
UNIT 26 A CRITIQUE OF MALINOWSKI AND RADCLIFFE-BROWN

A Critique of Malinowski
and Radcliffe-Brown

Structure

- 26.0 Objectives
- 26.1 Introduction
- 26.2 The Functional School - A Myth or Reality
- 26.3 A Natural Science of Society
 - 26.3.0 The Distinctive Place of Social Anthropology
 - 26.3.1 Radcliffe-Brown's Fieldwork
 - 26.3.3 Radcliffe-Brown's Theoretical Contributions
- 26.4 Growth of Anthropological Research under Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown
 - 26.4.0 Malinowski's Impact
 - 26.4.1 Radcliffe-Brown's Impact
- 26.5 Subsequent Developments
- 26.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 26.7 Key Words
- 26.8 Further Reading
- 26.9 Specimen Answers to Check Your Progress

26.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you should be able to

- appreciate the relative positions of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown in the development of sociological theory
- assess their influence on the succeeding generation of anthropologists.

26.1 INTRODUCTION

This unit is both a critical statement on the last four units of this block and a glimpse into the later developments in sociological thought. Much of what Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown contributed to sociological theory has been discussed in units 22, 23, 24 and 25. Going through these units, you must have formed your own impression of strong and weak points in their writings. In this unit you will find a critical appraisal of their contributions in terms of the history of ideas about human society. This kind of evaluation will help you understand their relative place in the total body of sociological thought.

You already know that social thinkers interested in the history of human civilisation found it useful to study primitive societies. They regarded that primitive societies represented the early stages of human development and

their study would help them to discover the laws of progress of humankind. Understanding primitive cultures in terms of the use or function of a custom or belief for the maintenance of a society was a radically new approach, which was evolved by Malinowski. It came to be known as the Functionalist School of Social Anthropology. Some, for example Radcliffe-Brown (1971: 188-9), may even doubt its existence and consider it as myth. While others, such as Firth (1957), regard Malinowski's attempt to analyse social reality in terms of functional approach as a turning point in sociological studies. We examine this issue in section 26.2 and show that the tradition of rigorous fieldwork was the hallmark of this school and without this it would not have been possible to make further advances in our understanding of human behaviour.

As a fieldworker Malinowski is supreme but as a theoretician he proves to be a failure and his failure prompted others to introduce new elements to the Malinowskian functional approach. After a consideration of inadequacies of Malinowski's theoretical framework, we move on to Radcliffe-Brown's brave efforts to provide a sound theoretical basis to our understanding of primitive societies and then on to that of human societies in general. We discuss in Section 26.3 Radcliffe-Brown's conception of social anthropology as a branch of natural science

Both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown had a large number of followers. A great deal of anthropological research was carried out under their direct or indirect guidance. A brief review of this literature is given in Section 26.4. Finally we indicate the lines of subsequent development of ideas for studying human societies. These developments succeeded functionalist analysis in providing alternative explanations of human behaviour.

26.2 THE FUNCTIONAL SCHOOL — A MYTH OR REALITY

You already know that Malinowski applied the concept of function to present in a coherent and logical manner the ethnographic account of the Trobriand Islanders' society. This proved to be a successful approach for making sense of apparently diverse and complex patterns of human behaviour. The whole exercise assumed the mantle of a school of thought, known as functionalism. As already mentioned in the Introduction to this Block, functionalism became a widely recognised theory (for the term 'theory' see Box 26.1) in social sciences. While rejecting the earlier established ways of understanding the progress of human civilisation, Malinowski provided an alternative way of making sense of the customs and beliefs of a primitive people. And, this was his unique contribution to sociological research. It is altogether another point that he tried to generalise his findings (which were strictly based on one case) in terms of human behaviour at large. This may not be acceptable. But the naivety of this step does not negate the lead that Malinowski gave by looking into the use or function of each custom. To explain one belief or activity he had to also look at its connections with other activities. This helped him in relating his account of Trobriand Islanders' life to one cultural whole. This was no

small achievement, considering the level of explanation of human behaviour offered by his evolutionist and diffusionist colleagues.

Box 26.1 Theory

This is a commonly used term in social sciences. It generally refers to a systematic scheme of abstract terms. Such abstractions help in articulation of ideas in a particular branch of knowledge. Very often, the ideas about human society and human relations are expressed by the term social theory. In our elective course ESO-13 we have used this term to refer to abstract conceptual schemes about human society. Abstract conceptual schemes are basically systematically thought out inter-related ideas, which are commonly comprehended and accepted by academics.

The main features of Malinowski's functionalism may be summarised as follows.

- i) Compared to catch-all descriptions of social phenomena, presented by the nineteenth century scholars, Malinowski gave a biographical account of his fieldwork and presented his material in a systematic and coherent manner.
- ii) He focussed on one particular aspect of culture and gradually moved to the whole culture. This gave a thematic unity to his **monographs**.
- iii) Malinowski's emphasis on individuals, their behaviour, reactions, emotional states brought alive before us the cultural patterns of the primitive people. His view of individual interests and social order provides a balance in his understanding of human social behaviour. Even a long time after Malinowski, anthropologists have found it relevant to refer to his interest in experimental psychology and individual needs.
- iv) Malinowski cut across theories about man's nature and spoke about the hiatus between what is said by the people and done by them. This shows his awareness of the tension between individual interests and social order. For example, he discussed the reciprocal nature of exchange in his book, *Aragonauts of the Western Pacific*. His insight into this principle of exchange inspired the analysis of gift-exchanges by Mauss. Later Mauss inspired Levi-Strauss who maintained that the principle of reciprocity was the most significant aspect of social control. Transactional analysis has its roots in this very idea of Levi-Strauss.

We do not know if you have been able to raise questions regarding Malinowski's functionalist approach. Remember, in Unit 22 we had asked you to try to find inadequacies in his approach. Here we point out some of them.

- i) Malinowski linked each aspect of culture with its other aspects. The question comes up, if everything is linked to everything else, where does one stop? Obviously, the point of relevance of these connections is not taken up by Malinowski. He has not worked on any specific

problems. Rather, he has been too occupied in construction an integrated cultural whole.

- ii) The lack of analytical relevance in his accounts implies an absence of **abstraction** and therefore the absence of any development of a theory.
- iii) Malinowski's functionalism is akin to a crude utilitarianism, where everything has to exist to serve a purpose. It is surprising that he never arrived at the idea of a social system, a relationship between groups.
- iv) Malinowski (1935: 479-81) was not able to take account of changes, which affected tribal societies. He admitted of not including in his writings the European influence on the Trobriands in his book, *Coral Gardens and their Magic*. He considered this to be 'the most serious shortcoming' of his research in Melanesia.
- v) While emphasising the importance of fieldwork Malinowski did not displace evolutionism and diffusionism. He only added to them a **synchronic** analysis of a particular community. In fact Malinowski (1929) wrote,

I still believe in evolution, in the process of development, only I see more and more clearly that answers to any evolutionary questions must lead to the empirical study of the facts and institutions, the past development of which we wish to reconstruct.

But the special contribution of Malinowski's work lies in another direction. This refers to his invention of methods of field research. His theory of functionalism has been much criticised and improved upon by subsequent scholars. But we have hardly anyone who can claim to have improved upon his techniques of field research. Standards set by him are still used as measuring yardstick to evaluate the quality of anthropological fieldwork. Even now, one is supposed to spend a minimum period of eighteen months among the people one wants to study. One is expected to learn the local language and use it for data-collection. By living among the people and participating in their activities, one has to make a psychological shift from 'they' to 'we'. In other words, one has to become a part of the community. These ideal guidelines set by Malinowski, some, for example Powdermaker (1970: 347) would claim, are a kind of myth, generated by Malinowski's charisma. They would claim that even Malinowski did not conform to these ideas. All the same we find that this myth has provided many anthropologists with real guidelines.

As a conclusion to an appraisal of Malinowski's contributions, we may say that he gave a new vision not only to social anthropology but also to inquiry into human behaviour in general and by implication into one's own conduct. At the same time he gave new techniques of observation and data-collection. But he lacked the ability to deal with abstractions. In fact, he was quite suspicious of abstract theories. The task of introducing theoretical concepts to guide anthropological research was completed by Malinowski's contemporary, Radcliffe-Brown, who established social anthropology as a branch of natural science.

Let us complete Check Your Progress 1.

Check Your Progress 1

- i) Would you describe Malinowski as an evolutionist? Use three lines for your positive/negative answer.

.....
.....
.....

- ii) How does a systematic ethnographic account of a society help us to understand better the culture of that society? Use three lines for your answer.

.....
.....
.....

26.3 A NATURAL SCIENCE OF SOCIETY

Radcliffe-Brown’s theoretical position is contained in his paper, *A Natural Science of Society*. As a response to psychological studies of man, he had a vision of comparative sociology dominating all social sciences. In the following section we will first discuss how he carved a distinct place for social anthropology. This will be followed by a discussion of Radcliffe-Brown as a fieldworker and then as a theoretician.

26.3.0 The Distinctive Place of Social Anthropology

As you have read in Units 24 and 25, Radcliffe-Brown held the firm conviction that social anthropology must model itself on the lines of the natural sciences. Its methods, concepts and conclusions were to be strictly ‘scientific’, objective and verifiable. Radcliffe-Brown made a clear distinction between social anthropology and ethnology. Ethnologists were engaged in conjectural history, which was a completely unscientific exercise according to him. As you read in Unit 25, Radcliffe-Brown stressed that to study primitive society, insistence on historical details was not really necessary. Rather than asking ‘how did this come to be’? Radcliffe-Brown, in line with Durkheim, preferred to ask ‘what does this mean’? In short Radcliffe-Brown spoke out against the prevailing trend of delving into the historical roots of everything and laid stress on the contemporary significance of the societies he studied.

Radcliffe-Brown was also wary of explaining social phenomena in psychological terms. Unlike Malinowski, he avoided psychological explanations. We have repeatedly stated how Malinowski’s functional theory was heavily tilted towards the biological and psychological. Radcliffe-Brown did not fall into this trap. For him, social anthropology was primarily concerned with social rather than biological functions, with the ‘persons’ in a society rather than biological ‘individuals’ (See Kuper 1975: 86).

Despite his attempts to chart out a separate territory for social anthropology, Radcliffe-Brown could not quite free himself from his natural science background. This reflects in his insistence on scientific method, rigorous concepts, and the need to derive laws about society. As the discipline developed over the years, these notions came to be regarded as old-fashioned and naive.

However, it cannot be denied that Radcliffe-Brown's contribution to the discipline was immense. He cleared the path on which a generation of brilliant scholars was soon to tread, as we shall read in section 26.4 of this unit.

26.3.1 Radcliffe-Brown's Fieldwork

Your reading of the previous units will have brought home to you the crucial role played by Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown in shaping modern social anthropology. You will by now have realised that fieldwork, as is practiced today, was brought into the forefront by Malinowski. Radcliffe-Brown too undertook a considerable amount of fieldwork. However, as has been pointed out by many scholars, the quality of Radcliffe-Brown's fieldwork was nowhere near the rich and lively work of Malinowski. Let us discuss this point further.

In the words of Adam Kuper (1975: 60) the fieldwork of Radcliffe-Brown was "... 'survey and salvage' ethnography, and it was sterile as compared with the type of fieldwork Malinowski was to persecute in the Trobriands". For example in his first field-study in the Andaman Islands, Radcliffe-Brown (1964) tried hard but failed to learn the local language. Finally, he resorted to collecting information by conversing in Hindustani, which the local people didn't really understand well. He made progress in his fieldwork only after he found an English-speaking informant!

Far from trying to involve himself with the life and customs of his "subjects", as did Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown maintained an aloofness, a distance which obviously reflected in the quality of his fieldwork. His fieldwork in Australia in 1910 was primarily directed towards gathering information about the complex Australian kinship system. To do so, he spent several months with his party on the Bernier Island, the site of a lock-up hospital for **Aborigines** suffering from venereal disease. It was partly on the basis of the memories of these informants that Radcliffe-Brown built up his model of a certain type of Aboriginal kinship system. So obsessed was he with the discovery of formal structures that he neglected the study of the many functioning tribes that still existed in Australia.

Radcliffe-Brown's basic concern was to fit facts into a logical, coherent theoretical mould. In the process it was inevitable that flesh-and-blood human beings with their special needs, ideas and values tended to be lost somewhere. On the other hand, Malinowski's fieldwork brought out the humanity of his subjects, their passions, motives and aims. In a way, Malinowski's work was content without much form whilst Radcliffe-Brown's work was form without much content. However, as has been repeatedly emphasised in the previous units, Radcliffe-Brown gave the discipline of social anthropology a theoretical impetus, a range of rigorous concepts that would make field work more focussed, more coherent.

26.3.3 Radcliffe-Brown's Theoretical Contribution

As you have studied in the previous units, the concepts of 'social structure' and 'function' advanced by Radcliffe-Brown are important in helping field-workers make sense of the data they collected. Let us once again review these concepts.

i) Social Structure and Function

Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, unlike their evolutionist predecessors, view primitive societies as living entities, rather than as links in the imaginary chain of progress and development. Both reject speculation and conjectural history and preferred to study primitive peoples on their own terms. The 'functionalist' school of social anthropology with which both are associated, sought to study social institutions and customs of primitive societies in terms of their relevance and value for the societies concerned, that is, their function. But while Malinowski's notion of 'function' draws primarily on physiological and psychological needs, (see unit 22), Radcliffe-Brown speaks of social functions or conditions of existence of the society used.

We have spoken earlier of the impact of Durkheim's sociology on Radcliffe-Brown's ideas (see unit 24). For Radcliffe-Brown, ceremonials, customs, ways of acting and believing had to be seen in the context of the social system from which they emerged, and the way in which they integrated and maintained that system. Our earlier discussion of the role of the mother's brother in some primitive groups amply illustrates this point (see unit 25).

Activity 1

If you were to make an anthropological study of a group of people, would you follow Malinowski and consider both individual interests and social order? Or, would you rather follow Radcliffe-Brown and consider conditions of existence of the society itself? Write a note of one page on how you would prefer to go about this exercise.

But while Malinowski's theoretical thrust ends with the notion of function, Radcliffe-Brown has in addition a well-developed notion of social structure. For Radcliffe-Brown, social structure refers to the web of social relationships entered into by the persons who constitute society. By describing social structure, the notion of function becomes more clear, more explanatory. Section 25.4 of Unit 25 has already made this point quite clear.

We shall now see how both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown influenced the succeeding generation of anthropologists.

Check Your Progress 2

i) How did Radcliffe-Brown's fieldwork differ from that of Malinowski?

.....
.....
.....

- ii) Distinguish between Malinowski's and Radcliffe-Brown's notions of function. Use three lines for your answer.

.....
.....
.....

26.4 GROWTH OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNDER MALINOWSKI AND RADCLIFFE-BROWN

The thirties and forties of the twentieth century marked an unprecedented growth of anthropological research in England. During this period, under the leadership of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, anthropologists experimented with radical methods of gathering sociological data and interpreting them in first, functionalist and later, structural functionalist terms. Malinowski is constantly present in meticulously carried out field researches and Radcliffe-Brown is abundantly present in the efforts at theorising through abstractions. We shall briefly examine highlights of this creative period in the development of sociological thought.

26.4.0 Malinowski's Impact

Malinowski continues to be a powerful influence in anthropology. His theoretical framework, comprising the ideas of culture and needs, may not inspire us now but his interest in methodological and philosophical issues is again and again referred in the Malinowski Memorial Lecture, held annually in his honour. The most profound impact of his ideas on his students is recorded in *Man and Culture*, edited by his student, Raymond Firth (1957). This collection includes essays by Audrey, I. Richards, Ralph Piddington, Talcott Parsons, Phyllis Kaberry, J.R. Firth, E.R. Leech, I. Schapera, Meyer Fortes, S.F. Nadel, Raymond Firth, Lucy Mair and H. Ian Hogbin. The essays by Malinowski's former students and colleagues are a clear testimony of his influence on their works. The spirit of this collection is not to write high praises, it is to evaluate Malinowski's contribution and its relevance for contemporary sociology.

His efforts to develop field techniques for carrying out intensive sociological studies of particular societies have been recognised by Evans Pritchard (1951), Firth (1951), and earlier by Richards (1939). Ethnography written from 1929 to 1940 reflects the liberal use of Malinowski's functional approach. His practice of documenting generalisations has also been emulated by his successors. For example, Firth's *We the Tikopia* (1936) and Schapera's *Married Life in an African Tribe* (1940) explain the institution of family in terms of its function. The functions of procreation and socialisation, have been related to other aspects of social life. Similarly, the function of providing sustenance has been described by Richards (1939) in explaining the economic activities of the Bemba in Northern Rhodesia. These rather voluminous books give long descriptions in a truly Malinowskian mould. They lack a sense of social organisation and its

principles. Descriptions of concrete ground-realities are expected somehow to spell out these principles. In other words they present a mix-up between analysis and description — a common feature of Malinowski's scholarship.

Students came to Malinowski from different parts of the world, including from Australia, New Zealand and India. Hogbin, Hart, Piddington, Kaberry and Stanner were from Australia and New Zealand. You may like to know a little more about Malinowski's Indian student. He was D.N. Majumdar, who wrote his Ph.D. thesis at Cambridge, in 1935, under T.C. Hodson. Based on this, he published in 1937 a book, *A Tribe in Transition : A Study in Culture Patterns*. Following Malinowski, this book takes the holistic approach of functionalist method. It appears that Majumdar (1937:1) was fascinated by Malinowski's notion of culture, defined as social response to biological and psychological needs.

26.4.2 Radcliffe-Brown's Impact

Radcliffe-Brown's first appointment to a professorship was in 1920, when he was invited to start a department of Anthropology in the University of Cape Town, South Africa. Thus he entered a new phase in his career which was now to be devoted to teaching, writing, developing theory and training a new generation of social anthropologists. In Cape Town he set up a School of African Studies. In 1926, he moved to Australia to take up a post at Sydney. He organised a course for undergraduates, started several research projects on the aborigines and launched a new journal called *Oceania*. He then went on to Chicago in 1931. American anthropology at that time was dominated by Lowie and Kroeber. The development of psychoanalysis had made 'culture and personality' studies very popular. In that milieu Radcliffe-Brown introduced a new way of thinking into American anthropology. People like Eggan, Warner and Tax came to represent a 'Radcliffe- Brownian' theoretical school whose contributions to the discipline have been considered.

In 1937 Radcliffe-Brown returned to England to the chair of social anthropology, newly established in Oxford. Shortly after his return, Malinowski left the country. Radcliffe-Brown took Malinowski's position as the leader of the profession. In Adam Kuper's (1975: 65) words, "...Radcliffe-Brown was the leader of a long overdue challenge to Malinowski, representing sense, clarity and sociology". The theoretical weaknesses of Malinowski forced many fieldworkers to look for a more theoretical, sociological orientation and Radcliffe-Brown seemed to fulfil this need.

The value of the sociological option offered by Radcliffe-Brown had yet to be demonstrated. Social anthropological analysis had to experiment with sociological frameworks. The results of these 'experiments' were such brilliant monographs as Bateson's *Naven* (1936), Evans-Pritchard's *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (1937).

Radcliffe-Brown's tenure at Oxford resulted in an extremely fruitful partnership with Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes, they produced a series of works mainly concerned with the political structure and kinship. In 1940 they brought out *African Political Systems*. Evans-Pritchard brought out

two monographs. *The Nuer* and the *Political System of the Anuak* in the same year. In 1945 and 1949 Fortes produced monographs on the Tallensi community. In 1949 and 1951 Evans-Pritchard published studies on the Sanusi of Cyrenaica and the Nuer kinship respectively. In this manner, Radcliffe-Brown brought into British social anthropology a new theoretical framework and areas of interest (notably political structure and kinship) which were to bear fruit in some of the most important and influential studies of the period.

You will probably be interested to know that Radcliffe-Brown had a very profound influence on one of India's leading social anthropologists, M.N. Srinivas. Srinivas's D. Phil thesis at Oxford, *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India* (1952) was completed under Radcliffe-Brown's supervision. In this work he attempted to see the connections between religion and the social structure leading to important formulations like 'sanskritisation'. Spearheading the movement for village studies in India, Srinivas studied the Indian village in terms of its social structure developing important concepts like that of 'dominant caste' along the way.

Check Your Progress 3

- i) Identify the feature of Malinowski's scholarship that is commonly shared by the followers of both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown.
- ii) Match the items in Column 'A' with those in Column 'B'.

A	B
i) Oceania	a) Srinivas
ii) Coorgs	b) Fortes
iii) Naven	c) Evans-Pitchard
iv) Tallensi	d) Bateson
v) Nuer	e) Radcliffe-Brown

26.5 SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS

As we have repeatedly stated, Malinowski failed to give his brand of social anthropology an analytical thrust. The concepts he used were not sufficiently rigorous. No doubt, he gathered extremely rich and interesting details about the societies he studied, but he failed to fit them into a sound theoretical mould. It is against this background that we can appreciate Radcliffe-Brown's efforts. Radcliffe-Brown tried to introduce a certain level of abstraction with the use of concepts like 'social structure' and 'function'. However, he was not too successful in his efforts. He defined social structure merely in terms of the interactions and relationships entered into by concrete person. In effect, the level of abstraction that he himself preached was not quite attained. Evans-Pritchard successfully attempted what Radcliffe-Brown could not.

Evans-Pritchard developed a notion of social structure which was basically concerned with the persistent, permanent groups in society like the family, the tribe and the nation. He brought home the realisation that the social anthropologist need not stop at observation of the actual interactions between persons to arrive at conclusions about the social structure. One needs to go to higher levels of abstraction. In his study, the Nuer (1940), he demonstrated the 'segmentary' structure of Nuer society in which different groups were mutually united and opposed at various levels of the social structure. In this fashion, he brought in a higher level of abstraction to the understanding of social structure. I was in fact Evans Pritchard who rejected 'structural-functionalism' and brought pure 'structuralism' into the discipline.

Another development was the work of the French 'structuralist' Claude Levi-Strauss. Borrowing heavily from linguistics, Levi-Strauss took the notion of 'social structure' to the highest level of abstraction. He distinguished between the 'structure' and 'social relation' and constructed models, which were basically analytical constructs against which actual social relations could be compared and contrasted. Levi-Strauss's studies of kinship and mythology became extremely influential.

In a nutshell, Malinowskian functionalism was refined into 'structural-functionalism' by Radcliffe-Brown. Following his lead, Evans-Pritchard introduced a greater level of abstraction in his theoretical framework and developed 'structuralism'. In France, 'structuralism' was given a new dimension with the work of Levi-Strauss. Sociology today may be said to be in the 'post-structuralist phase'. Many scholars have borrowed extensively from diverse disciplines like literature, linguistics, mathematics etc. resulting in exciting theoretical developments. It is not within the scope of this course to bring to you these developments, you may learn about them at the M.A level.

This brief resume of post-Radcliffe-Brownian developments may have conveyed the impression that functionalism died with Malinowski. This is certainly not the case, as functionalism continued to thrive. To this day it remains an important theory in sociology. The work of Talcott Parsons and Robert K. Merton is important in this regard. Block 7 will bring their contributions to you.

26.6 LET US SUMUP

In this unit we assessed the contributions of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown. First, we gave critique of Malinowski's achievements. Then we discussed in a little more detail Radcliffe-Brown's scholarship as both a fieldworker and a theoretician. We reviewed anthropological research under the direct and indirect guidance of both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown. The unit ended with a brief account of subsequent developments in sociological theory.

26.7 KEY WORDS

- Abstraction** It expresses a quality apart from an object and refers to the intrinsic form with no attempt at concrete representation. In the context of this unit, the term has been used to express the theoretical ideas as opposed to descriptive accounts of human behaviour
- Aborigines** The original inhabitants of a place. The tribal people in Australia are generally known as aborigines
- Monograph** A written account of a single theme
- Sanskritisation** It is a concept, given by M.N. Srinivas, who writes, “Sanskritisation is a process by which a low Hindu caste or tribe or other group changes its customs, ritual, ideology and way of life in the direction of a high, and frequently twice-born caste”.
- Synchronic** It concerns with the set of events existing in a contemporary time frame, without referring to historical events

26.8 FURTHER READING

Mair, Lucy, 1984. *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi

26.9 SPECIMEN ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

- i) Malinowski cannot be described an evolutionist because he became obsessed with empirical reality. Though he remained an evolutionist at heart, in practice he was moving away from the evolutionist’s love for speculations about human culture.
- ii) In catch-all accounts of social phenomena, it is not possible to find systematic and logical correlation between different aspects of a culture. But as systematic, ethnography is always based on data from a particular society, it is possible to relate all aspects of that culture in an integrated whole.

Check Your Progress 2

- i) Radcliffe-Brown maintained a certain aloofness and distance from the people he studied. Hence his fieldwork is sometimes dull, lifeless and sterile. Malinowski, on the other hand tried to fully involve himself with his subjects, resulting in lively and richly detailed field-work.

ii) Malinowski speaks of function primarily in terms of physiological and psychological needs. Radcliffe-Brown, on the other hand, speaks of the needs of society or its necessary conditions of existence.

**A Critique of Malinowski
and Radcliffe-Brown**

Check Your Progress 3

i) Meticulously prepared ethnography

ii) a) e

b) a

c) d

d) b

e) c

REFERENCES

- Bachofen, J.J. 1861. *The Mother-Right*. Princeton University Press: Princeton (translated by Ralph Manheim in 1967)
- Bateson, G. 1958. *Naven*. Stanford University Press: Stanford (first published in 1936)
- Beattie, J.H.M. 1964. *Other Cultures*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London
- Durkheim, E. 1947. *The Division of Labour*. Free Press: New York
- Durkheim 1976. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Allen & Unwin: London
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Evans-Pritchard 1940. *The Nuer*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Evans-Pritchard 1940. *The Political Systems of the Anuak*. AMS Press: London
- Evans-Pritchard 1949. *The Sanusi of Cyrenaica*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Evans-Pritchard 1954. *Social Anthropology*. Cohen & West Limited: London (first published in 1951)
- Evans-Pritchard 1951. *Kinship and Marriage among the Nuer*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. and Fortes Meyer (ed.) 1940. *African Political Systems*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Ferguson, A. 1767. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh
- Firth, Raymond 1951. *We the Tikopia*. George Allen & Unwin: London (first printed in 1936)
- Firth, Raymond (ed.) 1957. *Man and Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London
- Fortes, M. 1945. *The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi*, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Fortes, M. 1949. *The Web of Kinship among the Tallensi*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Frazer, J.G. 1922. *The Golden Bough*. MacMillan: London (first published in 1890)
- Hobhouse, L.T. 1906. *Morals in Evolution: A Study in Comparative Ethics*. Johnson Repr: London
- Jain, R.K. 1989, A.R. *Radcliffe-Brown and the Durkheimian School of French Sociology: Methodological Reflections*. School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Working Paper Series 1989-04, 55 pp.

- Junod, H.A. 1912-13. *The Life of a South African Tribe*. AMS Press: London
- Kaberry, Phyllis, M. 1939. *Aboriginal Woman: Sacred and Profane*. Geogre Routledge and Sons: London
- Kuper, Adam 1975. *Anthropologists and Anthropology - the British School 1922-72*. Penguin: London
- Kuper, Hilda 1947. *An African Aristocracy: Rank among the Swazi*. Clarendon Press: Oxford
- Leach, E.R. 1957. The Epistemological Background to Malinowski's Empiricism. In Raymond Firth (ed.) *Man and Culture, an Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London
- Levy Bruhl, L. 1923. *Primitive Mentality*, (first published, in French, in 1922). Translated by Lilian A. Clare. AMS Press: London
- Levy Bruhl, L. 1926. *How Natives Think*, (first published, in French, in 1912). Translated by Lilian A. Clare, Ayer Co. Publishers: London
- Lowie, R.H. 1937. *The History of Ethnological Theory*. Farrar and Rinehart: New York
- Maine, H. 1861. *Ancient Law*. Everyman's Library: London
- Maine, H. 1871. *Village Communities in the East and West*. Darby Books: London
- Majumdar, D.N. 1937. *A Tribe in Transition: A Study in Culture Patterns*. Longman Greens & Co: London
- Malinowski, B. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Waveland Press: London
- Malinowski, B. 1929. *The Sexual Life of Savages in Northwest Melanesia*. Harcourt: New York
- Malinowski, B. 1931. *Culture*. *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. 4: 621-46
- Malinowski, B. 1935. *Coral Gardens and their Magic*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington
- Malinowski, B. 1944. *A Scientific Theory of Culture*. The University Press: North Carolina: Chapel Hill
- Malinowski, B. 1948. *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*. Souvenir Press: London (first printed in 1925)
- Montesquieu, Baron de 1748. *The Spirit of the Laws*. (translated by T. Nugent in 1949) Oxford University Press: Oxford

- Morgan, L.H. 1871. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Smithsonian Contribution to Knowledge 17: 4-602
- Morgan, L.H. 1877. *Ancient Society*. University of Arizona Press: Arizona
- Nadel, S.F. 1957. Malinowski on Magic and Religion. In Raymond Firth (ed.) *Man and Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.: London
- Nieboer, H.J. 1900. *Slavery as an Industrial System: Ethnological Researches*. B. Franklin: New York
- Parsons, T. 1957. Malinowski and the Theory of Social Systems. In Raymond Firth (Editor), *Man and Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London
- Perry, W.J. 1923. *The Children of the Sun*. AMS Press: New York
- Piddington, R. 1957. Malinowski's Theory of Needs. In Raymond Firth (editor), *Man and Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London
- Pocock, D.F. 1961. *Social Anthropology*. Sheed and Ward: London
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1964. *The Andaman Islanders*. Free Press: Glencoe 111 (First Printed in 1922)
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1971. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. Cohen & West Ltd.: London (First printed in 1952)
- Richards, A.I. 1932. *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe*. Greenwood Press: London
- Richards, A.I. 1939. *Land Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia*. Oxford University Press: London
- Rivers, W.H.R. 1906. *The Todas*. MacMillan: London
- Rivers, W.H.R. 1914. *The History of the Melanesian Society*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Schapera, I. 1940. *Married Life in an African Tribe*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Schapera, I. 1943. *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate*. Lovedale Press: London
- Smith, A. 1776. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. (Penguin edition published in 1969) Penguin: London
- Smith, W. Robertson 1889. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. Arden Library: London
- Srinivas, M.N. 1952. *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford University Press: Oxford

Srinivas, M.N. (ed.) 1958. *Method in Social Anthropology*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago

Tylor, E. B. 1865. *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilisation*. Phoenix Books: London

Tylor, E. B. 1871. *Primitive Culture*. Murray: London

Tylor, E. B. 1881. *Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilisation*. Appleton: New York

Westermarck, E. 1891. *The History of Human Marriage*. Johnson Rpr: London

Westermarck, E. 1906. *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*. Johnson Rpr.: London.