

Chapter 1 : Anthropology and Autobiography - PDF Free Download

Autobiography is developed alongside political, intellectual, and historical changes. The anthropologists confront and examine issues of racism, reciprocity and friendships. Anthropology and Autobiography will appeal to anthropologists and social scientists interested in ethnographic approaches, the self, reflexivity, qualitative methodology.

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

humans, how the evolutionary past of *Homo sapiens* has influenced its social organization and culture, and from social sciences, including the organization of human social and cultural relations, institutions, social conflicts, etc. According to Clifford Geertz, "anthropology is perhaps the last of the great nineteenth-century conglomerate disciplines still for the most part organizationally intact. Long after natural history, moral philosophy, philology, and political economy have dissolved into their specialized successors, it has remained a diffuse assemblage of ethnology, human biology, comparative linguistics, and prehistory, held together mainly by the vested interests, sunk costs, and administrative habits of academia, and by a romantic image of comprehensive scholarship. During the 1950s and 1960s, there was an epistemological shift away from the positivist traditions that had largely informed the discipline. In contrast, archaeology and biological anthropology remained largely positivist. Due to this difference in epistemology, the four sub-fields of anthropology have lacked cohesion over the last several decades. Cultural anthropology, Social anthropology, and Sociocultural anthropology Sociocultural anthropology draws together the principle axes of cultural anthropology and social anthropology. Cultural anthropology is the comparative study of the manifold ways in which people make sense of the world around them, while social anthropology is the study of the relationships among individuals and groups. There is no hard-and-fast distinction between them, and these categories overlap to a considerable degree. Inquiry in sociocultural anthropology is guided in part by cultural relativism, the attempt to understand other societies in terms of their own cultural symbols and values. Ethnography can refer to both a methodology and the product of ethnographic research, i. As a methodology, ethnography is based upon long-term fieldwork within a community or other research site. Participant observation is one of the foundational methods of social and cultural anthropology. The process of participant-observation can be especially helpful to understanding a culture from an emic conceptual, vs. The study of kinship and social organization is a central focus of sociocultural anthropology, as kinship is a human universal. Sociocultural anthropology also covers economic and political organization, law and conflict resolution, patterns of consumption and exchange, material culture, technology, infrastructure, gender relations, ethnicity, childrearing and socialization, religion, myth, symbols, values, etiquette, worldview, sports, music, nutrition, recreation, games, food, festivals, and language which is also the object of study in linguistic anthropology. Comparison across cultures is a key element of method in sociocultural anthropology, including the industrialized and de-industrialized West.

Chapter 2 : Biological anthropology - Wikipedia

Anthropology and Autobiography will appeal to anthropologists and social scientists interested in ethnographic approaches, the self, reflexivity, qualitative methodology, and the production of texts. Search.

Southern England, s 9. The young man in the foreground was the little boy on her knee in the photograph. The theme was the same as the ensuing title of the book; Anthropology and autobiography. Contributors were invited to consider one or more of the following themes: Social anthropology, more than any other discipline in the humanities and the social sciences, has developed the practice of intensive fieldwork by a single individual, sometimes in collaboration with a spouse. The implications of this unique experience have not been fully theorised. Contrary to the claim that reflexivity has been incorporated into the discipline, there are few published examples. Some have begun to appear in the US. Otherwise, autobiographical accounts have been split off into novels, secreted under pseudonyms or in diaries. Alternatively, accounts appear as imagined heroism or are popularised as comic yarns for a readership indifferent to ethnography. Participant observation involves either close or superficial rapport with a variety of individuals. Their specificity is often lost or generalised in the standard monograph which tends to present the society through the overarching authority of the named author. Increasing interest in autobiographical narratives or life histories often reprocessed as biographies reveals the power of the individual voice. In the construction of the final ethnography, not only are the voices of many others concealed, but also that of the author. Like fieldwork, the process of writing and the creation of the final text involve a series of choices which depend on the selective interests of the ethnographer. Specialists in literary texts who have begun to re-examine ethnographies as texts ignore the experiential knowledge and practice of field-work. Their work, moreover, does not emerge from lived relationships in the cross-cultural encounter. The themes overlapped and extended certain strands from previous ASA conferences, namely those producing Semantic Anthropology Parkin and Anthropology at Home Jackson. The words by Edmund Leach at the ASA conference effectively launched the next but one when he declared: There can be no future for tribal ethnography of a purportedly objective kind. Ethnographers must admit the reflexivity of their activities; they must become autobiographical. But with this changed orientation, ethnographers should be able to contribute to the better understanding of historical ethnography. The sessions of paired papers brought out revealing juxtapositions and reciprocal insights. Many refractions of self emerged: Again, as is customary within the discipline, some anthropologists gave, in oral discussion, revealing autobiographical accounts which helped to locate their ethnographies. Although prepared to make these personalised interventions to an audience of over a hundred, they did not consider them relevant for academic publication. Analysing relations with individuals encountered in fieldwork raised sensitive questions. What was an appropriate term for an assistant working with an anthropologist over a long period? Other words proved unsatisfactory or misleading. Participants recalled moments of misguided perceptions and mutual misunderstandings which themselves produced powerful insights. Along with multiple selves and others, the topic of multiple texts emerged: The point was made that reflexivity was not carried through to the production of texts. Textual debates risked being too vaguely situated; poetics without politics and devoid of power relations. Monographs have too often been presented, then read as definitive and timeless, rather than selective and historically contingent. Ethnography requires a personal lens, its historicity made explicit. One participant suggested that the recognition of shared meanings during fieldwork needed to be extended to the production of texts; she had sent her monograph back to the people for possible revision before publication. Another participant said that she wrote for a readership in the dominant racist society to expose their treatment of a persecuted minority. If the chapters in this book attest to the vibrant cross-currents of discussion, they cannot convey the wit and laughter that enlivened the four days of the conference. There were also passionate disagreements. For some the notion of autobiography within the social sciences is still deeply threatening. Autobiography was also confused with self-aggrandisement, despite the evidence to the contrary from many of the papers. One participant commented afterwards that an ASA conference provides an unusual forum for debate and open disagreement because only one session is organised at a time. Those who disagree with a

specific theme cannot avoid hearing the detailed analysis. Those with shared assumptions have to learn about the opposition. As is usual at these events, more papers were presented than those included here. Some of the papers included had to be rigorously pared down. Others were in any case withdrawn for publication elsewhere. We are grateful to those who chaired sessions: Our warmest thanks are due to Anne Akeroyd who worked for many months as local organiser to provide congenial conditions for this lively meeting. Finally, we thank Heather Gibson for her encouraging and patient support for this project from its inception through to publication. Past, Present and Future. Chapman eds History and Ethnicity. Chapter 1 Anthropology and autobiography Participatory experience and embodied knowledge Judith Okely This collection is not concerned with the autobiographies of individual academics who happen to be anthropologists. Autobiography for its own sake is increasingly recognised by the literary canon as a genre Olney and, together with individual biographies, is being used within history Bertaux ; Vincent ; Bland and John Doubtless anthropologists could make innovative contributions in those domains. Within the discipline of anthropology, there is further scope for its insertion. In the early s, Scholte saw reflexivity as a critical, emancipatory exercise which liberated anthropology from any vestige of a value-free scientism: In this volume, Kirsten Hastrup draws attention to the peculiar reality in the field. He gave examples from his own work. My own advice to anthropology departments is that this volume be kept in a locked cupboard, with the key in the possession of the head of department, and that students be lent it only when a strong case is made out by their tutors. This use of the classical Greek myth is even more confused. Self-adoration is quite different from self-awareness and a critical scrutiny of the self. Indeed those who protect the self from scrutiny could as well be labelled self-satisfied and arrogant in presuming their presence and relations with others to be unproblematic. Reflexivity is incorrectly confused with self-adoration Babcock A fundamental aspect of anthropology concerns the relationships between cultures or groups. Fieldwork practice is always concerned with relationships cf. The anthropologist has to form long-term links with others across the cultural divide, however problematic. All of the contributors to this volume, in so far as they write of themselves, consider the self in terms of their relations with others. The autobiographical experience of fieldwork requires the deconstruction of those relationships with the rigour demanded elsewhere in the discipline. Where the encounter is exoticised, the autobiographical account merely embodies at an individual level the discredited practice of fictionalising the other in order to affirm western dominance. By contrast, the autobiography of fieldwork is about lived interactions, participatory experience and embodied knowledge; whose aspects ethnographers have not fully theorised. Geertz has, for example, reduced fieldwork to an instrumental account. As Carrithers has noted: The new emphasis on fieldwork as writing sees the encounter and experience as unproblematic. In an extreme stance, fieldwork has been downgraded to the mechanical collection of ethnography which is contrasted with the superior invention of theory Friedman Anyone apparently, can do ethnography, it is for the deskbound theoreticians to interpret it. This brahminical division assumes that the field experience is separable from theory, that the enterprise of inquiry is discontinuous from its results Rabinow Participant observation textbooks which reduce fieldwork to a set of laboratory procedures rest on the same assumptions. Before the textual critics, fieldwork was also considered theoretically unproblematic by much of the academy. Its peculiarity, drama, fear and wonder were neither to be contemplated nor fully explored in print. Neophytes were simply to get on with the job with tight-lipped discipline cf. Here, positivism destroys the notion of experience which I wish to evoke. The experience of fieldwork is totalising and draws on the whole being. Autobiography dismantles the positivist machine. An interest in the autobiographical dimension of the anthropological encounter has been conflated with a suggestion that ethnography has no other reality than a literary make-believe e. Yet, as Smith argues, the autobiographical contract is not as fluid as that which binds the fiction writer and the reader: The nature of that truth is best understood as the struggle of a historical rather than a fictional person to come to terms with her own past. Yet a reflexivity which excludes the political is itself unreflective. In this way the anthropologist as future author is made self-conscious, critical and reflexive about the encounter and its possible power relations Street Postmodernism which challenges master narratives and total systems has itself been understood as an extreme form of relativism where, in an atmosphere of valueless cynicism, anything goes. The disintegration of totalities, however, can be differentially interpreted as

the unleashing of the full range of creative possibilities Nicholson The cultural past can also be re-examined. Alternative paradigms have always existed at the margins; in this case, autobiographical texts which defied the master canon. Postmodernism may have created a climate where different autobiographies elicit new interest, but the former did not create the latter. Hesitations about incorporating and expanding the idea of autobiography into anthropology rest on very western, ethnocentric traditions. This is not to deny that autobiography can ever be more than a construction Spencer, Kenna, Rapport, this volume , but the specific criteria for its acceptance within a genre has been confined to the Eurocentric and literary canon. The western origin of the form is St Augustine with other major examples from Rousseau and J. While there will have been historical fluctuations in the tradition, western writers have worked within and against it. Autobiographies from seemingly vocationless women have been judged neither culturally nor aesthetically significant by earlier normative criteria Smith

Chapter 3 : Anthropology and Autobiography by Judith Okely

Anthropology and Autobiography provides unique insights into the fieldwork, autobiographical materials and/or textual critiques of anthropologists, many of whose ethnographies are already familiar. It considers the role of the anthropologist as fieldworker and writer, examining the ways in which nationality, age, gender, and personal history.

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

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

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

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

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

sciences or in the humanities.

Chapter 4 : calendrierdelascience.com | Anthropology and Autobiography | | Judith Okely | Boeken

Anthropology and Autobiography provides unique insights into the fieldwork, autobiographical materials and/or textual critiques of anthropologists, many of whose ethnographies are alr But until now, the theoretical implications of its use have not been fully explored.

Chapter 5 : Clifford Geertz | American anthropologist | calendrierdelascience.com

Provides insights into the validity of fieldwork autobiography and the textual critique of anthropologists, presenting new scope for the genre of autobiography and contributing to debates about.

Chapter 6 : Anthropology and Autobiography - Download Free EBooks

Anthropology and Autobiography provides unique insights into the fieldwork, autobiographical materials and/or textual critiques of anthropologists, many of whose ethnographies are already familiar.

Chapter 7 : anthropology | Definition, Branches, History, & Facts | calendrierdelascience.com

Anthropology and autobiography Social anthropology, more than any other discipline in the humanities and the social sciences, has developed the practice of intensive fieldwork by a single individual.

Chapter 8 : Anthropology and autobiography | Search Results | IUCAT

Anthropology and Autobiography provides unique insights into the fieldwork, autobiographical materials and/or textual critiques of anthropologists, many of whose ethnographies are already familiar. It considers the role of the anthropologist as fieldworker and writer, examining the ways in which nationality, age, gender, and personal.

Chapter 9 : Zora Neale Hurston - Anthropology - Oxford Bibliographies

Read "Anthropology and Autobiography" by Helen Callaway with Rakuten Kobo. Anthropological writings by anthropologists in the field have long been a valuable tool to the profession.