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"In China the males of a family are charged with responsibility for obtaining husbands for the daughters and even for the serving maids of the household. Non-marriage on the part of a woman disgraces the family. Hence Chinese often conclude that unmarried American lady missionaries have fled to China to escape the disgrace incurred by failure of their fathers or brothers to find a husband."

"To the American woman a system of plural wives seems 'instinctively' abhorrent. She cannot understand how any woman can fail to be jealous and uncomfortable if she must share her husband with other women. She feels it 'unnatural' to accept such a situation. On the other hand a Koryak woman of Siberia... would find it hard to understand how a woman could be so selfish and so undesirous of feminine companionship in the home as to wish to restrict her husband to one mate."

A Tibetan woman may become the wife of two or more brothers, all of whom exercise conjugal rights. The eldest brother is, however, her legal husband and the legal father of her children. Actual paternity, a matter of such grave concern to Americans, does not strike the Tibetan as a significant issue. The brothers, furthermore, are much less interested in exclusive possession of a woman than in the practical advantages of their cooperation for the benefit of the family and the continuance of the line.

"Among the Banaro of New Guinea the first born child must not be the offspring of the husband. The real father is a close friend of the bride's father... Nevertheless the firstborn child inherits the name and possessions of the husband. An American would deem such a custom immoral, but the Banaro tribesman would be equally shocked to discover that the firstborn child of an American couple is the offspring of the husband."

These illustrations of cultural diversity in the proprieties of
marriage and family arrangements could be endlessly multiplied. And every pattern considered proper in a given society would seem most peculiar, if not entirely outrageous, to the members of many other societies.

This enormous diversity in cultural patterning is equally conspicuous in all other aspects of social life. Making a living, raising children, dealing with the supernatural, keeping order both in the society and between it and other societies, communicating with one's fellows, and just staying "alive and kicking" — in each of these essentials of human life there is endless variation.

For more than half a century anthropologists have been busy recording distinctive and diverse ways of life. They have extended their investigations, via spade and notebook, over a staggering amount of time and space. Pre-historical as well as historical and contemporary peoples have been studied, and recently complex urban-industrial cultures have been included.

One of the results of all this has of course been the accumulation of an enormous reservoir of descriptive data, including a great many of those strange-facts-about-strange-people so useful for brightening a newspaper or magazine or filling a lull in the dinner table conversation. What has been irreverently called "the investigation of oddments by the eccentric" has produced rather more than an avalanche of curiosa, however. It has laid an empirical foundation essential to the formulation of reliable generalizations about human behavior.

In what follows we will review some of the major and currently respectable scientific generalizations which can be made about that universal but diversified phenomenon — culturally standardized behavior.

1. Society and culture

The human animal is a gregarious creature. He very rarely lives alone and if he does he seldom appears to like it. Human populations cluster in groups, and the larger, more stable, and more self-sufficient of these are called societies. Every one of these societies can be
described in terms of size, location, man-land adjustments, networks and frequencies of interactions between members, and other such attributes. Every society can also be described in terms of the distinctive life-ways learned, shared, and transmitted by its members. That is, it can be described in terms of its culture. The members of any given human society will be found, upon observation, to be the "practitioners" of a distinctive way of life - to be the bearers of a culture.

"The occurrence of cultureless true societies among the insects makes it clear that........... society precedes and underlies culture, though in man the two always happen to come associated. At any rate, society is a simpler and more obvious concept to grasp than is culture. That is apparently why sociocultural phenomena - the phenomena of man's total history in the broadest sense, which necessarily contain both social facts and cultural facts - usually have their social aspects recognized first. The result has been that the social-plus-cultural combination came at first to be called merely "social," and in popular and general use still carries that ambiguous name.

"For those who like their thinking concrete, it may help if they conceive the sociocultural total in man as similar to a sheet of carbon paper, of which the fabric side represents society and the coated side culture. It is obvious that to use carbon paper effectively, we must distinguish the sides. And yet the sheet is also a unit. Moreover, in certain respects, as when we are not concerned with manifolding but only with some operation like sorting, counting, or packing, a sheet of carbon paper is comparable to and is handled like a sheet of uncoated paper - which in turn would correspond to the cultureless animal societies. But if what we are interested in is the use of carbon paper, the impressions made by it, or if we wish to understand how it makes them, then it is the specific carbon coating that we must examine, even though this comes only as a sort of dry-ink film carried by paper of more or less ordinary cellulose fabric and texture.

"Like all similes, this one has its limitations. But it may be of
help in extricating oneself from the confusing difficulty that the word 'social' has acquired a precise and limited meaning - society as distinguishable from culture - in anthropology and sociology, while still having a shifting double meaning - society including or excluding culture-in popular usage and in many general contexts."

A society, then, is conceptually distinguishable from the culture by which its members live. "In anthropological theory there is not what could be called close agreement on the definition of the concept of culture. But......three prominent keynotes of the discussion may be picked out: first, that culture is transmitted, it constitutes a heritage or a social tradition; secondly, that it is learned, it is not a manifestation, in particular content, of man's genetic constitution; and third, that it is shared. Culture, that is, is on the one hand the product of, on the other hand a determinant of, systems of human social interaction.

"The first point, transmissibility, serves as a most important criterion for distinguishing culture from the social system, because culture can be diffused from one social system to another. Relative to the particular social system it is a 'pattern' element which is both analytically and empirically abstractable from that particular social system.

2. "Culture" and culture

There is still another respect in which the scientific usage of the word culture must be differentiated from the popular.

"For those unfamiliar with anthropological usage, the application of the concept culture to a digging-stick or a cooking recipe necessitates some readjustment in thinking. A popular concept of culture comes within the terms of what may be called a boarding-school definition, and is the equivalent of 'refinement.' Such a definition implies the ability of a person who has 'Culture' to manipulate certain aspects of our civilization that bring prestige. In reality, these aspects are principally the possessions of those persons who have the leisure to learn them.
"For the scientist...... a 'cultured person,' in the popular sense, commands but a specialized fragment of our culture, sharing more than he suspects with the farmer, the brick-layer, the engineer, the ditch-digger, the professional man. The rudest economy, the most frenzied religious rite, a simple folktale, are all equally a part of culture." 6

Conversely, "many educated people have the notion that culture applies only to exotic ways of life or to societies where relative simplicity and relative homogeneity prevail. Some sophisticated missionaries, for example, will use the anthropological conception in discussing the special modes of living of South Sea Islanders, but seem amazed at the idea that it could be applied equally to inhabitants of New York City. And social workers in Boston will talk about the culture of a colorful and well-knit immigrant group but boggle at applying it to the behavior of staff members in the social-service agency itself." 7

3. Culture (generic) and culture (specific)

We have noted that every human society can be described in terms of its distinctive culture, and that the variability of human cultures is enormous. Putting the matter a little differently we can say that culture is a universal phenomenon - a generic concept - and that there are many cultures - specific examples of this generic phenomenon.

Although this conceptualization may be confusing at first, it is basically simple enough. Parallel conceptualizations are not uncommon in the classificatory schemes of other disciplines. There is, for example, the biological usage of the concepts mammal and mammals. Biologists have demonstrated the existence of mammalia - of creatures having in common the capacity to bear their young alive, to nourish them via the secretions of the mammary glands, etc. But there are many mammals - creatures as unlike as whales and humans - who yet share mammalian attributes.

It is similarly true that cultures, however varied, fall into one larger class of phenomena because all cultures show basic structural
and functional similarities. "There are today some three to four
thousand peoples whose cultures are sufficiently distinctive to be
considered independent units," yet in every one of them there can be
found a structure—a configuration—adequate to serve the universal needs
of the human animal. Because these needs must be met if the society
is to survive, all societies which are going concerns have developed
comparable cultural structures which function toward comparable ends.

This abstract conceptualization about culture-generic and culture-
specific is very concretely symbolized by the existence of what are
called the Human Relations Area Files (formerly known as the Cross-
Cultural Survey) at Yale. Here are stored, under hundreds of topical
and sub-topical headings, all of the known facts about more than 200
different cultures. The scholar wishing to study any particular type of
patterning finds the relevant cross-cultural data ready to his hand in
these files. Recently, for example, there has been published a
comparative study entitled Patterns of Sexual Behavior, in which
are set forth many generalizations based upon data drawn from the
Human Relations Files.

It is feasible to set up such a cross-cultural file, in which the
topical headings represent the universal inventory (culture in the
generic sense), because "the members of all human societies face
some of the same unavoidable dilemmas, posed by biology and other
facts of the human situation, This is why the basic categories of all
cultures are so similar. Human culture without language is unthinkable.
No culture fails to provide for aesthetic expression and aesthetic
delight. Every culture supplies standardized orientations toward the
deeper problems, such as death. Every culture is designed to perpetuate
the group and its solidarity, to meet the demands of individuals for
an orderly way of life and for satisfaction of biological needs." 9

Culture in the generic sense has, however, still other features in
addition to the universal inventory. From the study of large numbers
of specific cultures there are beginning to emerge some reliable
generalizations about cultural processes—about the physiology as well
as the anatomy of culture, as it were. "We can recognize, behind the tremendous diversity of existing cultures and the innumerable episodes of history, certain basic principles of organization and growth. These are repeated again and again although the results will vary with the materials with which such principles operate." Although the present knowledge of cultural processes does not allow of precise prediction, it is sufficient to have marked practical significance. Colonial administrators, Point Four administrators, the U. S. Office of Indian Affairs, missionaries, and others who deal with practical problems involving cultural change have established this fact.

4. Patterning in culture

a. The nature of patterns

Culturally standardized – i.e. patterned – behavior "ranges from simple acts such as eating with a fork or with chopsticks, or tying a shoelace, to complex mathematical operations and philosophical speculation. A baseball game, an Iroquois game of lacrosse, the wearing of wooden sandals by Japanese, and a prayer meeting are cultural behavior of the participating individuals. The duties of the president and the techniques of safe-cracking, the forms of matrimony and the forms of parliamentary law – all are patterns of behavior learned individually by each person concerned. Some cultural behavior, as the wearing of clothes in conformance with fashion, is evident in the behavior of nearly everyone. Knowledge of a complex theorem in the calculus, however, becomes habitual in the activity of a minority only. Sins and crimes are cultural behavior, even though such activities are generally disapproved.”

Every specific culture is a complex of a very large number of patterns, that is, of regularities and uniformities in behavior. Whether these be simple or complex, whether involving the mundane or the sacred, whether explicit or implicit, formal or informal, transient or prevailing, approved or disapproved, widely or narrowly observed in the given society, whether primarily matters of emotion, of thought, or of action – still we are identifying patterns wherever we
can observe uniformities in the behavior of any significant number of people. We see patterned behavior whenever we see members of a society or subsociety behaving in very similar ways under similar circumstances. Behavior which upon extended observation appears to be quite average or typical among all the members of a society - or for persons of a particular age, sex, class, caste, occupational or regional category - is patterned behavior. Behavior which recurs among these people often enough to be modal (in the statistical sense of the most frequently occurring, the usual or typical item in a series of data) is patterned behavior.

Patterns might in fact equally well be called modalities. The term is a good one because it implies that there is a central tendency in behavior with a range of variation around it. This is exactly what culturally patterned behavior shows, though the ranges of variation differ greatly as between one culture and another and even more as between one aspect and another of a given culture.

American culture, for example, shows a much greater range of variation in respect to most types of behavior than does Tibetan. This contrast would hold for complex as against simpler cultures generally. Yet even within American culture the range of variation is much greater in the patterning of religious behavior or marriage and family practices than in food or clothing habits.

b. Types of patterns: ideal and behavioral

Examination of a given culture will also show that there are modalities not only in what people actually do, but also in what they are expected to do. These represent two types of patterns which may be called, respectively, behavioral patterns and ideal patterns. Ideal patterns are modalities in the expectations or standards for behavior in which a given people believe. If we are told that Americans generally, or Americans of a certain age, sex, etc., ought to behave in certain ways under certain circumstances, and if we can observe that Americans believe in these standards because we see them react with some degree of shock or surprise to
deviant behavior, then we have proof of the existence of ideal patterns, Behavioral patterns are modalities in the actual forms of behavior, and these actualities may depart little or much from the standards. Some discrepancy between ideal and behavioral patterns seems to appear in every culture, but the degrees of discrepancy and the aspects of living to which they are related are highly varied. American culture shows a high frequency of quite glaring discrepancies. Among the most conspicuous of these is the discrepancy between what has been called the "American Creed" of equality and inalienable rights for all citizens regardless of race, religion, or national origins, and the actual modalities of prejudice and discrimination.

The distinction between ideal and behavioral patterns is somewhat like the popular notion of the difference between theory and practice, but it does not represent a distinction between ideas and action. There are ideal patterns relating to ideas as well as to action, and similarly with behavioral patterns. Take for example the patterning of sexual behavior among Americans. In terms of middle class patterning, at least, one ought to be "pure" in both thought and deed (ideal idea and action patterns, respectively). On the behavioral level, if we accept the Kinsey Reports and similar data, action patterns depart notably from these middle class standards even in the middle class itself, and we may safely assume that idea patterns necessarily do too (some ideas rather inevitably accompanying acts).

For any comprehensive understanding of a culture as a whole, or even of any important segment of it, knowledge of both ideal and behavioral levels, and in respect to both ideas and actions, is required. It is particularly necessary for any dynamic view of social situations - any estimates of trends, changes, and how these can be controlled - that we know as much as we can about both ideal and behavioral patterns.

c. Types of patterns: beliefs, expressive symbols, and values

Patterns can also be classified in terms of their function in communication - a process which lies at the very heart of a society's
survival and continuity. It would be impossible for people to communicate consistently, intricately, and effectively had they not learned roughly the same sets of beliefs, symbols, and values, and much the same cues and canons for applying them in life situations. In a given situation all three types of patterning are likely to be involved, but with one of the three predominant.

The people of a given society or sub-society share beliefs of a great number of kinds. There are beliefs relating to empirical phenomena such as physical objects and non-human organisms, persons and or personalities, social groups (collectivities), and cultural objects (i.e., man-made or man-altered objects). There are also beliefs relating to the non-empirical; these are matters of philosophy, ideology, the supernatural, and, in general, beliefs about non-objective entities, attributes, and processes.

Such a matter as the Navaho belief in witchcraft, like most other locally important beliefs, involves subsidiary beliefs relating to a variety of both empirical and non-empirical phenomena. The kind of person and personality likely to be suspected of witchcraft, the objects the witch is likely to use, the processes of bewitching, the supernatural power upon which the witch can draw—all these and more form a set of related beliefs.

Patterns of expressive symbols also involve a wide variety of phenomena. Acts, qualities of personality or of the person, physical objects, or cultural patterns themselves may all become, by cultural definition, symbolic entities. The meaning of these is a matter of culture to the degree that they convey roughly the same messages to all or to certain categories of people in the society.

While the spoken and/or written language is perhaps the most obvious example of a system of expressive symbolism, there is in any culture a wealth of symbols of quite different sorts. Consider the "language" of gesture, facial expression, or posture, as a Japanese or Americans know it, and how much can be communicated by a smile, a glance, a handclasp. Or think of the significance of such ubiquitous symbols as the flag, the national anthem, or national rituals such as
the opening of the diet or of congress. Religious rituals have more explicit symbolic value, as do some of the more conventionalized art forms. The individual's clothing, house and other personal possessions speak more or less loudly to the initiated observer about the status of their owner. So too do his culturally patterned activities—his recreation at simple beer "joints" or fashionable restaurants, and, in America, his attendance at the Pentecostal Tabernacle or the Episcopal church.

Value systems—standards of evaluation—are of crucial significance in social life. Society's members must constantly make choices between courses of action, between persons, and between things. They do so primarily in terms of learned systems of values, i.e., by measuring the possibilities against culturally standardized preference-rejection scales.

In addition to the more obviously patterned values which we ordinarily call ethics, morals, taste, standards, etc., there are patterned values basic to specific types of activity. There are "professional ethics," the "democratic way," the "free enterprise system," "good sportsmanship," and "the honor system," to note but a few of the more explicit codes embodying American values.

5. Themes in culture

 Cultures do not manifest themselves solely in observable customs and artifacts. No amount of questioning of any save the most articulate in the most self-conscious societies will bring out some of the basic attitudes common to the members of the group. This is because these basic assumptions are taken so for granted that they normally do not enter into consciousness. This part of the cultural map must be inferred by the observer on the basis of consistencies in thought and action.

"Missionaries in various societies are often disturbed or puzzled because the natives do not regard 'morals' and 'sex code' as almost synonymous. The natives seem to feel that morals are concerned with sex just about as much as with eating—no less and no more. No society fails to have some restrictions on sexual behavior, but sex activity outside of marriage need not necessarily be furtive or attended
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with guilt. The Christian tradition has tended to assume that sex is inherently nasty as well as dangerous. Other cultures assume that sex in itself is not only natural but one of the good things of life, even though sex acts with certain persons under certain circumstances are forbidden. This is implicit culture, for the natives do not announce their premises. The missionaries would get further if they said, in effect, 'Look, our morality starts from different assumptions. Let's talk about those assumptions,' rather than ranting about 'immorality.'

"A factor implicit in a variety of diverse phenomena may be generalized as an underlying cultural principle (theme). For example, the Navaho Indians always leave part of the design in a pot, a basket, or a blanket unfinished. When a medicine man instructs an apprentice he always leaves a little bit of the story untold. This 'fear of closure' is a recurrent theme in Navaho culture. Its influence may be detected in many contexts that have no explicit connection.

"If the observed cultural behavior is to be correctly understood, the categories and presuppositions constituting the implicit culture must be worked out. The 'strain toward consistency' which Sumner noted in the folkways and mores of all groups cannot be accounted for unless one grants a set of systematically interrelated implicit themes. For example, in American culture the themes of 'effort and optimism,' 'the common man,' 'technology,' and 'virtuous materialism' have a functional interdependence, the origin of which is historically known. The relationship between themes may be that of conflict. One may instance the competition between Jefferson's theory of democracy and Hamilton's 'government by the rich, the wellborn, and the able.' In other cases most themes may be integrated under a single dominant theme. In Negro cultures of West Africa the mainspring of social life is religion; in East Africa almost all cultural behavior seems to be oriented toward certain premises and categories centered on the cattle economy. If there be one master principle in the implicit culture, this is often called the 'ethos' or Zeitgeist."¹²

Themes, then, are implicit and highly diffuse and pervasive through a given culture. They are seldom consciously recognized and
stated by the bearers of the culture themselves, hence the observer must arrive at his conclusions largely by inference. Themes are the very fundamental orientations of a people - their basic and largely subconscious premises. They are characteristic orientations which appear again and again, like the theme in a symphony, in pattern after pattern of a culture. Themes in culture, as in the symphony, have a unifying quality even though they appear in highly varied contexts.

Themes so dominant and thoroughly pervasive as Ruth Benedict suggests "Apollonian" and "Dionysian" to be, in their respective culture areas, approximate the ethos - the master principle or distinctive "flavor" of a culture. Certainly they are not patterns in the sense in which that concept is now generally used. Ethos and theme differ from pattern not only because the former are more pervasive and therefore serve to integrate larger segments of human behavior, but also because they are not ordinarily consciously formulated or verbalized by the people whose conduct they guide. They are not explicitly or literally transmitted but they are acquired and come to be taken completely for granted, forming (in Ruth Benedict's phrase) "unconscious canons of choice."

6. The individual and culture

Thus far we have discussed culture as though it existed on an elevated horizontal plane independent of and several levels of abstraction removed from people. The culture concept is in fact a high level abstraction from the doings of people, but no consideration of it, however cursory, can be complete without returning to the level of individuals and their activities, cultural and otherwise.

All culture is, after all, created by individuals, though few personally contribute very significantly to the slow accumulation of countless elements of which a given culture, however simple, is made up. Culture grows by accretion through these usually minor individual contributions and, more importantly, through borrowings by individuals of ideas developed by members of other societies.

Culture is "carried" by individuals in the sense that all of its elements are in the last analysis localized as constituents of personali-
ties. It is carried too in the sense that it is transmitted from generation, and from society to society, through the action and interaction of individuals.

But people are also the creatures of culture to the degree that their personalities are "made" by the learning of elements of culture through interaction with earlier initiates. What is sometimes called "culturization" is an enormously important factor in the shaping of personality, as students of "culture and personality," "basic" or "modal" personality, and "national character" have lately made us very much aware. But "cultural determinism" as an explanation of the distinctive personality types which are undoubtedly with distinctive cultures can be over-emphasized. Culture is one of the most important determinants of personality to be sure, but heredity, physical environment, and societal factors also play roles of variable importance.

Keeping this fact in mind we will conclude our introduction to the culture concept with a story which dramatically illustrates the potency of cultural determinism.

It is reported that "a native of the Emerald Isle, named Brien, made a descent on the mainland (of Australia), and carried off a native female, to share with him the sway of Flinders Island, for of that island he had constituted himself sole monarch. The woman had with her a son, then about twelve years old. Brien was, according, to custom, about to kill the boy, but the entreaties of the mother prevailed; and he said 'as he had stolen the dam he would keep the cub.'

"In a few years Bill (for that was the name conferred on him by his abductor) became very useful to Brien. He could handle an oar, help to capture a seal, discharge a rifle with precision, and execute any manual labor with the efficiency of an European youth. His habits became those of his teacher, and the ideas he acquired were derived from the same source. In the occasional absence of the old sealer, he was not a bad hand at bartering skins and melons for garments, tobacco, or spirits, with the crew of some whale-ship cruising
in the neighbourhood. His own language he never knew, and even his mother, after a few years, forgot it; but, instead, he imbibed the rich brogue of old Brien.

"When I had the honour to make his acquaintance, Bill had seen no aboriginal inhabitant of South Australia besides his mother, and but few white people except Brien. Until the period of which I write he had never left Flinders Island. It was in the autumn of 1845 that he favoured me with a call, and I was then dwelling alone in an isolated cottage by the sea-side. On hearing the greeting 'How do you do?' and raising my head from a book, I was not a little surprised to see before me a strapping blackfellow, six feet high, clad in a sailor's jacket, blue-stripe shirt, mole-skin trousers, a round straw hat, and provided, moreover, with a double-barreled gun and short black pipe. Without waiting for an invitation, he grounded his gun, seated himself, and began to cut tobacco; looking the while inquisitively over the apartment, and seeming to be especially puzzled by my books.

"What is he? Where does he come from? were the first thoughts that suggested themselves. To me he was an animated enigma. His features and colour were those of our natives, his dress and accoutrements bespoke no bushmen, and his dialect was the English commonly spoken by the peasantry of Ireland.

'Where did you come from?' I asked.

'From Flinders Island.'

'What countryman are you?'

'An Irishman.'

'What's your father's name?'

'He's dead - died two months ago.'

'But, what's his name?'

'Sure he told me it was Brien.'

'And what is your name?'
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'Bill Brien.'

'Are there any more of you?'

'Yes, I have two sisters and mother on the island.'

"He then informed me in what manner and with whom he left the island, and became very loquacious and inquisitive. - - -

"On many subjects my questions produced great confusion of ideas, and his very identity seemed entwined with that of old Brien. 'Would you like to see Ireland?' I said. "Yes, fait and sure I jist would now; I'd like to see the owld country onst more before I die.'

"His first interview with his own countrymen amused me excessively. I had the honour to introduce him. The natives were seated in groups among the sandhills, and on my approach with the sable stranger, of whose arrival they knew long before the fact was known to white men, they became silent, but assumed an appearance of perfect indifference. Bill observed equal taciturnity. He looked on them at first with an air of patronising dignity, yet sufficiently guarded to repel familiarity, and he evidently never forgot the vast difference subsisting between an Irishman and a blackfellow. The natives, one and all, cast upward indescribable glances, indicating distrust, dislike, contempt, and probably half-a-dozen other feelings. I introduced him as a brother native, - but they denied the soft impeachment; and disputed my statement with such triumphant queries as the following: - 'Why could he not speak their language?' 'Why was he not tattooed like them?' 'How was it that he used a gun instead of a spear?' I asked, 'Is he then a white man?' To which they replied, in a patois consisting of about equal portions of English and native, 'Why not! since he lives with you, speaks your tongue, wears your dress, and uses your weapons?' then with scornful expressions of countenance and angry intonations, they summed up all by declaring 'that he was neither a white man nor a black man; and added, in pure English, 'He is no good. Bill, on the other hand, being asked, after the interview, what he thought of his countrymen, replied,
'O, they are dirty brutes;' and added, 'I don't like black-fellows - they are a dirty, lazy set;' 14
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