

PERSPECTIVES IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

ANTHROPOLOGY 40400.02 – FALL 2005

Instructor **Greg Downey**
Office 619 Flanner Hall
 Hours: Weds 3-5 or by appointment
Contact 631-3763
 gdowney@nd.edu
 www.nd.edu/~gdowney
Class Meets DeBartolo 201
 Tuesday & Thursday 2:00-3:15 pm

Please note: This syllabus follows closely on that created by Prof. Susan Blum for Anthropology 430 (old numbering system) and on the **pedagogical approaches of Prof. John MacAloon**. Assigned readings follow Blum's model as does the goal of this class; perspectival orientation follows Prof. MacAloon's approach.

Anthropology is the most scientific of the humanities, the most humanist of the sciences.
Eric Wolf (1964)

Of all the social sciences, anthropology is one of the most diverse. Especially in the United States, anthropology departments include members who may go about what they do in radically different ways, with diverging, even conflicting, goals, research methods, and styles of thinking. One of the reasons that the field has been so influential theoretically is that we bring a diverse intellectual tool bag to the table, unlike some fields where a single style of research or analytical orthodoxy dominates how they tend to see things. This is also one of the great attractions of those trained to think anthropologically for those who might hire anthropologists!

This course takes students inside different ways of doing anthropological analysis, different frameworks for turning data into conclusions, and distinct starting points from which anthropologists ask research questions. It is not a "theory" or a "philosophy" course; you will not learn "theories" of how the world works or how to split semantic hairs. This is a *practical* course. When you leave this class, you should be able to "do anthropology" with data in a variety of ways. You will be able to study research materials or data and understand which perspectives are most likely to tell compelling stories from that data. You should also better recognize some of the limits of different forms of analysis. I hope that every student has many "Aha!" moments, when things that have once bothered you or seemed inconsistent start to appear in a clearer light.

The reading and work, however, is challenging. There's no way around it: learning to think in different ways is not easy, and it requires reading, writing, and talking. I make no apologies for that, and I hope you do not delude yourself into thinking this is easy. On the other hand, by the time you finish, you will have a set of intellectual skills that are useful, flexible, and—frankly—rare. They apply across the four fields of anthropology and far beyond, into other disciplines and occupations. If anyone ever asks you why an anthropologist is useful, this class will give you abundant material to answer them.



[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/)

Objectives

By the end of the semester you will

- Be able to analyze anthropological data using different techniques and frameworks;
- Recognize the analytical perspective that an author is using, or if he or she is combining several, and hurl appropriate epithets: “Structuralist!” “Functionalist!” “Crypto-social Darwinist!”;
- Be familiar with some of the leading thinkers, topics, and ideas in anthropology;
- Recognize influences across the field of anthropology, even when implicit, and how they unite (or divide) anthropologists, subfields, or schools of thought;
- Understand some of the contradictions and challenges inherent in the anthropological enterprise, and yet still find it engaging; and, finally...
- (Last but not least) Be able to explain to an HR administrator why he or she should, without delay, hire you!

Readings

Williams, Raymond. 1983. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. ed. Oxford University Press.

McGee, R. Jon, and Richard L. Warms. 2004. *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History*. 3d ed. McGraw Hill.

Perry, Richard J. 2003. *Five Key Concepts in Anthropological Thinking*. Prentice Hall.

Other readings—some mandatory, some optional, and some just confused—will be available **through electronic reserve** at the library.

Requirements

One of your primary goals this semester will be to develop a solid sense of the usefulness and distinctiveness of the analytical perspectives we will explore. The instructor’s belief is that all are useful, all have their place, and understanding thoroughly is far more important intellectually than learning to take potshots, making petty criticisms, or “choosing sides.” Each week I will do my best, at least 90% of the time, to demonstrate and make a case for each analytical method.

Grading

Your grade is based on the following components:

- 20% Class participation and attendance
- 10% Group presentation
- 25% Final exam
- 45% Response papers (10 total of 12 assigned)

Attendance

Attendance and participation in this course are absolutely essential. There is no single textbook for the course, and some of the most crucial points will *not* be made in the readings, but only in our discussions. In addition, because this course is about doing analyses, passively trying to cram facts or content into your head is a counterproductive exercise. Trying to do so would be like watching another person do a sport, hearing them talk about it, and hoping that doing so would make you develop the skills to perform the sport.

If you miss more than two periods, your final grade will automatically be lowered. If you need to miss for a university sanctioned reason, contact your dean or have the sponsoring university body (e.g., athletic department) contact me. Participation is required; instructor will call on students whether or not they raise their hands.



Group Presentation

Each student will be required to participate in a group presentation in which one of the analytical methods will be used to give an account of a familiar practice. The presentations will start during week 3, and during eight classes, we will hear from a group of three or four students, who will present a 20-minute analysis of some aspect of life with which all students are familiar. The key is NOT that the presentation be factually accurate, but that the presenters use the analytical perspective for that week.

Afterwards, we will evaluate the analysis in class and discuss in what ways it most effectively represented this analytical perspective, which aspect of the perspective the group chose to emphasize, and how the perspective might be accentuated or reinforced. Class participation will be especially essential during these post-presentation discussions.

A sign-up sheet for group presentation assignments will be distributed during the first week, assignments made and posted before the end of the first week to provide more than enough time for groups to work on these.

Final Exam

The final exam will be a take-home final, due during the exam period for this class. Students will be asked to choose from among a group of articles, giving examples from these articles of how an author has used one or more of the perspectives that we have studied in class, identify in the texts where these perspectives are most obviously present, and discuss how they relate to each other.

Response Papers

Response paper topics will be offered during most weeks after the first. Students are asked to submit ten of the twelve papers by the Friday afternoon of that week. No extensions will be given due to the pacing and the option of dropping two; late work will simply be counted as the essay from the next week. The instructor will try to give comments on early papers, but due to the large number of students, this will be selective and try to focus on the qualities that are most obvious, either strengths or weaknesses.

Please type, proofread, and print clearly these essays; please keep a copy of all work that you submit (there are horror stories of professors losing large numbers of papers, for example, when a colleague's briefcase was stolen). Note: Although students are allowed to subdivide papers to discuss multiple questions, these essays should be thoughtful, not "stream of thought."

Papers will be about 2 pages in length; if they are under length or otherwise inadequate, students will be allowed to compensate with excellence on the later papers (no extra credit will be available).

Please cite your texts appropriately; remember, not only is it necessary to avoid getting into trouble, it also earns abundant brownie points and demonstrates that you are reading the texts. Plagiarism is covered by the honor code, which the instructor upholds rigorously.



Schedule: topics, lectures and readings

Week 1 Analytical Perspectives, or, There's No View from Nowhere.

Topic Introduction: Analysis in anthropology, or how you look at things affects what you see. What is an analytical perspective and how can it lead to different conclusions from the same data? What is the difference between “theory” and “analysis”? How do the perspectives in the sample discussions of food prohibitions differ? How might you describe or categorize the differences: assumptions, terms, levels of analysis, data, cause-effect relations, objectives?

Readings

*Aug 23
(background)*

Barnard, Alan (2000) Visions of Anthropology, Chapter 1 of *History and Theory in Anthropology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-14.

Perry, *Five Key Concepts in Anthropological Thinking*, Chapter 1, pp. 1-11.

Williams, *Keywords*, “Theory.”

Leviticus 11. *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures*. The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, pp. 228-231. Deuteronomy 14, pp. 406-407.

Aug 25

Douglas, Mary (1971) “Deciphering a Meal.” In Clifford Geertz, ed., *Myth, Symbol, and Culture*. New York: W.W. Norton, pp. 61-81.

Harris, Marvin (1997 [1985]) “The Abominable Pig.” Reprinted in Carole Counihan and Penny van Esterik, eds., *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 67-79.

Note: **Please read the Aug. 25 readings first** as Aug. 23 readings are just background materials.

Week 2 Historical narrative, empiricism & The “un-interpreted” fact?

Topic Introduction: Even in simple narrative, such as a history, analytical perspectives guide decisions about relevance, cause and effect, and “context.” Storytellers have to make decisions about what to include, what they’re certain of, who the main characters are, and they often implicitly teach lessons through stories. As you read these different accounts, think of how they use different narrative conventions, what analytical decisions are concealed, what theoretical assumptions are being made, how “periods” or “events” are being defined, what is excluded as irrelevant, and why certain events are even chosen in the first place.

Readings

Aug 30

Williams, “Determine” and “History.”

DeMallie, Raymond J. (1993) “‘These Have No Ears’: Narrative and the Ethnohistorical Method.” *Ethnohistory* 40 (4): 515-538.

Fox, Richard Allan (1993) Excerpts from *Archaeology, History, and Custer's Last Stand: The Little Big Horn Reexamined*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, pp. 14-22, 114-119, 127-131, and 195-202 (325-340 available, but not required).

Fogelson, Raymond (1989) “The Ethnohistory of Events and Nonevents.” *Ethnohistory* 36 (2): 133-147.

Sept 1

Kuhn, Thomas S. (2000) “What Are Scientific Revolutions?” In his *The Road Since Structure: Philosophical Essays, 1970-1993, with an Autobiographical Interview*, edited by James Conant and John Haugeland. Chicago: University of Chicago, pp. 13-32.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (2000) “The Natural and the Human Sciences.” In his *The Road Since Structure: Philosophical Essays, 1970-1993, with an Autobiographical Interview*, edited by James Conant and John Haugeland. Chicago: University of Chicago, pp. 216-223.

Trigger, Bruce G. (2003) “Archaeological Theory: The Big Picture.” Grace Elizabeth Shalit Memorial Lecture Series, Department of Anthropology, Brigham Young University



Week 3 Modernization and Social Darwinism, or Does history have a goal?

Topic

Many analysts of human development see a recurring pattern in the development of societies, one of growing complexity, technological progress, and certain key thresholds. Is there a fundamental difference between “modern” and “traditional” societies? How do we explain the apparent quickening pace of change? What drives change, and is society developing in a particular direction? How do different authors define the difference between one stage and the next? Can it go backwards?

Readings

Williams, “Civilization,” “Development” and “Modern.”

Perry, chapter 2, pp. 12-54 (note: focus on pages 12-35 and 47-54).

Sept 6

Morgan, Lewis Henry, “Ethnical Periods,” in McGee & Warms, chap. 4.

White, Leslie, “Energy and the Evolution of Culture,” in McGee & Warms, chap. 20.

Levy, Marion J., Jr. (1966) *Modernization and the Structure of Societies: A Setting for International Affairs*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 9-26, 734-741.

Sept 8*

Mazrui, Ali A. (1968) “From Social Darwinism to Current Theories of Modernization: A Tradition of Analysis.” *World Politics* 21 (1): 69-83.

Appadurai, Arjun (1996) “Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology.” In his *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 48-65.

Sahlins, Marshall (1999) “What is Anthropological Enlightenment? Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28: i-xxiii.

Neo-Darwinism, dynamic systems theory: How well adapted are we?

Week 4

Topic

Introduction: The work of Charles Darwin and others also inspired anthropological theorists to consider how evolution might shape human beings without assuming that it had a goal or necessary stages. What is the role of adaptation in a strictly Darwinist approach? Does the development of culture make biological adaptation unnecessary for humans? What is the relationship between genetic and cultural adaptation to an environment? Is it nature or nurture? Can evolution produce dysfunction?

Readings

Williams, “Ecology” and “Evolution.”

Gould, Stephen Jay (1995) “Three Facets of Evolution.” In John Brockman and Katinka Matson, eds., *How Things Are: A Science Tool-Kit for the Mind*. New York: William Morrow, pp. 81-86.

Sept 13

Gould, Stephen Jay (1980) “The Panda’s Thumb.” *The Panda’s Thumb: More Reflections in Natural History*. New York: Norton, pp. 19-26.

Gould, Stephen Jay (1991) “The Panda’s Thumb of Technology.” *Bully for Brontosaurus: Reflections in Natural History*. New York: Norton, pp. 59-75.

Croom, Christopher (2003) “Language Origins: Did Language Evolve Like the Vertebrate Eye, or Was It More Like Bird Feathers?” Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, Hot Topics Series. URL <http://md2.csa.com.lib-proxy.nd.edu/hottopics/lang/oview.html>

Sept 15*
Guest: Agustín Fuentes

Barkow, Jerome, “The Elastic Between Genes and Culture,” in McGee & Warms, ch. 33.

Ehrlich, Paul, and Marcus Feldman (2003) “Genes and Culture: What Creates Our Behavioral Phenome?” *Current Anthropology* 44 (1): 87-107.

Oyama, Susan, Paul E. Griffiths, and Russell D. Gray (2001) “Introduction: What Is Developmental Systems Theory?” In Oyama, Gray, and Griffiths, eds. *Cycles of Contingency: Developmental Systems and Evolution*. Cambridge, Mass: Bradford/MIT, pp. 1-12.



Week 5 Interlude: Is Anthropology a Science? Is it important? Do we care?

Note: no class September 22nd! Installation of Fr. John Jenkins.

Topic Introduction: As we discussed at the outset of class, the status of anthropology—whether it is a science or humanity—has long been a subject of debate and continues to spark intense conflict within the field. What is the classic view of the “scientific method,” and how does it relate to anthropology? What is the relationship between science and the humanities, and how does it affect anthropology that it is a “science” in which human behavior (and understandings) are some of the primary research topics? Do different understandings of whether anthropology is a “science” and what that means make it impossible for anthropologists to all get along?

Readings Williams, “Science,” “Positivist,” and “Empirical.”
Dennett, Daniel C. (1995) “How to Make Mistakes.” In John Brockman and Katinka Matson, eds., *How Things Are: A Science Tool-Kit for the Mind*. New York: William Morrow, pp. 137-144.
Sept 20 Boyer, Pascal (1995) *Ceteris Paribus* (All Else Being Equal). In John Brockman and Katinka Matson, eds., *How Things Are: A Science Tool-Kit for the Mind*. New York: William Morrow, pp. 169-175.
Guest: Susan Blum Lett, James (1997) *Science, Reason, and Anthropology: The Principles of Rational Inquiry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 1-19.

Week 6 Functionalism, rational choice, and economistic modeling

Topic Introduction: When confronted by the odd practices of other peoples, one of anthropology’s most enduring analytical perspectives is to assume that, if a practice endures, it must be good for something. A functionalist perspective asks, “What useful function does this practice serve?” One contemporary form of this type of analysis is rational choice theory, in which situations are “modeled” as though all actors were making means-ends calculations, even if the actors do not think they are. Are people rational? If not, what guides their actions?

Readings Richard Perry, Chapter 5, pp. 133-158.
Sept 27 B. Malinowski, “The Essentials of Kula,” in McGee & Warms, chap. 13.
Marvin Harris, “The Cultural Ecology of India’s Sacred Cattle,” in McGee & Warms, chap. 23.
Sept 29* Silver, Harry (1981) “Calculating Risks: The Socioeconomic Foundations of Aesthetic Innovation in an Ashanti Carving Community.” *Ethnology* 20 (2): 101-114.
Rebecca Bliege Bird, Eric Alden Smith, and Douglas W. Bird, “The hunting handicap: costly signaling in human foraging strategies,” in McGee & Warms, chap. 34.
Myers-Scotton, Carol, and Agnes Bolonyai (2001) “Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model.” *Language in Society* 30: 1-28.



Week 7 Structural-functionalism, or, Society: the immortal animal

Topic Introduction: One of the most intriguing things about society according to many anthropologists is that, although people come and go—are born, grow old, change roles, get married and divorced, claim to be individuals, die—society often demonstrates great endurance. Even though the people in different roles or relationships change, these types of roles or relationships last. How might we analyze what is consistent in the constant flux of day-to-day life? How does society reproduce itself? How do institutions survive and provide continuity?

- Readings**
- Williams, "Society."
- Perry, chapter 4, pp. 95-108.
- Oct 4** Émile Durkheim, "The Cosmological System of Totemism and the Idea of Class," in McGee & Warms, chap. 7.
- Marcel Mauss, Extracts from *The Gift*, in McGee & Warms, chap. 8.
- Durkheim, Emile, and Marcel Mauss 1963 [1903] *Primitive Classification*. Trans. by Rodney Needham. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 10-26, 81-88.
- Oct 6*** A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "The Mother's Brother in South Africa," in McGee & Warms, chap. 14.
- E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "The Nuer of the Southern Sudan," in McGee & Warms, chap. 15.
- Max Gluckman, "The Licence in Ritual," in McGee & Warms, chap. 16.
- Viviana A. Zelizer (1996) "Payments and Social Ties." *Sociological Forum* 11 (3): 481-495.

Week 8 Structuralism, grammatical models, "cognitive anthropology": do thoughts have deep structure?

Topic Introduction: Language has long served as a marker of human distinctiveness and a model for learned differences. Clearly, different cultures commonly speak different languages. But more profoundly, how do differences in languages affect thought and perception? Are there deeper similarities between languages, especially in grammar or acquisition, that are concealed by their confusing variety? What causes these regularities in thought structure?

- Readings**
- Williams, "Structural."
- Perry, chap. 4, pp. 108-120
- Oct 11** Jakobson, Roman (1990) Why "Mama" and "Papa"? In his *On Language*, edited by Linda R. Waugh and Monique Monville-Burston. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, pp. 305-311.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, "Structural Analysis in Linguistics and in Anthropology," in McGee & Warms, chap. 26
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, "Four Winnebago Myths: A Structural Sketch," in McGee & Warms, chap. 27
- Oct 13*** Whorf, Benjamin (1956) "The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language." In *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: MIT, pp. 134-159.
- Diamond, Jared (1991) "Reinventions of Human Language." In D. Carlson & V. Bryant, eds., *Through the Looking Glass: Readings in Anthropology*. Pp. 195-203.
- Read one of the following:*
- Douglas, Mary, "External Boundaries," in McGee & Warms, chap. 38.
- Ortner, Sherry, "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" in McGee & Warms, ch. 28.
- Yentsch, Anne (1991) "The Symbolic Divisions of Pottery: Sex-related Attributes of English and Anglo-American Household Pots." In Randall McGuire and Robert Paynter, eds. *The Archaeology of Inequality*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 192-230.



Fall Break — Oct. 15 to 22.

Week 9 Marxist anthropology, materialism, critical theory: society as conflict

Topic Introduction: Karl Marx has inspired a range of creative projects in anthropology. Unlike structural-functionalists, who saw society as a consensus, Marx and those inspired by him began to see it as in constant conflict, with winners and losers constantly in struggle. These approaches ask: what is the nature of oppression? How and why is society divided? What brings about radical social change? How do dominant groups try to secure their dominance? Do oppressed groups resist? How? As you read, think about how materials discussed earlier in the semester might appear different from this perspective.

Readings

- Williams, "Bourgeois," "Capitalism," "Class," and "Hegemony."
Perry chapter 4, pp. 121-126.
- Oct 25 Marx, Karl (1977 [1857-8]) *Grundrisse* (excerpts). In David McLellan, ed., *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 345-387.
- Foucault, Michel (1980 [1977]) "Truth and Power." In his *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 109-133.
- Oct 27* Gilman, Antonio (1996 [1984]) "Explaining the Upper Paleolithic Revolution." Reprinted in Robert W. Preucel and Ian Hodder, eds., *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 220-239.
- Nash, June (1979) "Community and Class Consciousness." In *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 310-334.
- Scott, James C. (1984) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New York: Yale University Press, pp. 28-47.

Week 10 Cultural hermeneutics, symbolic analysis

Topic Introduction: Unlike other animals, humans understand the world around them through symbols, both language and other types. Essential to the variety of human lifeways is that the same material things may not be understood in the same way by different groups. Many anthropologists see that in order to understand this way of living, humans must be treated differently than other animals: like anthropologists, people interpret their realities and act on the basis of those interpretations. How does each of the authors treat symbols? Is culture just a difference in behavior? If not, what is it? Is it a useful analytical concept?

Readings

- Williams, "Culture" and "Subjective."
Perry, Chap. 3, pp. 55-69 and 77-94.
- Nov 1 Turner, Victor, "Symbols in Ndembu Ritual," in McGee & Warms, chap. 39
- Leach, Edmund (2000 [1958]) "Magical Hair." In *The Essential Edmund Leach. Volume II: Culture and Human Nature*, ed. by Stephen Hugh-Jones and James Laidlaw. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 177-201.
- Geertz, Clifford, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," in McGee & Warms, chap. 40



- Nov 3* Basso, Keith (1996) "Wisdom Sits in Places: Notes on a Western Apache Landscape." In S. Feld & K. Basso, eds. *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 53-90.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila (1991) "Writing Against Culture." In Richard G. Fox, ed., *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 137-162.
- Brumann, Christoph (1999) "Writing for Culture: Why a Successful Concept Should Not Be Discarded." *Current Anthropology* vol. 40, Supplement, February: S1-S13. Plus comments by Abu-Lughod et al., pp. S13-29.

Week 11 Symbolic interactionism, practice theory, phenomenology

Topic Introduction: Some sociologists and anthropologists grew discontent with explaining what they could observe (behavior) by using abstractions that could not be observed. They chose to focus instead on behavior patterns, norms of social interactions, and perceptions. They argued that society is built from "the ground up" rather than from the top down. What influences human behavior? What is the relationship between individual free choice and social constraint? Do patterns of perception shape behavior, creating the illusion that there is something like an over-arching culture?

- Readings** Williams, "Behavior," "Conventional," and "Experience."
- Erving Goffman (1956) "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor." *American Anthropologist* 58 (3): 473-502.
- Nov 8 Davis, Phillip W., and Jacqueline Boles (2003) "Pilgrim Apparition Work: Symbolization and Crowd Interaction When the Virgin Mary Appeared in Georgia." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 32 (4): 371-402.
- Ortner, Sherry (1994) "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." In Sherry B. Ortner, Nicholas Dirks, and Geoffrey Eley, eds., *Culture/ Power/ Theory: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 372-411.
- Nov 10* Stoller, Paul (1989) "Sound in Songhay Sorcery." *The Taste of Ethnographic Things: The Senses in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 113-122.
- Downey, Greg (2005) excerpt from *Learning Capoeira: Lessons in Cunning from an Afro-Brazilian Art*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 7-10 & 16-37.

Week 12 Psychoanalytic anthropology, culture and personality

Topic Introduction: Some anthropologists have tended to look to the dynamics of personality formation to explain cultural differences. Drawing heavily on the psychoanalytic work of Freud, some have sought to understand how basic familial dramas and dynamics shape character into the diversity we see around us. Although some of these approaches have been guilty of stereotyping, they ask penetrating questions about the individual's relation to society, how children are socialized, and why human nature does not appear universal.

- Readings** Williams, "Individual," "Personality," "Psychological," and "Unconscious."
- Perry chapter 4, pp. 69-77.
- Nov 15 Benedict, Ruth Fulton, "Psychological Types in the Cultures of the Southwest." In McGee & Warmes, chap. 17.
- Mead, Margaret, "Introduction" to *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. In McGee & Warmes, chap. 18.
- Renato Rosaldo, "Grief and a Headhunter's Rage," In McGee & Warmes, chap. 41.



Topic Postcolonial studies, subaltern studies

Introduction: The dissolution of colonial empires has led many theorists to think about the psychological dimensions of these massive sociological phenomena: How did colonization affect both the colonizer and the colonized? Did common psychological dilemmas influence the development of both? How might former colonial peoples respond when they gained independence? Did long-standing patterns of docility last beyond the end of political dominance? How is this perspective related to psychoanalytic perspectives discussed earlier?

Readings

Nov 17
Guest: Lisa
Mitchell

Said, Edward (1978) "Introduction." In his *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, pp. 1-28.

Fanon, Frantz (1963) "The Pitfalls of National Consciousness." In his *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, pp. 148-205.

Guha, Ranajit (1989) "Preface" and "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. vii-viii & 1-8.

Optional background reading:

Das, Veena (1989) "Subaltern as Perspective." *Subaltern Studies VI: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 310-324.

Week 13 Critique: Feminism and gender analysis

Note: No class November 24, Thanksgiving Holiday.

Topic

Introduction: Although not strictly its own perspective—feminist scholars come from a wide range of theoretical perspectives—feminism has been an important critique of anthropology, like it has of many social sciences. Feminist influences have placed the study of gender at the center of anthropology for a half-century, and anthropologists have been critical to feminism, both academic and political varieties. How does an attention to women and gender affect anthropology, both research methods and analysis? How does anthropology affect our understanding of what it means to be a man or woman?

Readings

Nov 22

Williams, "Sex" and "Violence."

Fausto-Sterling, Anne (1993) "The Five Sexes." *The Sciences* (March/April) 33 (2): pp. 20-25.

Hacking, Ian (1999) "Are you a Social Constructionist?" *Lingua Franca* (May/June): 65-72.

Strum, Shirley C., and Linda M. Fedigan (1999) "Theory, Method, Gender, and Culture: What Changed Our Views of Primate Society?" In Shirley C. Strum, Donald G. Lindburg, and David Hamburg, eds., *The New Physical Anthropology: Science, Humanism, and Critical Reflection*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 67-105.

Read one of the following:

Spector, Janet D. (1996 [1991]) "What This Awl Means: Toward a Feminist Archaeology." In Robert W. Preucel and Ian Hodder, eds., *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 485-500.

Gottlieb, Alma (2002) "Interpreting Gender and Sexuality: Approaches from Cultural Anthropology." In Jeremy MacClancy, ed., *Exotic no More: Anthropology on the Front Lines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 167-189.

Rubin, Gayle (2000) "Sites, Settlements, and Urban Sex: Archaeology and the Study of Gay Leathermen in San Francisco, 1955-1995." In Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds., *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 62-88.



Week 14 Critique: Postmodernity, Post-structuralism, Postprocessualism & the end of coherence?

Note: Class **may be canceled on December 1, 2005**, due to AAA meetings.

Topic Introduction: Some contemporary analysts look at the world around themselves and feel that it is no longer intellectually possible to put together a coherent account of what is happening, nor is it possible to ignore the imbrication of anthropologists in the subjects they try to study. They suggest that we have reached a cultural and intellectual moment that is beyond or after modernity—"post-modernity"—because of the juxtaposition of incompatible values and systems. Some anthropologists have responded by arguing that the very goals of our field must change to reflect this new condition of the world around us.

Readings

Nov 29

Perry, chapter 6, pp. 159-188.

Harvey, David (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. vii, 1-65.

Spiro, Melford E. (1996) "Postmodernist Anthropology, Subjectivity, and Science: A Modernist Critique." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38 (4): 759-780.

Optional background reading:

Wilk, Richard R. (1999) "Real Belizean Food': Building Local Identity in the Transnational Caribbean." *American Anthropologist* 101 (2): 244-255.

Costello, Julia G. (2000) "Red Light Voices: An Archaeological Drama of Late Nineteenth-Century Prostitution." In Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds., *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 160-175.

Taussig, Michael (1992) "Homesickness" & "Dada." In his *The Nervous System*. New York: Routledge, pp. 149-182, 190-193.

Week 15 Final reflections: Is there a reason to reach for unity?

Topic Introduction: Given all the different perspectives and critiques that we have studied, is it possible to defend the idea that all these forms of analyses and subject matters should remain under a single tent? Is there still some underlying commonality or shared goals that bring together the field? We will pause at the end to reflect on this as we prepare for the end of the semester and final exam.

Readings

Dec 6

Williams, "Ism."

Perry, Epilogue, pp. 189-198.

Tim Ingold (1998) "From complementarity to obviation: on dissolving the boundaries between social and biological anthropology, archaeology and psychology." *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 123 (1): 21-52.

