

## **Anthropology and the Changing World: How Can Anthropologists Serve Humanity?**

**H.M. Ashraf Ali<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** My principal objective in this paper is to delineate how anthropologists can understand and help solve human problems emerging from the global change. In this paper I will focus on three major anthropological domains. Firstly, following a brief overview on epistemology and foundations of anthropological knowledge (i.e. scientific methodological tradition), I will discuss contemporary human problems emerging from global change and assess how sociocultural anthropology can contribute to understandings of gender and health issues in development. Secondly, I will assess emerging development problems in Bangladesh with a critical anthropological lens, considering how anthropological viewpoints can contribute to solving these problems. In other words, I will contextualize how anthropological knowledge generated from socially-grounded methodological traditions can be applied to solve the problems of the contemporary humankind. Finally, following changing foci within academic anthropological discussions, I will examine the prospects of anthropology as an agent in both understanding and serving humanity.

**Key words:** Applied anthropology; development; cultural relativism; changing world

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Change is perhaps the most common aspect of human life experienced in every society of today's world. There may be differences in context, pattern, speed, scale, or extent of changes, but peoples across the globe more or less seem to share experiences of social, cultural and economic alteration in their everyday lives. Globalization, through the spread of the free market economy, the revolution of information and communication technologies (e.g., the spread of the Internet, media and entertainment technologies) rapid urbanization, the spread of consumer culture, and transnational migrations, have interconnected the world economically, culturally and politically. Even remote communities have been influenced by

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, Department of Anthropology, 13-15 HM Tory Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, T6G 2H4, Canada.

Email: haali@ualberta.ca, hmashraf78@yahoo.com

Assistant Professor (On Study Leave), Department of Anthropology, University of Chittagong, Chittagong, Bangladesh.

\* Received 5 October 2009; accepted 12 November 2009

global change. Such change has both positive and negative consequences on peoples' lives. Though many people's have been blessed by economic and technological advancements, economic inequalities between and within nations proliferate. In addition to the continuance, even growth of global poverty, violation of human rights, discrimination and violence against women, and stigmatization and exclusion of ethnic minorities means large numbers of people have little, if any, access to such technologies.

Thus too many people still do not have access to educational, economic, and health facilities and opportunities.

In many countries, hegemonic political-economic approaches and discourses shape development interventions, and imposition of such policies creates further problems, including displacement of indigenous people from their ancestral territories in combination with lack of adequate resettlement, environmental degradations, and ethnic conflicts over land use and natural resources management. My principal objective here is to delineate how anthropologists can understand and help solve human problems emerging from this global change. Anthropology has a rich tradition in comprehending the complex phenomena of human society, in valuing alternate knowledge systems, and in mediating problems that arise in conjunction with 'development'.

## **2. EPISTEMOLOGY AND FOUNDATIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Epistemology is the investigation of the systematic ways through which we understand the world and what constitutes a valid explanation about certain phenomena. Epistemology addresses the questions: "How do we know what we know? How do we know what or whom to believe? How do we differentiate between what is reasonable and what is not?" (Sidky 2004:12). Epistemology is itself based upon critical evaluation of diverse ways of knowing, including foundations of scientific knowledge and theoretical positions used in anthropology. Scientific knowledge generated through experimental or ethnographic research is usually based on sensory experiences, logic, authority, popular consensus, intuition, revelation and faith (Sidky 2004).

Science is a way of representing reality and its goals are explanation and validation of a given explanation. Science is not concerned with absolutes or universals, but rather with approximate truths (Sidky 2004:28). Scientific anthropological studies have generally been based on several postulates (e.g. holistic perspective, ethnographic fieldwork/participant-observation, comparative methods, and inductive and deductive theorizing) that came out of the generic concept of culture. These are modes of thought and research procedures that are relevant in all branches of the discipline, particularly for sociocultural anthropology. Much of the work of sociocultural anthropologists in this century has, directly or indirectly, involved the application of postulates. This has been an endogenous development of anthropology, the growth guided by its internal intellectual guidelines (Shimkin et al 1978: 26).

Therefore, anthropologists develop ideas from the ground up, rather than applying theory from above. In participant observation, when an anthropologist undertakes an activity that parallels the experience of native community members, he or she is *gaining new knowledge through immersion in doing* rather than solely by abstract intellectual manipulation of ideas. This approach is inductive; meaning is not imposed *on* the situation, but emerges slowly over time *from* the situation. In inductive reasoning an ethnographer begins by identifying common characteristics or patterns and developing generalizations ((Baba 2000:32; Nolan, 2003:10; Sidky 2004: 28).

Recently, reflexive anthropology has expanded the cultural aspects of humanity to include the ethnographer in the ethnography itself. This has given the ethnographer an opportunity to scrutinize his/her positions through the revelation of the intersubjective and intercultural relationships between ethnographer and research participants in formal ethnographic writings. The ethnographer's conscious reflection on the 'self' and the 'subject' in formal ethnographic writing is known as "reflexivity" (Thapan, 1998; Robben & Sluka 2007). For Hammersly and Atkinson (2007) reflexivity opens spaces for the ethnographer to narrate what he/she has learnt, and how he/she learnt it throughout his/her field

research. Moreover, it reveals the ethnographer's actual position in the field in terms of his/her relationships with the research participants, personal impression among the community, roles and strategies in developing rapport, and access to the relevant domains of information. Thus, reflexivity in ethnographic research has enriched and strengthened anthropology's epistemological standpoint, and increased the reliability and validity of data.

Traditional anthropological methods, together with insights and intuitive observations of the reflexive ethnographer are indispensable for identifying the significant questions, as well as for finding out how these questions can be studied in terms of local research setting (Pelto and Pelto 1978). Thus there is no alternative for intensive ethnographic fieldwork in understanding and resolving social problems and constructing theories from bottom-up through an in depth realization of a common humanity in this era of global change.

### **3. GLOBAL CHANGE AND PROBLEMS**

World events in the past decade have made it clear that we are living in a compressed world. Events in one area of the world, even those that may have appeared to be localized at one point in time, now reverberate across the globe. The emerging complex dynamics that connect global and local processes have intensified- the world has become, in many ways, a single place (Hill and Baba 2006:3). In fact, 'globalization' is not a new process in human history, but something marks contemporary globalization as different. Globalization connotes fundamental social, political, and economic change (Roberts and Hite 2007). The globalization processes, including neoliberal economic policies, spread of information and communication technologies (ICT), consumption cultures, rapid urbanization, and transnational migrations, have altered the pattern of human lifestyles and relationships around the globe. The transformation of society associated with these global processes--global cities, routine long-distance travel, huge farms devoted to export agriculture--give people everywhere more or less similar basic experiences of global change. This accelerated societal transformation comes with an array of new issues and problems such as spread of economic inequalities, sex tourism, HIV/AIDS, diabetes and other diseases (Lewellen 2002; Mohsin 2005; Helman 2007, Ashraf 2007). The economic and cultural dimensions of globalization are also partly responsible for increasing social and health problems including sex trafficking and substance abuse or the overuse of drugs (Helmen 2007:319). HIV/AIDS, diabetes, TB are emerging in epidemic form in many countries of the World. India, for example, with its population of 1.1 billion, has upwards of 100 million diabetics and that figure is growing every year. It is estimated that up to three million people die from the disease every year, and over a quarter of a billion people are affected (please see web link [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/7728092.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7728092.stm)). TB is emerging around the world as one the most dangerous diseases directly associated with poverty, malnutrition and bad living conditions. It is estimated that nine million people contract standard TB every year and 90% of them live in the developing country (please at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7729184.stm>).

There is ample evidence that among the world's six billion people, almost five billion live in countries where the average income is less than \$3 a day (World Bank Report 1997 cited in Roberts and Hite 2007a: 2). At the same time, on average, people in high-income countries get to live on 23 times that much (World Bank Report 1995 cited in Roberts and Hite 2007b: 2), and the gap between the two groups appears to be widening. About one out of four people in the world today live in absolute poverty, defined as "too poor to afford an adequate diet and other necessities" (Roberts and Hite 2007b: 2). Development interventions have had some benefit, as seen with the increased average life expectancy, but infant mortality is alarmingly increasing in some parts of the world, and famine, civil disorder, malaria, tuberculosis and HIV have emerged as life threatening for many people. Nearly one billion people remain illiterate; the enormity of discrimination and violence against females is simply outrageous (Chambers 1999:6-7). This is the case despite efforts of the World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, Asian Development Bank and other international, governmental development and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) those are working on poverty alleviation, education, health issues, women's

empowerment for the last three decades (ADB 2004; Bagchi 2005; Chambers 1999; Chowdhury et al 2001 Farmer 2005; Halim et al 2005; Rahman 2006; Rankin 2002; Roy 2004; UNDP 2005).

Thus, most of these problems especially gender discrimination and health problems are directly linked to the contemporary globalization including the economic reforms and structural adjustment programme (SAP) by the World Bank and IMF in developing countries in the 1980s. The economic globalization and SAP have had devastating impacts on health and gender issues in many countries which cut employment and investment in social sectors, weakened institutions by the rapid privatization of services and decreasing government control and accountability and created constraints for poor people's to access in basic needs including health and education. Privatization directly affected both poor people and women by creating economic inequalities and pushing women into physical and psychological insecurities in many developing countries of the world, including in Bangladesh.

#### **4. CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS IN BANGLADESH**

Accelerating globalization processes have interconnected Bangladesh with the world economically, culturally and politically. Liberal economic policies in Bangladesh have created space for the foreign investment in the export-oriented garments industries. The garment industry in Bangladesh is an expanding sector, creating employment for poor people, especially women and young girls from rural areas. But the wages received by workers are paltry, and working conditions are inadequate. Mohsin argues that "women take such jobs out of necessity for survival rather than as matter of choice, given the lack of options following the closure of their traditional means of livelihood through the SAP and the dynamics of globalization" (Mohsin 2005: 72).

Although the flow of global capitalism into the garment industry and increasing foreign aid create employment opportunities for women, and consequently women are more visible in public places and acquiring new and multiple identities of breadwinners and workers, at the same time they continue to face everyday dangers associated with discrimination, including sexual harassment, rape, psychological and physical insecurities (electric accidents in factories) and hazards of environment pollution (e.g. toxins and noise) (Mohsin 2005:70; Khan 2005). Emerging garment industries in urban areas of Bangladesh are encouraging rural to urban migration, and this in turn is leading to various problems like haphazard urbanization and growth of slums with lack of basic amenities (e.g. inadequate water, sanitation, health care services) and social problems including crime, prostitutions, floating people (Ashraf 2007).

Thus poverty still flourishes and illiteracy, malnutrition, lack of health care facilities, gender discrimination, and human rights violations continued to be problematic in Bangladesh. Though many national and international development agencies and NGOs are working on these issues and problems both in rural and urban areas, the overall situation still remains a major concern for ensuring social justice and equal human rights for the majority of the people. In the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) of Bangladesh, for example, more than 40 national and international development organizations are working on development programs but these NGOs hardly consider indigenous people needs, their cultural differences while formulating development policies and interventions.

What are the alternatives to such approaches of development? How can anthropologists contribute with their methodological and theoretical knowledge in solving the existing development problems in Bangladesh? Let me clarify some of these issues in the following section.

#### **5. ANTHROPOLOGICAL LENS OF ADDRESSING CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS**

As I have already described above, anthropology has a rich methodological tradition in understanding

complex cultural variations, situated meanings and connotations of various social phenomena defined by the local people in their own cultural context. The ethnographic fieldwork is the central not only to understand human cultures but also it develops a general conception for guiding the resolutions of human problems. My main argument here is that this anthropological insight is indispensable both to study and to help solving the development problems of contemporary global world. In this section, I will demonstrate how critical insights of anthropologists to development, gender and health issues can direct the most effective resolutions of such problems, with the especial emphasis in Bangladesh.

For a long time many anthropologists have worked within governmental and NGOs and demonstrated how socially-grounded anthropological knowledge can help the policymakers or developers. Yet, many other anthropologists are engaged in a radical critique of the very notion of development, arguing that as a concept it is morally, politically and philosophically corrupt (Gardner and Lewis 1996). In the mid-1980s, many anthropologists influenced by the poststructuralist/postmodernist thinkers (e.g. Foucault, Derrida) termed the development discourse as hegemonic, an exploitative apparatus consisting of asymmetrical power relations through which the West exploit the Third World (Crush 1995; Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1990). The 'deconstructors' of development have argued that a tendency for oversystematized and simplifying models misinterprets and misconstrues the nature of social action and, relatedly, that the diverse motivations and perspectives of different actors in the development process are overlooked. Development anthropologists have been accused of failing to acknowledge the relations of power within which they are embedded, in particular the links between colonial history and present-day political processes (Crew and Harrison 1999: 16).

Then, what should anthropologists do? Should they be reluctant to be involved in such development works? What is the alternative, and how can one avoid such allegation of being merely a broker to developers? Gardner and Lewis (1996) argue that while it is absolutely necessary to unravel and deconstruct 'development', if anthropologists are to make politically meaningful contributions to the worlds in which they work they must continue to make the vital connection between knowledge and action. People have a right to basic material needs and services (foods, clothes, housing, education, health care, etc.); they also have a right to fulfill their individual potential, whether this involves becoming literate, access to health care, retaining their cultural identity or their freedom, having the means to generate an income, access to modern technologies and opportunities, or whatever they define improves their lives. This means that the use of anthropological knowledge, both within and outside the development industry, must continue to have a role, but in different ways and using different conceptual paradigms than previously (Gardner and Lewis 1996:153).

Gardner and Lewis (1996) suggest to anthropologists to shift their focus away from development and on to relations of poverty and inequality, but it not necessary to leave work on the development institutions, international donor agencies, government or NGOs for working for seeking real change of the deprived. By drawing examples from anthropologists' collaborative working experiences on indigenous and aboriginal rights (e.g. self-determination, status recognition, land rights) among local peoples, NGOs, international agencies such the World Bank, and international transnational corporations in Ecuador, Baba and Hill argue that such collaboration and use of participatory methods can be driving force in bringing positive change for the people (Baba and Hill: 2006). Dove (1998) argues that it is not enough to study the farmers or rural peoples to solve their problems, it is equally important to study the government agencies and officials, to see how they treat local people negatively. He identifies government officials as the principal challenge in his project in Pakistan, and claims that "this is often the case in rural development, yet the belief systems of government officials in developing countries are rarely studied by anthropologists" (Dove 1998: 241).

In many cases, participation of poor people and women in development projects has turned into rhetoric which serves the interests of the status quo. For example, in Bangladesh research has been mostly funded by aid agencies and researchers mostly produce their writings on rural poverty, the social and economic position of women, and development. Academics, independent researchers and development practitioners have been conducting research, involved in development activities and publishing their findings since the late 1970s but the situation has hardly improved, and even worsened in some cases (White, 1992). White blames the Bangladesh state and patriarchal cultural ideology for discriminatory attitudes toward women regarding their low socioeconomic status in Bangladesh society.

Though many NGOs work on gender issues, sometimes their commitments on gender remain instrumental. There are many examples of women's programmes that reproduce, rather than challenge, the established pattern of male privilege in access to resources and opportunities (White 1992).

Feminist anthropological approaches are required to bring significant changes in Bangladesh society by diagnosing hidden dominant religious and cultural ideologies that keep women far behind men. Anthropologists can question how research, policy, and development institutions define gender, class and gender relations, situating these concepts in the wider economic, political and societal context. Who is excluded from the mainstream development process, and why? Who are subordinated and by whom? Whose voice are counted and whose not, and why? How can anthropologists make more effective development policies by situating them in grassroots understanding and practices? Anthropological knowledge is needed, with in-depth insights and historical perspectives, to unravel these issues in contemporary Bangladesh. Such knowledge has practical importance in that it may influence agencies, communities, governments, NGOs and international donor and development agencies to change how they think about the root causes of gender bias, discrimination and inequality.

Malnutrition, high maternal mortality, tuberculosis, tobacco use, mental disorders and drugs abuse are the major health problems for Bangladesh. Bangladesh is also vulnerable to expanded HIV/AIDS epidemic due to the prevalence of behaviour patterns and risk factors that facilitate the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS (e.g. expanding commercial sex industries and low levels of consistent condom use, transmigration) (WHO 2008; ADB 2004; UNDP 2005). Anthropologists need to study these emerging health problems emphasizing psychological, social and cultural factors, rather than merely the physical aspects of ill health (Helman 2007). Is disease linked to poverty, social inequality, gender bias, discrimination, stigmatization, ethnic/racial classification, violation of human rights? Who has access to health care facilities and who does not? Who are discriminated against and stigmatized, for what and by whom? Anthropologists can unravel many such hidden answers with their in-depth insights. Conventional biomedical science fails to understand human health problems holistically because of overwhelming emphasis on the body and disease, ignoring people's culturally sensitive understanding of life, death, health and healing. Medical anthropologists with their pluralistic health approach can provide substantial inputs for effective health interventions, which has so far remained untouched of anthropologists in Bangladesh.

## **6. THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF THE ANTHROPOLOGY: HOW CAN ANTHROPOLOGISTS SERVE HUMANITY?**

The present phase of globalization embodies a convergence of a number of interrelated factors: liberal economic ideology, the debt crisis and the consequent imposition of structural adjustments by the World Bank and IMF on Third World countries. During the 1990s, boundaries within and between nations and regions after World War II began to shift, blur, or perhaps disappear, reflecting structural changes in the underlying economic and political relationships. These shifts opened up vast new areas of the globe for the advancement of capitalism through accelerating technological innovations, the emergence of transnational corporations, NGOs. These interconnected changes in the globe also reflect on redirecting anthropologist's scholarship, especially in the conceptualization of culture, theoretical developments, and the ways that data are collected and analyzed. As a result of these dramatic shifts, anthropologists are experiencing the effects of a convergence process within their discipline, both globally and across the domains of theory and practice (Lewellen 2002:29; Baba and Hill 2006: 193). In this final section, I will briefly clarify how anthropologists through their teaching, research and the application of methodological and theoretical knowledge can understand and mediate the solutions of complex human problems.

What will be the contributions of anthropologists toward the humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? Many anthropologists emphasize that anthropology needs to focus on the currently occurring problems in the real world to bring them to the urgent attention of the policy makers. They argue that anthropologists need to address to new areas of knowledge by embracing a wider set of concerns, particularly

contemporary socioeconomic issues. These anthropologists argue that the contributions anthropologists make to the real world will rest on the quality of anthropological research, forging new perspectives, new ways of looking at things, anthropological claims to real knowledge and anthropologists' ability to producing future citizens who will have commitments and ethical obligations for serving humanity (Ahmed and Shore 1995; Ortner 2000; Giddens 1995; Kozaitis 2000).

## **7. BRIDGING THEORY AND PRACTICE**

Many anthropologists emphasize the interconnectedness of teaching, research and bridging between theory and practices. These anthropologists suggest that, in addition to new research problems, anthropologists should build upon their newly found strength and create more programs for the training of students and involvement in producing critical research findings for pragmatic solutions of human problems. These anthropologists emphasize the interdisciplinary convergence towards global standards in literature, methodology and practice (Gardner and Lewis 1996; Kozaitis 2000; Peacock 2001; Thomas 2006; Baba and Hill 2006; Farmer 2005). Kozaitis argues that academic anthropology is socially grounded and, as such, is subject to similar scrutiny, as are other forms of social practice; and it is as ethically and politically a *practice*, as any other public service from which we distinguish it and on which society depends for sustenance. To be elevated to *praxis*, our work in our education must consist of more humanitarian sensibilities, greater social responsibility, and a firm commitment to quality (2000: 52-53).

Anthropologists' involvements in the application of anthropological knowledge and reflections of their theoretical and methodological orientations are fundamental in developing new perspectives to look at things alternative ways. All of these processes are parts of their ongoing teaching, writing and academic research. The practical implications of teaching and research cannot be denied and anthropologists should not be refrained from working for humanity on the pretext of the discipline's stand of objectivity or value-free. Teaching is the most important medium both to share abstract knowledge between teachers and students and to apply these in the real world from the point of view of the both ethical and moral obligations of serving humanity. Interactive teaching techniques, communication to intellectual fitness create such spaces of knowledge sharing process that directly influence the minds and lives of developing citizens for the greater welfare of the humanity ((Kozaitis 2000). Writing and teaching on the human rights to basic needs and services do present opportunities to change minds about the root causes of all forms of human sufferings and inspire for positive change. In other words, theoretically these help human thoughts to understand the world and practically, human agencies help make it better (Messer 2008; Fallis 2007). Generating quality research, critical assessments on emerging global human issues are needed from anthropologists without any influences and bindings of the transnational development institutions and organizations (Farmer 2005).

Anthropologists need to be more critical and careful in applying the 'cultural relativism' perspective especially the considerations of understanding global problems. Gardner and Lewis (1996: 156), for instance, argue that 'global inequalities and poverty cannot simply be explained away as culturally relative. The first problem with this stance is that it relies upon the notion of bounded and separate cultures, all of which have their own internal logic; in this view there clearly are no universals. In a global context, it is increasingly recognized that the world and its cultures are highly interconnected and questions have been raised regarding this longstanding approach of anthropology in understanding local cultures. Rather than giving emphasis on cultural relativism it needs anthropology's insights of cultural differences and historical perspectives to uncover the root causes of poverty, social inequality, discrimination, and violation of human rights, especially in context of global political economy (Farmer 2005).

Therefore, it is obvious that integration of these diverse perspectives into the discipline anthropology in context of changing global condition is the urgent demands of the time both for deeper understanding of contemporary human problems and contributing for humanity. The preponderance of violation of human rights, the focus on economic inequalities and poverty, gender discrimination, diseases and many others have been a global concern. To go in depths into these problems, it requires a critical,

sophisticated and holistic perspective that anthropology has very much and thus anthropology deserves enough to deal with these global issues in future.

## 8. CONCLUSION

Development in the context of the globalization process, the relation of globalization to poverty, health and gender issues, human rights and the question of justice and equality, all are urgent issues of the current time to which anthropologists must give due priority as they have in-depth, holistic orientations, and critical perspectives in looking at these human issues different ways. As the world is globally interconnecting, people are more likely to lose control over their cultures, social relationships, economies and even their own lives. Anthropology tries to show the interconnectedness of various facets of social life and the complex relationships which exist between people under conditions of change. Anthropology encourages us to dig as deeply as possible, to go beyond what is immediately apparent in order to uncover the complexities of human experiences (Gardner and Lewis 1996). Anthropology has distinctive methodological (e.g. participant observation, holism, cross-cultural comparisons) and theoretical breadth (e.g. evolutionary theory, political economy, critical theory, feminist approaches, post-structural perspectives and phenomenology). These constitute different lenses with which to view and critique the multiple realities of contemporary times. Thus, many anthropologists emphasize an integrated, holistic anthropology that will combine both theory and practice, thereby (hopefully) contributing to humanity. Anthropology is what anthropologist do-they discover, write, teach, and practice-as well as what they see and think. What perspective anthropology builds on activities will change and new perspective will be formulated as the demands of changing time and necessities of the human society and culture (Thomas 2006: 11; Peacock 2001: 145).

Finally, I will conclude by echoing with James Peacock's (1997) critical, albeit optimistic comments about the future of anthropology: "anthropology remains intriguing and creatively diverse, sometimes iconoclastic but breathtaking in sweep and perception, yet it is also integral and even leading in addressing the complex challenges of a transnational yet grounded humanity" (Peacock 1997:14).

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A., & Shore, C. Eds. (1995). *The Future of Anthropology : Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone Press.
- Ashraf, Ali (2007). Urban Anthropology as an Emerging Sub-discipline of Anthropology: Issues and Prospects in the Context of Contemporary Bangladesh. In the *Chittagong University Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 24, No.1
- Asian Development Bank Report 2004*. BANGLADESH. Gender, Poverty, and the Millennium Development Goals: Country Gender Strategy. Manila: Asian Development Bank. URL: <http://www.adb.org/Documents/Reports/Country-Gender-Assessments/ban.asp>
- Bagchi, A.K. (2005) "Inequality, Deprivation and Displacement" In Banerjee, N. & Marjit, S. eds. (2005). *Development, Displacement and Disparity*. Hyderabad, India : Orient Longman Private Limited, pp.17-28
- Baba, M. and Hill, C. (2006). What's in the Name 'Applied Anthropology'? An Encounter with Global Practice. In *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin*. May 2006, Vol. 25, No. 1: 176-207.



- Baba, M. (2000). Theories of Practice in Anthropology: A Critical Appraisal. In *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin*. Jan 2000, Vol. 18, No. 1: 17-44.
- Crush, J. (eds.) (1995). *The Power of Development*. London: Routledge.
- Chambers, R. (1999). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chowdhury, A.M. R., Nath, S. R., Chowdhury, R.K. (2001) Equality Gains in Bangladesh Primary Education. *Research Monograph Series No. 20*, September 2001. Dhaka: BRAC Research and Evaluation Division.
- Crew, E. and Harrison, E. (1999). *Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid*, Dhaka: The University Press Limited.
- Dove, M. (1998). Anthropology Development vs. Development Anthropology: Mediating the Forester-Farmer Relationship in Pakistan. In *Applying Cultural Anthropology Readings*, Ferraro, G (1998). New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Dube, S.C. (1995) *Tradition and Development*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT LTD
- Edwards, J., Harvey, P., & Wade, P. Eds. (2007). *Anthropology & Science: Epistemologies in Practice*. New York: Berg
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: the Making and the Unmaking of the Third World*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Fallis, G. (2007). *Multiversities, Ideas, and Democracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Farmer, P. (2005). *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferguson, J. (1990). *The Ant-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, K. and Lewis, D. (1996) *Anthropology, Development, and the Postmodern Challenge*, London: Pluto.
- Giddens, A. (1995). Epilogue: Notes on the Future of Anthropology. In *The Future of Anthropology : Its Relevance to the Contemporary World* (Ahmed, A., & Shore, C. Eds.,1995). London: Athlone Press.
- Halim, S. Chakma, S. & Chakma, R. (2005). Gender and Human Rights Violation in Chittagong Hill Tracts: The Post Accord Situation. Dhaka: Forum on Women in Security and International Affairs (FOWSIA), Bangladesh Freedom Foundation.
- Hammersely, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice, Third edition*. London and New Yourk: Routledge.
- Helman, C. (2007). *Culture, Health and Illness*. London: Hodder Arnold
- Hill, C. & Baba, M. (2006). Global Connections and Practicing Anthropology in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin*. May 2006, Vol. 25, No. 1: 1-13.
- Khan, F.C. (2005). Gender Violence and Development Discourse in Bangladesh in *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 57, Issue 184, June 2005, pp.219-230 © UNESCO 2005. Published by Blackwell Publishing Limited, Oxford OX42DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148 USA
- Kozaitis, K. (2000). The Rise of Anthropological Praxis. In *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin*. Jan 2000, Vol. 18, No. 1: 45-66.
- Leve, L. & Karim, L. (2001). Privatizing the State: Ethnography of Development, Transnational Capital, and NGOs. In *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*. May 2001, Vol. 24, No. 1: 53-58.

- Lewellen, T. (2002). *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. London: BERGIN & GARVEY.
- Messer, E. (2008). Can a Right-to-Food Approach Help? In *Anthropology News* Oct 2008, Vol. 49, No. 7: 22–23.
- Mohsin, A. (2005). Globalization, Hegemony and the State in Bangladesh. In *Dislocating Nation-States: Globalization in Asia and Africa*, Abinales, P., Noboru, I. & Akio, T. Eds. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press. Pp. 64-88
- Nolan, R. (2002). *Anthropology in Practice: Building a Career outside the Academy*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Peacock, J. (1997). The Future of Anthropology. In *American Anthropologist*. Vol.99, No.1, March, 1997. Pp. 9-29.
- Peacock, J. (2001). *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Pelto, P. & Pelto, G. (1978). *Anthropological Research: the Structure of Inquiry*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortner, S. (2000). Some Futures of Anthropology. In *American Ethnologist*, 26 (4): 984-991
- Rahman, H. Z. (2006). Bangladesh 2015: Achievements and Future Challenges. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Power and Participation Research Centre, (PPRC) & Institute of Development Studies (IDS).  
URL: [www.asia2015conference.org](http://www.asia2015conference.org)
- Rankin, K. (2002). Social, Capital, Microfinance, and the Politics of Development. In *Feminist Economics*. Vol. 8 No. 1. 2002, Routledge. ISSN 1354-5701 print/ISSN 1466-4372 online.  
URL: <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>
- Robben, C. and Sluka, J. (2007). *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader (Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology)*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Roberts, T. and Hite, A. B. Eds. (2007). *The Globalization and Development Reader: Perspectives on Development and Global Change*. Malden, USA, Oxford, UK, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Roy, C. K. (2004). *Indigenous Women: A Gender Perspective*. Norway: Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous People.  
URL: [http://www.galdu.org/govat/doc/indigenous\\_women\\_croy.pdf](http://www.galdu.org/govat/doc/indigenous_women_croy.pdf)
- Schuller, M. (2007). Seeing Like a “Failed NGO: Globalization’s impacts on State and Civil Society in Haiti. In *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*. May 2007, Vol. 30, No. 1: 67-89.
- Shimkin, D., Tax, S., & Morrison, J. (1978). *Anthropology for the future (Research report - Department of Anthropology, University of Illinois; no. 4)*. Illinois: Dept. Of Anthropology, University Of Illinois.
- Sibley, W. (1992). Global Change and Changing Opportunities for Anthropology: A Participant's Observer's View. In *Central Issues in Anthropology*. Jan 1992, Vol. 10, No. 1: 134-141.
- Sidky, H. (2004). *Perspectives on Culture: A Critical Introduction to Theory in Cultural Anthropology*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Thapan, M. Eds.(1998). *Anthropological Journeys: Reflections on Fieldwork*. India: Orient Longman Limited.

Thomas, R. B. (2006). Anthropology for the Next Generation. In *Anthropology News Jan 2006*, Vol. 47, No. 1: 9–11.

Tripura, S. B. (2008). Blaming Jhum, Denying Jhumia. Challenges of the Jhumai Indigenous Peoples Land Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) of Bangladesh: A Case Study on Chakma and Tripura. An M.Phil. Thesis in Indigenous Studies submitted by the author to the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Tromsø, Norway.

URL: <http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/handle/10037/1535>

United Nations' *Common Country Assessment, Bangladesh*, January 2005. United Nations Country Team in Bangladesh.

URL: [http://www.un-bd.org/docs/Bangladesh%20CCA\\_2005.pdf](http://www.un-bd.org/docs/Bangladesh%20CCA_2005.pdf)

UNDP Country Programme for Bangladesh (2006-2010). October 2005

URL: [http://www.undp.org/rbap/Country\\_Office/CP/CP\\_BGD.pdf](http://www.undp.org/rbap/Country_Office/CP/CP_BGD.pdf)

URL: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/7728092.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7728092.stm)

URL: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7729184.stm>

World Health Organization Bangladesh (2008)

URL: [http://www.whoban.org/country\\_health\\_profile.html](http://www.whoban.org/country_health_profile.html)