultural traits but not whole cultures.

British Classical Evolutionism

Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917):

Edward B. Tylor was a generalist; he "embraced the whole field" (Lowie 1937). His major work 'Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization' (1865), which was followed by two volumes on 'Primitive Culture' (1871) where he gave classical definition of culture. He developed an evolutionary system, the classical comparative method and he studied religion and elegantly defined culture.

His unilineal system involved two major principles.

1. Tylor argued for uniformitarianism in culture because he thought that culture had been "created by universally similar human minds and governed by the same basic laws of cognition" (Moore 1997).
2. The concept of the survival emerged as an important scheme and believed that certain cultural traits have survived from an earlier culture, but the meaning has changed. Thus, as certain cultural traits represent earlier stages of culture, then some simpler cultures also represent these earlier stages (Moore 1997). He also asserted the concept of diffusion as another way that culturally disconnected traits may appear in a culture (Tylor 1958).

Along with his ideas on cultural evolution,

1. Tylor developed the classical comparative method that was used by the Classical Evolutionist and was attacked by the American Historical School.
2. Tylor's "concept of culture is most enduring"(Moore 1997).

In 1958 he defined culture as "Culture or civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."

In his book, 'Anthropology' in 1881, he described briefly the three stages of culture as the historical study of man's development in society, from 'Savagery' to 'Barbarism' and then to the rise of 'Civilization', as manifested by his acquired habits and capabilities, from a primitive state of affairs to more advanced stage of cultural development. He suggested that these are three universal stages of cultural progress, but he did not conceive it to be the moving power of history, rather used it as a tool for reconstruction of past conditions, as empirical generalisations, and on the scientific nature of anthropology which enabled the ethnographer to comprehend the continuity of culture. Tylor began to write on anthropology ethnographically and credit goes to Tylor to establish anthropology as an independent and scientific field of study.

American Classical Evolutionism

Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881):

Lewis H. Morgan was different from the other Classical Evolutionists, not in his theory, but in his method. He followed the idea of unilineal evolution in the model he developed, but he went into the field and studied the Iroquois (Moore 1997). The two major accomplishments of his career are his cross-cultural analysis of kinship in *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (1870) and his elaboration of cultural evolution using the ideas of Savagery, Barbarism and Civilization found in *Ancient Society* (1877).

Morgan studied Iroquois Indians and recorded their rapid changing cultures and published them in 'League of the Iroquois'(1851) and described dances, games, religion, languages, the material culture, form of government, family organization and later probed into Iroquois marriage and system of matrilineal descent. He has found the system of naming the kins during the study of rules of descent. As such, Morgan studied kinship to "trace the connections and explore their 'progressive changes' found in this system. Out of this work he developed kinship system terminologies that Lowie called his "main original contribution to ethnology" (Lowie 1937). Morgan saw six families of kinship systems with two main distinctions for all the kinship systems: the descriptive system and the classificatory system. The descriptive system is found in Semitic, Aryan and Uralian families and it keeps "lineal relatives distinct from collateral kin". The classificatory system is found among the Malayan, Turanain and Ganowanian families and this system treats "lineal and collateral kin as if they were the same". He also asserted that the descriptive system contained the civilized people and the classificatory contained the uncivilized (Moore 1997:33)b

Morgan developed three systems of evolution using technology, society and the family as his basis. He believed that as cultures became more complex the speed of evolutionary progress increased. He stated (1963) that human progress, from first to last, has been in a ratio not rigorously but essentially geometrical progress was slowest in time in the first period, and most rapid in the last.

His main evolutionary scheme revolved around technologically defined stages of Savagery, Barbarism and Civilization, with the first two stages being sub-divided into lower, middle and upper (Morgan 1963). His evolution of society involved the tribe and the state, termed as *societas* and *civitas*. As *societas* evolved new forms of society emerged, leading from sections to clans and matriarchy, then clans and patriarchy and finally the *civitas*. Finally, his evolution of the family involved steps from promiscuity, to group marriage, to polygyny and lastly monogamy (Weiss 2001).

There were several other figures in the Classical Evolutionist School. Henry Maine developed a level scheme that involved the evolution of kinship from patriarchy to modern society, evolution of political actions from kinship to “local contiguity” and of juridical power from status based to contract based (Maine 1861). Johann Jacob Bachofen developed a unilineal scheme from promiscuity to matriarchy to patriarchy (Bachofen 1861). Finally, John McLennan developed an extremely complicated evolutionary system that moved through many stages.

3. Write short note on
(a) National character b. Multilinear evolution

Answer 3a:
National Character

National character is a recent development in anthropological research on the problems of personality and culture. It was developed specially during the Second World War with some political bias. The features of national character approach are,

1. The group of persons with a shared social tradition, whose culture is studied, is selected because they are the citizens- the national-of a sovereign political state, and

2. The society may be so inaccessible to apply direct field observation may be difficult and hence, less direct methods of research, as applied in the national character study, have to be used.

Margaret Mead was opinion that the national character studies, like all culture and personality studies, are focused on the way human beings embody the culture they have been reared in or to which they have immigrated. These studies attempt to delineate how the innate properties of human beings, the idiosyncratic elements in each human beings and the general and individual patterns of human maturation are integrated within a shared social tradition in such a fashion that certain regularities appear in the behavior of all members of the culture, which can be described as a culturally regular character. In this sense, thus, cultural character is an abstraction which anthropologists use when their conceptual apparatus is divided to include assumption about intra-psychic structure.

According to Margaret Mead, the national character studies attempt to trace the way in which the identified cultural behavior of the individual members of the culture, combining cultural theory to explain how human beings embody the culture-learn it and live it.

Answer 3b:
Multilinear Evolution

Julian Steward opined that ‘multilinear evolution is essentially a methodology based on the assumption that significant regularities in cultural change occur, and it is concerned with the determination of cultural laws’. Multilinear evolution is concerned with the historical reconstruction, but does not reveal that the historical data should be classified in universal stages. Steward suggested that the multilinear evolutionists recognize that the cultural traditions of different areas may be wholly or partially distinctive and any meaningful similarities between certain cultures exist and whether these lend themselves to formulation.

Julian steward points out that ‘parallelism’ and ‘casuality’ are always present in cultural studies remains and thus, the methodology of cultural studies remains predominantly that of historical particularizing rather than of scientific generalizing. American anthropologists have traditionally assumed that there are old and new world parallels in the invention of farming, stock-breeding, ceramics, metallurgy, states, priests, temples, the zero and mathematics, writings and other features.

The determination and analysis of parallels as a methodological objective of multilinear evolution need not be carried out on a purely cultural level. Steward has endeavoured in various studies (1938) to demonstrate how cultural-ecological adaptations-the adaptative processes thorough which a historically derived culture is modified in a particular environment are among the important creative processes in culture change.

4. What were the contributions made by American diffusionists in Anthropological thought?

Answer 4:

The American diffusionists received impetus and inspiration from their German counterparts and therefore, it is said that the American 'Culture Area' theory of diffusion was influenced by the 'museum methodology' of German diffusion. Franz Boas is considered to be the founder of American and modern anthropology. He included the expansion of sociocultural anthropology, linguistics, physical anthropology and archaeology into his works. Boas brought in the idea that cultural traits must be explained in specific cultural contexts instead of a broad reference to evolutionary trends and opined that the art and characteristic style of a people can be understood only by studying its productions as a whole". Boas' basic approach to work was that culture was to be understood from detailed studies of specific cultures.

Boas' view on Anthropology is that anthropology should "provide an analysis of a unique culture describing its form, the dynamic reactions of the individual to the culture and of the culture to the individual". This view clearly influenced Mead and Benedict as students. Boas argued that customs and believes are not the objective of research. He sought to learn why they exist, how they exist, and the history behind them. His research was more focused on differences between societies, instead of similarities. His research showed that biology did not determine culture; biology could be changed by the environment.

It was found that the cultural items of some of the American tribes, which lived close to one another, were more similar than those of groups, who lived further apart. The geographical regions that displayed such internal similarities were called 'Cultural Areas' and their isomorphism was explained by diffusion. Thus 'Cultural Area' became dominant theme in American diffusion, besides a number of concepts like 'Food areas', 'Age area', 'Culture centre'

Culture climax etc., were also used to explain the nature and processes of diffusion operating in native America. There were many contributions of American diffusionists,

1. Clark Wissler: Mention the works and approaches by him
2. Alfred Louis Kroeber: Mention the works and approaches by him

5. Write an essay on the theory of Structure-functionalism of Radcliffe Brown

Answer 5:

Structure-Functionalism

Alfred Reginald was considered as the Father of Modern Social Anthropology. A.R. Radcliffe-Brown is remembered as the father of structural-functionalism and as one of the co-founders of British social anthropology, along with Bronislaw Malinowski. Radcliffe-Brown first came to prominence through his analysis of kinship and social organization among *The Andaman Islanders* (1922) and, later, among the aborigines of Australia, published in such works as *Social Organization of Australian Tribes* (1931). Structural-functionalism views society as an entity composed of functionally interdependent institutions. Structural-functional analysis, although later viewed as reductionist, deeply influenced the development of social anthropology and continues to influence the subfields of economic and political anthropology.

Radcliffe Brown became aware of the work of French sociologist Emile Durkheim, sparking a new interest in the way that social institutions act together to sustain society – much as physical organs work together to sustain a living body. Using his own modified version of Durkheim's theories, which he called "structural-functionalism", he reinterpreted the entirety of his work among the Andaman Islanders. And during his fieldwork among the Australian Aborigines (1910-1912), he utilized structural-functionalism to analyze kinship, myth, totemism, in the context of social organization.

Radcliffe Brown was a social anthropologist and a good theoretician. He described the theory of social structure from various angles and explained particularly in terms of net-works of social relations, and emphasized on the continuity of social institutions. According to Radcliffe Brown, the concept of structure refers to an arrangement of parts or components related to one another in some sort of larger unity. In social structure the ultimate components are individual

human beings or persons and 'structure consists of the arrangements of persons in relation to each other'. For instance, in a village, we find an arrangement of persons into families or households, which is again a structural feature. In family the structure consists of the relations of father, mother and children to each other. Radcliffe Brown illustrated the concept of social structure by citing the example from the tribes of Western Australia. Thus, the continuity of the social group is an important factor for the existence of the social structure.

Radcliffe Brown also explained the difference between social structure and the social organization. He also described the types of social structure, threw light on the spatial aspect of social structure, and made a distinction between social morphology and social physiology. Finally, he emphasized on the importance of the spread of members of the society are related at various stages. While discussing social structure, he also discussed his views on the concept of religion, social change, and social evolution.

6. Write short note on

a. Synchronic and Diachronic method

b. Psychic unity of Mankind

Answer 6a:

Synchronic and Diachronic method

A diachronic study or analysis concerns itself with the evolution and change over time of that which is studied; it is roughly equivalent to historical. Thus diachronic linguistics is also known as historical linguistics.

A synchronic study or analysis, in contrast, limits its concern to a particular moment of time. Thus synchronic linguistics takes a language as a working system at a particular point in time without concern for how it has developed to its present state. The extent to which synchronic study really does as it were take a frozen slice of history for study is itself not absolute: to talk of a system necessarily implies movement and interaction, and movement and interaction take place in time.

Thus the synchronic studies of complete cultures carried out by the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss involved investigation of, for instance, symbolic exchanges which were consecutive rather than simultaneous, so that the element of temporal sequence is still present in such structuralist investigations.

Note: Cite some examples

Answer 6b:

Psychic unity of Mankind

Bastian proposed 'Psychic unity of Mankind' a straightforward project for the long-term development of a science of human culture and consciousness based upon this notion. He argued that the mental acts of all people everywhere on the planet are the products of physiological mechanisms characteristic of the human species. Every human mind inherits a complement of species-specific "elementary ideas" (*Elementargedanken*), and hence the minds of all people, regardless of their race or culture, operate in the same way.

According to Bastian, the contingencies of geographic location and historical background create different local elaborations of the "elementary ideas"; these he called "folk ideas" (*Volkergedanken*). Bastian also proposed a lawful "genetic principle" by which societies develop over the course of their history from exhibiting simple sociocultural institutions to becoming increasingly complex in their organization. Through the accumulation of ethnographic data, we can study the psychological laws of mental development as they reveal themselves in diverse regions and under differing conditions. Bastian held that the object of research is not the study of the individual per se, but rather the "folk ideas" or "collective mind" of a particular people.

Bastian thought that the more one sees that the historically conditioned "folk ideas" are of secondary importance compared with the universal "elementary ideas". The individual is like the cell in an organism, a social animal whose mind – its "folk ideas" – is influenced by its social background; and the "elementary ideas" are the ground from which these "folk ideas" develop. From this perspective, the social group has a kind of group mind, a social "soul" (*Gesellschaftsseele*) if you will, in which the individual mind is embedded.

Bastian believed that the "elementary ideas" are to be scientifically reconstructed from "folk ideas" as varying forms of collective representations (*Gesellschaftsgedanken*). Because one cannot observe the collective representations per se, Bastian felt that the ethnographic project had to proceed through a series of five analytical steps.

1. **Fieldwork:** Empirical description of cross-cultural data (as opposed to armchair philosophy; Bastian himself spent much of his adult life among non-European peoples).
2. **Deduction of collective representations:** From cross-cultural data we describe the collective representations in a given society.

3. Analysis of folk ideas: Collective representations are broken down into constituent folk ideas. Geographical regions often exhibit similar patterns of folk ideas – he called these “idea circles” which described the collective representations of particular regions.

4. Deduction of elementary ideas: Resemblances between folk ideas and patterns of folk ideas across regions indicate underlying elementary ideas.

5. Application of a scientific psychology: Study of elementary ideas defines the psychic unity of mankind, which is due to the underlying psychophysiological structure of the species – this study is to be accomplished by a truly scientific, cross-culturally grounded psychology.

Through ethnographic research, Bastian opined that the study of the psychological laws of mental development as they reveal themselves in diverse geographical settings. Thus in modern day parlance, our different sociocultural forms are due both to trans-culturally shared processes inherent in our very distinct human psychophysiology—much of it operating at a non-conscious level—and to our development within a particular environment.

7. Discuss the contribution of Edmund Leach to the study of Social structure

Answer 7:

E.R. Leach was a British social anthropologist, who disliked synchronic functionalism. He has dealt with change without abandoning the useful notions of structure and function. E.R. Leach in his book, *Political system of Highland Burma* (1954) held views that social structure of Highland Burma consists of a set of ideas about the distribution of power between persons or group of persons. Leach proposed a creative solution by considering conflict itself as a form of structure.

The social system in Highland Burma area was such that it was presented individuals with inconsistencies in the schemes of values, by which they ordered their lives. They were, thus, faced with values, by which they ordered their lives. They were, thus, faced with alternative mode of actions. Leach believed that such decisions were usually made in terms of gaining power to acquire accesses to office or of learning social esteem that would lead to increased power. He presented a wealth of evidence that this was, indeed, the primary mechanism of change among the Kachin and Shan populations of Burma. They consciously attempted to manipulate their myths and marriage choices in manner that would increase their status.

Although, the cross-cultural validity of Leach's specific explanation has not been proven, his method is very important. He explained change not only by preconceived causal factors, but from the reality of Kachin and Shan life. In his term, functionalism became dynamic and diachronic.

8. What do you mean by 'Cultural relativism'? Discuss its importance in Anthropological studies.

Answer 8:

Cultural relativism

The idea that a person's activities or beliefs should be understood in the terms and values of their own culture, not someone else's. Cultural Relativism brought attention to the problem of Ethnocentrism; which is the belief that one's own culture is more valuable or better than another. Ethnocentrism leads us to make premature judgements about a culture and the people that are a part of that culture. Cultural relativism also led to the formation of ethnology. Ethnology is a comparison of cultures using ethnographic data, society, and culture. Ethnology is usually done when anthropologists go into, "the field"- meaning they travel to a country and live with the people there to get the best possible taste and experience of their culture. This data resulting from ethnography helps us understand other cultures and how they are similar and different to other cultures.

Methodologically, cultural relativism means that while the anthropologist is in the field, he or she temporarily suspends their own esthetic and moral judgements. The aim is to obtain a certain degree of "understanding" or "empathy" with the foreign norms and tastes. Morally and politically, cultural relativism means that we respect other cultures and treat them as "as good as" one's own. During fieldwork one frequently discovers that this is not as easy as it may sound.

Cultural relativism as a moral project may be caricatured, as it often is in critical accounts. These tend to spring from one of two points of view:

(1) From an e.g. nationalist viewpoint, cultural relativism may be perceived as a threat - as an acid that dissolves one's nation, culture, identity, safety.

(2) In contrast, from a universalistic viewpoint, e.g. from the point of view of the Declaration of Human Rights, cultural relativism amounts to a kind of non-intervention pact with all other cultures, which denies us the right to criticize even blatant human rights violations, in the name of respect for the life world of others.

During fieldwork, it is essential to bracket one's own values and control one's spontaneous reactions to a number of exotic phenomena. If one does not, one will simply not learn to understand the people under study. Without such understanding, it will be impossible to establish mutual trust, which is the precondition of entering into dialogue with them. Only through such dialogue change may be attempted. Without dialogue, change is impossible. What is true of fieldwork is, in this case, also true of normal, practical life, where respect and trust form the basis of all productive relations.