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THE GRAND TOUR: AN OVERVIEW OF CHANGE TYPES

Social scientists have studied a remarkably wide assortment of change phenomena. They have conceptualized them through types, methods, and theories. Partially they represent fashions or more noticeable phenomena at particular times such as globalization today or acculturation in the 1950s and 1960s. Yet, they all still contain some validity no matter the era. No change type needs to be viewed as completely superseding previously studied types—none is completely obsolete. By just reviewing the change types within a few interrelated clusters, we can learn a lot about the nature of social and cultural change.

Change Cluster Number One: The Elemental Types of Innovation, Diffusion, and Stimulus Diffusion

All sociocultural change begins with individual characteristics, items, or traits that are then linked with other traits and established in cultural inventories such as agricultural practices, rituals, and technological complexes. Borrowing from A. L. Kroeber (1948), we can say that all change begins with innovation, which normally involves the creation of new things by the combining and recombining of
existing items of culture. Innovation is always necessary, but paradoxically, it is among the least frequent of change types. Some individuals are noted as innovators, but the acceptance of innovations is a social process—a climate of acceptability has to be present.

Kroeber outlined several types of innovation. The first is *invention*, which consists of the combination of existing elements drawn from culture and/or relevant observations from nature. The existence of containers, such as bowls, could be combined with the observations of logs floating downstream into an invention of dugout canoes as floating containers of people. A later more profound example is the combination of a ship’s rudder, an internal combustion engine, and a light glider frame with wings to create the airplane. Nothing is invented out of a vacuum, and when complexity develops within a society, then that provides more cultural materials for more variety to be selected toward more inventions. Then, because of the existence of a certain range of items and the conditions attached to particular historical situations, some innovations may become virtually inevitable. Accordingly, in such cases, they do not necessarily rely on the specific genius of inventors—their time has come, so to speak.

The second and very much more common type of innovation is *variation*, which consists of relatively minor changes made upon existing items of culture or technology. Small details, twists, and accepted improvisations might be added to existing folk tales or rituals. Women’s fashions, such as dresses, may provide another example—the design is basic and ancient, but fashion may dictate factors such as the presence or absence of sleeves, or collars and hemline
lengths. The basic design of automobiles was established during the times of Karl Benz, Gottlieb Daimler, and Henry Ford—internal combustion engines, valves, axles and tires, carburetors, exhausts, and so forth—but styles and improvements as variations have been constant almost every year of the automobile’s existence.

Kroeber labels the final stage of innovation as tentation—that which involves the specific, purposeful search for solutions to problems. In the past, it seems as if invention proper was more accidental or emerged in the context of normal cultural practice or change. In the case of tentation, there is an explicit search for a solution. The search for new medicines during an epidemic would be an example. Tentation appears to be related to the maxim “necessity is the mother of invention,” which Kroeber suggests is far from being universal. Tentation, while sporadic culturally, comes into more formal being with the institutionalization of science and, for example, the more recent phenomena of laboratories devoted to finding cures for disease as well as the establishment of centers for research and development searching for solutions in particular areas. This more recent phenomenon of tentation accounts in part for the astonishing rapidity of change in innovations and our knowledge base since the time of the Industrial Revolution.

It also helps that the cultural inventory from which innovation is derived is also ever-increasingly bolstered by the breakdown of social boundaries through globalization. Cultural items of behavior, technology, institutions, and beliefs have
been spread so rapidly since the Age of Discovery that there are now very few meaningful boundaries.

While innovation is necessary for cultural change, it is much less common than diffusion or cultural borrowing. New items, when innovated, are distributed and accepted within particular societies, but then they have the potentiality of crossing societal and cultural boundaries that are always permeable at some level. This relates to the special adaptive capacity of human culture as being a learned phenomenon from within and without a social group’s boundaries. Humans can learn adaptive solutions, or easier ways of doing things, from other cultures implying that they don’t have to start anew and invest in a solution—they can borrow one or adjust one that has already been invented. For the purposes of this discussion, diffusion will refer to borrowings among societies that are, at least for the time being, autonomous from each other, although as we will see later, diffusion can blend into acculturation where previously autonomous societies come together to form a common society.

As Ralph Linton (1937) demonstrated in his frequently cited and satirical “100% American,” the inventory of any sociocultural systems is close to 90% or more borrowed from other cultures or historical periods from other groups. Ultimately, the cultural history of the world is a shared one. Just consider the domain of agriculture and how much of our current crop species—corn, potatoes, beans, squash, tomatoes, peppers, vanilla, etc.—came from indigenous peoples of the New World. In diffusion, whatever items there are under consideration have been tried and tested by originating societies before they are picked up by
the borrowing society—overall being much more economical and efficient than invention or tentation.

Kroeber (1940) coined an intriguing form of change that sits in between innovation and diffusion—he called it *stimulus diffusion* a circumstance that draws upon both principles—something that is observed from another society and has merit but is not fully understood and is reinvented. In early metal ages, bronze was first invented in the Near East and had made its way to the Far East through Central Asian trade routes. Asian peoples made implements and weapons from copper, but knew that there was something more durable and effective in the bronze items that they examined. Not knowing the combination of copper and tin, they reinvented an alloy through the combination of copper and lead. In a parallel fashion, Marco Polo brought dishware that was much durable and refined than crude European pottery back from China. The Chinese refused to reveal the secret ingredients of “chinaware,” so the Italians reinvented a version of their own.

Another dimension raised by Kroeber (1948) is that often when superior items are transferred from one society to another, there is an eventual “selective elimination” of the less effective items. Some of us are old enough to remember computer cards—whereby data was “punched in” through a series of holes in cards and presented for analysis to the technicians running mainframe computers. With the invention and diffusion of personal computers, punch cards are long gone. In some cases, though with selective elimination, the obsolete items become stored in museums, or in the case of outdated ideas, libraries.
Some items take on new functions—the sports of archery and fencing represent earlier forms of battle weaponry; the importance of horses and equestrian cultures are kept alive through rodeos and equestrian competitions.

A form of change that is constant is the modification of a culture’s inventory through variation, invention, tentation, and borrowing, as well as reinventing through stimulus diffusion.

**Change Cluster II: Sociocultural Evolution**

That societies evolve through time was the first and most fundamental anthropological insight regarding change. Innovations, diffused items, and those coming through stimulus diffusion are accumulated into overall adaptive and somewhat integrated complexes. These adaptive complexes organized around some principal innovations such as hunting tools, the domestication of crops and animals, factories, and the establishment of factory production. For the most part, it does seem that the significant drivers of evolution are innovations and variations that are most relevant to economy and environmental adaptation. Through evolution, the individual items that have been invented or diffused are integrated and made more consistent with each other. After the fact, we can recognize stages in evolution, and, while controversial, evolutionists have recognized long-term trends of simple to more complex forms.

Consider agriculture as a classic example. Agriculture appeared in both the Near East approximately 10,000 years ago and in northern Mexico approximately 6,000 years ago. Settled village, tribal societies, with full
complexes did not emerge immediately— it took several thousand years before the stage of Neolithic or Village farming had crystallized in its evolution. New crops were experimented with, new technologies, peoples’ commitments to tending the crops and permanent settlements as opposed to migratory hunting and gathering, new forms of kinship based resource and managing units, and new values and belief systems associated with tribal religions emerged. At the same time, dimensions of previous foraging societies were shed while some things persisted, but perhaps more adapted to the new circumstances— e.g., the bow and arrow, pottery, and shamanism.

In the study of evolution, several types have been recognized (Sahlins and Service 1960). General, or universal evolution, refers to the broad stages of human cultural development on a worldwide basis. This would involve the averaging out of trends associated with large time periods and stages—hunting and gathering, horticulture, pastoralism, tribal societies, intensive agriculture and the state, and the industrial period. The analogy to biological evolution is found with such stages as those associated with single-celled animals, fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and humanity. Specific evolution refers to changes relevant to the long-term cultural history of a particular region or society. One could refer to the specific evolution of Andean society, tracing back to early hunters and gatherers through the emergence of horticulture as associated with the potato, and then the gradual emergence of small warring states that ultimately coalesced into the Inca Empire.
Related to evolution, but almost its opposite, is *cultural involution*—a form of stagnating change. The term involution was used by Clifford Geertz (1963) in his discussion of agriculture in Java. The concept is borrowed from art history, where, in certain types of style, e.g., Byzantine and Rococo, basic shapes and styles had been firmly established. Over time, the shapes and styles are simply repeated filling up more and more space rather than permitting any advances. In Geertz’s view, at least in the 1950s, Indonesian agriculture was so involuted or involved in a long-term stagnation process with increasing complexity, it could not participate in modernized agriculture permitting the country’s participation in twentieth century industrialization and modernization. Java had shifted from a tribal form of slash and burn to irrigation with paddy fields at the time of expansion of Hindu states into the region. That form of agriculture was focused on high yields of rice and required large amounts of labor, which led to more rice, which led to higher populations.

State kingdoms flourished in Java until the coming of the Dutch in the seventeenth century. Conquering the kingdoms, the Dutch placed more and more attention on the growing of spices for their markets in Europe. Peasants were forced to pay less attention to their own domestic needs and put more into accumulating tribute to the Dutch in the form of spices. That could take up to, and sometimes more than, half of their labor. This forced them to continuously place more land into paddy fields requiring more labor, more rice, and more population. As time went on, much of the landscape of Java was occupied by small paddy fields and complex socio-economic arrangements of cooperation, renting, and
relations among wealthier and poorer peasants. More and more of the landscape and social arrangements became repetitions of the same theme. During World War II, the Japanese supplanted the Dutch. When the Dutch came back after the defeat of the Japanese and attempted to reestablish their exploitative colonial form of tribute, a nationalist movement rapidly defeated them. Free of both Dutch and Japanese colonialism, Javanese agriculture continued in the process of involution—free of the demands of producing spices, more rice was produced leading to higher populations, which provided the human labor for growing more rice which created higher populations that produced rice and other crops until practically all of the available land was taken up using the traditional labor intensive form of agriculture. According to Geertz, the system was so involuted it could not, in the 1950s, provide an opening for the mechanization of farming and land reforms that would lead to modernization in which excess rice could be sold on international markets and could have provided the capital for industrialization, as was the case in Japan. Involution can refer to situations of stagnation in which changes are still occurring, but only leading to more complexity of the existing form and not allowing breakthroughs.

*Revolution*, or very rapid change, is the next type of change that may refer broadly to evolution and long-term change. Regarding stages of evolution, several revolutions are often referred to—the Agricultural Revolution and the Industrial Revolution—the first lasting several thousand (out of 3,000,000 years) and the second about two hundred years. Relatively speaking, the changes that
occurred in means of production, social arrangements, values, and so forth were quite dramatic in contrast to the previous stages.

There are other types of revolutionary change as well. Eric Wolf (1969) refers to the relatively shorter time frames of Peasant Revolutions in the twentieth century—Mexico, Algeria, Russia, China, Vietnam, and Cuba—all based on land reform needs and most being communist in origin. All of these revolutions were violent and all of them have been of much shorter term than the Industrial and the Agricultural revolutions. What is interesting about all of them is that they were mechanisms of breaking through involuted circumstances—in general, the agricultural systems in such countries represented a kind of outdated feudalism or situations where rich absentee land owners exploited peasant workers or shareholders without effective production. Major dimensions of the revolutions were drastic transformations of the agricultural systems, which, in some cases, may have led to more problems than solutions. In the cases of these revolutions, violent and imposed changes were bought about in many dimensions of society.

The concept of revolution has many nuances such as the basic questions of when a revolution is complete, how long does it last, and how comprehensive it is. Also we may, at least loosely, speak of other types of more limited revolutions that may intersect with the other types of change that we are discussing in this book. For instance, we can refer to the feminist revolution that began in the 1960s, and the digital revolution that is well underway now.
Change Cluster Number Three: Acculturation and Assimilation

In popular speech, *acculturation* is sometimes confused with the term *enculturation*, which means learning your own culture. Although it should be noted that both terms imply learning (your own or parts of another culture) and both are processes involving change, the basic definition of *acculturation* is that it consists of those phenomena that come about when groups having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact with subsequent changes in the original or cultural patterns of both groups (Teske and Nelson 1974). It implies that the societies were previously autonomous but are not anymore—now a subordinate group and in continuous contact with the dominant subsociety, they form a single sociocultural system with one of the former autonomous societies. Obviously, a situation of diffusion could eventually lead to acculturation.

There is normally a feedback relationship involving individuals and groups—some individuals acculturate more rapidly and as time progresses, they may become a majority influencing the direction of the group. The directions involved can be one or two way, but there is more often a tendency for the direction to be one-way. However, elements, as in the diffusion process, may be provided to a more powerful or numerous society as, for instance, with pizza from Italian immigrants to the general population. Dominance is ultimately involved in some sense or another—it may not be in numbers; it may be political, economic, technological, or even moral as in the case with some missionary situations. Complete dominance occurs when society A can recruit members of society B into positions of low status and exclude members of society B who wish
admission to activities of high or equal status, an example being whites and non-whites in South Africa in the recent Apartheid past. The opposite would be a parity in which both A and B would have the ability to exclude the others from positions of high status while at the same time lacking the ability to recruit the others at low statuses (this remains more theoretical than actual since Teske and Nelson give no examples).

They offer some subtypes. One suggested type Teske and Nelson call **blind acculturation** (sometimes referred to as undirected change). Here, different cultures near one another have some influence on each other and cultural items are voluntarily chosen. The opposite is **imposed acculturation**, or **directed change**, which implies a suppression of the other people’s culture and the enforced imposition of the dominant group’s behavior patterns and ideas. Yet another is **antagonistic**, or **resistant acculturation**, where there is resistance to the lending or dominant society, and people may accept new means to the same ends (e.g., technologies such as rifles for hunting) but not the goals of major society (e.g., farming, settled life, and Christianity), or they may accept some things to draw attention away from themselves (e.g., slaves in Cuba appearing to be Catholics but actually practicing Santeria, a disguised version of West African polytheistic worship). **Controlled**, or **compartmentalized acculturation**, is a situation whereby people accept some things that are viewed as compatible or not threatening, but resists others as for instance with Hutterites in Canada accepting farming technology but not TV and consumer values. Regarding values in acculturation, according to Teske and Nelson (Ibid), value
identifications are not necessary conditions for acculturation. There may be
directed or forced change where certain elements may be accelerated by forcing
people to change, yet forcing them to change their values cannot be
accomplished. In many cases when things are accepted, they are incorporated
within existing value systems, though external behavioral patterns may change
without internal mental changes.

Assimilation is a process whereby groups or individuals acquire
sentiments, values, and come to share experience and history with another
group, blending into a single culture becoming incorporated into a common social
and cultural life (Ibid). Acculturation and assimilation may be interrelated but they
are not necessarily interdependent (one following from the other). Assimilation
differs from acculturation in that it requires a very definite acceptance of the out-
group by the dominating group, and opening up the possibilities for a common
set of identifications. Assimilation is very much a voluntary process—both the
dominant or majority society and the subordinate or less numerous people must
equally desire the absorption of one group into the other, and there must be an
ultimate sharing of identity, values, and attitudes as well as institutional
participation. Assimilation is a type of change that occurs more frequently in an
immigrant experience. As a frequently recognized example, German and
Scandinavian Protestants found, at least at first, it easier to assimilate into
mainstream American and Canadian societies than immigrants from other
traditions.
Acculturation and assimilation have fallen out of favor as usages in anthropology, although they both were extremely important in the history of change theories. Appendix C deals with them.

**Culture Change Cluster Number Five: Absolute Decline, or Collapse and Rebirth**

The concepts of cultural collapse or extinction and revitalization are put in the same cluster because they are the opposite of each other. The former sees the gradual erosion and even disappearance of a sociocultural system; the latter sees its rejuvenation.

*Collapse* is rarely discussed in anthropology but implicitly recognized. Change is universal and ubiquitous under normal circumstances—all societies, no matter how traditional, are always undergoing change because of their links through diffusion, trade, intermarriage, and the fact that culture itself allows for change, at least through borrowing and reinterpretation. The various other types of change, as mentioned previously and to be touched upon later, are in play—including those beyond the basics of innovation and diffusion. Change normally is accumulative and additive, even though some things may be replaced. Things tend to get more complex rather than simple.

However, there are a few cases where there has been change in the forms of decline and cultural loss, all without replacement. One example is the Siriono of Bolivia that Allan Holmberg (1950) studied in the 1930s. This grouping had once been an advanced tropical horticultural tribal society that, because of
intensive warfare stimulated by the coming of the Portuguese and Spanish, had been forced to retreat to the more remote regions of the Amazon Basin. With rudimentary technology and living in scattered bands, they were forced to forage for meager resources, having lost agriculture and the remnants of a previously much more complex religious system.

Another example can be seen with the Easter Island Polynesian society. Easter Island was the last discovered and settled region in the Polynesian triangle. It was lush with forest and agricultural lands and was the home for thousands of advanced tribal peoples. Warfare and soil denudations led to major declines and by the time the Europeans arrived, only several hundred people remained, clinging on to fragments of a once more complicated culture that was evidenced in artifacts such as massive statues (Diamond 2005).

Declines found in civilizations such as the Maya or in Europe during the Dark Ages may resemble deculturation, but they are not completely so since, for instance, with the Maya, there was later acculturation through contact with the Spanish and various forms of folk rejuvenations. Europe also experienced the Renaissance. Therefore, collapse is restricted to those circumstance where change brings about major cultural loses, sometimes to the point of complete disappearance of sociocultural systems. This will be our last view of it in this book, but this topic is well covered in archeologist Joseph Tainter’s (1988) *The Collapse of Complex Societies* and Jared Diamond’s (2005) *Collapse*.

Nonetheless, there are frequently times in the cultural histories of many societies when there are collective stresses and threats that may lead to the
breakdown or fears of possible disappearance. The sources may come from the conquest by a harsh invading foreign system (possibly through acculturation), or through attempts at development or modernizations as discussed in Chapters Five and Six. They may come through ecological and health crises such as epidemics or dramatic climate changes leading to massive population drops and suffering, or there may be combinations of contact disruptions and health and environmental changes. The sources of the threats may come externally or internally. At any rate, the older, more established social institutions, cultural belief systems, behaviors might appear to some to no longer seem to serve its people as well as in the past. As the crisis continues, especially in a situation that leads to further dysfunctionality, social, economic, and health deteriorations, a total breakdown of the sociocultural system and its disappearance or absorption into another one can eventually happen. Broadly, such a circumstance might resemble the potential for collapse.

Yet, according to Anthony Wallace (1956), there is always an opportunity for recovery. Wallace used an organic analogy of the mind or the body's innate capacity to heal itself. He saw the ideological system, especially that contained within spiritually, as the equivalent to the group's mind—so the healing or revitalization occurs there. *Revitalization movements* begin with the innovations of prophets who seek or gain visions of a supernatural nature that give spiritual directions for people to gain an escape avenue out of their suffering into a more meaningful way of life. In the content of the revitalization vision, there can be many dimensions—spiritual, social, economic, and ecological adjustments—as
well as political responses. These visions are transmitted to disciples who in turn help to organize the movement into attracting followers. Such movements, however, can fail if the messages do not resonate with the general population, or are crushed by more powerful forces. Yet, they can also be quite successful and, as Wallace points out, go through a number of stages where they eventually transform into a new status quo while presenting a relatively successful blueprint for sociocultural transformation. The latter is key to Wallace’s theory—revitalization movements are deliberate, conscious approaches to bring about change even though they may be couched in a spirituality or mysticism. Revitalization movements are very recurrent and historically significant.

It is interesting to note that revitalization movements or crisis cults can be seen to intersect with practically many of the other change processes that we are talking about—innovation, diffusion, stimulus diffusion, acculturation, modernization, urbanization, and globalization.

**Change Cluster Number Six: Social Networks and Social Movements**

It is ultimately people, not institutions, who bring about change. They do this by operating through varying degrees of “agency” or intention and attempted control over their circumstances, often through improvising on circumstances much less then ideal and with varying degrees of personal power. Change is brought about through the primary building blocks of innovation and very much more frequently by exchanging diffused, sometimes slightly modified, items and ideas. It is true that institutions, communities, societies, and nations, among other unit types,
may have boundaries and ideologies regarding the limits of their memberships, and indeed such units are useful for analyzing change. Yet, in the end, they are artificial. The ultimate more concrete reality is that people operate and act largely through social networks that overlap within and across institutions. That is where changes occur, or are directed through. Such networks are very important aspects of any social organization and they ultimately have complicated and almost unlimited overlaps. We can refer to the overlapped networks as webs.

In Chapter Five, network analysis is discussed in much greater depth. Understanding networks and how they operate is crucial for the study of social and cultural change, especially in this era of globalization. This is so because of the revolutionary informational technologies that have assisted the generation of ever-increasing (as well as some disappearing or diminishing) networks. They have infinite capacities to overlap even when they are virtual, thus not subject to direct proximity. So, changes of a social or cultural nature are ultimately delivered through some kind of network and then the primary dimensions of any further distribution has to occur through networks, thus spreading and “institutionalizing” the changes.

On a primary level, networks can be conceived as being made up of individuals tied together by links of family, work, ethnicity, friendship, common beliefs and interests in exchanges for economic or other purposes, through proximity in neighborhoods or communities, in systems of authority and submission, and a multitude of other relations. Networks can be mapped in various ways and through various levels of sophistication and measurement.
Individuals represent nodes, and the links among them can represent their interactions and closeness or distance with regard to the density and traffic of their influences upon each other. Units beyond individuals, such as institutions, organizations, firms, and even nation states can also be viewed and mapped in their interactions as networks.

Some of the origins of network theory came out of British social anthropologists trying to understand how Africans gained their social bearings in new settings, such as mining towns and cities, where people were migrating from very diverse tribal settings and villages. Back home, corporate entities such as lineages and the villages themselves seemed to be the concrete, relatively stabilized, and homogeneous units of social organization. In the newer and highly dynamic settings, kinship played much less of a role, and more interaction and influence was found in changing social organizations of a secular and non-kin nature. Methodologies were devised that had ethnographers following individuals and mapping their new interactions among workmates, bosses, strangers, and friends. It also involved noting how many of these networks intersected as well as what new influences passed through them. Later in other settings, modeling became more sophisticated, especially with the use of computational analyses necessitated by the huge amount of information gathered (White and Johansen 2005).

The ultimate reality is that everybody in the world is now linked through networks. Through globalization and its many, actual and virtual, overlapping ties (think “six degrees of separation”), network connections are more or less
complete, although, of course, some linkages and their influences are much stronger or weaker than others. Some are barely distinguishable, but they do have potential significance for activation. It would be hard to ignore the reality that the generation or acceptance of any changes, no matter the scale, makes their way through networks.

*Social movements* are also extremely important vehicles for change or attempted change. We have talked about a more specialized category, that of revitalization movements, in the previous section. We are now dealing with much more of an interdisciplinary field that includes more of sociology, social psychology, and political science. More broadly we are dealing with the largely, although not entirely, secularized versions of mass action and representation that arise through contestations for power, rights, and identity, and with claims for change and reform. These first emerged with the events surrounding the Western Enlightenment, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and the political reforms emerging through the development of parliamentary democracy. In sum, all of these ingredients led to modernity and its successor—globalization.

Movements, of course, are extremely diverse and are very much tied to historical and social contexts. Movements have included instrumental and political attention to such things as the abolition of slavery, the attainment of better working conditions, the right to vote and the attainment of civil rights, the promotion of nationalism, and even the rejection of rights to others. Movements can also be tied to social recognition and the formation of identity, such as in feminist and gay, lesbian, and queer movements, and many other possibilities—
thus having significant cultural elements. Environmentalism has been a big feature of late twentieth and early twenty-first century movements. It is largely instrumental and political, but it does contain elements that can be considered as the expression of identity and cultural formation in the sense of life style choices toward sustainability and simpler consumption.

The history of movements as major vehicles of change goes back two hundred and fifty years, yet a surge occurred following the mass protests against the policies of various countries in the turbulent 1960s. Much of that has continued in mass responses and movements directed against both the broader and more specific features of globalization and neoliberalism. As time goes on, and the tentacles of modernity and globalization become more widespread, many peoples, such as Mayan peasant Zapatistas and Ayamara miners in Bolivia, engage in social movements. Global networks also connect these movements to centers and allies in developed regions. To sum up, we are reminded that “social movements are intentional, collective efforts to transform social order” (Buechler 2000:213), thus some understanding of them is essential to the study of contemporary change.

Culture Change Cluster Number Seven: Modernization (Development), Urbanization, and Globalization

This cluster is the most significant for contemporary circumstances and much is paid to it in the book chapters. Modernization, or development, is a spin-off of a
particular stage of human evolution—industrialization and the general features of modernity that began with the so-called Western Enlightenment. It is seen as the process whereby an individual’s patterns of behavior and culture changes from a traditional way of life oriented to the past and present to a more complex, technologically complicated and rapidly changing lifestyle, oriented toward the future. It could be conceived as having emphases on residence and subsistence in urban areas; an emphasis on mass formal education; the commercialization of land, labor, goods, and services; a widening scale of social and cultural contacts, relationships, and involvements beyond their villages for most people; cosmopolitan tastes in clothing, technology, and the popular arts; an emphasis and widespread use of mass communications media; and the use of small and large scale technological innovations, such as computers and hydroelectric dams (Wood 1975).

Modernization, in effect, means keeping up with or changing in directions toward all of the advancements of industrial and postindustrial societies. The emphasis is on the present and the future rather than the past and the traditional. Modernization can be a spin-off or offshoot of the process of acculturation where, at first, a society had been exposed to an advanced industrial society as a byproduct of colonialism. It can also come about when a more traditional society (say Japan, Korea, or Thailand) internally chooses to go in the direction of modernity. Some regions of countries may be perceived as developing faster than others. Individuals and subgroups may be perceived as modernizing faster than others.
Modernization implies a model largely economically driven and based on Western capitalism, although alternative models of development through communism have been offered, but they too have included industrialism, mass education, and bureaucratic rationales—among other things. It is a very controversial concept within anthropology because of the huge dangers of Western chauvinism driving the model. Nonetheless, its manifestations are real and amount to a very real and massive phenomenon of change, whether or not we anthropologists like the term.

Modernization and development have been terms that are often used interchangeably, yet there may be some occasional needs to differentiate them. Modernity might be considered as constituting the broad trends (e.g., scientific medicine, capitalist modes of production, and parliamentary democracy). Development, often used in an applied context with a specific community or a region, could refer to an agenda to bring about change that supposedly would improve the life circumstances of a people. Often, though, it may actually lead to the reverse—underdevelopment. There may be other models of development that do not necessarily follow the ideology of European “rationalism,” the West, or capitalistic-derived notions of improvement.

Urbanization is a process that produces or enhances the urban characteristics of a population. Overall, it involves an increase in the proportion of city dwellers in a population with the absorption of tribal, peasant, and rural peoples through migration to highly densely populated centers. Urbanism, or the life-style of the city, is the cultural side of urbanization. Urbanism can include an
increase in impersonal styles in social, secularism, and heterogeneous relationships rather than homogeneous populations, a utilitarian or monetary (rather than sentimental) emphasis in social relations, and more complex and varied cultural systems. Urbanization involves an increase in the range of alternatives for people in most aspects of their lives. In the context of modernity, it also involves an increase in the proportion of manufacturing to the totality of the economy and the development of an urban middle-class (Basham 1978; Uzzell and Provencher 1976).

Cities maintain the economic and technical direction of the state, and they are not new to modernization. Cities, urbanization, and urbanism began to emerge approximately 6,000 years ago. However, the urbanization of the world’s population accelerated at the beginning of the industrial period (the introduction of modernity), accelerated in the post World War II period, and is in a state of hyper-acceleration in the contexts of contemporary globalization, especially in developing countries. More than half of the world’s population now lives in cities compared to tiny proportions in the pre-industrial period and in modern developed industrial countries where more than 80% live in cities. This is collectively a dramatic change in society and culture for humanity as a whole. Anthropologists have faced a kind of methodological crisis since the 1950s in dealing with these realities, yet they still have come up with some important insights through the study of urbanization. Urbanization, as an almost completely different subdomain, is included in Appendix E.

Globalization is an extension of modernization, but it is also a number of
other things. It implies an intensification of global interconnections with a world full of movement, mixtures, contacts, and interlinkages with borders and boundaries becoming more and more porous, allowing more and more peoples and cultures to be put into intense and immediate contact with each other. It significantly involves movements of people, commodities, ideas, power and technology. Through media and transportation innovations, there appears to be a shrinking of space and time (Eriksen 2007; Schaeffer 2003). To some extent, it seems to be characterized by the attempt and partial reality of hegemony (or domination and penetration) of the West and capitalist interests. It is largely driven by commercial interests surrounding “free trade” across state boundaries and the ascendancy of transnational corporations that, in many cases, have become more powerful than the nation state. The main question: are we heading toward a single world system of social, economic, and cultural system dominated by Western materialism and its culture?

When did globalization begin? Some, such as Eric Wolf (1982), might suggest it occurred during the Age of Discovery in the 1500s when European nation states extended their spheres of influence through mercantilism and capitalism. Within several hundred years, all of the world's peoples became interconnected. Some might argue that a true period of globalization began after the fall of the Soviet Empire in the early 1990s—this allowed capitalism to be the pre-eminent economic philosophy and practice potentially dominating most of the world. The latter events have accelerated the process, especially with the technological drivers of the media and the Internet. It is possible that we are on
the edge of a new stage of sociocultural evolution.

Globalization offers many challenges for anthropologists. They can no longer study people within tidy semi-autonomous or autonomous boxes of societies, cultures, identities, and economies. These are all blurred and often transient and new forms are emerging. While globalization must be conceptualized and studied anew, we will find that some of the older approaches taken in the study of sociocultural change have their significant roles for research on globalization.

Summary
This appendix has laid out an inventory of the types of change that anthropologists have used. Some of the concepts were more fashionable during certain periods—diffusion in the earlier parts of the twentieth century, acculturation in the mid-twentieth century, and globalization today. Similarly, they may refer to changes that were more salient to particular times. Acculturation best described the periods of contact between indigenous American peoples and European settlers, while today the blurring of cultural boundaries and identities is reinforcing our interests in globalization, yet all of them still have varying degrees of continuing usefulness.
INNOVATION AND DIFFUSION

Innovation

The origins of any social or cultural change ultimately flow out of innovation and diffusion. Diffusion as straightforward cultural borrowing tends to be easier to manage conceptually while innovation is more elusive—and they both overlap. The available literature is still not very deep, and there has not been much attention to the topic since Homer Barnett’s (1953) somewhat opaque *Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change* or Kroeber’s (1948) *Anthropology*.

The introduction to a recent edited volume (O’Brien and Shennen 2010a), contributed to mainly by archaeologists, explores the topic. O’Brien and Shennen (2010b) suggest that *invention* is the appearance of a new idea and *innovation* is the process of putting it in practice. They point out that Barnett, the topic’s pioneer, saw invention as consisting of physical things and innovation was conceived as any thought, behavior, or thing that is qualitatively different from existing ones.

Traits have been the standard anthropological reference point—traits or bits of culture are learned in any cultural system. Parents and other adults pass on to children knowledge of them and their functions through the enculturation process. Traits are always being added to as sociocultural systems so some degree of adult enculturation also ways occurs. Traits occur in complexes such as the individual parts of a ritual, themes in a myth, and procedures and pieces of technology for plowing a field or for engineering an automobile. Changes of
invention/innovation in O’Brien and Shennen’s approach can occur at the trait and trait complex level and in various proportions as to the number of traits innovated and their scales—minor to massive in the scope of change. This can be exemplified by small changes in ancient pottery techniques and design as contrasted to the massive changes from hand-powered home craftsmanship to mass production and generated steam powered factory systems of manufacture—the Industrial Revolution.

Another significant way of looking at traits, trait complexes, and innovation is to use the analogy of a recipe, such as that of baking a cake. The recipe consists of instructions, ingredients, and procedures. Parts of the recipe can be newly improvised, leading to variations. The recipe can be discarded then a brand new recipe can emerge with a different set of ingredients and procedures.

Innovation generates variation within societies for selections in making adaptations—it is initially beneficial to the individual using it and to the group when it is disseminated. Innovation occurs in many separate lines of cultural inventory and accumulating in trait assemblages. Innovation may be at a relatively slow, steady tempo with small-scale modifications, or there can be sudden revolution-like appearances. An innovation can be relatively trivial and remain locked within a local tradition or its introduction can lead to further more comprehensive and cascading changes such as with the domestication of plants, or the source of a new form of energy. It can be massive and in itself can lead to the equivalent of an entirely new branch of cultural evolution, such as agriculture and industrialism, and now we have recently entered a digital age based on
Internet technologies (Castells 2000b). Such revolutionary sets of changes spread beyond the borders of their initial appearance.

Joseph Henrich (2010) suggests a number of ingredients that may contribute to innovation. Overall, the nature of innovation is related to the degree of cultural connectedness and the sharing of information in a society. The more there is connectedness, the more conducive the innovation is compared to the isolation of individual or sub-groupings, and the more free-flowing the information, the more amenable it is to innovation. Regarding trends in cultural evolution, he suggests that it has favored the building of institutions whereby people get together frequently for joint tasks such as performing rituals or exchanging goods at markets. That fosters interconnectedness and information sharing among more people. The more bits of information are freely available, the more the cultural variety, and the more possibilities of inventors and inventions.

Social learning, according to Heinrich, would also be an important part of any theory of innovation. Learners tend to imitate those who succeed. Others more readily borrow the superior cost-benefit advantages of those who effectively innovate and the innovators' prestige usually rises, as well as other more tangible rewards such as profit. Heinrich is skeptical about the notion that necessity is the mother of invention. “Inventions usually find problems” is his response (Ibid: 108) suggesting instead that tough times usually lead to more conservative reactions. Innovation involves risk taking. So its pace would be discouraged during a crisis and people would tend to stay with what they consider time-tested solutions.
Valentine Rioux (2010) suggests that *invention* is the individual phenomenon—coming up with the trait or its assemblage in the first place—and *innovation* is the social process for institutionalizing it in society. Trends in culture history indicate that there is a prevailing quest that motivates people to find ways to spend less human energy in all their activities. Also, there is an orientation in designing items of material culture toward less volume, less weight, less cost, and faster response times.

In his archeological work, he has studied the emergence of pottery making technologies in the ancient Near East. Coiling techniques form the base with symmetrical strings of rolled clay ringed upward proved more efficient and provided more variety in pottery styles than merely hand or paddle shaping out of lumps of clay. Later, the technology became even more time efficient with the invention of “wheel coiling” whereby the coils were more rapidly deposited upward from the base and then the wheel was rapidly spun with moistened hand-shaping creating a smoother, more elegant shape. This invention, however, was restricted in its innovative spread. Hierarchical societies in the Near East typically had upper castes jealously restricting and protecting the knowledge attained in metalworking as well as advanced pottery making, so this innovation was restricted in its spread. Later with the breakdown of elite structures, the innovation became widespread. So again, factors of a social nature often enter into the process of innovation. To what extent is the society open or closed in the flow of its information? Open would lead, as Heinrich suggests, to more
continuous circumstances of innovation, closed to discontinuous conditions such as the wheel-coiling pottery case.

Bruce Rigsby (2006), an Australian anthropologist, provides a mentalistic or cognitive focus on innovation that is useful. His article was written in a law journal and meant to sort out conceptually elusive terms such as habit, custom, culture, and tradition. These were especially crucial in court cases involving Australian aboriginal claims to lands or other rights. Complicated, they often revolve around the notions of customs or traditions as being authentic or not. Were they actually practiced in the past, or have they been reinvented (sometimes by even reading anthropological monographs) to justify the claims made in court has been a crucial point needing clarification.

An interesting dimension of his discussion is that tradition is a reflection not only of the past, but it is a model that has to be interpreted through the lenses of the present. Reconstruction and reflections upon traditions are made in all cultures relevant to the peoples’ present needs. These processes involving symbolism may frequently be unconscious, but obviously consciously reflexive as well, and may even involve deceit in a few cases. Yet they are still framed within the present. While tradition in this regard is usually thought of as being deep in time, it may be established in the context of a few years.

He gives an Australian example that also serves to illustrate some principles of innovation. On April 25, 1916, 6,500 soldiers marched in the city of Brisbane honoring dead of the Boer War. This was repeated a few years later and combined with a dawn ceremony visiting the graves of soldiers that had died
in all Australian and New Zealand campaigns, especially the then recent
slaughter at Gallipoli in World War I. This custom spread and was repeated in
many towns and cities in Australia. Thus was created ANZAC Day,
commemorating Australian War dead, and it became a statutory holiday. As an
innovation, it very quickly had become an important, widespread Australian
“tradition.”

Rigsby suggests that the human mind operates basically the same way
under all circumstances whether in traditional, acculturating, or modern societies.
It is the ultimate source in the selection of all human adaptations—social, cultural
and individual. The individual mind thus was the source of all innovation.
Cognitively, consciously, and unconsciously, we can recognize the ingredients of
our perceptions of cultural as traits and we can see them in clusters of patterns
or configurations. These are provided by existing cultural systems and from that
which is known about nature, new elements such as metals, domesticated
animals or plants, religious ideologies, sources of knowledge, technologies, and
many other things can be introduced. To the potential innovators, these bits and
pieces of information or perception can be recognized, refocused, reinterpreted,
and recombined in innovative patterns, while discarding some dimensions. The
content of mental worlds of people are socially determined to a very large extent,
but the reordering and changes brought about within these traditions has to be
generated though the individual mind at some point. Cultural content is found in
mental configurations that are generated by sensory stimulations. They are
complete within themselves, take shape and form in perceptions of material
items, mental images of human characters, real or fictitious, sounds such as musical tones and so forth, and can stand out mentally in the foreground of a complex background.

These are not indivisible “atom” like units such as traits or memes—“...they dissipate on analysis but can also be synthesized as parts of large configurations (Ibid: 113).” These configurations prepare our minds through past experiences for processing in dealing with future events (prototypes or schema) and these help to shape possible innovations. Regarding the innovation of ANZAC Day mentioned earlier, Australians remembered their ANZAC (Australia-New Zealand, Army Corps) war casualties. Australians had been honoring with a parade their previous casualties from the Boer War. These two configurations were combined through a stimulus and a sense of a correlate with an early morning visit to war graves and an afternoon parade on a special day to honor their more recent ANZAC casualties of World War I.

Rigsby provides another example relevant to Australian court cases. At the time of early contact, aboriginal men killed game animals with spears. Soon afterward, they saw white men killing game animals with rifles. A simple obvious convergent analysis would see hunting and killing animals with spears or rifles. Soon, with the availability of trade items, it became the case that Aboriginal hunted animals with rifles. So this becomes an innovation within Aboriginal societies, and it has become legally accepted as an authentic tradition by the courts, going back several centuries to when they have been confronted with
cases arguing Aboriginal use of modern devices such as powerboats and rifles in game regulation cases.

We can see another implication in this type of formulation of innovation. Even if some item, such as a musket, was already invented in another society, the first to recognize and use it, say in an historical fur-trading situation, is an innovator of sorts within his or her social milieu. We also get a sense of how widespread and common innovation actually is. Again, with more materials available in any social situation, there is more possibility for innovation. Thus, innovation might be the most widespread form of social change since it blends in with diffusion and all the other change types discussed in this book.

**Small Scale Entrepreneurial Innovation**

Steven Gudeman (1992), an economic anthropologist prominent for research on development in Latin America, offers some useful examples and principles of ongoing innovation. Classical economist Joseph Schumpeter (1934) is Gudeman’s source of inspiration, drawing upon his theory of entrepreneurship. Schumpeter’s idea is that development can lead to real benefit when new products are brought to the market, new ways of making things are devised, cheaper sources of supplies are available to production and consumption, and new forms of business are created. These add real value to the economy and can benefit all. This requires entrepreneurship, which entails much more than simply putting capital to action. It requires innovation through putting inventions, new procedures, initiatives, and combinations into actual practice. Such innovators
break with tradition and stand against the current of doubt, social resistance, and inertia.

Gudeman takes this a step further and maintains that the entrepreneur/innovator—an agent of cultural change—is not the lone hero, but is an individual located within a social nexus of culture and action. He or she gains from the benefits of cultural items that have already been established in his local tradition or those newly brought into from other places. Through his acts of innovation, he adds to the cultural inventory of knowledge and practice for his society and is rewarded by money or other types of reward specific to the culture. The entrepreneur’s item or model of innovation is then spread throughout the community and becomes part of its cultural wealth. The whole process is socially embedded and innovators are as ultimately transitory as the profits that they gained as rewards for their contributions.

He points to the mixed nature of contemporary Latin American economies. They involve large transnational, profit making corporations, local businesses, small workshops, itinerant sellers, small household producers, and others. Different tools and procedures are used. Over time, the economies increase in value—develop—but given the dominance of the corporations, the wealth is being siphoned to the top. In Schumpeter’s terms, benefits of higher wages and lower prices have been denied.

Gudeman then focuses on the original and still most prevalent economy in Latin America and historically in the world—the house. Locally found, the house is never fully dependent on the market for its resources, yet there are limits to its
expansion based on its internal social organization and family obligations of consumption as well as production. As house economies grow, they tend to fragment into similar units or transform completely to corporations.

Of interest to Gudeman are the houses or family businesses represented by small stores, street sellers, and small-scale producers. They are in-between the corporation and the isolated house of the former traditional and colonial economies. They combine dimensions of eighteenth century artisanship, nineteenth-century divisions of labor, and twentieth century flexibility of production. This is a very fast-growing sector in Latin American economies and involves thrift, parsimony, and interest in saving. Above all, this type of unit is noted for its innovativeness. Thrift and capacities to make use of all items is a hallmark—a pot top, spoon, or broken gourd may be saved for some later use. Here, we see entrepreneurial innovators in the style that Schumpeter would have approved—“...new combinations by the uniting and disconnecting of things (Ibid: 145).” Gudeman’s hope for bottom-up, socially sound development lies in the long-term viability of this sector.

Several examples of innovations are given. One involved a simple new type of stove that had been developed in a region of Latin America with several problems to be solved. There was a shortage of firewood with forests being massively depleted and soils degraded. The traditional method involved open air-fires in the house that wasted fuel and heat for cooking purposes and created excessive smoke detrimental to health. The new, inexpensive stove consisted of a series of ceramic tubes fitted together within a cement base. The tubes led to
rectangular slabs of different sizes to place different sized cooking pots. The cook could start a small fire in the base and block off the unneeded tubes, channeling the heat directly to where it was being used. The smoke ran out the back of the stove to a chimney through the roof. The device saved approximately 30% of the fuel, the savings easily paid for the materials of construction, and there was an almost complete elimination of the unhealthy smoke.

Another example comes from a reorganization of production methods in a small artisan house that involved tinsmithing—the making of small, cheap items for the local popular market. Sets of items could include drinking or pouring vessels. The items were traditionally handcrafted, involving rollers, hammers, pliers, tables, soldering irons, and metal bars as tools. The father and head of the enterprise maintained a small artisan factory with several men who each worked quite independently. One of his sons also ran an adjacent operation with the profits going jointly to the house. The latter with his two fellow workers, innovated a system with continuous operations that produced superior products more rapidly. While making items for an order, they would divide a series of separate tasks that would prepare parts of the product for assembly, and at certain points they would work together in twos or threes to assemble the product or work toward bending and soldering metal which required cooperation. As days passed, the rhythm of the work would vary. Sometimes when a customer having to be attended to by one of them interrupted the pace, the men would spell each other off while knowing each other’s tasks well. The men overlapped and linked their behavior in a remarkably integrated manner. As one man would finish the
tasks on his item, he would toss it to the next man, who would assemble his required part, and then turn back to assembling his assigned components. All the tasks and their coordination were done without verbal instruction and, according to Gudeman, the flow of events resembled a dance with music being on all the time in the shop. The system that they developed also included a “just-in-time-inventory” control that minimized waste in excess materials.

What was innovated in this case was a knowledge and practice system that made the most accommodating use of the men’s skills, material variability, and the intrusions of others. This was not a single artisan approach, nor was it a Fordist assembly and specialized task approach—it was a unique innovation. The father who ran the joint household kept a ledger and was able to calculate that the approach taken by his son’s operation was allowing them to make gains in the fiercely competitive tinsmithing industry in the region. It was an innovation that did not require new equipment or producing new items, but involved simply reorganizing labor efforts, but had a significant economizing effect.

He goes on to give other examples with relevance to brick making and weaving. They all show how innovative the small, house economy sectors of Latin America actually are in their adaptations within a multi-sectored economy that, again, in terms of profit and capital investment, is dominated by a powerful corporate sector. Contributions to the cultural growth of the regions continue to be from this sector of innovative entrepreneurship.

Diffusion and Neo-Diffusionism
Diffusionism of various sorts has had a long history as an approach to cultural change in anthropology. By now, though, it has been relegated to a series of historical footnotes in anthropological theory (Voget 1975: 317-360). One lasting and major contribution, however, was A.L. Kroeber’s documentation of the role that Middle American high civilizations played at various times in periodic and pulsating waves of diffused elements upon the development of North American cultures' in most areas east of the Rockies. Kroeber (1945) developed the concept of Oikumene from the original concept that saw the Greek Oikumene dominating the Mediterranean region.

For lack of a better term, I have chosen to call a more recent version of diffusionism “neo-diffusionism.” This diffusionary approach used in modern development projects was introduced by the sociologist Everett Rogers (1962). In Rogers’s case, he uses it in a non-historical context of social exchange where the specific details of the actual process of exchanges are of crucial importance, and are just as or more important than the results. The crux of his and colleagues research is to figure out why some specific innovations, developed elsewhere, may or may not be acceptable and borrowed in particular communities or societies. It also shows who adopts the traits earliest and how they are passed on, and in what order, to others in the society or community. Many of their examples are cross-cultural and relate to international development projects. Their conceptual frameworks have now become interdisciplinary involving sociologists, anthropologists, agronomists, engineers, community developers and others in applied projects (see Chapter Twelve for a full treatment).
Is an Anthropology of Innovation and Diffusion Possible?

Jean Paul Olivier de Sardan (2005: 89-110), whose theories on development are discussed in Chapter Six, takes the same position as myself—the importance of enhancing the anthropological study of sociocultural change. He suggests, ideally, that sociocultural change could begin with a focus on the anthropology of innovation that still remains an undeveloped field. His claim is that anthropology has been too preoccupied with persistence rather than change and calls for an anthropology of innovation. This would be akin to the relatively recent emergence of new fields such as medical, business, and industrial anthropologies.

Change always starts with innovation, is part of ordinary social process, and is not to be confused with invention. It is both a social process and the elementary form of social change. His definition: “… any grafting of technique, knowledge, or hitherto unused mode of organization (usually in the form of local adaptation, borrowing or importation) onto previously existing techniques, knowledge and modes of organization (Ibid: 90).”

He reviews the use of innovation in context of culture history and acculturation. Acculturation, as discussed in the Appendix C, deals with situations where there is continuing first hand contact between two or several cultural systems with one dominating and forming a common social structure. Cultural traits are passed across social boundaries and syncretism very frequently occurs. Here, new blended configurations are derived from the materials brought into contact. The Virgin of Guadalupe, a visitation by an Aztec
goddess in the form of the Virgin Mary, is a Mexican example with special meaning to Mexican Indians. We could consider the same thing with the diffusion of the toboggan from First Nations people to white settlers in Canada. It was reinterpreted as an item of winter recreation rather than for hauling goods. Almost everything in the acculturation process is reinterpreted, and thus is an innovation of sorts. He contends the same for straight cross-cultural border borrowings or diffusion.

The next approach is the one briefly discussed above (Rogers 2003)—the diffusion of innovations in contemporary development where social barriers and opportunities are considered, as well as the types of individual who are more likely to adopt the innovations and in sequence. He likens this model as equivalent to epidemiology in medicine, where the patterns of disease transmission are mapped, barriers and opportunities accounted for, and human agents who aided or resisted the transmission are identified.

Then as the third example, he considers an approach taken in France—"innovation as social indexing." Innovations always occur within a social context—they are not just the results of individuals adopting them because of the motivations of need or interest. During the period of 1960-1980 in the Southwest of France, there was a fierce division and conflict regarding the introduction of an American hybrid corn variety (Mendras 1976). The proponents of the introduction of this innovation tended to be rich farmers and younger ones who wished to modernize the farming sector. Members of this category were also associated with a Catholic organization of young farmers with close association to priests.
Right wing politics were the norm for the advocates. The hybrid corn was capital-intensive, requiring inputs of machinery, pesticides and herbicides, fertilizers and irrigation, and was meant to enter commercial markets. Those in opposition were peasants with strong socialist and communist leanings, as well as being anti-clerical toward the power and influence of the church. They were anti-American, so they focused on the fact that the crop was coming out of American agriculture. Furthermore, their own local variety (the "great red") was adapted to self-subsistence as well as the market. It was also the mainstay for feed in the local poultry industry. Here, Oliver de Sardan gives us a much wider understanding of the full social context which needs to be understood in contrast to Rogers’ model which is parallel to an epidemiological model—a more simple tracing, in his opinion, of the spread of an innovation and accounting for its early adopters and resisters in a quantitative style.

The key aspects of this social indexing approach is a deep immersion into the local social complexities whereby social carriers of the innovation enter the nature of their positions and backgrounds, as well as the factions and contradictions of interest within the society. Furthermore, the different categories or groupings have different resources that influence their capacities to adopt the innovations. And what are the consequences of the adoption of innovation—do they help reproduce the existing social structure including existing social inequalities, or does something else emerge? Another example that Oliver de Sardan (2010: 98; Marty1986) cites is that in the recent drought plagued region of Central Africa, it is those that are the poorest or have had frequent contacts
with the outside world as migrants or traders who are most amenable to technical innovations in the agricultural and pastoralist sectors.

Still another approach to diffusion and innovation that he mentions is that of “innovation as popular experimentation.” Here, innovation is frequently already in process by peasants and others in the Third World. Peasant logic and ingenuity are constantly at play in their local experimentation with vast varieties of seeds, balancing characteristics such as nutritional value and climatic hardiness. He mentions Lord Lugard, a British agronomist who extolled the highly sustainable agricultural practices in India and Africa, reminding us that peasants can readily adapt and are much more knowledgeable about their regions and crops than those attempting to introduce European-styled agronomy. Although he does not cite him, this would be a position similar to Steven Gudeman’s (1992) described earlier in this appendix. “Innovation is thus seen as an endogenous, ‘local level’ phenomenon. We could go so far as to evoke an informal, peasant ‘research and development’ realm, whose existence depends neither on the world of science nor on the world of the written word (Ibid 100).” This approach needs, however, to avoid “ideological populism” and also examine the ways that peasants engage in innovation that includes items of technical aid introduced by development agents.

A final view of innovation—reinterpretation— involves the fact that once an item is accepted, it is often not simply accepted in a linear fashion, involving communication from the donor and the recipient. Function, meaning, and use are cognitively defined or redefined in new combinations by the user. All users, while
taking into account economic, cultural, environmental, and political constraints have some room for maneuver. Actors have agency or varying degrees of freedom in creating their life worlds. This is especially so in face-to-face societies where the reinterpretation and transformation tends to be from the bottom up.

Oliver de Sardan’s view is eclectic. All of the above views are salient and also enter into his perceptions of social change in general and can be combined flexibly in models of explanation, even though they were often developed in opposition to previous ones. " Innovations are diffused, but they are embedded into a local social system that is exposed to social pressure; local-level actors make experiments, and development offerings are both reinterpreted and sidetracked (Ibid: 104)." Innovation involves hybridization, reinterpretation, and reorganization. Cultural and social factors provide influences on the speed and or intensity in which innovations are accepted. Conflicting interests and social pressures may play a significant role. Yet creativity and agency find their way into the capacities of individuals to improvise and experiment. And cognitive processes, as Rigsby (see above) reminds us, are also part of the equation. Every society, in opening its existing cultural models, is permeable to innovation both from within and without to some extent, Again, a highly eclectic but sound set of factors to consider is recommended in looking at the role of innovation, and its diffusion in change.

Innovation does create some problems though, as it is so contextual it makes for some difficulty in providing principles for theory in cross-cultural
perspective—an idea that Oliver de Sardan would find desirable for a proposed
domain of innovation and social changes

**Summary**

Innovation and diffusion are processes of learning and cognition. They require
some aspects of instruction or analysis by the borrowing individuals to
understand underlying principles. The innovation, diffusion, and the less frequent
invention processes involve people analyzing circumstances and solutions, as
well as the reordering of existing thought configurations. Practically all of the
dimensions involved include innovation. In Rogers’s scheme, the first person to
bring an item in a new setting is labeled an innovator, even though he or she is
not the original innovator or inventor from outside the social setting. It implies the
reorganization of mental configuration and possible adjustment of behaviors and
institution. Thus, innovation and diffusion can be considered a continuum of the
blurring of innovation itself with the ripple outer edges perhaps leaning toward
more straightforward borrowing, but mostly aspects of some innovation beyond
invention.

It has to be remembered, as Ralph Linton (1937) so cleverly reminded us
in his satirical “One hundred percent American,” that over ninety percent of any
society’s cultural inventory has been historically derived by borrowing from
elsewhere or in a diffusionary manner. Diffusion, other than in the styles of
Rogers’s contemporary diffusion of innovation, may not be popular as an
academic topic any more, but it certainly has been enormously important for the spread of humanity’s common culture.

Innovation has still generated little interest in anthropology, beginning with Barnett’s pioneering effort (1953) that did not get much traction, yet some of the recent attention by Olivier de Sardan, Rigsby, Gudeman, and authors in the O’Brien and Shennen volume, suggests that it is ripe for a more comprehensive treatment. In fact, all sociocultural change at the ground level is innovation, no matter how much it blends into larger concepts such as evolution, acculturation, modernization, and globalization. Some principles have been emerging especially from the pioneering work of Everett Rogers (see Chapter Twelve) in the spread of innovations. Olivier de Sardan reminds us of the importance of understanding the full social context in understanding innovation and its agency. Book chapters on complexity and social networks reveal some other principles such as “tipping points, weak ties,” and “cascades” that can also apply to the study of innovation and diffusion. Innovation is ubiquitous and human societies are always in the process of reordering, restructuring, and resynthesizing, and most people have the capacity to participate as innovators at some scale.
Appendix C

SUSTAINED CULTURAL CONTACT

Acculturation

Acculturation as an inductive approach to change began in the 1930s and was influenced by two factors. One was the recognition that dramatic changes had been occurring among Native North Americans and most of them were negative. Previous research was almost exclusively salvage ethnology concentrating on recording Native American traditions before they disappeared. Margaret Mead (1932) changed that through her study about the “Antlers”—a pseudonym for the Omaha Indians. She described the deteriorating conditions that the Omaha were suffering through their exposure to the dominant American society. Another influence came from the British social anthropologists Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown who, along with their students, had been describing fully functioning societies within the British Empire rather than memory cultures.

For North American Native peoples, the most significant dimension in their lives was disruptive changes. They had undergone major transformations after about four centuries of contact with Europeans. The situations of tribal peoples living on reservations were very much affected by local whites, administration by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the economic, social and health conditions, and the technological and economic transformations shaped by constant Euro-American contact. From the mid-1930s until the mid-1970s, the
vast majority of studies—hundreds of them—about North American Indians and some other peoples in the Western hemisphere was based on the acculturation strategy. This was especially so in the U.S.A., Canada, Mexico, and regarded descendants of African slaves in the circum-Caribbean region (Herskovits 1941). Of all the periods of cultural change study in anthropology, this was the longest, yet its legacy has left controversies.

Studies tended to be local, dealing with specific groups’ current situations and descriptions of their contact histories with dominating European intruders. The latter was divided into stages such as fur trade, conquests, the arrival of settlers, mission experiences, confinement to reservations, and urban experiences. These shifts were viewed as acculturation periods that provided some continuity in explaining contemporary circumstances. Each cultural period was seen as having a particular set of institutional arrangements related to subsistence, economic exchange, politics, authority, conflict resolution, kinship and social organization, settlement patterns, relations with outsiders, sex roles, spirituality, health, division of labor roles, technology, subsistence, trade, and so forth. Each stage would be preceded by a discussion of the seminal events initiated by the intruding society—examples such as the initiation of trade, the signing of treaties, war, epidemics, etc. These events usually had major impacts that would ripple through the existing sociocultural system and all the changes in particular institutions would be described. What changed from previous periods would be documented and mention would be made of what persisted. Each
period was described in the manner parallel to a static or synchronic ethnography.

By intellectual osmosis, underlying assumptions were very close to that of the structural functionalists (Voget 1975: 480-539). Emile Durkheim’s work, as the founder of that school along with that of his British acolyte A. Reginald Radcliffe–Brown who was also present in the U.S. for half a decade at the University of Chicago, influenced the small American anthropological community. Similarly, Bronislaw Malinowski had a functionalist theory that varied somewhat from Radcliffe-Brown and Durkheim in that he believed that various institutions at a primary and secondary level ultimately emerged to serve basic individual physical and psychological needs.

What is interesting about Malinowski (1945) is that he tried to analyze the nature of change in British colonial society and to apply his functionalist approach to recommend policies of a benign nature to improve the circumstances of tribal peoples and minimize grief brought about by change. Malinowski saw two sociocultural systems in contact. New blended institutions were to be designed out of the materials of both societies, thus Malinowski saw a role for a “practical” anthropology that would document those elements and make recommendations for their synthesis. Radcliff-Brown, although not as directly involved in applied anthropology, also had an influence in the training of officials to serve as policy planners and administrators in the widespread British Empire of the time. These associations represent a controversial and largely negatively perceived attempt
at applied anthropology—viewed as a form of complicit, handmaiden role to British imperialism (Willis Jr. 1974).

A parallel set of activities was emerging in the 1930s and lasting into the 1950s in the U.S. This related to anthropological involvement in the New Deal policies of Franklin Roosevelt’s administration during the Depression and World War II. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) had been an imperialistic arm of the United States government. It had overseen the decline and humiliation of American Indians peoples through the brutal, sometimes corrupt, minimalist, or neglectful policies of the American government. It supervised the confinement of Indians to shrinking reservations, administered failed economic and educational policies, and did little to rectify conditions of poor health and morale. The New Deal sought reforms, and the policies of the BIA were overhauled and reshaped to bring about changes that might benefit American Indian tribes. Anthropologists were hired by the sympathetic, but paternalistic Commissioner of the BIA, John Collier, with the objective of providing background studies of particular groupings and how they came to their current circumstances and what could be done to improve things. These issues related to education, health, land bases and resource use, and governance (McNickle 1979). The acculturation approach was the dominant paradigm in these researches with assumptions parallel to the British.

Adjustments or creations of institutions were the basis of the changes. This era of American applied anthropology has undergone a similar set of criticisms for not really solving the issues of cultural preservation and self-
determination of Indian tribes and as being overly paternalistic. Yet, it was most certainly superior to the previous eras of neglect, violence, or corruption, and it did set off some significant reforms.

Returning to the more academic relationships of acculturation studies to structural-functionalism, there were assumptions that, in order to understand how societies and their cultures change, there is a need to first know how they operate and function under relatively stable situations. How does kinship and family relate to economic and political circumstances? How do the institutions of religion, spirituality, aesthetics, and values reinforce these institutions? How do they normally strain for consistency and persistence? The modeling of the interrelationship of the parts was the fundamental task. To some extent, there was always a recognition that innovations, as well as borrowings from other societies, could occur under precontact situations. There was also the possibility that some items would be lost over time. However, given the structural-functional model as it pertained to the peasants and tribal societies, normally studied by anthropologists at this time, change had been slow and its pace was modulated—each new item had to be carefully absorbed and integrated into the whole. The strain was for consistency and the maintenance of the society overall. The collapse of a society was viewed as extremely harmful.

The approach was highly inductive—there were no explicit theories or consistent causal pathways leading to acculturation other than the contact situations themselves. There were no presumed inevitable stages and causes leading to change. Change was hard to predict. But as a rule of thumb, it would
be expected that, if change items threatened the wellbeing and identity of the group, they would be rejected or resisted. If perceived as non-threatening and advantageous, they might be accepted. Any changes absorbed would be integrated and spread, influencing other subsystems. Technology, for instance, could have impacts on religion, family, and subsistence. Hundreds of local case studies were constructed during acculturation research’s heyday. Three significant symposia developed broad generalizations that could be associated with acculturation. They also presented templates through which case studies could be constructed. The first of these (Redfield et al 1936) included leading figures of Robert Redfield and Ralph Linton. Another one was the Social Science Research Council Seminar’s (Broom et al 1954) “Memorandum on Acculturation” and the next big one was Edward Spicer’s case study and discussion approach with multiple experts in his (1961a) edited Perspectives on American Indian Change. The Teske and Nelson (1975) article on acculturation and assimilation is useful as well. For the purposes of constructing a method to outline acculturation approaches, I have put together a composite from the first three symposia. The ingredients of acculturation could include the following:

1. **Cultural Systems in Contact**
   - The precontact situation, the base-line cultures, and societies.
     - E.g., boundary maintaining mechanisms

2. **The Contact Situation**
   - Ecological factors
   - Demographic factors

3. **Conjunctive Relations**
   - Directed and non-directed change—agendas.
   - The Contact Community (social structure of contact)
   - The nature of the structural linkage with the dominant society.
• Whether it is ecclesiastical, political, economic, military, or other.
• The kinds of roles with there accompanying sanctions assumed by the members of the subordinate society in the contact communities.
• The nature of the subordinate society’s social structure in terms of stability, whether new types of communities were in process of formation or not.
• Some types of contact community:
  o Spanish mission
  o Fur-trade
  o U.S. reservation
  o Canadian reservation
  o Urban segment

4. Some Acculturation Results
• Intercultural transmission
• Cultural creativity
• Cultural disintegration
• Reactive adaptation
• Progressive adjustment--cultural fusion, assimilation, and stabilized pluralism.

1. Cultural Systems in Contact
Reference to the “base-line culture” is essential in any acculturation study. Here, we are talking about the nature of the society that will undergo change and how it was structured and functioning on the eve of the contacts bringing about acculturation. Two or more sociocultural systems will have been brought into continuous first hand contact where usually one becomes dominant in a common social structure. Base-line cultures may be difficult to construct because of faulty or fragmentary information. Attempts are usually made through archaeology and the oral history of the peoples. Primary attention, though, is through reconstructions based on written reports by explorers, geological surveyors, adventurers, traders, government officials, missionaries, military, and early tourists with artistic and journalistic talents. Reports and descriptions may have
even been required of them, or they may have been voluntary and incidental. Biases and self-serving statements may be found in these reports that might also be tainted with the prejudices of the times. These can be extremely ethnocentric or even racist. Nonetheless, ethnohistorians and anthropologists try their best to factor out biases and “triangulate” from a number of sources seeking reliable statements that can be corroborated.

Ideally, the reconstruction of the base line will be as complete ethnographically as possible, from environmental subsistence, through economics, demography, social structure, authority and conflict resolution, religion, values, enculturation, gender, technology, and so forth. Among the themes brought up in the various symposia were the nature of authority systems—are they rigid and hierarchical, or are they loose and egalitarian? Are decision-making processes based in deference to hierarchy with factors such as ascribed rank, age, and sex being fairly rigid, structured and unchanging, or is there a fair amount of improvisation, independence, and openness to experimentation and innovation? Are there solidarity, pride, cohesion, and unity in the society, or is there a set of built-in conflicts, contradictions and factionalisms on the eve of contact? These and other factors will relate to styles and pace of changes that might accrue after acculturative change is underway.

One of the most useful dimensions of the base line cultural systems is the discussion of boundary-maintaining mechanisms that relate to the socio-cultural ways of dealing with outside influences and thus opening or closing to the possibilities of external sources of change. Tight boundary maintaining
mechanisms could include strong feelings of ethnocentrism or cultural superiority, stigmas against those who interact with outsiders, keeping language and ceremonials secret or inaccessible from outsiders, taboos or other sanctions against outside marriage, restrictions on trade, religious ceremonies that purify and revitalize local customs and senses of belonging to the group, as well as many other possibilities. Presumably in such cases, changes would not come that easily, or in cases of acculturation, the group would try their best to control and minimize rates of change. Less tight boundary mechanisms would be expected to lead to much more rapid changes.

A classic study of boundary maintaining mechanisms is John Adair and Evan Vogt’s (1949) “Navaho and Zuni veterans: A Study of Contrasting modes of Culture Change.” The Zuni of the American Southwest had tight boundary maintenance mechanisms. This was evidenced by their rejection of service in the American Armed Forces in World War II. Those who had somehow made it into the army had to go through secret purification ceremonies to be rid of the polluting circumstances of being in contact with American culture. A few were considered deviant and shunned and had to exile themselves to Arizona towns. The authors characterized the Zuni as long resistant to change, only slowly permitting change with other tribes then resisting much from the Spanish, Mexicans, and Americans.

In contrast, Navaho, having a significant warrior tradition, volunteered in large numbers for the American war effort. They were welcomed home as returning heroes and American Legion outposts were established on the
reservation. Given the wider and more cosmopolitan experiences of the veterans, many became the next generation of leaders on the reservation. The Navaho, as a Dene people, had been inveterate borrowers ever since they had arrived as latecomers from the North. They borrowed from local tribal horticulturalists and the Spanish, Mexicans, and Americans—most notably agriculture, pastoralism of sheep and goats, weaving, and silver work. Boundary-maintaining mechanisms were loose and flexible. Yet, that did not leave them open to either assimilation or rapid cultural loss. Their culture of borrowing was that of permeability for new items, but the character of their borrowings in diffusion and acculturation were such that items which were Navaho were clearly recognizable and persistence was strong in key dimensions of ideology—especially spirituality, kinship, and medicine. Also helping was the large size of their reservation and relative isolation from intense Euro-American influences.

The study of the base line or original cultures and their tendencies has always been crucial in the study of acculturation. But what is curious is that the reconstruction of the dominating sociocultural systems—usually European or Euro-American and Euro-Canadian—is usually relatively fragmentary, hardly beyond a few historical accounts about those making the contacts. It probably is hard to develop fully integrated accounts of Seventeenth Century Spanish or Nineteenth Century American Society. Some of the crucial elements do come out in the contact situations and conjunctive relations.

2. The Contact Situation
Circumstances surrounding the encounters between the indigenous group and the intruder can play a major role in shaping conjunctive relations and the outcome. Two very large issues requiring analysis are demographic and ecological issues often in conjunction with each other. These can have profound impacts that are not necessarily the result of the agenda of the invaders or the results of direct contacts among the peoples in question.

One example that covers both is the situation of contact involving Indian people of the Eastern Seaboard (more specifically Massachusetts) and English refugees (the Puritans). When the Puritans arrived on the Mayflower with barely a hundred people, they encountered large villages but few people. Many of the crops of these Native peoples had been abandoned. It appears that a chain of epidemics of small pox had been making its way south from the brief two-year colony established by the French under Samuel Champlain in what is now Nova Scotia. After the French abandoned their colony because of the epidemic, it still persisted, making its way through what is now the upper New England states by passing from Native group to Native group. When it made its way into Massachusetts, its impact was profoundly devastating, killing enormous numbers in these horticulturally favored regions. Thus the Indians did not have the resources or population to resist the Puritans who could have easily wiped out the British. Instead, they provided the intruders with invaluable assistance, such as agricultural knowledge and crops. Over time, the British gradually built up their populations and overwhelmed the Indians through violence and their demographic superiority (McNeil 1976: 186).
Another parallel example is both the American and Canadian Plains and the virtual extinction of the buffalo. A multitude of factors led to many Native peoples flooding onto the Plains—the East was becoming crowded because of European settlers. Through the diffusion of the horse culture and muskets, buffalo hunting became more feasible, and the trade for buffalo hides generated by the America Fur Company and the Hudson’s Bay Company added to the lure (Oliver 1962). Eventually, through a multitude of factors including the coming of the railroads and the buffalo hunting trade, the buffalo herds numbering about 60,000,000 dropped to mere thousands. Tied to wars of expansion by the United States and Canadian governments, this left the defeated, diseased, and demoralized Indians being confined to reservations while much more numerous White settlers set up ranches, grain farms, and towns settling the Great Plains (Rifkin 1992: 81-86).

Along with the agendas of intruding groups (to be discussed in the next section) the numbers and general demographic factors play a very large role in acculturation and can vary in their influences during different stages of the acculturation process. Large numbers of settlers can swamp out relatively small numbers of indigenous peoples. Though few in numbers, the militarily superior conquistadores in Peru defeated the Inca, yet acculturation was slow and not overwhelming among the Native peoples of the Andes (Service 1971b). In the Canadian North, very small numbers of fur-traders did not overwhelm local Dene and Inuit peoples. Given that the intruders were all male, the flow of culture coming from the French and British was largely masculine in its content.
3. Conjunctive Relations

This may be the most important set of ingredients leading to the varied outcomes of acculturation. The first question is what is the most significant agenda of the culture change agents? There may also be several sets of agents with differing agendas at any given time—in some cases contradictory, in others complementary. Explorers might be mapping or seeking new routes to distant sources of trade. Military adventurers may be looking for conquest and pacification of a local people on behalf of their imperialist home country. Missionaries may be seeking to save souls and may try to convert and to influence behavior of their intended flocks through the bestowing of privileges to those who comply. Traders may be keen to enter into relations to get exchanges of valuable commodities such as furs, spices, or precious metals for manufactured goods. Government officials and settlers may wish to displace the locals, keeping them confined to pacify and modify their behaviors. The last scenario leads to the possibilities of directed versus non-directed change.

The frequent North American situation of conquests of Indian peoples, confinement to reservations, highly pressured conversions to Christianity, as well as the separation of children into residential schools were classical scenarios of directed change with the idea of marginalizing and eliminating as much Indian culture and identity as possible. The Northern fur traders were examples of more non-directed change, where the traders were primarily interested in the trade of goods, and not comprehensive change other than the expectation that Natives
bring in furs and be compliant with the low prices. When directed change is the agenda and it is not working, agents of the dominant society may comfort themselves with the illusions that their erstwhile charges are stupid, barbarian, or stubborn. Resisters to directed change might covertly rebel against their external oppressors because their agendas have negative value, they resent the forced nature of changes in general, or they feel a moral or spiritual order has been breached and that is dangerous to their well being and survival.

Conjunctive relations include the intercultural networks of people who channel the items that are changed and are important to the context of the change. Spicer in his (1961b) approach refers to them as the social structure of contact. On one-side, there are the principle agents of change—traders, missionaries, priests, soldiers, government administrators such as Indian agents and soldiers, development specialists, teachers, outlaws, physicians, and nurses—who participate in the change exercises, directed or not, and come in contact with the people undergoing change. The agenda is crucial in these cases—what behaviors are to be changed? What ideologies are to be eliminated and replaced? What technologies and behaviors need to be promoted? What services are required of the people to be changed? These are indeed highly variable. A fur-trader hopes to get Northern Natives to devote more time to trapping small fur-bearers instead of moose or caribou in exchange for wool blankets; teachers and missionaries at residential schools wish to get young children to forget about their “pagan” customs, worship Christ, speak English, and adopt European table manners and dress. The success of these attempts
will depend upon a lot of factors, as related to the social structure of contact. How many change agents are there? How many people are there to be changed—what is the ratio of the change agents to “targets” of change? How direct is the contact between the two parties? If the change is directed, what kind of sanctions can be applied—physical punishments, removal, reduction of rations, the calling upon of invisible punitive agents?

As a fascinating example, Edward Spicer (1961c) refers to the social structure involved in the acculturation process during the Mission Period among 17th Century Yaqui in Mexico. Only up to a dozen Spanish priests were available in the dozen established towns. Their advice and instructions were filtered down various levels of Yaqui middlemen who learned Spanish and reached their way to the approximately 18,000 people who were rarely in direct contact with missionaries. As a result, the Yaqui were able to negotiate among themselves the content of their change, picking up useful technologies and behaviors associated with crops, livestock, housing, and government and put together a fascinating fusion or syncretic form of religion and mythology.

Another dimension of conjunctive relations is the degree to which the dominant society is fully represented in the contact situation. Military, explorer, and trader subcultures represented only tiny portions of the European Euro-American cultural inventory and agenda. Alcohol, weapons, violence, and patriarchy might be the dominant themes of transmission. Also tied to the male cultural dimensions, might be the demographic factors mentioned in the previous section. An imbalance of males to females frequently leads to sexual relations
and common-law marriages, and, as a result, a creolized population, culture, and language may emerge as a third unit or the dominant product of the acculturation process. Yet, if the local groups are strongly patriarchal, foreign males may be excluded from any conjunctive relations with local women. The men decide what is exchanged and under what circumstances with a big emphasis on technology.

As acculturation histories are often begun through conquest and trade, missionaries may come after the earlier more aggressive male adventurers, soldiers, and traders. For a number of reasons, the appeal of the Christian missions might be ripe for those in marginal positions because of their dissatisfactions related to status and material rewards. Those that may have the most direct conjunctive relations with the missions are very often women (a parallel often occurs with medical personnel as well). Although there are exceptions, acculturation studies often report much higher ratios of attendance of women and children at church services. Presumably, local males might find this less of a threat with their women being in contact with priests, monks, and ministers (although that “safety” is by no means airtight). Mission activities for various reasons might become successful and people undergoing the process after becoming devout Christians may be surprised to later learn that the missionary’s compatriots are not as devout.

It is only with the full arrival of communities of “settlers” establishing farms, towns, and then complex modern cities that the local indigenous peoples would become aware of something approaching the full representative scale of the dominant society and its wide range of agendas, institutions, and age and gender
representativeness. Yet even then, the networks of direct contact—the social structure of contact—would not be direct and complete for everybody. It is also important to note that the channels of transmission and influence can also be indirect—reading of the dominant group’s literature, spoken, visual, symbolic, and other representations can also play very large roles.

It would seem that of all the ingredients of acculturation, conjunctive relations—people to people contacts through networks and roles within the social structure of contacts—would be the most important considerations through which acculturative change would occur. The formulation of conjunctive relations in the acculturation literature often quite competently anticipated later formulations—network analysis, processual and transactional formulations, and praxis theory—the latter two being explicit critiques of the acculturation approach and its implicit source of inspiration—structural functional analysis. Even acculturation theorists would often recognize that it is people who change rather than sociocultural systems simply coming in contact with each other.

While isolating the important concept of social structure of contact, which draws our attention to the patterns where real people come in contact with each other and transmit items of culture, Spicer (1961b) also came up with the notion of “contact” communities. These are encapsulations of the social relations on a broad scale at any given period. These would include questions such as: what were the social relations bringing the societies in contact? What were the main strategies and agendas? What were the dominant society’s members interested in changing and how? What was the response of the subordinate group to such
programs? In retrospect for each period of acculturation, a contact community summary could be constructed. One community in the American Southwest and parts of Mexico was the “Spanish Mission” in which the linkage was primarily ecclesiastical from European interests to local indigenous peoples with some political and economic overtones. There were face-to-face interactions with strong coercive sanctions and structured stabilities in relations. “Fur Trade” contact communities were largely market linkages with non-coercive roles. “Reservation” contact communities in both the U.S. and Canada were strongly focused on political with secondary economic linkages with very coercive roles and a focus on major structural reorganizations of the Indigenous communities. American and Canadian reservation communities were similar, but with noted contrasts as well. The final community discussed was that of the “Urban Segment,” which was the broader more representative and contemporary version of the larger and more dominating Euro-American and Canadian societies. More complex and highly unstable through multiple dimensions of change, indigenous peoples might live within them or be strong influenced by them in their proximity.

In acculturation case studies, which constitute the majority of the work, rather than theoretical comparative overviews, there was a great deal of emphasis on the local, empirical, and inductive research. It was extremely important to fill in as much detail as is possible regarding the types of people who are or were coming in contact with each other as well as their motives, power, influence within their full networks of hierarchy, their exchanges, and demographic factors.
4. Some Result Types

Coming out of the various symposia on acculturation, as well as the Spicer volume, were a few standard types of results of the acculturation process. They would represent the overall impacts during stages of contact. One of these was *intercultural transmission*, or the equivalent of straightforward exchanges, borrowings, or diffusion when a process is already underway to join together in a joint society, coming through early contacts and trade exchanges that will become more fulsome and complete later. A very widespread type of change result was that of *syncretism* involving a kind of creativity where there was a reorganization and reinterpretation of existing materials in combinations with parts of the newly exposed cultural elements, and is often found in religious syncretism. Spicer (1961c) gives the example of the Virgin Mary being identified with an Indigenous goddess designated as “Our Mother.”

*Compartmentalization* has been a frequent dimension of acculturation, whereby a group freely changes some areas of their sociocultural systems (e.g., subsistence and exchange), while keeping others compartmentalized and relatively unchanged (e.g., primary family relations, religion). Among the Hutterites of Western Canada, modern farm implement acceptance, as well as all aspects of marketing the principal commodities, has been complete and it is insisted that they grow or raise crops and animals such as wheat or hogs. Yet language, their dialect of German, family relations, and kinship terms, as well as
liturgy and Anabaptist religious beliefs are very much kept intact and separate from any possibilities of corruption from the outside (Bennett 1967).

*Directed Change* is very common during harsher or colonialist periods of acculturation. Through various means of power and with explicit agendas, the dominating sociocultural systems may attempt to explicitly direct change in many aspects of its content—e.g., residential schools and, historically, some aspects of reservation systems—forcing the speaking of particular languages, wearing of certain types of dress, and forbidding certain religious ceremonies. Recently in Canada, the Federal Parliament through the statement of the Prime Minister apologized to First Nations people for the approximately 100 years of residential schools where amongst the aphorisms used in the early years was “kill the Indian in the child.” In a parallel fashion from 1921 to 1961, the Canadian government outlawed important First Nations ceremonials, such as the Potlatch and the Sun Dance. These policies of directed acculturation had many negative consequences upon generations of Indians, Inuit, and Métis in Canada.

Sometimes the impact of directed acculturation, along with other negative factors such as diseases, racism, being overwhelmed numerically by the invader, and so forth might lead to *disintegration*. The affected group may deteriorate into a shell of its former self, and engage marginal maladaptive coping that barely keeps the group distinguishable, but they remain stigmatized at the bottom of the social ladder. Lauriston Sharp’s (1952) seminal study of the Yir Yoront in Australia describes the negative result of missionizing and the transfer of iron tools leading to a scattered category of people barely holding onto their identity.
and engaged in dysfunctional intragroup actions such as alcohol abuse and family violence.

An alternative approach to these kinds of breakdown or culture loss through acculturation is that of resistance. The group feeling a threat, such as the Sioux and Apache uprisings in Nineteenth Century U.S.A, may openly rebel and organize at a much higher than normal level and resist militarily. It may find other means of isolating itself from further strong influences from outside. It may organize into revitalization movements such as the Ghost Dance religion (Mooney 1896). In any case, change of an acculturative nature is already underway and is often very much part of the resistance.

The participants in Edward Spicer's (1961a) symposium drew up a series of models of acculturative outcome that were “progressive,” or not as damaging as some of the above mentioned ones. One of these was the fusion or the incorporative model that was in effect the development of third cultures combining elements rather more or less freely from both. It is a relatively non-directed change involving the transfer of elements from one culture to another sociocultural system so that they easily conform to existing meaningful and functional relationships. They enhance or do not threaten the existing group’s orientations and values. For the most part in the history of the Navaho Indians of the American Southwest, this has been the case--the Navaho have been great borrowers but a people who reinterpret borrowings, sometimes syncretically, into their own unique patterns. Their forms of pastoral nomadism, and silver-smithing are good examples of that. Spicer (1961c), in his edited volume, uses the case of
the Yaqui Indians of Mexico who blended together in most aspects of their sociocultural systems mixtures of Spanish-Mexican culture with elements of their indigenous cores, that a third culture clearly emerged.

According to the *Perspectives on American Indian Cultural Change* (Spicer 1961b), *assimilation* is one of the progressive adjustment categories of acculturation. More on this later.

Another suggestion by the Spicer symposium is *stabilized pluralism*. Here, groups do not completely lose their autonomy. Intercultural systems have reached a point of institutionalized adjustment that can serve the interests of both groups. This seems highly speculative and abstract, and no concrete example is given. An example might be found in English and French Canada in their history resulting from the post-World War II period. There might also be European examples in the constitutional arrangements of countries such as Belgium and Switzerland where all groups, such as Dutch and French in Belgium or French, Germans, Italians in Switzerland, have equality in civil rights and capacities to participate in government. As an ideal, it seems to be something that First Nations people are seeking in the Canadian context. The label “First Nation” is now only semi-officially accepted for groupings that had been called bands or tribes who were paternalistically treated and variously perceived as child-like wards of the Canadian government. First Nations chiefs seek constitutional guarantees that will put them on a parallel situation of equality and autonomy as the French and English while being supported and participating in Canadian society on their own terms. Stabilized pluralism seems to be very gradually
evolving with the transfers to First Nations of various powers that had been held by the Canadian nation-state.

**Comment**

Overall, there are many dimensions and responses possible in acculturative contexts and they can shift quite a bit. Acculturation is not necessarily a one-way process. Many things may be going on at once, and individuals and subgroups may be acculturating at different rates and in different directions. Some of the broad outcomes of conjunctive relations also may only refer, after-the-fact, to historical stages of the group’s relations to a more dominant society. On the whole, the acculturation approach is best used for describing historical dimensions of culture contact and for describing broad aspects of intergroup relationships.

**Assimilation**

Assimilation is a possible but not frequent result of acculturation. Here, I rely on Teske and Nelson (1974). The members of a subordinate group seek out or are sought out for membership in a dominant group. It is marked by a recruitment of members of society A by society B into positions of equal status. Assimilation, with regard to the more subordinate grouping, permits and incorporates them into larger groupings at both the primary and secondary levels of social life. People are freely accepted into homes, intermarriage is possible, and people who are assimilating are accepted into associations and clubs, as well as political
institutions. No barriers should linger against their full participation. Yet, for assimilation to occur, the individuals have to make positive identifications with the process and the dominating group. Common values and identification are very definitely a part of this equation whereas they are not so in acculturation. There may be mixed situations where some members of the group may wish to assimilate, while others do not.

So, identification and mental dimensions, such as values, are significant for assimilation just as much, or possibly more, as is behavior. Yet, some indices in research might measure assimilation while the people, privately in their thoughts, remain ambivalent. As with the case of immigrants, if they speak the host language more frequently than their own or take out citizenship superficially, that may indicate assimilation. Yet those choices may not be whole-hearted in that the immigrants may be resigned to the fact that there are no comfortable alternatives.

It is important to stress the individual in discussing assimilation because ultimately, assimilation requires subjective changes that can only reside in the mind. Yet if a growing number of people in a group engage in a trend of assimilation that reduces the number of social and cultural supports for cultural persistence and separation, older members of the group may feel special poignancies in contrast to younger members, such as adolescents, who consciously or unconsciously seek the opportunities to fit in with their more numerous non-ethnic peers.
For the most part when we are speaking of assimilation, we are referring to acculturation circumstances where immigrants come to countries such as the United States, Canada, and Australia. Some immigrant groups seek and more readily achieve assimilation than others.

**Creolization**

In assimilation there is definitely direction and dominance that is unidirectional—two-way assimilation is hard to imagine. In some cases there are groupings that wish to be assimilated, but are denied. As one example, Anglo-Indians (mixtures of British men and Indian women) in India wished to be absorbed and accepted by the dominant British but were rejected. Variously, we can refer to creoles in the West Indies—intermixtures (depending on the colonial situation) of British, French, Spanish or Dutch, along with Africans and, in some cases, indigenous peoples of various intermixtures. To some degree, individuals may wish or have wished to blend in with the dominant European group but again are rejected. In the long term they may form third groups, a process Teske and Nelson (Ibid) refer to as *creolization* whereby they choose pride in their identity with a separated group that may develop their own dialects, food, dress, and many other symbols of identification as emerging out of the two founding groups. Included in this type of response are the Métis in Canada and Mestizos in Latin America, especially in Mexico. Creolization may be both a “racial” and cultural intermixture when historically there were blockages to assimilation. At the same time, very light skinned mulattos may be able to pass for and join the
dominant group, especially if their cultural behaviors and identities fit, though life style may be the most significant difference in some quarters. The author has a Bolivian-Canadian friend who looks very much like an Ayamara Indian yet was, nonetheless, considered Blanco or White because of his family’s wealth, life-style, and identifications. Also many years ago, when doing fieldwork among Inuit in the Canadian Northwest Territories, I became aware of a blue-eyed, blond, tall family of phenotypically dominant Scandinavian-looking types who were considered, by themselves and their society members, as Inuit because of their life-styles and identifications. There is a lot of subtlety to the whole issue of creolization as connected to genetic intermixtures.

Creolization is itself a controversial field of study (see Stewart 2007), involving change at its basis. But as simple building blocks, it is a fascinating one involving genetic, linguistic, and sociocultural mixtures, plus all sorts of social, cognitive, identity, and value dynamics as well as intergroup relations.
Summary and Assessment

The establishment of the acculturation approach in anthropology during the 1930s was seminal in that it redirected the focus of North American anthropologists to contemporary Native peoples. It made anthropology relevant to the study of more immediate social circumstances, inter-ethnic relations, and on-going observations at the local level.

The approach also mapped and compared the large array of both differing and similar change experiences brought about by the coming of Europeans over four and a half centuries. Some research was tied to applied anthropology as an attempt to bring about reforms that would enhance the viability and health of Native Americans in the midst of an overwhelming Euro-American presence. Acculturation studies were also emerging and melding research of a structural, functional, and psychological nature in anthropology.

Yet by the mid-1970s, after 40 years of largely North Americanist research, the term acculturation and the style of its research had virtually disappeared from anthropological discourse. Why is that so? Much of the underpinning of both theory and method of the approach had been based on structural-functionalist models. That paradigm had been savagely attacked by most anthropologists for well over a decade. Among the emerging alternatives to which many had flocked to was the transactionalist (Barth 1967) approach that is discussed in Chapter Three. This approach rejected the emphasis on institutions and total sociocultural systems characteristic of acculturation studies, and instead focused on individuals within networks changing through their personal
experiments in behavioral strategies and being influenced by other people, such
as patrons and brokers. Acculturation was considered passé by this time. This
had also been a time of great turmoil in society and in anthropology as a period
of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism centered liberation movements of various
sorts, beginning with the emergence of militant movements both abroad and on-
shore, commenced

Among them was the Native American renascence of “Red Power” and
other political, artistic, and social dimensions of this movement. Included were
bright young intellectual leaders, such as Vine Deloria Jr (1969), who wrote
*Custer Died for Your Sins*. He effectively lampooned anthropologists among
others. Fundamentally, they were portrayed as parasites and their presence on
reservations was only furthering their own careers while superficially, and often
inaccurately, documenting the lives of Indian people. They were accused of
leaving nothing of value behind in policy, advocacy, or real help. This was a
devastating and somewhat inaccurate generalization, but it contained enough
truth that it was widely accepted by Native peoples going through much
radicalization toward self-determination and reassertion of their pride. The
suffering and injustice done to them were very real, and the majority of
anthropologists understood that far better than most. However, anthropologists
had not been very powerful or influential in society or decision-making circles,
and anthropological progressive thinking during the New Deal had often been
thwarted by the self-serving influences of bureaucrats. It is also true that not
enough anthropologists demonstrated the requisite courage to engage publically
about the disgraceful treatment of Native American. There were a few significant anthropologist advocates for Indian peoples in this era—Sol Tax and Phileo Nash among others--but they were not influential enough to make a large difference. Most germane of all, Native North Americans wanted to speak for themselves in quests for justice and self-determination.

Anthropology relevant to North American Native peoples fell into a crisis. Unease, guilt, soul searching, and debates about relevance were the order of the day. This was also a time when Marxist anthropology was prominent, and previous anthropological research on North American Native peoples tended to be critiqued as colonialist, bourgeois, and conservative. The result was that many switched domains and far fewer new graduate students went into this area of research. When they started to come back by the late 1980s, they had absorbed the critiques and new fashions in anthropology. Fine work, as much of it is, is a form of an auxiliary advocacy to already held Native positions, yet still having little actual influence on the policy world.

There are other reasons for acculturation’s fade. To many critics and superficial readers, acculturation sounded like cultural loss and assimilation—an inevitable loss of customs and assimilation into the institutions of Western dominated industrial and post-industrial societies. A careful reading of the acculturation literature shows that that is just not so—many options reside within the loose inductive formulation—resistance, cultural fusion, secret compartmentalization, and protection of valued items, revitalization, stabilized pluralism, and other options. One classical study about the Blackfoot (McFee
recognizes two major trends—that of those who sought change and modernization and those who were more focused on traditional cultural ways of language, ceremonies, kinship, and so forth. Yet there is a third situation that McFee terms “150% Blackfoot” where well-educated armed services veterans, while providing leadership and new ideas to the reservation, were also fluent in the Blackfoot language, and major promoters of the rejuvenation of ceremonialism and traditions. It is true, nonetheless, that some scholars--Helen Codere (1961) regarding Kwakiutl for instance--were a bit too hasty in their predictions of assimilation as an inevitable trend of acculturation circumstances that was not appropriate, especially since the broader comparative literature would show that if we look at broad stages within a people’s acculturation history, we can see remarkable transformations that can bring about significant shifts toward revival and strengthening of traditions. That being the case, anthropologists always need to be careful in any attempt to make predictions.

Related to this is the fact that much of the classical acculturation literature was written before, or on the eve of the late 1960s early 1970s Native American renascence (see Lurie 1968) movements seeking self-determination, pride in customs and identity, and very large scale Pan-Native communication, support, networking, and the building of new institutions. Cultural change among American Native peoples could no longer be seen as just located in small communities and reservations, but had to be viewed as residing in many locations—cities, universities, states, provincial, and national capitals.
Also related to this has been the difficulty of characterizing or mapping all of the trends that could be generated out of more contemporary acculturation circumstances—it cannot be just reduced to “modernists,” “traditionalists,” and ‘150% Men.” Urbanization, modernization, and most certainly globalization compound the fluidity and complexity to the point where there may be as many trends, subgroupings, and categories as there are people. Accounting for the individual in his or precise context, his or her agency, and interactions, as we shall later see, became more a dimension of the newer anthropologies. As well, there was great deal of attention to avoiding stereotyping or essentializing peoples, especially when they themselves did not see themselves in the portrayals made by anthropologists no matter how benign they may have been intended—it takes a lot of words, well crafted, to portray any kind of reality.

Acculturation has pretty well disappeared from the vocabulary of contemporary anthropologists. Even the brilliant work of James Bodley (2008), *Victims of Progress*, in its various editions portraying and inductively generalizing strategies and trends from the contact histories of indigenous peoples around the world faced with colonial oppressors in the last four hundred years, is actually describing acculturation, but Bodley avoids using the term. In fact, in his (Ibid: 46) Fifth Edition, he even criticizes the concept by referring to the absence of mentions of ethnocide and for not placing enough emphasis on the use of military force---citing the original (Redfield et. al 1936) acculturation formulation. Others may write or about phenomena that resemble acculturation, but they rarely use the term.
It is doubtful whether there ever will be a revival of acculturation in anthropology—something akin to a “neo-acculturation” approach. But as with evolution, there is no denying something like it has occurred and is still happening—acculturation is simply the kinds of changes that occur when formally autonomous and separated societies come into continuous first-hand contact with missionaries, traders, conquerors, bureaucrats, urbanites, and others. To deny it would be ludicrous. We see the consequences of colonial histories and subsequent stages upon Native North American, New Guinea Native peoples, African tribal peoples, immigrants, and all sorts of peoples all the time. In retrospect and given the nature of historical documents, it is quite logical to see different periods of overall change, perhaps directed by economic, pacification, power and policy directives, and other factors allowing us to see broad, institutional, behavioral, and ideological changes. We may be able to identify sub-groupings and even individual responses to the change stimuli. The other option is to simply use historiography to describe events and trends, but this does little to provide analytical order.

We now have the field of ethnohistory (Harkin 2010) that is a sensible amalgamation of history and the ethnographic dimensions of anthropology. It is a value added way to provide some social science clarity to the enterprise. Considering the long and vast output of acculturation scholars’ notions, such as syncretism, fusion, contact communities, directed, and undirected change, these and many others can add to the analysis. So my contention is that, call it
acculturation or not, the mode of analysis is still highly useful in the analysis of the more immediate past of sociocultural contacts.

For contemporary anthropologists, acculturation formulations with their somewhat static analyses may not have much to add to Twenty-First Century enquiries on the complexities of globalization and development. Also, the late Twentieth Century focus on individuals, networks, entrepreneurs, and agency draws our attention away from structured institutional change to more fluid and innovative approaches. Where is the acculturation conceptual analysis (whether the term is actually used or not) still useful in our theoretical toolkit? It is logical to use it when we are attempting to summarize broad directions taking place between the dominant institutions, values, and interactional fields of society with those of subordinate, vulnerable, or even exploited and discriminated groupings—certainly where there are identifiable issues such as economic disparities. We can refer here to Indigenous or First Nations peoples, as well as immigrant groupings and ethnic minorities. See Ervin (1980) for an example with Alaskan Natives struggling to maintain a resource base and land rights in the midst of a massive resource rush by Euro-Americans.

It is interesting to note that acculturation studies still thrive in some other social sciences—especially psychology in its social and cross-cultural subspecialties. The tradition of measurements, consequences, and descriptions of cultural contacts continues (see Castro 2003; Sam and Berry 2006).
Appendix D

REVITALIZATION MOVEMENTS AND CRISIS CULTS

Anthony Wallace (1956), an anthropologist and psychiatrist, has been notable within anthropology for his contributions to the study of psychological anthropology, the anthropology of religion, and the Iroquois of northern New York. His most lasting contribution has been the establishment of the study of revitalization movements. The influence of that achievement has gone far beyond anthropology as well as generated some controversy. While Wallace can claim the credit for popularizing the field, the first anthropological observations and analysis of such phenomena were actually found in James Mooney’s (1896) remarkable study of the Ghost Dance Religion, a late Nineteenth Century response to the tragedies experienced by Western American Indian nations.

Revitalization movements, and this is important to our topic of sociocultural change, are seen by Wallace both as deliberate attempts to change society and culture and as group response to highly stressful on-going change. So revitalization movements are both a response to change and a form of change in themselves. Revitalization movements attract a lot of interest simply because they are very interesting, exotic, and dramatic. While exotic, they are recognizable as still being very human and repetitive—the underlying patterns of
stages, causes, and motivations, have been found over and over again amongst extremely different types of societies. They are panhuman, found in all culture areas, historical periods, and most societies and classes—almost every human group seems to have the potential. That in turn makes them interesting from a social science point of view—what are their underlying causes and motivations? Do they relate to a common psychological state of stress? How do we account for the magico-religious dimensions of seemingly wishful thinking that invisible spirits come to the aid of humans? Are the underlying causes really ultimately economic or political—are they attempts to overthrow oppressive power or forms of rebellion that have not yet found rationale, instrumental means? To what extent are they deliberate movements with specific goals, or could they possibly really be more random and undirected movements without a clear purpose? In that regard, to what extent do they depend on organized leadership, most especially the prophet with his or her vision? To what extent do the contents of such movements depend upon existing specific cultural historical foundations and contents relevant to renewal—e.g., the biblical tradition of prophets, messiahs, apocalyses, and second comings, or the Mayan notion of eras ruled by gods, time limited and always ending in destruction? To what extent are the movements generated by concrete measurable events such as economic, environmental, health or militarily induced stress, or to what extent are they ideological constructs of individual and or group consciousness and unconsciousness—the materialistic versus ideational debate within anthropology? All of these questions highlight the significance of these
movements as indicators and major epistemological debates—or what is the basis of knowing what we think we know.

Another dimension of interest is the wide range of results emerging from these movements. Some of the most sublime but debatable accomplishments of humanity have been found in such movements—the emergence of major religions (Christianity, Islam, Buddhism), perhaps all religions, as a result of this recurrent feature of adapting response. Also the fact that so many societies and subsocieties facing extinction or long-term dysfunction have been able to transform into a new stability or revitalization is impressive. Yet oppressed peoples may have also have been led into impossible promises of redemption or rescue that may instead lead to their demise being crushed by superior forces. This can occur also through internal demagoguery—think of the tragedy at Jonestown, Guyana as an example (Scheeres 2011) where 1000 people were murdered and committed suicide under the orders of Rev. James Jones. So they have included some of the noblest accomplishments of humanity and some of the lowest and most tragic. There is a vast range of success in considering such movements.

The role of the individual in change is also a matter of issue in the study of these movements. On the surface, it can be noted that many of these movements appear to have leaders who have been labeled as prophets, those who preach the original spiritual or religious message that influences and guides others—Jesus, Mohammad, and Siddhartha, among others. Such innovators make a profound impact on their societies and beyond. Are they specifically
necessary is the major question presented by those who suggest that it is the
underlying sociocultural and environmental circumstances that are the casual
forces that seem to lead to the inevitability of the prophets—the counter
argument goes somebody else would fill their niches if not them. Part of the
equation is the necessity for the leader/prophet to have disciples and followers—
otherwise there would be no movement. Then there is the suggestion that while
some movements may clearly have a hierarchy of prophets, disciples, and
followers, other movements may be opaque or diffuse without discernible
leadership or ideologies.

Also of significance is how these movements relate or intersect with the
other forms of change discussed in this book. Revitalization movements require
innovators, who often take the form of prophets. Once the message is created, it
has to diffuse among a larger following and, if the message is effective, it is
transferred across societal boundaries. The pressures of acculturation,
revolution, modernization, urbanization, and globalization can all lead to
revitalization movements as responses to cultural loss and stress and as
attempts to resist or create adaptations in confronting these major sources of
change. To some extent too, they can also be vehicles to participate in such
changes.

Of some interest to the goals of the book is their link to the realm of
applied anthropology (see Chapter Twelve). A significant dimension of
revitalization movements is that, in them, it is often apparent that people seek
change or improvements, even though it may appear that they expect God or the
gods to provide them with the ingredients to a better life. Nonetheless, changes or modifications in behavior, such as the end of alcohol consumption and internal group violence, and other socially destructive behaviors are often evident. This suggests a very strong motivational dimension within revitalization movements. A number of authors (Mead 1955, Goodenough 1963; Valentine 1968) have suggested that applied anthropologists and development agents should attempt to work with on-going revitalization movements, blending their agendas with the hopes and desires of those already wishing change—to help them fulfill their goals.

Before getting into more specific theoretical and conceptual presentations (e.g., Wallace1956; La Barre 1971; Worsley 1968) surrounding these movements, it would be helpful to provide the reader with a few sketches of such movements.

**Examples**

Wallace (1969) gives an extended example with Handsome Lake and the Longhouse Religion. By the late 1700s, the Seneca of upstate New York were at a low point because Americans treated them like defeated enemies—they had fought on the side of the British during the America Revolution. There was much disease, especially tuberculosis, smallpox, measles, and mumps. Family violence and alcoholism had escalated. Some women took medicines to make themselves sterile because they did not want to have families. Their land holdings, once extensive to support slash and burn horticulture, were drastically
reduced. Agriculture could not be properly supported. There were internal conflicts and witchcraft accusations, their neighbors (both Indian and white) ridiculed them, and the American government undermined them. The Seneca were dying as a society and culture.

In 1799, a Seneca named Handsome Lake, while lying sick with tuberculosis and recovering from alcoholism at a Quaker hospital, was cured by three angels who gave him a message from the Creator. The latter was saddened by the decline of the Iroquois, but was angry at their alcohol use, witchcraft, and use of abortion medicine—the Seneca needed to repent. Within a year, Handsome Lake had two more visions. One vision was that great drops of fire falling upon those who did not heed his teachings would consume the world. People could avert this by confessing their wrong deeds and giving up their sinful ways and returning to some of their traditional religious practices. The apocalypse supposedly did not occur because people were drawn to the new religion, later called the Longhouse Religion.

During the period 1803-1815, Handsome Lake provided secular interpretations about some teachings—alcohol was prohibited; peace between Indians and Whites was taught; scattered reservations were to be consolidated; family morality was to be upheld; divorce and adultery were not allowed; and, quite significantly, he advocated the establishment of intensive agriculture whereby men played large roles and used plows and fertilizers. Previously, agriculture, the realm of women, was considered effeminate and unworthy of
hunters and warriors. This religion became the orthodoxy among the Seneca and spread among other Six Nations Iroquois and into Canada.

The *Taiping Rebellion* (1851-1864) (Spence 1996), is an extremely exotic example. Southern China in the mid-1800s was in a state of incredible stress and turmoil. Pirates and Triad gangs violently ruled, and the corrupt Qing Manchu dynasty was not fully in control, but resented for its arrogant suppression of Han Chinese culture and actions against minority groups like Hakka Chinese in the region who were doubly persecuted by Han and Manchu. To add to the turmoil, Europeans had imposed their will by enforcing trade and missionizing Southern China through ports such as Hong Kong. Western technology and ideas had a certain attraction.

Hong Xiuquan, a Hakka, had written examinations to enter the Chinese imperial bureaucracy but failed four times. During the third examination, he had a nervous breakdown and saw visions. After the fourth failure, he spent a month in Hong Kong with an American missionary. He gained a very superficial knowledge of Christianity. He then started the God Worshiper’s Society in the more isolated Hakka region of Guangxi province. Hong Xiuquan reinterpreted his visions where he had visited Heaven and he had met a golden haired and bearded man (God) who told him to cast out demons. He also met Jesus, who was introduced as Hong’s older brother. Both Jesus and God had harems. Hong was told to start a Heavenly Kingdom of Great Peace (Taiping) on Earth

By 1850, the new religion had collected over 20,000 followers at its base community. In its Christian influences, it was much more Old Testament in
orientation—God was seen as vengeful and violent. The Taipings were against opium, alcohol, tobacco, adultery, prostitution, foot binding, and gave much scope to women who served in their army and had some administrative posts. They also used baptism, hymns, and selected passages from the Bible. In the beginning they were extremely egalitarian, but that broke down later with their leaders, who became corrupt and self-serving. In 1851, Hong proclaimed himself Heavenly King of a brand new dynasty and the Taiping rebellion began. They took on the Manchu Empire and brought it to its knees in southern China—Taiping military leaders were ingenious and 600 walled cities changed hands during the period (sometimes whole cities were completely massacred). They conquered Nanking where they set up their capital. Yet because of their arrogance and unorthodoxy, they did not get the expected support of from Europeans. Political divisions and assassinations occurred among the leaders. Eventually they were completely defeated by a Manchu army of 120,000. It has been estimated that during the fourteen years of the rebellion, as many as 20,000,000 died in the violence and economic disruptions leading to starvation. The experience of the Taiping Rebellion is one of the reasons why the contemporary Chinese government is nervous about the emergence of any new religious movement.

A response by Plains Indians after their defeat by the U.S. Government and their forced settlement on reservations was the Ghost Dance (Mooney 1896). According to the Paiute prophet Wovoka, dancing the Ghost Dance wearing ghost shirts would lead to invincibility against soldiers’ bullets. Ancestors
would return and assist the development of a new age. A new earth would emerge, pushing off White and bringing back the buffalo. The religion was especially popular among the Lakota Indians in South Dakota. Forced into misery on a reservation, malnourished and desperate, followers met to dance at Wounded Knee in 1890 and over 300 men, women and children were massacred by the 7th. U.S. Calvary. James Mooney (1896), a pioneering anthropologist working for the Bureau of Ethnology, provided a sympathetic report showing that the Ghost Dance Religion was largely a harmless religion, a byproduct of the enormous stress that Plains Indians had undergone. It was an early example of applied/policy anthropology, leading to a modulation of the oppression of Indians by the government.

The Peyote Cult, or the Native American Church studied by Weston La Barre (1938), is another example. The peyote cactus grown in the American southwest produces a hallucinogenic affect when eaten. It became the sacrament for the Native American Church that also grew as a response to the defeat and confinement of Western Indians in the late 1800s. It had many uses, but frequently advocated the simultaneous worship of God and Jesus while abandoning many previous spiritual practices. Peyote was seen as a sacramental substance provided by God. The peyote religion provided moral direction and meaning. It was incorporated in Oklahoma as an official church on equal standing with Christian churches after a protracted court battle that tried to outlaw it. It spread throughout the West, and even into Canada.
As Norman Cohn (1961) points out, the Western Judeo-Christian tradition is loaded with religious movements of revitalization occurring during periods of great stress or dislocation. Reinforced by the books of the bible associated with various prophets and the Book of Revelation, they have been linked through successions of religious protest movements into modern secular totalitarian movements (such as fascism and communism).

**Anthony Wallace’s Original Revitalization Formula**

In his presentation, Wallace (1956) saw an underlying set of psychodynamics that would draw people in diverse settings to form revitalization movements. Such collective actions were seen as deliberate and conscious efforts by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture. In order to reach that point, they had to feel that their present circumstances were unsatisfactory. It was felt necessary to innovate not just discrete items, but a whole new cultural system that would specify new relationships among people and provide new cultural values, beliefs, rituals, and sometimes even technologies. This kind of change could happen very rapidly and was similar to or could be part of revolutions. These movements resulted from the disequilibrium caused by stress. Wallace was also drawing from another significant paradigm of the time—the structural-functional one and the assumption that sociocultural systems were normally in states of equilibrium but could rapidly reorder their essential ingredients in order to survive.
His psychological theory drew upon a concept of his that he termed “mazeway,” which was roughly equivalent to worldview or the mental ways that people perceived and organized their relationships and the mapping of the natural and supernatural beings in their external worlds. Ideological components of culture, such as values and assumptions of cause and effect, were always shared to a certain extent, but each individual’s version as stored neurologically would be a slightly different version into which they had been enculturated and individually processed. People’s senses of self and security would emerge from the success of repetitive validations, or failures, of the individual mazeways in frequent social, natural, and spiritual experiences. Overall, individual psyches collectively reinforce the sociocultural system and vice versa.

However, extreme stress from a multitude of stressors—environmental change, economic downturns, class conflicts, external invasion, enforced changes from external invaders, the loss of power, and other factors—could lead to disturbing and dissonant mazeway experiences. Things do not work according to the standardized, repetitive, or institutional ways. The gods or spirits are not responding, gender relations are disturbed, younger generations ignore the advice of older ones, the crops do not grow, the game doesn’t return, people get sick in spite of their prayers and amulets, and much stress and anxiety is shared. Individually, consciously and unconsciously through the frequent agitations in emotion and cognition, people experienced extreme frustration and anxiety in their mazeways.
The old ways are not working. So as a kind of collective felt-need, the culturally shared mazeway is eventually perceived as being in drastic need of change. Tied into notions of innovation, and this is crucial to his theory, mazeway transformations begin with single innovators—prophets—and their innovations are transferred to others. These innovations most frequently emerge out of visions and dreams, thus the unconscious can play a very large role in the emergence of revitalization movements. Following his psychological theory, revitalization movements begin with individual personality transformations and then spread to others.

He makes the compelling argument that all the established religions of the world are relics of former revitalization movements. The stages of the movements are roughly the same regardless of the local circumstances. Wallace begins with an assumption of the steady state—that the sociocultural system would be in a structural-functional circumstance of equilibrium at some point. The major institutions of family, politics, religion, law, ecological adaptation, and enculturation work properly and serve the needs of most individuals. This assumption may be one of the ultimate flaws of the theory.

Then there is the period of increased individual stress where individuals one by one, and ultimately all members of the society undergo increasing stress and their traditional capacities to cope fail. Their abilities to deal with such things as environmental change, economic distress, epidemics, conquest, acculturation, and so forth are severely tested.
A period of cultural distortion then sets in. As Wallace puts it, “psychodynamically regressive coping” behaviors, such as alcohol and drug abuse, extreme passivity and indolence, intragroup violence, and the breakdown of family and the values attached to it can be examples of this stage’s behavior. A major dissatisfaction with the old culture (represented in the steady state) could set in along with a major apathy or hopelessness of finding ways to adapt to the stresses people are facing. At this point the sociocultural system could completely collapse, and, if the people do not die off, they likely would be absorbed as lower status people in another sociocultural system.

The period of revitalization contains a number of substages. The first of these is a mazeway reformulation—a set of innovations that contain the ingredients to a solution. This is developed in the mind of a leader or prophet and most often comes in the form of an inspiration or revelation. Wallace clearly maintains, and this is important regarding alternatives and critiques, that the reformulation occurs in the mind of a single person. A standard scenario is where the prophet receives one or several visions in which a supernatural being appears to the potential prophet. That being explains that the society’s problems are the result of certain behaviors or the violation of rules. The being promises revitalization if the rules are followed and certain rituals performed. If they do not adhere, it may also promise further catastrophe.

Normally, the prophet has experienced the same sorts of stress and personal breakdowns as others during the period of cultural distortion. After the vision, the prophets show remarkable and radical changes in their personalities.
and there is a remission of old chronic complaints. They show more active and purposeful lives and drop off old bad habits such as alcoholism. The content realms, visions, and reforms of the prophets could be analyzed as evidence of highly conflicted neurotic or psychotic personalities. Yet Wallace chooses not to take this route and sees these transformations in a positive light—insights that are creative towards healing but make use of a wisdom that can emerge from the unconscious.

In many cultural situations studied by anthropologists, there are already behaviors and experiences similar to this—for instance the ordinary seeking of a guardian spirit among North American Indians and the process of becoming a shaman. As he puts it, in some cultures it is possible for all three processes, including that of the prophet and his vision in revitalization, to be integrated with each other. In general, successful prophets are those who believe themselves to have communicated with the supernatural and rarely do they themselves maintain that they are supernatural. So as a psychiatrist and an anthropologist, Wallace is assuming that the religious vision, by itself, is not pathological or simply hallucinatory, but in this type of scenario, is the reverse—a healing mechanism. It seems to be a positive synthesizing and therapeutic process performed under extreme stress by individuals already sick.

The next step within the revitalization process is communication. Amongst many dimensions of the message delivered to potential followers of the central vision is that they will come under the care and protection of certain supernatural beings and both they and the society will benefit psychologically, spiritually, and
even materially from a new supernaturally sanctioned system. This process involves mass exhortations and possibly mass conversions.

Yet for any revitalization movement to be truly successful, there has to be organization. That likely involves small groups of people whom we might label as disciples. Like the prophet, these people undergo a personal revitalizing process in terms of behavior, values, and attitudes. They tend to have a close relationship with the prophet, even so far as, to use Wallace’s psychiatric jargon, to develop a “transference dependency” on him. But in the majority of cases, they themselves do not have intense personal relations with the supernatural. That is left to the prophet. In Wallace’s formulation, the prophet has charisma implying a special personality and one touched, as it seems, directly by the supernatural and carrying with him the essence of that legitimacy to justify his or her leadership, which may not even be voluntary. Charisma is a slippery concept, and one upon which several of the critiques of Wallace’s formulation will rest. Yet, even the “charisma” of the prophet may be a characteristic that could actually impede his capacity to lead the movement further. That is where he needs, to use our contemporary terms, a management team. The coterie of disciples provides the action plan and keeps the movement afloat. Internal dimensions have to be worked out—who is the principal disciple and who takes care of what organizational tasks? Any hierarchies and organizational features within the group have to be determined, even potential clashes with the prophet, as well as rules for succession. Then, the disciples have to organize their abilities to expand
the followership and make contact with groups and individuals outside of the organization.

A major and crucial stage for revitalization is that of adaptation and it is here where the movement could falter or fail. In some cases such as the Taipings mentioned earlier, the movement was revolutionary and one which sees the necessity to overthrow the existing society completely—including foreign invaders by military force. Members will certainly face military and other forms of resistance. For adaptation the movement must prevail. The Ghost Dance Religion mentioned earlier did not adapt. Although not military in direction, it was paranoidly perceived as designed to overthrow Whites. The American government overreacted, leading to the slaughter of over 300 Dakota at Wounded Knee. Later, the Peyote Cult, naming itself as the Native American Church, made use of lawyers, the courts, and other forms of public relations to get itself accepted as just another form of religion and to highlight some dimensions similar to Christianity. For a long time, persecuted Christians had to deal with the sources of power in the Roman Empire, so “rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar’s” was prevalent as a strategy by Christians. This was done consciously in order to adapt and not appear as subversive threats to the point where, eventually, the whole Roman Empire was accepting of Christianity. But many potential revitalization movements fail at this stage or they drastically change their original doctrines to adapt to their contexts. For adaptation, political and diplomatic maneuverability, and sometimes the aid of outside, powerful influences are needed.
Next comes the period of *cultural transformation* whereby the whole or large parts of the population in question comes to accept the new religion—a noticeable social revitalization occurs. This is marked by the reduction of personal disintegration of individuals and an enthusiastic program of group action. Revitalization is underway and its impacts can be observed in changes in behavior as well with as people in larger numbers joining the new religion.

Then comes the period of *routinization*. If the group action in its new program is effective in reducing the stresses that had led to the period of cultural distortion, then the impact of the movement becomes established as normal in various social, economic, political institutions, and through daily customs, all being new from previous periods. Rarely though, can the movement claim control over all the aspects of the transformed society. More than likely, through the spiritual authority and influence of the successful movement, practitioners will be able bring their newfound revitalized values and attitudes into other categories beyond religion.

The final stage is that of a *new steady state*. The culture coming out of the new emerging revitalization movement would start to and eventually succeed in developing a complete balance among family and kinship, ecological adaptation and economic production and exchange, politics, law and authority, enculturation, the arts, religion, values, and so forth. While psychological in theory, Wallace was also drawing from structural functional assumptions that were prevalent in the 1950s. So in this theory of revitalization, we begin with a
steady state and end with a steady state, although this in turn may go under a period of cultural distortion and lead to another revitalization movement.

At the end of his much-cited article, there is a discussion of some of the variety and emphases that revitalization might take. To what extent do they emphasize the recreation of a previous golden age or to what extent do they emphasize a future utopia? Both can be drawn upon as with the biblical traditions of the millennium as well as the Garden of Eden. To what extent do they draw upon foreign materials or do they draw upon nativistic traditions? Again, there can be a synthesis of both. Is there an emphasis on apocalyptic or eschatological traditions—in the expectations that before the benefits to arrive there has to be mass destruction and suffering first? To what extent does the movement have more of a secular focus in that, for instance, centrally certain economic goals may be most central (as with New Guinea cargo cults) or political as with attempts to remove oppressive colonial masters? To what extent is the movement otherworldly and mystical with perhaps expectations of future rewards, only coming after death in some heavenly sphere?

The theory of revitalization has had lasting power for over sixty years and is cited in virtually every introductory textbook in anthropology and has much influence in other subjects such as history, psychology, and religious studies. However, it in itself cannot be complete and others have found flaws, caveats and exceptions with certain dimensions of the theory.

The Trumpet Shall Sound: Peter Worsley and the Marxist Critique
The most direct criticism of Wallace’s revitalization approach came from Peter Worsley (1968) in his book *The Trumpet Shall Sound*, the title being taken from a phrase in the Book of Revelations, a biblical source of Christian and other revitalization inspirations. The book surveys the history and dynamics of countless cargo cults in New Guinea and associated Melanesian archipelagos such as the New Hebrides and New Solomon Islands. Worsley explicitly takes the political economic/ Marxist approach and suggests that these movements follow a form of class conflict—native Melanesian as opposed to British, Australian, French, Dutch, German, and occasional Japanese (during World War II) colonial oppressors. Such intruders on the islands defeated them in war, displaced them, imposed European laws, exploited their labor on plantations and mines sometimes through approaches resembling slavery, and forced foreign ideologies, such as Christianity, upon them. Furthermore, while maintaining their power through superior weaponry, divide and rule tactics, and arrogant senses of superiority, the Europeans had large amounts of material goods and luxuries—cargos—that were not created locally but delivered to them by ship and later by airplane.

Resentments against colonial masters spread and became contagious throughout the islands. The dominant belief system was that ultimately, the good things in life (as well as the bad) were supplied through the auspices of dead ancestors. Given widespread beliefs in magical cause and effect relationships, certain ritual’s forms could be used to please the ancestors to bring about good harvests, maintain health, defeat enemies, and gain desirable spouses. Forms of
stimulus diffusion through contacts reinforced Syncretic cargo cult movements with the Europeans—especially missionaries, drawing from teachings in the Book of Revelation that foresaw a Golden Age, the Millennium, and their own ritual approaches to dealing with their ancestors. The main focus of cargo cults was gaining the material goods, or cargos, to which the Melanesians felt they were entitled. In some cases, added to the beliefs was the view that the rich amounts of manufactured goods, food, and clothing that the Europeans were receiving were actually being intended for the Melanesians—their ancestors were trying to send the goods to them. Instead, the Europeans were using magic to divert the cargos intended for others to themselves.

Not having access to European factories, warehouses, and knowledge of their systems of economic distribution, the Melanesians used their notions of cause and effect that placed emphasis on magico-religious dimensions and the role of ancestors. They also borrowed forms in their rituals, such as representations of Jesus, holy water, baptisms, hymns, and biblical phrases that they thought relevant. They imitated other forms of behavior such as setting up airports and harbors and doing things like talking into tin cans in imitation of guiding airplanes to their airports with the hopes of diverting them away from their European airports. There was a great deal of variety to the hundreds of cargo cults Worsley studied, and there was significant variation on the degree of leadership—some had distinct leaders, others had more committee like structures, and many others were indistinct in leadership being in effect mass movements. Some were militant in attempting to militarily overthrow the
colonialists, some had faith in the ultimate benevolence of the ancestors to allow them to prevail materially, and others were more significantly oriented to some degree of cooperation with Europeans to bring about material change. As Margaret Mead pointed out in (1955) *New Lives for Old*, a restudy of the Manus, the local cargo cult was serving as one means whereby Manus were seeking participation in modernization (schooling, cash crops etc.).

Returning to Worsley, he sees such movements with religious content as represented by cargo cults as rationalistic political economic responses. The participants are protesting their lower status, lessened power, and comparative lack of resources. These are “political movements in progress” against oppressors making use of religious ideology in class warfare. In making this argument, he draws upon European history and peasant revolts in the Middle Ages that took upon themselves religious ideology in attempting to overturn the nobles oppression. Lacking guns, powerful political means, and other resources, people will turn to religion and new religious movements to direct their protest and express class conflict. Worsley suggests that religion, as an institution, can be just as much or more a source of change and rebellion as it is a mechanism to maintain the status quo. The notion that religion is fundamentally a conservative force—an ideological and behavioral projective system to preserve the status—originated with Emile Durkheim (1912), the French sociologist.

Worsley takes issue with Anthony Wallace and by extension the German sociologist Max Weber, and he places Wallace in Weber’s tradition. Weber (1905) emphasized ideas as motivating change rather than real material
conditions of economy and politics. Ideas bring about change as with the case of the Capitalism emerging out of Protestant thought. For Worsley and other Marxian leaning social scientists, material condition of economics, politics, and class conflict generates ideas. Worsley suggests that Wallace draws heavily upon Weber in his notions of charismatic leadership in explaining the emergence and role of the prophet in revitalization movements. According to the Weberian tradition, the charisma of the prophet, a mysterious spiritual power, draws followers. From the point of view of the followers, charisma, power directly given to the person by God or some other supernatural entity, justifies the authority that the leader has over the followers.

But the more Marxian interpretation is that the charisma is an invented, after-the-fact justification for the acceptance of the leadership or message from the prophet, religious, or political leader. For Worsley, there would be no prophet if there were not already a potential followership that will resonate with an acceptable message that recognizes the common frustrations of the lack of power and material goods that people are suffering. If it is not the particular “prophet” who succeeds in starting the movement, it can be another one, because it is a role that can be filled, and another eventually one will come along.

For Worsley the notion of heavy dependence on the innovative genius of the leader is very much overstated in Wallace’s formulation. Also, many movements have multiple leaders or leadership that is very diffuse. Furthermore, Worsley pays much less attention to factors of psychological stress and individual innovative genius than does Wallace. As a Marxist, he also rejects the
structural-functional approaches that are part of Wallace’s theory—there is no steady state in his view. There is always class conflict or some equivalent in the form of stresses and resentment among less and more powerful interests in any society. The latter forms the basis of a socio-religious movement that seeks to overthrow the current worldly realm as its goal, in its evolution, but for the moment, relies on the appeal to and through the supernatural since the followers do not have the secular power to achieve their goals. Later, though, in more evolved circumstances, the oppressed may then form unions, political parties, and even revolutionary movements to bring about the desired changes. In his book, he does cite some circumstances in the Melanesian context where in the later stages of colonialism, some cargo cults did indeed evolve into political parties.

So at this point, we have two somewhat conflicting points of view—a psychological, structural functional approach associated with Wallace that pays a great deal of attention to the innovative genius of the prophet, and a Marxist, political-economic one that focuses on real material, political, and economic circumstances embedded in class conflict that inevitably lead to socio-religious movements of protest with or without leaders who gain the ultimately empty category of charisma after the fact.
Crisis Cults: Weston LaBarre’s Attempt at a More Comprehensive Formulation

Weston LaBarre (1971) was an American anthropologist who, like Wallace, was immersed in the Cultural and Personality school and his major focus of study was the Peyote Cult (1968), or the Native American Church. Some of his psychological discussion is interesting and contains potential insight, but his framework is much wider than Wallace’s in explaining the causes and operations of the movements we are talking about. This framework gives the tools to look more specifically at the multicausal frameworks that are relevant to particular ethnographic circumstances in particular places and times. Here, we are avoiding “the one size fits” all approach to theory.

“Crisis cults are any group reaction to crisis, chronic or acute, that is cultic” (i.e., involving worship and religion). “The crisis is a deeply felt frustration or a basic problem where routine methods (whether secular or sacred) cannot cope.” “The cultic is the indisposition to accept either disruptive feedback or self-critique of the experience…” It is “instead supported by the wish needs of the participants to indulge in the appetite to believe. It includes any new sacred attitudes towards a set of beliefs. It excludes the pragmatic, revisionistic, secular response that is tentative and realistic.” It is essentially a matter of an “emotionally directed epistemological stance toward belief”—in other words, people see their world though a kind of child-like wishful thinking (Ibid: 11).

He claims that he is not assuming that those that have been labeled as “primitive” are any more prone to this type of wishful thinking than are so-called
“civilized” peoples. As he was able to show in his extensive literature review, crisis cults can occur among disposed, impoverished, marginal peoples, but also elite, powerful peoples. Crisis cults can occur among people who are demographically and in terms of power in the minority or oppressed, but they can also be found with demographically numerous and more powerful peoples.

There are many styles through which the cultic can be expressed. It can be heresy to the currently dominating religion, or it can be a supportive and further revelation to the orthodoxy. It can emerge out of circumstances that are internal to the society and its traditions. It can be a response; a reaction to external forces brought about by acculturation or attempted modernization and, in today’s context, globalization. In terms of character, they can be revolutionary and subversive, fairly mundane, and highly spiritual. They can be nativistic, revivalist, and traditional, or they can be highly innovative and future oriented. They take many forms and types. The descriptions and analyses of crisis cults can be political, economic, psychological or historical, or all combined. In this context there can be no cult without a crisis. Like Wallace, LaBarre assumes that just as the body responds to stress so does the mind, and there is the possibility for healing.

Much of his approach is psychological as well. Key to his theory is that people individually and collectively are responding to a “wounded narcissism”—a collective identity crisis where self-worth is in doubt. Cultural systems are, in his view, ultimately attempts to create homeostasis or balance to provide the group with a shared set of psychological defenses. If those are under threat because of
the crisis, then collective responses that are cultic may come into play. Such responses are not necessarily conscious and could be more unconscious, without a full awareness or intention to change circumstances, and without a particular agenda and leadership in the form of a prophet. This is where he differs from Wallace—these movements are not necessarily blueprints for intentional change.

In his literature review, he discusses theories of causation. *Political theories* are the first under review—the approach that sees them as responses of the disposed to seek justice. It is true that we can find such examples as with the Ras Tafari movements in Jamaica, but even Rastafarianism had elements of ordinary spirituality that related to everyday life. Wallace argues that even politically dominant elites and nations are not untroubled. Buddhism arose among powerful Brahmans and elites in India during times of spiritual troubles. Cults emerged among Aztec warriors in central Mexico who were haunted by the fears of the end of the world and awaited the return of a kind of savior in the form of Quetzalcoatl. The Peyote Cult that he studied so intensively never had political overtones about being anti-government or seeking separation from Whites. The political theory was most promoted by Peter Worsley in his pointing out that some cargo cults in Melanesia evolved into unions and political parties, but that seems to be a restricted regional response in some cases.

*Economic explanations* often go hand in hand with political ones, as is the case with Worsley’s political-economic theory associated with Melanesian cargo cults. In some cases, there was an extravagant desire for large amounts of
European material goods. The response, in their common economic myth, was that ghost ancestors provided all the good material benefits in one’s life—a pre-existing religious cause and effect set of beliefs—so it was deeply embedded in a complex preexisting set of religious beliefs. An economic rationalistic explanation for motives cannot be imposed smoothly upon this system. Besides that, economic motives, while embedded in some other contexts, are not universal as central explanations in the cults.

Another spin that comes up occasionally is a special circumstance of acculturation through being exposed to Christian missionaries and the notion that Jesus is going to return, or that there is some kind of messianism that is patterned on the notion of Jesus returning as a savior. That can happen as we saw in the earlier case in this chapter of the Taipai movement where Hong Xuiang perceived himself as Jesus’ younger brother, leading the Hakka in a spiritual and military crusade against the Manchu oppressors. LaBarre nonetheless points out that it would be extremely ethnocentric to believe that every native messiah is patterned on a European Jesus. When Captain Cook arrived in Hawaii, he was believed to be the return of Lono, a native god and former paramount chief, and a fever of cultish behavior surrounded his presence. Similarly, when Cortez came to Mexico at a time of eschatological fears, he was at first seen to be a return of Quetzalcoatl, a god who would bring benevolence to Mexico at a time of trouble.

In this discussion he refers to charisma and the notion of heroes as being somewhat universal and also to what he calls the “Barbarossa motif.” Barbarossa
was a medieval knight/hero/emperor of the Holy Roman Empire who led a crusade but on the way to Holy Land, drowned at a river crossing. There was, nonetheless, a belief that he never died and that someday he will return and overthrow injustice and lead people to a better life. The belief in Barbarossa continued for several centuries after his death. The immortality of heroes, LaBarre claims, is a form of very widespread animistic belief that can motivate in many different cultures, irrespective of any possible parallel of Jesus as savior who will return. So the return of a charismatic, heroic leader is a motif in many culture areas and crisis cults, but not present in every case.

Related to this issue is the Great Man Theory that is parallel to the debate between Wallace and Worsley over the prophet and charisma. The question is: do such movements absolutely depend on a highly innovative leader to begin? LaBarre takes the intermediate position that many movements will have significant leaders with what appears to be “charismatic” influence. But very frequently, they will also have a second leader who is the organizer upon whom the movement depends upon to advance. He gives the example of Joseph Smith as being the founder of Mormonism, but the movement depended on Brigham Young to grow. While pointing all of this out, he also takes a position somewhat similar to Worsley. People make history—you cannot have such movements without committed followers. History does not depend upon the actions of one individual—it takes many to make it unfold. Regarding the case of charisma—the special power and uncanny appeal of the prophet—it is seen as being contained within the messages being delivered that appeal directly to the unconscious.
wishes of the individual attracted to the movement. Overall the notion of the religious genius is ultimately a psychosocial phenomenon—it only has relevance if it is useful and the message can operate in actual social and cultural context. Otherwise, he may be viewed as insane or as a false prophet, and he and his messages are rejected because of the discrepancy with culturally perceived realities. Charisma is not a sacred or supernatural force, but is instead quite locally as being secular and psychosocial. The prophet forms a relationship with his followers on the basis of the resonance of his message with the unconscious wishes of the potential followers.

*Acculturation* may be a factor that supplies the stress motivating the emergence of a cult. Cultural systems are in clash and since the emergence of anthropology, we have opportunity to see many cultures in contact and the emergence of such things as cargo cults, the Ghost Dance Religion and so forth. Acculturation can be a significant motivator of such cults because of the dissonance that arises from the cultural clashes. Also, they are often expressions of the outcomes of acculturation in the revealing of syncretism or the combining of aspects of the cultures in contact with (e.g., native traditions being combined with Christianity). Yet acculturation can be seen as only one of many potential causes because crisis cults can arise within autonomous cultural traditions. People may well be dissatisfied with their own cultural system. He suggests that nobody is precisely enculturated to all aspects of his or her culture. With those that may innovate a new ideological system in attempts to reform such a system, they would be especially inclined to having ambivalence to his or her culture. But
in the context of acculturation, there is more than likely certainly dissatisfaction with elements of the alien culture, especially if it is engaged in directed change. So there would be plenty of material to generate crisis cults. Yet, as we have seen in the chapter of acculturation, there are many possibilities for response in acculturation situations, only one of which is a crisis cult.

LaBarre’s approach, like Wallace’s, does make use of psychological theories—psychological stress is always a necessary but not sufficient cause of crisis cults in his view. And he feels that it is not stress by itself that is important, but the reaction to it. In a psychodynamic framework, he considers the reactions to be “regressive”; a “form of infantile regression” that calls for “a state of grace” where the participants seek “protection and a favored status from a parent like figure.” He considers how humans adapt to their circumstances—technology has played a major role in human evolution, but so have notions of the sacred and magico-religious beliefs and practices. The beliefs in magico-religious forces beyond the individual, are regressive—“they do not evolve” and “are not adaptation to an outer world but only to an inner world.” In that regard, he also returns to the charisma controversy whereby the participants see it or its equivalent as a supernatural commodity of power and authority given to the leader or leaders. Yet, as he puts it, the leaders of crisis cults have the “capacity to communicate this emotional language of regression” so the essential feature of successful capabilities of communicating the message are essential in developing any theories about crisis cults. The stresses of cognitive dissonance—the thought patterns of the participants—are threatened by new
realities that do not match their ways of thinking. This leads to the stresses and they then regress to making use of magico-religious solutions that may be invented anew in order to deal with the crisis. That is matched with his notion of the peoples involved suffering from a “wounded narcissism” a vulnerability of a threatened set of identities and expected ways of believing and acting. People in response to a spiritual form of cultish response may quickly conform because, in many respects, it is comforting and consensus may provide the only standard of sanity. The myths and dreams come from the effective communication of the leaders who appear to have the important message from the supernatural realm of how to create the new man and woman to escape from the crisis. As he suggests, much in any culture tends to be irrational, but these beliefs and action often work well as means for coping and adaptation.

In contrast to those with “wounded narcissistic tendencies” and who follow movements in regressive, infantile ways, LaBarre contrasts them with those who are skeptical—“few minds have the emotional freedom, security, arrogance, loneliness, sense of adventure to be authentically scientific” (Ibid: 23-25).

In his conclusions, he is against reductionisms—such as reducing the movements to economic and political foundations or to responses to cultural contacts. He suggests, and this makes good common sense, that crisis cults can evolve in their form, shape, content, and causes as a result of a combination of factors including regional history, economics and politics, and contact factors, including whether or not there is a specific blueprint for change, and specific psychological and religious traditions. But consistent with all of them has to be
cognitive dissonance and stress—a deep dissatisfaction with the way things are working out. Through crisis cult dynamics, people are led to new worldviews—to new culturally designed epistemologies that explain things to relieve the stress and dissonance.

Some of LaBarre’s formulation may be unsettling or raise ambivalence with some (including myself). Perhaps he is projecting his own sense of personal worth and bias by separating the scientific skeptical mind—tentative, lonely, and nonconforming—from that of the wounded narcissist, who is regressive in seeking infantile solutions through crisis cults. Yet he is being honest, and most of us have probably thought this way at one time or another. I would bear in mind Wallace’s approach that some of the highest as well as the lowest accomplishments of humanity have come through these movements.

Summary
The heyday of crisis cult and revitalization movement research overlapped with that of acculturation and evolutionary studies as well as early forays into modernization and development. The exotic, dramatic, and at the same time intriguing possible universality of human response attracted a lot of attention. Central to change studies was the appearance that they were both responses to change and attempts to direct change. Here, they overlapped with acculturation and development studies. They also served to inspire some approaches relevant to applied anthropology. They also overlapped with periods of psychological anthropology in seeking psychological experiences, motivations, coping
behaviors, and cognitive patterns that reflected individual psyches of the leaders and the followers with group negotiated patterns for responding to or influencing change. The insights originating in anthropology served as powerful inspirations for other fields such as social psychology, sociology, history, and religious studies.

Eventually, as with acculturation and evolutionary studies, revitalization movement research faded from mainstream anthropology. It is also probably true with the metaphorical “slash and burn” nature of anthropology that this field had been virtually exhausted, and it was perhaps time to place it in fallow. Yet notice that just about every introductory textbook in anthropology has a significant chapter or subchapter, often in a discussion of religion that lays out the recurrent dimensions of such movements with prominent citations of Anthony Wallace. The theories and field have admirable staying powers. Revitalization movements themselves often recycle older materials and earlier phases of their existence—think of Old Testament prophets’ predictions of the coming of the Messiah and the later cycle of Revelations within Christianity. It is likely that, similarly, there will be a later revitalization of revitalization studies in some future period of anthropology. In the meantime, we can still benefit from this era’s insights.
Appendix E

NEO-EVOLUTIONISM

‘Change’ is scientific, progress is ethical; change is indubitable, whereas progress is a matter of controversy.
Bertrand Russell (Oxford 2006: 283)

Neo-Evolutionism arose primarily in the 1950s as bolstered first by advanced archeological reconstructions. Most notably, they came from the Near East with the establishment of irrefutable sequences (see V.G. Childe 1936; 1951)—i.e., stone, copper, bronze, and iron ages, and Neolithic farming and urbanism. In some cases, the revival was influenced by the Marxist writings that placed emphasis on stages of social development and the means of production and technologies that peoples used in their economies that were, in turn, related to power, class, and conflict. Such Marxist tendencies, however, were largely peripheral and were rejected by later Marxists who saw themselves as being closer to the orthodoxy of Marx and Engels. Two American cultural anthropologists, Leslie White (1949,195) and Julian steward took up the full explication of evolutionary theories. For that end, they pioneered the cultural materialist approach which is described in Chapter Two.

Leslie White and Universal or General Theories of Evolution

In his key works, Leslie White (1949,1959) saw himself as the direct intellectual descendant of the Nineteenth Century Evolutionism of E.B.Tyler and Lewis
Henry Morgan. That evolutionism had been discredited by the Boasians and the very long period of cultural history and historical particularism (Voget 1975: 317-359) that eschewed any notion of regularities, cultural laws, or principles in the study of human societies. The particularist reaction to evolution was that each society was a product of its own unique history and could only be understood in its own terms. Clusters of traits such as art styles or family terms could only be understood within their own contexts. Change was dealt with through the detailed accounts of traits, one by one being diffused into particular societies through diffusion. They could not be isolated and compared beyond their boundaries.

After rediscovering the merits of Lewis Henry Morgan (1877) and having been influenced by some Marxist writings on evolution, Leslie White set on a course to break through this Boasian impasse and establish a deductive, comparative science. He succeeded for a while in the late 1950s through the mid-1970s. Throughout most of the earlier, almost twenty, years that White tried to re-establish evolutionism in anthropology, however, he met with an incredible amount of hostility. Carneiro (2003: 99-102) describes various early meetings of the then American Anthropological Association, a small organization where everybody knew everybody else and was certainly extremely cliquish in the 1940s and 1950s. There, White’s papers were seen as iconoclastic and met with open hostility, sarcasm, and ostracism. Whether or not such responses could be seen as justified in the context of the times, there is no doubt White contributed to the conflict with his often acrimonious and sweeping generalizations.
Frustrated, Leslie White had returned to the agenda of the founders of anthropology bolstered by the solid empirical evidence of worldwide archaeology. In definite reaction to the Boasians, White’s vision of the study of cultural change was at the macro-level—towards the grand schemes rather than the small details of the local, the particular, and the historical. The purposes of anthropology were to discover and analyze the laws of cultural change and learn in contemporary context how to adjust to these laws (more about that later). To avoid the major pitfall of the Nineteenth Century, he did not propose unilineal stages—that societies had to go through a ladder of stages broadly contained within the notions of savagery, barbarism and civilization, one after the other, before they could progress or reach the highest stage—there were no skipping of stages, although misread or misunderstood by the critics according to Carneiro (2003). This serious flaw had led to major discrediting of evolutionism. Instead, he viewed broad universal sequences of evolution in which expansive types of cultural development were seen as dominating globally only in rough order—hunting and gathering, horticulture and pastoralism, agriculture and the state, industrialism and modernity—each in turn according to the time period. Other types of cultural systems, usually older, could exist during eras but the primary signifier of the period was the averaging out of systems in existence and in their dominance. Peoples could skip stages and draw upon diffusion or acculturation to more rapidly advance and catch-up as it were.

Contrary to most anthropologists of his time, he construed culture as not being distinct to particular societies. Claiming a heritage through E.B. Tyler, he
saw culture as a single system, a worldwide, phenomenon—participated in and collectively developed by all peoples of the world—through a common heritage. This single system moved through time and progressed with that progression being irreversible. In his younger years, White was intrigued by Marxist points of view and placed heavy emphasis on economy and especially technology as the main driving forces for other cultural changes. Later neo-Marxists would repudiate White and other cultural materialists, most especially Marvin Harris, as “vulgar materialists” (Friedman 1974). White’s approach has to be the most extreme form of determinism found in anthropology—limiting or denying the possibility of agency or free will in conceiving or implementing change. Also, local cases and local environments were not considered of importance. White was looking for the grand laws and principles to be found in the regularities of human cultural history.

Culture was seen “as an extra-somatic, temporal continuum of things and events dependent upon symbols. Specifically and concretely, culture consists of tools, implements, utensils, clothing, ornaments, customs, institutions, beliefs, rituals, games, works of art, language, etc.” (White 1959: 3) Culture was functional in that it arose to meet the needs of human species not as with Malinowski who saw culture as meeting the needs of individuals. Furthermore, culture exists separately from individuals who are born into society. Although not biological, culture does meet many of the biological impulses for security (Moore 2004:192).

Elaborating, Moore suggests that
The functionalist interpretation of culture was central to White’s theory of evolution because it implied that the most important dimensions of culture were those that imparted adaptational biological advantages. It logically followed that the most important cultural realm is the one that transforms energy and makes it available for human use: technology. And by extension, the evolution of culture could be measured by their relative capacities to obtain and divert energy (Ibid: 183).

Culture is divided into four categories—ideological, sociological, sentimental (attitudinal), and technological—and each of these categories depends on symbols. Symbolizing is a unique human characteristic. Symbolically, we label a person as a cousin—possibly as a cross or parallel cousin according to the society—and an example of the sociological category. An ideological example could be contained in the example of holy water—water a neutral category transformed by a positive valence that assumes the potential of healing. Culture, while having biological origins, comes into existence and then becomes part of a tradition that is carried by people—yet independent of its carriers. A baby is born with no culture but acquires it from outside of himself. Culture can be treated as if it had an existence of its own. Since humans are not necessary to the scientific study of language, a consideration of humans would not be needed for the science of culture. Culture also has a temporal flow with its components of tools, customs, sentiments, and ideology acting and influencing each other. Over time, with new combinations and interrelations, innovations are inevitable. Besides culture being temporal—its parts moving and interacting through time—it is also
synchronic. All of its components interact and influence each other in contemporary circumstances. Again, all of humanity's culture is seen as a single system. Those that have been designated cultures are just portions of a single system, and cultures, while not being self-contained, have elements that easily flow over societal boundaries and interact with each other in the open system which is always global.

One thing is very crucial to White's formulation—while recognizing a four-component cultural system with the parts influencing each other in a dynamic flow, he places a clear primacy on technology. Technology is the driver, the basis, and determinant of cultural systems and their changes. Sentiments, ideology, and society are all shaped by technology and when technology changes, so do the other components. Although not necessarily immediate, social and ideological changes follow technological changes. The interrelated parts, while moving, strive toward equilibrium relevant to the way technology leads, but since primacy is placed on technology and its changes, then the other parts will eventually succumb towards re-establishing that equilibrium. Ideologically, a worldview could consist of naturalistic and supernatural explanations for phenomena. He claims that the supernatural flourishes when human control over their relations with the external world is largely beyond people's control. When technological changes occur, such as the development of the telescope and the microscope, then the ideological components change with more people shedding their ideological reliance on supernatural explanations for disease or other phenomena. The sentimental is more elusive, but White gives
an example of ideals surrounding female beauty. When the control over the environment through technology is slight, then a large, heavy woman would be considered beautiful because of her capacity to survive under difficult circumstances. In a society that is hierarchical and with plenty of food through its technology, “obesity” is frowned upon and slenderness is valued.

In his scheme, technology is very much related to energy and its acquisition. The interrelationship between the two represents the crux of his theories on cultural change and evolution. Referring to energy as a basic concept in science, he points to how life forms on earth temporarily reverse the principle of entropy—the dissipation of energy. Instead, living forms capture energy and more complex living forms capture more concentrated forms of energy and transfer it to their more segmented and specialized subparts (i.e., organs). Evolutionary success of animals depends upon their capacity to capture energy and their “efficient” use of it. Mammals, being able to regulate and control energy as generated body heat, are more adaptable and successful than amphibians and reptiles. Regarding humans as advanced mammals, their primary energy-capturing device is culture. Energy is put into use through cultural activities such as performing rituals, training the young, and subsistence tasks. White sees culture as a thermodynamic system. Much of culture is organized around capturing and using energy. The success in energy capture is related to the size of the group, its capacities to replace itself with succeeding generations, its dominance or submission over others, its specialized institutions, and other
factors. The key to his explanation of the main driver of cultural evolution can be seen in this statement:

Other factors remaining constant, culture evolves as the amount of energy per capita per year is increased, or as the efficiency of the instrumental means of putting the energy to work is increased. Both factors may increase simultaneously of course (White 1949: 369).

So, technology is very closely related to energy capture. Beyond foot and hand power and physical endurance, humans are noted makers and users of tools. Significant changes in technology lead to changes in energy acquisition and use. The most significant was that surrounding the agricultural revolution ushered in by the Neolithic or Village Settled Farming Stage where humans were able to intervene in plant and animal production and vastly increase their food resources, sometimes as much as a hundred fold to their benefit.

White (1949) has a chapter titled “Kinship, Politics, Energy and Class” in which he takes off from Lewis Henry Morgan (1877) and transforms the analysis of the evolution of kinship types into a more modern view that relies on technology and energy for explaining causes and changes. Kinship was originally simply based on sex between adults with children staying home with the mother; then there was a sexual division of labor that brings males and females together in cooperating units. That arrangement became more complicated with extended families being established on a larger scale along with alliances of family groups for defense and exchange in terms of marriage and trade. In this, there were increasing principles of segmentation at work involving units such as lineages
and clans. This involved human groups evolving and elaborating strategies of subsistence during foraging and early horticultural periods.

Class is a new form of segmentation that emerged after the agricultural revolution intensified—kin-based segments yield new forces. In kin based societies, everybody had free access to resources but with civil or state society, close kinship broke down. With the agricultural revolution, there were new increased densities of population and the emergence of specialists who relied on others for food production. As trade and monetary exchange improved, society became divided into debtors and creditors, rich and poor. The social structure of kin based institutions eroded and new institutions arose to accommodate private ownership. Wealth differences, occupational specialties, social classes, property, inheritance, public institutions centered in law, formalized religions, permanent organizations of defense and war, finance, and centralized political authority came into being. Warfare served to help centralize political power that was essential to coordinate an ever-growing complex sociocultural system. Conflict and competition took the place of mutual aid. As the brain and central nervous system evolved to coordinate organisms, so did the political state in cultural evolution. White uses technologically and deterministic explanations to replace L. H. Morgan's that had been more or less vaguely explained by increases in human intelligence.

Although not taken up by anybody in the subsequent history of anthropology, White (1959) proposed the establishment of a new field, "Culturology," that focused on cultural phenomena. It was his view that
cultural phenomena behave in accordance with their own laws and principles. For this analysis, there was no need to examine economic, psychological, sociological, or ecological causes. Culture should only be studied in terms of culture. Culture consists of units and traits that are not haphazard and are attached in configurations such as in treating illness or worshipping a god. They are capable of crossing boundaries through diffusion and eventually swamping out pre-existing traits or constellations. Such traits and constellations contribute to evolution—one form grows out of another and evolution trends are accumulative and irreversible. Culturology, from his late 1950s perspective, would also relate to synchronic or contemporary studies parallel to structural functionalism. How do the parts and constellations identified through ideological, sentimental, and sociological types interconnect with technology and energy acquisition, and how do the latter two direct them? In his field of Culturology, White was not interested in the local case or the exceptions to the trends that he was suggesting in the long term that were inevitable results of evolution. Local ecological adaptations of people, their technologies, behaviors, and institutions were not of interest to White. Another evolutionist, Julian Steward, who formulated cultural ecology, as we shall see in the next section, advocated that approach. The two of them, although “neo-evolutionists,” sometimes debated each other over these issues.

Besides documenting the changes through time that have already occurred, it was significant that he suggested that Culturology should try to predict the future, especially as related to cultural changes brought about by
technology and energy. Coming out of an era of the nation state and industrialism, he predicted a future in which the nation state would become less important, blending into large trading blocks with eventual political power while steam and fossil fuel sources would eventually be replaced by atomic power. Resistance of ethnicity and nationalism were futile, and their last gasps would lead to a lot of grief. Individual and group agency as well as pockets of resistance were futile.

The role of Culturology was to inform people of the inevitable laws of evolution engendered by cultural changes through energy and technological shifts. Humans were to learn to adapt to processes or events that were bound to happen. He believed in an external world that existed independent of the observer and its regularities discovered as in the physical sciences. He also contended that some aspects of the universe were irreversible, having gone from the more simple to the complex and that progress was inevitable. This provided the basis for White’s deterministic (and apparently dogmatic) approaches to evolution—points for much debate.

Julian Steward—Specific, Multilineal and Ecologically-Based Neo-Evolutionism

Julian Steward, a contemporary supporter and sometime critic of Leslie White, had a more limited, local, inductive, empirical, and methodological approach to evolution and cultural change. His legacy was more widespread and lasting and his contributions to anthropology were diverse and multifaceted. He created the
field of cultural ecology, helped reshape theoretical archaeology, and presented elements of analysis appropriate for acculturation and modernization as well as evolution. Expressing a more moderate voice, he was more instrumental than White in breaking through the Boasian juggernaut of anti-evolutionism (Moore 2004:193).

As an anthropologist coming out of the Kroeberian tradition at Berkeley during the 1930s, he had a very wide range of empirical research. He studied among the Shoshoni in Utah, the Carrier of northern British Columbia, worked briefly for the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the Collier New Deal, and did cultural historical work relevant to archaeological findings in the American Southwest. Through the Smithsonian Institute, he supervised and edited a comprehensive multi-volume depiction of the culture history and peoples of South America (Steward 1946-1950). While at Columbia University, he directed a complicated team project on Puerto Rico—a pioneering experiment in an anthropological study of the equivalent of a nation state (Steward et. al 1956). Then transferring to the University of Illinois, he directed and synthesized a multi-sited project on modernization in a series of developing nations. Moore (2003:196,197) points out how Steward was among the very first to effectively organize large teams around common research problems that generated large amounts of comparable data and distinct conceptual frameworks in his Smithsonian work, and his Puerto Rican and modernization studies.

Out of all of this was an emphasis on regularities of a more limited or middle range derived empirically from sets of controlled comparisons from a
series of local cases. Cultural changes of all kinds—evolution, acculturation, and modernization—were his main concerns. His major work summarizing the main ingredients of this legacy is *A Theory of Culture Change* (Steward 1955). That book was extremely influential upon a key generation of anthropologists during anthropology’s most significant period of expansion.

He put his emphasis on technology, behavior, and the real circumstances necessary for human survival, what is key—the local geographical environment—and how humans with particular behaviors and technologies would adapt to those circumstances. Much of this interest came out of his direct observations of the Shoshoni in the 1930s—here dealing with a people that had to pay particular attention to their detailed adjustments in a difficult environment. In that analysis, he invented the field of cultural ecology and that legacy goes beyond the study of change, but has also been used quite extensively to discuss many peoples’ synchronic and contemporary sociocultural circumstances in their settings. He pioneered the comparative, cultural ecological studies of hunters and gatherers or foragers, horticulturalists, pastoralists, irrigation farmers, peasants, modern farmers, and even corporate farming. This work (along with White’s) also stimulated the investigation of the evolution and emergence of evolving political forms as associated with ecology and technology. Bands, tribes, chiefdoms, paramount chiefdoms, and the state all become significant areas of discussion with emphases on evolving transitions (see Fried 1967; Service 1962). Therefore, political changes among types or stages to others became a major spin-off of Steward’s work.
More directly, Steward's own approach saw much explanatory power resulting in peoples’ relations with their environments. Adaptation was very much a key to his analyses. The fields of biology and physical anthropology could be seen as related to cultural anthropology, yet he saw an appropriate division of labor with cultural anthropology looking at how humans connect to their habitats through culture. Culture was humanity’s primary form of adaptation and it was the vehicle through which humans met these environments—a significant uniqueness compared to other animals. Biological factors were to be left out of the equation. This was a weak point raised by the later spin-off field of human ecology that tried to link biological, demographic and cultural factors together in explaining human adaptations. For instance, diseases and or resistance to it could play enormous roles in culture history (Vadya and Rappaport 1968).

In regards to Steward, socio-cultural systems were perceived as more or less integrated—a common approach of his times. Yet some institutions and behaviors were considered more important than others. He did put the emphasis on technology and the behaviors that were most intimately related to getting the materials required for survival of the group. The focus was on what he called the *culture core* and from this, other institutions and behaviors could be derived and explained. In each case, the core was to be discovered empirically. Broadly, one would look at: 1) what technology is used in getting food and other resources; 2) what social organization is used in that regard (any division of labor even if only based on gender and age, and groupings that organize and manage production); 3) behaviors that are tied to the food quest (things like migratory versus settled
behaviors, fallowing, water distribution through irrigation, distribution of population, and so forth).

The core is the part of the culture that, functionally, directly interacts with the local environment. The core interacts or matches with just selected aspects of the environment, and those dimensions would have to be empirically investigated. For hunters and gatherers, it could include an inventory of plants and animals in their distributions and behaviors and a consideration of how the humans would adapt to these realities through their cores. For horticulturalists and agriculturalists, things that could really matter could include soil types and their fertility, the hydraulic circumstances of local lakes, rivers, and rainfall. Humans might respond in their cores through irrigation, fallowing, hoes or plows, property being held in extended families or lineages and clans with authority residing in elders or hereditary chiefs, plus many other factors that could be sorted out according to the situation.

Figuring out these local environmental adaptations through analyses of cores was the most important task to be done. Then it could be perceived how the core influenced all the other institutions of the society—economic exchange systems beyond the units of production, political authority and conflict resolution in the community, kinship and marriage institutions tying together the larger community, religious institutions, values, ideology, aesthetics, and enculturation processes. It was assumed that most of these latter institutions were on the periphery rather than the core of the sociocultural system. The core was much more important and it shaped the latter. The cause and effect formula that
Steward was using suggested that cultural adaptation to local ecological circumstances surrounding material production or collection of food and other resources shaped all the other institutions. When there were changes in the core that would bring about changes in the other institutions of course is central to the quest of this book—what causes change.

The next important dimension of his seeking regularities in cultures and their changes was to compare peoples in a broad similarity of subsistence strategies to see if there were inevitable parallels. Again, the focus was on core relations with local environments. Yet, what makes this approach interesting is that it is ecological—it looks at the relationships of these core human institutions in comparison to the selected aspects of the local environment. Were the relationships similar or different in the comparisons? In this, he might actually discover similarities in the ecology of physical environments that were otherwise quite different. For instance, in his examination of hunting and gathering societies, he found three that were ecologically similar but environmentally different, including the Utes and Shoshonis living in scrubby desert conditions of the American Great Basin, the seal dependent Inuit of the freezing dry Central Canadian Arctic, and the situation of peoples living in the cold, wet, coastal regions of Tierra del Fuego at the tip of South America. In all three cases, resources were scattered and in small numbers that led to the peoples there, in their core relations, responding in very similar ways. The institutions there beyond and on the peripheries, such as kinship and religion, were derived and shaped by the core in ways that were parallel.
When regularities among similarly culturally ecologically arranged groups could be empirically derived after inductive enquiry, they were labeled as similar levels of sociocultural integration. These levels could be considered as possible stages of evolution but of a more limited generality than Leslie White’s universal or general stages tied to technology and energy acquisition. Again, Steward’s stages were tied to factors of local cultural ecological arrangements.

In his *Theory of Culture Change*, Steward outlined three types of levels of sociocultural integration that were relevant to hunters and gatherers, or what we today label as foragers. Technologically, they all were at the same phase of development but otherwise, their core relations were different. The first already mentioned was called the *family level of sociocultural integration*, where the ecological connections of humans, through their cultural cores, required that they not be concentrated in groupings beyond a two or three generational family. The family contained all human institutions of authority, resource management, religion, conflict control, and so forth. Such families did cooperate and congregate with other families from time to time to share resources and information, and to arrange for marriages.

More advanced as a level of sociocultural integration was the *patrileal-patrilocal band*—a related grouping of cooperative males who brought in wives from other bands and numbered around fifty people with larger communities. Game and other resources could be found within fixed territories and since they hunted cooperatively, it was wise to keep the males together and manage resources through kin cooperation and hierarchies of brothers, fathers, uncles,
and male cousins. Beyond this, other functions such as religion, politics, social control, and relations with other groups would be conducted within this larger socio-cultural level—the band.

At an equal level of integration was the composite band in which there were no fixed rules of kinship derived residence and affiliation. Very loosely structured and at about the same size and densities, such bands could consist of closely related peoples—perhaps through a father’s patrilineage—but at the same time, a family could be residing at a location with a band in which the wife may have relatives, or some distant uncle or male cousin, or perhaps an encampment of a close friend. There were no fixed rules of residence and affiliation, and bands would be composed of people who might be closely related and those who were not. Such bands were highly fluid with people coming and going over time. The flexibility was due to the fact that local plant and animal resources might fluctuate widely and/or the principle game such as buffalo or caribou may be migratory and the annual routes of migration might fluctuate annually as well. As with patrilineal-patrilocals bands, the functions of religions, external relations, enculturation, the ceremonial, and so forth were contained within the level of the band. Still, the family level itself, which was considered less advanced, was absorbed and maintained within the larger level.

That was true of the next level that Steward discussed, the clan-based level of sociocultural integration, which would consist of many unilineal extended family groupings—the analog or equivalent of the band. The clan-based society was usually based on horticulture or food production—productivity was a lot
higher as were gross populations and densities in the various communities. Managing particularly defined resources and territories that were much more precise and important in such relations centered on the production of food. This necessitated the tying together of potentially competing groups into a web of cooperation—thus a higher level of sociocultural integration. Politics and social control were elevated to this higher level as well as dimensions of religion. Here, as is the tendency of the higher units, the earlier segments are absorbed.

In his various investigations, Steward also included discussions of levels of sociocultural integration that could be found at the state level and comparisons made among them—most notably in his discussion of the state and empires in the Andes and those in ancient Mesopotamia. Levels of socio-cultural integration were improvised and set in this analytical framework with his modernization studies and those of contemporary *Peoples of Puerto Rico* (Steward et. al 1956). In that case, he sorted various types of farming operations, such as the family holding as contrasted with plantations, the local community connected to vertically organized bureaucratic levels out of San Juan, and the way they interdigitated with local communities. Some of these would include government agencies and labor unions.

Again, the basis for all these units of analysis is that of the *culture core* in the use of technology, social organization, and behaviors that were most crucial in generating material goods or their exchanges. During the period in which structural functional approaches to understanding society and culture dominated, Steward’s formulation provided a useful alternative transition to more
comprehensive and less awkward analyses of change. That alternative was based on the notions of adaptation around material needs, certain behaviors, technologies, and selected dimensions of social organization. If we could understand those carefully inspected in context, then we could understand causes of existing forms as tied to adaptation.

That led to the key strategies for understanding change. It boiled down to if there were changes in the core, then there would be changes elsewhere in the shape of the society—evolution. In contrast to White, the details in the core were not general or universal to all situations, that is to say based on some deductively derived formula that would link energy accumulation with technology. Instead, they were very context specifically tied to the society’s environment, and to a lesser extent on its previous history that allowed for the accumulation of certain ingredients in its core. When these elements changed, the society changed in specific ways.

This led to a vision of change that has been characterized as multilineal evolution. Picture a tree with many branches with the trunk can representing humanity’s common and original cultural heritage. With time, many branches, regional paths of culture history, establish themselves. But rather than just describing them in their environmental contexts as A.L Kroeber (1939) and other cultural historians did, Steward analyzed them through the lenses of ecological adaptations to see if there were regularities and parallels in their evolution. The details of the local stages of the development of Andean civilizations outlined by Steward were compared to similar ones that had been established for
Mesopotamian civilizations. Limited parallels as well as differences were located in terms of cultural ecological relations during certain time periods, and thus small-scale parallel lines of evolution could be identified.

Regarding cultural change, the strategy of cultural ecology was also effective in looking at shorter-range changes, as would be found in acculturation and modernization studies. In *Theory of Culture Change*, Steward (1955) discusses the acculturative circumstances of the Shoshoni as compared to other peoples in the American Southwest such as the Zuni and Hopi. The latter two had much slower rates of change, in part because the changes from Spanish, Mexicans, and Euro-Americans would have to be filtered through a complex series of local of sociocultural integration including lineages, clans, and secret ritual societies. The Shoshoni, in contrast, were at the family level of sociocultural integration and that was parallel to the nuclear family of the Western Euro-American culture. Without as much in the way of barriers, Shoshoni families would seek work on American ranches or mines, and the changes would then flow more directly to this layer.

**Steward Case Study: Tappers and Trappers—Parallel Changes in Northern Canada and Tropical South America**

This study (Murphy and Steward, 1956) shows the use of cultural ecology and levels of sociocultural integration to present change related to acculturation and intriguing ecological parallels in extremely different environments. Two groups, the Montagnais (now called Innu) of northern Quebec and the Mundurucu of
Brazil, started out very differently but ended with surprising similarities. This was so because of the underlying processes they experienced since contact with Europeans—processes that transformed their cultural cores.

**The Innu**

This northern group originally consisted of very loosely integrated bands, nominally patrilineal for the purposes of hunting large game. In the winter, because of difficulties in getting resources, they sometimes broke into smaller, single-family groupings. Changes started to occur with the introduction of the fur trade. At first, they only became slightly involved in trading that was secondary to native subsistence. They went after marginal fur animals (beaver, martin etc.) after first ensuring their food supply. Their territories remained intact through band control, and leadership stayed there too.

As an intermediate stage, there was more dependency on the trader, trade goods, and winter food bought from the store. Many started to leave their families at trading posts and trapped in the company of other men. The trading post and the dependency on goods and people there became a more significant part of life as well as. Finally, everybody became absolutely committed to this new type of economy. The emphasis was then placed on individual family rights to delimited fur territories held by the male head of the family. The people in that smaller territory more or less had the exclusive rights to the animals within the area. The nuclear family became the primary social and economic unit, and interfamly dependency and cooperation decreased remarkably. People become dependent on the trading posts rather than reciprocity within the group. An
administrative band later emerged but was not the same as past bands. It is now a means of operating linkages to outsider whites principally representing the government and subject to the provisions of the Canadian Indian Act.

**The Mundurucu**

The Mundurucu live in tropical gallery forests and savannah lands of Brazil. Originally they lived in semi-sedentary villages consisting of basically autonomous families. Each household consisted of women and their female offspring—peculiarly, there was matrilocal residence within a patrilineal society. Related men married into extended units from the same village or other villages. For men, the focus of activities was the men’s hut. Subsistence activities such as slash and burn horticulture, hunting, and fishing were organized by wet and dry seasons. The seasons involved periods when small groups would go out gathering for as much as three months. Manioc was the main staple food. Yet in spite of family economies, village cohesion was high with ranked chiefs and tribal organization to support warfare and intersocietal and intervillage connections.

Then came the rubber trade. At first, all of the rubber was turned over to the chief who negotiated directly with the trader and then distributed the trade goods to individual families. As they became more and more involved in trade, the chiefs were more subordinate to traders. Traders later appointed trading chiefs and that undermined the status of the hereditary chiefs. In later years, individuals directly dealt with the trader, bypassing the chiefs, and political organization was shattered. The underlying basis of village life was no longer
significant. There was more and more emphasis on trade goods. The individual families moved and lived near “tap” lines and along rivers.

Trade went through several periods, at first involved in manioc flour and wild products, and by 1875, rubber was the most important wild product. The second stage, up until about 1914, was not as disruptive but intermediate, and involved people who tapped for about three months. As dependence on European material goods increased, eventually there were a majority of one-family groupings that came to be in debt and dependent on the trading post. The hereditary chiefs and collective structures also lost their influences because of rapid decline in warfare. Eventually, the real operating society came down to nuclear or small extended families as with the Innu. Even in some cases where villages were reestablished, they were then dependent on the missionaries for assistance and authority. Individual families became the basis of agriculture, and the earlier political structure was lost.

**Similarities**

The two societies—Innu and Mundurucu—both became involved in a mercantile economy in which the collector of wild products was tied by bonds of debt and credit to merchants. Both experienced growing dependence upon traders at the expense of preexisting collective bonds within their societies. While latex for rubber and animal furs were very different, they are found in similar cultural-ecological context, being more efficiently exploited by one man in tap or trap lines and having families dispersed so people have to live at some distance from each other.
The end product was a parallel breakdown in the larger dimensions of these two native societies that became dependent on European institutions in roughly the same way. These two situations represent high degrees of structural parallelism in change. Fundamentally, what was involved was a set of similar materially based ecological processes of relationship in the local environments, and the social response was uncannily similar.

**Adaptation**

Adaptation is a key concept emerging out of evolutionary and materialistic studies. While perhaps sometimes overused, it is crucial as a conceptual tool within the evolutionist and cultural materialist traditions for analyzing change both of a long- and short-term nature. In a comparative context, both humans and other life forms are noted for genetic and physiological adaptations to the challenges that face them, and over time, natural selection and population dynamics generate and promote those adjustments. Adaptations are not necessarily the best possible solutions to the challenges or stresses that present themselves because they grow out of existing materials and variations. Some that are actually maladaptive may persist longer than expected in the ebb and flow of evolutionary advances, yet presumably, forces of selection will have some role eventually.

Culture in its behavioral, institutional, and cognitive aspects is an extremely important added dimension to the adaptive inventory of humans. As it becomes more complex either on the locally, general, or universal, there is more
cultural stuff to be drawn out for selection by environmental and cultural forces. Culture also becomes part of the human environment. Supposedly, culture provides humans with advantages in that adaptive solutions can be generated or borrowed in the short term. Robert Carneiro perceives the concept this way:

In the narrowest sense, adaptation may be thought of as a tracking device by means of which a society continues to seek adjustments to its environment, since no environment remains static indefinitely. As the new environment changes, a society may be expected to adjust and readjust to these changes in its external conditions. To be sure, some of these adaptive changes may not entail any large structural changes. However, some of the modifications do bring about new structural features designed to carry out new functions, or to perform old functions more efficiently. Since the addition of new structural elements to a society, almost by definition entails an increase in the society’s complexity, adaptation can often be said to be an agent of evolution… Indeed, one way to look at cultural evolution is to regard it as a succession of adaptive changes undergone by a society as it seeks to adjust to changes in its physical and social surroundings, in the process of which it increases its complexity (Carneiro 2003: 179-180).

The kinds of major adaptations that a society or a sub-society usually has to make are in its material connections to the environment—thus infrastructure and cultural core types of formulations. They are the most far-reaching and impact other domains. Whether completely successful or not, and whether driven by
human agency, there appears to be a strain for consistency amongst the primary adaptive forms and their spin-offs and connection. This leads to the long-term elaborations of the evolutionary processes (Carneiro 2003, 180-181).

It is certainly true that adaptation remains a centrally favored, although far from universally favored, concept in the study of sociocultural change.

Summary

Evolution is a more massive and complicated topic than can be fully discussed here. However, the dominating intellectual descendants of the Boasians object to the categorizations, essentializations, stage-building, and the presumed underlying hubris of Western progress supposed to be found in evolutionism. So this “grand theory” or “narrative” is not popular in contemporary mainstream social science.

My concern has been two-fold. One is to pay homage to the reality of evolution—human societies have evolved—that is quite simply an undeniable fact. Denying it is akin to being a member of a flat earth society. Social organizations have become more complicated as obviously have technologies, and they and other factors have interacted in complex ways to generate totally and ever-evolving complex sociocultural systems. These can include ideology and the arts that, in turn, may have influences upon on-going evolution. The more cultural “stuff” that becomes available through the other processes—innovation, diffusion, acculturation, modernization/development, urbanization—
the more sociocultural systems evolve, become more complicated, and become more interconnected.

We could consider the current state of globalization as a stage or grade of evolution. The world is becoming smaller and more interconnected. Time, space, and the communication of information are being reshaped through a multitude of factors that in the end may be evolutionary. Ironically, globalization might well be humanity’s last “stage” of evolution because of the possible unsustainability of the material dimensions of neo-liberal capitalism—the alarming spread of its accompanying culture of consumption and environmental destruction. We could lay to rest the accusation of Western chauvinism supposedly contained within the notion of progress. Let’s return to the quote by Bertrand Russell at the beginning of this chapter: “‘Change’ is scientific, progress is ethical; change is indubitable, whereas progress is a matter of controversy (Oxford 2006: 283). Within the framework of evolutionary analysis, we find many examples where practices among "less complex forms" (e.g., bands, tribes, and peasants) may be superior in achieving sustainability, true democracy, health and well-being, inclusiveness, and much better human social and emotional support. The second concern in this chapter is looking at the various methods, concepts, and causal frameworks that have emerged out of the study of cultural evolution that might be useful for the study of long- and short-term change. The frameworks come from cultural materialism (see Chapter Two). White’s notions of the importance of technology and energy acquisition as the principal drivers to change were mainly applied to
the broad stages of evolution. Still, they can be fruitfully used in more manageable case studies of small-scale societies, communities, and institutions.

Related to this is Steward’s notion of the *culture core* incorporating those devices—technological, social, and behavioral—that are devoted to getting the material resources that societies need for survival and wellbeing. Cultural ecology, making use of the cultural core concept with the most pertinent features of the local environment helps us to understand the nature of the adaptations of the people and the shape of the subsequent dimensions of other aspects of their sociocultural systems.

The twin paradigm of cultural materialism and neo-evolutionism was once a dominant theoretical influence in anthropology. It is still practiced by a minority. Evolution and cultural materialism are very large topics within anthropology and there are many subtopics we could have discussed in more detail—such as adaptation, rates of evolution, stages vs. processes or grades, direction in evolution, alternatives to materialism in causality, and so forth. For an update on these and other subtopics, I suggest Carneiro (2003), Sanderson (2007) and Johnson and Earle (2000).
Appendix F

URBANIZATION

Part I—The Foundation

Urbanism can be considered as the way of life of people living in a city.

Urbanization is a process whereby people change from rural ways of life to urban ones. It can also refer to the large-scale transformation of society where proportionately more and more people start to migrate to cities from rural areas and participate in city life. Insofar as change is part of a unified anthropological science that includes archeology, the earliest considerations would be archeological studies of urbanization and urbanism as evolutionary processes in the Near East (Childe 1950)

Urbanization issues, however, became much more significant for social anthropologists in the post World War II period of modernization (see Chapter Five) when so many people moved from rural and tribal areas to cities. Anthropologists started to follow them there. The development of an urban anthropology was a way of extending studies of human sociocultural niches and to shape an obvious need to account for social complexity. Some earlier interest includes Robert Redfield’s The Primitive World and Its Transformations (1953) where he saw urbanism as a distinct way of life dominated by the technical order—an emphasis on tools and practicality or exploitations in social relations rather than sentiments based on extended kin relations. Peasants within state
societies were seen as an intermediate type where kinship and the moral order still strongly influenced them. Peasants in their lives had to make reference to the city whereas tribal peoples did not and lived through the moral and spiritual order governing their relationship. Redfield’s scheme offered a cultural change theory, yet it was subsequently criticized as being overly idealistic and highly simplistic in its categorizations. Around the same time Lloyd Warner, who had done work in Australia with a small hunting and gathering society, as a team leader, did an ethnographic study of a small New England city that he called Yankee City (1941-1947). It was largely influenced by Bronislaw Malinowski’s functionalism which was the paradigm for his earlier work.

Then William Whyte (1943) using ethnographic methods of participant observation wrote Street Corner Society, a portrayal of an Italian slum in Boston. Thus began a tradition of anthropological ethnography whereby a small slice of urban life is presented in rich detail and the reader develops an intimate familiarity with a few characters. Later, similar works included Oscar Lewis’s (1961,1965) research in Mexico City, Puerto Rico, and New York where he investigated the circumstances of families migrating to the city. Moving from rich narrative, he developed his controversial Culture of Poverty notion. Other later portrayals of poverty cultures in the city included Elliot Liebow’s Tally’s Corner (1967), James Spradley’s You Owe Yourself a Drunk (1970) and Philippe Bourgois’s In Search of Respect (1996).

At the same time, a series of British social anthropologists (Little 1957, Mitchell 1969) studied tribal migration to cities, innovated network analysis (see
Chapter Eight), and the recognition of emergent forms of social organization, such as tribal voluntary associations, to provide aid for new migrants to cities. This was extremely important as a transition and a set of clues to how to approach methodology in this more complicated urban realm. Following functionalist-styled analyses in African villages, investigators had identified corporate units, such as lineages and clans, along with status and chieftain-like authority, and rituals of solidarity that were frequently followed out within the context of ascribed social membership with very specific rights and responsibilities.

These all broke down when people moved to the cities that were heterogeneous and represented many different groupings. Individual migrants sought support and information from newly established, voluntary, mutual aid societies that ranged across tribes and corporate groupings. Also, since the boundaries of social interaction primarily within village and corporate groupings were no longer viable, the basis of social organization had to be constructed anew, inductively and empirically, within the new social settings in the newly adapted the city. So investigators followed convenient and judgment samples of individuals going about their daily activities, mapping what they did with whom, when, and with what regularities and what degree of intensity. What were the qualities of interaction and what were the purposes? Central figures in the networks would interact with some kin, some fellow tribespeople, some workmates, neighbors, employers, sports teammates, co-religionists, and so forth. Network analysis could also map the possibilities of continued interactions
with people in the home village. Yet obviously, the mode of analysis was meant to make discoveries of what actually were the new and changed condition and details of society and culture in the cities for new townsmen and urban dwellers. Network analysis eventually became significant beyond just urban anthropology and is an important key in the study of social and cultural change in general.

Some Key Issues in Post 1950s Urban Anthropology

For the discussion that follows, one that examines the directions that the newly developing urban anthropology took up until the 1980s, and its most generally researched subtopics, I am relying much on Richard Basham’s (1978) *Urban Anthropology*. I am summarizing the topics he raises in roughly the same order. To bring things more up to date with an accounting of recent interests, I will later rely on Setha Low’s (1999) edited *Theorizing the City: The New Urban Anthropology Reader*.

Rural Urban Migration

Urbanization very much accelerated during the Industrial Revolution, yet only in the twentieth century did it become a widespread phenomenon that affects most people. In 1800, the world’s population was about 1 billion and of them, only about 15 million lived in cities. By the 1960s, with the world’s population at 4 billion, 500 million were in cities. In 2000, 47% of the 6.06 billion people in the world lived in cities and has now surpassed 50% with the world’s population at 7 billion. Much of the urban growth is due to people moving from small towns and
rural areas, rather than any major increase in cities’ birth rates—in fact, birth rates tend to go down in urban settings. Previously, ancient cities were always more subject to decreases in population or avoidance due to the threat of epidemic diseases. In the contemporary twenty-first century, circumstances are such that now people are racing to the cities. Mexico City has grown from 470,000 in 1910 to well over 20,000,000 now. Most countries in the developed world have urban components that surpass 80% in ratio. Obviously urbanization is a profoundly important type of social and cultural change in itself and it also provides the raw material for continuing complexities of change, especially as related to modernization, globalization, and any emergence of a truly post-modern situation.

Is this growth due to factors that drive people out of impoverished rural areas, or is it the result of some factors about the city that draws them there? It is a process, nonetheless, in which people from rural and tribal traditions undergo an extreme discontinuity coming under the influence of a society organized by the technical order, modernization, and bureaucracy. The rural values and statuses of migrants can be seriously undermined for people in developing countries. Also, much of the real economic and political power had rested with Westernized civil servants and foreign technocrats, thus creating challenges of adaptation and the expression of agency.

Cityward Migration—The Push Factor

One assumption is that cities are primarily populated by migrants who
have been pushed to leave their rural and small town homes as the result of economic hardship. This approach was sometimes emphasized by the sort of bias that anthropologists have had regarding the good life, the solidarity of corporate kinship, and the notion of the harmonious rural community. In that portrayal, there would be little intrinsic reason to leave.

Some examples that Basham (1978; 63-73) cites include Ireland during the potato famine in the 1800s, Vietnam during saturation bombing, and the general events of the Vietnam War. In the former French colonies of Africa, the imposition of head taxes on people forced many into urban-based economies to get the cash. Basham cites a study of the Papago reservation in the American Southwest. Desert conditions are such that it does not provide much so people go to the cities initially to get supplies and then return. Yet as time goes on, the cyclical migration starts to subside and become a linear migration after they become used to the city and what it has to offer.

Another dimension to all of this is the question of the stability and harmony of small village life. Robert Redfield’s (1940, 1950) work in villages of Chan Kom and Tepotzlan in Mexico stressed harmony with people operating by the “golden rule,” cooperation, and with kinship support being extensive. This has to be contrasted with the indifference, hostility, or exploitation characteristic of urban relations. Yet a study by Oscar Lewis (1951) of Tepotzlan showed the opposite of what was to be expected. People viewed each other as intrinsically hostile, reserved, and guarded in relationships. Friendships were portrayed as few with peoples’ motives being suspect. George Foster (1965), also working in Mexico,
came up with the notion of "the limited good"—that all the desirable things in life, e.g. food, land, friends, health, love, money, and so forth, were all limited in availability. If the system is closed and the belief is that you can only get things at the expense of your neighbors, then that could also become a motive towards a push in migration. Portrayals of peasant communities as sources of division, individualism, and conflict have also been supplied for Thailand. Robert Edgerton’s (1971) work in East Africa characterized farming groups as showing hostility and tension in contrast to pastoral groups that would dissipate them by moving away. Such tensions with agriculturalists would also lend support to the notion.

All of this would lend some credence to the view and because of some bad conditions in the villages, moving to the city could be viewed as a way to improve one’s situation. To some extent then, the city draws on the ambition that feeling pushed out and provides economic opportunities as well as a way to escape the strains of social conflict.

Yet another source relevant to the push factor is found in the massive levels of technological and economic development that displaces rural people. Barbara Rose Johnston (2008) reports that over 60,000 dam projects have been created since World War Two with massive dislocations of people from their drainage areas. This author, when visiting Hanoi, Vietnam, was struck by the massive amount of peasant dislocation that occurred in order to create free trade manufacturing zones surrounding the city with the established assembly plants for primarily Japanese-owned businesses.
Pull Factors

The attraction or lure of “city lights” is the metaphor here. The idea has been widespread that cities provide paths to wealth, education, and general success. It is kind of related to the concept that the “grass is greener on the other side of the fence,” although the case is always exaggerated in the minds of potential rural and small town migrants. Part of the dream of success may be to improve one’s status back home—the myth of the poor country boy who makes good in the city, with the belief sometimes being that he will go to the city, build up wealth, and then return to be a rich and influential peasant.

This was often the case of overseas Chinese in the nineteenth and early twentieth century coming to North America or going to cities in Southeast Asia. The reality is that most people do not achieve the aspired success, so it is difficult to actually return and maintain “face.” It is also one way of shedding the possible incessant demands for money and other resources put on them by kin. When they return home, they may find that the villagers are suspicious of them because they seem so European or modernized. The migrant may have gotten used to the way of life in the city and the pull of the city becomes stronger and stronger while the ties to the village become weaker and weaker. In many studies involving interviews with migrants, the attraction of the city’s potential seems or can outweigh the push of bad situations in the village. People do frequently come to the city seeking the good life—improvement for themselves and their children in all parts of the world (Basham 73-77).

Beyond Push or Pull
The realities are much more complex (Ibid: 77-83) when one takes into account personal motivations. A person may migrate seasonally or circularly with the notion of gaining the means to stay at home in the rural area while becoming prosperous. The process may be oscillatory in the sense that the migrants can’t make up their minds—being both pushed and pulled. A circular pattern of back and forth could eventually be turned to linear and permanent urbanization and the remaining links with the rural area may eventually be terminated even though people had previously been tied to it for strong ritual and kin purposes. Compelling economic factors may override in the end. For example, involuntary migrants are usually not as skilled whereas those who are pulled are usually more skilled.

So there may be personality factors at play with some being more adventuresome, as well as age—urban migration is easier on the young—whether or not people are married, and whether or not people already have relatives in the city may play a role. Cultural factors may be significant. For example, in Thailand, society is loosely structured and all relationships including parents and siblings at a certain age are voluntary. In the Theravadan Buddhism practiced by Thai, there is stress on the responsibility of individuals for their own destiny, so this would support urbanization (Embree 1950). With Chinese in the past, law and religion stress is placed on being tied to the land and loyalty to one’s family and village. So the ultimate reality is very complex and one cannot use a single dimension theory of either push or pull.
The impact of City Life on Kinship and Family

Families have been long assumed to shrink in size and function in cities. There is a division of the activities of parents and children into separate spheres. Families become less like units of production and enculturation and become units of consumption and recreation over time and as their prosperity increases. These trends are assumed to be controlled by economic forces, especially those of industrialism. However, it may not be as simple as all of this. Elizabeth Bott (1957) discovered that, as Basham cites, extended family and contacts among the members were still extremely important in East London in Britain. Migrants often go to cities where they already have kin and they try to live nearby. Then, long time-experienced urbanites might have the ability to risk migration to other cities where they do not have kin.

A modified extended family does seem to play a role in cities for social support and identity, but it still tends to revert to secondary status if necessary and may even disappear eventually. At the same time, larger kindreds may support geographic mobility with an attempt to regain proximity later after some of its members achieve prosperity.

In spite of some situations where contacts with extended family seem to be more important than once thought, it would seem to be the case that its supportive intensity is not the same with North American urbanites. There, people live in cities with their connections based more on friendship and work associates. Also on a world scale, long-term trends seem to increase the importance of the nuclear family in residential, emotional, and economic terms.
and the pull of extended families gradually wears off and voluntary friendship arises as associated with friendship.

How does culture affect this issue? Basham cites an early study in French Canada (Garique 1956) where the average number of relatives recalled was 215 (range 75-484) among the middle class as compared with 30-33 among students at Vassar College in the U.S.A. Cultural values, including the role of the Catholic Church, supported extremely large family sizes and extended family links. Yet Marcel Rioux (1959) pointed out from an Acadian study on Cape Breton Island that it used to actually be even much wider—over 500. Rioux argues from this French Canadian situation with a shallower depth of urbanization going through the same trends that in the long term, the same thing is occurring there. Research from the post 1980 period showed that Rioux was very right—French Canadian families in Quebec now are the smallest in all of Canada (Tremblay 1973).

In India, the ideal is joint extended families involving brothers in the cities, but they too are breaking up. A study by Michael Ames (1969) found 71% wanted them but only 17% were able to practice them because economic reasons largely prohibited them. As already indicated, Thai families are loosely structure-- surnames which is an indication of a concern for extended families only came in during the twentieth century and as a legislated requirement. Peculiarly, family size in Bangkok was actually increasing slightly relative to the previous situation in the rural area. In Latin America, because of breakdowns induced by poverty, the matrifocal (mother-headed) family is becoming more evident. In the African
context, there is still strong support for the extended family in the urban context because many would feel that only there one could find ultimate security. However, in some cases, as with the urban elite, this is breaking down somewhat and there has been a shift to European kinship terminology and the use of the nuclear family.

Broadly, the worldwide trends are towards increased residential and emotional attention to the nuclear family and there is a tendency to give extra-nuclear family ties the same status as voluntary friendship, and some cases, it disappears altogether.

Some Further Adaptations and Adjustments to the City—Topics of Research in Urban Anthropology

Voluntary Associations

As mentioned earlier, British social anthropologists pioneering in urban anthropology in both East and West Africa discovered the importance of voluntary associations, either as tribal or pan-tribal, as sources of mutual-aid for potentially alienated tribes people moving from rural areas early on (Little 1957). Some of the functions, such as marriage, funerals, and creating meaningful affiliations at home are carried out by these organizations. This also holds true of other zones of the world as with North American Indians (e.g., the Indian and Métis Friendship Centre in my home city) or immigrants to complex urban circumstances. Of course, the functional and organization structures will vary.

Social Problems and Health
Anthropologists have been attracted to studying problems such as stress related illnesses, mental illness, and crimes. For many newcomers, there are uncertainties and tensions in the city. Norman Scotch’s (1960) study with the Zulu in South Africa showed that urban Zulu have much higher blood pressure. Problems such as obesity and diabetes are very common in the city due to carbohydrates and sugar increases in diets. Studies of mental illness are a bit controversial. The Mid-Manhattan Study (Srole 1962) in New York showed a serious impairment rate of 24% that was especially high among the most recent immigrants—Puerto Ricans. Yet there were similarly high rates in the Stirling County study—a rural area (Leighton 1969). Rural areas may provide more protection and support for coping and fewer tests of the emotions and thinking. However, the city may be an escape for others—freedom from repression. Basham (1978: 149) claims that the over identification of migration stresses might possibly be the mental projections of middle class social scientists who are searching for problems which may or may not be there. A broad problem in migration studies is that there are not adequate before and after base line studies to make for proper conclusions.

*Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Gangs*

Supposedly, juvenile delinquency and youth gangs arise as a problem because of a vacuum in older more traditional forms of enculturation (Ibid: 152). Since there is not much in the way of extended family to care for the children, customary values are difficult to maintain. Both parents may be working, and juvenile delinquency and gangs are also related to family breakups. Youth,
especially of recent migrants, may become alienated between home and school and thrown into marginal positions, thus seeking community in gangs and petty crime. This has become a significant domain of research in studying the nature of these youth categories.

**Beggars**

As visits to most downtowns in any North American city will attest due to hard times and the collapse of much government supported social safety nets, issues related to begging are not restricted to underdeveloped countries. Yet they are more vivid and crucial in Third World cities (Ibid: 157-165) where there are no adequate social welfare programs for orphans, the aged, crippled, blind, lepers, and mentally ill who cannot rely on relatives for care. In many cities a distinction can be made between subcultures of genuine and professional beggars. One observation has been made—often those who are only slightly better off themselves give them the most aid. Culture also plays a role—the ideology of alms giving, as in Islamic countries and in countries where taxation is resented and governments, cannot be relied to meet social needs, and may reinforce begging (Ibid: 160).

**Cultures of Poverty**

Oscar Lewis (1966) formulated the concept of the Culture of Poverty, as found in his books *La Vida* (1965) and *Children of Sanchez* (1961). It involves a disengagement from the larger society and culture—a counterculture that is present oriented and transmitted generation to generation. People do not participate in formal institutions such as unions or political parties. Marriages are
informal or consensual; families are often matrifocal with an emphasis on mothers’ kin. Makeshift economic strategies are used and include petty crimes such as stealing and drug dealing. One assumption was that it was transmitted from generation to generation; therefore, while perhaps eliminating poverty, it would be difficult to replace the culture of poverty. Lewis’s views were criticized because they failed to account for the diversities among the poor in many different cities (Valentine 1968). These could be seen with factors of race and ethnicity, and historical traditions. The culture of poverty notion was seen as a “blame the victim” ideology—people were poor because of their culture. There are a lot of complexities to the issue, but one thing that is conceded is that maybe there are many different cultures of urban poverty depending upon precise contexts that needed to be studied carefully. Most certainly there are a lot of poor people in the cities of the world, and it is important to debate and analyze how to conceptualize that reality. Urban poverty is a very large subdomain of anthropology. Truth of the matter is we do not get much real opportunity to “study-up” with regard to wealthy elites due to a matter of access.

Overcrowding and Housing Shortages

Housing shortages are a tremendous problem in many places with the rush to the cities and inadequate planning or resources available (Basham: 169-174). Many people end up in slum dwellings. Many problems, such as safety and the lack of sleep, and children being sent out into the streets in shifts, emerge. Many
other social issues flow from the foundational dilemmas of housing shortages and inadequate quality of shelters.

*Squatter Settlements*

In many less developed countries, as many as three quarters of new migrants go to slums in inner cities or makeshift unauthorized squatter settlements on the edges of cities. People come with hopes of making it out into better housing, but they face great obstacles. The authorities may often see them as great threats and their settlements as sources of crime. They may try to eliminate them by bulldozing their houses.

Ethnographies often show that such settlements may be the only realistic adaptation for the migrants (Ibid: 174-185). They arrive with rural values and hopes, but crises start to occur when, for instance, the husband cannot find work. Family cohesion breaks down and they can adapt through deviant or more acceptable lifestyles. Slum dwellers and squatters are in different circumstances. Slum dwellers can lay claim to legitimacy since they can pay rent. Squatters may be eliminated, but they, as studies have shown, may also form very effective communities and support for each other in a serious struggle for survival. They may form economic adaptations, involving petty capitalism as with vending on streets, garbage collection, and so forth. Local cohesion and social support may build up so intricately that they may move to more suitable locations as whole communities.

*Solutions of Public Housing*
The solution of public housing, especially in American cities, may actually become more of the real problem when they are culturally inappropriate, or seen simply as a way of removing the blemishes of slums or squatter settlement. They may destroy the old community and create new problems. One of these is juvenile crime directed towards older residents by younger ones. Public housing may remove people from legitimate sources of income. They can be successful when well designed, affordable, and culturally appropriate, giving the residents a sense of pride in their own housing (Ibid: 185-194).

**The Study of Social Stratification and Pluralism in the City**

Cities represent an intensification of pressures in human societies towards social inequality resulting from the ever-increasing division of labor. In traditional cities, a fixed aristocracy tended to rule. Later, middle classes emerged and created wealth while supporting the states in their commercial expansions. By the eighteenth century they started to eliminate aristocracies. With today’s cities, aristocracies have been eliminated and new elites of businessmen, bureaucrats, and technocrats have prevailed. The theme of individual achievement orientation is much more prominent than in the past. Even older elites have to eventually gain the right training for new types of activities if they want to retain positions. So the dynamics of class are extremely important to urban life and they are constantly in flux.

Similarly, cities have always been a context for ethnic diversity, beginning with rulers, merchants, and slaves, perhaps as separated from local indigenous
peasants. Race may also be a factor in shaping social differences. Generally speaking, people in complex urbanized societies organize themselves around caste, class, or ethnicity. In developing cities, more people may be entering middle classes but a vast majority treads water or desperately tries to stay the same. Some questions emerge regarding particular urban contexts--do urban situations promote individual achievement and social mobility, and is there a reduction of birth-ascribed features such as caste or ethnicity? Basham looks at various regions of the world from the perspective of 1978.

_Africa_

Tribal identity was and probably still is very important in determining status and the formation of elites. This is partly because colonial administrators, especially the British, emphasized tribalism, and thus some became ascendant and in control relative to others. This has been a major stumbling block in the unification of new states. However, you can find some divisions emerging even within tribes in the city. In South Africa there are the Red Xhosa focused on traditional tribal matters and the School Xhosa who have been involved in education and business (Mayer 1962). Also in many places in Africa, South Asians have filled middle class positions and have become very rich, but they pay the price of being disliked or even hated by Africans. Class distinctions based on education, achievement, and occupation are slowly emerging, but dual loyalties between ethnic groups and classes are present to some degree.
Southeast Asia

In countries like Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia and so forth an important group has been the “Overseas Chinese,” with 14,000,000 of them moving in 1978. They carry out primary merchant functions. They tend to be endogamous, wealthy, and very much resented by indigenous peoples. Overall in Southeast Asia, there is a kind of de facto caste system with Indian, Chinese, European and indigenous populations marrying ostensibly among themselves. Edward Bruner (1973), in research relevant to Indonesia, suggests that ethnicity is the primary mechanism determining status and social relations.

In North America, class was originally the most significant factor in the development of cities. But the middle and upper classes were largely occupied by earlier migrants (British, German etc.). Over time, through assimilation, other incoming migrants to North America were, to some extent, able to penetrate these classes. Therefore, individual ability and achievement is more notable for class membership. But, according to Basham (1978: 278), for the vast majority of urban peoples in the world, primordial identities of ethnicity and race form the basis for social inequalities or class. Basham feels that there needs to be reforms and that these identities tend to be the basis of much of the social conflicts emerging in developing nations.

Part II: Theorizing the City—An Update on Urban Anthropology

Although anthropology was once done overwhelmingly in rural areas, one gets the impression that it too is starting to be more reflective in its efforts of the global
urban population shift. That is so because that is mainly where the people are, or on the move to. Since Basham’s (1978) significant review, it is hard, however, to categorize what is the precise nature of urban anthropology, how many are actually doing it, and there is certainly no grand theory guiding this research.

Setha Low (1996, 1999a) has twice now done an admirable explication of what is happening recently and in the second review (1999), she uses it as an introductory chapter to a collection of readings representing trends as she sees them. For the sake of brevity (one could and perhaps should read the original article and chapter), I will just sketch the trends that she mentions and not back them up with all her supporting references, other than a few special cases and some that are in her book.

Given the latest styles in anthropology, Low suggests that there is a tendency to avoid “essentializing”—presumably defining and describing presumed concrete entities (e.g., perhaps “juvenile delinquency,” “cultures of poverty”)—types that are directly compared and contrasted, such as structural functional institutional static descriptions, and anything resembling evolutionary stages and grades. Overall, there is a focus on social relations, metaphors, and images, or a predominance of that which we might label as postmodern and containing a significant amount of ethnographic detail.

Social relations constitute the first category—no big surprise given anthropology’s broad mandate and because of the extreme heterogeneity found in cities—as a hallmark of this domain. The ethnic city (Ibid: 5-7) is mentioned first and can include the circumstances of ethnic groups, particularly immigrant
ones, and research frequently involves discussions of how such groups deal with marginality in relation to those who have preceded them and those who are in power and controlling the cities. Studies can involve the history of particular ethnic groups within the city and the nature of interethnic relations. Cities as mosaics of ethnic enclaves are a recurrent theme—Miami being one significant example with the emergence of Cuban Americans as a more dominant grouping over time.

Somewhat tied to all of this are studies in which Low categorizes as the *divided city* (Ibid: 7,8), especially when the division is racial. This has always been a big part of American urban research focused on the Black-White divides and the notions of uptown versus downtown categories. It also involves the widespread displacement of impoverished non-whites due to “gentrification” projects. Yet, since the Civil Rights era, there have been further breakdowns and conflicts over space such as the situating of housing projects and other institutions servicing the poor. These can illustrate class divisions even within urban Afro-Americans themselves. One of the articles in her collection (Gregory 1999) illustrates a New York borough where neighborhoods are in conflict after the golden age of Civil Rights solidarity. Middle class Afro-Americans are sometimes now showing values and political behavior similar to whites by trying to exclude those whom they consider less desirable. Nonetheless, the older political economy of race and the divided city also still predominates with the failure of city officials to equitably distribute resources such as those associated with education. Ida Susser (1999) demonstrates this with policies associated with
shelters and temporary welfare hotel accommodations for Afro-American homeless families. Men and teenage boys are excluded, thus seriously damaging the already fragile family structure and placing juvenile males in especially vulnerable circumstances.

The gendered city (Low 1999a) is yet another category within social relations. Traditionally, the city was seen as a “man’s realm.” More recent research looks at women in emerging work circumstances and the social contexts of their work relations. Another subdomain portrays efforts of women in the city struggling to support their children, a topic which goes back to the 1960s. More and more women are finding themselves in the informal economy as street vendors, market women, piece workers in urban factory situations, and as domestic servants. Much of this comes from circumstances of vulnerability and exploitation, but also heroic struggle and success.

Tying together these dimensions of social relations and fitting postmodern poststructuralist trends is the concept of the contested city (Ibid: 10-12). Here, ethnic, racialized, gendered and lifestyle groupings, social movements, and others may lay claim to urban space and present representations of themselves through street parades and other events centered on their pride and proclamations of legitimacy, marking their rights of cultural reproduction. They may also make claims to particular spaces such as parks, plazas, and shopping and other public areas as well as neighborhoods. Low in this volume (1999b) provides an excellent example of multiply contested space and representation in two plazas in San Jose, Costa Rica. Also in the book, Rotenburg (1999)
describes controversies in contemporary Vienna over open spaces and gardens where a controversial ecological movement has been trying to propagate free ranging, uncultivated gardens reflecting the wildness of nature. This is in opposition to those in Vienna who object to the proliferation of this unregulated style.

Low’s (1999a) second big domain is that of economics. One subtopic that has been of particular interest over the last several decades has been the deindustrialized city. She starts the discussion through mention of Michael Moore’s famous film *Roger and Me* about the closing down of General Motors factories in Flint, Michigan. Other more academic studies have been done which document the impacts of this phenomenon and those involve downsizing industries and show its negative impacts on working class people as industries are relocated offshore. Studies of such impacts often spill over into nearby suburbs where the middle class dream is threatened by the same phenomena.

Tied to this theme is the global city where new “post-Fordist” manufacturing and service industries are being constructed and where cities such as New York, London, and Tokyo, while still maintaining their “command post” position in world economies, are undergoing massive changes in their structures and spatial arrangements. Polarization occurs in these cities that drastically separate casual labor from those in information processing and management at the very top. New regional urban complexes are emerging with previously unseen dynamics. One of these is the massive integrated manufacturing and distribution complex along the U.S.-Mexico border with large
scale cross-border commuting. Another one is a large region in South China centered on Hong Kong and involving scores of millions of residents with complex networks of thousands of firms tied together by gift exchanges and equally complex extended kin networks. This is accomplished without the problems that usually come through the outside investment that comes from already developed capitalist countries. Then, other dimensions relevant to global cities have placed big emphases on large-scale transnational migrations. These include, as discussed, the phenomena of deterritorialization. Here, previously localized ethnic groups, now in a diaspora, reproduce their culture but blended together with their significant contemporary innovations, simultaneously through contacts with other traditions in a multitude of interconnected but distanced locations.

Next is the notion of the informational city (Castells 1989) based on informational processing that now dominates the world economy. Here, computer networks, access to technology, and information are the sources of power and influence and new creators of culture. Hannerz (1996: 127-140) roughly looking at the same domain but with a wider perspective sees cities, especially global ones, as major creators of culture through a creolization or blending of cultural materials more or less equally derived from developed centers and from those contributed from the Third World peripheries. Through diaspora, migrations to these cities and with the people keeping in contact by media and directly visiting their homelands, the periphery flows to the core and the core to the periphery with relevance to cultural content.
Another domain is that of *Urban Planning and Architecture*. The discussion begins with a critique of the *Modernist City* that is used as an example in her book with a discussion of one of the worst examples in Brasilia (Holston 1999). Brasilia epitomizes the period of high modernity. Yet with its remote abstracted modern architecture and top-down planning, while symbolic of Brazil’s new position in global society, it has been a disaster in connecting with the actual needs of its people. The *colonial city* as another parallel phenomenon that represents those imperial centers artificially established in European colonies and has, in many respects, continued in their cultural remoteness for most new citizens in post-independence times.

Another recent theme in research is the *postmodern city*. Much of the thrust of this is attached to realms of imagining such cities for cultural consumption or as cities of illusion—in other words the packaging of cities as commodities. Several papers in this volume (Rutheiser 1999 and McDonough 1999) discuss the ways in which city officials in Atlanta and Barcelona, respectively, repackaged and rezoned aspects of their cities in order to succeed in winning the Olympics and to provide positive public images to promote tourism. The displacement coming from gentrification and urban renewal inflamed existing and created some new social divisions. A similar paper in the volume by Cooper (1999) describes the debate and conflicting ideologies between development and environmental sustainability in the Toronto Waterfront renewal project.
Next in consideration is the *fortress city*—a spin-off of the divided city where more affluent residents live in gated communities while the imagery of dangerous youth gangs and homeless reinforce these fears. While images and actual acts of violence and crime increasingly generate fear, they likewise impact inner city resident patterns that remain isolated in places where police no longer patrol and everyday violence is associated with activities such as the drug trade. How people imagine, project, and manage their fears of violence and crime is an important theme. Research on the behaviors and ideologies of those marginalized into violence and crime continues to be a tradition in urban anthropology.

Concluding the survey, Low (1999a: 20) briefly mentions work done in South Asia in the *sacred city* where, within Hindu contexts, these cities symbolically link the sacred and social realms of everyday life and also provide multi-sited contexts for complex ritual cycles. The *traditional city* is also mentioned in context of urban centers in Japan, China, and India again where there is a struggle to maintain tradition with regard to class, occupation, and sex roles in the midst of the rapid change of high modernity and globalization.

In summary, Low suggests that contemporary urban anthropology receives theoretical influences from political economy, architecture and planning, cultural studies, urban geography, and sociology, yet its main internal anthropological influences are post structural and postmodern. Altogether these include topics that involve race, class, gender (traditional topical areas), political economic studies of transnational sociocultural contexts that are emerging
through globalization and research on symbolic aspects, and the social
production of urban space and planning for it. Images and symbols are significant
in concepts such as the divided city and the global city. It also contextualizes
culture making and reproduction and shifting meanings that inform behavior in
the city.

**Summary**

The domain of urban anthropology thrives but is, theoretically, just about as
diversified as anthropology as a whole, and in research topics. Although once
primarily rural in ethnographic scope, today’s anthropology is done much more in
urban settings because that is where a very large number of our subjects dwell.
Methodologically, that creates challenges because the methods of village-styled
ethnography have their limitations in city settings. The usual style is still,
nonetheless, ethnographic with detailed portrayals, narratives, life-histories and
so forth focused on life-styles of particular urban types such as gang members,
stock-brokers, gated suburban dwellers, and small scale capitalists, but rarely,
the power brokers and urban elites.

Urban anthropology also blends very much into two other topics in the
book—modernization (Chapters Five and Six) and globalization (Chapter
Seven)—and is one of the defining characteristics of both. Cities are a source of
much innovation and constant large-scale cultural creolization due to the
movements of ethnic and national diasporas. Networked social linkages and the
operations of social movements are much more apparent in these contexts.
Chapter Twelve was devoted to the relationships between cultural change theories and applied anthropology. During the reviews of the book, the need for more background on applied anthropology came up several times. That is a huge task, because the profession is arguably as old as the discipline itself and at least as varied in subject matter. Here, I quote myself in broadly outlining the practicality of applied anthropology:

Applied anthropologists use their knowledge of peoples and cultures for practical purposes. They do this framed by anthropological concepts and a methodology—ethnographic fieldwork—that portrays people in their actual circumstances. Social soundness studies investigate how broad policies, such as health promotion, might work or need specific revisions with a particular people before being implemented. Through needs assessments on a topic such as immigrant seniors, anthropologists discover what peoples’ unmet needs are. A program evaluation assesses an existing program as to how well it is working according to its original goals. A Social Impact Assessment anticipates what the effects of large-scale development,
such as dams, pipelines, oil and gas drilling, uranium mining, clear-cutting forests, community relocation, and the building of new towns, will be upon local peoples and their ways of life—especially as related to the land. Anthropologists might do advocacy, performing a kind of "whistle blowing" when social injustice has been done.

In these types of work, applied anthropologists are largely working as policy scientists. They make their special contributions through capacities to interpret communities and institutions from insiders' perspectives and in being able to identify pertinent cultural factors. Overall, applied anthropologists contribute ground-level, bottom-up perspectives and recommend approaches that have a chance of actually working. Costly mistakes and social conflicts can come through top-down planning by policy-makers who know little about their intended beneficiaries. Furthermore, policy-makers are frequently unaware of how their values have shaped policies that they mistakenly assume will work with people from different cultures.


For much of applied anthropology’s history, it was more noticeably part-time and academically situated with some professors contracting with organizations beyond universities for whom they would provide detailed strategic information and recommendations on practical matters. These were most frequently government agencies responsible for the administration of indigenous or minority peoples. During the 1960s, however, there was an exponential growth of
anthropology in terms of students, departments, professors, and especially topics and domains of study. Both obstacles for academic employment and new challenging, and sometimes lucrative, opportunities led many PhD anthropologists to improvise their skills for service completely outside of the traditional security of university employment. Thus arrived yet a third categorization—that of practicing anthropology that has a much closer relationship to applied anthropology than to academic anthropology in its focusing on skill sets and the ways of framing knowledge.

Non-academic practice takes the forms of full-time consulting, and taking jobs in business, government, non-government, and not-for-profit organizations. Many more skills than were offered at the university level are needed for this work—sophisticated policy analysis, implementation and review, management and administration, more varied styles of advocacy and communication, much greater variety of methodological techniques especially quantitative ones, more stringent demands for attention to ethics, and many other requirements. The domains of practice are ever expanding and most of them have particular policy contexts that need to be framed beyond pure academic analysis. Some of the current ones are:

- Development (as discussed in Chapters Five and Six)
- Environmental Issues and Resource based industries (mining, agriculture, forestry, fisheries), sustainability, environmental rights and justice, climate change, biodiversity preservation, co-management of resources etc.
• Business and industrial anthropology—marketing, international co-ventures, product design, research on work place issues

• Medical anthropology—public health, transfer of health jurisdictions, nutrition, preventative programs, treatment programs, alternative medicine

• Cultural resources—national parks, heritage sites

• Education—curriculum development and evaluation, multicultural education

• Tourism—ecotours, marketing cultural heritage, evaluation and impact assessment

• Military—overseas bases, military culture, embedded “human terrain-systems” intelligence (very controversial) for occupying forces in Iraq and Afghanistan

• Transportation and communication

• Technology transfers and impacts

• Town planning and architecture—culturally appropriate designs

• Poverty, housing, and employment issues and policies in urban contexts

• Family issues—child welfare, spousal violence and other issues

• Organizational structures and operations—bureaucracies, firms, corporations etc.

• Refugees and resettlement

• Immigration and multiculturalism

• Human rights, law, and justice

• Race and ethnic relations
- Indigenous peoples' policy issues—self-government, administration, relations with sectors larger societies
- Other emerging domains and topics

Feedback from pioneering practitioners about the limitations of traditional academic training in anthropology led to rethinking of the way we train students. For some of us, there has been a concern to better prepare them to use their anthropological skills in these nonacademic, real world, practicing circumstances. So in the early 1970s, two specialized programs in the training for practice were established at the University of South Florida and the University of Kentucky. By now, there are approximately forty such Masters programs in the United States plus several that offer PhDs in practice. This is important because approximately one half of PhD graduates end up in practice, let alone the tens of thousands of bachelor and masters level graduates who will not find jobs teaching and doing research in universities. I would, nonetheless, maintain that the study of sociocultural change as outlined in this book is a topic vital to all three disciplinary and professional categories—academic, applied, and practicing—and can serve to link them in analytical and knowledge foundations. The rest of this appendix provides some resources available for those wishing to further explore the issues of application and practice.
Basic Textbooks


Journals in Applied Anthropology

Annals of Anthropological Practice (formerly NAPA Bulletins)

http://practicinganthropology.org/publications/annals/

Anthropology in Action

http://journals.berghahnbooks.com/aia/

Human Organization

http://www.sfaa.net/publications/human-organization/
Significant Collections of Applied Anthropology Articles


Kedia, Satesh and John van Willigen. *Applied Anthropology: Domains of Application*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005


Major Organizations Devoted to Applied or Practicing Anthropology

Consortium of Applied and Practicing Anthropology Programs (COPAA)

http://www.copaa.info/associations/
National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA)
http://practicinganthropology.org

Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA)
http://www.sfaa.net

Career Building Advice


