

YOU MUST LEARN ANTHROPOLOGY!

Dr. M.P. Damodaran¹

Abstract

Anthropology is a fascinating discipline centered around human beings, and humanity. It takes efforts to understand the world through a comprehensive model of humanity. The celebrated human-friendly, cultural relativistic perspective of *anthropology* well fits the democratic world order today. Its multidimensional, and holistic viewpoint helps us to understand the self, others, and our universe. As a companion, *anthropology* aid individual, and collectives to develop their wisdom, freedom, and fraternity. Learning *anthropology* is so important in all respect as far as an individual is concerned to enhance their orientation about life, and existence in harmony with environment, and this living world.

Key words: Anthropology; Humanity; Culture; Ethnicity; Identity; Relativism.

Introduction

Anthropology was hardly heard beyond the academic domain, till recent times. It was taught as a tiny university subject only in few countries across the globe. It has been also regarded as ‘a kind of sacred esoteric knowledge’ of certain elite upper-class people. There was a prominence for armchair-anthropological imaginations which have been tailored predominantly ‘speculative images’ of ‘the other’ around the world. Moreover, *Anthropology* on many occasions was ‘wrongly branded’, and the *Anthropologists* have even referred experts of the so-called *tribes, primitives, natives*, and so on. Nowadays, people of all kinds particularly the orators, speakers, scholars, researchers, politicians, and academicians are seen often referring *Anthropology* to a great extent. This could be signaling the sign of a ‘new fashion’ but of course, clearly characterizes the significance, and uniqueness of an ‘exceptional discipline’, *that is Anthropology!*

Etymologically the term *anthropology* denotes the “knowledge or, study of human beings” (Dobzhansky, 1963; Mead, 1964; Malinowski, 1960; Thompson, 1950; Linton, 1945; Scupin&DeCourse, 2016). By and by, learned scholars around the world took efforts to formulate appropriate views, definitions, and each of them eventually manifests the charm, uniqueness, and scope of *anthropology*. For instance, Hundt (1501) considered *anthropology* as, “the study of man in detail”. Topinard (1876) perceived it as, a “Branch of natural history which treats of man and the races of man”. A pioneer of Modern *Anthropology*, Boas (1938:1), affirmed that the science of *anthropology* “deals with the history of human society”. Herskovits (1948) declared *anthropology*, “The study of Man and His Works”. Kluckhohn (1950) compares it to a mirror by saying that “out of all the sciences which study various aspects of man, *anthropology* is the one which comes nearest to being a total study of man”. Lewis (1982) defines *anthropology* as, “The general term for the science of man: the cultural, social, physical development and behaviour of man throughout his history”, while Eriksen (1995) explained that *anthropology*, which “Tries to account for the social and cultural variation in the world,

¹Department of Anthropology, University of Madras, Chepauk Campus, Chennai-600 005.
Tamil Nadu. Hand Phone: 9840245078 Email ID: damodaran68mp@gmail.com

but a crucial part of the anthropological project also consists in conceptualizing and understanding similarities between social systems and human relations". Harris (1968:1) saw *anthropology* as, an "Enlightenment and the vision of a universal history of mankind". However, many more definitions could be available here to quote, but finally, we turn on to Goodenough (2002:423) envision *anthropology* as, "A field of scholarly endeavor that involves both scientific and humanistic approaches in interaction".

Historical turn of Anthropology

Over the years, *Anthropology* has grown from, "A discipline of infinite curiosity about human beings" (Ember et al., 2002:2), and would put on display its potential to dismantle the human nature, life, and ways of existence across space, and time; i.e., the pre-historic, proto-historic, historic, and the period of contemporary knowledge societies. (Damodaran, 2014:11-12; 1999:36-37; Majumdar & Madan, 1986:5). Though it had a humble beginning, what Boas (1904:513) was referred to as a 'speculative anthropology' of the early days, soon took progress into an 'exceptionally different subject'. The change from a science of man to a "broader and more complex" (Nader, 2002:441) scientific discourse of everything by the gradual expansion of its scope, and method is something remarkable! *Anthropology* has changed because, mainly because the non-academics in the West turn on to show interest in *anthropology*, and started noticing its 'representation of certain fundamentals of human conditions' (Eriksen 2004:3).

It was quite common that *anthropology* undergoes several twists, and turns at different periods of time. This fact was endorsed by Penniman (1935), in his popular book, *Hundred Years of Anthropology*, by suggesting that *anthropology* progressed through four phases; namely, the Formulatory Period, the Constructive Period, the Convergent Period, and the Critical Period. In the beginning, the knowledge of *anthropology* was believed to be scattered far, and wide in various subjects, and was started to consolidate in the second phase. The classical *anthropological* theories were constructed during this period. *Anthropology* was significantly influenced, and inspired by the scholars, and theories of other disciplines. Eventually, the teaching of *anthropology*, and the dissemination of its knowledge considerably escalate by the publication of journals to a great extent. In spite of this, he indicates scholars from the different subjects were begun to undertake *anthropological* projects during the Convergent, and Critical periods. Similarly, many renowned *Anthropologists* like Firth (1944, 1992), Giddens (1996), Needham (1970), etc. at different points of time voiced that our subject was passed certain 'twists and turns, and which were perceived as 'serious identity crisis over time'.

For instance, we quote Bunzel (1962:5) who described how did *anthropology* once downsides that, "When Boas first turned to anthropology in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, "ethnography" consisted largely of unsystematic observations of primitives by untrained observers and travelers, while "ethnology" consisted mainly of speculations on the history of civilization, with little reference to observed facts. Both approaches to the science of man were equally unrelated to the problems of modern life. So long as "savages" were regarded as a different species or an inferior and undeveloped branch of the human race, little could be learned from them, and the study of their strange customs had a purely antiquarian and collector's interest". A century ago, *anthropology* evidently spun around the accounts of Missionaries, Travelers, Administrators, etc., and tailored speculative-armchair theories. The Western fantasy towards the exotic, and otherness has superbly surged Ethnography. This was going along with the colonial, and imperial interests as well. Later, an overwhelming influence of race presented little prominence to Ethnology but, various stream of innovations such as,

Enlightenment, Evolutionism, Neo-evolutionism, Diffusionism, Functionalism, Structuralism, Marxism, Feminism, Post-Colonialism, Modernism, Post-Modernism, Extensive-fieldwork, Cultural Relativism, and Cross-Cultural Comparisons shaped *anthropology* into an outstanding discipline.

Uniqueness of Anthropology

Right now, *anthropology* is deemed to be a ‘complete science’, always seeks to amass an inclusive, ‘comprehensive knowledge upon humanity’. Consequently, the scope of *Anthropology* deduces into a much-awaited paradigm of a *Unified Anthropology* or, *General Anthropology*. This will be probably accomplished through the ‘integration’ of its ‘four subfields’, i.e., *Biological Anthropology*, *Archaeological Anthropology*, *Linguistics Anthropology*, and *Social-Cultural Anthropology*. Tax (1977:5) hint Broca (during 1860-1870) hoped that anthropology could “Extract, by means of a rigorous synthesis, the ultimate idea of general anthropology, which sooner or later will be the crown and glory of our science”. Likewise, Boas (1940:244) held a similar view, "We may perhaps best define our objective as the attempt to understand the steps by which man has come to be what he is, biologically, psychologically and culturally".

Today, we are living at the age of globalization, and the information age. Our World is predominantly under the massive hegemony of a unipolar world order, global capitalism, international finance, and trade interests. Equally, our time is phenomenally marked by the supremacy of the internet, satellite T.V., mass, and social media, multi-ethnic modernity, wars, civil wars, violence, terrorism, genocide, ethnic cleansing, poverty, and pandemic. To make a meticulous understanding of this confusing, complex, misty nature of humanity requires a fairly accurate fitting perspective, and that must have relativistic, *emic*, and *etic* views towards all human societies, and their similarities, and differences. Moreover, humanity should look from a global, and local perspective. At this juncture, only we think of anthropology, which believed to be having the right approach, and perspective on human beings, and humanity. Moreover, the congruent idea of Erikson (2004:6) was deeply inspirational, who said that, “The only academic subject...is anthropology, which studies humans in societies under the most varying circumstances imaginable, yet searches for patterns and similarities, but is fundamentally critical of quick solutions and simple answers to complex questions”. As an intellectually stimulating subject that has centered around human beings, and humanity, *anthropology* persistently transcends a multi-dimensional comprehensive picture of human culture, and human society across space, and time. Erikson (2004:7) puts the course of this action of our discipline as simple as, “At the deepest level, anthropology raises philosophical questions which it tries to respond to by exploring human lives under different conditions”. He further added that *anthropology* confronts two important insights. The one is about the existing cultural variation in the world. For example, anthropology talks about the relevance of caste in India, the impact of technology among the highland people in New Guinea, the influence of kinship on politics in the Middle East, and the idea of gender in the Amazon basin are all exhibit global cultural variations. Subsequently, the discipline also offers theoretical, and methodological perspectives for effective *anthropological* explorations (Eriksen, 2004:7).

Concept of Culture

We all living in human societies, and each has its culture. Wissler (1938: VI, xi) once dramatically puts, "Everyone is born, lives and dies in a culture". *Anthropology* comprehended culture as our total way of life, and ‘all human nongenetic learned behavior’ which has been

shaped humanity. Consequently, Tylor (1871:1) figure out his famous ‘fundamental definition of culture’ as, "That complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". Stewart (1964:442) had the pride to write *Anthropologists* ‘discovered’ culture’ (see also Ellwood, 1927; Beals&Hoijer, 1965). Kroeber (1952) saw this act of *anthropologists* as a ‘fabulous contribution of anthropology’. Evidently, underscoring the fact that each culture is ‘an integrated whole’, only *anthropology* developed a *scientific concept of culture*.

Interestingly, the concept of culture has also gone through paradigm shifts. For instance, Boas (1938:159) spell out culture as, “The totality of the mental and physical reactions and activities that characterize the behavior of the individuals composing a social group collectively and individually in relation to their natural environment, to other groups, to members of the group itself and of each individual to (her or himself)”. Young (1939:19) describes that, the “Cultural world is the creation of man himself as he has learned how to manage nature and himself throughout his entire existence”. For Geertz (1973:89) culture is, a “Historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life”. Harris (1975: 144) opined that, “A culture is the total socially acquired life-way or life-style of a group of people. It consists of the patterned, repetitive ways of thinking, feeling, and acting that are characteristic of the members of a particular society or segment of a society”. Appadurai (1996:12) explicate culture, which “Appears to privilege the sort of sharing, agreeing, and bounding that fly in the face of the facts of unequal knowledge and the differential prestige of lifestyles, and to discourage attention to the worldviews and agency of those who are marginalized or dominated”. Finally, the words of Hoebel (1956:168), “Human beings are unique among all the creatures of the animal kingdom in their capacity to create and sustain culture” (see also Herskovits 1948:37-38; Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952:145; Linton 1936:78; Malinowski 1931:633-634; Stewart 1964:431) is well enough to give clarity what is the state of affairs, and the kind of discussions going on in *anthropology* over the concept of culture.

There are a number of terms, ideas, and usages that are always seen associated with the concept of culture. We list out a few of them here such as, cultural system, and cultural pattern, cultural integration, cultural heritage, cultural complex, cultural centre, cultural area, cultural pool, cultural context, cultural trait, cultural component, cultural type, cultural thing, cultural property, cultural homogenization, cultural hybridization, cultural symbol, cultural identity, cultural hub, cultural lag, cultural shock, cultural exchange, cultural contact, cultural diffusion, cultural osmosis, cultural assimilation, material cultural, plural culture, multi culture, subculture, acculturation, and enculturation.

All these indicate the vastness of our subject, culture. *Anthropologists* always feel excited whenever they sail over the concept of culture. Kroeber (1948, 1944, 1952) puts it in a simple way, “Culture... is a factor that produces enormous effects...a tremendous force affecting all human beings, socially and individually” which are pointing the fact that the fascinating feature of culture makes all excited! It also indicates culture has amazing features that made humanity, something brilliant, and shining! Therefore, nothing wrong with believing culture helps to evolve human beings being, and becoming a unique species in the whole animal kingdom! Further, whatever the meaning, character, and attributes a culture have, we could see it as a human ‘inventive construction’ that form, define, and redefine the ways of human survival, human existence, and humanity in total!!

Cultural Identity, Self, and Ethnocentrism

Culture is not only defining the world, but also develops our ideas, and worldview (Cohen, 1993:196). Helman (1990) held a similar opinion that culture refers to shared systems of meaning, symbols, and world views. So, we could see the key role culture has been playing to make our life something spectacular, and meaningful. Erickson (1950, 1968) relates an individual's "common culture" to his or, her 'cultural identity'. In the same way, De Vos (1990) has explicated the cultural identity, "A sense of common origin, as well as common beliefs and values, or common values". Yinger (1986) assumed that there is an ethnic attachment to the "genuine culture" that forms the person's "basic identity". Cohen (1993:201) demonstrates the relation between culture, and identity by stating that, "Culture is represented as identity through symbols: simple in form, complex in substance...One can easily posit the icons of a culture-tartanry, cuisine, costume, music". Look at a few examples of such kind of 'cultural representation of identity' from our day-to-day life such as, *Kuduma*-tucking of hair into a peculiar style, *Mukuthi*-nose stud adorned by pricking nostrils, *Thali*-neck chain indicating the marital status of a woman, *Pachakuthal*-tattooing, putting special drawings or, designs on body parts, circumcision of genital parts, and chipping or, grinding tooth. Those icons of cultural representation of identity also indicate 'cultural personhood'. We cannot imagine a soldier without a gun! These examples give us clear clues to think about how does culture constructs 'perception of individuals' (as well as collectives) or, 'cultural personhood'.

Identity simply hints at 'understanding'. So, it primarily indicates how did individuals understand, and define themselves. It also determines how others understand, and define one or, a group. Identity is a feeling of being and belonging. This is mostly happening in the state of affairs when an individual or, groups have come into contact with other or, others; when their living world undergoes rapid changes; and when they confronted with a new unexpected challenge which makes them naive to take choices before. In such testing times, people look back, and ask *who am I, who are they really, and what they want to be*. It becomes necessary, and unavoidable to ask such imperative questions on identity when individuals or, society feel destabilized, challenged or, disoriented. Identity, at times, discerns as 'individualism', and more often likely to treat as the synonym for 'a person' or, 'self'.

The notion of the person or, self is not at all identical from a global perspective. In India, the majority of the population is Hindus who believe in re-birth, *Dharma, Karma, and Karma*. A person does not regard fully a new one, but a re-born soul depends on its good and bad deeds in the previous life. Each person not born free, but, bound to a particular caste, which defines one's wisdom, conscience, duty, desire, and destiny of life. Subsequently, in our country a person or, self is seen as 'a social-centric ego'. Traditionally, in an African village, a typical person will be molded under the sturdy influence of religion. They have individual freedom, and accountability in life, however, living under the shadow of ancestral spirits which offer guidance, discipline, and even punishments. Coming to the world of Western society, the person is evidently licensed to possess individual liberties. Persons are free to take decisions, responsibilities, and consequences. Here, we would say, the person or, self-epitomized by and large egocentric because, ego is placed at the center of life.

Oxford English and Spanish Dictionary (www.lexico.com) explains ethnicity as, "The quality or fact of belonging to a population group or subgroup made up of people who share a common cultural background or descent", which means ethnicity is the "shared culture of a group" (see www.wikipedia.org). *Anthropologists* see ethnicity as a continuing ascription classifying a person in his or, her general, inclusive identity (see Barth, 1969). This idea comes

close to Cohen (1993:197), who pretends ethnicity as, “a mode of action”, “decision of people”, and “representation” through which people themselves or, others “symbolically demonstrate their cultural identity”. Thus, we can comprehend culture, ethnicity, and identity were, and are perceived as intersecting concepts in the line of Nikora’s (1995) thinking, who said, “Ethnicity is essentially an identity that reflects the cultural experiences and feelings of a particular group”.

Ethnicity not only politicizes culture (Cohen 1993 & 1995; Paine, 1984) but, also politicizes cultural identity. This ultimately intensifies the magnitude of marginalization of certain cultures, due to their relative powerlessness with respect to the powerful marginalizers (Cohen 1993 & 1975). We could see one classical example, in Said's *Orientalism* (1979) that illustrates how the Western intelligentsia ‘versions of oriental cultures’ rationalize its imposition upon oriental peoples, and the West's domination over the Orient as a benevolent ‘act of civilizing’ the marginalized. Similarly, Western thought justified the deeds of cultural marginalization by the European countries across continents such as, imposition of imperialism, and colonial expansion. We can see the culturally bound ethnic, egocentric, ‘identity pride’ triggered despotism set out the outbreak of World War II. Fortunately, the then prominent racist, and misanthropic ideas were notwithstanding for a longer period, a new world order came into existence soon after World War II, sideline the earlier viewpoints. The resultant whirl of radical, and rapid thinking for transformation breeze around the globe, letting fly the despotic ideas of domination, and despotism. The breakthrough movements for Democratic government, Home-rule, and Self-governance were to get utmost admiration. The ‘politicization of cultural identity’ helps to develop pride, and self-respect among people, but, on the other hand, more escalate ethnocentrism. This is something very sad, unfortunate, awkward, and embarrassing.

Ethnocentrism is regarded as a feeling, idea or, judgment of other cultures (or, societies) by the values, and standards of one’s own. It has a comparative viewpoint, as Sumner (1906:13) long ago defined it as, "View of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it". Kroeber (1948:266), given an anthropological view of ethnocentrism, a “Tendency...to see one’s in-group as always right and all outgroups as wrong wherever they differ”. More recently, Anderson (2010:11,19,20,70) has taken ethnocentrism as, “Feelings of affiliation and loyalty to groups with which (one identifies)”, and as, “in-group favoritism”. Yet there are ideas, nevertheless to say, ethnocentrism generally means, and promotes an ‘emic-ego centric’ cooperation, solidarity, survival, etc. of individuals or, group/s at the expense of others. Examples are several, for instance, pride on birth, religion, caste, language, and territory are good examples. Most of the conflict between old Dynasties, Kingdoms, and even modern Nation-states were hinged on either cultural or, ethnic identity-centric reasons. For instance, I think the following examples were, and are ethnocentric in nature. The historical war of Ashoka the great, with Kalinga Desa; the World War I, and II; the infamous practice of ‘euphemism’ as the Holocaust in Nazi Germany; the South African Apartheid; the Indian practice of untouchability; worldwide practices such as, racial or, colour discrimination, genocide, and ethnic cleansing; and lastly, one of the world's most enduring conflicts between Israel, and Palestine over 50 years on the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip has rooted in ethnocentric ideas.

Coming to our country, India, we have so many examples. An in-depth analysis could lead us to an understanding that there was an ethnocentric motive behind *KurukshetraYudh*. It was a war between two groups of cousins, the Kauravas, and the Pandavas, for the throne of Hastinapura. As a dynastic succession struggle, this epic battle *MahabharataYudh* of eighteen

days was only fought for keeping the spirits of ‘in-group favours’, really ethnocentric. The castes-system, and social-hierarchy blessed age-old social-custom “untouchability” is seen rigorously floated upon ethnocentrism. The theory of “purity, and pollution” always hinder equality, and human rights. Those Indian concepts largely divide us, and kindle a great deal of hatred, and distress rather than bringing in social harmony, and solidarity among our population. At this moment we all need to think ‘assertions of cultural superiority are inevitably wrong’ (see AAA, 1947; Lukes, 2008). Therefore, nowadays, ethnocentrism is naturally considered as negative, wrong, harmful, unfair, and outdated, and a theme should be condemned, and eliminated. The above statement of mine was supported, and testifies by Cook (1999: 80-81) who asserted that, “Obviously, the term “ethnocentrism” presupposes that the relativistic account of morality is correct”.

Cultural Relativism

In his famous classic ethnography, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, Malinowski (1922:518) puts his worthy note on the relative character of *anthropology*, “The Science of Man, in its most refined and deepest version should lead us to such knowledge and to tolerance and generosity, based on the understanding of other men's point of view”. Cultural relativism is usually regarded as making judgments relative to culture. It respects the views of others. The focal point of view is that each culture has its moral standard, which does not apply to a different culture. Therefore, cultural relativism helps us to understand the culture of another person or, group from his, her or, their point of view (also see Malinowski, 1922).

There are too many examples of cultural relativistic thinking that much prevailed among the tribal societies. Both Malinowski (1922), and Levis-Strauss (1949) reported through their empirical researches that reciprocal relationships were maintained by people to keep their political as well as kinship interests other than economic concerns. In an Indian context, we have lessons about it right from the olden days. For instance, the *Varna* system was likely originated with the ‘proto-cultural relativistic’ ideas. We feel sorry for the same system later turned into a ‘pro-ethnocentric’ system, soon after the birth of a person being the sole criterion of its membership. There are numerous mythological references also available. The friendship between Sugriva, Vibhishana, and Rama; Karna and Duryodhana; Satyavathi’s marriage with Santhanu; Hidimbi’s marriage with Bhima; the story of Sabarimala *Ayyappan*, and *Muthappanteyyam*; the story of *Pottanteyyam* endorsing the defeat of Sankaracharya by a Pulayan in a scholarly debate, etc. are all capable to provide clues about our cultural relativistic ideas which was probably prevalent in India even during the olden times. Ramayana, the *Adikavya*, Valmiki starts with the slogan *Ma Nishada...!*, meaning not only human beings but, even animals should not be hurt, harmed or, disturbed. A great indication of the poet’s relativistic mind!

The life message, teaching, and preaching of Vardhamana Mahavira, Gautama Buddha, many more *Munimar*, sages, and seers of India on hierarchy, human suffrage, equality, empathy, tolerance, etc. were vastly rooted in the spirits of cultural relativism. All of the *NavothanaNayakar* (campaigner of Renaissance movement) of our country was held high the fundamentals of humanity, such as, wisdom, freedom, and fraternity, and all of them get inspired by the idea of cultural relativism. Likewise, leaders of India’s Freedom Struggle Movement were highly influenced by the ethos of cultural relativism.

The soul of our Nation, “The Constitution of India”, the supreme law of the country, declares in its Preamble that, “We, the People of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute

India into a Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens: Justice, social, economic and political; Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; Equality of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the Nation; in our Constituent Assembly this twenty-sixth day of November, 1949, do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this Constitution” (www.constitutionofindia.net). The essence of our great Constitution is obliged to a great extent the ideas of cultural relativism in its letter and spirit. Moreover, the federal nature of our country; the concept such as, unity in diversity, and National integration are also standing on the idea of respecting, and understanding each other by and large owing to the morals of cultural relativism. The plural nature of Nations was noted by Steward (1955:46), he said that, "The culture of a modern nation is not simply a behavioral norm...Different groups of individuals are substantially dissimilar in many respects. They have subcultures" (see also Kroeber 1948:274). All indicate the fact that we must consider, appreciate, and respect the pluralistic nature of the value systems of our cultures (and any cultures). We should not make our judgment in any means on the basis of any single system of culture (see also Herskovits, 1958 & 1972). That is the wonder lingering in cultural relativism that forever fosters a democratic, positive, cooperative, and inclusive outlook, and attitude among people!

Academically speaking, cultural relativism is relatively a recent notion in *anthropology*, and closely identified with our subject. Boas, and his students were accredited to the rise, and popularization of this idea. Now, the inspirational, and worthy words of Herskovits (1972:34) on cultural relativism gives us a “Leverage to lift us out of the ethnocentric morass in which our thinking about ultimate values has for so long bogged down”. Therefore, we are advocating cultural relativism, not in a blind, and romantic sense. For us, cultural relativism neither serve as a tool intended to promote any form of ‘extreme ethnocentrism’ nor, instrumental to support any means of undesirable, undemocratic, and unhealthy ways of thinking such as, Chauvinism, violence, terrorism, and any inhuman ideas, and attitudes. Look at Ember and Ember (1996:11), who endorse the above contention of us by saying that, “Anthropology is useful, then, to the degree that it contributes to our understanding of human beings. In addition, it is useful because it helps us avoid misunderstandings between people. if we can understand why other groups are different from ourselves, we might have less reason to condemn them for behaviour that appears strange to us”. Therefore, the learning of *anthropology*, its strength, scope, and application is so significant since, we had high concerns over wisdom, liberty, equality, and fraternity are our fundamental rights. The unique perspectives of *anthropology*, we say without any doubt, certainly inspire, and encourage every individual who learns anthropology. It teaches students the value of humanity, and the nature of our universe. Thus, *anthropology* has the potential to develop a deep sense of self-understanding, and knowledge about others among pupils. Annihilating undesirable elements, attitudes, etc. from the mind of people, *anthropology* polish, refine, and prepare them to shine!

Conclusion

We have several reasons to say learning *anthropology* is so important for every individual. Understanding the self is one of the primary concerns of *anthropology*. By knowing self, one can easily appreciate, and understand others. We are living in a democratic world that values humanity very high, whereof utmost importance is given to human dignity, fraternity, and freedom. Yet, society is keen to observe human rights, equality, gender parity, etc. Thereby, a more human-centered cultural relativistic perspective is necessarily required to envisage the Universe, humankind, and the meaning of life. Making misapprehensions owing to the meager, repressive, egocentric, and ethnocentric prospects should be avoided. At an early

age, individuals (especially students) naturally show enormous enthusiasm to learn about culture, and social life to prepare themselves to become adults. The possibility of elimination of ethnocentric cultural biases of an individual at an early stage of life, and at the onset of education through the teachings of anthropological principles had great significance. Therefore, we strongly suggest learning *anthropology*. It has the strength to supply pretty well, accurate, and culture-relativistic worthy insights. *Anthropology* also accredited credits by developing a scientific temper in learners since, its knowledge fundamentally factual, and empirical in nature.

Lastly, *anthropology* would serve us as a window to make understand our contemporary world, through a multidimensional, holistic, and human-friendly point of view. Our world is not only expanding, but also shrinking. The advancement in science, technology drastically translated human life fast, and fabulous. Distance is no longer blocks close contact, and communication. Satellite communication, the internet, and mobile phone networks are few examples of trans-cultural communication, and connectivity. Globalization initiatives are bringing the idea of a 'global village' promises to demolish walls between countries. So, globalization enforces Nation-States to give unconditional welcome for international trade, business, and the flow of global finance by opening their doors, and windows. The economy is currently seen as more globally integrated, and policies are formulated with a vision of 'sustainable development'. The concepts such as, Civil society, Knowledge society, and Virtual community are reorienting the existing world's social systems. It resulted in demand for more transnational, and transcultural associations among the formerly separated societies, and countries (which were else stratified by class, culture, geography, and opportunities) was directly emerged out of the understanding of humanity in its fundamentals, i.e., sameness, and equality. So, there is a great cry for more, and more intercontinental collaborations, and cooperation in identifying, realizing, and solving several international issues like AIDS, epidemics, terrorism etc. We see culture takes up changes everywhere. Social institutions, morality, and ethics are seen undergoing mutations. For instance, food habits, the size and structure of families, and marriage customs are at the forefront being briskly altered. Elsewhere, the local traditions are challenged by globalization, and international capital interests. Another eye-catching subject of exploration is that the rise of interest among people on cultural identity. To conclude, I would like to say, think of anthropology be fitting for such occasions. It had a 'comprehensive model of humanity', which stands on holistic, human-friendly, comparative, and cultural-relativistic perspectives. So, anthropology has the strength to give comprehensive pictures of humanity, swear solutions, and answers to day-to-day demands, precarious questions, and challenges that arise out of contemporary social-cultural contexts. Even we could examine, and learn the impact of a pandemic, and Covid-19 viruses on humanity by probing questions such as, *what is this Covid-19? why do this Pandemic putting huge, and persistent challenges on humanity? how do we control the spread of the virus?* and discovering fitting solutions, remedies, and answers with the aid of anthropology! Therefore, learning anthropology is significant. It serves like a Social Engineer, who can understand and make repair society (culture as well). Anthropology also had the potential to render service to society like a doctor, who could diagnose, treats, and cures the ill-health of society, and culture as well!

References:

American Anthropological Association (AAA). (1947). Statement on Human Rights in *American Anthropologist*, 49/4, pp.539-543.

- Anderson, Elizabeth. (2010). *The Imperative of Integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Beals, Ralph L. and Harry Hoijer. (1965). *An Introduction to Anthropology*. Third edition. New York: Macmillan.
- Boas, Franz. (1940). *Race, Language, and Culture*. New York: Macmillan.
- Boas, Franz. (1938). Introduction in Franz Boas edied *General Anthropology*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. pp.1-6.
- Boas, Franz. (1904). The History of Anthropology in *Science, New Series*, Vol. 20, No. 512 (Oct. 21, 1904), pp. 513-524.
- Bunzel, Ruth. (1962 & 1928). Introduction in Franz Boas's *Anthropology and Modern Life*. USA: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1993). Culture as Identity: An Anthropologist's View in *New Literary History*, Vol. 24, No. 1, (Culture and Everyday Life, Winter, 1993), pp.195-209.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1975). The Management of Myths: The Politics of Legitimation in a Newfoundland Community (Manchester, 1975).
- Cook, John W. (1999). *Morality and Cultural Differences*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Damodaran, M.P. (2014). *The Anthropology of Dalits*. Chennai: Chemparuthy Books.
- Damodaran, M.P. (1999). A Preface to Anthropology in *The Researcher*, Vol. I No. I, December 1999, pp. 36-38.
- De Vos, G. (1990). Conflict and accommodation in ethnic interactions in G. A. De Vos & M. Suarez-Orozco edied *Status inequality: The self in culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 204–245.
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius. (1963). Anthropology and the Natural Sciences: The problem of Human Evolution in *Current Anthropology*, 4:138, pp.146-48.
- Ellwood, Charles A. (1927). Recent Developments in Sociology in Edward C. Hayes edited *Recent Developments in the Social Sciences*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, pp. 1-49.
- Ember, Carol R., Melvin Ember and Peter N. Peregrine. (2002, 1996). *Anthropology*. Delhi: Pearson Education Asia.

- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. (2004). *What is Anthropology?* London: Pluto Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. (1995). *Small Places, Large Issues*. London: Pluto Press.
- Erikson, E. (1968). Growth and crises of the healthy personality in H. Chiang & A. Maslow (edited) *The healthy personality*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, pp. 30–34.
- Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Firth, Raymond. (1992). A Future for Social Anthropology? in Sandra Wallman edited *Contemporary Futures: Perspective from Social Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp.208-224.
- Firth, Raymond. (1944). The Future of Social Anthropology in *Man*, XLIV: 1922.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1973). Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture in *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1996). The Future of Anthropology in *In Defence of Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goodenough, Ward H. (2002). Anthropology in the 20th Century and beyond in *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 104, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 423-440.
- Harris, Marvin. (1968). *The Rise of Anthropological Theory-A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc.
- Harris, Marvin. (1975, 2nd edition). *Culture, people, nature: An introduction to general anthropology*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Helman, C. (1990, 2nd edition). *Culture, health and illness*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Herskovits, Melville J. (1973). *Cultural Relativism*. New York, Random House, p. 15.
- Herskovits, Melville J. (1972). Cultural Relativism and Cultural Values, in Frances Herskovits (edited) *Cultural Relativism: Perspectives in Cultural Pluralism*. New York: Random House.
- Herskovits, Melville J. (1948). *Man and His Works: The Science of Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hoebel, E. Adamson. (1956). The Nature of Culture in Harry L. Shapiro edited *Man, Culture, and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 168-181.
- Hundt, Magnus. (1501). *Antropologium De Ho[Min]Is Dignitate*. Leipzig: Wolfgang Stockl.

- Kroeber, Alfred L. and Clyde Kluckhohn. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, (Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 47, No. 1). Cambridge: Peabody Museum.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. (1952). *The Nature of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. (1948, revised edition). *Anthropology: Race, Language, Culture, Psychology, Prehistory*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. (1944). *Configurations of Culture Growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1950). *Mirror for Man*. London: George G. Harrap and Co.Ltd.
- Levis-Strauss, Clude. (1949). *Elementary Structure of Kinship*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lewis, John. (1982). *Anthropology*. London: Heinemann.
- Linton, Ralph. (1936). *The Study of Man: An Introduction*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Linton, Ralph. (1945). The Scope and Aims of Anthropology in *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 3-18.
- Lukes, Steven. (2008). *Moral Relativism*. London: Profile Books.
- Majumdar, D.N. and T.N. Madan. (1986). *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*. Noida: Mayoor Paperbacks.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1960). *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press Galaxy Book.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1931). Culture in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4:621-645. New York: Macmillan.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, p. 518.
- Mead, Margaret. (1964). *Continuities in Cultural Evolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nader, Laura. (2002). Missing Links: A Commentary on Ward H. Goodenough's Moving Article "Anthropology in the 20th Century and beyond" in *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 104, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 441-449.
- Needham, Rodney. (1970). The Future of Social Anthropology: Disintegration or Metamorphosis? in *Anniversary Contributions to Anthropology*. E.J.Brill: Leiden, pp. 34-47.

- Nikora, L. W. (1995). *Race, culture and ethnicity: Organization of naori social groups: A working paper* (Working Paper, University of Waikato Psychology Department. Hamilton). New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Paine, Robert P. B. (1984). Norwegians and Saami: Nation-state and Fourth World in Gerald L. Gold edited *Minorities and Mother-country Imagery* (St. John's, Nfld., 1984), p. 212.
- Penniman, T. K. (1935). *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co.
- Said, Edward W. (1979). *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Scupin, Raymond and Christopher R. DeCorse. (2016, 2009). *Anthropology: A Global Perspective*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private limited.
- Steward, Julian H. (1955). *Theory of Culture Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Stewart, Omar C. (1964). The Need to Popularize Basic Concepts in *Current Anthropology*, 5:431, 442.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Tax, Sol. (1977). The Anthropological Tradition in Sol Tax and Leslie G. Freeman edited *Horizons of Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, pp. 1-20.
- Thompson, Laura. (1950). Operational Anthropology as an Emergent Discipline in *Beitragezur Gesellungs-und Volkerwissenschaft: Professor Dr. Richard Thurnwaldzusei'nemachtzigstenGeburtstaggewidmet*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, pp. 333-44.
- Topinard, Paul. (1876). *The anthropology (l'Anthropologie)*. Paris: Reinwald.
- Tylor, Edward B. (1871, Vol. I). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*. London: John Murray.
- Wiswiler, Clark. (1938, 1923). *Man and Culture*. New York: Crowell.
- Yinger, J. (1986). Intersection strands in the theorisation of race and ethnic relations in J. Rex &D. Mason edited *Theories of race and ethnic relations*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 20–41.
- Young, Kimball. (1939). *An Introductory Sociology*. New York American Book Company.
- <https://en.wikipedia.org>.
- <https://www.constitutionofindia.net>.
- <https://www.lexico.com>.