

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018/19**

**SOAN 30052/60052: An Anthropology of Science, Magic and
Expertise
Semester 1, Alan Turing Building, G.107
Credits 20 (UG) 15 (PG)**

Course

- Convener:** Professor Penelope Harvey
- Lecturers:** Penny Harvey and Vlad Schuler
- Room:** (Penny Harvey) 2.058 Arthur Lewis Building. Telephone: 275-8985
- Email:** penny.harvey@manchester.ac.uk
Vlad.schulercosta@manchester.ac.uk
- Office Hours:** (Penny Harvey) Mondays 3-4pm
(Vlad Schuler) TBC
- Administrators:** **UG**
Kellie Jordan, UG Office G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
(0161) 275 4000
kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk
- PG**
Vickie Roche, 2.003, Arthur Lewis building
(0161) 275 3999
Vickie.roche@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** **Monday 9.00 - 11.00 am Alan Turing Building, G.107**
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System
- Assessment:** **Short reports (500 words) x 3 = 10%**
1000 word Book review = 20%
3000 word Assessed essay = 70%
- PGT (MA students) 4000 word Assessed essay = 100%**
- Due Dates:** **Short report 1 - Friday 19th October 2pm**
Short report 2 - Friday 16th November 2pm
Short report 3 - Friday 7th December 2pm

Book review - Friday 9th November 2pm
Final essay date – Monday 14th January 2pm

PGT (MA students) – Monday 14th January 2pm

Please read the following information sheet in the Assessment Section on Blackboard, in connection with Essays and Examinations:

- INSTRUCTIONS FOR SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY UNDERGRADUATE ESSAYS AND COURSEWORK

Reading week: There will be a reading week in week of 29th October

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY**
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018/19**SOAN 20802: Sex, Gender and Kinship**
Semester 2
Credits 20**Course**

- Convener:** Dr. Juan M. del Nido
- Room:** 2.055 Arthur Lewis Building (shared with Andrew Irving)
- Telephone:** 68025
- Email:** juanmanuel.delnido@manchester.ac.uk
- Office Hours:** Mondays 09.00-10.00 and Tuesdays 09.00-10.00 during teaching weeks.
Book via email in advance or turn up at the reception area on the second floor of the Arthur Lewis Building during office hours and ring through to Andrew Irving's office, which I will be using for the semester.
- Administrator:** Kellie Jordan, UG Office G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
(0161) 275 4000
kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Monday 11.00-13.00
- Place:** **Mansfield Cooper_G.21**
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System
- Tutors:** Mattia Donno (mattia.donno@manchester.ac.uk)
Angélica Cabezas Pino (angelica.cabezaspino@manchester.ac.uk)
Noreen Mirza (Noreen.mirza@manchester.ac.uk)
- Assessment**
- 15% - 1,500 word mid-term essay (maximum, exc. bibliography): March 15th, 2019**
- 85% - 3,500 word final essay (maximum, exc. bibliography): TBC**

2018–2019

SOAN20802: SEX, GENDER AND KINSHIP

Kinship is at the heart of social life in every society, and kinship has been a central concern in social anthropology from the get-go. But what is it? There have been many, and many heated, arguments in anthropology about how to define kinship and whether it is a universal phenomenon. Family forms clearly differ, but how about the way in which human beings are related to each other, or persons reproduced? We will touch on some of the debates about sex, gender and kinship within social anthropology in this course. And we will draw on ethnographic examples from across the world to discuss how people understand themselves to be related to each other. Kinship is often linked to ideas of identity and personhood (the ‘who do you think you are?’ kind of thing) and is central in the reproduction of persons and the care of infants. A focus on kinship, then, inevitably leads us to an interrogation of the relationship between sex and gender and opens a window on to different understandings of women and men, femininity and masculinity, femaleness and maleness, thus offering important insights into topics such as marriage, sexuality, parenthood, the formation of households and the role of the state. Matters of historical and abiding interest to social anthropologists will be investigated alongside issues of contemporary and wider concern.

Aims of the Course:

- To examine some of the major questions which have emerged in the anthropological study of kinship
- To chart recent shifts in the study of kinship and in particular to investigate contemporary trends which have brought issues of sex and gender to the fore
- To encourage a careful, critical, reading of ethnographic examples
- To situate the themes of sex, gender and kinship within the general field of social anthropology.

Lectures and Tutorials

This module consists of ten weekly two-hour lectures and nine weekly one-hour tutorials, incorporating small group discussion of key readings which will focus on questions set by the lecturer. You must attend the tutorial on which you are registered on the student system; you will be able to select a tutorial group in the same way as you selected your module options.

Tutorial Preparation

Tutorials are a fundamental part of the course; take them seriously. In large courses they will be your main opportunity to discuss ideas, ask questions and engage with texts and classmates. The tutor's role is *not* to rerun or give a lecture, but to coordinate a discussion based on the Key Readings of each week. Come to your tutorials prepared: do your readings. They are organised on the premise that you will have questions about the texts. If possible have a printed or online copy of the reading to the tutorial; if not, bring at least your notes from the reading. Bring questions and challenges to the text – this entire hour is designed for that! Some of the texts are quite complex; success is not about understanding the texts quickly, but about identifying what it is that is you need help with and using the weekly tutorial to discuss this. Please note there are no tutorial tasks for this course.

Attendance and Absences

You are expected to attend all lectures, tutorials, and workshops that are part of your programme, and to arrive on time. Tutors will be taking attendance, and absences pile up quickly. You know by now tutorial groups are small and tutors are preparing their sessions counting on your presence. Both for academic records and as a matter of courtesy, if for any reason you are unable to attend a

tutorial, let your tutor **and** Kellie Jordan in the Undergraduate Office know (Kellie.Jordan@manchester.ac.uk).

Email and Blackboard

You need to check your University email and Blackboard regularly in order to make sure that you receive any communications from tutors, lecturers or administrative staff. These might, for example, concern important meetings with staff, changes of room, notification of course options registration, or course-relevant information from your lecturer. Being unaware of arrangements because you have not checked your email or Blackboard is not a relevant excuse.

Course Readings

Readings are divided into Key Readings and Additional Readings. You should read at least the Key Readings before the tutorial assigned to that topic. Essays, of course, will require reading from the Additional Reading list, and perhaps also texts that those authors cite, or that the lecturer or your tutor has made you aware of. You would also be wise to draw on the ethnographies that you have read during the course. All readings should be available in the University Library. Do browse the anthropological journals: there is something new coming out about sex, gender and kinship every month – let us know what you have found that relates to the course.

Assessment for this course

15% - 1,500 word (maximum, excluding bibliography) mid-term essay

85% - 3,500 word (maximum, excluding bibliography) final essay

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Lectures and Readings

General and background reading

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. New York and London: Routledge.

Carsten, Janet (ed). 2000. *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge: University Press.

Dumont, Louis and Robert Parkin (translator). 2006. *Introduction to Two Theories in Social Anthropology: Descent Groups and Marriage Alliance*. London: Berghahn Books

Donnan, Hastings and Magowan, Fiona. 2010. *The Anthropology of Sex*. Berg, Oxford.

Edwards, Jeanette, & Salazar, Carles (eds). 2009. *European kinship in the age of biotechnology*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Franklin, Sarah and McKinnon, Susan (eds). 2001. *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ginsburg, Faye, & Rapp, Rayna (eds). 1995. *Conceiving the new world order: the global politics of reproduction*. Berkeley: University California Press.

Herd, Gilbert (ed.). 1994. *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone.

Hernlund, Ylva and Shell-Duncan, Bettina (eds). 2007. *Transcultural bodies: female genital cutting in global context*. New Brunswick, N.J.; London, Rutgers University Press.

Hirsch, Jennifer and Holly Wardlow (eds). 2006. *Modern Loves: The Anthropology of Romantic Courtship and Companionate Marriage*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Holy, Ladislav. 1996. *Anthropological Perspectives on Kinship*. London: Pluto Press.

Lancaster, Roger N. & Micaela di Leonardo (eds). 1997. *The Gender Sexuality Reader*. New York, London: Routledge.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1969. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miles, Joanna, Perveen Mody & Rebecca Probert. 2015. *Marriage Rites and Rights*, Oxford: Hart.

Parkin, Robert and Linda Stone (eds). 2004. *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Robertson, Jennifer (ed.). 2005. *Same-sex cultures and sexualities: an anthropological reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schneider, David. 1984. *A critique of the study of kinship*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Harbor.

Stone, Linda (ed.). 2001. *New Directions in Anthropological Kinship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Thelen, Tatjana and Erdmute Alber. 2017. *Reconnecting State and Kinship*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Press.

Ethnography

You will be expected to draw on ethnographic examples in your final essay, and you should choose at least one ethnography from the following list and read it over the course of the course (perhaps choosing on the basis of a region of the world or a specific topic that intrigues you). If you find an ethnography that you would really like to read that is not listed here – great! But pass it by us first: seek advice, in advance, from me or your tutor.

Basu, Paul. 2007. *Highland homecomings: genealogy and heritage tourism in the Scottish diaspora*. Routledge, London.

Boddy, Janice. 1989. *Wombs and alien spirits: women, men, and the zār cult in northern Sudan*. Madison, Wis.; London: University of Wisconsin Press.

Busby, Cecilia. 2000. *The Performance of Gender: An Anthropology of Everyday Life in a South Indian Fishing Community*. London: Athlone.

Campbell, John. K. 1964. *Honour, Family and Patronage; a Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Carsten, Janet. 1997. *The Heat of the Hearth: The Process of Kinship in a Malay Fishing Community*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cassidy, Rebecca. 2002. *The Sport of Kings: Kinship, Class, and Thoroughbred Breeding in Newmarket*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collier, Jane F. 1997. *From duty to desire: Remaking families in a Spanish village*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Daniel, E Valentine. 1984. *Fluid Signs: Being a Person the Tamil Way*. Berkeley: University California Press

Delaney, Carol. 1991. *The seed and the soil: gender and cosmology in Turkish village society*, Berkeley: University California Press

Edwards, Jeanette. 2000. *Born and Bred: Idioms of Kinship and New Reproductive Technologies in England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1951. *Kinship and Marriage Among the Nuer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ginsburg, Faye. 1998 (updated edition). *Contested Lives: The Abortion Debate in an American Community*. Berkeley: California University Press

Good, Anthony. 1991. *The Female Bridegroom: a Comparative Study of Life-Crisis Rituals in South India and Sri Lanka*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goodfellow, Aaron 2015. *Gay fathers, their children, and the making of kinship*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Gow, Peter. 1991. *Of Mixed Blood: Kinship and History in Peruvian Amazonia*. Oxford: OUP

Gutmann, Matthew. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: UC Press.

- Howell, Signe. 2006. *The kinning of foreigners: transnational adoption in a global perspective*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Kahn, Susan Martha. 2000. *Reproducing Jews: a cultural account of assisted conception in Israel*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kapadia, Karin. 1995. *Siva & her Sisters: Gender, Caste, and Class in Rural South India*. Boulder: Westview Press
- Kligman, Gail. 1998. *The politics of duplicity: controlling reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Kulick, Don. 1998. *Travesti: Sex, Gender, and Culture among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mayblin, Maya. 2010. *Gender, Catholicism, and Morality in Brazil: Virtuous Husbands, Powerful Wives*. New York: Palgrave
- Modell, Judith 1994. *Kinship with Strangers*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Mody, Perveez. 2008. *The Intimate State: Love-marriage and the Law in Delhi*. Routledge India.
- Ragone, Helena. 1994. *Conception in the Heart: Surrogate Motherhood in America*. Boulder: Westview
- Reddy, Gayatri. 2005. *With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schneider, David M. 1980 (2nd edition). *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Stasch, Rupert. 2009. *Society of Others: Kinship and Mourning in a West Papuan Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1992. *After Nature: English Kinship in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Trawick, Margaret. 1990. *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weston, Kath. [1991] 1997. *Families We Choose*. New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press.
- Yan, Yunxiang. 2003. *Private Life under Socialism: Love, Intimacy and Family Change in a Chinese Village 1949-1999*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia J. 2002. *Producing Culture and Capital: Family Firms in Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lecture 1: The language of kinship

In this first session, we set out the aims and the objectives of the course and explain the structure and the workload associated with it. We will consider how 'kinship' came about as a subject of study that defined the discipline of anthropology for many years. Yet, by the late 1970s, kinship had lost its prominence in the discipline and according to some had pretty much disappeared as a core disciplinary concern. Why? What, then, inspired its 'rise from the ashes' (Schneider) - some would say its reinvention - in the 1990s? As a start, we will learn the language of anthropological kinship and define some key terms developed in early/classical kinship studies.

Key Reading

Holy, Ladislav. 1996. *Anthropological Perspectives on Kinship*. London: Pluto Press (Ch1. First Principles pp 1-40). E-book

Stone, Linda (ed.). 2001. *New Directions in Anthropological Kinship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield (Introduction: Theoretical Implications of New Directions in Kinship. pp 1-20).

<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=187ff0f2-94d6-e711-80cd-005056af4099>

Further Readings

Feeley-Harnick, Gillian. 2001. The Ethnography of Creation: Lewis Henry Morgan and the American Beaver. In Franklin, S. and McKinnon, S. (eds), *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*. Duke University Press, Durham & London. pp 54-85.

Kuper, Adam. 1988. *The Invention of Primitive Society*. New York: Routledge (Ch. 3 Lewis Henry Morgan and Ancient Society).

Dumont, Louis and Robert Parkin (translator). 2006. *Introduction to Two Theories in Social Anthropology: Descent Groups and Marriage Alliance*. London: Berghahn Books. (See the editor's introduction pp. vii-xxvii for the broad contours of descent theory and alliance theory that dominated anthropological thinking about kinship from the 1940s to the late 1970s.)

Fox, Robin. 1967. *Kinship and Marriage*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (Ch. 9 for kinship terminology).

Trautman, Thomas. 1987. *Lewis Henry Morgan and the Invention of Kinship*. Berkeley: University of California Press (particularly Ch. 3, A Lawyer Among the Iroquois, and Ch. 8, Kinship's Other Inventors).

Peletz, Michael G. 1995. Kinship Studies in Late Twentieth-Century Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 343-72.

Lecture 2: The genealogical imagination: who do you think you are?

WHR Rivers developed a means of rapidly assessing and recording who was related to whom on very short visits to unfamiliar societies. The genealogical method, as it came to be known, was widely used by many anthropologists in many parts of the world: the idea being that you could quickly apprehend the social structure of a small community or village by collecting the 'pedigrees' of knowledgeable inhabitants. Now ... pedigrees have a long history in English reckoning of kin particularly amongst the aristocracy – and in animal breeding. What do pedigrees establish? What's the difference between a pedigree and a genealogy? While the genealogical method has more or less disappeared from the anthropological toolkit, and its premises well and truly critiqued, the general popularity of genealogical and family history research has grown enormously, particularly in

the global north. What are people hoping to find in the search for their ancestors? What's in a family tree?

Key Readings

Edwards, Jeanette. 2017. A feel for genealogy: family treeing in the north of England. *ethnos* <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/hd8HFtv8XasXSuXAvizJ/full>
Or <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2017.1322115>

Ingold, Tim. 2007. *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge (Ch. 4 'The Genealogical Line', pp 104-119). E-book.

Further readings

Cannell, Fenella. 2011. English Ancestors: The Moral Possibilities of Popular Genealogy. *JRAI* 17: 462-480.

Nash, Catherine. 2002. Genealogical Identities. *Environment and Planning* (D: Society and Space) 20 (1): 27-52.

Rivers, W.H.R. 1900. A genealogical method of collecting social and vital statistics. *JRAI* 30: 74-82.

Leykin, Inna. 2015. Rodologia: Genealogy as Therapy in Post-Soviet Russia. *Ethos* 43(2): 135-164.

Cassidy, Rebecca. 2009. Aborescent culture: writing and not writing racehorse pedigrees. In Sandra Bamford and James Leach (eds). *Kinship and Beyond: The Genealogical Model Reconsidered*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Bouquet, Mary. 1996. Family Trees and their Affinities. *JRAI* 2(1): 43-66.

Schramm, Katharina. 2004. Coming Home to the Motherland: Pilgrimage Tourism in Ghana. In Eade, J. and Coleman, S. (eds). *Reframing Pilgrimage: Cultures in Motion*. Routledge London. Pp 133-149.

Schramm, Katharina. 2012. Genomics on Route: Ancestry, Heritage and the Politics of Identity across the Black Atlantic. In K. Schramm, D. Skinner & R. Rotenburg (eds). *Identity Politics and the New Genetics*. Oxford: Berghahn Books. Pp 167-93.

Basu, Paul. 2007. *Highland homecomings: genealogy and heritage tourism in the Scottish diaspora*. Routledge, London.

Edwards, Jeanette 2010. Genealogical Ancestors. In Virginia Fons, Anna Piella & Maria Valdes (eds.), *Procreacion, crianza y genero*. Barcelona PPU.

Bear, Laura. 2007. Ruins and Ghosts: the Domestic Uncanny and the Materialisation of Anglo-Indian Genealogies in Kharagpur. In Janet Carsten (ed.) *Ghosts of Memory: Essays on Remembrance and Relatedness*. Blackwell (online access).

Hertz, Deborah. 1997. The genealogy bureaucracy in the Third Reich. *Jewish History* 11(2): 53-78.

Lecture 3: What's biology got to do with it?

Much 'classical' anthropology started with unexamined assumptions about the 'natural' differences between women and men and the primacy of sexual intercourse and biological reproduction in kinship. The rekindling of interest in kinship in anthropology in the 1990s was partly inspired by feminist scholarship that insisted on scrutinising both the biological 'facts' of reproduction and the

'natural' differences between women and men. There was a call for a unified analysis of sex, gender and kinship as all part of the same complex that assumed 'natural' and essential biological difference. We will further our discussion about the interrelatedness of sex, gender and kinship through an argument about the presumed 'ignorance of paternity' that Malinowski noted for the Trobriand Islanders. If biological reproduction and heterosexual intercourse are universally the basis of kinship, how come the Trobriand Islanders, it was asked, appeared not to know about the role of men in conception? Indeed, about the 'facts of life'? What do those same 'facts' look like in the science of conception? How is gender performed through the body?

Key Readings

Bodenhorn, Barbara. 1990. "I'm Not the Great Hunter, My Wife Is": Iñupiat and anthropological models of gender. *Études/Inuit/Studies* 14, (1/2): 55-74 (published by Université Laval).
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42869683>.

Garcia, A. 2010. *The Pastoral Clinic: addiction and dispossession along the Rio Grande*. Chapter 3, "Blood Relative". Pp.: 111-150. (Available as ebook)

Further Readings

Collier, Jane F. & Yanagisako, Sylvia J. 1987. *Gender and Kinship: Essays Towards a Unified Analysis* (Introduction. Pp 14-50).

Martin, Emily. 1991. The egg and the sperm: how science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles. *Signs* 16 (3): 485-501

Leach, Edmund. 1966. 'Virgin Birth'. *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp 39-49.

Delaney, Carol. 1986. The meaning of paternity and the virgin birth debate. In *Man* 21 (3): 494-513.

Franklin, Sarah. 1997. *Embodied progress: A cultural account of assisted conception*. Abingdon: Routledge (Chapter 1, 'Conception among the anthropologists'. Pp 17-73).

Correspondence in *MAN* vol. 3(4) 1968; vol. 4 (1, 2 & 3) 1969; vol 7 (2) 1972.

Malinowski, Bronislaw 1968 [1929]. *The sexual lives of savages*. London: Routledge Kegan & Paul (Chapter 7).

McCormack Carol and Strathern, Marilyn (eds.) 1980. *Nature, Culture, and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Chapter 1).

Delaney, Carol. 1991. *The seed and the soil: gender and cosmology in Turkish village society*, Berkeley: University California Press.

Lecture 4: 'It takes a village to raise a child': nuclear families, adoption, fostering ...

One dominant model in many western societies, until relatively recently, was that children are ideally brought up by their biological parents. That is, that 'a family' comprises heterosexual, married parents and their biological offspring. The biological tie, in many contexts, is still privileged, despite the fact that, in practice, many families differ from this ideal. We know that there are strong bonds of kinship between non-biologically related persons and that, across the world, families take very many different forms. Theories of modernisation posited that kin-based societies would give way to state-based societies and that, within state-based societies, kinship would be a separate (domestic) domain. Let's begin unpacking those assumptions by looking at what we mean by

'family'. We will investigate different ways in which children are incorporated and cared for. We need to keep hold of the idea that children create parents.

Key Readings

Howell, Signe. 2003. Kinning: The Creation of Life Trajectories in Transnational Adoptive Families, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9 (3): 465-484.

Erdmute, Alber. 2003. Denying biological parenthood: fosterage in Northern Benin. *Ethnos*, 68 (4): 487-506 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0014184032000160532>

Further Readings

Collier, Jane, Michelle, Z. Rosaldo, & Yanagisako, Sylvia. 1997. Is there a family? In N. Lancaster Roger & Micaela di Leonardo (eds.), *The Gender Sexuality Reader*. New York, London: Routledge. Pp 71-82.

Goody Esther. 1982. *Parenthood and Social Reproduction: Fostering and Occupational Roles in West Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp 6-34.

Alber, Erdmute. 2003. The transfer of belonging: Theories on child fostering in West Africa Revisited. In Erdmute Alber, Jeannett Martin and Catrien Notermans (eds) *Child Fostering in West Africa: New Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. Leiden: Brill. Pp 79-111.

Khatib-Chahidi, J. 1992. Milk kinship in Shi'ite in Islamic Iran. In Vanessa Maher (ed.). *The anthropology of breast feeding: natural law or social construct*. Oxford: Berg.

MacClancy, Jeremy. 2000. The milk tie. In Harlen Walker (ed.) *Milk: beyond the dairy*. Totnes: Prospect Books. Pp 248-259.

Howell, Signe. 2001. 'Self-conscious Kinship: Some Contested Values in Norwegian Transnational Adoption'. In Sarah Franklin and Susan McKinnon (eds.). *Relative Values*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp 201- 223.

Simpson, Bob. 1994. Bringing the 'Unclear' Family into Focus: Divorce and Re-Marriage in Contemporary Britain. *Man*, 29(4), 831-851.

Bowie, Fiona (ed.) 2004. *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Adoption*, London: Routledge.

Yngvesson, Barbara. 2003. Going "Home": Adoption, Loss of Bearings, and the Mythology of Roots, *Social Text* 21 (1): 7-27.

Modell, Judith 1994. *Kinship with Strangers*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Howell, Signe. 2001. 'Self-conscious Kinship: Some Contested Values in Norwegian Transnational Adoption'. In S. Franklin and S. McKinnon (eds.). *Relative Values*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp 201- 223.

Dorow, Sara and Amy Swiffen. 2009. 'Blood and Desire: The Secret of Heteronormativity in Adoption Narratives of Culture.' *American Ethnologist* 36(3): 563-573.

Lecture 5: 'Families we choose'

This was a phrase used by Kath Weston in the title of her early influential study of gay and lesbian kinship. Since that study, gay marriage has been instituted in a number of western countries (to date 25). In this lecture, we explore perspectives that shed light on how kinship is created through 'choice' and ask what choice means in such contexts. What of the impact of assisted reproductive technologies? What possibilities do they open up for making kin out of unrelated persons? Are there limits to 'choice' and to how human beings can be created?

Key Readings

Thompson, Charis. 2001. Strategic naturalizing: kinship in an infertility clinic. In Sarah Franklin & Susan McKinnon (eds.), *Relative values: reconfiguring kinship studies*. London; Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=fa8a4d54-51f4-e711-80cd-005056af4099>

Corrine, P. Hayden. 1995. Gender, Genetics and Generation: Reformulating Biology in Lesbian Kinship. *Cultural Anthropology*, 10 (1): 41-63.

Further Readings

Edwards, Jeanette. 2009. 'Skipping a Generation': Genealogy and Assisted Conception. In Sandra Bamford & James Leach (eds). *Kinship and Beyond: the Genealogical Model Reconsidered*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Stacey, Judith. 2005. The Families of Man: Gay Intimacy and Kinship in a Global Metropolis. *SIGNS* 30 (3): 1911-48.

Lewin, Ellen. 1998. *Recognizing Ourselves: Ceremonies of Lesbian and Gay Commitment*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Robertson, Jennifer. 2005. *Same Sex Cultures and Sexualities: An Anthropological Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Boswell, J. (1995). *The Marriage of Likeness: Same-sex Unions in Pre-modern Europe*. London: HarperCollins.

Dolgin, Janet. 1995. Family law and the facts of family. In S. J. Yanagisako and C. Delaney (eds.), *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. Stanford: Stanford University Press (Ch. 2 pp 47- 67).

Weeks, Jeffrey, Brian Heaphy and Catherine Donovan. 2001. *Same Sex intimacies: Families of Choice and Other Life Experiments*. London: Routledge.

Weston, Kath. [1991] 1997. *Families We Choose*. New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press.

Strong, Thomas. 2002. Kinship Between Judith Butler and Anthropology? A Review Essay. *Ethnos* 67 (3): 401-418.

Lecture 6. Reproductive Labour

Based on the distinction between productive and unproductive labour, Marxist feminists developed the notion of reproductive labour – the work that goes into ensuring the reproduction of the domestic sphere and other aspects historically understood as beyond market logics (care, nurture, cleaning, sex, etc.). In this lecture we will retrace the development of this notion and analyse how reproductive labour is enmeshed with gender and kinship constructions, mapping

out who works in what ways for whom in the contemporary world, on the domestic and global scales, entwining remittances, sex, legal and illegal migration, the labour of care and death.

Key Reading

Constable, N. 2016. "Reproductive Labor at the Intersection of Three Intimate Industries: Domestic Work, Sex Tourism, and Adoption," *Positions: Asia Critique*, 24(1), pp.: 45-69.

Further Readings

Constable N, (ed.) 2005. *Cross-Border Marriages: Gender and Mobility in Transnational Asia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Constable, N. 2009. The Commodification of Intimacy: Marriage, Sex, and Reproductive Labor. *Annual Review of Anthropology* (38), pp.: 49-64

Duffy, M. 2007. Doing the Dirty Work. Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective. *Gender & Society* 21(3), pp.: 313-336.

Lan, Pei-Chia. 2008. New Global Politics of Reproductive Labor: Gendered Labor and Marriage Migration. *Sociology Compass*, 2(6), pp.: 1801-1815

Ehrenreich B, Hochschild A., (eds.) 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Holt/Metropolitan Books

Gallo, E., Scrinzi, F. 2016. *Migration, Masculinities and Reproductive Labour: Men of the Home*. London: Palgrave: Macmillan.

Hochschild A. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Pande, A. 2014. *Wombs in Labor: Transnational Commercial Surrogacy in India*. New York: Columbia University Press

Lecture 7. Politics of reproduction: sex and gender

States always have a vested interest in the reproduction of its citizens. But who gets to count as a citizen? States are more or less interventionist in reproductive policies and their interventions are sometimes entwined with religious concerns. In this lecture, we will look at examples of the anti and pro-natalist policies pursued by different governments and the way in which women's bodies and particularly women's reproductive bodies are the sites of such interventions.

Key readings

Kahn, Susan Martha. 2000. Eggs and wombs: the origins of Jewishness. In *Reproducing Jews: a cultural account of assisted conception in Israel*. Durham: Duke University Press. Pp 112-39. E-book. Also in R. Parkin & L. Stone (eds) *Kinship and family: an anthropological reader*. London: Blackwell. Pp 362-378

Kligman, Gail. 1992. The politics of reproduction in Ceaucescu's Romania: A case study in political culture. *East European Politics and Society*. 6 (3): 364-418.

Further Readings

Mishtal Joanna. 2017. Quiet Contestations of Irish Abortion Law: Abortion Politics in Flux? In Stettner S., Ackerman K., Burnett K., Hay T. (eds) *Transcending Borders*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Oaks, Laury. 2000. 'Pro-woman, Pro-life': The emergence of Pro-life feminism in Irish Anti-Abortion Discourses and Practices. *International Journal of Feminist Studies* 4 (1): 73-90.

Ginsburg, Faye 1998. *Contested Lives: The Abortion Debate in an American Community*, Updated edition. Berkeley: California University Press.

Das, Veena. 2007. The figure of the abducted woman: the citizen as sexed. Ch. 2 in *Life and words: violence and the descent into the ordinary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Das, Veena. 1995. National honour and practical kinship. In Ginsburg, Faye, & Rapp, Rayna (eds.) *Conceiving the new world order: the global politics of reproduction*. Berkeley: University California Press.

Kligman, Gail. 1998. *The politics of duplicity: controlling reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lecture 8: Marriage and marriageability: what's love got to do with it?

States also have an interest in the marital status of citizens – why? What do conventions and laws about marriage tell us about citizenship and the relationship between the state and minority groups? Is marriage a universal phenomenon? What about romantic love? To what extent (and in what forms and discourses) does love exist in companionate marriages, cross-cousin marriages, arranged marriages etc.? What kind of exchanges take place with marriage? Do people across the world marry for the same reasons?

Required Readings

Marsden, Magnus. 2007. Love and elopement in northern Pakistan. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 13 (1): 91-108.

Blackwood, Evelyn. 2005. Wedding bell blues: Marriage, missing men, and matrifocal follies. *American Ethnologist* 32 (1): 3-19.

Further Readings

Charsley, Katherine. 2005 Unhappy husbands: masculinity and migration in transnational Pakistani marriages. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (1): 85-105.

Ahearn, Laura 2003. Writing desire in Nepali love letters. *Language and communication* 23 (2):107-12.

Simpson, Bob 2006. Scrambling Parenthood: English Kinship and the Prohibited Degrees of Affinity. *Anthropology Today* 22 (3): 3-6.

Venkatesan, Soumya, Jeanette Edwards, Rane Willerslev, Elizabeth Povinelli, and Perveen Mody. 2011. [The anthropological fixation with reciprocity leaves no room for love: 2009 meeting of the Group for Debates in Anthropological Theory](#). *Critique of Anthropology* 31: 210-250.

Hart, Kimberley. (2007). Love by Arrangement: the Ambiguity of 'spousal choice' in a Turkish Village. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13(2): 345-362

Miles, Joanna, Perveen Mody & Rebecca Probert. 2015. *Marriage Rites and Rights*, Oxford: Hart (Ch. 9 Forced Marriage: rites and rights).

Yan, Yunxiang. 2005. The Individual and Transformation of Bridewealth in Rural North China. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11(4): 637-658.

Sharma, Ursula. 1984. Dowry in North India. In R. Hirschon (ed) *Women and Property, Women as Property*. Croom Helm. (Or see Sharma, Ursula 1997. "Dowry in North India: its Consequences for Women" in Patricia Uberoi, (ed) *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*, Oxford University Press: Delhi.)

Macfarlane, Alan. 1987. Love and capitalism. In *The Culture of Capitalism*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. Pp. 123-43.

Pamporov, Alexey 2007. Sold Like a Donkey? Bride-Price among the Bulgarian Roma. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 13 (2): 471-476.

Lecture 9: Circumcision

Up to now we have discussed, amongst other things, the politics of reproduction and marriageability. In this lecture, we are going to put these themes into conversation with each other by addressing what has proved to be one of the most contested and challenging subjects in anthropology – female circumcision, female genital cutting. Debates about what is commonly referred to as female genital mutilation ('FGM'), have been fraught. From some perspectives, the range of practices that come under the rubric of FGM reveal the limits to cultural relativism; from others, the campaigns against FGM reveal the dominance and imposition, yet again, of Eurocentric ideals. What procedures are included under the label FGM? Why is the term itself contested? What is the relationship between male and female genital cutting? Why is one, from many perspectives, massively more problematic than the other? What do they achieve?

Key readings

Ahmadu, Fuambai Sia. 2000. Rites and Wrongs: An Insider/Outsider Reflects on Power and Excision. In Bettina Shell-Duncan & Ylva Hernlund (eds.), *Female "circumcision" in Africa: culture, controversy, and change*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers. Pp. 283-312.

<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=a660d306-0ef6-e711-80cd-005056af4099>

Boddy, Janice. 2007. Gender Crusades: The female circumcision controversy in cultural perspective. In Y. Hernlund and B. Shell-Duncan (eds) *Transcultural bodies: female genital cutting in global context*. New Brunswick, N.J.; London, Rutgers University Press. Pp 46-67. E-book

Further Readings

Boddy, Janice. 1982. Womb as Oasis: The Symbolic Context of Pharaonic Circumcision in Rural Northern Sudan. *American Ethnologist*. 9: 682-698.

Toubia, Nahid. 1993. *Female Genital Mutilation: A Call for Global Action*. New York: Ink.

Kratz, Corinne. 2003. Circumcision, Pluralism, and Dilemmas of Cultural Relativism. In P Brown & A. Podolefsky (eds.), *Applying Anthropology: an introductory reader* (pp. 269). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Obermeyer, Carla Maklouf. 2003. The Health Consequences of Female Circumcision: Science, Advocacy, and Standards of Evidence. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 17(3), 394-412.

Gruenbaum, Ellen. 2001. *The female circumcision controversy: an anthropological perspective*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hodžić, Saida. 2017. *The twilight of cutting: African activism and life after NGOs*. Oakland, University of California Press.

Shweder, Richard, A. 2000. What about "Female Genital Mutilation"? And Why Understanding Culture Matters in the First Place. *Daedalus*, 129(4), 209-232.

Kratz, Corrine. 1999. Female Circumcision in Africa. In K. A. Appiah and J. Henry Louis Gates (eds), *Africana: The Encyclopedia of the African and African American Experience*. Pp 616-620.

Talle, Aud. 2007. Female Circumcision in Africa and Beyond. In Y. Hernlund and B. Shell-Duncan (eds), *Transcultural bodies: female genital cutting in global context*. New Brunswick, N.J.; London, Rutgers University Press. Pp 91-106.

Walley, Christine J. 2006. Searching for "Voices: Feminism, Anthropology, and the Global Debates over Female Genital Operations. In Ellen Lewin (ed.), *Feminist Anthropology: a Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lecture 10: Wrap up

In the final session we will tie up some loose ends, and revise where we got to in our bumpy and selective ride through the anthropological study of sex, gender and kinship.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE
2018/19

SOAN 20811
Anthropology of Religion
Semester 1
Credits 20

Course Convener:	Dr. Sébastien Bachelet
Room:	2.048 Arthur Lewis Building
Telephone	66934
Email	Sebastien.Bachelet@Manchester.ac.uk General Office Hours: 3-4 Mondays & 12-1pm Thursdays (Term time)
Office Hours:	
Administrator	Kellie Jordan UG Office G.001A Arthur Lewis Building Kellie.Jordan@Manchester.ac.uk (0161) 275 4000
Tutors:	Tom Boyd (Tom.Boyd@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk) Jasmine Folz (Jasmine.Folz@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk) Julia Perczel (Julia.Perczel@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk)
Lectures:	Monday 11.00-13.00, Chemistry_G.54
Tutorials:	Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System
Assessment:	100% 3-hour Examination. You will be asked to answer 3 essay questions.

Please read the following information sheet in the Assessment Section on Blackboard, in connection with Coursework and Examinations:

- **UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION**

Reading week: 29th October – 4th November 2018

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course.

Course Description

What does it mean to study religion anthropologically? This course introduces students to anthropological approaches of studying religion. We will explore how anthropologists have struggled to define religion, and what debates and contestations about definition can tell us about the assumptions of classic anthropological understandings of religion, and how our thinking has changed since. We will explore multiple religious beliefs, meanings, experiences, expressions and practices across diverse sociocultural environments. Through an engagement with anthropological works on ritual, practice, death, and meaning-making, we will learn how religion is understood, experienced and expressed.

Aims

- To introduce students to the main anthropological approaches to the study of religion.
- To work with key anthropological texts on the topic of religion.
- To examine how concepts initially outlined in the anthropology of religion have become of utility in anthropology and vice-versa.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

On completion of this course successful students will be equipped with sufficient knowledge and skills to:

- Understand and engage with debates and literature in the anthropology of religion.
- Explore the place of religious practice and belief in social life.
- Undertake comparative analysis of 'religious' phenomena, knowledge and practice.

Tutorial Groups

Tutor	Location	Tutorial Group	Day	Starts	Ends
Tom Boyd	Sam Alex_A114	Tutorial 1	Monday	14:00	15:00
Tom Boyd	Sam Alex_A114	Tutorial 2	Monday	15:00	16:00
Jasmine Folz	Mansfield Cooper_2.14	Tutorial 3	Thursday	13:00	14:00
Jasmine Folz	Mansfield Cooper_2.14	Tutorial 4	Thursday	14:00	15:00
Jasmine Folz	Mansfield Cooper_2.14	Tutorial 5	Thursday	15:00	16:00
Jasmine Folz	Mansfield Cooper_2.14	Tutorial 6	Thursday	16:00	17:00
Julia Perczel	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Tutorial 7	Friday	13:00	14:00
Julia Perczel	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Tutorial 8	Friday	14:00	15:00
Julia Perczel	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Tutorial 9	Friday	15:00	16:00
Tom Boyd	Uni Place_4.210	Tutorial 10	Tuesday	10:00	11:00
Tom Boyd	Simon_5.05	Tutorial 11	Tuesday	12:00	13:00

Assessment

- 100% assessment through 3 hour final exam. You will be asked to answer 3 essay questions.

Thinking and writing practice:

In order to prepare for exams, and for improving your thinking and writing skills more broadly, you can undertake suggested pieces of writing for qualitative feedback in tutors' office hours. This is **optional** but you are strongly advised to take advantage of the opportunity to clarify your understanding and improve your work. Practicing writing and explaining your argument will be immensely beneficial for answering exam questions.

PLEASE NOTE: You can bring ONE piece of written work for feedback (no more than 300 words) in the semester (before week 9). Bring the piece of writing to your tutor during office hour (printed out if possible).

Feedback will be verbal as the idea is to expand your understanding and learning through discussion. These tasks are optional and are distinct from specific tutorial tasks.

1. How does Tylor explain the origins of religion? Do you find his intellectual approach convincing? What about his evolutionary approach?
2. For Durkheim, religion is fundamentally social – it orders and unites society. Discuss.
3. Explain, in your own words, Geertz's definition of religion.
4. Asad argues that there cannot be a universal definition of religion. Why and how?
5. Explain in your own words EACH of the following key terms – Belief, Ritual, Practice, Materiality.

In order to do so, you will be drawing on the relevant lectures and readings. So you can write about each term after the relevant lecture and take your writing in to a tutorial or office hour. Remember, different authors have approached these terms differently. Your job will be to summarise succinctly some of these different approaches, dwelling on and synthesizing the ones you find most useful/interesting.

6. To say that something has a social function is to say that it does something/serves a purpose in the social world. Discuss with reference to religion.
7. Religion serves to control and manage individual experience for the good of society. Discuss.

READINGS

There are three types of readings on this course: key readings, supplementary readings, and ethnographic readings, which ground some of the more abstract concepts that will come up in lectures. **In addition**, you have to read one of the following monographs over the course of the semester. Feel free to seek help with choosing one.

All key and discussion readings (as well as other additional ones) are available on JSTOR (J), in e-journals on the library website (L) or in PDF form on blackboard (B). I have provided stable URLs where available but all journal articles in the reading list can be located through a Google search and accessed on campus computers/network or through VPN. There are several copies of the monographs available in the library.

Please make sure that you have **gone over the key readings before the lecture**, but do not panic if you do not fully understand it. They will be explained in the lectures. However, **some lectures require that you have read at least one clearly identifiable reading before the lecture**. If you **have not read your assigned reading**, you will not be able to contribute to the discussion, and **you will be asked to leave**. Please come to office hours to discuss any difficulty with a reading or to clarify your understanding.

Please make sure that **you have read the tutorial readings before the tutorial**. It is vital for the tutorial discussion that you have familiarity with, and some understanding of, the assigned texts.

MONOGRAPHS – (please pick at least one for reading over the term)

Clark-Decès, I. (2000). *Religion against the self : an ethnography of Tamil rituals*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cook, J. (2010). *Meditation in modern Buddhism : renunciation and change in Thai monastic life*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Daswani, G. (2015). *Looking back, moving forward : transformation and ethical practice in the Ghanaian Church of Pentecost*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Heilman, S. C. (2001). *When a Jew dies : the ethnography of a bereaved son*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschkind, C. (2006). *The ethical soundscape : cassette sermons and Islamic counterpublics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Janson, M. (2014). *Islam, youth and modernity in the Gambia : the Tablighi Jama'at*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keane, W. (2007). *Christian moderns : freedom and fetish in the mission encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Laidlaw, James. 1995: *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy, and Society among the Jains*. Clarendon Press.
- Liberatore, G. (2017). *Somali, Muslim, British : striving in securitized Britain*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Luhmann, T. M. (2012). *When God talks back : understanding the American evangelical relationship with God* (1st ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Mahmood, S. (2012). *Politics of piety : the Islamic revival and the feminist subject*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Marsden, M. (2005). *Living Islam : Muslim religious experience in Pakistan's North-West Frontier*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Orsi, R. A. (2005). *Between heaven and earth : the religious worlds people make and the scholars who study them*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Parry, J. P. (1994). *Death in Banaras*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pedersen, M. A. (2011). *Not quite shamans : spirit worlds and political lives in northern Mongolia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Robbins, J. (2004). *Becoming sinners : Christianity and moral torment in a Papua New Guinea society*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Webster, J. (2013). *The anthropology of Protestantism : faith and crisis among Scottish fishermen* (First edition. ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Werbner, R. P. (2015). *Divination's grasp : African encounters with the Almost Said*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Willerslev, R. (2007). *Soul hunters : hunting, animism, and personhood among the Siberian Yukaghirs*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

GENERAL READINGS IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF RELIGION

While we will not be following any specific reader in the anthropology of religion (of which there are many), you might want to dip into one or more of the following to expand your understanding of the field. In particular, Lambek's (2008) *Reader* is extremely helpful.

Boddy, J. P. (2013). *A companion to the anthropology of religion*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Bowie, Fiona. 2000. *The Anthropology of Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eller, Jack. 2007. *Introducing the Anthropology of Religion*. London: Routledge.

Lambek, M. (2008). *A reader in the anthropology of religion* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Morris, B. 2006. *Religion and Anthropology: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Orsi, R. A. (Ed.). 2012. *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Turner, Brian S (Ed.). 2010. *The New Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Religion*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Classic texts in the anthropology of religion

Durkheim, Emile. 1912. *The elementary forms of religious life*. Entire book available online; translation by Karen Fields.

Evan-Pritchard, E. 1956. *Nuer Religion*. University of Michigan Press.

Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society: an outline of interpretive Sociology*. Ed. Roth, Geunther and Wittich, Claus. University of California Press. Chapter VI Religious Groups (The Sociology of Religion). PP 399-634. [Full text available online at <https://archive.org/details/MaxWeberEconomyAndSociety>]

LECTURE 1. Definitions, Function and History

How can we define religion? Why does it matter? Why should “religion” be a problem for anthropologists? We take a look at the distinguishing features of religion, as it was defined in the social sciences of late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Exercise 1 (in class group-work)

Suppose you were to invent a religion: what would it look like? What if your invented religion didn't involve “belief” or “faith” or even an afterlife? Would it still be a religion? Would it be better to have just one god, or lots of them? Some ghosts? Demons? Secret societies? Civil celebrations? Degradation ceremonies? Sorcery? (Taken from Aycock, 2008).

Key readings

Tylor, Edward B. 2002 [1871]. Religion in Primitive Culture. In Lambek, M (Ed.) *A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion*. Blackwell. Pages 21-33. (B)

Durkheim, Emile. 2002 [1912]. The Elementary forms of religious life. In In Lambek, M (Ed.) *A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion*. Blackwell. Pages 34-49. (B)

Supplementary readings (in date order so you can follow the chronological trajectory of thinking on religion and get a flavour for how this changed over time and with new debates and ways of thinking etc.).

Radcliffe-Brown. 1945. A. R. Religion and Society. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 75(1/2): 33-43. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2844278>

Firth, Raymond. 1959. Problem and Assumption in an Anthropological Study of Religion. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 89 (2): 129-148. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2844265>

- Godelier, Maurice. 1975. Toward a Marxist Anthropology of Religion. In *Dialectical Anthropology* 1(1): 81-85. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29789837>
- Saler, Benson. 1977. Supernatural as a Western Category. In *Ethos* 5(1): 31-53. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/640071>
- Martin Southwold. 1978. Buddhism and the Definition of Religion. *Man*, New Series, 13(3): 362-379. (J)
- Burton. John. W. 1983. Answers and Questions: Evans-Pritchard on Nuer Religion. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 14 (Fasc. 3): 167-186. (J).
- Orsi, R. A. (2011). The problem of the holy. In R. A. Orsi (Ed.), *Cambridge Companions to religion* (pp. 84-108). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

NB: the first reading takes on and extends Tylor's understanding of the importance of dreaming and of animism, the second reinvigorates Durkheimian understandings of ritual and society.

Willerslev, Rane. 2007. *Soul Hunters: hunting, animism and personhood among the Siberian Yukhagirs*. PP 173 (The dream world) – pp 191. (B).

Robbins, Joel. 2010: "If There is No Such Thing as Society, Is Ritual Still Special? On Using *The Elementary Forms* after Tarde." In *The Social after Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessments*, M. Candea, ed. London: Routledge. Pp. 93-101 (B).

LECTURE 2. Contestations on Terms and Categories of Analysis in Religion

How have anthropologists reflected on the categories of analysis and sensibilities used in the study of religion? This lecture focuses on some of the debates and contestations between anthropologists on how to define key areas and terms within the anthropological study of religion. In addition, we look at the ways in which the Christian inheritance of anthropology has significantly shaped categories of analysis within the study of religion.

Key readings

- Geertz. 1966. Religion as a Cultural System. In *The interpretation of cultures*. (B)
- Asad, Talal. 1983. Anthropological Conceptions of Religion: Reflections on Geertz. *Man*, New Series 18 (2): 237-259. (J) Article Stable URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2801433>

Supplementary readings

- Austin, Diane. J. 1979. Symbols And Culture: Some Philosophical Assumptions in the Work of Clifford Geertz. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice* 3: 45-59. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23159581>
- Cannell, Fenella. 2005. The Christianity of Anthropology. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 11(2): 335-356. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804213>
- Geertz, Clifford. 2005. Shifting Aims, Moving Targets: On the Anthropology of Religion. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (1): 1-15. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3803986>
- Stirrat. R. L. 1984. Sacred Models. *Man*, New Series 19(2): 199-215. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2802277>

Class discussion

Should we discuss our own religious beliefs, upbringing, practices etc. in class? Can that help us in understanding the anthropology of religion?

Tutorial

Debate: Everyone must read the two key readings before this week's tutorial. Each of you will be assigned to one of two groups – the Geertz group and the Asad group.

The Asad group will critically present his argument that “religion” is not a self-evident category, but is the product of particular Euro-American and Christian history. Anthropologists should be reflexive of the processes that make us assume that religion is a common-sense term.

The Geertz group will defend Geertz's argument that we can more or less identify something that we can call ‘religion’ and furthermore, that religion makes the world meaningful for people. It helps people answer ‘why’ questions.

Each group will be given 15 minutes to prepare its case and 5 minutes to make the initial presentation after which the discussion will be open.

(Idea for the debate taken from Mayblin 2013)

Remember a review of these two papers is important to get a sense of the debates about definitions of religion, so it is worth really using the tutorial session to make sure you understand them.

LECTURE 3. RITUAL

Belief and ritual have long been identified as the two key components of religion. While the term belief refers to interior states, rituals can be observed and therefore are more amenable to anthropological study, analysis and explanation. The key readings in this lecture comprise three key theorists of ritual whose work continues to inform anthropological understandings of ritual.

Class discussion: Must ritual always be religious? In what other contexts can we describe certain behaviours as ritual? What might be the minimum conditions to identify a set of behaviours as ritual?

Key readings

Van Gennep, A. 1960. "Chapter 1: The Classification of Rites" In *The Rites of Passage*, pp. 1-15. (B)

Turner, V. 1969. "Liminality and Communitas" in *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti- Structure* pp. 94-130. (B)

Supplementary readings

Deflem, Mathieu. 1991. "Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner's Processual Symbolic Analysis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(1): 1-25. Available at: http://deflem.blogspot.com/1991/08/ritual-anti-structure-and-religion_29.html

Olaveson, T. 2001. Collective Effervescence and Communitas: Processual Models of Ritual and Society in Emile Durkheim and Victor Turner. In *Dialectical Anthropology* 26 (2) 89-124. (J)

Stasch, Rupert. 2011. Ritual and Oratory Revisited: The Semiotics of Effective Action. In *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 159-174. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41287726>

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

NB: the first paper is an ethnographic piece by Geertz written before his famous definition of religion; the second asks how we can work with Durkheim in a situation where different religions exist in the same place.

Geertz, Clifford. 1957. Ritual and Social Change: A Javanese Example. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series 59(1): 32-54. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/666528>

Baumann, Gerd. 1992. Ritual implicates 'Others': rereading Durkheim in a plural society. In de Coppet, D (ed) *Understanding ritual*. Routledge. (available on Google scholar)

LECTURE 4. BELIEF

Does belief hold the same status in different religions or assemblages that we recognize as religious? What does it mean to believe and/or to know and when is it better to be ignorant than knowledgeable?

Key readings

Lindquist, Galina and Coleman, Simon. 2008. Introduction: Against Belief? In *Social Analysis* 52(1): 1-18. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23182444> .

Mair, Jonathan. 2012. Cultures of belief. In *Anthropological Theory* 12(4): 448-466. DOI:[10.1177/1463499612469588](https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499612469588)

Supplementary readings

Davis, Sarah Henning. 2008. What's Not to Know? A Durkheimian Critique of Boyer's Theory of Religion. In *Ethos* 36 (2): 268-281.

Chua, Liana. 2011. Soul encounters: emotions, corporeality and the matter of belief in a Bornean village. In *Social Analysis* 55(3): 1-17. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23182206>

Articles from the special issue of Ethos, Vol. 40, No. 3, The Dynamics of Belief and Experience: Cultural and Psychological Responses across Religious Traditions (September 2012). Available online.

Cassaniti, Julia. Agency and the Other: The Role of Agency for the Importance of Belief in Buddhist and Christian Traditions. 2012. In *Ethos* 40(3): 297-316. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23254141>

Simpson, Edward. 2007. 'The changing perspectives of three Muslim men on the question of saint worship over a 10-year period in Gujarat, western India.' *Modern Asian Studies*, 42 (2 & 3). pp. 377-403. Available online at <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/4572/> or on JSTOR.

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

NB: the first reading focuses on belief in an emerging Christian sect; the second on a particular prayer ritual in Muslim Turkey.

Bielo, James. S. 2012. Belief, Deconversion, and Authenticity among U.S. Emerging Evangelicals. In *Ethos* 40(3): 258-276. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23254139>

Henkel, Heiko. 2005. Between Belief and Unbelief Lies the Performance of Salāt: Meaning and Efficacy of a Muslim Ritual. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11(3): 487-507. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804315>

Lecture 5. PRACTICE/DOING

We do things before we think about them or reflect on them, especially things learned from childhood. Could we then say that practice precedes belief? What implications does that have for our understanding of religion? Further, how much of practice (what people do) is habitual and how much is driven by conscious reflection and understanding? Can focusing on practice open up questions of gender, the body, authority etc.?

Key readings

Furey, Constance M. 2012. Body, Society, and Subjectivity in Religious Studies. In *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80(1): 7-33. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41348768>

Bender, Courtney. 2012. Practicing Religions. In Robert A. Orsi (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*. Cambridge University Press. Pages 273-295. (B)

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

NB: the first paper describes how women who are excluded from formal religious roles practice religiosity. The second one focuses on text and practice in Islam.

Sered, Susan Starr. 1988. Food and Holiness: Cooking as a Sacred Act among Middle-Eastern Jewish Women. *Anthropological Quarterly* 61(3): 129-139. (J)

Lambek, Michael. 1990. Certain Knowledge, Contestable Authority: Power and Practice on the Islamic Periphery. In *American Ethnologist* 17(1): 23-40. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/645250>

Further ethnographic readings

Anderson, Jennifer L. 1987. Japanese Tea Ritual: Religion in Practice. In *Man*, New Series 22(3): 475-498. Article DOI: 10.2307/2802501

Fuller, C. J. 1997. *Religious texts, priestly education and ritual action in south Indian temple Hinduism*. In *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 31 (1): 3-25. Available online at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/468/>

Kray, Christine. A. 2007. Practice Approach to Ritual: Catholic Enactment of Community in Yucatán. In *Anthropos* 102(2): 531-545. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40389739>

Luhrmann, T.M; Nusbaum, Howard and Thisted, Ronald. 2010. The Absorption Hypothesis: Learning to Hear God in Evangelical Christianity. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series 112 (1): 66-78. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20638762>

[READING WEEK 29th October – 4th November]

LECTURE 6. MATERIALITY

Key Readings

Keane, Webb. 2008. The Evidence of the Senses and the Materiality of Religion. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 14: S110-S127. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20203801>

Engelke, Matthew. 2012. Material Religion. In Robert A. Orsi (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 209-229. (B)

Supplementary reading

Miller, D. 2005. Materiality: an introduction. In Miller (Ed.) *Materiality*. Duke University Press. Pages 1-50. (Available online)

TUTORIAL READING (Read at least **one** before the tutorial)

Engelke, Matthew. 2005. Sticky subjects and sticky objects: the substance of African Christian healing. In Miller (Ed.) *Materiality*. Duke University Press. Pp 118-139. (B).

Hüwelmeier, G. (2016). Cell phones for the spirits: ancestor worship and ritual economies in Vietnam and its diasporas. *Material Religion*, 12(3), 294-321. doi: 10.1080/17432200.2016.1192149 (L)

LECTURE 7. SELF-CULTIVATION.

In this lecture, we will examine how people, either individually or collectively, seek to shape themselves according to idea-types posited by their understandings of religious tenets. It is worth noting that all the ethnographic examples pertain to systematized religions.

Key readings

Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the self. In Martin, L.H; Gutman, H; Hutton, P.K (Eds.) *Technologies of the self: a seminar with Micheal Foucault*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. Pp 16-49. (B)

Mahmood, S. (2001). Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival. *Cultural Anthropology*, 16(2), 202-236. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656537>

Supplementary readings

Carrithers, M. 1985. An alternative social history of the self. In Carrithers, M; Collins, S and Lukes, S (Eds.) *The category of the person: anthropology, philosophy, history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp 234-256. (B)

Ho, E. (2007). The Two Arms of Cambay: Diasporic Texts of Ecumenical Islam in the Indian Ocean. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 50(2/3), 347-361. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25165199>

Lambek. M. 2013. The continuous and discontinuous person: two dimensions of ethical life. *JRAI (NS)* 19: 837-858.

Laidlaw, J. 2002. For an anthropology of ethics and freedom. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 8(2): 311-332. (J)

Soares, B., & Osella, F. (2009). Islam, Politics, Anthropology. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 15, S1-S23. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20527686>

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

Schielke, Samuli. 2009. Being Good in Ramadan: Ambivalence, Fragmentation, and the Moral Self in the Lives of Young Egyptians. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15 (Islam, Politics, Anthropology): S24-S40. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20527687>

Luhrmann, T. M. and Morgain, Rachel. 2012. Prayer as Inner Sense Cultivation: An Attentional Learning Theory of Spiritual Experience. In *Ethos* 40 (4): 359-389. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23360481>

Further ethnographic readings

Desai, A. 2010. Dilemmas of devotion: religious transformation and agency in Hindu India. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 16 (2): 313-329. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40606102>

Laidlaw, James. 2000. A Free Gift Makes No Friends. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6(4): 617-634. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2661033>

Marsden, M. (2009). A tour not so grand: mobile Muslims in northern Pakistan. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 15, S57-S75. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9655.2009.01542.x (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20527689>

McDougall, D. (2009). Becoming Sinless: Converting to Islam in the Christian Solomon Islands. *American Anthropologist*, 111(4), 480-491. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20638720>

Venkatesan, S. 2014. Auto-relations: doing cosmology and transforming the self the Saiva way. In Abramson, A and Holbraad, M (Eds.) *Cosmologies: making contemporary worlds*. Manchester University Press.

McDougall, Debra. 2009. Becoming Sinless: Converting to Islam in the Christian Solomon Islands. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series 111(4): 480-491. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2063872>

LECTURE 8. LIFE: BEING ACTED ON AND ACTING ON AND IN THE WORLD.

While trying to lead a good life or one aimed towards sociological and soteriological rewards is important, so is life as it is lived with all its vicissitudes, uncertainties and unfairnesses. For many people around the world, seeking help from or blaming agencies that are not human but human-like (witches, ghosts etc.) is one way of coping with life and understanding causality. Evans-Pritchard's famous monograph (on your list of monographs) is one of the forerunners of taking such explanations and understandings seriously. The studies on witchcraft, the occult, promises made and kept/broken to non-human agencies are important in the anthropology of ethics as much as they are in the anthropology of religion. Equally, people also draw on religious tenets to orient their actions and make the world predictable and their actions fruitful in this world and the next.

Key readings.

Comaroff, Jean and Comaroff, John L. 1999. Occult Economies and the Violence of Abstraction: Notes from the South African Postcolony. In *American Ethnologist* 26 (2): 279-303. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/647285>

Mandelbaum, David G. Transcendental and Pragmatic Aspects of Religion. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series 68(5): 1174-1191. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/671039>

Supplementary readings

E. E. Evans-Pritchard. 1929. The Morphology and Function of Magic. *American Anthropologist*, New Series 31(4): 619-641. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/661174>

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

Greenwood, Susan. 1995. 'Wake the Flame Inside Us': Magic, Healing and the Enterprise Culture in Contemporary Britain. In *Etnofoor* 8(1): 47-62. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25757856>

Lindquist, Galina. 2000. In Search Of The Magical Flow: Magic And Market In Contemporary Russia. In *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 29(4): 315-357. (J) Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40553406>

Further ethnographic readings

- Nabokov, Isabelle. 2000. Deadly Power: A Funeral to Counter Sorcery in South India. In *American Ethnologist* 27(1): 147-168. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/647130>
- Rudnykyj, Daromir. 2009. Spiritual Economies: Islam and Neoliberalism in Contemporary Indonesia. In *Cultural Anthropology* 24(1): 104-141 . Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20484532>
- Street, Alice. 2010. Belief as relational action: Christianity and cultural change in Papua New Guinea. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 16(2): 260-278. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40606099>
- Amira Mittermaier. 2012. Dreams from Elsewhere: Muslim subjectivities beyond the trope of self-cultivation. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 18(2): 247-265. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41507959>

LECTURE 9. DEATH

Differing definitions of religion notwithstanding, a great deal of human thought is focused on death. What happens to a person after he or she dies? Is there some part of him/her that lives on? What should one's relations with the dead person be? Intimate, agonistic, placatory, helpful? How does one remain in contact with the dead? Are specialists required? Can the dead come back as the living? If we take Geertz's point that phenomena, activities and understandings and attitudes that are usually described as religious are generally concerned with the meaning of life, we find that death is most definitely caught up in the ways in which people make sense of life.

Key readings.

Bloch, Maurice and Parry, Jonathan. 1982. *Death and the Regeneration of life*. Cambridge University Press. Esp. Introduction. (B)

Supplementary Readings

Green, James, W. 2008. *Beyond the Good Death: The Anthropology of Modern Dying*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Kaufman, Sharon R. and Morgan, Lynn M. 2005. The Anthropology of the Beginnings and Ends of Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 34: 317-341. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25064888> (mainly bio-medically focused, but of interest nonetheless).

Metcalf, Peter and Huntington, Richard. 1991. *Celebrations of death: the anthropology of mortuary ritual*. Cambridge University Press. Esp. Introduction.

TUTORIAL READING (read at least **one** before the tutorial)

Lohmann, Roger Ivar. 2005. The Afterlife of Asabano Corpses: Relationships with the Deceased in Papua New Guinea. In *Ethnology* 44(2): 189-206. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3773996>

Jorion, Paul. 1982. The Priest and the Fishermen: Sundays and Weekdays in a Former 'Theocracy'. *Man, New Series* 17 (2): 275-286. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2801813>

Vitebsky, Piers. 2008. Loving and Forgetting: Moments of Inarticulacy in Tribal India. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 14(2): 243-261. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20203628>.

Further ethnographic readings

Cannell, Fenella. 2011. English ancestors: the moral possibilities of popular genealogy. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17 (3): 462-480. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23011309>

Gottlieb, Alma. 1998. Do Infants Have Religion? The Spiritual Lives of Beng Babies. *American Anthropologist* New Series 100 (1): 122-135.

LECTURE 10. REVISION

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY**
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018/19**SOAN 20821: Political and Economic Anthropology**
Semester 1
Credits 20**Course**

Convener:	Dr Gillian Evans
Room:	2.052 Arthur Lewis Building
Telephone:	5-8994
Email:	gillian.evans@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours:	Tuesdays and Wednesdays 10-12am Ring Gillian's Office from the Second Floor Landing in the Arthur Lewis Building
Tutors:	Joana Nascimento Joana.Nascimento@manchester.ac.uk Matthew McCullen Matthew.McCullen@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk Giuseppe Troccoli Email to be confirmed
Administrator:	Kellie Jordan, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building (0161) 275 4000 kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk
Lectures:	Tuesdays 4-6pm Samuel Alexander Building Room A113
Tutorials:	Weekly Tutorials - check your timetable on My Manchester
Assessment:	Final Essay 4000 words 80% of total course mark Portfolio of Ten Tutorial Tasks 20% of total course mark

Please read the following information sheets in the Assessment Section on Blackboard, in connection with Coursework and Examinations:

- INSTRUCTIONS FOR SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY UNDERGRADUATE ESSAYS AND COURSEWORK
- LATE SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK

Reading week: 29th October to 2nd November

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course.

SOAN20822 POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Semester One 2018-2019

Dr Gillian Evans

Description of the Course

This course takes students on a journey of exploration into the political and economic conditions of their own lives and from there, towards a cross-cultural appreciation of the diverse ways that human groups organize their livelihoods, harness and distribute resources, and derive power and influence from doing so. The course explores the sub-field of political and economic anthropology and addresses how anthropologists continue to develop new directions in anthropology out of their concern to address current events affecting people's lives around the world. Students will become familiar with ethnographic work in political and economic anthropology and gain an understanding of concepts such as capitalism, industrialisation, post-industrialisation, socialism, post-socialism, commodity, gift, debt, market, money, production and consumption, distribution and exchange, the state, nationalism, colonialism, globalisation, multiculturalism and indigeneity.

Suggested Background Readings

Carrier J. 2012. *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Hann C. & Hart K. 2011. *Economic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Llewellyn T. 2003. *An Introduction to Political Anthropology*. USA: Praeger Publishers.

Narotzky, S. 1997 *New Directions in Economic Anthropology* London: Pluto Press

Vincent, J (ed) 2002: *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Organisation of the Course:

The course covers 10 topics over 10 weeks in the second semester. Each week students should attend a two hour-long class comprising of an interactive-style lecture, sometimes including film. A one-hour tutorial group meeting with a teaching assistant follows on another day.

Students are expected to do one compulsory reading marked * on the reading list for each week on the course outline, which relates to each lecture and this should form the basis for subsequent tutorial discussion and the preparation of a tutorial portfolio of reviews of readings done, which forms 20% of the course mark.

Students are expected to think critically and communicate their thoughts about readings in the tutorial and, at the request of the tutor, to carry out other small research and/or reading and presentation activities.

Lecture One: Capitalism and Liberal Democracy: the Financial Crisis

Readings:

*Ortiz H. Anthropology – of the Financial Crisis.

Chapter 8, P585-597, in Carrier J. *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Carrier J. *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Graeber D. 2011. 'Occupy and Anarchism's Gift of Democracy.' In *The Guardian, Comment is Free*, 15th November 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/nov/15/occupy-anarchism-gift-democracy>. Accessed 3rd December 2011.

Hart K. 2011. One World Capitalism. Chapter 8, P. 142-163, in Hann C. & Hart K. *Economic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hart K. & Ortiz H. 2008. 'Anthropology in the Financial Crisis'. In *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 24, Issue 6, pp. 1-3

Harvey D. 2011. *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. London: Profile Books Ltd.

Ho K. 2009. *Liquidated: an ethnography of Wall Street*. USA: Duke University Press.

Nash J. 1981. Ethnographic Aspects of the World Capitalist System. In *Annual Review of Anthropology; Vol 10: 393-423*.

Ourossoff A. *Wall Street at War: The Secret Struggle for the World Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Paley J. 2002. Towards an Anthropology of Democracy. In *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol 31, pp. 469-496.

Tett G. 2009. *Fool's Gold: how the bold dream of a small tribe at J.P. Morgan was corrupted by Wall Street greed and unleashed a catastrophe*. New York: Free Press.

Lecture Two: Money, Markets and the State

Readings:

*Hart K. & Hann C. 2009. Introduction: learning from Polanyi
Chapter 1, pp. 1-17, in *Market and Society: the Great Transformation today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckert J. 2009. The Great Transformation of Embeddedness: Karl Polanyi and the new economic sociology. Chapter 3, pp.38-55 in *Market and Society: the Great Transformation today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graeber D. 2011. *Debt: the first 5000 years*. New York: MelvilleHouse.

Graeber D. 2009. Debt, Violence and Impersonal Markets: Polanyian meditations. Chapter 7, pp. 106-132 in *Market and Society: the Great Transformation today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gregory C. 1997. Savage Money. Chapter 8, pp. 265-297. In *Savage Money: the anthropology and politics of commodity exchange*. London: Routledge.

Hart K. 2009. Money in the Making of World Society. Chapter 6, pp. 91-105 in *Market and Society: the Great Transformation today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart K. 2012. Money in Twentieth Century Anthropology. Chapter 10, P. 166-183, in Carrier J. (Editor) *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Hart K. 2012. The Financial Crisis and the History of Money. Chapter 38, P. 626-639, in Carrier J. (Editor) *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Maurer B. 2006. The Anthropology of Money. In *Annual Reviews of Anthropology Vol 35: 15-36*

Polanyi K. *The Great Transformation: the political and economic origins of our times*. USA: Beacon Press.

Polanyi K. 1957. The Economy as Instituted Process. In Polanyi K., Arensberg C. & Pearson H. (eds.) *Trade and Market in the Early Empires: economies in history and theory*. New York: The Free Press.

Robotham D. 2009. Learning From Polanyi 2. Chapter 15, P. 272, in Hann C. & Hart K. *Market and Society: the Great Transformation Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharma A. & Gupta A. Eds. *The Anthropology of the State: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lecture Three: Classic Case Study One: Prestige and the Politics of Exchange

Readings

* Stack C. 1983. 'Swapping: what goes round comes around'. Chapter 3 in *All our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. USA: Basic Books

Carrier J. 1995. *Gifts and Commodities: Exchange and Western Capitalism Since 1700*. London: Routledge.

Gregory C. 1982. *Gifts and Commodities*. London: Academic Press.

Gregory C. 1980. **Gifts to Men and Gifts to God: Gift Exchange and Capital Accumulation in Contemporary Papua** In *Man New Series*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Dec., 1980), pp. 626-652

Malinowski B. 2002 [1922]. Essentials of the Kula. Part III, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: an account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.

Malinowski B. Chieftainship: power through wealth. Chapter 5, Part II, in Malinowski B. 2002 [1922]. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: an account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.

Malinowski B. 2002 [1922]. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: an account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.

Martin K. 2013. *The Death of the Big Men and the Rise of the Big Shots: custom and conflict in New East Britain*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Mauss M. 1954. *The Gift: forms and functions of exchange in archaic society*. UK: Cohen and West.

Smith K. 2017. "You don't own money. You're just the one who's holding it": **Borrowing, lending and the fair person in North Manchester**" In *Sociological Review, Monograph Series*. 65, 1, p. 121-136

Stack C. 1983. *All our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. USA: Basic Books

Young M. & Willmott P. 1986. [orig.1957]. *Family and Kinship in East London*. Penguin Books.

Weiner A. 1976. *Women of Value: Men of Renown: new perspectives in Trobriand exchange*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Weiner A. 1980. Reproduction: a replacement for reciprocity. In *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 7, No.1.

Lecture Four: Post-Industrial Crisis and the Politics of Place, Economy and Nationalism

Readings:

*Evans G. 2017. Brexit Britain, Why We Are All Post-Industrial Now. In *American Ethnologist*: Vol 44:2 p: 215-219

Evans G. 2017. **Social Class and the Cultural Turn: Anthropology, sociology and the post-industrial politics of 21st Century Britain** In *Sociological Review, Monograph Series*. 65, 1, p. 88-104

Evans G., Edwards J. & Smith K. 2012. 'The Middle Class-ification of Britain.' In. Evans

G., Edwards J. & Smith K. eds., pp. 1-28, Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Evans G. 2011. The Clash of Classes. In *Britain in 2012*. Swindon: ESRC.

Edwards J. 2012. Ancestors, Class and Contingency. In Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Evans G. 2012. "The Aboriginal People of Britain": the culture of class politics in contemporary Britain. In Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Grill J. 2012. "It's building up to something and it won't be nice when it erupts": The making of Roma/Gypsy migrants in post-industrial Scotland. In Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Gusterson H. 2017. From Brexit to Trump: anthropology and the rise of nationalist populism. In *American Ethnologist: Vol 44:2 p: 209-214*

Hoschild A. R. 2016. *Strangers in Their Own Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right*. New York: The New Press.

Howard P. 2012. Workplace Cosmopolitanisation and "the Power and Pain of Class Relations at Sea". In Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Lamphere L. Deindustrialisation and Urban Anthropology: what the future holds. In *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*. Vol. 14, No. 1/3, Declining Fortunes: anthropological perspectives on deindustrialisation. Pp. 259-268.

Smith K. 2012. Anxieties of Englishness and Participation in Democracy. In Class, Community and Crisis in Britain, special section of *Focaal*, Journal of Historical and Global Anthropology, Vol. 62, 2012.

Vance J. D. 2016. *Hillbilly Elegy: a memoir of a family and culture in crisis*. New York: Harper Collins.

Waquant L. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: a comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Waquant L. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: the neoliberal government of social insecurity*. Duke University Press.

Waquant L. 2012. Three Steps to An Historical Anthropology of Actually Existing Neoliberalism. In *Social Anthropology: Vol 20: 1 p66-79*

Lecture Five: Industrialisation, Global Cities and the Politics of Work

Readings:

*Hobsbawm E. 1996. City, Industry, the Working Class.

Chapter 12, pp. 245-269, in *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875*. London: Abacus Books.

Bourgeois P. 2003. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carrier J. Emerging Alienation in Production. Chapter 9, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Davis M. 2007. *Planet of Slums*. Verso.

Evans G. 2006. *Educational Failure and Working Class White Children in Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Evans G. 2017. **Minutes, Meetings and 'Modes of Existence': navigating the bureaucratic process of urban planning in East London.**

Evans, G. 16 Mar 2017 In : Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.

Gluckman M. Anthropological Problems Arising From the African Industrial Revolution. Chapter 15, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Low S. 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Anthropology and the City*. London: Routledge.

Massey D. 2007. *World City*. New York: Polity Press.

Marx K. Bourgeois and Proletarians. Chapter 20, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Mollona M. 2009. *Made in Sheffield: an ethnography of industrial work and politics*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Nash J. 2009. The Cultural Roots of Working Class Identity in the Bolivian Tin Mines. Chapter 23, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Roberts R. Class Structure in the Classic Slum. Chapter 22, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Roberts T. 1990 [orig. 1971] *The Classic Slum: Salford Life in the First Quarter of the Century*.

Smith T.C. Peasant Time and Factory Time in Japan. Chapter 4, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Sassens S. 2014. *Expulsions: brutality and complexity in the global economy*. USA: Harvard University Press.

Symons J. 2018. **We're not hard-to-reach, they are!' Integrating local priorities in urban research in Northern England: an experimental method** In The Sociological Review. 66, 1

Thompson E.P. Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism. Chapter 1, in Mollona M., DeNeeve G & Parry J. (Eds.) 2009. *Industrial Work and Life: a reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Lecture Six: Classic Case Study Two: Egalitarian Societies: Immediate Return Hunter Gatherers

Readings

*Woodburn J.C. 1982. Egalitarian Societies. In *Man*, Vol 17, pp. 431-451.

Kaplan D. 2000. The Darker Side of the "Original Affluent Society"
Journal of Anthropological Research, Vol. 56, No. 3 (Autumn, 2000), pp. 301-324 Published by:
University of New Mexico

Engels, F. 2010 [orig. 1884] *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. London: Penguin Books

Lee R. 1979. *The Kung San! Men, Women and Work in a Foraging Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marlowe F. 2010. *The Hadza: Hunter-Gatherers of Tanzania*. USA: University of California Press.

Marlowe, F. W. (2004b). What explains Hadza food sharing? *Research in Economic Anthropology*, 23, 69–88.

Sahlins M. The Original Affluent Society. Chapter One in *Stone Age Economics*. New York: Routledge.

[Shostak, Marjorie](#): 1981. *Nisa The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman*, Boston: Harvard University Press.

Shostak M. 2002. *Return to Nisa*. USA: Harvard University Press.

Testart A. 1982. The Significance of Food Storage among Hunter-Gatherers: residence patterns: population densities and social inequalities. In *Current Anthropology*, Vol 23, No. 5.

Turnbull, C. M. (1983). *The Mbuti pygmies: Change and adaptation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Turnbull, C. M. (1962). *The forest people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Woodburn, James. 1970. Hunters and gatherers: the material culture of the nomadic Hadza. London : British Museum

Woodburn, James. 1968. "An introduction to Hadza Ecology", in Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine.

Lecture Seven: Classic Case Study Three – Ethnicity and Nationalism: The Nuer

Readings

* Hutchinson S. 2000. Nuer Ethnicity Militarised. *Anthropology Today*: 16, Vol 3,

Anderson B. 2006. *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso

Evans-Pritchard E. 1969 [origin 1940] Interest in Cattle. Chapter 1, pp. 16-50, in Evans-Pritchard E. 1969 [orig. 1940] *The Nuer: a description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans-Pritchard E. 1969 [orig. 1940] The Political System. Chapter 4, pp. 131-191, in Evans-Pritchard E. 1969 [orig. 1940] *The Nuer: a description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans-Pritchard E. 1969 [orig. 1940] *The Nuer: a description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans-Pritchard E. & Meyer Fortes (Eds.) 1970. *African Political Systems*. Oxford University Press.

Gellner E. *Nations and Nationalism; new perspectives on the past*. USA: Cornell University Press.

Hobsbawm E. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: programme, myth and reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson S. 2015. Violence, legitimacy, and prophecy: Nuer struggles with uncertainty in South Sudan. In *American Ethnologist* Vol 42:3 p: 415-430.

Hutchinson S. 1996. 'Blood, Cattle and Cash: the commodification of Nuer values. In *Nuer Dilemmas: coping with money, war and the state*. California: University of California Press.

Hutchinson S. 1996. *Nuer Dilemmas: coping with money, war and the state*. California: University of California Press.

Hyland-Eriksen 2010. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press

Pocock, D. 1961. Segmentary Lineage: An Organization of Predatory Expansion". In *American Anthropologist* 63: 322-45.

Smith M. G. 1956. On Segmentary Lineage Systems. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*

Vol. 86, No. 2 (Jul. - Dec., 1956), pp. 39-80

Lecture Eight: Crises of Differentiation: Colonialism and Globalisation

Readings:

* Inda J. X. & Rosaldo R. 2002. 'Tracking Global Flows' (p3-47). Chapter One In *The Anthropology of Globalization: a reader*. (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell).

Anderson B. 2002. The New World Disorder. Chapter 21, pp.261-271. In Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Appadurai A. 2002. Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination. In Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Asad T. (ed.) 1973. *Anthropology and the colonial encounter*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Asad T. 2002. From the History of Colonial Anthropology to the Anthropology of Western Hegemony. Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Bodley, John H. 2008. *Victims of progress*. 5th ed. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

Comaroff J & Comaroff J. 2002. Of Revelation and Revolution. Chapter 17, pp. 203-212, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Ferguson J. 2002. The Anti-Politics Machine. Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Friedman J. 2002. Transnationalisation, Socio-Political Disorder and Ethnification as Expressions of Declining Global Hegemony. Chapter 23, pp. 285-300, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Fox R. 2002. East of Said. Chapter 13, pp. 143-152, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Gal S. 2002. Between Speech and Silence. Chapter 18, pp. 213-221, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Gough, Kathleen. 1968a. New Proposals for Anthropologists. *Current Anthropology* 9.5: 403-435.

Gough, Kathleen. 1968b. Anthropology and imperialism. *Monthly Review* 19.11: 12-24.

Horvath, Ronald J. 1972. A definition of colonialism. *Current Anthropology* 13.1: 45-57.

Hylland-Eriksen T. 2007. *Globalisation: key concepts*. Oxford: Berg.

Diane Lewis, "Anthropology and Colonialism," *Current Anthropology* 14, no. 5 (Dec., 1973): 581-602.

Martell L. 2008. Britain and Globalization. In *Globalizations*, 5, 3, September 2008, pp449-466

Pels P. 1997. The Anthropology of Colonialism: culture, history and the emergence of western governmentality. In *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 26 (1997), pp. 163-183

Pels, Peter, and Oscar Salemink, eds. 1999. *Colonial subjects: Essays on the practical history of anthropology*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.

Ranger T. 1983. The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa. Chapter 6. (p211-263) In *The Invention of Tradition*. Hobsbawm E. & Ranger T. (Eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roseberry W. 2002. Images of the Peasant in the Consciousness of the Venezuelan Proletariat. In Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Stocking, George W., Jr., ed. 1991. *Colonial situations: Essays on the contextualization of ethnographic knowledge*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

Stoler A. 2002. Perceptions of Protest: defining the dangerous in colonial Sumatra. In Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Taussig M. 2002. Culture of Terror: space of death. Chapter 15, pp. 172-187, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Tsing A. 2002. Politics on the Periphery. Chapter 26, pp. 325-337, in Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Van Bremen J & Shimuzu A. (Eds) 1999. *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*. London: Routledge.

Wolf E. 1982. *Europe and the people without History*. Berkeley ; London : University of California Press

Wolf E. 2002. Facing Power – Old Insights, New Questions. Vincent J. Ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: a reader in ethnography, theory and critique*. Oxford: Blackwells Publishing Ltd.

Lecture Nine: Consumption and the Politics of Desire

Readings:

* Miller, Daniel. 1998. "Coca-Cola: A Sweet Black Drink from Trinidad." In *Material Cultures: Why Some Things Matter*, edited by Daniel Miller, 169–87. London: University College London Press.

Colloredo-Mansfeld. 2005. "Consumption." In *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, edited by James Carrier, 210–28. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Foster Robert. 2008. *Coca-Globalization: Following Soft Drinks from New York to New Guinea*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 4: 'A Network of Perspectives, pp99-145

Foster, Robert. 2002. *Materializing the Nation: Commodities, Consumption, and Media in Papua New Guinea*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Chapter 2: pp36-62

Friedman, Jonathan, ed. 1994. *Consumption and Identity*. Amsterdam: OPA.

Graeber, David. 2011. "Consumption." *Current Anthropology* 52 (4): 489–511.

Graeber D. *The Very Idea of Consumption: desire, phantasms and the aesthetics of destruction from Medieval times to the present*. Chapter 2, pp. 57-84, in Graeber D. 2007. *Possibilities: essays on hierarchy, rebellion and desire*. Edinburgh: AK Press

Klein N. Alt. *Everything: the youth market and the marketing of cool*. Chapter 3, pp. 63-86, in Klein N. 2002. *No Logo*. New York: Picador

Miller, Daniel. 1995. "Consumption and Commodities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 141–61.

Miller, Daniel. 1998. *A Theory of Shopping*. Ithaca: Polity Press.

Miller D. *Consumption Studies as the Transformation of Anthropology*. Chapter 8, pp. 263-292, in Miller D. *Acknowledging Consumption*. London: Routledge

Mintz S. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: the place of sugar in modern history*. London: Penguin Books.

Douglas M. & Isherwood B. 1996. *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu P. *The Aristocracy of Culture*. Chapter 1, pp. 11-96, in Bourdieu P. 1988. *Distinction : a social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge.

Reed, Adam, 2007. 'Smuk is king': the action of cigarettes in a Papua New Guinea prison. In *Thinking through things: theorizing artefacts ethnographically* (eds.) A. Henare, M. Holbraad & S.Wastell, London: Routledge, Chapter 2: pp32-46.

Spooner B. Weavers and Dealers: the authenticity of a Persian carpet. Chapter ,pp. In Appadurai A. (Ed.) *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lecture Ten: Socialism And After

Readings:

*Hann C. Introduction.. In Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

Barnard A. Primitive Communism and Mutual Aid. Chapter 1, pp. 1-19. in Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

Bevir M. 2011. Introduction: Socialism and History. In *The Making of British Socialism*: Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Caplan P. Socialism from Above in Tanzania: the view from below. Chapter 4, pp. 59-76, in Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

Creed G. Economic Crisis and Decline in Eastern Europe. Chapter 3, pp. 57-73, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Feuchtwang S. Remnants of Revolution in China. Chapter 10, pp. 196-214, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Hann C., Humphries C & Verdery K. 2002. Introduction: postsocialism as a topic of anthropological investigation. Chapter 1, pp. 1-28, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Latham K. Rethinking Chinese Consumption: social palliatives and the rhetorics of transition in postsocialist China. Chapter 11, pp. 217-237, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Kideckel D. The Unmaking of a Central European Working Class. Chapter 6, pp. 114-132, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Kalb D. Afterword:globalism and postsocialist prospects. Chapter 16, pp. 317-334, in Hann C. 2002 *PostSocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge.

Overing J. The Anarchy and Collectivism of the Primitive Other: Marx and Sahlins in the Amazon. Chapter 2, pp. 20-37, in Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

Potter J. Socialism and the Chinese Peasant. Chapter 10, pp. 152-168, in Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

Spencer J. Anthropology and the Politics of Socialism in Rural Sri Lanka. Chapter 7, pp. 106-122

Wright S. 'Working Class' versus 'ordinary people': contested ideas of local socialism in England. Chapter 16, pp. 249-268, in Hann C. 2005. *Socialism: ideals, ideologies and local practice*. London: Routledge.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY**
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018/19**SOAN 20830: Anthropological Theory****Semester 2, Block 1**
Credits 20

- Course Convener:** Dr. Juan M. del Nido
- Room:** 2.055 Arthur Lewis Building (shared with Andrew Irving)
- Telephone:** 68025
- Email:** juanmanuel.delnido@manchester.ac.uk
- Office Hours:** Mondays 09.00-10.00 and Tuesdays 09.00-10.00 during teaching weeks.
- Book via email in advance or turn up at the reception area on the second floor of the Arthur Lewis Building during office hours and ring through to Andrew Irving's office, which I will be using for the semester.
- Administrator:** Kellie Jordan, UG Office G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
(0161) 275 4000
kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Thursday 14.00-16.00
- Place:** **Mansfield Cooper_G.19**
- Tutorials:** allocated via Student System
- Tutors:** **Guilherme Moreira Fians** (guilherme.fians@manchester.ac.uk)
Sinead O'Sullivan (sinead.osullivan@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk)

	UNDERGRADUATE
Modes of Assessment	100% 3-hour Examination on full course (whole year)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY

FIRST BLOCK SECOND SEMESTER

Dr. Juan M. del Nido

Introduction

This block of anthropological theory is organised around the topics of Politics and the Political, Materiality, Difference, Gifts and Political Economy. Across lectures and topics we will focus on the running question, and at times intractable debates, of how anthropology could, and should, engage with, problematise and theorise from certain phenomena. Which approaches yield what? Which epistemological or even ontological assumptions are implicit and carried forward in certain theories? As was the case in both blocks of the first semester, anthropologists have often borrowed from sister disciplines to frame their answers to this question; we will revisit some key authors from other sciences that have either been incorporated in mainstream anthropology or have authored some particular work where certain theoretical struggles in anthropology are exceptionally well condensed.

As we make our way through the course you will find these topics intersect more or less obviously theoretical discussions you have already had in the first half: you will be encouraged to explore these links during class and tutorials, but neither I nor the tutors will be able to cover the breadth or nuance of this interactions: Tutorial readings are thus unsurprisingly mandatory, and a healthy dose of independent study would be strongly advised.

Week 1: Politics and the political

We will start our block by addressing explicitly a matter that students often infer on the go: what do anthropologists (and social scientists at large) mean when they say something is political, or speak of “the political”? Although comparatively seldom problematised explicitly in ethnography, the political is one of the most recurrent themes in contemporary anthropology. From the Manchester School pioneering studies into political anthropology, we will examine the transition from political anthropology to an anthropology of such a thing as “the political”, discussing Jonathan Spencer’s use of Chantal Mouffe’s notion of disagreement. We will end the lecture with a study of the post-political, or the theory that there is such a thing where disagreement exists no more.

Tutorial and Key Readings:

- Mouffe, C. 1993. *The Return of the Political*. Introduction: For an Agonistic Pluralism. pp. 1-8.
- Oosterlynck, S. and Swyngedouw, E. 2010. Noise Reduction: The Postpolitical Quandary of Night Flights at Brussels Airport. *Environment and Planning A* (42), pp.: 1577-1594.

Read Mouffe first. What is the political and why does she speak of its “return”?

As you read the other article, think about what is political about the situation in Brussels airport and why do Oosterlynck and Swyngedouw speak of a “quandary”? The tone of the article is almost sardonic – why? How are certain forms of knowledge – of governmentality, even! – embroiled in the post-political project, and

what is it they are missing? What was so intractable about an airport's location, and why would it be political?

Additional Readings:

Spencer, J. 1997. Post-Colonialism and the Political Imagination. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 3(1), pp.: 1-19

Mouffe, C. 2005. *On the Political*. London: Routledge, chapters 1 "Introduction" and 2 "Politics and the Political", pp. 1-34.

Spencer, J. 2012. Performing democracy and violence, agonism and community, politics and not politics in Sri Lanka. *Geoforum* 43, pp.: 725–731

Wilson, J., and Swyngedouw, E. (eds.) *The Post-Political and Its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wilson, J., and Swyngedouw, E. 2014. "Seeds of Dystopia: Post-Politics and the Return of the Political". In Wilson, J., and Swyngedouw, E. (eds.) *The Post-Political and Its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.: 1-22.

Fortes, M., and Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1940. *African Political Systems*. London: Humphrey Milford. Preface and introduction.

Gluckmann, M. 1958. *Analysis of a Social situation in Modern Zululand*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. Chapter 1.

Week 2: Materiality

The question of whether, how and why anthropologists should engage with matter and materials has flared up in recent years under the aegis of what is known as "the material turn". In this lecture we will examine how anthropologists have traced the philosophical emergence of matter as something separate from thought (ideas, concepts), and how they have reflected on this separation's impact on how we theorise the world around us. You have talked about matter – things, stuff, what they are and what they do - already in this course, from the angles on theories of agency, actors and networks, and later from the perspective of infrastructure. This lecture will complement those approaches by focusing on the following questions: does materiality always matter? If so, does it matter universally or differentially? Can materiality be ethnographically relevant beyond the human – non human divide yet without assigning matter any agency?

Tutorial and Key Readings:

- Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press. Read Preface: pp.: vii-xix.
- Abrahamsson, S, Bertoni, F., and Mol, A. 2015. Living with omega-3: new materialism and enduring concerns. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 33, pp.: 4–19.

Read Bennett first. You are familiar by now with discussions of agency and affect in the way she treats them. Why does she argue matter matters, what are social scientists' shortcomings when studying it and how does

she suggest we move forward?

Abrahamsson et al.'s article is quite precise in the use of language and in the claims it makes. Why do they say matter matters and how is their position different to Bennett's? How do they theorise from the particular example they examine? What happens to the (political) discussion when we claim matter is alive/has agency (equated in the text)?

Additional Readings:

Appadurai, A. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1: Introduction: commodities and the politics of value, pp.: 3-63.

Barry, A. 2013. *Material Politics: Disputes Along the Pipeline*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Braun, B. and Whatmore, S. 2010. "The Stuff of Politics: An Introduction". Political Matter. In Braun, B. and Whatmore, S. (eds.) *Technoscience, Democracy, and Public Life*, pp.: ix-xl.

Collier, S. 2011. The Intransigence of Things. In *Post-Soviet Social: neoliberalism, social modernity, biopolitics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp.:202-244.

Henare, A., et al. 2007. "Introduction". In Henare, A., Holbraad, M., and Wastell, S. (eds.) *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*. London: Routledge, pp.: 1-31.

Jansen, S. 2013. People and things in the ethnography of borders: materialising the division of Sarajevo. *Social Anthropology*, pp.: 23-37.

Miller, D. 2005. "Materiality: An Introduction". In Miller (ed.) *Materiality*. Durham: Duke University Press, ONLY Pp. 1-29.

Mitchell, T. 2002. *Rule of Experts*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Read Chapter 1: "Can the Mosquito Speak?", Pp.: 19-53.

Von Schnitzler, A. Traveling Technologies: Infrastructure, Ethical Regimes, and the Materiality of Politics in South Africa. *Cultural Anthropology*, pp.: 670-693.

Week 3: Difference

What it is that makes societies different, how different they actually are and when differences in degree turn into differences in kind are some of the oldest questions in anthropology. Beginning by examining Whorf's hypothesis that different languages encode different worldviews, we will trace how debates about how different humans were led to debates about whether we can even begin to understand these differences and then to represent them. We will discuss the ontological turn and a particularly salient contribution to the debate over how different we all really are by David Graeber (LSE).

Tutorial and Key Reading:

- Graeber, D. 2015. Radical alterity is just another way of saying “reality”. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5 (2): 1–41.

What does the title of this piece mean? Follow the structure of the argument. How is this debate in a sense a new version of Evans-Pritchard’s “witches don’t exist” faux-pas? How does Graeber argue certain forms of ontological stances are not only not radical but in fact extremely conservative? How does our epistemological (in the sense of the text, ontological!) stance preclude our capacity to understand difference, engage with it or render it in other terms? What is problematic about the premises of the ontological turn?

Additional Readings:

For a clear yet sophisticated discussion of the ontological turn, see Paolo Heywood’s entry on it for the Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Anthropology here: <http://www.anthroencyclopedia.com/entry/ontological-turn>

Carrithers, M., Candea, M., Sykes, K., Holbraad, M., & Venkatesan, S. (2010). Ontology Is Just Another Word for Culture: Motion Tabled at the 2008 Meeting of the Group for Debates in Anthropological Theory, University of Manchester. *Critique of Anthropology*, 30(2), 152–200.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1983. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*, Oxford: Oxford U. Press

Heywood, P. 2012. Anthropology and what there is: reflections on ‘ontology’. *Cambridge Anthropology* 30, pp.: 143-151.

Holbraad, M. and Pedersen, M. 2017. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Especially “Introduction: the Ontological Turn in Anthropology”, pp.: 1-29.

Levi Strauss, C. *Race and History*. Paris: UNESCO

Tambiah, S. 1990. *Magic, Science and Religion and the Scope of Rationality*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6: Rationality, Relativism, the translation and commensurability of cultures, pp.: 111-139.

Viveiros de Castro, E. 2015. “Who’s afraid of the ontological wolf: Some comments on an ongoing anthropological debate.” *Cambridge Anthropology* 33 (1): 2–17.

Whorf, B. 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality*. New York: Wiley.

Week 4: Gifts

Classical anthropologist like Mauss, Lévi-Strauss and Sahlins zoomed in on gifting practices as a way of anchoring and developing theories concerning human exchange. As we revisit the framing of these theories, the development of notions of gift itself, reciprocity, commodity and alienability and certain spin offs to the issue, we will consider how recent discussions (Carrier 1991) have sought to sophisticate our understanding of the gift and direct our anthropological efforts towards new examinations of how exchange is always somehow embedded (Granovetter 1985) in the mutual obligations we reserved for the gift.

Tutorial and Key Reading:

- Smart, A. 2013. Gifts, Bribes, and Guanxi: A Reconsideration of Bourdieu's Social Capital. *Cultural Anthropology* 8(3), pp.: 388-408.

Why does Smart argue that “The literature on gifts has a tendency toward essentialism”, and how does he challenge it? Is he successful in this challenge? To what ends is he putting in dialogue the notion of the gift with Bourdieu’s capital? What kind of theoretical work do they do individually and combined?

Additional Readings:

Carrier, J. 1991. Gifts, Commodities, and Social Relations: A Maussian View of Exchange. *Sociological Forum*, 6(1), pp. 119-136

Carrier, J. (1995) *Gifts and Commodities: Exchange and Western Capitalism Since 1700*, London, Routledge. Esp. chapters 7, 8 and conclusion.

Douglas, M. (1990) “No Free Gifts.” Foreword to Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, vii–xviii. London: Routledge.

Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91 (3), pp.: 481-510.

Laidlaw, J. (2000) “A free gift makes no friends.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6, 4: 617-634.

Levi-Strauss. 1971. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Beacon Press.

Mauss, Marcel (1925/1990) *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, London: Routledge.

Sykes, K. 2005. Arguing with Anthropology: An Introduction to Critical theories of the Gift. Chapter 1: A sceptical introduction to theories of gift exchange, pp.: 1-15.

Week 5: Political Economy

We will finish this 5-lecture block by considering one of the predominant approaches in the social sciences today – political economy. A broad umbrella seldom meticulously defined, what most of us mean when we speak of political economy stems from 19th century notions of economic life: Quesnay, Ricardo and most famously Marx. What we now call Economics broke off from this tradition, coalescing around the notions of scarcity and individual choice and their “intuitive truths” (Gregory 1982). In the 1960s, world events, a renewed interest in Marxism’s explanatory power and feminist and post-colonial currents recovered the notion of political economy. We will trace the historical development of this approach, examining the kinds of answers it provided to certain questions, its position vis-a-vis postmodern approaches and the reasons why it remains a cornerstone of critical anthropology today.

Tutorial and Key Readings:

- Roseberry, W. 1988. “Political Economy.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* (17), pp.: 161–186. **READ ONLY pages 161-173.**
- Di Leonardo, M. 1993. “What a Difference Political Economy Makes: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era”. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 66, 2(1), pp. 76-80.

- Barnard, A., and Spencer, J. 2010. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge. Entry on “Political Economy”, pp.: 552-556.

How does Di Leonardo define postmodern anthropology/ethnography and political economy? What is it she argues are the key differences between one and the other, and why does she prefer political economy? In Joan Vincent’s entry on political economy in Barnard and Spencer’s encyclopaedia and Roseberry’s article, what kinds of answers did political economy provide to what kinds of questions? Overall, what kinds of insights did anthropologists, and in particular certain feminists, find fruitful in Marxism?

Additional Readings:

Di Leonardo, M. 1991. “Introduction: Gender, Culture and Political Economy: Feminist Anthropology in Historical Perspective”. In Di Leonardo (ed.) *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 1-51.

Gregory, C. 1982. *Gifts and Commodities*. London: Academic Press. Introduction, pp.: 1-9, and Chapter 1: The competing theories, pp.: 10-28.

Ortner, S. 1984. “Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 26(1), pp. 126-166.

Ricardo, D. 1812. On The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. Available at: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/economics/ricardo/tax/index.htm>

Wallerstein, I. 1976. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Walras, L. 1954. (1874). *Elements of Pure Economics*. London: George Unwin.

Wolf, E. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY**
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**SOAN 20830: Anthropological Theory****Full Year**
Credits 20**Semester 1: Blocks 1 and 2****Course****Convener:** Dr. Soumhya Venkatesan (also **Block 1 lecturer**)**Room:** 2.063 Arthur Lewis Building**Telephone:** 53917**Email:** Soumhya.Venkatesan@manchester.ac.uk**Office Hours:** Soumhya Venkatesan: Wednesdays 16: 17:00 (weeks 1-6). Second Floor ALB

There is no need to make appointments for office hours. Just turn up and call 53917 from the internal phone on the second-floor landing

Lecturer: Prof. Stef Jansen (Block 2)**Room:** 2.056 Arthur Lewis Building**Telephone:** 5-3993**Email:** Stef.Jansen@manchester.ac.uk**Office Hours:****Teaching Weeks only** – no appointment necessary. Call 53993 from the telephone on the second floor landing.**Administrator:** Kellie Jordan, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
(0161) 275 4000
kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk**Lectures:** Thursdays 14.00-16.00**Tutors**

Sinead O' Sullivan: <mailto:sinead.osullivan@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk>

Guilherme Moriera Fians: <mailto:guilherme.fians@manchester.ac.uk>

Tutorials (all year): Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System

12:00	13:00	Monday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Guilherme Moreira Fians
13:00	14:00	Monday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Guilherme Moreira Fians
14:00	15:00	Monday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Guilherme Moreira Fians
15:00	16:00	Monday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Guilherme Moreira Fians
10:00	11:00	Thursday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Sinéad O'Sullivan
11:00	12:00	Thursday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Sinéad O'Sullivan
12:00	13:00	Thursday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Sinéad O'Sullivan
13:00	14:00	Thursday	3-6, 8-13, 21-27, 31-33	Sinead O'Sullivan

Assessment: 100% 3-hour Examination on full course (whole year)

Please read the following two information sheets in the Assessment Section on Blackboard, in connection with Coursework and Examinations:

- UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

Reading week: 29th October 2018

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY

2018-2019

Semester 1

BLOCK ONE

Dr Soumhya Venkatesan

Lecture 1	Concepts and Theories
Lecture 2	Society
Lecture 3	The individual

Lecture 4	Agency
Lecture 5	Networks and actors

LECTURE 1: CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

This lecture will focus on the following related questions:

What is 'theory'?

How do particular ways of thinking give rise to particular concepts?

How do concepts travel?

What are the limits of concepts?

Reading for class discussion. Please come to the lecture having read this paper. It is one of mine, where I try and work through an incident in my fieldwork in different ways. Don't be afraid of being critical or asking questions about it. Come to the lecture with two questions you have from the paper. Any kind of question, so long as it shows evidence of reading is fine – thus, you can ask for clarification, or you may place the article in discussion with something else you have read, or you may explore the implications of an argument contained within the paper. Remember, there are no right or wrong questions.

Venkatesan, Soumhya. 2012. Sometimes similar, sometimes dangerously different: exploring resonance, lamination and subject formation in South India. *Ethnos* 77(3): 400-424.

Key readings

Ortner, Sherry B. 1984. Theory in Anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26(1): 126-166.

Ingold T. 2007. Anthropology is *not* ethnography. The Radcliffe-Brown Lecture in Social Anthropology.

You can also see comments on this lecture on the following websites:
savageminds.org/2009/05/20/sideways-glance/ (*Savageminds blogspot*) and
<http://www.adambohannon.org/notes/?p=40>

Tutorial reading and task

For this first tutorial, I am asking you to read the same paper that we discussed in the first lecture.

Venkatesan, Soumhya. 2012. Sometimes similar, sometimes dangerously different: exploring resonance, lamination and subject formation in South India. *Ethnos* 77(3): 400-424.

Please focus on the following questions, and on the lecture as you read:

1. What is the 'puzzle' at the heart of this paper?
2. How does the author try and understand the ways in which Hindu-Muslim relations play out in this place?
3. Which framing do you think works best – hegemony, harmony or resonance to explain what is going on here?
4. Is it better to think in terms of 'intentionality' or 'aboutness' when analysing interactions that are quick and responsive?

Reading with these questions in mind will help you see the particular theoretical directions this paper takes and give you a sense of why it does so. It also will help you

see that there are potentially different ways of understanding ethnographic material and that some work better than others. This in turn will give you a grounded way of thinking through the questions posed for the lecture as a whole.

Supplementary readings (starred readings are particularly recommended)

Do please dip into one or more of the following to get a fuller sense of how people have thought about anthropological theorizing/theory in anthropology

*Ingold.T. 1996. General Introduction. In *Key debates in Anthropology*. Routledge: London. Pages: 1-12 (B).

*Gell, A. 1999. *Art and agency: an anthropological theory*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 1.

Gellner, E. 2003. Concepts and society. In *Ernest Gellner: selected philosophical themes*, vol. 1, E. Gellner. Routledge. 18-46.

Rumsey. A. 2004. Ethnographic Macro-Tropes and Anthropological Theory. *Anthropological Theory* 2004 4: 267. The online version of this article can be found at: <http://ant.sagepub.com/content/4/3/267>

*Moore. H and Sanders. T. 2006. Anthropology and Epistemology. In Moore. H and Sanders. T (eds.) *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*. Blackwell: Oxford. Pages 1-22 (B).

*Ellen. R. 2010. Theories in anthropology and 'anthropological theory'. In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (NS) 16: 387-404. (JSTOR)

LECTURE 2: SOCIETY

What exactly do we mean when we use the term 'society'? Are we simply referring to a bunch of people? Do they have to share some norms and values? How are these internalised and enforced? How do people become part of a society? Is there really such a thing as society over and above the people who are seen to form it? Is it helpful to talk about society?

Key readings

Emile Durkheim, 1982 [1938]. Chap 5. Rules for the explanation of social facts. In *The Rules of Sociological Method* (ed. Steven Lukes; trans W. D. Halls). Free Press: New York. The entire book is available online at <http://comparsociology.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Emile-Durkheim-Rules-of-Sociological-Method-1982.pdf>

Ingold. T (Ed.) *Key debates in Anthropology*. Routledge: London. [The 1989 GDAT debate. The concept of society is theoretically obsolete.](#)

Overview reading

Rapport. N and Overing. J (Eds). 2000. Society. In *Social and Cultural Anthropology: the key concepts*. Routledge. [The entire book is available online: <https://chairflogficphiloscult.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/social-and-cultural-anthropology.pdf>]

Reading for classroom discussion. Read the paper below before the lecture and come prepared to discuss your reading of it. You will be asked to leave if you do not have a very good reason for not having done the reading.

[Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1940. 'On Joking Relationships'. *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 13\(3\), 195-210. \(Library e-journals\)](#)

Tutorial task

Read the paper below before the tutorial and come prepared to discuss it. As you read the paper, think through the following questions:

1. What is the social problem that requires managing in Sykes's paper?
2. What is the key difference in the social setting between Sykes's paper and Radcliffe-Brown's?
3. Sykes has applied R-B's model of 'Joking Relations'. Does it work?
4. What might be the problems with Sykes's paper?
5. What other factors might you want to consider when thinking through Sykes's paper?

Sykes, A.J.M. 1966. 'Joking Relationships in an Industrial Setting'. *American Anthropologist*, 68(1), 188-193. (JSTOR)

Supplementary readings (starred ones are particularly recommended)

Spickard, James V. 1989. A Guide to Mary Douglas's Three Versions of Grid/Group Theory *Sociological Analysis* Vol. 50, No. 2, Thematic Issue: A Durkheimian Miscellany (Summer, 1989), pp. 151-170. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3710986>

Tonnies, F. 2002. *Community and Society*. Read especially the Introduction by Loomis C.P and MicKinney J. C. PP 1-31. The introduction and selected chapters are available on google books:

*Alan Macfarlane. 'Emile Durkheim and the Riddle of the Modern World' in http://www.alanmacfarlane.com/contents_web.html

* S. N. Eisenstadt. 1961. Anthropological Studies of Complex Societies. In *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (Jun., 1961), pp. 201-222. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2739628>

Evens, T. M. S. 1982. Two Concepts of 'Society as a Moral System': Evans-Pritchard's Heterodoxy. In *Man*, New Series, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Jun., 1982), pp. 205-218. (JSTOR)

*Wolf, Eric R. 1988. Inventing Society. In *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Nov., 1988), pp. 752-761. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/645518>. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2801809>

Kuper, Adam (Ed.). 1992. *Conceptualising Society*. Routledge.

Godelier, Maurice. 2010. Community, Society, Culture: Three Keys to Understanding Today's Conflicted Identities. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Mar., 2010), pp. 1-11. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40541801>

*Mary Douglas.

1970 and 1973. *Natural Symbols: explorations in cosmology*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Chapter 4. Grid and Group. (B)

(ed.).1982. *Essays in the Sociology of Perception*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Introduction to Grid/Group analysis. (B)

LECTURE 3: THE INDIVIDUAL

For Dumont, while the individual is an empirical fact (i.e. there is no denying that we have bounded individual bodies and some sense of self), individualism or the consciousness of oneself as an 'individual' with individual desires, needs and drives which demand recognition is a historical product of a particular way of thinking. That is to say, we must not look for individuals in this sense everywhere. Can we agree?

Key readings

Dumont, Louis. 1970. *Religion, Politics, and Society in the Individualistic Universe*. *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 1970 (1970), pp. 31-41. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3031738>

Miller, Daniel. 2009. Individuals and the Aesthetic of Order. In Miller (ed.) *Anthropology and Individuals*. Berg. Miller's chapter is available online at <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/anthropology/people/academic-teaching-staff/daniel-miller/mil-30>

The entire book if you want to carry on with it is available at https://archive.org/stream/DanielMillerAnthropologyAndTheIndividualBerg2009/Daniel%20Miller-Anthropology%20and%20the%20individual%20Berg%20%282009%29_djvu.txt

Overview reading, but with a particular slant

Rapport, N and Overing, J (Eds). 2000. Individualism; Individuality. In *Social and Cultural Anthropology: the key concepts*. Routledge. [The entire book is available online]

Reading for classroom discussion. You will be asked to leave if you have not read this before the session.

Rapport, N. 2004. Envisioned, Intentioned: A Painter Informs an Anthropologist about Social Relations. In *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 10, No. 4: 861-881.

As you read try and think through

1. To what extent it is feasible in anthropology to focus so much on one individual and his world-making.
2. Can one individual inform social theory to the extent that Rapport argues is possible?

NB: this paper really divides people with some loving it and some hating it. Whatever your reaction, do read it and try and work out whether or not you agree with Rapport's position.

Tutorial task

Read the following paper and come to the tutorial prepared to discuss it.

Venkatesan, Soumhya. 2014. Talk and practice: ethics and an individual in contemporary south India. *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 32(2): 26-41.

As you read,

1. Try and think through how the individual appears in this paper.
2. How does this approach differ from Rapport's in the paper you read for classroom discussion, and also from the lecture's key readings?
3. In what ways does the individual in this paper serve as a window into wider society?
4. Can an individual make a difference to social norms and practices? [this question will come up in the next session on agency.]

Supplementary readings (starred ones are particularly recommended)

Alan Macfarlane. 1992. On individualism. The Radcliffe Brown lecture. Available on http://www.alanmacfarlane.com/contents_web.html

*Douglas, Mary. nd. A History of grid and group cultural theory. Lecture: Introduction: what is grid and group cultural theory? How can it be useful in the modern world? <http://projects.chass.utoronto.ca/semiotics/cyber/douglas1.pdf>

Cole, Sally. 2002. "Mrs. Landes Meet Mrs. Benedict": Culture Pattern and Individual Agency in the 1930s. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 104, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 533-543. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/684003>

*Marriott. M. 1989. Constructing an Indian Ethnosociology. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 23: 1-40. <http://cis.sagepub.com/content/23/1/1>

Paul, Robert A. 1987. The Individual and Society in Biological and Cultural Anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Biological and Cultural Anthropology at Emory University (Feb., 1987), pp. 80-93. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656397>

*Harris, Grace Gredys. 1989. Concepts of Individual, Self, and Person in Description and Analysis. *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 91, No. 3 (Sep., 1989), pp. 599-612. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/680868>

Moeran, Brian. 1984. Individual, Group and Seishin: Japan's Internal Cultural Debate. *Man*, New Series, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Jun., 1984), pp. 252-266. Article DOI: 10.2307/2802280. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2802280>

Raeff, Catherine. 2006. Individuals in Relation to Others: Independence and Interdependence in a Kindergarten Classroom. In *Ethos*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Dec., 2006), pp. 521-557. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4129780> [those of you doing the anthropology of childhood and learning may find this interesting]

Hess, Sabine. 2006. Strathern's Melanesian 'Dividual' and the Christian 'Individual': A Perspective from Vanua Lava, Vanuatu. *Oceania*, Vol. 76, No. 3, Marijuana in Papua New Guinea (Nov., 2006), pp. 285-296. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40332038>

Tsuji, Yohko. 2006. Mortuary Rituals in Japan: The Hegemony of Tradition and the Motivations of Individuals. *Ethos*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Sep., 2006), pp. 391-431. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3806505>

LECTURE 4: AGENCY

In this lecture, we will discuss a key and yet problematic concept in anthropology – agency. In simple terms, social agency can be understood as action that makes a social difference within a particular social or structural context. Such action may be accepting of the constraints/limits imposed on it; it may seek to work with the constraints to generate new kinds of possibilities; it may be a form of resistance to such constraints (in such cases, especially where society is seen to be oppressive of the individual, it is often romanticised). As social agency seeks to understand how individuals or groups (social agents) act within and beyond social and structural possibilities, it mediates between models that overly emphasise either society or the individual. Some people such as Gell (1999) even argue that under certain conditions things can and should be seen as social agents. The concept of agency has a long history and many definitions. We will consider some of these and see how we can work with them.

Key readings

Giddens, A. 1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: action, structure and contradiction in social analysis. University of California Press. Chapter 2. Agency, Structure.

Ortner, Sherry. 2006. Chapter 6. Power and Projects: Reflections on Agency. In *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power and the Acting Subject*. Duke University Press. PP 129-154.

Overview reading

Rapport, N and Overing, J (Eds). 2000. Agent and Agency. In *Social and Cultural Anthropology: the key concepts*. Routledge. [The entire book is available online]

Class discussion:

Please come having read one of the two papers below. As ever, if you have not read one, unless you have a very good reason, you will be asked to leave.

Gershon, Ilana. 2011. Neoliberal Agency. *Current Anthropology* 52 (4): 537-555 (JSTOR)

OR

Mahmood, S. 2001. Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival," *Cultural Anthropology* 6(2): 202-236

As you read, please think through the following questions:

Gershon:

1. Is Gershon's focus on the neo-liberal individual as a project convincing?
2. What kind of person emerges within this account?
3. Neo-liberalism eschews the notion of society. Is this constraining or liberating for individuals? Can you place this in conversation with Durkheim's ideas?

Mahmood:

1. Mahmood criticises liberal notions of agency that emphasise resistance. Why does she do so?
2. Does placing yourself willingly within constraints constitute agency?
3. Can you explain Mahmood's notion of 'docile agency'?
4. Is all agentic action docile to some extent?

Tutorial task:

Read the following paper and come prepared to discuss it.

Venkatesan, Soumhya. 2009. Rethinking Agency: Persons and things in the heterotopia of 'traditional Indian craft'. *JRAI* 15 (1): 78-95 (JSTOR)

As you read, keep the following questions in mind.

1. Is agency or the ability to do things in the social world self-generated and willed, permitted by existing structures or a combination of the two things?
2. Does it have to be intentional, i.e. do social agents have to decide in advance what they intend to do? Or, is it better to think of them as drawing on rules and resources (in a Giddensian vein) and hoping that actions will have desirable consequences.
3. Does this paper enable you to draw a distinction between person and individual?
4. If agency is the ability to influence the social milieu, does it make sense to say that things have agency?
5. Is all agentic action docile to some extent? (Think back to the Saba Mahmood paper if you have read it)

Supplementary readings (starred ones are particularly recommended)

Some general readings on agency

- *Karp, I. 1996. Agency and Social Theory: A review of Anthony Giddens. *American Ethnologist* 13 (1): 131-137 (JSTOR)
- *Ahearn. L. M. 2001. Language and Agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 109-137. (JSTOR)
- Demmer, Ulrich. 2015. 'Agent Plus' and 'Practical Reasoner': A Comparative Study of the Ethical Person. *Ethnos*, 80(1): 91-116
- Davies. B. 1991. The concept of agency: A feminist poststructuralist analysis . *Social Analysis* 30: 42-53. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23164525> (JSTOR)
- *Loyal, S and Barnes, B. 2001. "Agency as a red herring in social theory". *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 31(4) 507-524.
- Kockelman. P. 2007. Agency: The relation between meaning, power and knowledge. *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (June 2007), pp. 375-401. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/512998>
- Khan. Aisha. 2007. Good to Think? Creolization, Optimism, and Agency. *Current Anthropology* 48 (5): 653-673 Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/522318> (JSTOR)
- Julia Cassaniti. 2012. Agency and the other: the role of agency for the importance of belief in Buddhist and Christian traditions. *Ethos* 40(3): 297-316 (JSTOR)

Emancipatory agency (including agency and resistance

- DeGelder, Mieke. 2012. "Ways of Dying: AIDS Care and Agency in Contemporary Urban South Africa." *Ethnography*, vol. 13, no. 2: 189–212. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43496444.
- Durrenberger, E. Paul, and Suzan Erem. "The Dance of Power: Ritual and Agency among Unionized American Health Care Workers." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 99, no. 3, 1997, pp. 489–495. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/681736.
- Kaye, Kerwin. "Rehabilitating the 'Drugs Lifestyle': Criminal Justice, Social Control, and the Cultivation of Agency." *Ethnography*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2013, pp. 207–232. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24431709.
- Lopez, Iris. "Agency And Constraint: Sterilization And Reproductive Freedom Among Puerto Rican Women In New York City." *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, vol. 22, no. 3/4, 1993, pp. 299–323. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40553252.

The agency of things:

- Gell, A. 1999. *Art and agency: an anthropological theory*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 2.
- Daniels, Inge Maria. "Scooping, Raking, Beckoning Luck: Luck, Agency and the Interdependence of People and Things in Japan." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2003, pp. 619–638. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3134703.

LECTURE 5: NETWORKS AND ACTORS

Can we dispense with the concept of agency altogether, instead focusing on action and asking when and how action that makes a positive or negative difference to the social world takes place? Would thinking about 'actors' rather

than 'agents' make a difference to our understandings of who and what can act socially?

Key readings

Law, J. 1999. Traduction/Trahison: Notes on ANT

Mol, Annemarie. 2010. Actor-Network Theory: sensitive terms and enduring tensions. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Sonderheft, 50*, 253-269. (Available on A. Mol's website). Read from the sub-heading *Actor*.

Class discussion

Read the following paper and come prepared to discuss it. As ever, you will be asked to leave if you have not read the paper and do not have a good reason.

Jansen, Stef. 2013. **People and things in the ethnography of borders: materialising the division of Sarajevo.** *Social Anthropology*

As you read, think through Jansen's distinction between people-centred anthropology and thingist anthropology. If the word agency were replaced with action, would it make a difference to his analysis?

Tutorial task: Read and discuss the following paper

Laidlaw, James. 2010. Agency and Responsibility: Perhaps You Can Have Too Much of a Good Thing. In *Ordinary Ethics: Anthropology, Language, and Action*. Edited by Michael Lambek. New York: Fordham University Press: 143-64.

The following will help orient your reading:

1. What is Laidlaw's problem with the concept of agency?
2. How does he critique both the concept of agency and the actor of actor network theory?
3. In what way does the concept of responsibility inflect his discussion of agency and of action?

Supplementary readings (starred ones are particularly recommended)

*Latour, B and Johnson, J. 1988. (35) Mixing Humans with Non-Humans: Sociology of a Door-Closer In *Social Problems* (special issue on sociology of science, edited by Leigh Star) 35: 298-310. (<http://www.bruno-latour.fr/node/279>)

Callon, Michel. 1986. The sociology of an actor-network: the case of the electric vehicle. In *Mapping the dynamics of science & technology* (Eds.). Michel Callon, John Law, Arie Rip, 19-34. London: McMillan.

*Latour, B. 1993. *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. [Trans. Catherine Porter].

*Strathern. M. 1996. Cutting the network. In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 2(3): 517-535. (J)

E. Yates-Doerr & A. Mol. 2012. Cuts of meat: disentangling Western natures-cultures. *Cambridge Anthropology*, 30(2), 48-64. (JSTOR)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY

2018-2019

Semester 1

BLOCK TWO

Prof. Stef Jansen

This block focuses on arguments in anthropology surrounding a set of core concepts. Although much of the common meaning of these concepts originates from outside the discipline, they are used very extensively in anthropology. Yet it is not always exactly clear how we are supposed to understand this use and this block will start from this simple question: 'What do anthropologists actually mean when they say 'X'?' Yet of course we do not remain on this 'nominal' level: rather than focussing on the words themselves, the next and more important question is: what work do these concepts *do*? How do they contribute to anthropological theorisation? How are they used as analytical tools? Which emphases do they entail? What kind of questions do they guide us towards? What kind of answers do they yield? Predominantly based on theoretical writings, we disentangle the sometimes contradictory ways in which these concepts are understood and the ways in which they are deployed in anthropological analysis.

IMPORTANT. Preparatory tasks: In preparation for every session of this block, all students must prepare at least 1 question to ask in class about every key reading for that week. So, come to class with a piece of paper on which you have written down 2 questions, one for each key reading. You may ask for clarification of a particular point made by the author, or about the relationship between her/his arguments and those of other authors, or about the implications of certain arguments, or... Anything goes as long as the questions show clear evidence of reading. Therefore, questions must specifically refer to particular passages in the texts, with page numbers. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' questions; and this not a competition between 'smart' questions and 'stupid' questions. Evidence of serious reading does not require that you have understood everything perfectly—in that case there wouldn't be anything left to learn. [Serious reading for the weekly sessions also sets you well on your way for the assessment too. For the final essay you will need to show (page-specific, referenced) evidence of close engagement with core readings as well as additional readings from the list for the relevant topics.]

If you have not done your readings and/or prepared questions, you won't be able to follow the lecture and you won't have anything to contribute to the discussion. So you'll be asked to leave.

Finally, a message to those of you who feel impeded by shyness and/or intimidated by others who seem more articulate: please always remember that lecturers (and tutors) can ONLY try to clarify things for you if you ask for it. Silence cannot lead to feedback. Silence, for whatever reason, just means that we can't do our jobs properly. And that you miss out. And not just you: remember that asking questions is not just a matter of narrow self-interest. In the sessions everyone's questions will serve as a basis for discussion and clarification, which means your questions will also help other students and vice versa.

Note on drop-in hours. Use them. If you want feedback on your ongoing work for this module, this is where you should come and get it. They are *drop-in* hours: there is no need to make appointments. Just turn up in Room 2.056, Arthur Lewis Building. If the glass doors are closed, call me from the phone on the second-floor landing (+53993) and I will open them for you.

1) QUESTIONS OF PATTERNS: STRUCTURE

This session addresses anthropological attempts to detect patterns in human behaviour and social organisation, and to formulate generalisations on the basis of those patterns. We do this by taking on a key concept in classical anthropology that is still widely used by a variety of authors as well as in non-academic parlance: structure. We will unravel the different uses to which the concept 'structure' has been put in anthropological writings, aiming to create clarity where there is often considerable confusion. In particular we will focus on two uses of the term 'structure' and explore their implications for anthropological studies: structural-functionalism as inspired by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown (which foregrounds social structure as a patterned set of social relations between individuals) and structuralism as inspired by Claude Lévi-Strauss (which foregrounds cognitive structure as a patterned set of classifications enacted by people). Finally, we will address Marxist efforts to theorise structural patterns in human behaviour and social organisation by shifting the emphasis to historical development of modes of production and economic relations of inequality.

key readings

- Glucksmann M. 1974. *Structuralist analysis in contemporary social thought: a comparison of the theories of Claude Lévi-Strauss and Louis Althusser*. London: Routledge. [pp. [Glucksmann 17-23](#), [Glucksmann 31-40](#)]
- Wolf E. 1981. '[The mills of inequality: a Marxian approach](#)' Berreman G. (ed) *Social inequality: comparative and developmental approaches*. New York: Academic Press. 41-57.

additional readings

- Fortes M. (ed) 1949. *Social structure: studies presented to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fortes M. 1970. *Time and social structure, and other essays*. London: Athlone.
- Kronenfeld D. & Decker H.W. 'Structuralism' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8, 503-541.
- Kuper A. 1996. *Anthropology and anthropologists: the modern British School*. London: Routledge. [parts about Radcliffe-Brown's structural functionalism and Lévi-Strauss's structuralism]
- Lévi-Strauss C. 1963 (1958). *Structural Anthropology (transl. C Jacobson and B Grundfest Schöpfung)*. London: Allen Lane.
- Lévi-Strauss C. 1969 (1949). *The Elementary Structures of Kinship (transl. J.H. Bell, J.R. von Sturmer, & R Needham)*. London: Eyre & Spottiswood.
- Moberg M. 2013. *Engaging anthropological theory: a social and political history*. London: Routledge. 178-200, 266-272.
- Nugent S. 2007. 'Some reflections on anthropological structural Marxism' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13:2, 419-431.
- O'Laughlin B. 1975. 'Marxist Approaches in Anthropology' *Annual Review Anthropology* 4, 341-370.
- Radcliffe-Brown A.R. 1940. 'On social structure' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 70:1, 2-12.
- Roseberry W. 1988. 'Political economy' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17, 161-186.

some questions for tutorial discussion

* What are the similarities and differences between the uses of 'social structure' in structural-functionalism, 'structure' in structuralism and 'modes of production' in Marxism? What kind of emphasis do each of them result in? For the exploration of what kind of research questions are they useful analytical tools?

* Link-up question: are the questions addressed by these uses of 'structure' the same as questions addressed under the rubric of 'society' (Block 1)? How do they relate to each other?

2) QUESTIONS OF REPRODUCTION: HABITUS

This session looks at the work of Pierre Bourdieu, who started off as a more-or-less structuralist anthropologist doing ethnographic fieldwork in Algeria, but became better known as a sociologist who researched French society and who developed a distinct framework of social theory. Rejecting the distinction between sociology and anthropology, and proposing concepts such as 'habitus', 'field', 'social and cultural capital', and many others, Bourdieu hoped to build a practice-oriented social theory that would overcome the dilemma between a more socially determinist ('objectivist') or a more individually voluntarist ('subjectivist') model of social action. We will explore how well he succeeded in this ambition and we will pay special attention to the opportunities and problems this opens up for ethnographic research.

key readings

- Brubaker R. 1985. 'Rethinking classical theory: the sociological vision of Pierre Bourdieu' *Theory and Society* 14:6, 745-775.
- King A. 2000. 'Thinking with Bourdieu against Bourdieu: a "practical" critique of the habitus' *Sociological Theory* 18:3, 417-433.

additional readings

- Bidet J. & Bailey A. 1979. 'Questions to Pierre Bourdieu' *Critique of Anthropology* 4, 203-208.
- Bourdieu P. 1981. 'Men and machines' In: Knorr-Cetina K. & Cicourel A.V. (eds) *Advances in social theory and methodology*. London: Routledge. 304-317.
- Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge UP. [Chapter 2]
- Bourdieu P. 1985. 'The social space and the genesis of groups' *Theory & Society* 14:6, 723-744.
- Bourdieu P. 1989. 'Social space and symbolic power' *Sociological Theory* 7, 14-25.
- Bourdieu P. 2002. 'Habitus' In: Hillier J. & Rooksby E. *Habitus: a sense of place*. Aldershot: Ashgate. 43-52.
- Bourdieu P. 2003. 'Participant Objectivation' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9:2, 281-294.
- Bourdieu P. & Lamaison P. 1986. 'From rules to strategies: an interview with Pierre Bourdieu' *Cultural Anthropology* 1:1, 110-120.
- Dumont L. & Evens T.M.S. 1999. 'Bourdieu and the logic of practice: is all giving Indian-giving or is "generalized materialism" not enough?' *Sociological Theory* 17:1, 3-31.
- Jenkins R. 1982. 'Pierre Bourdieu and the reproduction of determinism' *Sociology* 16:2, 270-281.
- Jenkins R. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge. [Chapter 4]
- Mudimbe V.Y. 1993. 'Review: reading and teaching Pierre Bourdieu' *Transition* 61, 144-160.
- Sulkunen P. 1982. 'Society made visible – the cultural sociology of Pierre Bourdieu' *Acta Sociologica* 25:2, 103-115.
- Swartz D. 1977. 'Pierre Bourdieu: the cultural transmission of social inequality' *Harvard Educational Review* 47:4, 545-554.
- Swartz D. 1997. *Culture and power: the sociology of P Bourdieu*. Chicago: Chicago UP. [Chapter 5].
- Wacquant L. 1989. 'Towards a reflexive sociology: a workshop with Pierre Bourdieu' *Sociological Theory* 7:1, 26-63. [esp. 38-45] or longer version: Bourdieu P. & Wacquant L. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity. [esp. 115-140]

some questions for tutorial discussion

* According to Bourdieu, in what ways does the 'habitus' concept help us avoid both objectivism and subjectivism in explaining human phenomena, i.e. to bridge the structure/agency dichotomy? Which criticisms have been raised of this approach? On balance, what do you think the value of Bourdieu's approach is?

* For the exploration of what kind of research questions is a Bourdieusian conceptual framework, with 'habitus' at its heart, most useful? What do we miss and what do we gain with it?

* Link-up question: how does the way in which Bourdieu addresses the structure/agency dichotomy diverge from actor-network theory's approach to it?

3) QUESTIONS OF POWER / KNOWLEDGE

This session aims to introduce some key insights by Michel Foucault, whose work has been extremely influential in our discipline for decades now. We will explore some of Foucault's central contributions on the relation between power and knowledge, through concepts such as governmentality, discipline and biopolitics. In particular we will critically discuss the productive avenues opened up by his early anti-humanist approach (his proposal to *not* start from human beings as intentional subjects in our analysis) and his related critical stance towards the knowledge pretensions of the Enlightenment. We will explore where this leaves ethnographers in terms of theorising human subjectivity and action.

key readings

Foucault M. 2006 (1978) '[Governmentality \(Lecture at the Collège de France, transl. R Braidotti, C Gordon\)](#)' In: Sharma A. & Gupta A. (eds) *The anthropology of the state: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell. 130-143. [first English translation in Burchell G., Gordon C. & Miller P. (eds) 1991. *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. 73-86.]

Inda J.X. 2005. 'Analytics of the modern: an introduction' In: Inda J.X. (ed) *Anthropologies of modernity: Foucault, governmentality and life politics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1-20.

additional readings

interviews with Foucault on power

1980. 'The eye of power (Interview with Barou and Perrot)' and 'Truth and Power (Interview with Fontana & Pasquino)' In: Gordon C. (ed) *Power/Knowledge*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. 109-133 and 146-165.

1988. 'On power (Interview with Boncenne)' and 'Power and sex (Interview with Lévy)' In: Kritzman L.D. (ed) *Michel Foucault. Politics, philosophy and culture: interviews and other writings 1977-1984*. London: Routledge. 96-109 and 110-124.

1979. 'Truth and power: an interview with Michel Foucault' *Critique of Anthropology* 4, 131-137.

general on Foucault and power

Abélès M. 2008. 'Foucault and political anthropology' *International Social Science Journal* 59:191, 59-68.

Clegg S.R. 1989. *Frameworks of power*. London: Sage. Chpt 7.

Foucault M. 1990 (1976). *The history of sexuality: volume 1, introduction (transl. R Hurley)*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault M. 1977 (1975). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison (transl. A Sheridan)*. London: Allan Lane.

- Foucault M. 1982. 'Afterword: the subject and power' In: Dreyfus H.L. & Rabinow P. *Michel Foucault: beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Brighton: Harvester. 208-226.
- Horrocks C., Jevtic Z. & Appignanesi R. (eds) 1997. *Introducing Foucault*. Cambridge: Icon Books.
- McHoul A. & Grace W. 1993. *A Foucault primer: discourse, power and the subject*. London: UCL Press. [esp. 57-90]
- McNay L. 1994. *Foucault: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity. 91-131.
- Merquior J.G. 1991. *Foucault*. London: Fontana. 85-118.
- Miller P. 1987. *Domination and power*. London: Routledge. [Chapter 7]
- Patton P. 1998. 'Foucault's subject of power' In: Moss J. (ed) *The later Foucault: politics and philosophy*. London: Sage.
- Rouse J. 1994. 'Power/Knowledge' In: Gutting G. (ed) *Cambridge Companion to Michel Foucault*. Cambridge UP. 92-114.
- Sheridan A. 1980. *Michel Foucault: the will to truth*. London: Tavistock. [esp. 135-163]
- Simons J. 1995. *Foucault and the political*. London: Routledge. [Chapter 7]
- Smart B. 1985. *Michel Foucault*. Chichester: Ellis Horwood. [Chpt 3 and 132-136]

some questions for tutorial discussion

- * According to Foucault, how are power and knowledge inextricably related to each other?
- * What does it mean to say that 'government' is the 'conduct of conduct'?
- * What, if any, is the place of individual human agency in the conceptual framework of (the early) Foucault?
- * For the exploration of what kind of research questions is this (early) Foucaultian conceptual framework most useful? What do we miss and what do we gain with it?
- * Link-up question: how does (early) Foucaultian conceptualisation of agency compare to any of the ones dealt with in Block 1?

4) QUESTIONS OF INFRASTRUCTURE

This session addresses the possible contributions of the study of infrastructures to anthropology. Think for example of utility infrastructures—grids of pipes, wires, roads and rails without which infrastructure of contemporary life would be unthinkable. Yet despite, or perhaps precisely because of, their centrality to the organisation, the government and the unfolding of our everyday routines, such infrastructures often remain invisible. As long as they function more or less according to plan, they tend to be taken for granted both in our everyday lives themselves and in many scholarly studies. It is here that a relatively new domain of research seeks to intervene, focusing precisely on such infrastructures and laying bare their role in the making of contemporary lives. What kind of insights can such work offer? What kind of emphasis does it entail and what gets occluded in turn?

key readings

- Star S.L. 1999. 'The ethnography of infrastructure' *American Behavioral Scientist* 43:3, 377-391.
- Larkin B. 2013. 'The politics and poetics of infrastructure' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42, 327-343.

additional readings

- Cultural Anthropology* 2012 Curated Collection on Infrastructure, edited by Lockrem J. & Lugo A.
http://production.culanth.org/curated_collections/11-infrastructure

- Dourish P. & Bell G. 2007. 'The infrastructure of experience and the experience of infrastructure: meaning and structure in everyday encounters with space' *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 34:3, 414-430.
- Edwards P.N. (2003) 'Infrastructure and modernity: force, time and social organization in the history of sociotechnical systems' In: Misa T.J., Brey P. & Feenberg A. (eds) *The History of Sociotechnical Systems: Modernity and Technology*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 185-226.
- Edwards P.N, Bowker G.C., Jackson S.J. & Williams R. 2009. 'Introduction: an agenda for infrastructure studies' *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 10:5, 364-374.
- Harvey P., Bruun Jensen C. & Morita A. 2017. 'Infrastructural complications' In: Harvey P., Bruun Jensen C. & Morita A. (eds) *Infrastructures and social complexity: a companion*. London: Routledge. 1-22.
- Harvey P. & Knox H. 2012. 'The enchantments of infrastructure' *Mobilities* 7:4, 521-536.
- Lampland M. & Star S.L. 2009. *Standards and their stories: how quantifying, classifying and formalizing practices shape every life*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.

some questions for tutorial discussion

- * What is the contribution of a focus on infrastructure to our understanding of contemporary societal dynamics? How can alertness to breakdown and failure help in this?
- * What kind of emphasis does such a focus on infrastructure entail and what do we miss out on as a result?
- * Link-up question: what are the potential convergences of a focus on infrastructure with Foucault's approach? And with actor-network theory (Block 1)?

5) QUESTIONS OF AFFECT

This session addresses relatively recent calls in anthropology to pay more attention to affective dimensions of human life. The term 'affect' is most often used here as referring to something different from emotion: less individual, less subjective, less signifiable in language, less graspable in conventional terms of anthropological analysis. Something like and atmosphere, a 'vibe'. While many will agree that it is crucial to the ways in which humans live, affect has not always attracted anthropological attention as much as it may deserve. In this session we will look at far-going calls for an 'affective turn' that encourage anthropologists to embrace the potential of a focus on affect to develop new ways of perceiving, thinking and writing. Then we will explore how other anthropologists have addressed affect in terms that are more in line with pre-existing anthropological approaches. Again we trace what kind of insights these approaches can offer? What kind of emphasis does a focus on affect entail and what gets occluded in turn?

key readings

- Stewart K. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. Durham: Duke University Press. pp.1-7 plus a random selection of the very short entries from other pages. [e-book accessible through library catalogue]
- Navaro-Yashin Y. 2009. 'Affective spaces, melancholic objects: ruination and the production of anthropological knowledge' *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute* 15:1, 1-18.

additional readings

- Blackman I. & Venn C. 2010. 'Affect' *Body & Society* 16:1, 7-28.

- Clough P.T. & Halley J. (eds) 2007. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fontein J. 2011. 'Graves, ruins, and belonging: towards anthropology of proximity' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17:4, 706–727.
- Hemmings C. 2005. 'Invoking affect: cultural theory and the ontological turn' *Cultural Studies* 19:5, 548-567.
- Irni S. 2013. 'The politics of materiality: affective encounters in a transdisciplinary debate' *European Journal of Women's Studies* 20:4, 347-360.
- Jansen S. 2016. 'Ethnography and the choices posed by the "affective turn"' In: Povrzanović Frykman M. & Frykman J. (eds) *Sensitive objects: affects and material culture*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. 55-77.
- Leys R. 2011. 'The turn to affect: a critique' *Critical Inquiry* 37:3, 434-472.
- Massumi B. 1995. 'The autonomy of affect' *Cultural Critique* 31, 83-109.
- Muehlebach A. & Shoshan N. 2012. 'Introduction: post-Fordist affect' *Anthropological Quarterly* 85:2, 317-343.
- Navaro-Yashin Y. 2009. 'Affective spaces, melancholic objects: ruination and the production of anthropological knowledge' *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute* 15:1, 1-18.
- Reeves M. 2011. 'Fixing the border: on the affective life of the state in southern Kyrgyzstan' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29:5, 905-923.
- Seigworth G.J. & Gregg M. 2010. 'An inventory of shimmers' In: Gregg M. & Seigworth G.J. (eds.) *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press. 1-25.
- Shouse E. 2005. Feeling, emotion, affect. *M/C Journal* 8 [<http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0512/03-shouse.php>].
- Thrift N. 2004. 'Intensities of feeling: towards a spatial politics of affect' *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* 86:1, 57–78.

some questions for tutorial discussion

- * What is 'affect' and in what ways is it different from emotion?
- * How can affect be studied by anthropologists?
- * Link-up question: what are the potential convergences of a focus on affect with actor-network theory (Block 1)?

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES - SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19

SOAN20842: The Ethnographer's Craft
Semester TWO (20 credits)

Lecturers	Dr Katherine Smith and Skyler Hawkins
Office	2.053 Arthur Lewis
Telephone	0161 275 3996 (Internal 53996)
Email	Katherine.smith-3@manchester.ac.uk Skyler.hawkins@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours	Tuesdays 11-12 and Wednesdays 11-12

Administrator: Kellie Jordan - 01612754000

(Kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk)

Lectures: Tuesdays 10:00 – 12:00

Venue: Mansfield Cooper – G.19

Venues can be subject to change so you should check your weekly timetable on MyManchester for the most up-to-date information.

Modes of Assessment:

1 x Oral Presentation – 20%

**1 x Portfolio – includes 5 x 250 word weekly tasks 25% (collectively)
and
1 x 3000 word essay 55%**

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF ASSESSED WORK:

Deadline for final essay is 2.00 pm (UK time)

1. Oral Presentation – These will be scheduled in class over two weeks.
(20%)

2. Portfolio – Monday 13th May 2019, by 2pm (80% in total)

WORD LIMITS FOR ASSESSED WORK:

All pieces of assessed work are subject to prescribed word limits. Students exceeding the maximum word limits on assessed work will be penalised. There is no formal minimum word limit, but students should consider whether essays that fall substantially below the maximum have adequately covered the topic. An automated word-count must be printed on each piece of assessed work – failure to do this will result in an automatic deduction of 2%.

Please note that the word-count that appears on Blackboard is the word-count for the whole piece of work and does not discriminate between the body text and bibliography, etc. **Actual word limits include the body text of the piece of work, plus footnotes, but excludes the bibliography.**

LATE SUBMISSION OF ESSAYS AND OTHER COURSEWORK – WHETHER SUBMITTED VIA BLACKBOARD OR TO YOUR TUTOR:

See the [Policy on Submission of Work for Summative Assessment on Taught Programmes](#)

The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (including weekends), after which a mark of zero will be awarded for any assessed work submitted after the specified submission date, unless the student has an extension. Extensions are granted by Schools, as set out below:

- School of Social Sciences Undergraduates – Contact your Programme Administrator
- School of Arts, Languages and Cultures (SALC) – Apply online at: <http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/support/mitigatingcircumstances/>

Do not ask your lecturer for an extension. All extension requests are dealt with through the channels above.

Note a “day” is 24 hours, i.e. the clock starts ticking as soon as the submission deadline has passed, which means that a piece of work submitted at 2.01 pm is late.

Important: Submitted work counting for less than 15% of the overall mark will get a mark of 0 if it is submitted late. Please note that mitigating circumstances procedures would still apply and that these rules do not apply for marks given for participation and attendance.

EXAMINATION TIMETABLES

The examination schedule is produced using dedicated software for which the overarching factor is the production of a timetable with no, or as **few** as possible student clashes. Whilst attempts are made to ensure that you have a spread of examination dates throughout the examination period, in many cases this is not possible given the institutional constraints on the numbers of examination venues that are available, the number of examinations that are scheduled to take place and the options available to students on any particular programme. You should expect therefore to have examinations on two or more consecutive days and, potentially, have more than one examination within a single day. The timetable is received in the Undergraduate Office on the same day as the students receive it – normally about a month before the start of the examination period.

This course has pre- and co-requisites and is not open to all students.

<u>Communication:</u>
Students <u>must read their University e-mails regularly</u> , and consult the <u>Blackboard</u> zone for this course as important information will be communicated in this way.
<u>Examinations:</u>
There is no exam for this course.

The Ethnographer's Craft
SOAN20842
Katie Smith and Skyler Hawkins
Semester 2, 2018-19

What is this course?

Welcome to Ethnographer's Craft! This is a core methods course in Social Anthropology. In this module, you will have the opportunity to conduct self-directed ethnographic research based on your own interests and questions. For most of you, this will be your first engagement with self-directed research and so this module introduces you to what ethnography and ethnographic research is, what it entails, how to write for the discipline of anthropology and make arguments that will convince your readers. What is relevant in terms of ideas, materials and concepts with a view to making your arguments *work* is all part of what will be covered in this course.

Over the coming weeks in this semester you will be taken through key stages in conceiving a workable idea for research, how to go about asking researchable questions, pursuing those questions ethnographically, and thinking through what it means to write up ethnographic data as well as presenting it. All this entails thinking about what anthropological research and writing involve, and what an ethnography actually *is* – essentially a narrative document which uses ethnography comparatively in order to make arguments about issues in social theory and/or to inform understandings of social phenomena.

Key Aims of this Course

The key aims of this course are:

- To give you some experience of carrying out ethnographic research and of being placed in the position of “ethnographer”.
- To enable you to relate that experience to the literature produced by anthropologists and others about ethnography as a research practice involving both investigation and writing up.
- To give you a solid grounding of what ethnography is now and has been in the past.

- To acquaint you with how ethnography is practiced: how a research question is defined and a research design developed; what a fieldsite it; what fieldnotes are; how ethnography is done in the field.
- To address the problems that are encountered in ethnographic (and other) research, including those related to ethical and political relationships.
- To explore the question of what constitutes an ethnographic text and how approaches to this have changed over time.
- To give you some experience of presenting your work to a live audience.

Learning Outcomes

On completion of this module, successful students will have acquired:

- A critical sense of the role of ethnography in social anthropology.
- A grasp of the practice of ethnographic fieldwork, and first-hand experience of using ethnographic methods in a small-scale research project.
- An understanding of the political, ethical, theoretical and methodological issues involved in doing ethnography.
- An appreciation of the nature and limitations of ethnographic data and what they can tell us about the social worlds around us.
- First-hand experience of preparing and delivering an oral presentation to an audience.

Discussions and Group Work

This course will be run as a seminar each week. This means that each week over the semester, students will be expected to **come prepared** to the seminar with completed tasks (each task is listed below according to week) that they will be expected to discuss and develop in each seminar. **Group work is CENTRAL to this course. And each completed task forms a percentage of your final mark.** You must attend each seminar week with a completed task, as outlined below. If for some reason you cannot make a seminar, please do let the course convenor know.

Therefore, each week, students should be prepared to talk about and update where they are with the development of their ideas as well as speak about their completed tasks. One of the best 'tools' for learning and developing ideas is through open discussion.

Conditions for Undertaking Fieldwork

Conducting fieldwork always raises **ethical** issues. You want to be able to think through and anticipate any ethical issues that might come up in your fieldwork *before* you begin face-to-face interactions for fieldwork.

All students on this course are REQUIRED to complete an online ethics form **before** carrying out your fieldwork. There are important steps to take on this form so that your project can receive approval in plenty of time for you to conduct your fieldwork. We will be covering Ethics and the ethics form in WEEK ONE of this course. This is to start off on the right foot, knowing what is achievable and ethical for your forthcoming fieldwork.

For your information, and as will be covered in WEEK ONE and WEEK FOUR seminars, here is the link to the online ethics form:

<https://submission-ethicalreview.manchester.ac.uk/ActivityForm/Index>

You will need to log in with your Manchester ID and password.

Assessment

Your Portfolio: Your portfolio comprises 5 weekly tasks of 250 words (detailed below), typed on an A4 sheet, as well as a 3,000 word essay that describes your fieldwork project.

Tasks

In total, there are 5 tasks over the course of this module that you will need to complete. Each task is linked to a relevant seminar and is listed below under the relevant week. You are expected to bring in either handwritten or typed work to the seminar. You will then need to keep your 5 tasks in your PORTFOLIO over the course of the semester, along with a 3,000 word essay on your project, for submission at the end of the semester (due date 13th May by 2pm).

BRING HARD COPIES OF TASKS TO CLASS. Do not forget to put your name and group number on the top.

3000 word essay

Your essay will also form part of your PORTFOLIO. Your essay should discuss your project

ESSAY QUESTION: TBA

Your Research Project

The course revolves around five practical exercises, which can seem daunting if you have never done anything like this before (or even if you have). A common source of anxiety is knowing what is expected, in terms of designing and carrying out a project and then in terms of writing it up. These issues will be addressed in the course, but as a pointer, it is not expected that you will generate significant “findings” or results; nor are you expected to invent projects that no other student has done before. Instead, the idea is to experience the position or stance of the ethnographer, try out the process of designing a project (i.e., moving from research idea to actual practice),

experiment with some of the basic techniques of ethnography, and reflect on (and write about) all that in the light of what others have written about ethnography. Do not worry or panic –nothing is being asked of you that you cannot do and there will be help along the way. In addition to the 2-hour lecture/seminar sessions there are dedicated weekly office hours, some of which will be used for small group meetings and others open for you to come individually and discuss your project with us. This means that your project will receive collective, small group-based and individual attention and feedback.

TIME BUDGET: A common question is how much time should you devote to actually carrying out the project (including associated exercises). There is not a definitive answer to this, but the University calculates that a 20-credit course involves a total of 200 hours of your time. Of these, 20 hours are spent in class and perhaps another 40 in doing the key readings for each class. We are then left with around 20 days (@ 7 hours/day) in which you can carry out your research. Some of this time will be spent doing hands-on “ethnography”, at other times you will be busy with planning (setting up contacts, initial meetings etc.), thinking, reading, writing and rewriting. But this gives you a rough idea of the time budget of the course.

FIELDWORK DIARY/NOTES: It is very important that you keep a record of your research from the start (i.e. including the planning phase). At the beginning, this may only be a few notes but they will grow when you are actually carrying out the research. You should carry a notebook at all times - you never know when a good idea will pop up. Your field-notes will be a crucial resource for writing up. You cannot say that you have adopted the stance of an ethnographer unless you keep some kind of record as you go along.

In the first session of this module, you will be invited to think about a research project that you can realistically tackle over the course of the semester.

Once you have identified what you want to do, you will try to answer and advance your research questions in the following weeks, by carrying out a series of exercises and writing up the results in weekly tasks which will go into your Portfolio due 13th May, 2019 by 2pm.

As noted above, the Portfolio and Oral Presentation are compulsory.

The timetable and seminar topics are as follows:

Timetable

Week 1 – Tuesday 28 Jan. 2019:

Lecture and Open Discussion: What is ethnography and ethnographic research? (Including introduction to Ethics)

Week 2 – Tuesday 5 Feb. 2019:

Proposals, Fieldwork Site, and Establishing Researchable Research Questions

**Task 1: Research Proposal and Participant Information Sheet

Week 3 – Tuesday 12 Feb. 2019:

Making It “Anthropological”: Exploring the Literature: This week we will have a Library session that introduces you to the anthropology databases via Manchester Library, how to access them and how to refine your searches around your specific topics and interests.

Week 4 – Tuesday 19 Feb. 2019:

Ethics Forms

**Task 2: Bring hard copies of ethics forms to class, including description, summary of methods, participant information sheet and consent form. Include any questions you may have about the ethical issues you face and/or of the ethics form itself.

Week 5 – Tuesday 26 Feb. 2019:

Interviewing and Participant Observation

**Task 3: Bring in list of interview questions for open discussion

Week 6 – Tuesday 5 March 2019:

Research Week!

Week 7 – Tuesday 12 March 2019:

Lecture and Open Discussion: Reflections on Participant Observation and Using the Self as Ethnographic Resource

**Task 4: Reflect on what you expected from fieldwork, and how what it was like was different from your initial expectations.

Week 8 – Tuesday 19 March 2019:

Anthropological Writing: Bring in your fieldwork diary and notes.

**Task 5: Fieldwork Diary and Notes: write 250 words on the main points that you want to raise about your project in your final essay.

Week 9 – Tuesday 26 March 2019:

Group 1 Presentations

Week 10 – Tuesday 2 April 2019:

Group 2 Presentations

*****SPRING BREAK: 5 April – 29 April 2019*****

Readings

This course is *practice oriented*. The set readings below will help you to think through the various practical exercises.

Paloma Gay y Blasco and Huon Wardle (2007) *How to Read Ethnography* (Oxford: Routledge) is a useful background text. There are numerous copies of this book in the library. It is also available as an e-book on the library website, so access to it should not be a problem.

The book will also be relevant and useful for other courses that explore ethnographic research and writing.

Another, more recent text is Lynda Mannik and Karen McGarry's (2017) *Practicing Ethnography: A Student Guide to Method and Methodology*.

There will be other materials (listed below) that will be required to read for different sessions/seminars. All of these materials are available at one or more of the following: as links on Blackboard, on JSTOR, or on the JRUL electronic journals site.

General Readings

The following texts provide general information about ethnographic approaches. You are not required to read all of them but are advised to browse through one or more as you formulate and work through your particular research projects.

Robben, Antonius and Jeffrey Sluka (eds). 2006. *Ethnographic fieldwork: an anthropological reader*.

Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolcott, Harry F. 1995. *The art of fieldwork*. Walnut Creek: Altamira [There is a second edition to this book published in 2005].

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Amit, Vered (ed.). 2000. *Constructing the field: ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*.

London: Routledge.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson (eds). 1997. *Anthropological locations: the boundaries and grounds of a field science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mclean, Athena and Annette Liebing (eds). 2007. *The shadow side of fieldwork: exploring the blurred borders between ethnography and life*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Greenhouse, Carol J., Elizabeth Mertz, and Kay B. Warren, eds. 2002. *Ethnography in unstable places: everyday lives in contexts of dramatic political change*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Marcus, George E. (ed.). 1999. *Critical anthropology now: unexpected contexts, shifting constituencies, changing agendas*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Behar, Ruth. 1996. *The vulnerable observer: anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Agar, Michael H. 1980. *The professional stranger: an informal introduction to ethnography*. New Jersey: Academic Press.

Atkinson, Paul et al. (eds). 2001. *Handbook of ethnography*. London: Sage.
Stewart, Alex. 1998. *The ethnographer's method*. London: Sage Publications.

Hammersley, Martin and Paul Atkinson. 1995. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge. [There is a 3rd edition of this book, published in 2007, available as an e-book through the Library. Some of it is also accessible via Google Books.]

Jorgensen, Danny. 1989. *Participant observation: a methodology for human studies*. London: Sage.
Spradley, James. 1980. *Participant observation*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Bernard, H. Russell. 1998. *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*. London: AltaMira Press.
Smith, Carolyn D. and William Kornblum. 1989. *In the field: readings on the field research experience*.

New York: Praeger.

Stocking, George. 1983. *Observers Observed: essays on ethnographic fieldwork*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Fluehr-Lobban (ed.) 1996. *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a new era*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Anthropologists' accounts of their fieldwork

Some anthropologists have written books about doing their fieldwork. These are not intended as academic accounts of the culture and social relations of the people with whom they worked, but as a reflection on what it was like to do fieldwork.

A useful list of these is included as Appendices 2 and 3 of Robben, Antonius and Jeffrey Sluka (eds). 2006. *Ethnographic fieldwork: an anthropological reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 523-526.

See also:

Bowen, Elenore Smith. 1954. *Return to laughter: an anthropological novel*. New York: Harper Row [Smith is a pseudonym used by the anthropologist Laura Bohannon].

Barley, Nigel. 1983. *The innocent anthropologist: notes from a mud hut*. London: British Museum Publications.

Rabinow, Paul. 1977. *Reflections on fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Powdermaker, Hortense. 1966. *Stranger and Friend: The Way of an Anthropologist*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Other sources

There are some journals dedicated to ethnography, such as *Ethnography* and the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, both are accessible as e-journals. They are not necessarily all about methods or the actual practice of ethnography, but they publish stuff that depends on ethnographic approaches. Browse through them and pick up on things that you find of interest. Such browsing may also give you inspiration for your dissertations. Think of this course as preparation and priming for your dissertation work in your third year.

Structure of the Course

Week One: What is ethnography and ethnographic research?

This session will involve exploring the relationship between process and product, data and analysis. It also will include an introduction to ethics, ethical considerations and the ethics form that every student will have to complete on this course.

Key Reading

Hammersley, Martin and Paul Atkinson. 1995. "Research design: problems, cases and samples". Ch. 2 of *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 23-54.

Pratt, M.L. (1986) Fieldwork in common places. In J. Clifford and G. Marcus (Eds) *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 27-50.

Further Reading

Barrett, Stanley. (2009) *Anthropology: A Student's Guide to Theory and Method*.

Booth, Wayne, C. (2003) *et al. The Craft of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Castaneda, Quetzil E. 2006. The invisible theatre of ethnography: the performative principles of fieldwork. In *Anthropological Quarterly* 49(1): 75-104.

Mills, Wright, C. (1959) Appendix: On Intellectual Craftsmanship. In *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford University Press. Pp. 195-226.

Mills, D. (2003) Like a horse in blinkers? A political history of anthropology's research ethics. In P. Caplan (Ed.) *The ethics of anthropology: debates and dilemmas*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 37-54.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1991. Against Ethnography. In *Current Anthropology* 6(3): 306-322.

Turner, Aaron. 2000. Embodied ethnography. Doing culture. In *Social Anthropology* 8(1): 51-60.

Week Two: Research Proposals, Fieldwork Site, and Establishing Researchable Questions

This session, we will be going over the questions of *who, what, when, where, why* and *how* in preparations for your research projects. This session is an opportunity for you to discuss your ideas and ask questions in greater depth, and focus your questions and approach. You do not need to be certain of any of the above questions for this session. But you do need to come with some ideas to discuss in groups.

FOR PORTFOLIO: Task 1: Bring into this week's seminar your Research Proposal and Participant Information Sheet:

Describe what do you propose to do? Briefly describe your fieldsite: the place, the people, and what happens there. Why are you interested in this fieldsite? Note the anthropological questions that emerge from your fieldsite. What questions do you want to address? What will be your timetable?

Bring this task to the seminar this week and we will discuss in groups: Are there issues of access? What are the ethical issues? How would you describe your research project to the people you want to study?

Double-spaced, font-size 12.

Key Reading

Jeffery, L. and N. Konopinski (2014) Planning your research project (Chp. 2). In *Doing Anthropological Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge. Pp. 21-36.

Further Reading

DeWalt, K.M. and B.R. DeWalt (eds) (2011) *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.

Eriksen, T.H. 2001. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Pluto.

Kolopinski, N. (ed.) (2014) Introduction: about *Doing Anthropological Research*. In *Doing Anthropological Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge. Pp. 1-5.

Murchison, J. (2010) *Ethnography Essentials: Designing, Conducting and Presenting Your Research*. London: Wiley.

Week Three: Library Session: Making it “Anthropological”: Exploring the Literature

This week we will have a Librarian introduce you to the wealth of materials and databases available to you in Manchester University Central Library – the largest Library in Europe. The Librarian will introduce you to the anthropology databases via Manchester Library, how to access them and how to refine your searches around your specific topics and interests.

In the second hour, we will work in groups identifying main topics to pursue in your database searches the library.

Week Four: Ethics Forms

All students on this course are required to complete online Ethics Forms for your projects. This is a requirement and not as tedious as it may seem.

In this session, we will be going over the electronic ethics form, familiarising ourselves with the online platform. We will work in groups on our Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms, which are requirements on your ethics application online. You will be expected to submit your ethics forms.

Ethical concerns with ethnographic research do not only emerge with regard to the interactions in the field. In this session, we will look at formal ethical review processes, which are now routinized across academic institutions, usually adopting a model derived from the life sciences in which ideas of informed consent and clearly delimited sets of research questions are central.

All research projects must now pass through ethical reviews. We will discuss some of the ways in which we can accommodate our research plans to such demands. This includes a focus on ‘informed consent’ and the exclusion of harm. And we will discuss how as anthropologists, you will have to navigate three sets of ethical processes: firstly, dealing with your institution and professional expectations (including the ethical guidelines of the Association of Social Anthropologists and the American Anthropological Association); secondly, with your informants’ perceptions of what you are doing; and thirdly, with your own personal ethical stance about what and how you research.

FOR PORTFOLIO: Task 2: Identify some of the main ethical issues that you expect to arise as potential points of ethical concern in your research. Which concerns do you think might be raised by the University ethics committee? Why? Are these the same issues which will arise for your informants? How do you intend to address these issues at both institutional and personal levels (i.e. for a University’s ethics committee and in the interactions that will make up your research)? Which concerns do you consider most important yourself? On a personal level, what are the ethical issues that your research raises for you as an individual?

Key Reading

Harper, I. 2014. Ethics. In M. Kolopinsky (ed.) *Doing Anthropological Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge. Pp. 91-102.

Caplan, P. (2003) Introduction. In P. Caplan (Ed.) *The ethics of anthropology: debates and dilemmas*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1-34.

Further Reading

Fleur-Lobban, C. (2013) *Ethics and Anthropology: Ideas and Practice*. AltaMira Press.

Hammersley M. & Atkinson P. 2007. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Routledge.

Mills, D. (2003) Like a horse in blinkers? A political history of anthropology's research ethics. In P. Caplan (Ed.) *The ethics of anthropology: debates and dilemmas*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 37-54.

Josephides, L. (ed.) 2015. *Knowledge and Ethics in Anthropology: Obligations and Requirements*. London: Bloomsbury.

Kalir, B. (2006) The field of work and the work of the field: conceptualizing an anthropological research engagement, *Social Anthropology*. 14/2: 253-246.

Lewis, I.M. (1999) *Arguments with ethnography: comparative approaches to history, politics and religion*. London: Athelone Press.

RynKiewich, M.A. and J. Spradley (1976) *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. London: Wiley.

Thomas. N. 1991. 'Against Ethnography' *Current Anthropology* 6:3, 306-322.

Week Five: Interviewing and Participant Observation

The method that is most closely associated with social anthropology is participant observation. This session, we will discuss participant observation and the utility of interviewing. We will ask: is participant observation really a 'method'? Anthropologists tend to be eclectic in their choice of research methods; however, participant observation remains a minimum credential. Ethnographic fieldwork often combines participant observation with interviews (and on occasion, surveys); anthropologists may also map communities, analyse documents or archival materials, take photographs, make films, or

even draw diagrams. What exactly is participant observation? What is the relationship between participating and observing? Is it a method, an approach, a stance? How can we make the most of participant observation and interviews?

FOR PORTFOLIO: Task 3: Bring in list of interview questions for open discussion in groups.

Key Reading

Smith, K. 2015. Finding my Wit: Explaining Banter and Making the Effortless Appear in the Unstructured Interview. In K. Smith, J. Staples and N. Rapport (eds) *Extraordinary Encounters: The Ethnographic Interview, Biography and Authentic Data*. Oxford: Berghahn Books. Pp. 83-99.

Hockey, J. and M. Forsey 2012. Ethnography is not participant observation: reflections on the interview as participatory qualitative research. In J. Skinner (ed.) *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach*. ASA Monographs 49, Oxford: Berg. Pp. 69-88.

Further Reading

Fabian J. 1999. 'Ethnographic misunderstanding and the perils of context' In: Dilley R (ed) *The problem of context*. Oxford: Berghahn. 85-104.

Fernandez J.W. 1993. 'A guide to the perplexed ethnographer in an age of sound bites' *American Ethnologist* 20:1, 179-184.

Jorgensen D. 1989. *Participant observation: a methodology for human studies*. London: Sage.

Marcus G. 2008. 'The end(s) of ethnography: social/cultural anthropology's signature form of producing knowledge in transition' *Cultural anthropology* 23:1, 1-14.

Rapport, N. (2012) The Interview as a Form of Talking-partnership: Dialectical, Focussed, Ambiguous, Special. In J. Skinner (ed.) *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach*. ASAP Monographs 49, London: Berg. Pp. 53-68.

Skinner, J. 2010. Leading questions and body memories: a case of phenomenology and physical ethnography in the dance interview. In P. Collins and A. Gallinat (eds) *The self as ethnographic resource: writing memory and experience into ethnography*. Oxford: Berghahn. Pp. 111-128.

Smith C.D & Kornblum W. 1989. *In the field: readings on the field research experience*. New York: Praeger.

Spradley J. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt Rhinehart and Winston.

Spradley J. 1980. *Participant observation*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stewart A. 1998. *The ethnographer's method*. London: Sage.

Stocking G.W. (ed) 1983. *Observers observed: essays on ethnographic fieldwork*. Madison: Wisconsin UP.

Strathern M. 1987. 'The limits of auto-anthropology' In: Jackson A. (ed) *Anthropology at home*. London: Tavistock. 16-37.

*******Week Six: RESEARCH WEEK! – No seminar.*******

Week Seven: Reflections on Participant Observations

This week we will reflect on our own experiences of conducting participant observation, and using the 'self' as ethnographic resource. We will ask questions about what it means to live and use ethnographic fieldwork, the ways in which we might use ourselves as ethnographic resources – identifying our own reactions to events and what that might tell us about how we might understand ethnographic insights from fieldwork. You will bring in your fieldwork diary and any notes you took in your fieldwork for open discussion in groups.

FOR PORTFOLIO: Task 4: In 250 words, briefly reflect on what you expected from fieldwork, and how what it was like was different from your initial expectations. We will discuss this your reflections in groups, so make sure to bring in your task.

Key Reading

Collins, P. and A. Gallinat (eds). (2010) The Ethnographic Self as Resource: an Introduction. In *The Ethnographic Self as Resource: Writing Memory and Experience into Ethnography*. Oxford: Beghahn Books. Pp. 1-24.

Eriksen T.H. 2001. 'Chapter 3: Fieldwork and its interpretation' In: Eriksen T.H. *Small places, large issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology* (2nd edition). London: Pluto.

Further Reading

Aull Davies C. 1998. *Reflexive ethnography: a guide to researching selves and others*. London: Routledge.

Behar R. 1996. *The vulnerable observer: anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon.

Beteille A. & Madan T. (eds) 1975. *Encounter & experience: personal accounts of fieldwork*. Honolulu: Hawaii UP.

Coffey, A. 1999. *The ethnographic self: fieldwork and the representation of identity*. London: Sage.

De Vita P.R. (ed) 1992. *The naked anthropologist: tales from around the world*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Lawless R., Sutlive V. & Samora M.D. (eds) 1983. *Fieldwork: the human experience*. New York: Gordon & Breach Publishers.

Perry J. (ed) 1989. *Doing fieldwork: eight personal accounts of social research*. Geelong: Deakin UP.

Smith, K. 2009. Is a happy anthropologist a good anthropologist?
Anthropology Matters. Vol. 11, No.1
http://www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php?journal=anth_matters&page=article&op=viewArticle&path%5B%5D=28

Week Eight: Writing Up!

This week, we will discuss the process of writing up your findings, what is expected of ethnographic writing, and how uncomfortable the process of writing fieldwork experiences into ethnography is what makes the Ethnographer's Craft both challenging and productive of a particular kind of knowledge and understanding, in equal measure.

FOR PORTFOLIO: Task 5: Write 250 words on the main points that you want to raise about your project in your final essay. What arguments/ points/claims do you really want to bring home to your readers? Why? Why are they important? We will discuss these questions in groups - convince your group!

Key Reading

Hovland, I. (2007) Writing up and feeling down: Introduction, *Anthropology Matters Journal*. 9/2: 1-4, accessible online here:
https://anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/view/46/86

Further Reading

Caplan, P. (1992) Engendering knowledge: The politics of ethnography. In S. Ardener (Ed.) *Persons and Power of Women in Diverse Cultures*. Oxford: Berg. Pp. 65-87.

Cohen A. P. 1992. 'Post-fieldwork Fieldwork' *Journal of Anthropological Research* 48:4, 339-354.

Clifford, J. and G.E. Marcus (eds) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Emerson, R.M., R.I. Fretz and L.L. Shaw (1995) *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herzfeld, M. (1997) Anthropology: a practice of theory, *International Social Science Journal*. 49/3: 301.

Marcus, G.E. (Ed.) (1999) *Critical anthropology now: unexpected contexts, shifting constituencies, changing agendas*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Piña-Cabral, J. (1992) Against translation: the role of the researcher in the production of ethnographic knowledge. In J. Piña-Cabral and J. Campbell (Eds) *Europe observed*. Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-23.

Smith, K. (2009) Is a happy anthropologist a good anthropologist? *Anthropology Matters Journal*. 11/1, accessible here: https://anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/view/28

Week Nine: Group Presentations!

Week Ten: Group Presentations!

Some general readings on anthropological approaches:

******Please note: these readings are a general guide for you as you explore issues to do with conceiving of an idea, doing research, reading anthropologically, writing anthropologically, and interpreting material/case studies. Below, you will find online resources, of which we will be dealing with in seminars.**

- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (1998) Foreward: moving backward. In J. Ferrell and M.S. Hamm (Eds) *Ethnography at the edge: crime, deviance and field research*. Boston: Northeastern University Press. Pp. xii-xvi.
- Bernard, H. (1994) *Research methods in anthropology*. Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003) Participant objectivation, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. (N.S.) 9: 281-294.
- Burgess, R. (1984) *In the field: an introduction to field research*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Caplan, P. (1992) Engendering knowledge: The politics of ethnography. In S. Ardener (Ed.) *Persons and Power of Women in Diverse Cultures*. Oxford: Berg. Pp. 65-87.
- Caplan, P. (2003) Introduction. In P. Caplan (Ed.) *The ethnics of anthropology: debates and dilemmas*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1-34.
- Coffey, A. (1999) *The ethnographic self: fieldwork and the representation of identity*. London: Sage.
- Coleman, S. and P. Collins (Eds) (2006) *Locating the field: space, place and context in anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.
- Douglass, W.A. (1992) Anthropological methodology in the European context. In J. de Piña-Cabrall and J. Campbell (Eds) *Europe observed*. Oxford University Press. Pp. 123-132.
- Ellen, R. (1984) *Ethnographic research: a guide to general conduct*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Emerson, R.M., R.I. Fretz and L.L. Shaw (1995) *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fernandez, J.W. and M.T. Huber (Eds) (2001) *Irony and action: anthropology, practice and the moral imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harris, M. (2006) Anthropology and the will to meaning: a postcolonial critique, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 12/1: 259-60.
- Herzfeld, M. (1997) Anthropology: a practice of theory, *International Social Science Journal*. 49/3: 301.
- Hovland, I. (2007) Writing up and feeling down: Introduction, *Anthropology Matters Journal*. 9/2: 1-4
- Hylton, K. (2009) *Race and sport: critical race theory*. London: Routledge.
- Kalir, B. (2006) The field of work and the work of the field: conceptualizing an anthropological research engagement, *Social Anthropology*. 14/2: 253-246.
- Kirtsoglou, E. (2004) *For the love of women: gender, identity and same-sex relations in a Greek provincial town*. London: Routledge.
- Kulick, H. (Ed.) (2008) *A new history of anthropology*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.

- Lewis, I.M. (1999) *Arguments with ethnography: comparative approaches to history, politics and religion*. London: Athelone Press.
- Marcus, G.E. (Ed.) (1999) *Critical anthropology now: unexpected contexts, shifting constituencies, changing agendas*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Marcus, G. (1995) Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 95-117.
- Mills, D. (2003) Like a horse in blinkers? A political history of anthropology's research ethics. In P. Caplan (Ed.) *The ethics of anthropology: debates and dilemmas*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 37-54.
- Piña-Cabral, J. (1992) Against translation: the role of the researcher in the production of ethnographic knowledge. In J. Piña-Cabral and J. Campbell (Eds) *Europe observed*. Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-23.
- Piña-Cabral, J. (2000) The ethnographic present revisited, *Social Anthropology*. 8/3: 341-348.
- Pratt, M.L. (1986) Fieldwork in common places. In J. Clifford and G. Marcus (Eds) *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 27-50.
- Sykes, K. (2003) My aim is true: Postnostalgic reflections on the future of anthropological science, *American Ethnologist*. 30/1: 156-68.
- Thomas, N. (1991) Against ethnography, *Cultural Anthropology*. 6/3: 306-322.

Online Sources of Information for Anthropology:

Anthrosource:

<http://www.anthrosource.net/>

Anthropology Plus: Google 'anthropology plus' and click on the links

IBSS:

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/eresources/databases/i/dbname,11582,en.htm>

Intute:

<http://www.intute.ac.uk/socialsciences/anthropology>

MIMAS:

<http://zetoc.mimas.ac.uk>

AIO:

<http://aio.anthropology.org.uk/aiosearch/>

World of Knowledge:

<http://wok.mimas.ac.uk>

Blogs:

<http://www.anthropologi.info/blog>

<http://www.anthroblogs.org/anthroblogblog/>

And don't forget:

The library:

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/>

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/eresources/>

You may also want to have a look at the web-based tutorial on anthropology resources accessible from the John Rylands Library, Internet Anthropologist, where your guide will be the anthropology librarian. See:

<http://www.vts.intute.ac.uk/he/tutorial/anthropologist>

General literature on ethnographic research

Agar M.H. 1980. *The professional stranger: an informal introduction to ethnography*. Academic Press.

Agar M.H. 1986. *Speaking of ethnography*. London: Sage.

Atkinson P. et al. (eds). 2001. *Handbook of ethnography*. London: Sage.

Aull Davies C. 1998. *Reflexive ethnography: a guide to researching selves and others*. London: Routledge.

Barnard A. & Spencer J. 1996. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of social and cultural anthropology*. London: Routledge. (esp. Sanjek R. 'Ethnography' 193-8 and Carrithers M. 'Fieldwork' 229-32).

Briggs,

Burgess R.G. 1991(1984). *In the field: an introduction to field research*. London: Routledge.

Castaneda Q.E. 2006. 'The invisible theatre of ethnography: the performative principles of fieldwork' *Anthropological Quarterly* 49:1, 75-104.

Cohen A. P. 1992. 'Post-fieldwork Fieldwork' *Journal of Anthropological Research* 48:4, 339-354.

Denzin N.K. 1997. *Interpretive ethnography: ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Eriksen T.H. 2001. 'Chapter 3: Fieldwork and its interpretation' In: Eriksen T.H. *Small places, large issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology (2nd edition)*. London: Pluto.

Evans-Pritchard E. 1951. 'Fieldwork and the empirical tradition' In: Evans-Pritchard E. *Social Anthropology*. London: Cohen and West. 64-85.

Fabian J. 1999. 'Ethnographic misunderstanding and the perils of context' In: Dilley R (ed) *The problem of context*. Oxford: Berghahn. 85-104.

Fernandez J.W. 1993. 'A guide to the perplexed ethnographer in an age of sound bites' *American Ethnologist* 20:1, 179-184.

Goodwin C. 1994. 'Professional vision' *American Anthropologist* (NS) 96:3, 606-633.

Grasseni C. 2004. 'Skilled vision: an apprenticeship in breeding aesthetics' *Social Anthropology* 12:1, 41-55.

Grimshaw A. & Hart K. 1995. 'The rise and fall of scientific ethnography' In: Ahmed A.S. & Shore C. (eds) *The future of anthropology*. London: Athlone.

- Hammersley M. & Atkinson P. 2007. *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hobbs D. & May T. (eds) 1993. *Interpreting the field: accounts of ethnography*. Oxford UP.
- Hockey, J. and M. Forsey 2012. Ethnography is not participant observation: reflections on the interview as participatory qualitative research. In J. Skinner (ed.) *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach*. ASA Monographs 49, Oxford: Berg. Pp. 69-88.
- Jenkins T. 1994. 'Fieldwork and the perception of everyday life' *Man* (NS) 29:2, 433-455.
- Jorgensen D. 1989. *Participant observation: a methodology for human studies*. London: Sage.
- MacClancy J. 1996. 'Fieldwork styles: Bohannan, Barley, Gardner' In: MacClancy J. & McDonough C. (eds) *Popularizing anthropology*. London: Routledge. 225-244.
- Marcus G. 1998. *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Marcus G. 2007. 'Ethnography two decades after Writing Culture: from the experimental to the baroque' *Anthropological Quarterly* 80:4, 1127-1146.
- Marcus G. 2008. 'The end(s) of ethnography: social/cultural anthropology's signature form of producing knowledge in transition' *Cultural anthropology* 23:1, 1-14.
- Marcus G. (ed). 1999. *Critical anthropology now: unexpected contexts, shifting constituencies, changing agendas*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- McLean A. & Liebing A. (eds). 2007. *The shadow side of fieldwork: exploring the blurred borders between ethnography and life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Peirano M.G.S. 1998. 'When anthropology is at home: the different contexts of a single discipline' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27, 105-128.
- Robben A. & Sluka J. (eds). 2006. *Ethnographic fieldwork: an anthropological reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Skinner, J. 2010. Leading questions and body memories: a case of phenomenology and physical ethnography in the dance interview. In P. Collins and A. Gallinat (eds) *The self as ethnographic resource: writing memory and experience into ethnography*. Oxford: Berghahn. Pp. 111-128.
- Smith C.D & Kornblum W. 1989. *In the field: readings on the field research experience*. New York: Praeger.
- Smith, K. 2012. *Fairness, class and belonging in contemporary England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (Chapter 2)
- Spradley J. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Spradley J. 1980. *Participant observation*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Stewart A. 1998. *The ethnographer's method*. London: Sage.
- Stocking G.W. (ed) 1983. *Observers observed: essays on ethnographic fieldwork*. Madison: Wisconsin UP.
- Strathern M. 1987. 'The limits of auto-anthropology' In: Jackson A. (ed) *Anthropology at home*. London: Tavistock. 16-37.
- Thomas. N. 1991. 'Against Ethnography' *Current Anthropology* 6:3, 306-322.

- Wellman D. 1994. 'Constructing ethnographic authority: the work process of field research. An ethnographic account' *Cultural Studies* 8:3, 569-83.
- Wolcott H.F. 1995. *The art of fieldwork*. Oxford: AltaMira Press.

On field notes

- Emerson R.M., Fretz R.I., Shaw L.L. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: Chicago UP.
- Sanjek R. (ed) 1990. *Fieldnotes: the makings of anthropology*. Ithaca: Cornell UP. 47-70.
- Wolf M. 1992. *A thrice-told tale: feminism, post-modernism and ethnographic responsibility*. Stanford: Stanford UP. (Chpt 3 on Fieldnotes)
- http://lowie.kent.ac.uk/Era_Resources/Era/Kingdom_Bum/pmkdesc.html
(fieldnotes of Phyllis Kaberry from a 1963 visit to West-Central Africa)
- <http://erkansaka.net/> ("a blog of PhD student's Erkan Saka's fieldwork for his dissertation on Turkish journalism and the European Union")

Anthropologists' accounts of doing ethnographic fieldwork

- Anderson B. 1990. *First fieldwork: the misadventures of an anthropologist*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Barley N. 1983. *The innocent anthropologist: notes from a mud hut*. London: British Museum / Penguin.
- Behar R. 1996. *The vulnerable observer: anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon.
- Beteille A. & Madan T. (eds) 1975. *Encounter & experience: personal accounts of fieldwork*. Honolulu: Hawaii UP.
- Bowen E.S. 1954. *Return to Laughter: an anthropological novel*. London: Gollancz.
- Casagrande J. 1960. *In the company of Man: twenty portraits by anthropologists*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chagnon N. 1974. *Studying the Yanomamo*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Coffee, A. 1999. *The ethnographic self: fieldwork and the representation of identity*. London: Sage.
- De Vita P.R. (ed) 1990. *The humbled anthropologist: tales from the Pacific*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- De Vita P.R. (ed) 1992. *The naked anthropologist: tales from around the world*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Fortes M. 1975. 'Strangers' In: Fortes M. & Patterson S. (eds) *Studies in African Social Anthropology*. London: Academic Press.
- Freilich M. (ed). 1970. *Marginal natives at work: anthropologists in the field*. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Geertz C. 1995. *After the fact: two countries, four decades, one anthropologist*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Hicks D. 1976. *Tetum ghosts and kin: fieldwork in an Indonesian community*. Palo Alto: Mayfield.

- Jongmans D.G. & Gutkind P.C.W. (eds) 1967. *Anthropologists in the field*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Kaplan F. 1994. 'Some thoughts on doing fieldwork at the Royal Court of Benin, Nigeria, and other things: a Fulbright experience' *Studies in Third World Societies* 53, 17-31.
- Kumar N. 1992. *Friends, brothers and informants: fieldwork memoirs of Banaras*. Berkeley: California UP.
- Lareau A. & Shultz J. (eds) 1996. *Journey through ethnography: realistic accounts of fieldwork*. Boulder: Westview.
- Lawless R., Sutlive V. & Samora M.D. (eds) 1983. *Fieldwork: the human experience*. New York: Gordon & Breach Publishers.
- Lévi-Strauss C. 1973 (1955). *Tristes Tropiques*. New York: Atheneum.
- Loizos P. (ed) 1977. 'Anthropological research in British Colonies: some personal accounts' *Anthropological Forum* 4:2.
- Malinowski B. 1967. *A diary in the strict sense of the term*. London: Routledge.
- Mead M. 1977. *Letters from the Field 1925-75*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Perry J. (ed) 1989. *Doing fieldwork: eight personal accounts of social research*. Geelong: Deakin UP.
- Powdermaker H. 1966. *Stranger and friend: the way of an anthropologist*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Rabinow P. 1977. *Reflections on fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: California UP.
- Read K. 1965. *The High Valley*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Read K. 1986. *Return to the High Valley*. Berkeley: California UP.
- Smith, K. 2009. Is a happy anthropologist a good anthropologist? *Anthropology Matters*. Vol. 11, No.1
http://www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php?journal=anth_matters&page=article&op=viewArticle&path%5B%5D=28
- Spindler G.D. (ed) 1970. *Being an anthropologist: fieldwork in eleven cultures*. New York: Holt.
- Ward M. 1989. *Nest in the wind: adventures in anthropology on a tropical island*. Prospect Hts: Waveland.
- Watson C. (ed) 2000. *Being there: fieldwork in anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wax R.H. 1971. *Doing fieldwork: warnings and advice*. Chicago UP.
- Whyte W.F. 1997. *Creative problem solving in the field: reflections on a career*. Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Wormsley W. 1993. *The White Man will eat you! An anthropologist among the Imbonggu of New Guinea*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Bibliography and Referencing

Assessed essays:

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate reference will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is a serious offence and students should consult the University of Manchester guidelines, also the Faculty's TLO Website

http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/studyskills/essentials/writing/avoiding_plagiarism.html

<http://www.studentnet.manchester.ac.uk/crucial-guide/academic-life/formal-procedures/conduct-and-discipline/>

All Dissertations, like your essays, must employ the scholarly apparatus of references (or footnotes) and a Bibliography. At the end of an essay, you must provide a Bibliography which lists your sources in alphabetical order by author's surname. In the essay itself, you must use a reference or footnote to give the source for any quotation, data, and/or for any view or interpretation which you summarise or which you attribute to another source or author. References (or footnotes) enable the reader to find as easily as possible the authority for every important statement and the sources contributing to all ideas and comments.

There are different acceptable referencing styles. Professional journals and scholarly books can provide students with examples of different acceptable styles. Whatever referencing style and bibliographic style you choose to use, be consistent.

The titles of book, journals, newspapers, and magazines are either underlined or italicised, while the titles of articles are placed inside quotation marks. Quotation marks are not placed around the titles of books and journals.

In the Bibliography, sources are listed in alphabetical order by author's surname. Hence, in the Bibliography, an author's surname comes before forenames; however, in a footnote (or endnote), forenames precede surname. For further details please see the referencing guide, available online at:

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=2870>

Assessment Criteria

For further details of assessment criteria, including what evidence of levels of understanding and expression constitute the range of marks available, please see the School of Social Sciences intranet website:

<http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/pg/>

*****I hope you enjoy the course!*****

**SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018/19****SOAN 20852:
Materiality and Representation
Mansfield Cooper G.22
Second Semester
Credits 20**

Lecturer: Dr Arran Calvert
Room (office): 2.052 Arthur Lewis Building
Telephone: 58994
Email: arran.calvert@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours: Wednesday 11-12, Thursday 4-5
Administrator: Kellie Jordan, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building (**Undergraduate**)
 (0161) 275 4000
kellie.jordan@manchester.ac.uk

Teaching Assistants: Nada Al Hudaid (nada.al-hudaid@manchester.ac.uk)
 Tom Boyd (tom.boyd@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk)

Lectures: Tuesdays 4-6

	UNDERGRADUATE
Modes of Assessment	70% - Assessed Essay of 3000 words 20% - A short blog, using images and 500 words based on the course workshops. The blog will build from group discussions of the museum visit, the film screening and personal accounts of the collection and display of material forms. 10% - AQCs.
Deadlines	Seminar Portfolio – ongoing – 6 AQCs to be handed in. Blog – Friday 29th March at 2pm Final Essay – Monday 13th May at 2pm

Please read the following information sheet in the Assessment Section on Blackboard, in connection with Essays and Examinations:

- INSTRUCTIONS FOR SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY UNDERGRADUATE ESSAYS AND COURSEWORK

Communication: Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course.

Aims:

- To introduce students to a range of key anthropological approaches to materiality, sensorial experience and representational practice.
- To introduce students to key theoretical approaches including semiotics and phenomenology.

Learning outcomes:

On completion of this unit, successful students will:

- Understand a range of concepts employed in anthropological approaches to human sensory perception of and engagement with matter and things;
- Become familiar with ethnographic analysis and the use of theory in the anthropology of materials, of the senses and of display;
- Acquire insight into how anthropology contributes to an understanding of how objects and materials shape human worlds;
- Become aware of the importance of cultural and historical variation in human perception of material forms;
- Engage in a critical analysis of material displays

Mode of Assessment:

1. Assessed Essay of 3000 words.
Weighting within unit: 70%
2. A short blog, using images and 500 words based on the course workshops. The blog will build from group discussions of the museum visit, the film screening and personal accounts of the collection and display of material forms.
Weighting within unit: 20%
3. Short class exercises drawing on seminar discussions of key concepts.
Weighting within unit: 10%

Content:

This course will introduce students to the ways in which objects and materials shape human worlds. We will discuss some of the key preoccupations and philosophical questions concerning objects and materials, and explore the anthropological debates that address such issues as the social life of things, the vitality of matter, and the affective force of material forms and substances. We will also consider the ways in which expressive arts and rituals use material forms and bodies as communicative media. The course will combine lectures and workshops - including a museum visit and a film screening. We will consider the qualities of materials such as texture and colour,

and the ways in which material forms can move, unsettle or excite. We will address the material dimensions of key contemporary issues such as environmental change, toxicity and pollution, the built environment, and practices such as collecting, hoarding, and display. We will think about infrastructures and the ways in which material and informational forms combine, and we will also discuss the internet of things, virtual worlds, and spectral figures.

Teaching and Learning Methods

- Lecture, seminar, workshops
- In addition to the lecture/seminar format, the course will also involve 3 workshops. The workshops will encourage students to apply and experiment with theory presented in lectures and seminars.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate fora is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback for the course "Materiality and Representation" are **verbal feedback** in seminar groups on readings and discussion topics, and **written feedback** on workshop blogs and assessed essays.

Suggested preliminary readings

Appadurai, Arjun (ed). 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, Penny et. al. 2013. *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*. Routledge.

Harvey, Penny, Casper Bruun Jensen and Atsuro Morita. 2016. *Infrastructures and Social Complexity*. Routledge.

Howes, David (ed). 2005. *Empire of the senses: the sensual culture reader*. Berg.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment : Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. Routledge.

Stoler, Ann. 2013. *Imperial Debris*. Duke University Press.

Stella, Paul. 1989. *The Taste of Ethnographic Things*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Taussig, Michael. 2003. *My Cocaine Museum*. University of Chicago Press

Tilley, Christopher. 2004. *The materiality of stone: explorations in landscape phenomenology*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

AQCs

Students should bring a printed copy of your AQC to the relevant tutorials where they will serve as a basis for your contribution. Bringing it on a USB or a laptop or some other device will not count: we need to see two printed copies in every case. By the end of the day following your tutorial in the relevant week: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10 you should also upload your AQC on Turnitin.

To allow us to identify it for marking, entitle the document like this:
"student number, surname, AQC" e.g. 9875584 Calvert AQC 1; 9875584 Calvert ACQ2, etc.

Students must read the lecture readings before each lecture and read and complete the AQC's before the respective tutorials.

Week 1: MATERIALITY AND REPRESENTATION: AN OVERVIEW

(Tuesday 29th January)

An introduction to the module in which we will discuss and explore the concept of 'materiality' and work through some of the connections, and the differences, between materiality and representation. I will discuss the various modes of assessment and the ways we will combine the lectures, workshops and tutorials. In this first week we will also look at Bill Brown's discussion of 'thing theory' (including reflections on why 'things' need 'theory') and we will relate this to Appadurai's work on 'the social life of things' – and beyond that to some of the key issues of anthropological debate which we will return to on a regular basis as we move through the course materials over the coming weeks.

I will also introduce you to some key resources that we will draw in this course and two **key journals** that I will encourage you to explore: *The Journal of Material Culture* and *Cultural Anthropology*. I will also introduce you to the **material world blog** (<http://www.materialworldblog.com>), founded by Haidy Geismar and Daniel Miller.

Lecture Reading:

Bill Brown. 2001. 'Thing Theory' in *Critical Inquiry*, 28(1):1–22.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Kitty Hauser. 2004. 'A Garment in the Dock; or, How the FBI Illuminated the Prehistory of A Pair of Denim Jeans' in *Journal of Material Culture*. 9(3):293–313

Further Readings:

Appadurai, Arjun (ed). 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Brown, Bill. 2003. *A Sense of Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Craciun, Magdalena. 2014. *Material Culture and Authenticity: Fake Branded Fashion in Europe*. London: Bloomsbury.

Heidegger, Martin. 1971. 'The Thing.' In *Poetry, Language, Thought*, 163–184. Translated by A. Hofstadter. New York: Harper and Row.

Hicks, Dan and Mary C. Beaudry, eds. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook Of Material Culture Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hodder, Ian. 2012. 'Thinking About Things Differently'. In *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things*, 1–14. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lane, Paul. 2005. 'The Material Culture of Memory.' In *The Qualities of Time: Anthropological Approaches* by Wendy James and David Mills, eds., 19-34. Oxford: Berg.

Miller, Daniel (ed). 2005. Introduction. In *Materiality*, 1-50. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Tilley, Christopher, and Miller, Daniel. 1996. Editorial. *The Journal of Material Culture* 1(1):5-14.

Webpage: <http://www.materialworldblog.com/>

Week 2: MATERIAL QUALITIES (1) - SENSES AND PERCEPTION

(Tuesday 5th February)

The lecture this week will focus on phenomenological approaches to the body, looking at how human experience is grounded in bodily movement within a social and material environment. We will discuss work by Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Pierre Bourdieu – in order to begin a discussion of the tensions between theories of embodied practice and theories of symbolic representation. These theoretical approaches will be drawn into conversation with contemporary anthropology of the senses.

Lecture Reading:

Tim Ingold. 2004. 'Culture on the Ground: The World Perceived through the Feet' in *Journal of Material Culture*, 9:315-340.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Michael Jackson. 1983. 'Knowledge of the Body' in *Man*, 18:327-345.

Further Readings:

Bille, Mikkel, and Tim Flohr Sørensen. 2007. 'An Anthropology of Luminosity the Agency of Light'. *Journal of Material Culture* 12(3): 263–84.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Csordas, Thomas J. 1994. 'Introduction: The Body as Representation and Being-in-the-world.' In *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*, 1-25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilley, Christopher. 2004. From body to place to landscape: a phenomenological perspective. In *The materiality of stone: explorations in landscape phenomenology*, 1-31 Oxford: Berg.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, Michael, (ed). 1996. *Things as They Are: New directions in phenomenological anthropology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 2014. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Donald A. Landes. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Ram, Kalpana, and Christopher Houston, eds. 2015. *Phenomenology in anthropology : a sense of perspective*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Thomas, Julian. 2006. 'Phenomenology and Material Culture.' In *Handbook of Material Culture*. Chris Tilley, Webb Keane, Susanne Küchler, Mike Rowlands, Patricia Spyer, eds., 43-59. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.43-59.

Howes, David, ed. 2005. *Empire of the Senses: the sensual culture reader*. Oxford: Berg.

Stoller, Paul. 1989. *The Taste of Ethnographic Things: The Senses in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Week 3: REPRESENTATION (1) – FILM AND PHOTOGRAPHY

(Tuesday 12th February)

This week's session will be structured around the screening of a film – with the aim of furthering our conversation around materiality and representation. The experience of watching and interpreting the film will allow us to think further about self presentation – and about the tensions between what is seen and what is unseen, visibility and invisibility, tangible and intangible forces.

Lecture Reading:

David MacDougall. 2006. 'Introduction' to *The Corporeal Image: film, ethnography and the senses*.

Film: *The Salt of the Earth* (2014) Directed by Juliano Ribeiro Salgado and Wim Wenders (1 hours 50 minutes)

Further Readings:

Corpus: Mining the Border photo essay - https://culanth.org/photo_essays/1-corpus-mining-the-border

Week 4. REPRESENTATION (2) - COLLECTION AND DISPLAY

(Tuesday 19th February)

Following on from the discussion of film and photography we will connect these issues back to previous discussions of the body by thinking further about performativity, and exhibitionary practices. The idea for this lecture is to demonstrate some of the theoretical and empirical connections between different representational media (museums, exhibitions, social media, bodies). We will discuss the connections between collection and display in preparation for the workshop on sites of collection and display in week 5.

Lecture Reading:

Svetlana Alpers. 1991. 'The Museum as a Way of Seeing'. In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven Lavine, 25-32. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Sonja Vivienne and Jean Burgess. 2013. 'The remediation of the personal photograph and the politics of self-representation in digital storytelling' in *Journal of Material Culture*, 18:3, 279-298.

Further Readings:

Chatterjee, Helen J. 2008. *Touch in museums: policy and practice in object handling*. Oxford: Berg.

Butler, Shelley Ruth. 2000. The Politics of Exhibiting Culture: Legacies and Possibilities. *Museum Anthropology* 23(3):74-92.

Brown, Bill. 2003. 'Regional Artifacts'. In *A Sense of Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 81-135.

Clifford, James. 1986. *On Collecting Art and Culture*. In *The Predicament of Culture*, 215-251. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 1991. 'Resonance and Wonder'. In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, eds., 42-56. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1989. 'The World as Exhibition'. In *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31:2, 217-236.

Onol, Isil. 2008. 'Tactual Explorations: A tactile interpretation of a museum exhibit through tactile art works and augmented reality'. In *Touch in museums: policy and practice in object handling*. Helen J. Chatterjee, ed., 92-106. Oxford: Berg.

Week 5. WORKSHOP 2: SITES OF COLLECTION AND DISPLAY

(Tuesday 26th February)

This week we will spend the first hour of the lecture period in the Manchester Museum. In two groups we will be given a tour of the museum stores and there will be time also to browse the collections and to decide on a focus for your blog entry for this week. In the second half of the lecture period we will discuss the practical activity of producing a blog on materiality and representation. For further information on the blog see notes on Blackboard.

Workshop Reading:

Macdonald, Sharon. 2011. 'Collecting Practice'. In *Companion to Museum Studies*. Macdonald, Sharon ed., 81-97. Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Further Readings:

Balthazar, A. C. 2016. 'Old things with character: The fetishization of objects in Margate, UK'. *Journal of Material Culture*, 21(4):448–464.

DeMello, Margo. 2000. *Bodies of Inscription: Cultural History of the Modern Tattoo Community*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mascia-lees, Francis E. And Sharpe, Patricia. 1992. *Tattoo, torture, mutilation, and adornment: the denaturalization of the body in culture and text*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nicolescu, G. (2016). 'The museum's lexis: Driving objects into ideas'. *Journal of Material Culture*, 21(4), 465–489.

6. MATERIAL QUALITIES (2) – LAYERS, HISTORIES AND HAUNTINGS

(Tuesday 5th March)

This week we will discuss material qualities by thinking about affect and aura. We build our discussion from Walter Benjamin writing on 'iron'. From here we will consider the use of stone in the construction of cathedrals as well as the use of both colour and light as material qualities. From these discussions we will move on to thinking about authenticity and how the histories of things are carried forward in time, and the ways in which the particular qualities of materials and of objects can provoke powerful responses.

Lecture Reading:

Walter Benjamin. 2002. 'F [Iron Construction]' in *Arcades Project – 1927-1940.*, 150-170. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Michael Taussig. 2008. 'Redeeming Indigo' in *Theory, Culture & Society*. 25(3), pp. 1-15.

Further Readings:

Böhme, Gernot. 1993. 'Atmosphere as the Fundamental Concept of a New Aesthetics'. *Thesis Eleven* 36 (1): 113–26.

Brajer, I. 2009. 'The Concept of Authenticity Expressed in the Treatment of Wall Paintings in Denmark'. In *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*, edited by Alison Richmond and Alison Lee Bracker, 2nd ed., 84–99. London: Routledge.

Edensor, T. 2005. 'The Ghosts of Industrial Ruins: Ordering and Disordering Memory in Excessive Space.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23(6), 829–849.

Edensor, Tim. 2005. *Industrial Ruins: Spaces, Aesthetics, and Materiality*. Oxford; New York: Berg.

Edensor, Tim. 2012. 'Illuminated Atmospheres: Anticipating and Reproducing the Flow of Affective Experience in Blackpool'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30 (6): 1103–22.

Grant, Stuart. 2013. 'Performing an Aesthetics of Atmospheres'. *Literature & Aesthetics* 23 (1): 12–32.

Hasse, Jürgen. 2011. 'Emotions in the Urban Environment: Embellishing the Cities from the Perspective of the Humanities'. In *Cities and Fascination*, edited by John Urry, Wolf-Dietrich Sahr, and Heiko Schmid, 49–74. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate.

Jones, Siân. 2010. 'Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves: Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity'. *Journal of Material Culture* 15 (2): 181–203.

Jones, Siân, and Thomas Yarrow. 2013. 'Crafting Authenticity: An Ethnography of Conservation Practice'. *Journal of Material Culture* 18 (1): 3–26.

Tanizaki, Jun 'ichiro. 2001. *In Praise of Shadows*. London: Vintage.

7. MAKING THINGS – ART/CRAFT

(Tuesday 12th March)

The craft practices involved in 'making things' is the subject of this week's discussion, in which we consider how material qualities and embodied practice come together in the processes of material production. In doing so we will consider ideas of negotiation and improvisation and thinking about questions of authorship and whether 'aesthetics' is a useful concept for anthropological analysis.

Lecture Reading:

Alfred Gell. 1996. Vogel's Net: Traps as Artworks and Artworks as Traps. *Journal of Material Culture*, Vol 1, pp. 15-38.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Soumhya Venkatesan. 2014. 'From stone to god and back again: Why we need both materials and materiality' in Harvey et. al. (eds) *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*. London: Routledge, pp. 72-81.

Further Readings:

Adamson, Glenn. 2007. Skilled. In *Thinking through Craft*. 69-101. Oxford: Berg.

Brand, Stewart. (1995), *How Buildings Learn: What happens after they're built*. Penguin Books, London.

Ewart, Ian J. (2013), *Designing by Doing: Building Bridges in the Highlands of Borneo*. In: Gunn, W., Otto, T., Smith, R.C. (Eds.), *Design Anthropology: Theory and Practice*. Bloomsbury, London, New York, pp. 85–99.

Marchand, Trevor. 2010. 'Embodied cognition and communication: studies with British fine woodworkers'. In *Making Knowledge*, ed. Trevor Marchand, special issue, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 16:100-120.

Hallam, Elizabeth, and Ingold, Tim. (2007), *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation*. Berg Publishers, Oxford.

Ingold, Tim. 2010. The Textility of Making. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 34:91–102.

Ingold, Tim. (2013), *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. Routledge. London, New York

Sennett, Richard. 2008. *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin Books

Turnbull, David. (1993), The Ad Hoc Collective Work of Building Gothic Cathedrals with Templates, String, and Geometry. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 18, 315–340.

8. WORKSHOP 3: UNMAKING AND REMAKING THINGS

(Tuesday 19th March)

In this final workshop I ask you to think about your chosen sites of display (from week 5) in terms of what is made and what is unmade in the material setting that you are going to present in your blog. I will introduce some different perspectives on unbuilding and destroying 'things', and the relations they entail. We will also think further on the aesthetics of decay.

Lecture Readings:

Crang, Mike. 2010. 'The Death of Great Ships: photography, politics, and waste in the global imaginary' in *Environment and Planning A*, volume 42, pages 1084-1102 .

Fennell, Catherine. 2012. 'The Museum of Resilience: Raising a Sympathetic Public in Post-Welfare Chicago' in *Cultural Anthropology* 27, no. 4, pp. 641–666.

Further Readings:

Chris Killip, The Last Ships, Exhibition and Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jMzN35AyZs8>

Dirt in its Place waste conference video: <https://vimeo.com/221489356>

Lemonnier, Pierre. 2012. *Mundane objects: materiality and non-verbal communication*. California: Left Coast Press.

Chalfin, Brenda. 2014. Public Things, Excremental Politics, and the Infrastructure of Bare Life in Ghana's City of Tema. *American Ethnologist* 41(1): 92-109.

'Are we flint' webpage - <https://limn.it/articles/are-we-all-flint/>

Renfrew Daniel. 2018. *Life without Lead: Contamination, Crisis, and Hope in Uruguay*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 5: New House, New Life.

'The Infrastructure Toolbox' webpage - <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/725-the-infrastructure-toolbox>

9. VITAL MATTER – MATERIAL QUALITIES (3)

(Tuesday 26th March)

Material vitality is the key topic for this lecture, that takes forward the discussion of waste matter from the previous session. I will introduce you to debates that are calling for a greater emphasis on the vital power of materials in our analyses of social and cultural worlds. This topic allows us to return to our discussions of material qualities in a new way – via a consideration of energy sources,

of toxicity, and of the intrinsic vitality of materials – such as stone. These discussions of vitality also connect back to previous weeks and the topics of affect and of aesthetics.

Lecture Reading:

Hecht, Gabrielle. 2018. 'Interscalar Vehicles for an African Anthropocene: On Waste, Temporality, and Violence.' *Cultural Anthropology*, 33(1): 109–141.

Tutorial Reading for AQC:

Catherine Allen. 2016. 'The Living Ones: Miniatures and Animation in the Andes' in *Journal of Anthropological Research*, vol 7:4, 416-441.

Further Readings:

Fredericks, Rosalind. 2014. Vital Infrastructures of Trash in Dakar. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*. 34(3): 532-548.

Raffles, Hugh. 2012. 'Twenty Five Years is a long time' *Cultural Anthropology*, 27(3):526-534.

Harvey, Penelope. 2016. Waste Futures: Infrastructures and Political Experimentation in Southern Peru, *Ethnos*, 82(4):1–18.

Miller, Daniel. 2007. Stone age or plastic age? *Archaeological Dialogues*. 14(1):23-27

Edensor, T. (2005). Waste Matter - The Debris of Industrial Ruins and the Disordering of the Material World. *Journal of Material Culture*, 10(3), 311–332.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant matter: a political ecology of things*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Watson, Janell. 2013. "Eco-sensibilities: An Interview with Jane Bennett." *Minnesota Review*, 81:147-158.

Tilley, Christopher, and Bennett, Wayne. 2004. *The materiality of stone: explorations in landscape phenomenology*. Oxford: Berg.

Massey, D. (2006). Landscape as a Provocation: Reflections on Moving Mountains. *Journal of Material Culture*, 11(1–2), 33–48.

McLean, Stuart. 2011. "Black Goo: Forceful Encounters with Matter in Europe's Muddy Margins." *Cultural Anthropology* 26(4): 589–619.

10. MEDIATION – MATERIALITY AND REPRESENTATION

(Tuesday 2nd April)

This week will be a revision lecture. We will review the blogs and discuss the assessed essay titles. I will also introduce the concept of 'mediation' that will be helpful for your thinking about the relationships between materiality and representation – and we will revise the ground we have covered in thinking about materials, images, words, bodies and 'things'.

Lecture Reading:

Haidy Geismar, Susanne Küchler, Timothy Carroll. 2016. 'Twenty Years On' in *Journal of Material Culture*, 21(1):3-7.