Synopsis of Anthropological Theories 2: 20th-Century Theories

These brief synopses are to help you choose theoretical/methodological perspectives for use in your term paper. They should be supplemented by reading the relevant sections in one or more of the histories of anthropology included in the General History and Criticism bibliography, and by more detailed readings from the corresponding weekly bibliographies.

Early 20th Century

Boasian Ethnographic Descriptive Holism (NOT suited for a short paper)*

Main emphases: “Boasian” or “American” school was antievolutionary and antiracist; stressed fieldwork in preference to armchair anthropology, and careful and comprehensive collection of data (observations and informants’ “texts”) in preference to preconceived theories. Viewed cultures as separate, inherently different and equal (“cultural relativism”); each a complexly integrated whole within itself, with specific historical (rather than general evolutionary) relationships with neighboring cultures.

Main varieties: Boas’ theoretical emphasis on importance of change and historical studies gradually superseded by his students' interests in classification and comparison of cultural “configurations” (Kroeber), “patterns” (Benedict), and other more static emphases. Kroeber developed theory of culture as “the Superorganic”, an entity that developed on its own power, and the study of which need not involve specific consideration of human beings. Lowie's view of culture as a “collection of shreds and patches”, by contrast, seemed to represent the opposite extreme of an antitheoretical or antisystematic approach. Major developments included Culture and Personality studies (see Psychological Anthropology, below) and Culture Area studies (see below).

Musical applications: Boas influenced Stumpf and Hornbostel, despite their attraction to the comparative method (see Evolutionism and Comparative Musicology, above), to produce primarily ethnographic-descriptivist studies. Several of his students (Sapir, Kroeber, Herskovits, and more intensively, Herzog and Roberts) conducted research on music, with the latter two leading the development of musical culture area/music cultures theory (see Culture Areas and Music Cultures, below). Indirect influence through students of students (McAllester, Nettl, etc.) pervasive in American ethnomusicology.

Criticisms: Fact- and description-centered approach hinders development of clear theory. *Descriptive standards require collection and correlation of large amounts of information, making this approach impossible to emulate or adequately illustrate in a paper of the length required for this class.

Fieldwork and Participant Observation (NOT practical for 10-week class)*

Main emphases: Methodological emphasis on the importance of anthropologists working directly with people in the field, rather than armchair analysis of reports by travelers, missionaries, etc., typical of most 19th century anthropology.

Main varieties: Although a few pioneering writers of late 18th-early 19th century (Volney, Murray, Catlin) used and advocated it, participant-observation fieldwork overshadowed by predominance of “armchair” anthropology for most of 19th century. Promoted by Boas and others towards end of 19th century; most
influential was Malinowski's fieldwork and development of “participant observation” method (living among people studied, and participating in their way of life as much as possible) during World War I. While Anglo-American anthropologists emphasized individual fieldwork, some traditions, especially French anthropology, made a serious effort to develop team fieldwork projects and methods.

**Musical applications:** early work by researchers such as Villoteau, Alice Fletcher and Frances Densmore; virtually all 20th century ethnomusicology is fieldwork-based. Mantle Hood's “bimusicality” (performance study, prefurred by Villoteau and Fletcher) a specifically musical counterpart of participant observation.

**Criticisms:** Individual fieldwork promotes image of “anthropologist as hero” that may exaggerate sense of authority and mask subjectivity of constructions; group fieldwork more likely to produce fragmented views and disrupt life of community being studied. *Fieldwork is not generally practical as part of the class paper project for most students because of the short time available in the quarter.*

**Culture Areas and Music Cultures**

**Main emphases:** Views cultures in terms of specific similarities and differences over large geographic areas, rather than as isolated individual cultures or in terms of supposed universal features shared by all cultures. For example, cultures of Indians of northwest coast (Makah, Kwakwakawakw (“Kwakiutl,” Nuu-chah-nulth (“Nootka,” etc.) are grouped together as “Northwest Coast” culture area on the basis of similarities ranging from subsistence (fishing) to architecture (wooden longhouses) to art (painted wooden masks and sculptures); while they are contrasted with other areas, such as the “Plains” (Sioux, Cheyenne, etc.) with their buffalo hunting, teepees, artwork in lightweight and portable media, etc.

**Main varieties:** Boas stressed interrelationship of parts (holism) within cultures, and known historical connections between them. Wissler based culture area mapping of North American Indians on ecological zones. Kroeber kept ecological emphasis, added complex statistical analysis of trait distributions, suggesting that each culture area had a “climax” area where its characteristic traits occurred in highest concentration, falling off towards edges of area. Outside North America, best-known attempts to define areas are Herskovits for Africa, Bacon for Asia.

**Musical applications:** Musical culture areas for North America defined by Herzog, Roberts, and Nettl and for Africa by Merriam; widely assumed by ethnomusicologists for other world regions, with little or no theoretical discussion. Lomax's Cantometrics combines culture-area, psychoanalytic, and behaviorist approaches.

**Criticisms:** Areas often not clearly contrasted, but seem to shade gradually into one another; disagreement between scholars based on which criteria are viewed as significant for defining areas suggests a certain degree of arbitrariness.

**Diffusionism**

**Main emphases:** Views cultures primarily in terms of influences coming from the outside, with the major research problem being to map the extent and source of such influences. Assumes humans are conservative and uninvventive, and thus that innovations usually develop once and are diffused from their original source. While some diffusionist accounts of cultural influences were based on historical evidence of movement or contact of peoples, the strongest and most characteristic theories involved inferences, hypotheses and speculations positing influences of one culture on another on the basis of perceived similarities, where other historical evidence was unavailable to show that migration or contact between them had actually occurred.

**Main varieties:** British “heliocentric diffusionism” that assumed diffusion of virtually every important cultural innovation from Egyptian civilization; and German *Kulturkreis* or “Culture-Circle” diffusionism
which postulated multiple diffusions of different innovations outwards in “circles” from their centers of origin, with “marginal survivals” of older traits at the edges of the circles.

**Musical applications:** Some of Hornbostel’s work, particularly the “theory of blown fifths” (Blasquintentheorie), takes a diffusionist perspective. Such perspectives were particularly applied to theories of diffusion of musical instruments, as in much of the work of Curt Sachs. Diffusion is still a widely-used emphasis in studies of cultural and musical phenomena where historical proof of diffusion exists (as in the importation and adaptation of Western popular songs, instruments, etc.).

**Criticisms:** Many cases of independent invention show diffusion not exclusive or most important explanation of innovation; assumptions of conservatism and uninventiveness often reflect European prejudices about inferiority of non-Europeans.

**Functionalism and Structural-functionalism**

**Main emphases:** Views the various parts of culture and social organization as having specialized “functions” which interact with one another to maintain the whole culture or society. Each part has its own function(s) relative to the whole, analogous to the functions performed by various organs for the benefit of the organism - eyes function to help locate food, provide safety, etc., digestive tract functions to convert food into energy used by the organism, and so on. Avoided study of “culture” because of doubts that many aspects of culture could be defined or studied as precisely as social organization; unlike American followers of Boas who considered themselves “cultural anthropologists,” British functionalists defined themselves as “social anthropologists” or “sociologists”. Historical studies were also avoided in favor of what was directly observable, i.e., contemporary behavior and events.

**Main varieties:** Malinowski’s functionalism, which views functions in terms of both biological and social needs; and Radcliffe-Brown’s “structural-functionalism” which analyzes functions more narrowly in terms of how they help to maintain a social structure. (There is no connection between this “structural-functionalism” and the “Structuralism” described below; don’t confuse them!) Later functionalists such as Evans-Pritchard were more tolerant of cultural and historical studies, and Firth emphasized symbolism, an area more characteristic of “cultural” than “social” anthropology. A kind of anti-functionalism, the “Manchester school” (Gluckman, Turner and others), grew to consider how things functioned to produce conflict rather than stability.

**Musical applications:** Music also viewed as “functioning” to maintain other parts of social organization; e.g., to reinforce and validate the power of a ruler or ruling class, to attract interest and participation in religious rituals, to promote the interaction of kinship groups in marriage ceremonies, etc. Still a widely-used approach, often together with other theories, whether or not explicitly identified as a theoretical basis for any given study.

**Criticisms:** criticized for presenting cultures as frozen in time, eternal and unchanging, due to emphasis on “functions” maintaining stability of social “organism” and avoidance of history. “Functions” constructed by outside scholars often conflict with insiders’ perceptions of how their own culture worked.

**(Psychological Anthropology)**

**Main emphases:** General emphasis on investigating relationships between culture and individual consciousness and emotions. More a subfield of sociocultural anthropology than a theoretical school, although some varieties have held distinctive theories.

**Main varieties:** “Classical” (Freudian) psychoanalytic approaches (Roheim, Devereux, LaBarre) emphasized sexual symbolism and “complexes” assumed to be universal, but defined in terms of European mythology and pathology; early efforts to create culturally variable, less ethnocentric approaches by Malinowski and Sapir. From 1930s on, modified culture-relativist psychoanalytic “culture
and personality” approaches emphasized culture, individual and emotions in relation to child-raising practices, sexuality, unconscious thoughts and their relation to repression of socially disapproved feelings (Mead, Bateson), and differences in personality types resulting from culture differences (Benedict, Erikson). Midcentury interest in study of behavior (Whiting, LeVine) and psychological testing (Wallace, Herskovits) followed by later interests in anthropology of consciousness, including trance and altered states of consciousness (Bourguignon, Lewis) and the construction of personhood (Daniel). See also Anthropology of Experience below.

Musical applications: Little use of psychoanalytic theory and method, except in Alan Lomax's Cantometrics, which combines it with behaviorism and culture-area theory; considerable recent interest in consciousness and trance, with Rouget's work best known.

Criticisms: Concentration on individual may distract from shared aspects of culture; definition and analysis of emotions, psychological states and pathology may be Eurocentric; psychoanalytic theories and the “unconscious” considered speculative by some, and these and theories of repression may rest on ethnocentric assumptions; later theories insufficiently tested and critiqued.

(Behaviorism)

Main emphases: Beginning in 1930s and dominant in 1950s, school inspired by behaviorism in psychology and other social (“behavioral”) sciences attempted to establish a rigorously objectivist scientific anthropology through strict emphasis on observable “behavior”. Requires strict avoidance of invisible things such as thoughts and concepts, which can only be explored through “verbal behavior”.

Main varieties: Often linked with a strong emphasis on quantification and complex statistical analysis of observed behavioral traits; Murdock's Human Relations Area Files and related publications attempt a comprehensive worldwide database.

Musical applications: Best known works are Merriam's theory-method text, Anthropology of Music, and his ethnography, Ethnomusicology of the Flathead Indians. Lomax's Cantometrics project combines approaches from culture area studies, psychoanalytic theory and behaviorist/quantitative emphasis on worldwide comparison of “objective” observation by outside observers.

Criticisms: Objectivism a mistaken emphasis for those who consider anthropology to be subjective and humanistic; thoughts and concepts considered by some to be equally or more important for understanding cultures than observed, quantifiable behavior.

Later 20th Century

Culture Change

Main emphases: Takes change in culture as primary object of study. Rejects theories and methods that treat culture as stable or tending to equilibrium (e.g., the functionalist “organic” model), and treats change rather than stability as a norm. Often associated specifically with change resulting from contact with Western culture, urbanization (see Urban Anthropology below) and development of mass-market “popular” culture.

Main varieties: Earlier in 20th c., Boas stressed change in terms of specific historical relations between cultures; Margaret Mead in terms of problems created for individuals (particularly women) and relationships; Malinowski in terms of colonial administration; Herskovits, Linton and others in terms of “acculturation”, or contact and adoption of traits from an outside culture. Later scholars prefer “change” as a more neutral or positive term; use a variety of theories and methods, including world-system theory (Wallerstein) and Marxist anthropology (see below).
Musical applications: Largely in the study of popular music (Waterman, Coplan, Manuel, many others), although first major ethnomusicological study of change (Becker on Java) focused on “classical” music, and some studies, including earlier examples (Boas, Wachsmann), deal with other kinds of music.

Criticisms: As this is more an area of study than a theoretical-methodological school, criticisms center on the different approaches used by different scholars.

(Cultural Ecology and Neo-Evolutionism)

Main emphases: Views culture change as progressive development based on technological adaptation to the environment, with social organization and culture developing new forms to support successful changes in subsistence strategies. Technoenvironmental factors seen as primary causes for secondary developments in society and culture.

Main varieties: Steward’s “multilinear evolutionism” rejects 19th c. evolutionists' “unilinear” belief that all cultures follow a single line of evolution towards a single higher state, and posits instead that different cultures follow different lines of evolution leading to different results, none necessarily higher. White and Harris (“cultural materialism”) explicitly identify with Marx and adhere more closely to classical Marxist (see Marxist Anthropology, below) views of a unilinear direction of progress towards more “advanced” forms of culture. White considers symbolism the basis of culture, and culture as autonomous, best explained without reference to humans; Harris rejects all forms of “idealism” and attempts a strictly materialist-behaviorist approach; Rappoport considers study of people's ideas and concepts a valuable counterpart of ecological/materialist approaches.

Musical applications: Very little interest in ecology by ethnomusicologists.

Criticisms: For “unilinear” varieties, same as for 19th c. evolutionism. Claims of scientific objectivity disputed as subjective and speculative, as in Harris' writings on sacred cows in India. Primacy of technoenvironmental sphere a priori dogma rather than proven fact, for some cases seem to suggest that cultural and social causes affect technology and environment, rather than the reverse. Mental and/or non-material aspects of culture equally or more important for understanding culture, and should not be underrated or omitted.

Urban Anthropology

Main emphases: Subfield of sociocultural anthropology rather than a theoretical school. Concentrates on anthropology of cities, partly as correction for early 20th c. emphasis on village ethnography. Stresses relationship of culture, ethnicity, social organization, change, etc. to urban environment.

Main varieties: Studies of “traditional” cities often emphasize factors such as urban space and architecture, ceremonies and symbolism in relation to traditional classes and political systems, religion etc., while studies of “modern” industrial/postcolonial cities often emphasize factors such as immigration, multi-ethnic populations, commercialization and popular culture, and relationships to social and economic change.

Musical applications: greater emphasis on studies of “modern” cities, often centered on popular music; Nettl's Eight Urban Music Cultures provides a sample, with earlier work by Keil and more recent work by Waterman, Coplan and others.

Criticisms: relatively new and defined by area of study rather than theory, so criticisms center on individual authors and their works rather than on urban anthropology as a field.
**Structuralism**

**Main emphases:** Investigates the structuring of ideas based on assumed universal human experience of opposing dualities (right/left, male/female, etc.), which create tendency to symbolic linkage of binary opposites (nature/culture, raw/cooked, musical instruments of light/instruments of darkness, etc.). In mythic narratives, such binary oppositions can undergo transformation of symbolic contents (a pair of animals, humans or instruments can be substituted for a pair of birds), while the underlying structure of binary opposition between them remains constant. The anthropologist's task is to identify these binary oppositions and trace their transformations, both within and between cultures, which ultimately will reveal basic universal structures of human thought.

**Main varieties:** Theory and methods originated and dominated by Claude Levi-Strauss, influenced by linguistics, cybernetics and Marxism, and applied by him to studies of kinship, totemism and mythology. Edmund Leach and Mary Douglas developed modified structuralist approaches to study of symbolism; and Bourdieu and others developed structural-Marxist approaches.

**Musical applications:** Best-known example is Feld's structuralist analysis of Kaluli myths and music.

**Criticisms:** restriction to very limited subject matter and cross-cultural comparisons create fragmented, decontextualized analyses that omit or distort culture as a whole. Structures perceived by anthropologist may be totally arbitrary. Static focus creates detemporalized view that omits consideration of process and change. Humans and society seem irrelevant to method and results.

---

**Cognitive Anthropology/Ethnoscience**

**Main emphases:** Attempts a highly systematic investigation of cultural “insider's” viewpoint by eliciting native-language terminology for a specific conceptual “domain” (kinship categories, kinds of birds, etc.), arranging them in ordered sets (taxonomies, paradigms, trees) that show which terms include which others, and which contrast with others on the same level (eagles contrast with hawks, both included in raptors, which contrasts with songbirds, etc.). “Componential analysis” used to identify “components” of meaning which determine contrast and inclusion: e.g., eagles and hawks contrasted by size and other features. Requires work in language of people studied, and careful elicitation methods to avoid suggesting categories to people rather than encouraging them to volunteer their own. Because each culture organizes each domain in different ways, method offers highly specific information on patterns of thinking unique to each culture. These unique patterns take precedence over outsiders' theories, giving the school a culture-specific orientation referred to as the “new ethnography”. Also called “ethnoscience” because classification systems studied overlap, showing various similarities and differences, with Western scientific classifications. Views anthropology as a formal science, like mathematics, where logic rather than observation is primary.

**Main varieties:** Most studies share features described above, differing largely in kinds of domains studied; representative collection of studies in Tyler. A few studies (e.g., Lounsbury on Crow and Omaha kinship) make cross-cultural comparisons of different ways of classifying and organizing similar domains. Berlin and Kay's study of color classifications takes an evolutionary view, concluding that some cultures have more complexly developed classifications than others.

**Musical applications:** Best-known examples are Hugo Zemp's writings on 'Are'are musical classifications.

**Criticisms:** largely the same as those listed for Structuralism above; except for subjectivity and arbitrariness, since methodology is so clearly specified. Rather, criticized as potentially trivial, and perhaps largely determined by “observer effect” which stimulates people to think more systematically than they normally would.
Symbolic Anthropology

Main emphases: Takes the study of symbolism (things that stand for something else) as key to understanding culture. More an area of study than a theoretical school, with nearly as many approaches as there are scholars. A strong field of anthropological interest almost from the beginnings of the discipline. Considerable influence by linguistic theories of Saussure and philosophical writings of Peirce. Some say that virtually all sociocultural anthropology of the last few decades has been symbolic anthropology.

Main varieties: Wide variety of theories and methods. Some scholars take a psychoanalytic approach to symbolism (Obeyesekere, Paul; see Psychological Anthropology, above). Raymond Firth interprets symbolism from a social anthropology-functionalist viewpoint, while Victor Turner takes a “Manchester school” anti-functionalist position (see Functionalism, above), treating symbols as embedded in social processes, often centering on conflicts; later turned to an Experiential (see below) approach. Edmund Leach developed a general theory of symbolism based on Levi-Straussian Structuralism (see above). Clifford Geertz takes a humanistic standpoint that considers anthropology “not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning”, which is to be found in interpretation of “clusters of symbolic acts” through “thick description” stressing the complexity of people’s experience and the anthropologist’s reactions, rather than reduction to patterns and logic. Bourdieu and others interpret symbols from a Marxist standpoint (see below). Much overlap with other recent trends in anthropology discussed below.

Musical applications: Traditional ideological dogmas of the autonomy of music and “the music itself” have relegated symbolism to the realm of the “extramusical”, and hindered the adoption of symbolic-anthropological approaches. Most widely used in study of musical instruments (classic study of Chinese “lute” by van Gulik; recent work by De Vale and others) and religious music, often from older, speculative theoretical standpoints.

Criticisms: For followers of viewpoints that treat anthropology as scientific rather than humanistic, or take objectivist position on primacy of materialism, behavior, etc., focus on symbolism is idealistic, subjective, and unscientific. Other criticisms focus on the specific theories and methods of specific authors.

Performance, Experience, and Communication

Main emphases: A broad and diverse grouping of “humanistic” or “interpretive anthropology” approaches, with considerable overlap with Symbolic Anthropology (see above) and with each other, and which includes a wide range of theories and approaches, perhaps best characterized by their subject of focus rather than theoretical schools. Performance studies take various kinds of performances as central to the study of culture; anthropology of experience focuses on the experiences of individuals and groups; and “communication” is a broader and less-defined label that characterizes a general emphasis on the communication of meaning within cultures.

Main varieties: Performance studies range from Singer’s concept of “cultural performances” which embody important aspects of culture, to Schechner’s work on theater and ritual, to Fabian’s work on a change-and-conflict centered dramatic production. Victor Turner (see Symbolic Anthropology above) and Bruce Kapferer provide other important examples of process-and-conflict studies focusing on aspects of performance and communication. Some scholars concerned with analysis of communicative features such as metaphors, tropes, and mimesis (Turner, Fernandez, others). Collections include those edited by Schechner (Ritual, Play, and Performance), Ruby (A Crack in the Mirror) and Turner (Anthropology of Experience).

Musical applications: Close relationship between music and performance seems to have inhibited development of clear conceptualization of a performance-theory approach, while traditional objectivist-
animist stress on “music itself” may have similarly hindered attention to experience and communication. Chernoff's *African Rhythm and African Sensibility* broadly combines aspects of these approaches under an overtly anti-theoretical umbrella; Friedson's work on music in Mali healing rituals adopts an experientialist-reflexivist perspective with a phenomenological philosophical base; while scholars such as Qureshi and Stone, among others, are concerned with issues of communication and meaning.

**Criticisms:** For objectivist and materialist scholars, these emphases are idealist, subjective, vague and unscientific; other critiques tend to focus on individual approaches.

**Marxist Anthropology**

**Main emphases:** Approaches culture from a Marxist standpoint, by analyzing and critiquing ownership and control of means of production, class exploitation and struggle, materialist/economic factors as primary causes of “superstructural” parts of culture such as family and social organization, ideology and religion, arts and music. Conflict propels society through different stages, with capitalism preceding revolutionary transition to socialism/communism.

**Main varieties:** Historical overview provided by Bloch. Classical Marxist anthropology borrowed directly by Marx and Engels from theories of Lewis Henry Morgan (see Evolutionism, above); included classification of peoples and cultures into evolutionary hierarchy which, in Marxist version, was modified to include the transition from capitalism to communism as the highest stage. Frankfurt School of 1920s-30s critiqued new mass-media popular culture as a capitalist industry used to influence and control lower classes. Neo-Marxist anthropology de-emphasized the ranking of peoples and cultures as higher and lower; showed more openness to importance of non-economic ideological and artistic elements dismissed as superstructural by early Marxism, and de-emphasized treatment of popular culture as a capitalist tool. Strong division between self-defined Marxists outside Marxist mainstream with individual or idiosyncratic theories (e.g., Harris), often divorced from emphasis on the need for political organization and action to overcome class exploitation and promote revolution, and mainstream Marxists for whom Marxism requires action as well as analysis.

**Musical applications:** Adorno, a Frankfurt-school theorist, strongly critiqued popular music as capitalist manipulation of masses. Charles Keil, a kind of “folk Marxist” with idiosyncratic approach, has taken positions that sometimes emphasize popular music's lower-class producers and consumers, and sometimes critique its capitalist industrial base. Recent work in variously-defined neo-Marxist approaches focus on producers and consumers, less critically on industry.

**Criticisms:** for classical Marxism, generally same as for evolutionism, of which it is a variety. Neo-Marxist approaches sometimes criticized by other Marxists for abandoning principles of classical Marxism. Outsiders criticize materialist emphasis, devaluation of ideas and other elements of “superstructure”, unilinear evolutionary tendencies.

**Reflexivist Anthropology**

**Main emphases:** Anthropological research as a reflexive or reciprocal experience of interaction between anthropologists and people they study, involving considerations of dialogue and mutual influence on perceptions of one another. Seeks to correct impersonal objectivist perspective of “scientific” ethnographies of earlier 20th c. which left anthropologists, often individuals they worked with, and interactions between them out of the picture, treating culture as object found in nature that could be studied without attention to human relationships that directly shaped the process of understanding. Considerable overlap with anthropology of Performance, Experience and Communication (see above) and Critical Anthropology (see below).
Main varieties: Some reflexivist studies attempt to provide narrative accounts of interaction in the process of fieldwork (Rabinow, Dumont), while others focus on reflexive analysis of the effects of interaction between the ethnographer and people studied on the results of research, i.e., on how various aspects of culture are represented and perceived. Collections of studies edited by Ruby (A Crack in the Mirror) and Stocking (Observers Observed); but at least some attention to reflexive issues has been pervasive in ethnography during the last decade.

Musical applications: Reflections on fieldwork process and interaction go back as far as Villoteau; a major early 20th c. example is Colin McPhee's A House in Bali. Some discussion of reflexive issues in many recent ethnomusicological studies (e.g., conclusion of Feld), but major work with a predominantly reflexive focus has yet to become generally available.

Criticisms: attention to anthropologists draws attention away from people who should be main focus of study. Emphasis criticized as narcissistic, trivial, subjective, unsystematic, unscientific, etc., not always with serious consideration of issues raised by reflexivist approaches. Question whether it is really possible for anthropologists to understand and discuss themselves on same level as they understand and discuss cultures of others.

Anthropology of Gender (Feminist, GLBT, etc.)

Main emphases: Takes gender identities and roles as primary objects of anthropological research, treating them as constructed within cultures rather than given by nature, and as subject to negotiation and political contestation. Attempts to correct for apparent gender-blind approaches of earlier anthropology that masked strong andro- and hetero-centric biases, and resulted in neglect of female, gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered individuals and groups. Influence from literary postmodernism, deconstruction and cultural studies. Some overlap with Reflexivist, Experientialist, and Marxist anthropology (see above).

Main varieties: Some issues raised, and others concealed, in early 20th century work of anthropologists such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, working from a Culture and Personality standpoint (Psychological Anthropology, above). Feminist anthropologists of the 1960s and 70s (Ortner, Rosaldo, Lamphere), influenced by contemporary political feminism, tended to focus on issues such as universality of male dominance and female subjugation. Later feminist studies (e.g., Abu-Lughod, Bell) shifted to emphases on female resistance, agency, etc.; and emergence of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered studies developed into new theoretical approaches such as queer theory.

Musical applications: Beginning in 1980s and 90s, publication of survey articles (Sarkissian, Monson) and edited collections of articles (Koskoff, Herndon and Ziegler, Magrini, Barkin and Hamessley, eds.). Gender-theorized musical ethnographies begin to appear in late 1990s (Sugarman, Muller). A recent and rapidly growing field of interest, with most current work yet to be published.

Criticisms: Some see proliferation of fields of study focused on different interest groups as distraction from anthropology’s traditional emphasis on human unity, while others see it as a continuation of the equally traditional emphasis on study of human diversity. Theoretical positions and critiques of them may show more directly apparent links to strongly felt issues of personal identity and political commitment than in some schools that claim to have more value-neutral approaches, although some would claim such apparent differences are illusory, others that the differences are real and enhance the value of such writings.

Critical Anthropology

Main emphases: Criticizes omissions and distortions in anthropology resulting from anthropology's involvement in larger cultural and world political and economic processes (colonialism, neocolonialism, world system, etc.), or from traditions and conventions within anthropology (fieldwork methods, previous
theoretical emphases, ethnographic writing style, etc.). Critiques may or may not be presented in conjunction with new research or models designed to correct problematic features. Influence from literary postmodernism, deconstruction and cultural studies. Considerable overlap with reflexivity and, in part, with anthropology of Performance, Experience, and Communication (see above); both Marxist and non-Marxist varieties.

**Main varieties:** Could be considered as a continuum from substantivist to formalist critiques, according to whether emphasis is on criticizing omissions/distortions based on substance (colonialism, world system, gender, contemporary changes in world or specific cultures, etc.) or the form and style of anthropological writings. Influence of colonialism on anthropology given early critique by Asad (1973), and afterwards by many writers; a recent general collection of studies is Stocking, ed., Colonial Situations. More specific critiques of Orientalism (Said), “time travel” and detemporalizing of non-Western cultures (Fabian), invention of “tradition” as reification of temporally contingent phenomena (Hobsbawm & Ranger). “Formalist” critiques deal with distortions resulting from the form and style of anthropological writing, with attention to issues such as discourse, authority, “voice”, etc. (Geertz, Clifford, Marcus).

**Musical applications:** Most frequent appearance in conjunction with studies of change, urban and popular music (see Culture Change, Urban Anthropology, Marxism above); widespread interest, with more extensive and general applications in progress.

**Criticisms:** many similar to criticisms of Reflexivity (see above); formalist critiques seen by some as dehumanizing attempts to reduce anthropologists to their written products; some critiques seen as overstated, tending to throw out baby with bathwater; others as insensitive to cultural and historical contexts that shaped earlier studies.