

Anthropology in Bangladesh: Its Emergence in Relevance to Global Contextual

A. H. M. Zehadul Karim

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, International Islamic University Malaysia
Gombak Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Telephone: +60163907940, E-mail: ahmzkarim@yahoo.com*

KEYWORDS: Anthropology. Emergence in Bangladesh. Global Context

ABSTRACT Anthropology offers a special worldview to study human beings, their community-life and various aspects of the indigenous culture from comparative and holistic perspectives; thus, the discipline produces a useful generalization about people and their way of life. The subject matter of Anthropology is as old as human society itself but its formal emergence as a discipline everywhere has been delayed due to several reasons. As an emerging discipline, Anthropology dates back only two centuries ago when a number of renowned scholars in this field oriented themselves in intensive field-based ethnographic studies on various aspects of culture in the global context. A similar contextualization is also relevant in regard to the emergence and development of the discipline in Bangladesh. Bangladesh possesses a long traditional history and heritage for anthropological research though the institutional recognition of the discipline was delayed due to some administrative and technical problems. During the 1950s, a number of foreign scholars had conducted a few valuable research in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) regions of the country. At the initial stage, tribal studies did not attract local scholars at that time, though many of the academics for the last two decades and until now have become too fascinated by these tribal issues. During the 1970s and onwards until the 1990s however, Redfield's Mexican model (1930) of village studies had remained a desirable ethnographic strategy in Bangladesh and as part of it, a few valuable village-based ethnographic research on rural communities were produced in the country during this period. This trend of rural research continues until now, as every year, a few village-based ethnographic and academic research on various aspects of rural people are conducted. The institutional development of anthropology saw its emergence when the subject was recognized and included as part of the core course for the postgraduate students pursuing their MPhil and PhDs at the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS) who, as part of their research have always employed participant observation method as the main research approach. The same paradigmatic trend however, has not been found in the academic anthropology in all the universities in Bangladesh; as a few of them has the tendency to disregard the traditional research strategies of Anthropology and instead, they base them towards more Philosophical orientation. With this dichotomous divergence, the paper provides a historical overview of the emergence and expansion of Anthropology in Bangladesh and provides critical explanation in an analytical framework.

INTRODUCTION

Anthropology offers a broad view of human beings, their community living with their indigenous cultural features from comparative and holistic perspectives, in producing useful generalization about people and their way of life. The subject matter of Anthropology is as old as human society itself, but its formal emergence as a discipline everywhere has been delayed due to several reasons. Firstly, it may be because of the Eurocentric ethnocentrism which discourages the cultural study of people who are uncultured and also the geographical reason which creates some geographical constraints. Prior to the 19th century, academicians from many disciplines had the tendency to identify Anthropology from a biological point of view. This situation existed until the middle of the 19th century, when Paul Broca, a dominant naturalist finally became con-

vinced to utter the most euphonious word 'anthropology' in one of his lectures in Europe in 1869 (Penniman orig 1935/1965). It may be noted that between 1771 to 1790, a few cultural linguists from Gottingen University in Germany used the words 'ethnography' and 'ethnology' interchangeably to mean Anthropology; and among these theorists, Ludwig Schlozer's name is often most prominently pronounced.

The formal recognition of the discipline in European context however, came in 1884, when the subject was offered as a separate discipline at Oxford University by bestowing Radcliffe-Brown the responsibility. Subsequently in phases, it was offered at Liverpool University, with the initiative of James Frazer. In the United States, Anthropology did not, however, follow exactly the British pattern; instead, it brought its own cultural paradigm having the direct influence of Franz Boas and others. The formal offering of the

subject in the United States came in 1861 when an undergraduate course in Anthropology was taught at Vermont University, and a few years later in 1879, it was formally offered at Rochester University (see Haviland 2013).

The recognized institutional emergence of Anthropology as a separate discipline in Bangladesh is very recent and its appearance at the university level came only in the later part of the 1980s and early 1990s, when Anthropology as an independent discipline was introduced at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels in universities in Bangladesh. Although the institutional emergence of Anthropology took quite some time, the subject has not always remained academically inaudible, rather a non-institutional existence of it was found to be visible in various academic arenas of the country. It is evident when anthropological techniques as methodological tools for socio-cultural exploration of communities had remained quite dominant for a long in the Social Science discipline at universities and academic research institutions in Bangladesh.

Having been inspired by Redfield's village studies, as many as two to three dozens of sociologists and anthropologists in Bangladesh from home and abroad (for example, Hara 1967; Qadir 1968; Bertocci 1970; Islam 1974; Chowdhury 1978; Jahangir 1979; Arefeen 1986; Karim 1990; Islam 1995) have employed anthropological technique of 'participant-observation method' in their field-based rural ethnographies in Bangladesh. When tribal studies were gaining its popularity in the African communities under the academic leadership of Evans-Pritchard (1940), Fortes and Evans-Pritchard (1940), Meyer Fortes (1940) and others in Anthropology during the 1940s, its sequential continuation gave a touch to Bangladesh's situation as well; a few renowned anthropologists from abroad also became interested in similar tribal explorations in Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) in Bangladesh. The first initiative came from Claude Levi-Strauss, a renowned French anthropologist who had conducted some field-based research on the deciduous forest people of Chittagong Hill Tracts in the eastern part of Bangladesh. In doing fieldwork on the CHT people in 1952, Levi-Strauss was very much amazed to see the rich storage of cultural diversities of the tribal people and felt the necessity of having anthropological exploration among those communities. His research further excited

many national and foreign anthropologists to do rigorous works in tribal studies in Bangladesh. Shortly after that Pierree Bessaignet (1957) a sociologist from France and David Sopher (1963; 1964) a renowned South Asianist and a cultural geographer from the United States conducted several field studies on the tribal communities in Chittagong Hill Tracts. Pierree Bessaignet was the first Head of the Department of Sociology at Dhaka University in Bangladesh, and as part of his academic interest, Bessaignet wrote a 'macro-passionate ethnography'¹ on the CHT groups of people. David Sopher's² (1963) writings were based on anthropological exploration, and a few of those were published in the *Annals of the Association of the American Geography* and the *Geographical Review*. Lucien Bernot (1957) also wrote articles on Chittagong Hill Tribes in a book edited by Pierree Bessaignet (1959). With this introductory background on Anthropology in Bangladesh, this paper will provide a brief history of its institutional emergence and processual development, showing its continuity in regard to global contextuality.

Institutional Emergence of Anthropology in Bangladesh

The credibility of the institutional beginning of Anthropology in Bangladesh in the real sense goes back to the Department of Sociology at Dhaka University which was founded in 1957. At the very beginning of the inauguration of the department, it had appointed five faculty members as its teaching staff where at least two were basically anthropologists while one was a psychologist having absolute training in ethnography and had employed anthropological method in his village study Zaidi (1970). The remaining two were British statistician, W Flick (1957-1970) and A K Nazmul Karim (1957 until 1980); and the latter being a renowned rural sociologist and a student of TB Bottomore at the University of London. AK Nazmul Karim received his PhD from the United Kingdom in the early 1950s. While writing his dissertation on rural society at a micro perspective, he depended entirely on field-based anthropological and ethno-historic data collected from a village in Bangladesh. Karim gathered ethno-historic data on the Muslim stratification pattern which he generalized for wider Muslim communities of the Indo-Pak-Bangladesh sub-continent. Karim (1964: 6) rightly did a fore-

cast that "Sociology therefore must be Social Anthropology in context of our country at least for some years to come". His statement based on this idea however, only was materialized in the year 1986, when for the first time in the country Anthropology was opened as a separate department at Jahangirnagar University. As a matter of fact, Karim's futuristic forecast and Claude Levi-Strauss's enchantment did not have much impact on having the discipline offered in the universities in Bangladesh at a quicker time; a few sociologically oriented anthropological research on social structure, social problems and social changes have however, been conducted.

However, the real recognition of Anthropology in Bangladesh came in the late 1980s and early 1990s when five independent departments on the subject were opened in five universities in the country. The first Department of Anthropology in the country was established at Jahangirnagar University in the year 1986 with Mustahidur Rahman as its founder chairman who occupied this status due to having his position as Dean of Faculty of Social Sciences at that university. After a short while, the responsibility of the Department however, went to Nurul Alam (1986) basically an economist later being trained as an anthropologist from Purdue University in the United States; he subsequently built the department gloriously as part of its development³. After Jahangirnagar, Anthropology as a separate department emerged at Dhaka University in 1994 with Anwarullah Chowdhury as its founder chairman, who had a good reputation as a social anthropologist in the country. In 1996, a similar department was opened at Chittagong University which was headed by Ahmed Fazle Hasan Choudhury, another US trained anthropologist from Southern Illinois University. Exactly a year before, the department was also established at Shajalal University of Science and Technology at Sylhet. But unfortunately, being the second largest university and having a special anthropological base at the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), University of Rajshahi lagged behind in opening the discipline. However, finally the department was set up at the University of Rajshahi and AHM Zehadul Karim became its founder chairman⁴. Later as Vice Chancellor of Comilla University (2008-2009), a separate Department of Anthropology was also opened there under his direct initiative in 2009⁵.

Contributions of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)

The IBS at the University of Rajshahi is one of the pioneering institutes in promoting anthropological research in the country in the mid-1970s. The institute was established in 1974 and since its inception it has carried out outstanding anthropological explorations of rural communities in Bangladesh. As a post-graduate research institute, IBS is regarded as the most prestigious institution having international recognition where it employed a few trained anthropologists from the United States to work as faculty members. For example, Jean Ellickson of the Western Illinois University was the first professional anthropologist who joined the IBS as a Visiting Professor of Anthropology in the year 1974. Next to Ellickson, Peter Bertocci, an anthropologist from Oakland University and a renowned South Asianist visited the institute in 1975 and was associated with it for about two and a half years supervising a number of postgraduate students for MPhil and PhD degrees in Anthropology. Joana Kirkpatrick was another anthropologist from Bennington College of the United States who joined the institute in 1976. She stayed there for a little more than a year. After that, a Bangladesh-born American anthropologist named AKM. Aminul Islam from the Wright State University joined the institute in 1978 and Raymond Lee Owens arrived in 1979. Clarence C. Maloney, another anthropologist from the United States and a famous linguist had stayed with the IBS from 1979 to 1982. Many of the researchers do not even know that as a higher learning institute how much the IBS has contributed to Anthropology in the mid 1970s and 1980s. It is very interesting to note that the IBS is now offering Anthropology as a required course for its M Phil and PhD. students every year. It is perhaps the only institute in the country at the postgraduate level which promotes anthropological orientation for all of its students. It provides its students with financial assistance and has a very stimulating research environment for carrying anthropological research relating to topics on Bangladesh society and culture. The main purpose of providing this brief history of the IBS here is simply to indicate its orientation and to show a profound influence of Anthropology in the academic arena of the institute. In the following pages, some of the important issues which seem to

be relevant in the development of Anthropology in Bangladesh will be highlighted.

Focus on Major Research Issues and Problem Areas in Anthropological Investigation in Bangladesh

This section introduces the readers to the issues of Anthropology in Bangladesh, arguably to discover and understand the diversities of its research areas. As mentioned earlier, a few field-based ethnographic research covering diversified issues of the rural culture of Bangladesh villages have been done and on this account, some examples are given. Following Bailey's (1963) 'model of encapsulation', Islam (1974) conducted an anthropological study on the political process in a Bangladesh village and related it to the process in the wider community. Bertocci (1970) studied two villages in Comilla District in Bangladesh and correlated the socio-political status with landownership and referred to the process of 'cyclical kulakism' where there occurred a regular rise and fall of families due to partible inheritance of land. Chowdhury (1978) studied a village named Meherpur, focusing on the social stratification system in the village based on multi-dimensional paradigm of power, status and prestige. Meanwhile, Jahangir (1979) identified differentiation as a kind of polarization among the peasant groups in rural Bangladesh and he noted that the rich peasants manipulated power through their access to huge amounts of landholdings.

Apart from these village studies, there have been a little research on tribal communities in different regions of the country, especially concerning the CHT people (see Bertocci 1970; Jahangir 1979; Karim 1989; Ahamed 1994; Akand 2006; Maheen and Karim 2006; Karim et al. 2008). Some of these studies portray the diverse ethnic communities and the cultural confrontation in the enigmatic rites of passage of the Paharia (Islam 2009) an ethnic community in Northwestern Bangladesh. Among these studies, Ahamed (1994, 2002) conducted two extensive research on the CHT people for his M.Phil and Ph.D. degrees at Cambridge and London universities respectively. In one of his research, Ahamed (1994) conceived the social forestry issue and intertwined it with ethnicity and environment. His doctoral work was based on extensive field-based data collected from the CHT areas by his

participation with three communities for two years, and he specifically showed the predicaments of the CHT people who found their cultural differentiation with the mainlanders in the country.

At this moment however, the most important is perhaps the academic and applied dichotomy which is now standing at a very controversial situation in the academic discipline of Anthropology in Bangladesh. It has frequently been mentioned that the term 'Applied Anthropology' was first used by AR Radcliffe-Brown in the year 1931 and it is well-known that a similar term with the title of 'Practical Anthropology' was first used by Malinowski even prior to AR Radcliffe-Brown in 1927. British Social Anthropology is generally said to have begun with the ethnographic base of AR Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski, although formally, the discipline was instituted at the university level by appointing EB Tylor as the Head of the Department at Oxford University. James Frazer from Liverpool came to Oxford University in 1884. After the Second World War until the 1970s, there was a significant expansion of academic anthropology in North America though it was never an off-shoot of the British Social Anthropology (see Sol Tax 1965).

Between 1955 and 1957, British and American anthropologists researching in Europe mostly concentrated on a limited number of themes concerning the culture of small communities and on small ethnic minorities. Interestingly, these emerged from relatively autonomous professional paradigms having clearer anthropological influence (see Grillo 1985). The great majority of these researchers came from different parts of Europe and many of them started exploring marginal populations at the peripheral regions. The study of marginal cultures included the people in southern Italy, northern Norway and minorities such as Polish immigrants and gypsies (for example, Thomas and Znaniecki 1935). A similar tendency has also been observed in the United States where some non-anthropologists like Hunter (1953) and Dahl (1961) conducted some small community studies. This is to prove two things: firstly, that academic anthropology has enormous field in its application, having diversified and changing community issues. Secondly, to caution anthropologists: that if it is not responded accordingly, the credential for Anthropology will be undermined and the non-anthropologists and so-

called 'pseudo-claimant anthropologists' will soon replace the anthropologists.

But the conventional account and ethnographic narratives soon faced a critical challenge in the late 1970s when learners in the educational institutions around the world began to turn their attention to comparatively practical and job-oriented subjects (see Alam 1999). It has been observed that during this time there was a sharp decline in the number of students in many liberal arts and social science subjects including Anthropology throughout the world. Obviously, to respond to this situation, anthropologists throughout the world started redefining and re-examining the discipline to be more suitable to the socio-economic development of the people. Many international NGOs and academic institutions in Bangladesh during the 1980s were looking for practical anthropologists in the country to work for their developmental programmes. Due to the non-existence of the subject at the universities, the discipline itself suffered enormously, failing to respond to their demands in this respect.

Applied Anthropology has often been identified as a legacy of colonial rule. It is usually believed that Applied Anthropology does not contain any theory nor does it have any clearer anthropological paradigm. The subject now belongs to the non-anthropologists and is practiced mostly by them. It is known that Applied Anthropology is modeled according to the desire of the donor agencies (see Alam 1999). The author of this paper however, does not fully disagree with the above views. As it may not always be true because, while the author was a student at Syracuse University, Glynn Cochrane, a renowned anthropologist left the department to work with an international development agency in Tonga and other areas of New Guinea. He has now been able to establish himself as a great academician in the field of development anthropology. What is important here is that there is a big gap between an anthropologist and a non-anthropologist. He who can conceptualize the real anthropological paradigm and has proper anthropological training from the academic point of view, certainly will make a difference; having proper training will allow a researcher to have better insights and clarity to work at the field level. Development theorists have now realized very well that the traditional cultural systems and

the traditional beliefs now remain as basic obstacles to many technological changes. Hence, the problem of cultural resistance to modern technology can be overcome by employing anthropologists in their programmes and projects.

In one of the universities in Bangladesh, Anthropology still orients its students to focus solely on the philosophical-based theoretical aspect of the subject, without giving any importance to the field-based practicum. This researcher understands that their anthropological knowledge will certainly be limited and they may be unsuitable to work in newly demanding practical situations available in national and international organizations. The development of a discipline depends entirely on the number of persons on demand by professional organizations and it can only be expected if it can provide discipline-trained persons having proper orientation, both from the theoretical and applied perspectives. In his Africa paper on Applied Anthropology, EE Evans-Pritchard (1946) though apparently endorsed applied research and was concerned about it, went on to warn us saying that "what would happen to anthropological research on fundamental issues like kinship and rituals" and thus reminded us that anthropology is a kind of history which means that it should contain an ethnographic history of culture. This author feels that the solution is not total detachment; rather to having a combination of the two by responding with much clarity and understanding of the socio-cultural phenomena.

Methodological Issues Relating to Anthropological Research in Bangladesh

The recent methodological issues and the development of anthropological research in Bangladesh are briefly explored in the following pages. The main method of anthropological

research is certainly the participant observation method, desiring to have a holistic view over the social phenomena at a micro-level investigation. Except for a few traditional arm-chair anthropologists (for example Morgan 1877; Tylor 1874), most of the founding fathers of Anthropology adopted this technique of intensive field investigation to analyze social phenomenon. Their dependence entirely was on qualitative data and for this purpose, Malinowski (1922) remained in the field for about three years, Radcliffe-Brown (1948) was with the Andamans for

Table 1: A few anthropological and anthropologically-oriented ethnographic research in different regions of the world including Bangladesh

<i>Focusing on broad research areas</i>	<i>Urban Research Community Studies Micro Issues Relating To Various Socio-Cultural Aspects</i>		
<i>Global Context</i>	Markham 1912 Radin 1927 Zorbaugh 1929 Wirth 1928	Thomas and Znaniecki 1935 Whyte 1943 Willy 1953 Muara 1956	Birket-Smith 1936 Mangin 1967 Hunter 1953
<i>Bangladesh Situation</i>	Maine 1871 Baden-Powel 1896	O'Malley 1916 Khan 1977	
<i>Focusing on Broad Research Areas</i>	<i>Ethnographic Research on Island People Studies on Coastal and Riverine People</i>		
<i>Global Context</i>	Codrington 1891 Malinowski 1922	Piddington 1939 Radcliffe-Brown 1948	Oliver 1951 Sahlins 1958 Vaiyda 1960 Chagnon 1992
<i>Bangladesh Situation</i>	Islam 1995 Ali 1998	Karim et.al. 2008	
<i>Focusing on Broad Research Areas</i>	<i>Tribal Ethnographic Studies and Tribal Culture</i>		
<i>Global Context</i>	Fortes and Evans-Prichard 1940 Evans-Prichard 1940 Kluckhohn 1942	Barth 1961	Sopher 1963,1964 Leach 1954/1986
<i>Bangladesh Situation</i>	Sopher 1955 Bessaiget 1958 Ahamed1994	Ahamad 2002 Akand 2006 Karim and Karim 2006 Karim et al 2008	Islam 2009
<i>Focusing on Broad Research Areas</i>	<i>Village Ethnographies Rural Studies and Rural Issues</i>		
<i>Global Context</i>	Birket-Smith 1936 Redfield 1941 Dube 1955 Firth 1946/2000	Lewis 1958 Srinivas 1959 Epstein 1962	
<i>Bangladesh Situation</i>	Karim 1956 Qadir 1968 Zaidi 1970 Maine 1871	Islam 1974 Jahangir 1979	Chowdhury 1978 Arefeen 1986 Karim 1990

two years and Chagnon's (1992) stay with the Yanomamo was about three years. The anthropologists of Bangladesh have enough evidence (for example, Chowdhury 1978; Arefeen 1986; Karim 1990; Jahangir 1979) to show where Bangladesh anthropologists had spent quite lengthy periods of time in their field investigation in different rural areas in the early 1980s and 1990s. Apart from their dependence on ethnographic qualitative data, most of these studies (for example Karim 1990; Ahamed 1994, 2002) have additionally used some statistical data to complement their ethnographic information. But there are many anthropologists who reacted vehemently to this idea and are quite reluctant to use any quantitative data for Anthropology. It has been observed in recent literature that there has been a significant change in the methodological sce-

nario of anthropological research. The existing anthropological research tools have now been expanded to adopt partial quantitative research techniques such as structured interviews and total household enumeration. A recent common anthropological technique is to combine both the quantitative and qualitative data where the deficiency of one is supplemented by the other. Pelto and Pelto (1988) for that reason mention that anthropologists are now becoming more accustomed to counting things. In that context, the Chicago School of Ethnography towered a number research studies under the guidance of Robert E. Park and E.W. Burgess during 1917 and 1942 where the researchers in Chicago laboratory area used statistical data combining them with a series of qualitative techniques like in-depth interviews, face to face symbolic interac-

tionism, life histories and other techniques (see Vidich and Lyman 1994). As part of another divergence, William Foote Whyte had given a new dimension relating to his research on Street Corner Society based on his life experiences and designated it as a kind of 'participant observation' (see Whyte 1943). Thus the method of triangulation may also be accepted for anthropological research which allows the use of a number of research techniques in one specific study. In this context, what the present researcher wants to say that anthropologists now should avoid the tendency of compartmentalization.

In the last few decades, there has been a significant development in the methodologies of applied social sciences including Anthropology, where a few developmental practitioners under the leadership of Robert Chambers (1983) introduced a new technique to generate the right information at a quicker time. Rapid Assessment Procedure (RAP), Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Focused Ethnographic Study (FES) are new techniques that are frequently used by anthropologists in their research application. All these techniques in anthropology are usually employed to obtain data comparatively at a swift and shorter period of time (see Pelto and Pelto 1988). Many developmental organizations now prefer to use these techniques for anthropological studies. This researcher is quite aware of the limitations of these techniques but depending on the situation and the intricacy of the issues, these techniques may be modified slightly for better use in a particular structural condition. If an anthropologist has rigorous academic and ethnographic training as a participant observer at one stage, he may use these techniques for his future research. But absolute dependence on these techniques without having any prior academic training will certainly jeopardize the project's goal and also at the same time, it will undermine the real purpose of academic anthropology. The Anthropologists must remember that without real anthropological training, it would be difficult to analyze ethnographic data in proper anthropological language.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Bangladesh possesses a long traditional history and heritage for anthropological research yet the institutional recognition of the discipline has been delayed due to some administrative

and technical problems. During the 1950s, a number of foreign scholars had conducted a few valuable research in the CHT regions of the country. Tribal studies did not attract the local scholars at that time, though many of the academics for the last two decades and until now have become very interested in these tribal issues. During the 1970s and onwards until the 1990s, Redfield's model of village studies had remained a desirable ethnographic strategy in Bangladesh and as part of it, a few valuable village-based ethnographic research on rural communities were conducted in the country at that time. It remains a continuous trend until now, as every year, a few village-based ethnographic and academic research on various aspects of anthropology are being conducted at the IBS and in universities in Bangladesh. The economic change and development of the country are fully dependent on the changes that could be brought through our academic rapport in the countryside. Anthropologists have very significant role in this context. But recently, it is observed that in the name of development in many countries around the world, academics are now diverting their research interest, mostly focusing on urban issues and thus neglecting their research interest relating to rural and kampong life. Hence, the rural areas and their ethnographic investigations in this context remain neglected.

The paper suggests that together with the academic development of the discipline, it should also equip its young professionals with applied anthropological knowledge which will enable them to respond to the needs-oriented global anthropological requirements. Finally, this researcher urges for coordination among anthropologists in deciding their methods to proper suitability. The development agents and donors should not decide because they have their own professional strategies to rescue themselves with their own intrinsic developmental agendas⁶.

NOTES

1. This is not an ethnographic description of the CHT communities; but certainly, it is a kind of 'passionate macro ethnography' at the broader context providing valuable information on CHT people. Following Spradley (1980), this author uses this term to show the significance of such studies in the field of anthropological research.
2. David Sopher was an eminent cultural geographer from Syracuse University, USA. Like Claude Levi Strauss, Sopher also visited and stayed at CHT region during 1950s.

- 3At the initial stage, the Anthropology Department at the Jahangirnagar University received full academic and logistic support from the Ford Foundation and British Council which enabled the department to send its academic staff for higher education at Sussex University in England.
4. Having studied Anthropology for several years at Syracuse University; the researcher had a keen desire to start a new Department of Anthropology in a formal institutional framework at Rajshahi University. Although all administrative formalities were completed however, due to some obstacles, the plan did not fall through. With all these disappointments, the author accepted a teaching assignment in Malaysia in 1995 and remained involved with University Science Malaysia until 1998. In 1998, the then Vice Chancellor of Rajshahi University, Professor Dr. Abdul Khaleque requested that a separate Department of Anthropology was set up under the researcher's leadership in the Social Science Faculty of Rajshahi University. That is the beginning of Anthropology at Rajshahi University. At the infancy of the department, Dr. M. Zulfiqar Ali Islam taught Ecological Anthropology and some other courses as beginners. Later, Dr. Faizer Rahman was hired to teach Statistics in the department. As part of continued program, two lecturers fully trained in Anthropology named Ms. Shaolee Mahboob and Kamal Akand joined the department subsequently as faculty members. Prof. Dr. Susan S. Wadley of Syracuse University donated a big shipment of books from her own possession which was very beneficial to build up the department further at the initial stage. In this context, the US Embassy at Dhaka allowed using their diplomatic assistance.
5. While the researcher was the Vice Chancellor of Comilla University (2008-2009), a separate Department of Anthropology was opened under his direct initiative. Prior to that, Anthropology was opened at Khulna University and a lengthy syllabus for it was also prepared; which was later turned down by the Vice Chancellor of that university with his domineering directives. With his autocratic decision, the discipline was subsequently closed down at Khulna.
- 6This is the first part of the paper and a lengthy second part of it with further details in regard to the 'Emergence and Development of Anthropology in Global Context and World Perspective' will come out soon; Bangladesh part however, will not be emphasized in that discussion. Since this present paper is designed to focus mostly on Bangladesh situation, global analysis however, could not be emphasized here in lengthy discussion.

REFERENCES

- Ahamed FU 1994. *Significance of Social Forestry Projects in Combating Landlessness and Forest Degradation*. MPhil Thesis, Unpublished. UK: University of Cambridge.
- Ahamed FU 2002. *Tribal Culture and the State in Bangladesh*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. London: London University.
- Akand MK 2006. *Cultural Adaptation of the Ethnic Migrants to an Urban Setting: An Anthropological Study of Rajshahi City in Bangladesh*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Rajshahi: Rajshahi University.
- Alam SMN 1999. *Anthropology in the 21st Century. A Paper Presented in an International Seminar the Next 21st Century: Some Random Thoughts*. Comilla, February 1-2, 1999. Bangladesh.
- Ali A 1998. *Santals of Bangladesh*. Calcutta: Institute of Social Research and Applied Anthropology.
- Arefeen HKS 1986. *Changing Agrarian Structure in Bangladesh, Shimulia: A Case Study of a Periurban Village*. Dhaka: Centre for Social Studies.
- Arensberg C 1937. *The Irish Countryman*. Gloucester: Massachusetts.
- Baden-Powel BH 1896. *The Indian Village Community*. London: Longmans Green and Company.
- Bailey FG 1963. *Tribes, Caste and Nation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Barth F 1961. *Nomads of South Persia: The Bisseri Tribes of the Khamseh Confederacy*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Bernot L 1959. Ethnic groups of Chittagong Hill tracts. In: Pieree Bessaignet (Ed.): *Social Research in East Pakistan*. Dhaka: Asiatic Society, pp.137-177.
- Bertocci PJ 1997. *Elusive Villages: Social Structure and Community Organization in Rural East Pakistan*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Birket-Smith K 1936. *The Eskimo*. New York: Harper.
- Chagnon NA 1992. *Yanomamo: The Fierce People*. 4th Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Chambers R 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Harlow: Longman Group.
- Chowdhury A 1978. *A Bangladesh Village: A Study of Social Stratification*. Dhaka: Center for Social Studies.
- Codrington RH 1891. *The Melanesians*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dahl RA 1961. *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dube SC 1955. *India's Changing Village*. London: Routledge.
- Epstein TS 1962. *Economic Development and Social Change in South India*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Evans-Pritchard EE 1940. *The Nuer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Firth R 1946/2000. *Malay Fishermen: Their Peasant Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Fortes M, Evans Pritchard EE (Eds.) 1940. *African Political Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grillo R 1985. *Applied Anthropology in the 1080: Retrospect and Prospect*. In: Ralph Grillo, Alan Rew (Eds.) *Social Anthropology and the Development Policy*: London: Tavistock Publications. PP 1-37.
- Hara T 1967. *Poribar and Kinship in a Muslim Rural Village in East Pakistan*. PhD Dissertation, Unpublished. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Haviland W 2013. *Cultural Anthropology*. Orlando: Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Hunter F 1953. *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision-Makers*. Chapel Hills: University of California Press.
- Islam AKMA 1974. *A Bangladesh Village, Conflict and Cohesion: Anthropological Study of Politics*. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company.

- Islam F 2001. *Women, Employment and the Family: Poor Informal Sector Women Workers in Dhaka City*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. U.K.: Sussex University.
- Islam MZA 1995. *Environmental Adaptation and Survival Strategies of the Riverbank Erosion Displaces in Bangladesh: A Study of Two Villages in Nawabganj District*. PhD Dissertation, Unpublished. Institute of Bangladesh Studies. Rajshahi 6205, Bangladesh: University of Rajshahi.
- Islam MZA 2006. Diverse Rites of Passage of the Terrace Ethnic Communities: A Study of Barind Tract in Northwestern Bangladesh. *Paper Presented in Society for East Asian Anthropology Conference* held in The Chinese University of Hong Kong on 13-16 July.
- Islam MZA 2009. Marma Kinship Taxonomy: A Study on the Mountainous Ethnic Community in Bangladesh. *Paper Presented in the 4th Inter-Congress Indian National Confederation and Academy of Anthropologists on Anthropology in India* held at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India, 21-22 February.
- Jahangir BK 1979. *Differentiation, Polarization and Confrontation in Rural Bangladesh*. Dhaka: Center for Social Studies.
- Karim AHMZ 1989. The linguistic diversities of the tribesmen of Chittagong Hill Tracts: A suggestive language planning. *Asian Profile (Hong Kong)*, 17(2): 169-176.
- Karim AHMZ 1990. *The Pattern of Rural Leadership in an Agrarian Society: A Study of the Changing Power Structure in Bangladesh*. New Delhi: Northern Book Center.
- Karim AHMZ, Chowdhury AQ, Maheen SK 2008. The socio-cultural diversities of the Navaho Indians and the Santals in Bangladesh. *South Asian Anthropologist*, 8(1): 1-7.
- Karim AKN 1956. *Changing Society in India and Pakistan*. Dhaka: Ideal Publishers.
- Karim AKN 1964. *The Methodology for a Sociology of Bangladesh*. In: Pierre Bessaignet (Ed.): *Social Research in Bangladesh*. Revised Edition. Dhaka: Asiatic Society of Pakistan Publication, pp. 1-7.
- Khan FR 1977. *District Town Elites in Bangladesh*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Department of Sociology. England: University Edinburgh.
- Kluckhohn C 1942. The Navahos in the machine age. *Technology Review*, 44(1): 13-21.
- Leach ER 1986. *Political System of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Lewis Oscar 1958. *Village Life in Northern India: Studies in a Delhi Village*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Maheen SK Karim AHMZ 2006. Impact of Christianization on the Santal of Barind Regions in Bangladesh: A study of culture change. *South Asian Anthropologist*, 6(2): 121-127.
- Maine HS 1871. *Village Communities in the East and West*. London: John Murray.
- Malinaowski B 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Longmans Green and Company.
- Mangin W 1967. Latin America squatter settlement: A problem and a solution. *Latin American Research Review*, 2: 65-98.
- Markham CR 1912. *The Incas of Peru*. London: Englewood Cliffs.
- Morgan LH 1877. *Ancient Society*. Cleveland: Meridian Books
- Oliver DL 1951. *Pacific Islands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley LSS 1916. *Bengal District Gazetteers: Rajshahi*. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book.
- Park RE, Burgess EW 1925. *The City*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Pelto PJ, Pelto GH 1988. *Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Penniman TK (original 1935) 1965. *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd.
- Piddington R (Ed.) 1939. *Essays in Polynesian Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Qadir SA 1968. *Modernization of an Agrarian Society*. Mymensingh: Bangladesh Agricultural University.
- Radcliffe-Brown AR 1948. *The Andaman Islanders*. London: Glencoe, III.
- Radin P 1927. *The Story of the American Indian*. New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Redfield R 1941. *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sopher DE 1963. Population dislocation in the Chittagong Hills. *The Geographical Review*, LII(3): 337-362.
- Sopher DE 1964. The swidden/wet-rice transition zone in the Chittagong Hills. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 54: 101-122.
- Spradley JP 1980. *Participant Observation*. Florida: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Srinivas MN 1959. *The Remembered Village*. New York: Harper.
- Tax Sol (Ed.) 1965. *Horizons of Anthropology*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Thomas WI, Znaniecki F 1935. *The Polish Peasants in Europe and America*. Boston: Richard G. Badger.
- Tylor EB 1874. *Primitive Culture*. London: John Murray.
- Vaidya S 1960. *Island of the Marigold Sun*. London: Glencoe.
- Vidich AJ, Lyman SM 1994. Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In: NK Denzin, YS Lincoln (Eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 23-59.
- Wirth L 1928. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Whyte WF 1943. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zaidi SMH 1970. *The Village Culture in Transition: A Study of Bangladesh Rural Society*. Honolulu: East West Center.
- Zorbaugh HW 1929. *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.