

1



Race and Ethnicity: Anthropological and Sociological Perspectives

Raymond Scupin, *Lindenwood University*

In 1999, 21-year-old Benjamin Smith spent the July 4th weekend cruising in his car in Chicago and central Indiana areas shooting at African Americans, Orthodox Jews, and Asians. In this three-day shooting spree, two were killed and nine were wounded before Smith shot and killed himself during a police chase. The African American killed was Rick Birdsong, a former basketball coach at Northwestern University. He was jogging with his children when he was shot in the back. Won Joined Soon, a Korean graduate student at Indiana University, was killed outside of a Korean church.

Benjamin Smith was a former member of the World Church of the Creator, which is currently led by Matt Hale of East Peoria, Illinois. Hale refers to himself as Pontifex Maximus and teaches that only white Anglo-Saxons are true human beings, descendants of Adam and Eve. Jews are believed to be illegitimate offspring of Eve and Satan, and African Americans and other people of color are descendants of inferior non-Adamite anthropoids called “mud people.” The church believes that the United States should be “cleansed” of all Jews and nonwhites. The church’s Web site features a discussion of the mental inferiority of African Americans, with a reference to Canadian psychologist Philippe Rushton’s “scientific” research confirming this view.

Although groups such as the World Church of the Creator are small, with only a few thousand members, their influence seems to be on the rise. For many years, most social scientists believed that racism and ethnic conflict were going to decline. However, the Southern Poverty Law Center (splcenter.org), a group that has been a leading authority on reporting hate groups, indicates that since 2000 there are a record number of 926 hate groups in the United States, an increase of more than 50 percent. These hate groups include Klu Klux Klan cells, Neo-Nazi sects, white nationalists, racist skinheads, and other merchants of hate. Despite the fact that the current U.S. president is an African American and the United States has politicians who are

Jewish, Muslim, and Hispanic, hate groups and racism are still a reality in U.S. society and the world.

Some commentators have suggested that since Obama was elected as president, the United States has become a *post-racial* society. In one major interpretation of this *post-racial* phenomenon, Obama represents the fulfillment of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s famed "I Have a Dream" speech in 1963 in which he suggested a future U.S. society where all humans would be judged by the content of their character, rather than the color of their skin. This interpretation of *post-racial* suggests that President Obama's election has ended prejudice and discrimination based on skin color or ethnicity and the reduction of inequality in income, education, and political power. However, as the various chapters in this textbook will indicate, the term *post-racial* appears to be a greatly exaggerated interpretation of Barack Obama's 2008 election. Racial prejudice

and discrimination persists in U.S. society (and elsewhere throughout the world). The claim that race or ethnicity does not matter any longer in the United States or elsewhere has to be viewed with a great deal of skepticism.

And in other parts of the world, extremist racist and ethnic groups have emerged within the past two decades. For example, in the former East Germany there has been a rise of a neo-Nazi movement among German youth who resent the immigration of nonwhites into their society. Ethnic extremism among the Hutu and Tutsi peoples in Central Africa has resulted in tragic genocidal policies. Conflicts among Serbs, Croats, and Bosnians in Yugoslavia, Tamils and Sinhalese in Sri Lanka, Jews and Arabs in Israel, and so-called "white Europeans" and "people of color" in the United States are ongoing. Everywhere one looks, ethnic conflict seems to be emerging worldwide. Although the causes of these conflicts are very complex, ethnic and race conflicts remain a continuing global problem in the twenty-first century.

Currently, we live in societies that are becoming more globalized, with more extensive contact among peoples of different ethnic backgrounds and cultures. Globalization refers to the expansion and interlinking of the world's economy through the spread of market capitalism, communications technology, and industrialization and their consequences. One of the results of globalization has been the transfer of capital, technology, labor, and media throughout the world. Global migration trends have been radically transformed since the 1950s. Immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East—the so-called Third World—to the industrial societies of Europe, the United States, Australia, and Canada has increased substantially. For example, England and France have growing numbers of immigrants from their former colonies in Africa and Asia. Furthermore, the societies in the Third World are also being transformed by new trends in immigration. Refugees and migrants are becoming increasingly mobile throughout the world.



President Barack Obama.

Societies that may have been very homogeneous or ethnically similar in the past are now facing questions about their increasing multicultural and multiethnic differences.

As we will see in later chapters, U.S. society in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries faced similar issues. Immigrants flowed into the United States from many areas of the world. Currently, the United States is again encountering the challenge of multiculturalism. For example, a typical elementary school in Los Angeles may have as many as 20 different native languages spoken by members of the school population. In 2000, California became the first U.S. state where the white ethnic population became a minority. Due to the increase of Hispanic and Asian populations, the white ethnic population was 49.9 percent. Event calendars in daily newspapers announce ethnic festivals in major U.S. cities that originated in many nations. All of these changes have resulted in some reservations regarding the new ethnic patterns and multiculturalism in the United States. In 1991, the distinguished historian Arthur Schlesinger wrote a book entitled *The Disuniting of America*, which argued that ethnic and racial separatism was the major obstacle for a truly integrated multicultural society in the United States. Schlesinger believes that extreme versions of multicultural education and what he terms the “cult of ethnicity” are tearing apart the U.S. social and political fabric. He suggests that the growing emphasis on multicultural heritage exalts racial and ethnic pride at the expense of social and political cohesion. On the other hand, other scholars, such as Nathan Glazer in his book *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*, argue that all children should be taught mutual tolerance and respect for all of the various ethnic groups in U.S. society.

As societies become more multicultural and multiethnic, they confront new challenges. In many circumstances, ethnic groups may be in competition with each other over political and economic resources. In other cases, they may be at odds over religious or other cultural differences. Conversely, some people are benefiting from the multicultural trends in their society by learning

from one another’s cultures, thereby discovering that multicultural environments can enrich one’s experience and be extremely rewarding.

In any case, many people are seeking answers to basic questions regarding these new changes in race and ethnic trends within their societies in the twenty-first century. What are the reasons for these continuing race and ethnic conflicts and problems? Do the claims of people like Matt Hale and the World Church about superior and inferior racial groups have any scientific validity? What are the significant distinctions among the races? What is the difference between race and ethnicity? What is the basis of one’s ethnic identity? Why do some societies and countries have less race and ethnic conflict than others? Why has there been a recent increase in racial and ethnic conflict around the globe? Have these racial and ethnic conflicts always existed? Under what conditions do increases in race and ethnic conflict occur? Under what societal conditions do race and ethnic prejudice and discrimination develop? In what interracial and interethnic situations can race and ethnic prejudice be reduced? Under what conditions do different ethnic groups live peaceably together and benefit from each other’s experience?

Sociologists and anthropologists are currently engaged in major research efforts in an attempt to answer some of these questions. In fact, both disciplines have an intimate acquaintanceship with questions about race and ethnicity issues. Anthropology was the first field devoted to systematic scientific investigations into questions about race and ethnicity. These questions persist as one of the fundamental priorities within the research efforts of contemporary anthropologists.

This textbook will cover some of the most important research on race and ethnicity by both sociologists and anthropologists. Although the authors of the various chapters are anthropologists, most of them have drawn from sociological studies, too. But, first, we will discuss the interrelationship between these questions about race and ethnicity and the discipline of anthropology.

ANTHROPOLOGY: THE FOUR FIELDS AND RACE AND ETHNICITY ISSUES

The word *anthropology* stems from the Greek words *anthropo*, meaning “human beings” or “humankind,” and *logia*, translated as “knowledge of” or “the study of.” Thus, we can define anthropology as the systematic study of humankind. The field of anthropology emerged in Western society in an attempt to understand non-Western peoples. Europeans, including Christopher Columbus, had been exploring and colonizing the world since the fifteenth century. They had encounters with non-Western peoples in the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Various European travelers, missionaries, and government officials had described some of these non-Western societies, cultures, and races. By the nineteenth century, anthropology had developed into the primary discipline and science for understanding these non-Western societies, races, and cultures. The major questions that these early nineteenth-century anthropologists grappled with had to do with the basic differences and similarities of human societies, cultures, and races throughout the world.

The predominant explanation that nineteenth-century anthropologists offered to explain the differences and similarities among human societies, cultures, and races became known as *unilineal evolution*. Charles Darwin had developed his theory regarding the evolution of life in 1859, with the publication of his book *On the Origin of Species*. Many anthropologists of the nineteenth century were influenced by Darwin’s thesis, and attempted to apply these evolutionary concepts to the study of human societies, cultures, and races. These early anthropologists took the descriptions of early historians, archaeologists, classical scholars, travelers, missionaries, and colonial officials for their basic data. Based on these data, they proposed that all societies and cultures had developed from early, original “savage” stages through a stage of “barbarianism,” and eventually some evolved into “civilized” stages. Thus, these early anthropologists developed models of the stages of humankind’s

universal history using the concept of unilineal evolution.¹ They constructed a model of a hierarchy of societies that could be ranked from savage to civilized based on differences in society, culture, technology, and race.

Since the nineteenth century, anthropology as a field has continued its research efforts of different societies, cultures, and “races.” However, beginning in the twentieth century, many of the ideas of nineteenth-century theorists were thoroughly criticized and debunked through systematic and scientific research techniques. The efforts of nineteenth-century anthropologists need to be understood within their own historical setting. These early anthropologists did not have a very precise understanding of the concept of “culture,” nor did they comprehend the roles of genetics and heredity. The development of a more thorough concept of culture and a scientific understanding of heredity and genetics did not develop until the twentieth century. Because of their limited understanding of culture and heredity, they labored under many misconceptions about non-Western societies, cultures, and races. One of the basic underlying assumptions was that their own society and culture were superior to those of any other. This is an example of what is known as *ethnocentrism*, the belief that one’s own society and culture are superior to any other. In addition, during the nineteenth century, most of these early anthropologists were convinced that their own so-called “race” was superior to that of any other “race.” This is known as *racism*, the belief that there are distinctive biological “races” and that one can rank and categorize superior and inferior biological “races” within the human species.

It was only after twentieth-century anthropologists absorbed the new findings of genetics and heredity, developed a more sophisticated comprehension of the concept of culture, and had a better appreciation of concepts of “race” and “ethnicity” that these earlier views could be criticized exhaustively. One of the major anthropological projects that critiqued these early views was associated with the efforts of Franz Boas (1858–1942). Boas had been born, educated, and trained in physics in Germany. Later, he became

interested in geography and culture and did research among the Eskimo in the Canadian Arctic. Through these experiences he turned to the study of anthropology, immigrated to the United States, and taught for many years at Columbia University. While at Columbia, Boas and his students carried out extensive research in physical anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, and cultural anthropology (or ethnology), providing the contemporary foundations for the systematic investigation of such topics as race, culture, and ethnicity (Degler 1991; Stocking 1968). One of the primary aspects of research that Boas emphasized was the “fieldwork” experience in anthropology. Instead of speculating on various theories about the evolution of culture based on written materials, anthropologists had to go into the “field” and do empirical research among the people in different societies.

In the United States, Boas’s research activities developed into what has become known as the “four-field approach” within anthropology. Most U.S. anthropology programs feature four subdisciplines, or subfields, that bridge the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. These four subdisciplines—physical anthropology, archaeology, linguistic anthropology, and ethnology—give anthropologists a broad, holistic approach to the study of humanity through space and time. In addition, all four of these fields have enabled contemporary anthropologists to contribute significantly toward the study of race and ethnicity. Though these four subfields demarcate the fields within which most anthropological research is conducted, we need to emphasize that within these four fields anthropologists draw on the findings of many other disciplines, such as biology, history, psychology, economics, sociology, and political science, to examine race and ethnic relations. These four fields, however, offer anthropologists a unique perspective for assessing questions of race and ethnicity.

Physical Anthropology

Physical anthropology (or biological anthropology) is the branch of anthropology most closely

related to the natural sciences. Physical anthropologists conduct research in two major areas: human evolution and human variation. The majority of physical anthropologists focus on human evolution. Some investigate fossils, the preserved remains of bones and living materials from earlier periods, to reconstruct the evolution and anatomical characteristics of early human ancestors. The study of human evolution through analysis of fossils is called *paleoanthropology* (the prefix *paleo* means “old” or “prehistoric”). Paleoanthropologists use a variety of sophisticated scientific techniques to date, classify, and compare fossil bones in order to determine the links between modern humans and their biological ancestors. For example, paleoanthropologists are studying the relationship of early populations of *Homo erectus* and Neandertals to determine their precise connections with modern humans.

As we will see in Chapter 3, on race, paleoanthropologists have been doing basic research on the evolution of physical characteristics of ancestral populations in all parts of the world. Paleoanthropologists have developed elaborate techniques to measure observable physical characteristics of humans based on their fossil remains, primarily fossil bones and teeth. Early paleoanthropologists tried to establish clear-cut criteria for distinguishing the evolution of various “races” in different regions of the world. However, modern paleoanthropologists have concluded that these early attempts were based on simplistic categories of racial differences. Today, paleoanthropologists have much more sophisticated methods and techniques for differentiating ancestral human populations, and they exercise extreme caution when evaluating the evolution of different races.

Another group of physical anthropologists focuses their research on the range of physical variation within and among different “modern” human populations. These physical anthropologists study human variation by measuring physical characteristics such as body size, by comparing blood types, and by examining differences in skin color or hair texture. *Human osteology* is the particular area of specialization within

physical anthropology dealing with the comparative study of the human skeleton and teeth. Physical anthropologists are also interested in evaluating how disparate physical characteristics reflect evolutionary adaptations to different environmental conditions, thus shedding light on why human populations vary. Noting how specific physical traits have enabled these populations to adapt to different geographic environments, these anthropologists reveal how human populations have developed. Early physical anthropologists wanted to use biological attributes to classify various living populations throughout the world into distinctive “races.” Eventually, however, physical anthropologists developed advanced research techniques and methods that led to the abandonment of simplistic constructions of “race” among human populations. As physical anthropologists have learned more about physical variation among human populations, they became more aware of how difficult it was to classify humans into distinguishable “racial” populations. They discovered that traditional biological characteristics such as skin color did not necessarily correlate with other physical characteristics that demarcate one “race” from another. In fact, the vast majority of anthropologists have rejected the concept of “race” as a useful scientific concept. Thus, today, physical anthropologists have learned to be extremely careful with their assessment procedures in attempting to study biological characteristics and classifications among human populations.

An increasingly important area of research for some physical anthropologists is genetics, the study of the biological “blueprints” that dictate the inheritance of physical characteristics. Research on genetics examines a wide variety of questions. It has, for example, been important in identifying the genetic sources of some diseases such as sickle-cell anemia, cystic fibrosis, and Tay-Sachs disease. Genetics has also become an increasingly important complement to paleoanthropological research. Through the study of the genetic makeup of modern humans, geneticists have been working on calculating the genetic distance among modern humans, thus providing a

possible means of inferring evolutionary relationships within the species. For example, genetic studies have been used to determine the physical and evolutionary connections between Native American Indians and Asian peoples.

Archaeology

Through *archaeology*, the branch of anthropology that seeks out and examines the artifacts of past societies, we learn much about the lifestyles, history, and evolution of those societies. *Artifacts*, the material remains of former societies, provide tangible clues to the lifestyle, environments, and political economies of extinct societies. Some archaeologists investigate past societies that did not have written documents through which to leave a record of their past. Known as *prehistoric archaeologists*, these researchers study the artifacts of groups such as Native Americans to understand how these people lived. Other archaeologists, called *classical archaeologists*, conduct research on ancient civilizations, such as Egyptian, Greek, and Roman, in collaboration with historians and linguists. Another group of archaeologists, known as *historical archaeologists*, pursue research with historians and investigate the artifacts of societies of the more recent past. For example, many historical archaeologists are probing the remains of plantations in the southern United States to gain an understanding of the lifestyles of slaves and slave owners during the nineteenth century.

Only after intensive analysis do archaeologists cautiously interpret the data they have collected and begin to generalize about a past society. Unlike the glorified adventures of fictional archaeologists, the real-world field of archaeology thrives on the intellectually challenging adventure of careful, systematic, detail-oriented scientific research that enhances our understanding of past societies.

Modern archaeologists have developed a greater in-depth understanding of past societies in various parts of the world, and have shown how environmental circumstances and prehistoric or historic conditions have influenced the societal development of human populations in different

regions. They have illuminated through careful research how nineteenth-century archaeologists were misled by their simplistic categorizations, and racist and ethnocentric beliefs, in assessing the societal developments of other cultures. Thus, recent archaeological research has refuted racist and ethnocentric views about non-European or non-Western societies.

Linguistic Anthropology

Linguistics, the study of language, has a long history that dovetails with the discipline of philosophy, but it is also one of the integral subfields of anthropology. *Linguistic anthropology* focuses on the relationship between language and culture, how language is used within society, and how the human brain acquires and uses language. Franz Boas was the founder of linguistic anthropology in North America, and his pioneering linguistic research revolutionized the study of language, culture, and ethnicity.

As do researchers in other fields within anthropology, linguistic anthropologists seek to discover the ways in which languages are different from each other as well as how they are similar. Two wide-ranging areas of research in linguistic anthropology are *structural linguistics* and *historical linguistics*. Structural linguistics explores how language works. Structural linguistics compare grammatical patterns and other linguistic elements to learn how contemporary languages mirror and differ from one another. Structural linguistics has uncovered some intriguing relationships between language and thought patterns among different groups of people. Do people who speak different languages with different grammatical structures think and perceive the world differently from each other? For instance, do native Chinese speakers think or view the world and life experiences differently from native English speakers? This is just one of the questions that structural linguists attempt to answer. Such questions bear on the relationship among language, culture, and ethnicity.

Linguistic anthropologists also examine the connections between language and social behavior

in different cultures. This specialty, called *socio-linguistics*, focuses on both how language is used to define social groups and how belonging to particular groups leads to specialized language use. For example, a number of linguists have been doing research on Ebonics, a distinctive variety of American English spoken by some African Americans. The term *Ebonics* is derived from the words “ebony” and “phonics,” meaning “black speech sounds” (Rickford 1997). These linguistic anthropologists find that Ebonics is no more a lazy form of English than Italian is a lazy form of Latin. Instead, Ebonics is a different language with systematically ordered grammar and pronunciation usages. Linguistic research such as this has helped to undo racist and ethnocentric assumptions about various ethnic minorities.

Another area of research of interest to linguistic anthropologists is historical linguistics. *Historical linguistics* concentrates on the comparison and classification of different languages to discern their historical links. By examining and analyzing grammatical structures and sounds of languages, researchers are able to discover rules for how languages change over time, as well as which languages are related to each other historically. This type of historical linguistic research is particularly useful in tracing the migration routes of various groups through time, confirming archaeological and paleoanthropological data gathered independently. For example, historical linguistics has been used to confirm the migration of the Navajo Native American Indians from Canada down into the southwest region of the United States.

Cultural Anthropology

Cultural anthropology is the subfield of anthropology that examines contemporary societies. Contemporary cultural anthropologists do fieldwork in all parts of the world, from the tropical rain forests of Africa and Latin America to the Arctic regions of Canada, from the deserts of the Middle East to the urban areas of China. Until recently, most cultural anthropologists conducted research on non-Western or remote cultures in Africa, Asia,

the Middle East, Latin America, and the Pacific Islands, and on the Native American populations in the United States. Today, however, many anthropologists are doing research on their own cultures in order to gain a better understanding of their institutions and cultural values. In fact, as will be seen in chapters in Part II, which focuses on the United States, ethnographers have been actively engaged in research on ethnic groups in the United States for decades.

Cultural anthropologists use a unique research strategy in conducting their fieldwork in different settings. Unlike the early nineteenth-century “armchair” anthropologists, contemporary ethnologists live for an extended amount of time within the societies that they study. The American Franz Boas and the Polish-born British Bronislaw Malinowski are two examples of those who used this important research strategy in twentieth-century anthropology. They knew that the early studies relied too heavily on superficial, nonquantifiable descriptions and comparisons from classical scholars, travelers, missionaries, and colonial government officials.

Boas and Malinowski promoted and institutionalized the practice of doing intensive fieldwork in the various societies around the world—a research strategy called *participant observation*, which involves learning the language and culture of the group being studied by participating in the group’s daily activities. Through this intensive participation, the ethnologist becomes deeply familiar with the group and can understand and explain the society and culture of the group as an insider. Presently, many anthropologists use the term *etic* to refer to the description of the culture by the anthropologist, and *emic* to refer to the natives’ point of view of their culture.²

The results of the fieldwork of the cultural anthropologists are written up as an *ethnography*, a description of a society. The typical ethnography describes the environmental setting, economic patterns, social organization, political system, and religious rituals and beliefs of the society under study. However, some ethnographies concentrate on particular areas such as religious beliefs and practices, whereas others may focus on

environmental conditions or political institutions. The description of a society is based on what anthropologists call *ethnographic data*. The gathering of ethnographic data in a systematic manner is the specific research goal of the ethnologist or cultural anthropologist. Some anthropologists use ethnographic data to do comparative cross-cultural studies of different societies. These comparative studies are extremely important in discovering both differences and similarities among people throughout the world—one of the major objectives of the anthropological project.

Most contemporary cultural anthropologists do their research in a much more different manner than Boas or Malinowski did in the beginning of the twentieth century. Today, in the twenty-first century, many of the so-called natives with whom ethnographers interact are combining their traditional understanding of their own culture with formal education, and some are even choosing to become anthropologists themselves. Thus, cultural anthropologists are becoming more like colleagues with the people they are studying, collaborating on research projects together. Instead of the “lone ranger” cultural anthropologist doing research alone on an island among isolated tribal populations, contemporary anthropologists are more likely to reside in urban areas and work with teams of people from the native population to comprehend the effects of globalization and related processes and change within local regions of the world. And, as we will see in this text, many present-day cultural anthropologists are working with ethnic groups within their own society and collaborating on research projects to gain insights into ethnic interaction and cultural change within multicultural societies.

Most U.S. anthropologists are exposed to all four subfields of anthropology in their education. Because of all the research being done in these different fields, however, with more than 300 journals and 100 of books published every year dealing with anthropological research, no one individual can keep abreast of all the developments across the discipline’s full spectrum. Consequently, anthropologists usually specialize in one of the four subfields. Though the four-field

approach tends to be an ideal for anthropology in this age of proliferating information and research data, the research in these different disciplines has been important in establishing basic conclusions regarding race, culture, and ethnicity.

As emphasized earlier, anthropology does not limit itself to its own four subfields to realize its research agenda. Although it stands as a distinct discipline, anthropology is interdisciplinary and has strong links to other fields of study. Cultural anthropology, for instance, is closely related to the fields of history, cultural studies, and in particular sociology. In the past, cultural anthropologists examined traditional, whereas sociologists focused on modern societies. Today, cultural anthropologists and sociologists explore many of the same societies using similar research approaches. For example, both rely on statistical and nonstatistical data whenever appropriate in their studies of different types of societies. In later chapters, we will see how basic sociological research has informed ethnographic studies of ethnicity. A recent, allied field that has influenced anthropology is cultural studies, which combines a number of disciplines with the concept of culture to do research on a number of topics related to ethnic and race relations. Likewise, anthropology dovetails considerably with the field of history, which, like anthropology, encompasses a broad range of events. Studies of ethnicity could not be conducted without a comprehensive historical perspective. These fields, as well as others, which will become evident throughout this textbook, have contributed to the anthropological perspective on race and ethnic relations.

Through their interdisciplinary approach, sociologists and anthropologists have emphasized both a *holistic* and a *global* perspective. The holistic and global perspectives enable sociologists and

anthropologists to consider the biological, environmental, psychological, economic, historical, social, and cultural conditions of humans at all times and in all places. Sociologists and anthropologists do not limit themselves to understanding a particular ethnic group or set of societies but, rather, they attempt to demonstrate the interconnections among different societies. This combined holistic and global perspective is used throughout this text to demonstrate how different ethnic groups have developed unique interrelationships and patterns throughout the world.

In this age of rapid communication, worldwide travel, and increasing economic interconnections, young people preparing for careers in the twenty-first century must recognize and be able to deal with the cultural and ethnic differences that exist among peoples while also understanding the fundamental similarities that make us all distinctly human. In this age of cultural diversity and increasing internationalization, sustaining this dual perception, of underlying similar human characteristics and outward cultural differences, has both practical and moral benefits. Although nationalistic, ethnic, and racial bigotry are rife in many parts of the world, our continuing survival and successful adaptation depend on greater mutual understanding and cooperation. Anthropology promotes a cross-cultural perspective that allows us to see ourselves as part of one human family in the midst of tremendous diversity. Our society needs citizens that have skills in empathy, tolerance of others, and an understanding of a complex interlocking world. We need world citizens who can function in inescapably multicultural and multinational environments to work cooperatively and become productive citizens, as well as helping to solve humanity's pressing problems of bigotry, poverty, and violence.

References Cited

- DEGLER, CARL N. 1991. *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and the Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RICKFORD, JOHN R. 1997. Suite for ebony and phonics. *Discovery* 18(2):82–87.
- STOCKING, JR., GEORGE W. 1982 [1968]. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Notes

1. The British Edward B. Tylor (1832–1917) is one of the best-known nineteenth-century anthropologists. Tylor’s major anthropological and theoretical works are *Primitive Culture*, 2 vols (volume 2 is titled *Religion in Primitive Culture*, part II of *Primitive Culture*, Harper Torchbooks, 1871/1958); *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization* (John Murray, 1881); and *Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Man* (D. Appleton, 1881/1898). The other well-known nineteenth-century anthropologist is the American Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–1881). Morgan did an early anthropological work entitled *League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois* (2 vols, New York), a detailed description of one group of Seneca Indians living in upstate New York. Morgan’s later work included a cross-cultural analysis text called *Ancient Society* (1877), which had an enormous influence on nineteenth-century thought.
2. The terms *etic* and *emic* are derived from the words “phonetic” and “phonemic,” as used in linguistics. Phonetics refers to the different types of sound units in languages. Thus, there is an International Phonetic Alphabet used to designate various sound units of languages throughout the world. In contrast, a phoneme is a sound unit that is understood to have a meaning within a particular language. Phonemics refers to the sound units understood by the native speaker of a specific language.