

応用人類学の現状と課題（解説：江渕一公）

シングルトン, ジョン

江渕, 一公
福岡教育大学

<https://doi.org/10.15017/2235340>

出版情報：九州人類学会報. 11/12, pp.1-11, 1984-06-01. Kyushu Anthropological Association
バージョン：
権利関係：

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

昭和57年度九州人類学会総会記念講演

John Singleton

Applied anthropology is essentially the application of a particular view of the world, which starts with the cultural base of human existence and interactions, and a particular method for knowing or experiencing that world, through ethnographic fieldwork, to the problems that human beings face in meeting personal, group, and organizational purposes. Anthropology is a world view based upon a theory of culture; ethnography is its method for apprehending and interpreting the reality posited by its theory. To apply anthropology is to make the theory and practice of it relevant to problems of real people in real settings. It is not, in my view, a science of "social engineering" but a science of interpretation. It does not tell us how to make people change, but how to help them and ourselves make choices of goals for social change and to negotiate cooperation for that change.

While there are many applied social sciences (economics and psychology are the most prevalent), the unique contribution of anthropology is its emphasis on a direct, grass-roots approach to people in the real social and organizational settings where we and they feel important purposes are to be served. Socio-cultural complexity, social conflict, economic and political inequality, and poverty are some of the problems addressed in contemporary life. As in any applied social science, the knowledge-generating traditions shared by a scientific systematic empirical knowledge-seeking society of practitioners is drawn upon to meet human needs in some specific time and place.

Applied anthropology, too, is a knowledge-generating process. Its primary contribution to the amelioration of social problems is in the generation of publicly credible descriptions and interpretations of social process. When this knowledge contributes to relevant social actions, it can be justly labelled applied social science. It is also potentially a scientific or academic exercise in so far as it tests or changes scholarly images of social reality. Contemporary cultural and linguistic theory in U. S. anthropology has been directly affected by these efforts, as in the scholarly contributions of Ward Goodenough and Dell Hymes.

Applied anthropology is not, however, limited by many academic or professional views of anthropology. In the first place, it is an interdisciplinary enterprise within which anthropologists are joined by sociologists, social psychologists, economists, political scientists, educators, medical doctors, nurses, engineers, social workers, and other professionals involved in complementary perspectives. In the second place, there is collaboration with people who use different cultural and social theories, whatever discipline they come from. Two important theoretical dimensions of difference are those of cultural theory (cultural materialism and ideational theories) and those of standards for credible knowledge (qualitative and quantitative means of research). Finally, applied anthropology is not limited to certified and school-ed practitioners. It is a perspective and method that can be shared with citizens — sometimes useful in the empowerment of ordinary people as they deal with the political and social organizations of their society.

Besides theory (culture) and method (ethnography), there is a third feature of anthropology inherited from a previous era but of great importance to applied anthropology. When academic anthropologists began their studies of strange natives in esoteric parts of the world, they often found that their intellectual achievements were based on close personal collaboration with a few key informants. Looking back, it is clear that the informants deserved as much recognition as the scholars in the development of ethnographic knowledge. In the United States, for instance, we are just beginning to acknowledge the contributions of American Indian intellectuals to the development of American anthropology — many of them through the long and intense informant-ethnographer relationship. The process of developing this kind of social collaboration is what is important to applied anthropology, even as the product was important to the mother discipline.

In applied anthropology, the ethnographer-informant collaboration is also the model for cooperation between development agents and client communities in cooperation for developmental change. Ward Goodenough is responsible for a theoretical model of "cooperation in change" that makes this point. It has been important in understanding the variety of specific human relationships that have evolved in the practice of applied anthropology. It has also led him into the elaboration of an ideational theory of culture which has helped us to apply the concept of culture to the modern world.

Anthropology is no longer distinguished from sociology as the study of primitive peoples. It is, rather, a distinctive approach to the study of any social group, building upon theoretical traditions inherited from our adventurous forebears. An important contributor to this change in

western anthropology was, of course, Fei Xiaotong who showed in his early studies of China an extension of anthropological inquiry to a historically complex civilization. He helped us understand some of the broader applications of a modern anthropology.

In the development of this modern anthropology, our concept of culture has changed, even though our language in anthropological reports has not always reflected this change. Goodenough made it explicit when he described "multi-culturalism" as the normal human experience. It is quite evident in contemporary complex societies that every individual belongs to many cultural groups, the boundaries of which are much more difficult to distinguish than the boundary water of the Trobriand Islands where Malinowski (Fei's mentor) did his fieldwork. Anthropology is, itself, a cultural system in which some of us here participate -- and my lectures are intended to entice all of you into it though it is up to you to decide the limits of your intellectual commitment. In other words, we must use culture theory to look at ourselves just as we look at others.

Organizationally, it is possible to talk of several models of applied anthropology practice. One conventional list suggests four categories (adapted from Spradley and McCurdy):

1. Administrative Anthropology — the use of anthropological knowledge for the management or governance of a local group by an agency which is foreign or external to that group and has some degree of control or influence over it. Colonial administration, industrial management where workers do not participate in that management, and anthropological consultants to organizational authorities are examples. The emphasis here is on "social engineering" and planned change that is initiated by hierarchical authority.

2. Adjustment Anthropology — the use of anthropological knowledge to make inter-group social interaction more predictable. In this model an anthropologist often acts as an interpreter between groups, usually between administrators and the administered. This is especially useful when the administered speak a different language and practice a different culture and it allows for two-way communication. It was developed as a model for collaboration between American administrators and Micronesians in the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands after World War II — but it was also suggested seriously to the administrators of my university as a pattern for providing better communication with faculty and students at a time when there was much conflict between the administrators and the faculty.
3. Action Anthropology — the use of anthropological knowledge and skills by a local group, itself, for its own purposes. In this case, an anthropologist may be a consultant to the group and not to those external authorities with which the group must deal. Sol Tax is famous for his invention of this model in his and his students work with American Indian groups. It is also applied to anthropologists who are working with self-help groups in American society who are trying to provide mutual assistance for individual change independent of governmental or professional social agencies — such as Alcoholics Anonymous.
4. Advocate Anthropology — the use of anthropological knowledge and skills in political actions to increase power for self-determination by local groups. In this case, anthropologists become political activists on behalf of groups they wish to assist. While it has been usually associated with the rights of underprivileged ethnic groups in American societies, it is also practiced on behalf of tribal groups

in the Amazon who are the victims of national economic development plans and on behalf of American consumers by Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Groups.

In these four categories, we can see three dimensions of difference in the involvement of applied anthropologists with specific organizations and groups. In the first dimension, the activities of the applied anthropologist range from being a cultural interpreter between groups to that of direct involvement in management of some specific group (administration, planning, and evaluation are aspects of such management). In the second dimension, the anthropologist is a passive knowledge provider for other people to make decisions and carry out specific actions or he may become an active knowledge applier taking responsibility for consciousness-raising or some form of professional administration or practice. A third dimension is suggested by the extent to which an anthropologist and his knowledge providing skills are used to mediate between groups and their respective interests or are used selectively to the benefit of one side or the other (the managers or the managed).

Applied anthropologists are placed in complex sets of ethical responsibilities to their several audiences. Working in the tradition of a scientific discipline, they are ethically committed to high standards of truth-telling in their scientific reports. Science, itself, is a knowledge system that is totally dependent upon an ethic of truthfulness in its participants. In the international science community there are only two unpardonable sins — gross inhumanity to the subjects of ones studies and untruthfulness in the presentation of data.

But in applied anthropology there is also a powerful commitment to avoid harm to one's informants. Since the very basis of our knowledge and action requires the development of mutual trust with them, it is unethical to initiate any action, even a scientific report, which could reasonably be expected to seriously harm their interests. On the other hand, one is also responsible to the people who hire or support us. If we are willingly engaged in actions of applied anthropology, we have contracted to serve at least some of the interests of those who make our work possible. Inevitably there are ethical conflicts for us when our responsibilities to our science, our informant collaborators, and our sponsors lead to choices between their separate interests. Moreover each of these groups often contain opposing and competing factions. We are also responsible to ourselves as individuals — and those national, political, organizational, or religious commitments which we have made.

In the last 15 years, applied anthropology in the U.S. has been developing several well-defined specializations that move it beyond its origins in colonial administration to some very specific applications to the contemporary patterns of privately and governmentally-organized (usually bureaucratized) social services. "Human organization" is the domain of these applications (and the title of the journal published by the Society for Applied Anthropology). Most numerous are the educational and the medical anthropologists who set up separate organizations and journals in 1967-68. They are associated with the respective professions of education and medicine and are further subdivided by both professional roles (e.g. there is a separate group of nurse anthropologists) and by the topics of their research (e.g. schools, bi-lingual education, etc.)

While there is collaboration between these organizations and an informal interlocking directorate with the Society for Applied Anthropology and the American Anthropological Association, there is no central directorate or coordinating council.

A large group of anthropologists continue to be interested in "development" (cultural, social, and political aspects of economic development) in international and in domestic U.S. contexts. Sub-divisions of this interest include rural/agricultural development, international development assistance, and local governmental (usually urban) development. Social Impact analysis, evaluation, and planning are particular processes associated with these development interests.

Other anthropologists are working on problems of the justice system (police, courts, prisons, the law) and of social work. There are even individual applied anthropologist experts on traffic safety and innovative sewer systems. Many missionary organizations employ an applied anthropology in their management and field operations — one large one is the Summer Institute of Linguistics which is involved in vernacular literacy and the introduction of vernacular translations of the Bible all over the world. Philanthropic foundations and the specialized agencies of the United Nations employ some anthropologists for their purposes. Anthropologists also work as business and industrial consultants.

Very recent developments include the organizing of groups in clinical anthropology (anthropologists working directly with individual clients in such services as marriage counseling) and in futures research. The development of an "Ethnographic Futures Research" method (Robert Textor) is beginning to attract attention, both as a research technique for understanding

group conceptions of the future and as a consciousness-raising technique to stimulate concern for the long-range implications of present personal and organizational decisions.

The traditional anthropological concern for cultural differences and the need for interpretation between groups with different cultural orientations unites most applied anthropologists. Whether it is cultural minorities in our own society or international cultural difference, the applied anthropologists are interested in increasing cross-cultural sophistication and understanding.

Many of the current specializations in applied anthropology share a concern for dealing with bureaucratized social services. In the U.S. some of us are concerned, for instance, with the over professionalized and specialized development of these agencies that deal with education, health, welfare, and justice. Schools, hospitals, courts, and welfare offices are publicly justified by their services to the public. In maintaining their organizational fiefdoms, the agencies' actual services are subverted by informal and overlooked patterns of social organization. Too often we assume that what is good for the agencies is good for the people they serve — and this is not necessarily so. Many informal, unorthodox, and non-professional patterns of care-giving and self reliance that actually serve people's social needs are ignored in public policy decisions.

Anthropological perspectives to explore on the issues of social service needs would include (1) a comparative view of social agencies in different societies, (2) an holistic view of the implicit social functions of such agencies, (3) a recognition of informal community resources for social welfare, and (4) an ethnographic research strategy which would

explore the strengths of non-professional, community-based opportunities for defining and solving social problems.

The comparative perspective of anthropology is important, for instance, in contrasting the vastly different experience of social agencies in different social contexts. Chinese reorganization of basic health care is an example that contrasts sharply with the assumptions of contemporary professional Western medicine. The "barefoot doctor" has been an unthinkable alternative in Western societies, because it challenges the foundations of our medical beliefs and the faith we have place in elite medical professions. Japanese elementary schools are organized in sharp contrast with American schools. That Japanese students show higher average achievement than Americans is somewhat galling (Are they smarter than us?), but the worst shock comes when we find that they much more effectively practice an egalitarian education that gives all children far more equal chances to learn and to advance in social status than our children. They have out-democratized us!

The problem of human organization, which applied anthropology seeks to address, are ultimately questions of social policy. The cultural worldview, the ethnographic fieldwork method of knowing, and the collaborative model of agent-community relations must eventually influence the people who make decisions at every level of political organization — if we are going to be able to make a claim that applied anthropology makes a difference in human affairs.

この論文は、昭和57年度九州人類学研究会総会における記念講演（「応用人類学の現状と課題」）において講演者ジョン・シングルトン氏より配布されたものである。元来この原稿は、同氏が九人研総会に先だつ1年ほど前に北京大学人類学部において行った講演原稿に手を加えたものであるとのこと

であったが、わが国でも紹介する価値があると考え、同氏の快諾を得てここに収録することにした。シングルトン氏は現在ピッツバーグ大学教授として国際開発教育研究所および人類学部において応用人類学・教育人類学を担当している。アメリカ人類学会（American Anthropological Association——略称AAA）傘下の教育人類学会（Council on Anthropology and Education——略称CAE）の初代会長をつとめ、また、最近まで応用人類学会（Society for Applied Anthropology——略称SfAA）の会長として活躍した。この講演は、甲南大学にある甲南—イリノイ・センターの1981—82年度プログラム・ディレクターとして来日中の一日を九人研のために割いていただいたものである。この機会を借りて改めてご厚意に感謝したい。

「応用人類学」という言葉は、わが国ではなじみが薄いけれども、アメリカではこの名称の学会が存在することからも容易に想像できるように、かなり一般化している。歴史的に遡るならば、“間接統治”で知られるイギリス流の植民地行政において現住民文化に関する人類学的知識が活用されたことにその発祥を求めることができる。そのため応用人類学には現住民支配に手を貸したという植民地主義の暗いイメージがつきまとうと言う人もいる。応用人類学が最も目覚ましい発展を遂げたアメリカでもそうしたイメージが全くないわけではないけれども、しかしここではむしろ、応用人類学は現住民の声を代弁する役割を果たしたというイメージの方が強いようである。いわゆる“インディアン問題”に悩まされる行政当局が「インディアン文化＝病理的文化」という見方に陥りがちな傾向に対して、“文化相対主義”の立場から現住民文化を理解することの重要性を説き、両者の仲介者として行動する人類学者が少なかつたからであろう。第二次世界大戦中、多数の高名な人類学者が動員されて進められた、いわゆる「国民性研究」も未開社会の文化の研究から生まれた人類学の理論・方法を複雑な文明社会の文化の研究に“応用”したという意味において、一種の応用人類学であった。戦後は、周知のように、人類学の対象がいちじるしく拡大されて複雑な産業社会にも関心の眼が向けられるようになったが、それとともに、人類学の“応用性”もまた一段と高まった観がある。コミュニティ開発を助ける「開発人類学」や、「産業人類学」、「医療人類学」、「教育人類学」などは、そうした背景のなかで発展した新しい人類学の諸分野である。しかし、応用人類学と言っても、それを他の一般人類学ないし基礎科学的人類学から明確に区別することはかならずしも容易ではない。例えば、Ward H. Goodenough の“Cooperation in Change”（1963）は、いわゆる開発人類学の代表的著作としてよく知られるが、この本はすぐれた応用人類学の本であると共に、認知人類学的観点から新しい文化概念を提起した理論的著作としても高い評価を得ている。応用人類学は人類学理論の実際生活への応用であるが、その応用経験は人類学的理論の生成に貢献していると言うことができよう。

本論文は、そうした方法論的特色に言及すると共に、その主要範疇（管理・行政を目的として政府関係職員などが人類学的知識を利用することを意味する administrative anthropology, 行政官と住民との間の調整役として人類学者が介在する adjustment anthropology, 住民自身が自分達のために人類学的知識や方法を用い、人類学者は陰の相談役としてかれらを助ける action anthropology, 政治的発言力を高めようとする住民集団の代弁者として人類学者が関与する advocate anthropology など）について要約的に述べ、最近のアメリカ応用人類学のもつ多様な性格を指摘したものである。

（江 淵 一 公）