

Rethinking the Concept "Primitive"

Francis L. K. Hsu

Current Anthropology, Volume 5, Issue 3 (Jun., 1964), 169-178.

STOR

Your use of the JSTOR database indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use. A copy of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use is available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>, by contacting JSTOR at jstor-info@umich.edu, or by calling JSTOR at (888)388-3574, (734)998-9101 or (FAX) (734)998-9113. No part of a JSTOR transmission may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except: (1) one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or (2) with prior written permission of JSTOR and the publisher of the article or other text.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Current Anthropology is published by University of Chicago Press. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Current Anthropology

©1964 University of Chicago
Press

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2001 JSTOR

Papers in Honor of Melville J. Herskovits

Rethinking the Concept "Primitive"

by Francis L. K. Hsu

IF **THERE** IS one term which is consistently identified with anthropology, it is "primitive," an adjective **used** to **describe the** data found by anthropologists all over the world: primitive science, primitive religion, primitive economics, primitive mentality, primitive peoples, primitive societies and cultures. According to **Webster**, the **term** "primitive" is **defined as** "pertaining to the beginning or origin or to early times, **or** characterized by the **style**, simplicity, **rudeness**, etc., of early times; old-fashioned, **as**, primitive tools." There is **no** doubt that the **idea** of **being** "inferior" **was** what E. B. Tylor, the first major anthropologist in the **world**, had in mind **when** he spoke of the three stages of cultural evolution in his *Anthropology* (1881), **first** published just 10 years after his *Primitive Culture* (1871): (1) a "**savage**" **stage**, characterized by subsistence on wild **plants and** animals and the utilization of stone **age** implements; (2) a "barbaric" stage characterized by agriculture,

FRANCIS L. K. HSU is Professor of Anthropology and Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., U.S.A. Born in 1911 in a village in south **Man-**churia, China, he **was** educated in the University of Shanghai (**Sociology**) and **as** a Sino-British Boxer Indemnity Fund Scholar at the London School of Economics (Ph.D., Cultural Anthro- pology, University of London, 1940). He came to the United **States** in 1944, after carrying on field research in southwest China and teaching at the National Yunnan University, Kun- ming, China. He taught at Columbia and Cornell Universities before joining Northwestern University in 1947. In 1949-50 he did field research among the Chinese in Hawaii and in 1955-57 field research among Hindus in India.

Hsu's main theoretical publications are on family, religion, national character, and culture and personality (psychological anthropology); and his major geographical areas of study are China, India, and the United States. He is particularly known for his comparative studies of large and literate societies. His books include *Under the Ancestors' Shadow* (1948), *Religion, Science and Human Crises* (1952), *Americans and Chinese: Two Ways of Life* (1953), *Psychological Anthropology: Ap- proaches to Culture and Personality* (editor and contributor) (1961), and *Clan, Caste and Club* (1963). The last book is a comparative study of the psycho-cultural orientations of Chinese, Hindus, and modern Americans, each group seen through its most characteristic secondary groupings. He is scheduled to carry out a field project in the Kyoto-Kobe area of Japan in 1964.

Hsu's paper is the eighth and last in a series, edited by him- self and Alan P. Merriam, especially prepared to honor Melville J. Herskovits. The entire series constitutes a new type of Festschrift (CA 4:92).

Vol. 5 · No. 3 · June 1964

metal work, **and** some form of community life in villages and towns; and (3) a "civilized" **stage** which began **when** men acquired **the art** of writing. (Tylor 1881:1-18).

Alexander Goldenweiser has **perhaps** given the most concise and **explicit** definition of the term "primitive" in his *Early Civilization* (1922:117-18). Although he speaks of "primitive" **as** being small, **isolated**, etc., there seems to be no doubt that he also equates it with "inferior." For in a later work, *Anthropology: An Introduction to Primitive Culture* (1937), he expresses himself as **follows**:

People in general, **and** primitives **in particular**, do **not** think **or** analyze their **culture**-they live it. It **never** occurs to **them** to **synthesize what they live** or **reduce it** to a common denominator, **as** it **were**.

Or again:

A sad commentary on **the** psychological limits of diffusion is presented by **the disheartening failure** of White civiliza- tion to **either** leave primitives alone or pull them **up** to its **own** level (1937:47 and 490) (*Italics mine*).

Over the years **the** connotation of inferiority **and other difficulties** have often troubled many scholars. For this **reason there**

have been attempts at reform along **two** lines. On the one hand some scholars have suggested other kinds of dichotomies to take the place of **the** primitive-civilized one. Sapir's (1925) Genuine versus Spurious cultures **as well as** Redfield's (1941) Folk-Urban continuum **are** notable examples of this trend.

Herskovits explicitly suggested substituting **the** term "non-literate" for **the** term "primitive," the first such need eloquently voiced. **After** showing **that** all those **called** "primitives" or "savages" **are** much more diverse in their **cultural** characteristics **than** the groups which **are** called "civilized," he **says**:

In anthropological works, the words "primitive" or "**savage**"-**the** latter being **used** mainly **as a** synonym for "primitive" by English **writers**-do not have **the** connota- tion they **possess** in **such a work as** Toynbee's, or in other non-anthropological writings. **As for the word** "barbaric," most **anthropologists** do not employ it **at all**. Anthropolo- gists **merely use the word** "primitive" or "**savage**" to denote **peoples outside the stream** of Euro-American culture, who **do not** possess written languages. By reiterating this mean- ing, it was hoped **that** all other connotations might be

169

sloughed off, and **that** it would **no** longer convey such **meanings as** simple, or **naive**, or **serve as a** catch-all to **describe**, except in **the** single matter of absence of writing, such differing civilizations **as** those of **the Siberian reindeer herders** or **the** Lunda empire of **the** Congo (1958:75).

He then goes **on** to suggest the use of the term "non-literate" for "primitive" because the former is "colorless, **conveys its** meaning unambiguously, **and** is readily applicable to the data it seeks to delimit, [and] is thus to be preferred **to** all the other terms we have considered" (1948:75).

On the other hand, some scholars are determined to search for greater precision in the use of **the** term. In this regard Radin (1953) has contributed greatly, but lately Stanley Diamond (1963) has done more than others in finding **what** he calls "a positive definition" of the term primitive by observing that:

all primitive peoples **are** marginal to **the** mainstream of modern history, primarily because of "accidents" of habitat, **In the** sense already noted, contemporary primitives can be roughly perceived **as** our contemporary, pre-civilized an- cestors (Diamond 1963:79).

Diamond then **proceeds** to enumerate 10 characteristics of the "primitive," from "commu- **nalistic** economic base" to the role of "ritual **drama**" **as** "a culturally comprehensive vehicle

for **group and** individual expression at critical junctures in the social round or **personal** life cycle. . . ." The overall purpose of Diamond's redefinition is perhaps indicated by his tenth characteristic which is: "if the fulfillment and delineation of the human person within a social, natural and supernatural (self-transcendent) setting, is a universally valid measure for the evaluation of culture, primitive societies are **our** primitive superiors," and by his plea that "we cannot abandon the primitive; we can **only** outgrow it by letting it **grow** within us" (Diamond 1963:103 and 111).

A few years ago Sol Tax sounded the bugle against

use of the term "primitive" (1960:441). His objections to it **were** supported by a "Memorandum on the Use of Primitive" by a research assistant Lois Mednick (1960:441-45) which shows **how** the term has been used by a variety of scholars, primarily anthropologists. The many enthusiastic responses to these **two** pieces (CA 2:396-97 and 3:206) reflect fairly the above-mentioned division of opinion in **our** profession today. Some, including Sol Tax himself, are opposed to its continuation except to "men who have been extinct since the late Pleistocene, **while** a majority seem to **prefer** either redefining it **or** substituting it with some other terms such as "anthropological. "primary," "peripheral," "ethnological" or

even

of the world's peoples and cultures into two varieties, The thesis of **the** present paper is that a dichotomy no matter under what disguise, presents large difficulties. In particular the primitive-civilized dichotomy is replete with undesirable psychological connotations and scientific consequences which **cannot be** avoided by redefinition even of the most positive kind. Furthermore, by his plea that we not "abandon" **the** primitive but let it "grow within us," Diamond has distinctly left the path of science and entered the door of charity, for the problem is neither one of turning the tables (by stressing that the primitives are our "superiors") nor of permitting or wishing the nurture of the primitive in us.

Lois Mednick's "Memorandum on the Use of Primitive" (1960) referred to **before** already provides us with an excellent panorama of **the** "ambiguous and inconsistent" way in which the term "primitive" is used. But in order to ascertain the extent to which this state of affairs exists in anthropological works of a general nature, especially introductory texts, Nancy Schmidt, a research assistant, and I examined a total of 30 books published in the last

10 years (except for Murdock 1949, **Evans-Pritchard** 1951, Kroeber 1952 and Levy **1952**).

The following table summarizes the results:

THE USE OF THE **TERM "PRIMITIVE"** in TEXTS ON ANTHROPOLOGY (IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
BUT EXCLUDING PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY) PUBLISHED IN THE YEARS 1953-63.

Explanation of Table: When the word "primitive" is italicized, the author has used it himself; whereas, when it **is** not italicized, he has used it in reference to the way it **has** been used by someone else. Most of the definitions following the word "primitive" are paraphrases, or else were obtained from the general context in which the word appears. Only when the definitions appear in quotation marks are they the authors' exact definitions. The page numbers indicate the pages on which the meaning of the word "primitive" **is** found; they do not in all cases correspond to the pages on which the word "primitive" itself appears. There is no correlation between the number of pages following a category and the frequency with which the word "primitive" occurs in the text. The word that the author uses the most or prefers **is** marked with an asterisk (*); or when the word "primitive" is rarely used, this is noted.

(**BEALS** and HOIJER 1959)

*non-*literate* peoples: those studied by ethnologists, formerly called
primitives (2)
primitive people: calendars of (2)
primitive culture: subject matter of ethnologists (2), in references
to Tylor's work (15-16)
primitive art: art forms of non-literate people (598-99)

170

(**BOHANNAN** 1963)

*most often **uses** folk (11, 51, 284, 263)

primitive peoples: those into whose languages the Bible was translated (42 ff.), those whose political systems are studied by anthropologists, in reference to Lévy-Bruhl's comparisons of mentality (321, 322)

primitive society: in reference to Lowie's theory of non-kinship **groups** (147-48), in reference to Tylor's theory of magic (319) primitive economics: economic analyses by anthropologists (233) "*primitive*" warfare: **as** conducted by warriors in contest, not by

whole societies (305)

primitive culture: in discussing works of Tylor and other early anthropologists (311) |

primitive man: in reference to Lévy-Bruhl's and others' works on mentality (321)

primitive religion: rejects the traditional study of animatism, fetishism, and totemism (313 ff.)

(**COON** 1962)

primitive culture: culture of men before modern times (appears in title, definition based on context, not specific citation) *primitive* people (of today): simple, not civilized (1) *primitive* arts: skills of living primitive peoples (93 ff.)

(**EVANS-PRITCHARD** 1951)

*primitive society: small in scale in terms of numbers, territory, and social contacts, have simple technology and little specialization of social functions, often have no

CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY

literature (8) used throughout book, anthropological concern with (8-10), manner of studying (15-18), philosopher's consideration of (25 ff.), study of religion in (90)

**primitive peoples*: institutions of (39), role of ethnologist in studying (48 ff.), functional study of (55)

primitive science

primitive art

primitive technology

specialized studies

of anthropology (14)

primitive family: in reference to theories of Bachofen (29) *primitive*

institutions: not related to mentality (35)

primitive society: Durkheim's contribution to theories of (51 ff.) *primitive man*: speculations about (65 ff.)

primitive languages: need for anthropologists to learn (79-80)

(FIRTH 1956)

**primitive*: used extensively in the following ways:

primitive people: those who retain tribal **ways** of life, distinguished

from peasants, those in simple societies, savage tribes (39) *primitive*

communities: **have** comparatively simple material equipment that is not integrated into industrial organization (71), lack wide intercommunication with each other (72), not part of world market (72)

primitive economics: study of technology, **arts** and crafts, and basic principles that control the work and wealth of "native societies" (72)

primitive group: as distinguished from purely individual activity (73)

primitive transaction: "the equivalent of buying and selling on a non-price level" (80)

primitive distributive system: gives reward for social advantages of participating in production (81)

primitive money objects other than coins, with a relatively standard value, used in exchange (92)

primitive society.

primitive culture

primitive tribe

used **as** synonym for primitive people (93, 97, 47)

primitive behavior: **as** regulated by custom (132)

primitive law: rules expected to be obeyed, and normally kept through some means for insuring obedience (137)

primitive thinking: used in discussion of Lévy-Bruhl's theory (152) *primitive life*: in reference to the role of dreams in lives of primitive people (174)

primitive religion: beliefs of (171 ff.), rites of (182-85)

(GLEASON 1961).

not used, distinctions between written and unwritten languages, the specific language referred to is usually named

(GOLDSCHMIDT 1959)

**primitives*: contrast to moderns (223, 224), comparative not absolute term (223, 224), uses by anthropologists (224), circumlocutions for (223, 224), in reference to historical theories (43) *primitive man*: in reference to work of Radin (223) *primitive people*: means of social control among (153), in reference to works of Herskovits (223)

primitive cultures: in reference to Boas' works (39) *primitive state systems*: discussion

of Steward's criteria (208) *living* primitives: in reference to data collecting (43),
evolution
(153)

primitive level of social systems: contrasted to civilized systems
(155-57)

primitive conditions: of social forms (153)

(GOLDSCHMIDT 1960)

[Analysis only of articles by Goldschmidt]

**primitive*: contrasted to modern, all people outside Western civilization, is a
comparative, not absolute, term, "preliterate" not an adequate term (664, 665)

primitive people: those with technology fundamentally like those
of prehistoric times (122, 123, **125**)

primitive: contrasted to civilized (172)

primitive society: division of labor in (173), affiliations in (268,
275), child-training practices in (177)

primitive *people*: residence patterns of (223), spatial groupings of (275, 419),
clans in (225, 277), status relations among (317), government an extension of kinship
(266 ff.), religion among (475 ff.), moral rules of (529 ff.), private property of (545)

Vol. 5

No. 3 • June 1964

Hsu RETHINKING THE CONCEPT "PRIMITIVE"

primitive level: of family development (277, 279, 280) primitive tribes: lack of
government in (368), comparative ethics
of (544 ff.)

primitive man: religious rituals of (476 ff.)

primitive art: contrasted to European art (586)

(HAWKES 1954)

primitive: contrasted to civilized (17, 103), used very seldom, the
book is historical and specific names are usually used

(HERSKOVITS 1955)

*non-*literate* used throughout book, not defined, but a substitute
for primitive (123, 363, 522, 367-68)

primitive culture: as opposed to civilized (358, 359), contrasted to folk culture
(521), synonym for primeval (435), synonym for savagry and barbarism (360),
problem of defining (360, 362), rejection of term (363)

primitive people: simple people (360), those traditionally studied
by anthropology (368-69)

primitive society: in discussing Kulturkreis (464, 465) primitive man: synonym for
contemporary ancestor (358, 359), in discussing theories of culture change (448 ff.),
in reference to works of Tylor and Morgan (434-36)

(HILL 1958)

primitive not used: refers to *speech* communities (4)

(HOCKETT 1958)

not used: occasional reference to savages (4) and aboriginals or
aboriginal times (8, 479)

(HOEBEL 1960)

**primitive*: preliterate or non-literate (defined 657), used through-
out book in all contexts

primitive man: use of caves by (202), husband-wife relations of

(334-36), weapons of (512) , religion of (526 ff.)
primitives: hunting techniques of (185), traps used by (202), marriage among (301 ff.), kin terms of (357 ff.), divorce among (314 ff.), polygyny among (325)
primitive peoples: domestic animals of (196), houses of (206), stone tools of (217), effect of culture contact on (590), status among (357), stock ownership of (445)
 primitive communism: in reference to the theories of Morgan (201) *primitive art*: art of primitive peoples, not crude art (253 ff.) *primitive society*: marriage in (301 ff.) , women's groups in (402), classes in (415 ff.), slavery in (425 ff.)
primitive world: role of the aged in (391-92) , inheritance in (460)
 primitive law: contrast to European (468-69), systems of (471 ff.) *primitive warfare*: tactical operations of (511-12) *primitive mythology*: stable core of (539)

(HONIGMANN 1959)
 *most often uses *culture* without any adjectives (25)
primitive ancestors: reference to concern of early anthropologists (23)
primitive stage of human existence: reference to the fallacy of such labels (24)
primitive cultures: isolated ways of life investigated by anthropologists traditionally (23 ff.) *primitives*: as used by Lévy-Bruhl (679)

(HONIGMANN 1963)
 *"small scale" used throughout book (25, 28, 94, 202) *primitives*: in reference to current disuse of the term (21)

(KEESING 1958)
primitive, **non-literate*, *simpler: distinguishable from civilization, not survivals from an earlier time (45-46) *primitive societies*: most today are nearly peasant societies or well on the way (46), in reference to evolutionary theories (139 ff.), in reference to psychic unity of mankind and comparative method (141, 142), in reference to historicalism and kulturkreise (146), in reference to works of Durkheim (153), organization of life cycle in (247 ff.)
primitive law: in reference to theories about non-codified law systems (305-6)

171

primitive culture; in reference to theories of religion (325 ff.) *primitive science*: in reference to Frazer (332) *primitive arts*: difference from civilized arts (348)

(KROEBER 1952)

The term "primitive" is not used much. In the 50 essays, the word appears in the title of 1; most essays are of a general theoretical nature.

primitive culture: contrasted to European culture (47, 49), in reference to works of Tylor et al. (19 ff., 144 ff.), in reference to work of Roheim and Freud (303, 304)

primitives: contrasted to civilized (219 ff.), in reference to theories

of Morgan (169, 170), psychoses of (310 ff.) *primitive life*: social organization of simple peoples (219 ff.) *folk culture*: occasionally used as synonym for primitive (310) *primitive man*: less civilized peoples with important kinship organization (219, 224)

(LÉVY 1952)

*usually uses *society* or *social system* (6 ff., 18 ff., 111 ff.), contrast between industrialized and *non*-industrialized societies (97), contrast between traditional and modern societies (131, 320 ff.), "primitive," *non-literate* compared to modern societies (132), a

self-sufficient **social** system (132), contrast between "simple" and modern societies (166)
"primitive" society: in reference to prerational nature of (376)

(LINTON 1955)

*usually **uses** culture prefixed by a place name (African culture)
(431) or occupation (**dairying** culture) (438)

primitive languages: **unwritten** languages (9)

primitive **cultures**: in reference to theories of arrested development (41)

primitive **women**: those who have simple cultures, like those in the Stone Age (71)

modern "*primitives*": people with simple culture, esp. simple tools (84)

primitive **pattern** of life: in reference to Neolithic (174)

"primitive" **areas**: those inhabited by simple people esp. in reference to Polynesia (183)

primitive group: simple tribes, esp. reference to Indian influence in Southeast **Asia** (187)

primitive art: an inaccurate designation when applied to African sculpture (438)

primitive man: prehistoric man (593)

(MEAD and CALAS 1953)

Mead (1953) savages, non-literate (xvii ff.)

primitive peoples: savages (**xix ff.**)

Nicholas Calas (1953) unknown peoples (xxvi ff.)

Engels (1884) barbarians: as opposed to civilization (14-15)

T. Reik (1919) *primitive* peoples: those who practice the couvade (26)

E. Crawley (1902) *primitive culture*

}

characterized by homo- *primitive society* (geneity (29-30) R. Marett (1911)
primitive [appears in title, but not defined (32)] L. Lévy-Bruhl **primitives**: those who regard artificial likenesses as real (33), natives (34), those who regard their names as concrete, real, and sometimes sacred (37), uncivilized races (41) **primitive** peoples: in reference to Hill Tout's work on Salish (38) E. B. Tylor (1871) *primitive culture*: that of tribes "low on the scale of humanity" (49)

savages (primitives); distinguished from civilized men (50-51) D. Lee (1949) *primitive society*: those among whom being is identical with the objects (53 ff.) (selection refers to Trobriands) R. Benedict (1932) **primitive peoples**) homogenous **groups** as dif-

primitive **tribes** differentiated from modern stratified groups (80 ff.) P. Radin (1927)
primitive man: one endowed with overpowering sense of reality (258)

primitive community: where **everyday** facts have religious and ritual covering (259)

G. T. Emmons (1911) *primitive people*: those who endow all nature with spirit life.

(MURDOCK 1959)

*usually uses **society** or social unit without adjectives, makes comparisons by saying "our society-other societies" (56)

primitive society: (occasional use, not defined) in reference to adjustment of co-wives (31)

(58) primitive times: in reference to theory of matriliney (185)

primitive man: in reference to 19th century theories of evolution

(NADEL 1957)

primitive society: (not used often, not defined, but apparently synonym for tribal), different number of roles in (61 ff.), linkage of roles in (65 ff.), coherence of role systems in (72 ff.), current work of anthropologists in (146)

(PIDDINGTON 1950/1957)

Vol. 1

Primitive is used with great frequency, but only a few examples are given for each category

primitive communities*: usually **literate, have small social **groups**, low level of technical achievement, social relations based **on** kinship most **important**, **lack** of economic specialization, but not **sharply** divided from civilized communities (5), social status in (189), political authority in (190), voluntary associations in (216), land tenure in (287)

primitive culture*: "material **and spiritual or social" culture of primitive communities (14), need for **functional analysis** of (45), discussion of theoretical approaches to (14-17), **emphasis on** variety of (31-33), past and present study of (26), in Asia (60), in India (65), in Pacific (71) **primitive society*: groups with primitive culture (272), **production** in (267), economic exchange in (271), idea of property in (282), social structure of (107 ff.), place of women in (169 ff.), initiation ceremonies in (175), education in (179 ff.), **law** and customs in (319 ff.), hunger and famine in (257), belief in immortality in (375), taboos in (379)

**primitive people*: members of primitive societies, cultures and communities (11), descent systems of (151), local groups among (167), totemic groups of (200), mythology of (370)

primitive communism: all property belongs to the community (270-71), reference to use by Engles (267), fallacy of the term's application (287), questionnaire to test peoples' view of its meaning (416—19)

primitive economics: material production of primitive societies

(266 ff.), applicability of modern economic concepts to (267) *primitive* education: conditions of (187)

primitive law: the whole normative system of a primitive community (351), compared to modern law (355) |

primitive promiscuity: in reference to Engle's theory of social development (315)

primitive religion: magico-religious institutions of primitives (356), ethical implications of (381)

primitive man: in reference to idea of the noble savage (393)

Vol. 2

primitive art: artistic embellishment of objects with social utility or significance (516), meaning associated with (518), difference from our own (520)

primitive trade: examples of (459)

primitive ceremonial: importance of **feasting** and food distribution in (470)

primitive technology: reasons for primitiveness (485), why advance **occurs** (486)

(RADCLIFFE-BROWN 1952)

primitive society*: living, non-literate societies that can be studied only by direct observation and contact, have no historical records, contrasted to advanced (used very frequently), **preliterate (2, 3, 18, 25)

primitive people: those with very important kinship relations (15, 2, 153)

primitive myth and ritual: in reference to totemism (130) *primitive* times: in reference to Robertson Smith's religious theories (156)

primitive law: social control by application of force among primitives (212 ff.)

(RADCLIFFE-BROWN 1957)

*usually uses **society** or *human society*

primitive people: early distinctions between primitive and civilized (33-34)

savage tribes: territorially delimited groups studied by anthropologists (60)

"primitive": use of word in typing societies (74 ff.)

primitive **society**: simple society, gift giving in (114 ff.), ritual pollution in (135)

CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY

(RADIN 1953)

**primitive* civilization: aboriginal civilization in which is respect for the individual, amazing degree of political and social organization, and strong concept of personal security (ix ff., 184 ff., 260 ff., 286)

**primitive*: and aboriginal are used interchangeably throughout the

book (4, 5), contrasted to civilization (7, 8) *primitive* man (ix): must be studied

in terms of positive achievements (x), life permeated by magic and religion (26),

analysis of Ego by (57), knowledge of legal principle (114 ff.), philosophizing of (233)

primitive people: have efficient tools (32), the thinker among (43), economic structure of (105 ff.), anti-social behavior of (120), puberty ceremonies of (168-69)

primitive man: in reference to theories of Lévy-Bruhl (49)

primitive religion (103-4)

primitive communities: in reference to Malinowski's theory of reciprocity (111)

primitive economics: characterized by intricate transfers (117)

primitive tribes: inadequate description of religion of (138),

localized authority among (232)

primitive **societies**: change in (192), real authority in (245) *primitive*

tribal lore: in reference to theory of Jung (309)

(THOMPSON 1961)

*mankind: all men, all human phenomena of all times and places (xxvi), anthropological study of (xxiii ff.) used throughout book non-literate people in reference to ethnographic survey (5-6)

primitive culture

primitive economics: in reference to early theories (27-28) aboriginal

community: synonym for primitive or non-literate (112 ff.), more frequently uses human community (126, 28 ff., 156 ff.)

primitive peoples: in reference to works of Mead (137) *primitive* and

folk communities: contrasted to civilized communities (201 ff.)

(TITIEV 1959)

**primitive* peoples: aim of anthropologists to understand their customs (19), distinguished from non-primitive (used throughout book)

**primitive* society: in reference to Neolithic society (209), in reference to societies before acculturation (387), relatively isolated group of racially similar people that work

together for common **goals**, usually **has** relatively uniform **language** and religion,
usually non-literate (208–9) (**used** throughout book) primitive customs primitive religions

use of analogies to in **archaeological** interpretation
(118, 131)

primitive community: members of a primitive **society** living in
one **area** (208, 333)

primitive world: all **primitive** societies (332)

primitive kinship: **prime** importance of in understanding (283–85) primitive

law: **used** as Hoebel does (208 ff.)

primitive religion: different definitions and functions (333 ff.)

Hsu : RETHINKING THE CONCEPT “PRIMITIVE”

primitive folk: non-literate folk (272)

primitive personage: in reference to seeking supernatural aid (339 ff.)

(TITIEV 1963)

primitive: "non-literate,

relatively small in numbers, relatively isolated, comparatively homogeneous in culture, and **racially and** linguistically alike" (386)

primitive society: **preliterate**s studied by archaeologists (5), desire for children in (442), **plural** marriage in (454), mother-in-law taboo in (458), cross-cousin marriage in (461), institutionalized **friendship** in (472), classificatory terms in (478) , model for **national** character study (498), sacred songs in (548), connection between dancing and verbal **arts** in (557)

primitive contemporaries: groups studied by early anthropologists (3)

primitives: cultures used for archaeological analogy (196) *primitive* people: **interest of** anthropologists in (387), **differentia-** tion among **religions** in (463), linguists' concern with (539), **art of** (553-554), games of (569) **primitive** tribe
primitive life

interests of anthropologists in (387)

primitive group: relation of subsistence to **religion** in (278), ethno-
logists' contact with (389), kinship in (458)

primitive folk: difficulty in making contact with (388), accumu-
lated knowledge of (516)

primitive culture: **personal** reports of (391) *primitive*
law: **as** Hoebel uses it (464 ff.)

primitive religion: **sociocultural aspects** of (501 ff.)

primitive **man**: beliefs in the supernatural of (511), knowledge of
the seasons among (525)

primitive customs: study of in **relation to our own** mores (576)

(WHITE 1954)

primitive* man: native societies, uncivilized, non-urban, **savages (10-11)
(used throughout), anthropological **study of small**, com- **pact** groups of (13)

primitive **man**: size of communities compared to those of man-apes

(47), synonym for **early** man (48) *primitive* tribesman: **senses** of (83) **primitive** mind: theories of (83 ff.)

primitive community: **characteristics** of (94-95), **stages** in deveolp-
ment of (118 ff.)

primitive world: **life** in early times before there **were** many inven-
tions (101-2)

primitive people: **cultural** environment of (108)

primitive economy: those without money **and** price system (119 ff.)

primitive life: communistic traits of (125 ff.)

primitive population

primitive **family** *primitive marriage primitive social structure*

traits of (129 ff.)

}

kinds of (134 ff.)

are as

It is clear from **this table that the** term "**primitive**"
enjoys wide currency in **introductory and general** works
and the meanings attached to "**ambiguous and inconsistent**" as
Lois Mednick found them to be in **her** briefer **survey**. In
general the follow- ing meanings **are attached to it**:

non-literate, **lower**, simple, simple tools, not civilized, **pertaining** to
technology fundamentally like **that of pre-** historic times, **small-scale**,
isolated, arrested in **develop-** ment, folk, **all** peoples **outside western**
civilization, less civilized, lacking in historical records, **low** level of **tech-**
nical achievement, pertaining to societies in **which** social **relations** are based
primarily on kinship, distinguished from non-primitive, aboriginal,
non-**industrialized**, savage, **contrasted** to **civilized**, law **contrasted to**
European system, lacking in **literature**, **relatively** homogeneous, non-urban
and tribal, **general lack of abstract** time reckoning, below **the** general **level**
of **the state** of civilization, with **all** **pervasive religion**, money-less,
peasant, traditional, lack

Vol. 5

No. 3 *June* 1964

of economic specialization, one endowed with over-power- ing sense of reality, where everyday facts have
religious and ritual covering, those who **endow** all nature with spirit
life, civilization with respect for **the individual**, amazing degree of political
and social organization, strong concept **of** personal security, isolated,
society in **which** cooperation for common goals frequent, **language**
and religion uniform, all human phenomena of all times and places.

Several things **emerge** from this tabulation. First, although **a few speak of salutary characteristics** like "strong
concept **of** personal security," or "frequent cooperation for common
goals," or of neutral **ones like "social relations... based** primarily
on kinship," or "relatively homogeneous," **a** majority give the
term the meanings of simpleness, antiquity, **undesir-** ableness,
and undisguised inferiority.

Second, many of the meanings attached **are** not

only multifarious **and** uncoordinated, but **generally** slapdash and conflicting.

Third, some **seem** to use **the** term through force of habit **as when** Thompson (1961) **refers** to all **men and** all human phenomena **of** all times and places which **she deals with in her** book **as** "primitive."

Fourth, **even** though some do not use **the** term "primitive" for categorizing their **own** data, **they make no** attempt to evaluate its use in **other works which they quote** or to **which they refer**.

Lastly, in particular the use of the term "primitive" **does** not seem to **have any** significant **intellectual** or **analytic advantage**. It cannot be shown from **these surveys how the use of the term has given us any** noticeable advantages in **theory-building**. On the contrary, I think it can be **shown that** its **continued** use **may** be an effective **bottleneck** against **further advances in our discipline**.

In the science of man, as in all sciences, terms or concepts **are** essentially **means of classifying data** or points of **reference around** which the **data may be organized so as to achieve an** empirically descriptive picture to **enable** one to grope for **some theoretically based** insights into **the data**. The major criterion for the introduction or **the continuance** of a concept **should** be, **therefore, that it has empirical validity** (e.g., when we employ terms to designate categories **used by the natives** themselves) or theoretical utility (e.g., when we describe one system **of** economy **as** characterized by barter **and another** by money, using this **contrast to reveal the different extents to which** kinship or other ties **affect** economic transactions). My contention is **that** the concept "primitive," **as it has** been and is used in a majority of anthropological **works, has** neither empirical **validity** nor **theoretical** utility, and **that** this is why **our** use of this term **has** been so miscellaneous **and intellectually unproductive**. The concept **of "primitive" is scientifically applicable to prehistorical** phenomena, **and was** functional during **the early stages of development of our** science, but it is now like a worn out old shoe, to which we **are** still attached seemingly for sentimental **reasons** or from sheer inertia, **but** which will do **no** more for **us than** clutter up **our** anthropological closet **and catch dust**. There is no **longer** an empirically or **theoretically** defensible ground for dichotomizing **all cultures or societies** into the **two** broad categories "primitive" **and** "civilized."

First let **us** look at the empirical picture. There are **small** societies that **are** very highly urbanized in Europe. There

are predominantly **rural** societies of enormous **scale** such as China. The kinship **system** of the **Americans** of the highly complex industrialized **society** of the United States is extremely **simple** but the **kinship** system of the **Australian** aborigines, whose **main** tools for production are the **digging** sticks and the boomerang, must be **rated** in **general** among the most complex in the **world**. There are **societies** with **highly** organized political structures such **as** that of Uganda and Dahomey which share the **lack** of written language with **others** with **no** trace of **centralized** **government** whatsoever such **as** those of various branches of Eskimos or **Kaska** Indians. Barter as the main form of trading is found among the **Toda** with their **polyandry** and among diverse **other** peoples including **Chuckchee** of **Siberia**, **Congo** pygmies,

174

Bantus, Melanesians, and many Indians of the New World. As for the importance of the **sense** of personal security **and cohesiveness** of communal life, compare such peoples **as Dobuans and Alores, on the one hand**, and **Zuni and Fox Indians, on the other**. Religion **and** religious rituals are far more homogeneous and important among **Catholics in the world as a whole than among the widely divided and various Protestants as a whole**. This **contrast** holds **true whether we compare them intrasocietally or intersocietally**. Who among us have **observed that Catholics are therefore more primitive than Protestants?** Even the criteria of **abstract** thinking versus **concrete** thinking **are not** foolproof for differentiating the primitive from the civilized. Is the **Arunta** or **Murngin** type of social organization **less abstract than the Arab or Chinese traders' profit calculations?**

The most **troublesome** meaning of the term "primitive" is that connected with various shades of inferiority. Sometimes we **can unquestionably determine that some single items or usages of a culture are more inferior or less inferior than others** in the same culture or in other cultures. In **this sense**, we can describe **hand-pushed carts as more primitive than horsecarts and horsecarts as more primitive than automobiles**. We are not likely to run into **serious disputes here**. In the same sense we **can** speak of a more primitive way of crime detection and a less primitive one, **a more primitive way of transmitting messages and a less primitive one, a more primitive teaching aid and a less primitive one**. But **the primitiveness of other single items is by no means so easy to settle**. For example, is the custom of sending children to boarding school or to **summer** camp more or less primitive **than that** of continuous parental supervision of the **children at home?** Is a **totalitarian system of government more or less primitive than tribal rule or benevolent despotism?** Is a religious system based upon

monotheism **with** a **history** of heresy persecution, **witch** hunting, and holy **crusades** more or less primitive **than another** with a *laissez faire* attitude **toward** different **creeds and** ritual **practices**? Is the custom of taking **care** of aged **parents at** home more primitive than that of leaving them to themselves or in institutions?

Though satisfactory **answers** to such questions are difficult to come by, our difficulties **become** much **greater** **when we** attempt to **determine the** inferiority or superiority of **whole societies** or cultures. Why, despite **the** scientific indefensibility of applying the concept "primitive" to contemporary cultures **and** societies, have so many **anthropologists** tolerated such lack **of** precision? In a previous **paragraph I alluded** to sentiment or inertia. **But I think there are more** complicated factors at work.

First, there is probably a **reluctance on the part of** some scientists to **subject** their **own** cultures to the **same** kind of **scrutiny** applied to those **not their own**. As long **as** they are analyzing the **strange and the exotic** they can be emotionally uninvolved. **But the same type of analysis applied to their own** ways of life **may** be too painful, especially if such **analyses** threaten to turn up customs and practices **and** thought patterns which **may not only** be unsalutary but **even similar** to those they **have**, for **whatever** reason, labelled "pri- mitive" with its **many inferiority connotations**.

In this connection it is interesting to note **that**,

CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY

though **some** of Margaret Mead's works are referred to in almost **every general** book on anthropology, **her study of** the American family, child-rearing **practices, psychological orientation, etc., namely** *And Keep Your Powder Dry* (1942), is not usually mentioned. As **a matter of fact** it is **only barely** referred to in **3 of the** books we have examined (Hoebel 1958, Honigmann 1959, and Keesing 1958) and quoted in a short **selection** in only one of them (Goldschmidt 1960). **Mead's credentials as an expert on American culture are at least as good as** hers on the Manus, Arapesh, and Mundugumor, or Lowie's (1935) on the Crow Indians. **Yet while Mead's work on the South Seas is** among **anthropological classics, her work on the United States enjoys** no such **esteem** among her colleagues.

Another phenomenon is **also** worth noting in **this** connection. **We have many studies on acculturation. But whether in general works on the subject dealing** with theories of **acculturation built on facts from many cultures** (Herskovits 1938), or in **more** limited works dealing with the **acculturative processes**

of single societies (Linton 1940 or Hallowell 1955), we usually obtain a one-sided picture. We read about which tribes or which sections of a tribe are more acculturated; we also know something about the effects of acculturation on tribal culture and personality; but we find only sporadic or passing mention rather than serious and systematic analysis of the cultures to which the tribes under scrutiny are acculturating. Yet acculturation is certainly a two-sided affair. If we are analysing the impact of acculturation among the Ojibwa or the Menomoni, we should have systematic treatments of the White American cultures as much as of the Indian cultures. For example, many are the statements that the social acceptance of the Negro depends upon the extent of his acculturation. Sociologists of the importance of Hauser continue to make statements such as: "But as the Negro becomes acculturated he will become acceptable and will be accepted" (Moore 1964). But how many social scientists have actually attempted to harmonize the contradictory nature of many reasons given for discrimination against minority groups by considering the possibility that there is an inherent need for prejudice on the part of many self-reliant Whites irrespective of the professed reasons (Hsu 1961a:216-29)? Fred Gearing's work on the Fox in Iowa (in a yet unpublished manuscript) is the only study on Indian-White contact I know of so far which has attempted seriously and systematically to analyse the White image of the Indian as much as the Indian image of the White (Gearing n.d.). For both affect Indian acculturation.

All this, it seems, is not accidental. There is perhaps an aversion on the part of anthropologists to study their own cultures. How deepseated is this aversion may perhaps be gauged in the attitude expressed by A. L. Kroeber, dean of American anthropologists, in connection with irrational taboos and beliefs:

Quite likely our civilization has its share of counterparts, which we cannot segregate off from the more practical remainder of the business of living because we are engulfed in this civilization of ours as we are in the air we breathe. Some centuries may be needed before the full recognition of our own non-rational couvades and totems and taboos become possible (1948:307).

There are many **obvious flaws** in this statement, but only **two** need be **dealt with here**. **On the one hand**, if "**some centuries**" **are needed** to understand the **Western cultures**, the **same or similar length of time** will **evidently** be required to understand **many non- Western cultures**. In **that case** a majority of non- **literate cultures** must **be** left unstudied, for **few** of **them** have a **historical depth of even 100 years**.

On the other hand, fortunately we do not have to wait for "**some centuries**" to study any culture. For the essential contribution of **anthropology** to the **science of man** lies in its **cross-cultural perspective**. **The Melanesians, the Africans, the Hindus, and all other non-Western peoples are understandably too "engulfed" each in their own particular civilization as they are in the air they breathe, but anthropologists (a majority of whom have been Westerners so far) who are not so "engulfed" have been able to achieve relatively more objective views of these non-Western ways of life**. Does it not logically **follow that non- Western anthropologists could also conceivably scrutinize the non-rational couvades, totems and taboos in the Western ways of life in a more objective light than native Westerners without waiting for some centuries to come?** In fact, **the study of Western cultures by non-Western anthropologists is a method- ological necessity**. It is **inconceivable that a scientist of Kroeber's stature should fail to see this point**. **The only explanation for his statement would seem to be that he was unwilling to subject his own culture to the same kind of scrutiny that he has applied to others—at least not for "some centuries" yet.**

The second reason **why anthropologists have been unwilling to forego the unsatisfactory concept of "primitive" to designate a conglomeration of diverse cultures and societies is a methodological one**. Here the difficulties are real and **the main problem is coverage**.¹

The **difficulties are not obscure**. **In dealing with materials from the so-called "primitive" societies possessing no written histories, the researcher can usually obtain relatively complete coverage of the data**. **Thus if he is comparing the political systems of sub-Saharan Africa, he can usually be fairly sure of having examined all the significant ethnographic reports concerning the societies in his study**. **None of these societies has great historical depth, and the writings on each are highlighted by the major works of one or a few authorities**. Even if he wants to **compare these African systems with the political basis and with the same assurance of reasonable cover- systems in Polynesia, he can still proceed on the same**

age.

However, suppose **the researcher wants** to compare **the African and the Polynesian systems** with those of China and Japan or of India. **The problem of coverage at once** seems overwhelming, for **these** literate and historical societies have **been** studied and written about by specialists in diverse **fields** for many generations, and the anthropologist is **immediately**

1. In **assessing** these difficulties I have greatly benefited from a discussion with my colleague, Dr. Raoul Naroll.

175

confronted with mountains of **material**, the **study of a small part of** which tends to become a lifetime **work for many a scholar**. Under such circumstances what **part** of this **mountain of material** is the comparative scholar going **to use without** being **attacked left and right by the many** sinologists or indologists, **not to say** historians and art **specialists**, who **have spent their** lives on one limited **phase of life or culture of one of these large societies?**

This is an aspect of **the** methodological problem **for which** we **have at present indeed** no **completely satisfactory answer**. **But our ability and** determination to solve this problem will **have a** most significant bearing on **the future of theoretical** anthropology. And the **prevailing state of affairs in which the students who** study **the historical and** literate **societies and the students who** study **the non-literate societies generally** go their **separate ways** is certainly not bringing **us nearer** its solution.

In this situation we can proceed by letting **the** methodological difficulties **dictate our theoretical** direction, **or** we **can** devote some time **and energy toward** overcoming the methodological difficulties in order to **attain our theoretical** goal. I have no **doubt** that if **we decide** upon the former **course** we **shall be allowing the tail to wag the dog**. For **there is no scientific justification whatsoever for** confining ourselves to **one kind of society and not all societies**. **Physical anthropology and** linguistics **have never been confined** to data among "primitive" **peoples**. **Physical anthropologists deal with the physical** characteristics of all branches of mankind just as linguists **deal with all types of languages**. **These are, of course, as** they should be. No zoologist deserving of his title can **confine his** deliberations to horses **and cows** or lizards and fish. **Any science of society and culture must similarly be based on the data found in all mankind wherever they occur**.

Given this major premise, we shall note **that** the difficulties

in the path of those students who wish to compare all peoples with no regard to whether they do or do not possess historical depth are far from insurmountable. For one thing, some groundwork has been laid by anthologies such as *Societies Around the World* (Sanders et al. 1953) and cooperative field projects on specific aspects of culture such as *Six Cultures: Studies of Child Rearing* (Whiting 1963). The works of Chapple and Coon (1942) and Homans (1950) are valiant attempts to construct theory on the basis of data from all types of societies without fitting them into the primitive-civilized categories or other forms of dichotomy. The technical problems of such comparative studies are real and probably will not be solved to anyone's satisfaction for a long time. But this is simply one area where more anthropologists will have to make more intensive efforts, unless we insist that adequate theories of man's ways can be derived from a particular variety of mankind.

However, over and above the empirical and theoretical reasons just outlined, there is a practical necessity today for pause before using the term "primitive" in describing cultures and societies. There was a time when anthropologists from a Western society could write about the "primitive" Bantu or the Maori without the fear of being challenged. The peoples who were objects of study could not read the ethnographic

reports nor were they in any position to challenge them even had they read them. Today many of these once voiceless peoples have become members of independent nations taking their places as equals with their most powerful brothers in the international arena. To a majority or to all of them we have sent ambassadors, and we receive their ambassadors. Among every one of these newly independent peoples the zeal for national pride runs high. None of them will regard with delight the designation of "primitive" applied to any aspect of their culture, far less to their way of life as a whole, no matter how the concept is defined. The overall psychological and political climate of the world today is simply unfavorable to the continued application of this term to any people who have a voice. We need only recall the incident involving the American girl serving as a Peace Corps member in Nigeria who wrote a postcard to one of her friends at home deploring the conditions in which she found herself. The Nigerian students' reaction was prompt and explosive. One can almost say with certainty that similar incidents will occur in many

parts of the world with similar or other kinds of provocation. On the other hand, one can also say with certainty that such incidents were not likely to have occurred before World War II.

For this reason even the more descriptive term "non-literate" proposed by Herskovits (1948) is not going to be useful for long. For as national states emerge from among previously non-literate peoples, the leaders of each new state will be anxious to adopt or create a written language suited to their particular circumstances. Ghana has adopted English as its lingua franca. Tanganyika has adopted Swahili as its lingua franca. Indonesia has adopted Bahasa based on Malay spoken in Sumatra and some Pidgin Dutch. Other new nations are either adopting existing languages or creating their own with the aid of some Indo-European alphabet. Judging from historical examples from the Japanese and the Manchus to the Russians and the Mongols, this transformation of a people without a written language into one with a written language is well within the grasp of any organized society so determined. It will not be long before a majority or all of the presently non-literate peoples become literate. Then the term "non-literate" as distinguished from "literate" will be meaningless unless it is used with qualifications such as "non-literate until 1961."

Nor will interesting efforts such as that of Stanley Diamond (1963), already discussed, appreciably help to restore the concept of primitive to the central place it once unquestionably occupied in anthropology. Diamond's work in this connection embodies and may even be regarded as a synthesis of three lines of antecedent thought in our discipline. One is that represented by Goldenweisser (1922:117-18), in attempting clearly to formulate criteria of primitiveness as contrasted to civilizedness, and by others of the folk-urban dichotomy sort. A second line is represented by Herskovits (1958:61-78) in his formulation of cultural relativism, the central theme of which is the need for avoiding judgment of one culture by the standards of another. A third line is both older and younger than either of the two already noted. This is the idea of the noble savage prevalent in the West

CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY

years and even centuries ago, tarnished by later discovery of savage inferiority and the White Man's burden, but, in more recent years, gaining importance once again because of the stress on racial equality and the dignity of the individual.

Diamond's effort has not restored the concept of "primitive" to its former greatness but has, instead, I believe,

clearly shown how incompatible the "superior" characteristics of his "primitive" are with modern developments such as industrialization and the building of political states motivated by nationalism. Industrialization and nationalism are today the twin goals that most or all peoples want to achieve, either by their own bootstraps or through some form of aid from capitalistic or communistic sources. But these goals are not possible unless peasants are willing to leave the security of their small plots of land to work in mass-producing factories, unless believers are willing to ignore the dictates of gods and oracles to accept the verdicts of market analyses and scientific medicine, and unless most natives are willing to forget or suppress their kinship obligations and replace them by impersonal and cold-blooded considerations such as efficiency and capacity to produce. Finally, when Diamond pleads for letting the "primitive grow in us," he has left behind most of the characteristics of the "primitive" as he has defined them and concentrated on the community aspect of it as an antidote to the increasing alienation of men from each other which, according to him, accompanies civilizational development. Diamond has pointed out a wish, a de-

a desirable wish, but how he proposes to reach that end, or whether it is feasible, is not at all clear from his writings on the subject (Diamond 1960; 1963; and 1964). My view is that as long as Western men and the rest of the world pursue the objectives they do now, Diamond's wish will remain a beautiful wish. Glorification of the concept "primitive," or some phases of it, is likely to be unattractive to mankind, most of all to those whose behavior patterns exemplify the "primitive." For whether we assume the "inferiority" of the "primitive" vis-a-vis the "civilized" or protest the "superiority" of the "primitive" vis-a-vis the "civilized," the anthropologists will be dichotomizing the world's societies and cultures with little or no allowance for other historical cultures and societies but with their own Western variety of societies and cultures as the central point of reference (unless they wish to make the unconvincing and unlikely claim that their central point of reference is the "primitive"). This suggests the very kind of ethnocentrism which anthropology as a profession has been trying to eliminate or at least reduce.

Above all, however, we must not allow the tremendously wide spectrum of differences among the societies and cultures to be concealed by the concept "primitive." These

differences **are** crucial not only from **the** point of view of scientific curiosity **but** also in terms of **their** dissimilar reactions and adjustments to the impact of the modern industrial and nationalistic West. Anthropologists, after painting themselves to a corner by their unwillingness to discard the concept "primitive," have no alternative to using it in so many differing, imprecise, conflicting, or meaningless ways because it is **a grab bag**. Even Diamond, **after** defining this concept by a list of 10 specific

Vol. 5 No. 3 · June 1964

Hsu RETHINKING THE CONCEPT "PRIMITIVE"

characteristics, if forced to resort to such vague **and** scientifically **useless** statements **as** "primitives possess the immediate **and** ramifying sense of the person .." **and** that "primitive society at its most positive, exemplifies an essential humanity" (Diamond 1963:111), when he **tries** to show **what it is that** his "primitive" can offer to his "civilized."

The grab bag **nature** of the concept "primitive" **makes** this inevitable. Each user must either impute some particular meanings to **it** without regard to **what other students** do, or **resort** to statements about **it** too **general** to be **scientifically** usable. Continued elaboration of **and** preoccupation with this concept **can only** obscure rather than clarify what **we** hope to **analyse**, and seriously hamper our endeavors in building a science of man.

In this paper my purpose is to **show** the empirical, **theoretical and** practical obsolescence of the concept "primitive" except in some most restricted sense referring to specific items of **culture** or to certain pre-historical forms of development. But I do not **deny** the **need** for classification of **man** and his **works** in other **ways**. In **fact**, **classification** is **essential** to **all sciences**, but **the usefulness** of **the** classificatory categories is dependent upon the **extent** to which they do or do not correspond to the facts or yield significant insights into **the facts** so classified.

We must be flexible enough **with our** classificatory categories at any one time so that **they** will **serve** primarily as **convenient** tools to shift and tie facts together but not as invariable points of **reference** so that **our** thinking is molded and predetermined by them. As our knowledge increases we must refine **our** classificatory categories to suit **the new developments**. I firmly **believe** that **we** have come to a time **when** **we** must go beyond the concepts of "primitive" and "civilized", or other forms of simple dichotomy, and move to more refined modes of classification.

There are already many such new modes of classification at our disposal. For example, different kinds of **descent**, inheritance, **and** succession provide **us** with one basis for

classification. Different **varieties** of economic practices and organizations provide **us** with **another** basis for classification. We can classify societies according to **the extent** to which they exhibit **the** characteristics of an organized **state** as distinguished from those which are stateless. We can classify them into those which, to borrow David Riesman's terms (1950), are predominantly tradition-directed, inner-directed, or **other**-directed, or, to use my terms (Hsu 1963), according to **patterns** of interpersonal interaction, into those which **are** characterized by mutual dependence, unilateral dependence, or self-reliance. **Societies** could be classified on **the basis** of a **few** precise traits, such **as** language, **territorial** contiguity, and political organization, into Hopi, **Flathead**, Aztec, and Tarascan types (Naroll 1964). Or **they** could be classified according to **what** I designate **as** the dominant attributes in the kinship content, which **serve** as keys to their wider **psycho-cultural** orientations (Hsu 1959; 1961b; 1964).

Each **of these** modes of classification may, **of** course, **only** elicit particular kinds of results which **may** not be entirely **relevant** to those elicited by

177

others. As **the** science of man moves **forward**, the scientifically less productive classificatory schemes. will be **replaced** by scientifically **more** meaningful ones. We will also **have** to find means of integrating **some** of them **or relating** them to each other. But to stagnate at **the** level of a "primitive" versus "civilized" dichotomy and its substitutes is to block **our** paths to progress.

Abstract

This article **shows** the empirical, **theoretical**, and practical, and practical obsolescence of the concept "primitive" except in some most **restricted** sense, such **as** application to peoples and cultures in **prehistorical**

times. A survey of 30 basic books in anthropology written during **the last** 10 years reveals **that** the concept still enjoys a high degree of currency in **an** ambiguous, inconsistent, or scientifically meaningless way.

The reasons for this insistent use of the concept by anthropologists despite its obsolescence **are** discussed. **One of these** reasons **is** the seeming reluctance of anthropologists to examine their **own** societies and cultures. Another **is** the difficulty in comparing large societies with extensive **historical** records and **relatively small ones** with shallow pasts. **But** whatever **the reason**, the continued use of and preoccupation with the concept "primitive" (through **such** efforts as redefinition or

substitution), will hamper **the** further prog-
ress of our science.

References Cited

BEALS, RALPH L. and HARRY HOIJER. 1959. 2d edition. An introduction to anthropology. New York: Macmillan.

BOHANNAN, PAUL. 1963. *Social anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

CHAPPLE, E. D. and C. S. COON. 1942. *Principles of anthropology*. New York: Henry Holt.

COON, CARLETON S. 1962. 2d edition. *The story of man, from the first human to primitive culture and beyond*. New York: Knopf.

DIAMOND, STANLEY. 1960. "Plato and the definition of the primitive," in *Culture in history: Essays in honor of Paul Radin*. Edited by Stanley Diamond, pp. 118-41. New York: Columbia University Press.

1963. "The search for the primitive," in *Man's image in medicine and anthropology*. Edited by I. Galdston, pp. 62-115. New York: International Universities Press.

1964. "Introduction: The uses of the primitive," in *Primitive views of the world*. Edited by Stanley Diamond, New York: Columbia University Press.

EVANS-PRITCHARD, E. E. 1951. *Social anthropology*. London: Cohen and West.

FIRTH, RAYMOND. 1956. *Human types*. London: Nelson.

GEARING, FRED. n.d. *The public face of the Fox Indians* (in press). GLEASON, HENRY A.

1961. Revised edition. *An introduction to descriptive linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

GOLDENWEISER, ALEXANDER. 1922. *Early civilization*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

1937. *Anthropology: An introduction to primitive culture*. New York: F. S. Crofts.

GOLDSCHMIDT, WALTER. 1959. *Man's way*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co.

Ed. 1960. *Exploring the ways of mankind*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

HALLOWELL, A. L. 1955. *Culture and experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

HAWKES, JACQUETTA. 1954. *Man on earth*. London: Cresset Press.

HERSKOVITS, M. J. 1938. *Acculturation: The study of culture contact*. New York: J. J. Augustin.

1948. *Man and his works: The science of cultural anthropology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

1955. *Cultural anthropology*. New York: Knopf.

HILL, ARCHIBALD A. 1958. *Introduction to linguistic*

- structures**. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- HOCKETT, **CHARLES F.** 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- HOEBEL, E. A. 1960. 2d edition. *Man in the primitive world*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- HOMANS, **GEORGE C.** 1950. *The human group*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co.
- HONIGMANN, **JOHN J.** 1959. *The world of man*. New York: Harper and Row.
1963. *Understanding culture*. New York: Harper and Row.
- HSU, **FRANCIS L. K.** 1959. Structure, function, content, and process. *American Anthropologist* 61:790-805.
- 1961a. "American core value and national character," in *Psychological anthropology: Approaches to culture and personality*. Edited by **Francis L. K. Hsu**, pp. 209-30. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- 1961b. "Kinship and ways of life: An exploration," in *Psychological anthropology*. Edited by **Francis L. K. Hsu**, pp. 400-56. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
1963. *Clan, caste and club*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
1964. Dominant attributes in kinship and social grouping: a hypothesis. Revised paper read at American Anthropological Association Meetings, San Francisco, November 1963.
- KEESING, **FELIX.** 1958. *Cultural anthropology*. New York: Rinehart and Co.
- KROEBER, **A. L.** 1948. *Anthropology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
1952. *The nature of culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LEVY, **MARION JOSEPH.** 1952. *The structure of society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- LINTON, **RALPH,** Ed. 1940. *Acculturation in seven American Indian tribes*. New York: Appleton Century.
1955. *The tree of culture*. New York: Knopf.
- LOWIE, **R. H.** 1935. *The Crow Indians*. New York: Rinehart and Co.
- MEAD, **MARGARET.** 1942. *And keep your powder dry*. New York: William Morrow.
- MEAD, **MARGARET,** and **NICHOLAS CALAS,** 1953. *Primitive heritage*. New York: Random House.
- MEDNICK, **LOIS.** 1960. Memorandum on the use of *primitive*. *Current Anthropology* 1:441-45.
- MOORE, **RUTH.** 1964. Hauser rejects area projections patterned on past. *Chicago Sun Times* (January 26), p. 22.
- MURDOCK, **G. P.** 1949. *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- NADEL, **S. F.** 1957. *The theory of social structure*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- NAROLL, **RAOUL.** 1964. On ethnic unit classification. *Current Anthropology* (in press).
- PIDDINGTON, **RALPH.** 1950/1957. *An introduction of social anthropology*. 2 vol. Edinburgh, Scotland: Oliver and Boyd.
- RADCLIFFE-BROWN, **A. R.** 1952. *Structure and function in primitive society*. London: Cohen and West.
1957. *A natural science of society*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- RADIN, **PAUL.** 1953. *The world of primitive*

tive man. New York: Schuman. REDFIELD, ROBERT. 1941. *Folk culture* of Yucatan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

RIESMAN, DAVID. 1950. *The lonely crowd*.

New Haven: Yale University Press. SANDERS, I. T., R. B. WOODBURY, F. J. ESSENE, T. P. FIELD, J. R. SCHWENDE- MAN, and C. P. SNOW. 1953.

Societies *around* the world. New York: The Dryden Press (2 vols.).

SAPIR, EDWARD. 1925. Spurious and genuine cultures. *American Journal of Sociology* 29:405.

rent Anthropology 1:441. THOMPSON, LAURA. 1961. Toward a *science* of mankind. New York: McGraw-Hill, TITIEV, MISCHA. 1959. Introduction to *cultural* anthropology. New York: Henry Holt.

- 1963. 2d edition. The *science* of man. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

WHITE, J. E. M. 1954. Anthropology.

London: English Universities Press. WHITING, BEATRICE, Ed. 1963. Six *cultural* studies: Studies of child rearing. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY