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**Course Syllabus**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the course | Anthropology of belief and knowledge |
| Title of the Academic Programme  | History Department (Social Anthropology minor)  |
| Type of the course  | Elective |
| Prerequisites | None  |
| ECTS workload | 5 |
| Total indicative study hours | Directed Study | Self-directed study  | Total |
| 60 | 130 | 190 |
| Course Overview | Anthropology of both religion and science seek an understanding of an understanding: it aims at grasping what people across cultures admit to be true. How various systems of knowledge and belief distinguish the rational and the irrational? What is sense and senselessness? How knowledge, belief, intuition and revelation are distinguished in different social and cultural contexts? How epistemologies are related to aesthetics, ethics, moral order and everyday knowledge practices? We consider these questions by drawing on detailed ethnographies of science and religion. Cases that we explore range from studies of shamanism and conspiracy theories to economic rationality; include ethnographies of Christianity and Islam, and various knowledge systems from fortune-telling to big data. The course will also assess the applied skills that anthropologists have developed in these fields. This includes anthropological mediation of indigenous knowledge, cultural property, and negotiations of boundaries of science, culture and religion. During the course students will be able not only read key ethnographies, but also make an individual research, based on the unique ethnographic experience, applying the skills learnt through the course.  |
| Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) |  *ULo 1 Able to learn and demonstrate skills in the field, other than the major field**ULo 5 Work with information: find, define and use the information from different sources which required for solving of research and professional problems (including the system approach)**ULo 8 Able to efficiently communicate based on the goals and communication situations* |
| Teaching and Learning Methods | The course consists of both lectures and seminars that will focus on selected readings. Students are encouraged to lively participate in the discussions both during lectures and seminars.  |
| Content and Structure of the Course |
| **№** | **Topic / Course Chapter** | **Total** | **Directed Study** | **Self-directed Study** |
| **Lectures** | **Tutorials** |
| 1 | Anthropology and Imperial Knowledge | 16 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| 2 | Anthropology and science studies | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 3 | Symbol, classification & culture | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | Magic | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5 | Rationality & belief | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 6 | Pollution & taboo | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 7 | Ontological turn | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 8 | Transparency and Conspiracy | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 9 | Religion vs Science: the Case of Creationism | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 10 | Economic Theologies | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 11 | The concepts of time and cause. Conspiracy theories, truth and suspicion | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 12 | Exchange in science | 12 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| 13 | Religious conversion and pedagogies of persuasion | 14 | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| 14 | Is secular world possible? | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 15 | Ontological turn and perspectivism | 14 | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| 16 | Ritual, Agency and Power. Film: Mad Masters | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 17 | “Technologies of self” and religious practices | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 18 | Ethical turn and the study of religion | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 19 | Technologies of Mediation. Revision and colloquium.  | 14 | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| 20 | Death and Ancestors. | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 21 | Sacred necropolitics | 8 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 22 | Body and Discipline | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 23 | Materiality and Affect | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 24 | The Power of Words: Ritual and Language | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total study hours** | 190 | 20 | 40 | 130 |
| Indicative Assessment Methods and Strategy  |  The course is designed as a series of lectures and seminars devoted to the discussion of key conceptual issues related to anthropology of science and religion. Attendance of seminars and participation in the discussion are taken into account when calculating the accumulative mark. The discussion during the seminar takes place on the basis of selected fundamental works from the list. To assist in preparing for the seminar, some reading lists contain leading questions (questions for discussion). Students must participate in a colloquium at the end of the course, which is considered to be a brief revision of the material studied, additional preparation for the exam, and discussion of project research papers.Research is the main substantive basis of the accumulative assessment. This is a work based on individual or group research on one of the given topics. In the case of a group research project, the written work must be done by each member of the team separately. The purpose of this study is to become familiar with the skills of anthropological research (observation included, interviews and other types of field work). The topic can be proposed by the student and agreed with the teacher during the first month of the course.As an exam, the student must submit an exam essay. An essay is a written discussion of two randomly selected questions from a list (students get acquainted in advance with a list of sample exam questions). The student needs to analyze the empirical material and the various theoretical approaches considered in the course. In particular, when answering each of these questions, students should use at least three key jobs marked “\*” in the course curriculum (what was discussed at the seminars) and not repeat the material when answering each of the two questions. EITHER / OR in the exam question means that the student can choose one of the question formulations. Sending a work after the deadline (both essay and research paper) takes 10% of the maximum possible estimate (10% for each day of delay).Formula for calculating the final and accumulative marks:Macc.= 0.1 \* Mattendance + 0.2 \* Mdiscussion + 0.1 \* Mcolluvium + 0.6 \* Mresearch paper. Mexam = MessayMfinal = 0.2 \* Oacc. + 0.8 \* Oexam |
| Readings / Indicative Learning Resources | Mandatory Douglas, M. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. Routledge, 2003.OptionalOushakine, Sergey. *The Patriotism of Despair: Nation, War, and Loss in Russia.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.  |
| Indicative Self- Study Strategies | **Type** | **+/–** | **Hours** |
| Reading for seminars / tutorials (lecture materials, mandatory and optional resources) | + | 20 |
| Assignments for seminars / tutorials / labs | + | 50 |
| E-learning / distance learning (MOOC / LMS) | - |  |
| Fieldwork (field + analysis)  | + | 40 |
| Project work | - |  |
| Other (please specify) | - |  |
| Preparation for the exam | + | 20 |
| Academic Support for the Course | Academic support for the course is provided via LMS, where students can find: guidelines and recommendations for doing the course; guidelines and recommendations for self-study; samples of assessment materials. Readings could be found in the Electronical Resources of HSE (via full text founder <https://elib.hse.ru/e-resources/e-resources.htm> , it is more comfortable to do search by the title).  |
| Facilities, Equipment and Software | (If required) |
| Course Instructor | Jeanne Kormina (core lecturer): jkormina@hse.ruNikolai Ssorin-Chaikov: nssorinchaikov@hse.ruAlexandra Kasatkina alexkasatkina@gmail.comEkaterina Melnikova melek@eu.spb.ruAsya Karaseva asya.karasyova@gmail.com |

**Аnnex 1**

**Lectures**

**Lecture 1 and 2. Anthropology and Imperial Knowledge**

This lecture links the anthropological concerns with classification and causality with the emerging field of the anthropology of science by looking at the historiographic or reflexive turn in anthropology.

**Lecture 3. Symbol, classification & culture.**

This lecture opens the course by asking how people classify things in the world, and what is the role of culture in such classifications. Continuation of Lecture 3: Are people everywhere “rational” in the same way? Are the concepts of time, space and cause universal or relative to culture?

**Lecture 4: Ontological turn.**

OT is a new trend in the anthropology of knowledge. Lecture outlines its emergence, main questions and areas of contribution.:

Woolgar, Steve and Lezaun, Javier. ‘The wrong bin bag: a turn to ontology in science and technology studies?’ *Social Studies of Science* 43, no. 3 (2013): 321–40.

Heywood, Paolo. ‘Anthropology and what there is: reflections on “ontology”’. *Cambridge Anthropology* 30 (2012): 143–51.

Henare, Amiria, Holbraad, Martin and Wastell, Sari, ed. *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artifacts Ethnographically.* London: Routledge, 2007.

Helmreich, Stefan. ‘Extraterrestrial relativism’. *Anthropological Quarterly* 85, no. 4 (2012): 1115–39.

**Lecture 5. The concepts of time and cause. Conspiracy theories, truth and suspicion.**

Barkun, M. *A Culture of Conspiracy: Apocalyptic Visions in Contemporary America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Basham, L. ‘Living with the Conspiracy’. *The Philosophical Forum* 32, no. 3 (2001): 265–280.

Thompson, D. *Waiting for Antichrist: Charisma and Apocalypse in a Pentecostal Church.* N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Oushakine, Sergey. *The Patriotism of Despair: Nation, War, and Loss in Russia.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

**Lecture 6. Is secular world possible?**

Lecture discusses definitions of religion, secularization debates and anthropological approaches to secularism and secularization.

**Lecture 7: Ethical turn and the study of religion**

What is ‘ethical turn’ in anthropology and why is it important to the study of religion?

Faubion, James. Toward an anthropology of ethics: Foucault and the pedagogies of autopoiesis. *Representations* 74 (2001):83-104.

Robbins, Joel. “Beyond the Suffering Subject: Toward an Anthropology of the Good.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 19, no. 3 (2013): 447-462.

**Lecture 8: Body and Discipline**

**Lecture 9: Materiality and Affect**

The lecture discusses the material turn in anthropology. It focuses on the ways this turn influenced the study of religion, including such topics as mediation and the senses.

Meyer, Birgit, ed. Aesthetics of Persuasion: Global Christianity and Pentecostalism’s Sensational Forms. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 109, no. 4 (2010): 742–763.

Houtman, Dick, and Meyer, Birgit, ed. *Tings: Religion and the Question of Materiality*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.

Keane, Webb. “The Evidence of the Senses and the Materiality of Religion.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 14 (2008): 110–127.

Hazard, Sonja. Material Turn in the Study of Religion. *Religion and Society: Advances in Research* 4 (2013): 58–78

**Lecture 10: The Power of Words: Ritual and Language**

**Seminars**

**Seminar 1. Anthropology and Imperial Knowledge**

Questions for discussion:

- How did the concept of “successful fieldwork” change through the time?

- Is “heteroglossia” a useful conceptual category in talking about ethnographic fieldwork?

\*Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology.* London: Pluto Press, 2015, pp. 1-32.

**Seminar 2: Anthropology and science studies**

Question for discussion:

- What unique could be said about the anthropology of science?

Boellstorff, Tom. Three Comments on Anthropology and Science. *American Anthropologist* 113 no. 4 (2011): 541-544.

**Seminar 3: Magic**

Questions for discussion:

- Is it useful to ask about the relationship between magic and religion, on the one hand, and science on the other?

- Is magic ‘primitive’ science?

Wittgenstein L. *Remarks on Frazer’s The Golden Bough.* Chicago: HAU Books, 2017, pp. 29-77.

**Seminar 4: Rationality & belief**

Questions for discussion:

- Is belief useful analytical category?

- Do people have different ideas of causality?

\*Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology.* London: Pluto Press, 2015, pp. 264-286.

**Seminar 5: Pollution & taboo**

Question for discussion:

- How does thinking of dirt “as matter out of place” illuminate why certain things, places, animals, etc, are forbidden or permitted in different cultures?

\*Douglas, M. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* Routledge, 2003, pp. 7-42.

**Seminar 6: Transparency and Conspiracy**

Pelkmans, M, Machold, R. Conspiracy Theories and Their Truth Trajectories. *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 59 (2011):66–80.

\*Oushakine, Serguei. “Stop the Invasion!” Money, patriotism, and conspiracy in Russia. *Social Research* 76, no. 1 (2009): 71–116.

**Seminar 7: Religion vs Science: the Case of Creationism**

Latour, Bruno. Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry* 30 (2004): 225–48.

Konrad, Monica. Culturing Artificial Life in a Digital World by Stefan Helmreich. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.* 9, no. 1 (Mar. 2003): 186-187.

**Seminar 8: Economic Theologies**

Questions for discussion:

- How does trading with God give a way of engaging with capitalist present?

Wilk, Richard R., Cliggett, Lisa C. *Economies and Cultures: Foundations of Economic Anthropology.* Routledge, 2007, pp. 85-94.

**Seminar 9 and 10 Exchange in science**

Question for discussion:

- What is ‘giving credit’ in the context of science?

- What is the relationship between manners, knowledge and exchange systems?

\*Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology.* London: Pluto Press, 2015, pp. 217-241.

**Seminar 11 and 12. Religious conversion and pedagogies of persuasion**

\*Beekers, Daan. A moment of persuasion: travelling preachers and Islamic pedagogy in the Netherlands. *Culture and religion* 16 no. 2 (2015):193-214.

**Seminar 13 and 14: Ontological turn and perspectivism**

Questions for discussion:

- How different is perspectivism from cultural relativism?

Erazo, Juliet. Managing alterity from within: the ontological turn in anthropology and indigenous efforts to shape shamanism: Managing alterity from within. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute Volume* 24, no. 1 (2018): 145-163.

**Seminar 15: Ritual, Agency and Power. Film: Mad Masters**

\*Morgain, Rachel. The alchemy of life: Magic, anthropology and human nature in a Pagan theology*. Australian Journal of Anthropology* 24 no. 3 (2013): 290-309.

**Seminar 16: “Technologies of self” and religious practices**

- What are the “technologies of self” in religious cultures?

- What is the role of right intentions in religious ritual?

Hellweg, Joseph. Hunters, ritual, and freedom: dozo sacrifice as a technology of the self in the Benkadi movement of Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15, no. 1 (2009): 36-56.

**Seminar 17: Technologies of Mediation**

\*Hirschkind, Charles. The Ethics of Listening: Cassette-Sermon Audition in Contemporary Egypt. *American Ethnologist* 28, no. 3 (2001):623-649.

**Seminar 18: Colloquium. Course revision and discussion about the useful conceptual categories for both anthropology of science and religion.**

**Seminar 19: Death and Ancestors.**

Cannel, F. English ancestors: the moral possibilities of popular genealogy. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17 (2011): 462-480.

Film: No one Dies in Lily Dale (HBO) 1h 23 min

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bJx8sR-Wb5k

**Seminar 20: Sacred necropolitics**

\* Bernstein, Anya and Yurchak, Alexei. Sacred Necropolitics. *HAU*  2 (2017): 165-198.

**Annex 2**

**Assessment Methods** **and Criteria**

**Assessment Methods**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Types of Assessment** | **Forms of Assessment** | **Modules** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Formative Assessment | Test |  |  |  |  |
| Essay |  |  |  |  |
| Report/Presentation |  |  |  |  |
| Project |  |  |  |  |
| In-class Participation |  |  |  | \* |
| Attendance  |  |  | \* | \* |
| Interim Assessment(if required) | Colloquium |  |  |  | \* |
| Summative Assessment | Exam (take-home essay and research paper) |  |  |  | \* |

**Assessment Criteria**

**In-class Participation (discussion and colloquium)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | A critical analysis which demonstrates original thinking and shows strong evidence of preparatory research and broad background knowledge.  |
| «Good» (6-7) | Shows strong evidence of preparatory research and broad background knowledge. Excellent oral expression.  |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | Satisfactory overall, showing a fair knowledge of the topic, a reasonable standard of expression. Some hesitation in answering follow-up questions and/or gives incomplete or partly irrelevant answers. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | Limited evidence of relevant knowledge and an attempt to address the topic.  Unable to offer relevant information or opinion in answer to follow-up questions.  |

**Research paper**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject, number of methods used). • The chosen research question is formulated in a transparent way and terms of the course key topics.• The paper is well structured, logical, and coherent. • The choice of methods is well proofed. • The research paper contains cogent and convincing arguments, contributing to an existing debate on the topic. • The paper demonstrates excellent skills of English and ideally follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Good» (6-7) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject, number of methods used). • The chosen research question is formulated in a transparent way and terms of course key topics.• The organization of the paper is logical, the critical elements of it are identifiable, it’s coherent. • The choice of methods is more or less clear; the materials analyzed carefully; the paper contains some excerpts from the sources of analysis (quotations from interviews, examples of discourse or historical documents). • The main findings of the paper should be formulated in relevance and terms of an existing debate. • The paper demonstrates good skills of English, follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | • The paper partially fulfills the necessary formal requirements of the assignment (technical requirements as relevance to the course agenda, length). • The paper lacks a certain research question. The research methods are unclear.• The paper in structured poorly, it is illogical and not coherent. The main ideas of the paper are vague or incomplete. • The materials used in the analysis and research methods are unclear. • The paper contains pervasive errors in the use of English, style, or formatting. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | • There is no paper provided. • The paper doesn’t meet the requirements of the assignment regarding length or topic.• Plagiarism or data falsification is detected. |

**Take-home essay**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject).• The two answers are given, there theoretical sources (three key readings) are used in discussion of each question; • The organization of the paper is logical; the giving arguments are strong and convincing.• The student demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the introduced concepts and can compare these concepts with each other. • The paper is well structured, logical, and coherent. • The paper demonstrates excellent skills of English and ideally follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Good» (6-7) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject). • The two answers are given, three theoretical sources (three key readings) are used in discussion of each question.• The organization of the paper is logical, the given interpretations are correct in principle, but shallow. The analysis needs more work. • The paper demonstrates good skills of English, follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | • The paper partially fulfills the necessary technical requirements of the assignment (relevance to the course agenda, length). • Only one question is covered. • Less than three of key readings from the course syllabus is covered in each question.• The argumentation is illogical; the answers are not coherent. • The paper contains pervasive errors in the use of English, style, or formatting. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | • There is no paper provided by the deadline. • The paper doesn’t meet the requirements of the assignment regarding the topic; no key reading is covered in the essay. • Plagiarism is detected. |

**Annex 3**

**Examples of exam questions (take-home essays).**

1.EITHER: Is knowledge determined by society?

OR: Are people everywhere ‘rational’ in the same way?

2. How can anthropological concerns with classification be understood in the context of anthropology itself?

3. Is belief a useful analytical category?

4. How, if at all, has the concept of liminality AND/OR the role of right intentions proved useful in understanding how cultural categories are organised and manipulated in ritual contexts?

5. EITHER: What are the ‘technologies of self’ in religious cultures?

OR: How are religious subjectivities created and maintained?

6. Discuss two or more of the following in the context of science and religion:

- credit

- money

- capitalism

7. EITHER: Discuss the concept of performativity in the context of religion AND/OR science.

OR: Is magic a ‘primitive’ science?

8. Discuss science AND/OR religion and symbolism in terms of two or more of the following approaches:

- textual and linguistic approaches

- material turn

- ontological turn

- cultural relativism

- ethical turn

- feminist perspectives

9. Discuss definitions of religion and secularization in the context of anthropological approaches to secularism AND/OR analogies between scientists and god

**Recommendations for students about organization of self-study**

Self-study is organized in order to:

* Systemize theoretical knowledge about milestones in the history of anthropological thought (by refreshing materials received through lectures);
* Extending theoretical knowledge during preparation for the seminars (a student can look through the additional literature suggested for the deep understanding in lecture materials);
* Enhancing critical thinking and personal development skills through comparing different fieldwork methods studied, analyzing the theoretical concepts of the different anthropologists, etc.;
* Development of research skills through the fieldwork (participant observation, interview, digital ethnography, etc.)

In order to show the outcomes of self-study it is recommended:

* Try to compare different stages of the development of the anthropological thought, naming the divergences of scholars using such criteria: where did this scholar get his or her education? What is his or her background (family, religion, political view)? What was the first field experience (if any) of this scholar? What was his or her impact on the development of the anthropological thought?
* Revise as many research methods, as possible and try to think about the applicability of them for different cultures, institutions, etc. What difficulties could be faced?

**Recommendations for essay**

The topic for essay includes development of skills for critical thinking and written argumentation of ideas. An essay should include clear statement of a research problem; include an analysis of the problem by using correct theoretical framework. The volume of the paper should not exceed 2,000 words, the minimum word limit is 1,000 words (each essay). If you managed to develop the topic using less then 1,000 words, you could stay with this amount.

Essay structure:

1. *Introduction and the brief explanation of the question.*

2.*Body of the essay* which include both elaboration on the theoretical concepts and certain examples which are presented in the monograph, article, etc. which correspond to the topic.

3. *Conclusion* and argumentative summary about the question and possibilities for further use or development of this question in anthropology.

**Recommendations for research paper**

The volume of the paper should not exceed 4,000 words. The minimum word limit is 2,000 words.

In the research paper:

1) explain why you have chosen your project (groups that you studied, a case, a situation). This explanation should include a clear connection to course topics to which it is related, e.g. religion and science or specific theme within these topics.

2) explain why you have chosen your research method — in particular if you decided to use methods other that ethnographic participant observation and ethnographic interview. Make sure you use more than one method (interview, discourse analysis, historical analysis, comparison with other cases). Use qualitative, rather that quantitative methods.

3) clearly formulate you research question or hypothesis. What is the question to which your paper and its materials are the answer?

4) explain how your research and methods help you to address the question/hypothesis

5) present your material — including quotations from interviews, examples of discourse or historical analysis.

6) describe the context of your material. In what context your interviews or observations were made? What is the social, cultural and historical context of the material that you have collected/explored?

7) describe if you had any ethical difficulties in doing this research

8) present the main results and conclusions of your research

Paper structure:

- Paper title and your name, and the course which this paper is for.

- Introduction (points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the above) - Main body of the paper (points 5, 6 and 7 of the above)

- Conclusion (point 8 of the above)

- list of references: bibliography and other sources that you used

**Special conditions for organization of learning process for students with special needs**

The following types of comprehension of learning information (including e-learning and distance learning) can be offered to students with disabilities (by their written request) in accordance with their individual psychophysical characteristics:

1. *for persons with vision disorders:* a printed text in enlarged font; an electronic document; audios (transferring of learning materials into the audio); an individual advising with an assistance of a sign language interpreter; individual assignments and advising.
2. *for persons with hearing disorders: a* printed text; an electronic document; video materials with subtitles; an individual advising with an assistance of a sign language interpreter; individual assignments and advising.
3. *for persons with muscle-skeleton disorders: a* printed text; an electronic document; audios; individual assignments and advising.