

# Review of: "Social-Cultural Anthropology in the Oldest Department of Anthropology in India: Writing History or the Suppression of Records?"

Erond L. Damanik<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Negeri Medan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The main point of debate in this manuscript is Partha Chatterjee's view which is said to be biased in assessing the current direction and goals of learning (curriculum) and research at The Anthropology Department at the University of Calcutta (CU), India.

As stated by the author of this article, the orientation of the department's curriculum has, from the beginning, placed a strong emphasis on physical anthropology and archaeology. Of course Chatterjee's statement is not wrong in referring to the history of the founding of the department. Later, a debate arose with Chatterjee's statement; "a small school of cultural anthropology developed by Nirmal Kumar Bose. In this section, the author of the manuscript translates the "small school" as Socio-Cultural Anthropology which is not taught in the department.

On the statements of both, the manuscript author and Chatterjee, the following are my thoughts; (1) This debate boils down to the tendencies and orientation of learning and research carried out by the Anthropology Department at CU which is focused on physical anthropology and archeology and is considered to ignore socio-cultural anthropology where the objects of study are different, even though they talk about race. It is possible that this debate arose by looking at the tendencies or tendencies of the curriculum and research carried out by the Anthropology Department at CU. Furthermore; (2) it is impossible for another scholar (Chatterjee) to make statements without data, without evidence, especially through the orientation or tendencies of studies and learning that have been and will be carried out.

On the one hand, the author of this manuscript proves that the Department of Anthropology at CU is also carrying out studies on socio-cultural anthropology by showing a number of results of studies that have been carried out. However, in this view, it may be that the number is not comparable to physical anthropology or archaeological studies, or the lack of studies that integrate the two approaches. It is possible that the meaning of Chatterjee's statement is not always stated to be biased or minor, and is possibly a suggestion for proportioning or combining the two approaches in learning and research to obtain adequate or maximum results.

Beyond all assumptions, of course, I have no other reason to reveal why this debate, or Chatterjee's statement is considered biased or minor, occurred, and conversely, why the author of this manuscript is not happy with Chatterjee's statement. As noted in the abstract and conclusion points, the author of the manuscript emphasizes that the Department of Anthropology at CU is not as stated by Chatterjee which should be proven by learning curricula, textbooks, parallel textbooks, learning assignments, lectures, seminars, discussions, graduate work, and even the results of the latest research carried out by students and lecturers in the Anthropology Department at CU.