

## Cultural Development in Analysis of the Evolutionary Paradigm, Diffusion and Structural Functional

Ulung Napitu<sup>1</sup>, Corry<sup>2</sup>, Wilson Simanjuntak<sup>3</sup>, Bakhrul Khair Amal<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Simalungun University, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Christian Religion, Tarutung, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

[ulungnapitu2018@gmail.com](mailto:ulungnapitu2018@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*This research aims to examine the process of cultural development analyzed from the perspective of the evolutionary, diffusion, and structural-functional paradigm. The importance of this analysis in the study of various anthropological paradigms is that no matter how simple society, it is absolutely necessary to experience gradual and revolutionary changes in development and culture. These changes lead to the disruption of socio-cultural values in people's lives. The approach used in this study is a qualitative approach with the biographical method. In collecting, processing and analyzing data, the authors searched for various literatures which were followed up with content analysis by comparing, and selecting various contents of literature books to formulate conclusions. The results of the study show that in the life of a very simple and complex society, socio-cultural changes are found. The results of the analysis based on the paradigm of evolution, diffusion and functional structure in the midst of an increasingly complex society found the disruption of socio-cultural values due to the dynamics of society, the rapid development of science and technology.*

### Keywords

development; culture; paradigm; anthropology



## I. Introduction

In the development of social science (sociology) there are three paradigms and in anthropology fifteen paradigms were developed in several sub-paradigms (Ahimsa, 2011; Wirawan, 2012). Paradigms in anthropology are all views, frameworks of thinking or approaches in socio-cultural science consisting of elements: basic assumptions, values, models, problems to be solved, concepts, analytical methods, analysis results and ethnography (Amberatnani, 2015).

At the beginning, anthropological writing was ethnocentric and adhered to the Old Testament and the New Testament. Various criticisms and views on the paradigm of cultural evolution were put forward by Frans Boas, R. Brown, and Malinowski who developed another paradigm; L. White and J. Steward did not reject the evolutionary paradigm but saw its weaknesses. L. White (1989) sees Taylor and Morgan as subjective, technologically biased, they should be objective with quantitative and energy measurement criteria with the formula:  $C = E \times T$  (culture = energy+technology). This means that cultural evolution is a change that occurs through energy transformation with the help of technology. White's (1989) view, known as cultural universals. Julian Stewart saw the weakness of Taylor and Morgan in data that did not come from the field but only came from secondary data. Steward argues that cultural evolution is closely related to environmental conditions, adaptation and stops evolving if it is in accordance with the

environment and introducing Core culture which gives birth to adaptation to the environment and the environment determines the direction of evolution so that evolution is not unilinear but multilinear and human culture is 'inventive' (Haviland, 1993).

The paradigm of diffusion or the spread of culture is not opposed to evolution. Taylor and Morgan never denied the cultural change that could happen because of spread. Diffusionism reconstructs the history of culture because it pays attention to external factors. The idea of diffusion was originally conceived in England by W.J. Perry and E. Smith who researched ancient Egyptian culture. This opinion was rejected by anthropologists because it was not supported by accurate data and did not carry out clear research. The diffusionists with the evolutionistic assumption about the equality of cultures in various places because humans are the creators of culture. Frans Boas agrees with the paradigm of cultural diffusion but considers the history of culture to be based on careful and intensive field research (Steward, 1979). Culture is very complex, including knowledge, art, morals, law, customs, and other abilities obtained by humans as members of society (Martozet, 2019). Culture cannot be separated from religious life, which is a manifestation of ethnic theology and cosmology (Zulkifli and Ridwan, 2019).

The functional paradigm has the assumption that everything has a function and this function can explain its existence in the socio-cultural life of the community. This paradigm gives birth to a new understanding of socio-cultural phenomena which is considered a revolution in anthropology. This paradigm sees the stages of functional development more interested in the function of socio-cultural phenomena. The figure who developed this paradigm was Malinowski (1961). With the development of research methods and ethnographic writing, he introduced the participatory observation method, which until now has been a feature of anthropological research techniques. Radcliffe Brown developed functionalism into structural functionalism with followers of Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes. Radcliffe-Brown proposed the term social function to express the influence of a belief, custom or institution on social solidarity in a society. Structural functionalism is also known in sociology with the figures of E. Durkheim, T. Parson, R. Merton on the concept of function, alternative dysfunction of functions and AGIL (Radcliffe, Brown, 1979). Functional structures recognize many emerging social phenomena such as; cultural functions, mythical functions, ritual functions, kinship system functions, symbol functions, political functions, and others.

## **II. Research Methods**

The data collection in this research is using a qualitative approach and literature study, using collections, books, journals and other sources that are considered relevant without conducting field research (Vredenbregt, 1984; Danim, 2002; Zed, 2008). To complete the data and sources in this study, various documents are considered relevant to the problem being researched by collecting, evaluating, synthesizing, analyzing, and carrying out content and source criticism (Bugin, 2008; Creswell, 2015; Silalahi, 2015).

Referring to this view, this research was conducted by collecting, selecting books, journals and other literature related to the phenomenon of cultural development. To ensure the validity of various sources, the authors carry out evaluation, content analysis, and synthesis of related sources.

### III. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 The Development of Culture is Analyzed from the Paradigm of Evolution

Evolutionism cannot be separated from Charles Darwin. In 1859, he published *The Origin of Species*, stating that species cannot mutate, but that they are linear descendants of certain species which are generally extinct, in the same way recognized as variations of past species." (Saifudin, 1986). Until 1871 Darwin avoided stating categorically that humans came from non-human forms, it became increasingly clear that what Darwin meant as the ancestors of humans were ape-like creatures (Ember and Ember, 1996).

Cultural evolution is a process of cultural change from a simple level to a complex level in the long term. The paradigm related to the concept of evolution is evolutionism which emphasizes changes gradually for the better or more advanced from simple to complex (Saifudin, 2006).

Evolutionism is the initial foundation for the formation of various paradigms in anthropology. Although some current paradigms implicitly or explicitly disagree, the explanation of evolutionism, especially to understand culture, consciously or unconsciously anthropologists and other social scientists use evolutionistic expressions in responding to certain social phenomena such as: "simple-complex", "progress". - regression", "traditional-modern", or "rural-urban", indicates a way of thinking that refers to the process of change or development from one stage to another, evolutionistic (Saifudin, 2006).

The evolution of culture according to EB. Taylor (1865), divided into three stages: a). Savagery, human life has characteristics: hunting, gathering, tools of wood, bone, stone, nomadic; b). Barbarism: human life has the following characteristics: farming, sedentary life, metal tools; and c). Civilization: humans are familiar with writing, urban life, making large buildings, requires sophisticated knowledge and equipment and complex social organization. This opinion was developed by Morgan (1977) dividing the stages of human evolution consisting of: a). *Savagery: Lower Savagery, Middle Savagery and Upper Savagery*, b). *Barbarism: Lower Barbarism, Middle Barbarism and Upper Barbarism*, c). *Civilization* (Ahimsa, 2011; Ambaretnani, 2015).

Biological evolution and cultural evolution are not completely separate processes. In anthropology, there are three major lines of evolutionist thought, namely unilinear, universal, and multilinear, plus the first three strands, namely the gradualist approach with the labels of unilinear, universal, and multilinear. Neo-Darwinism extends from sociobiology in the 1970s to more recent approaches to cultural origins (Steward, 1979; Saifudin, 2006).

Social evolution contains an analogy with biological evolution. Today most educated people learn through evolutionary biology books before they study other cultures. At the end of the 19th century, when it comes to social progress, it is often analogous to biological evolution (Saifuddin, 1996). To find out more details about evolution can be explained as follows:

##### a. Unilinear Evolutionism

Unilinear evolution is a view that says that all cultures in the world develop very slowly from simple forms to complex cultures because of the strong encouragement of all cultures through stages (Suyono, 1985). All societies progress through the same stages. Societies will progress at different rates, societies with lower rates of progress will remain at lower rates of progress than those with higher rates. Unilinear evolutionists emphasize on; material culture, ways of subsistence, kinship organization and religious beliefs and

believe that socio-cultural phenomena are interrelated with one another (Saifudin, 1996; Levi-Strauss, 2013).

The idea of unilinear evolution grew out of the theories of monogenesis, which reached its peak in the late 19th century, emerging as a central idea of anthropological thought. The first major issue is the result of research on *family versus social contract*, which inspired the birth of kinship theory. Maine, argues that society does not come from social contract work, but comes from the family and kinship is formed from the family. There was not much opposition from within anthropology itself, but from this idea a new debate developed about the prehistory of the family, hereditary systems, and the relationship of these systems to "primitive promiscuity", the notion of private property, totems', and *the incest taboo* (Garbarino, 1994).

Morgan is remembered as an evolutionary figure for two reasons: he was one of the few 19th century theorists who took the field seriously. Morgan spent many years working with the Iroquois and other Native Americans. After his discovery of the "relationship classification system" essentially, the classification of cousins parallels the same terms as brothers and sisters. Morgan developed a comparative model for understanding kinship systems around the world. The Iroquois of the New York and Ontario states that Morgan studied for decades share matrilineal heredity and inheritance rules and terms of kinship in common with some cases in South Asia. Morgan hypothesized about the marriage system of several siblings with one woman. From such a system, matrilineal descent emerged. According to Morgan, patrilineality comes rather slowly, namely when private ownership and rules related to inheritance increase from father to son (Koentjaraningrat, 1990).

Jacques Bachofen, in his book, *Das Mutterrecht*, (1967) put forward another theory about matrilineal dominance. His theory lies in the so-called early feminist movement, which undermined male dominance. This movement was followed by a revival of male authority. The evidences put forward by Bachofen are mainly persistence, the concept of female gods (which are ascribed to the matriarchal phase) and the ethnographic discoveries of the *couvades* in South America (which are regarded as "male overpowering female authority") (Van Ball, 1988).

*Primitive Culture*, from Tylor, discusses the evolution of culture with the doctrine of survival. Today's culture retains elements that have now lost their function, but their existence in the present is a testimony of the importance of these cultural elements in the past (Pals, 2012). In the context of religion, Tylor is of the view that the survival of religious rites and beliefs continues for a long time even after the original meaning is forgotten, while the more instinctive and primitive thoughts of civilized humans still retain certain elements from the development of previous religious ideas (Saifuddin, 2006).

Tylor's theory of religion consists of an evolutionary scheme ranging from animism, dynamism, polytheism, and monotheism. All doctrines include that souls in other *animi* languages exist independently of the material world. In virtually every human society, there is the same thought about the spiritual essence of death. Humans around the world give offerings to the dead, or worship objects such as trees or streams of water where the soul or spirit is believed to reside (Saifudin, 2006; Pals, 2012).

The origin and evolution of religion can only be explained speculatively and it has never been discovered. There are two methods that people use in building theories about the origin and evolution of religious development, namely; a). so-called comparative method and view b). Talking about the origin of religion is from Emile Durkheim (1915), who argues that to understand the role of religion in society we must understand the role of religion by studying religion in its purest and simplest form, namely totemism (Pals, 2012).

Tylor emphasizes the importance of the soul element in defining religion and in understanding the stages of evolution through which the phenomenon of religion and belief in the existence of a soul-animism-is the minimum definition of religion. Tylor expanded his original theory of spirit into a broader doctrine of the soul, the animistic theory of nature. The development of the view that spirits are the personal cause of world phenomena; the origin of guardian spirits and nature spirits, the origin of polytheism and finally, the development of the idea of monotheism as a complement to the polytheistic system. The origin of that spirit or soul received sharp criticism from other experts. One criticism is the question of intellectual explanation, and that the need for reason to explain the physiological phenomena of extraordinary psychic states such as dreams not only has nothing to do with primitive man, but also fails to produce the emotional qualities required for a religion (Koentjaraningrat, 1958; Keesang, 1990).

James Frazer through his *Golden Bough*, studied extensively by generations of anthropological intellectuals. What is very important in his opinion is that when Frazer presents a cultural reality which he calls science, he is actually referring to the most primitive and most civilized culture. Frazer views religion as evolving in line with primitive knowledge and modern culture (Van Ball, 1987; Koentjaraningrat, 1990; Kubar, 1996).

### **b. Universal Evolutionism**

Universal evolution states that all cultures in the world develop through similar cultural stages and run universally (Suyono, 1985). Universal evolution emerged in the early 20th century as a sign of the "softening" of the principles of unilinear evolutionism. New ethnographic and archaeological evidence, rigidly unilinear phases, which are cross-culturally consistent across the globe, are no longer tenable. Instead, broad, "universal" stages of evolution are put forward, such as the classical division between "*savagery*", "*barbarism*" and "*civilization*". The debate on issues such as matrilineality versus patrilineality becomes speculative to be accepted in the future (Kubar, 1996; Saifudin, 2006).

Childe (1936) examines human history as a whole, tracing the evolution from hunting and gathering, agriculture, to the formation of states, the urban revolution and the human knowledge revolution (Van Ball, 1987; Kubar, 1996).

Leslie White in his writing entitled: *The Science of Culture* (1949), put forward the concept of culture as an integrated, dynamic, symbolic system and its most important component is technology which proposes the study of culture as 'culture logy'. In his book *The Evolution of Culture* (1959), White focused on the evolutionary continuum from the "Primate Revolution" to the fall of the Roman Empire and argued that energy was a key mechanism of cultural evolution.

### **c. Multilinear Evolutionism**

Multilinear evolutionism is a view that says that culture in this world develops universally but not uniformly, because the last element is the influence of different environments and history (Suyono, 1985). This founder of multilinear evolutionism did not seek to reaffirm the classical theory of evolution and did not seek to establish a synthesis of cultural evolution. He calls himself a "multilinear evolutionist". Julian Steward (1979) as a multilinear main character, pays attention to specific lines of development in society or specific groups of people who share what is called the core of culture. The core of culture is the constellation of characteristics that are most tied to subsistence activities and economic order. The core includes social, political, and religious patterns that are

empirically closely related to this order. On this basis, Stewart argues that the culture that evolved in the Indus, Tigris-Euphrates, or Nile valleys, has the same cultural core. The place shows elements of irrigated agriculture, city-states, and a religious system centered on a place of worship (Saiffudin, 2006).

Multilinear evolution was proposed by Julian Stewart as an explicit attempt to get out of the vague generalizations of universal evolutionism and the problems of unilinear evolutionism. Multilinear evolutionism seeks to solve problems by placing the originators of technology and social evolution. In 1979 when his important writings were published under the title: *Theory of Culture Change* was a study of technologically advanced societies, and his comparative writings on hunting-gathering societies (Steward, 1979).

#### **d. Twentieth Century Evolutionism**

Progress and direction of progress are two issues related to social evolution. Socio-cultural evolution progresses from less complex to more complex, from less efficient to more efficient, from using less energy to becoming more energy. Sometimes the social system also declines after reaching the peak. Until now humans have difficulty predicting or even determining the direction of evolution, even though social evolution is limited. Coincidental and deterministic social events are two inseparable elements in the process of social evolution (Steward, 1979; Kuper, 1996; Keesing, 1999). Today's evolutionists, such as In gold Team (1986) in England, and a number of ecological anthropologists in Japan and the United States, establish boundaries between animals and humans. Knight seeks to erase the line between presymbolic humanity and man as we know it. The first limit above lies in factors such as social relations from the use of technology, while the second one lies in the affective aspects of culture and society (Haviland, 1993).

Evolutionism in anthropology bears parallels with evolutionism in other fields, including archeology and biology. In addition, evolutionism in anthropology is also unique because it has three classical forms, namely; unilinear, universal, and multilinear. Unilinear evolutionism takes the view of monogenesis and treats culture equally in that it will find everything in the same order and be passed on through the same stages of development. Universal evolutionism recognizes greater complexity (Saifudin, 2006).

### **3.2 Cultural Development Analyzed From the Diffusion Paradigm**

Diffusion in general is the spread of cultural elements from one place to another, from one community group to another and from one individual to another. Cultural diffusion originally emerged in England from W.J. Perry and Elliot Smith who researched Ancient Egyptian culture. Their admiration for this cultural sophistication led them to conclude that other ancient civilizations on earth actually originated in Egypt. The spread of civilization occurred when the Egyptians, whom they called "sons of the sun god", spread to various parts of the world in search of precious metals and precious stones (Van Ball, 1987). This theory was immediately rejected by anthropologists because: (a) it was not supported by good and accurate data; and (b) the data was not collected using clear research methods and procedures, so that the theory was actually only the fruit of speculative thinking (Ahimsa , 2011).

Anthropologists realize that Perry and Smith's view of culture is correct, that elements of culture can spread from one society to another, and that some cultures do appear to have a certain center, which then becomes a kind of center of distribution. At the cultural center there is the highest cultural dynamics. They offer a new perspective on culture. Culture then no longer has to be seen in an evolutionist way, but can also be seen in a diffusionistic way. That is, the dynamics and development of culture does not only

take place in a certain time span, but also in a span of space. There are dimensions of time and space in cultural change.

Popular diffusion in England and in Germany at the beginning of the 20th century, this paradigm was born and seeks to improve and at the same time be critical of the weaknesses of the theory of evolution which sees society as static and not based on scientific research and is ethnocentric. The diffusion paradigm attempts to explain the similarities between different cultures. Diffusion is a historical process and cultural change through cross-cultural transfusion of learned material objects, behaviors and beliefs (Saifudin, 2006). The diffusion paradigm was put forward by Fritz Graebner (1911) and Wilhelm Schmidt (1939) in Europe, in America by Clark Wissler (1971) and Alfred Kroeber (1939) with the concept of cultural area. Evolution is not opposed to diffusion so that Tylor and Morgan never deny that cultural change can occur due to spread (Ihromi, 1987; Ambaretnani, 2015).

The German and Austrian Kulturkreist schools, represented by Fritz Graebner and Fr. Wilhelm Schmidt, held the view that reconstruction was a mixture of cultural evolution and diffusion along with pan-Egyptian schools. They and their followers argue that the spread of cultural elements may occur to very far areas. Fr. Schmidt separates a group that is considered to be the oldest people according to ethnology. They consist of the hunter gangs who are the remnants of a society that broke away from the world's oldest cultures. By studying the general characteristics of these cultures, Schmidt suggests that it is possible to reconstruct the characteristics of the world's oldest cultures (Ember and Ember, 1987; Ihroma, 1987).

Diffusionists attach importance to the pre-history and cultural history to show that many cultural similarities in some places in the world are considered human migration and cultural spread. Cultural development is caused by borrowing, using and recombining and modifying cultural elements from various places. The new concept that emerges is the existence of a cultural environment and cultural layers (Ball, 1997). By using the quantity and quality criteria, Schmidt in his comparative study determines the level of relationship between cultural elements that are considered to have a relationship, because they show certain similarities in a certain area so that global culture history can be reconstructed. The German analytical method on cultural contact is considered to have weaknesses because conclusions are drawn speculatively, and the availability of data on adjacent non-cultural elements of culture and field research is not carried out to obtain the necessary cultural data (Koentjaraningrat, 1980; Ball, 1987; Ambaretnani, 2015).

Although German scientists have improved their analytical methods, there are still some weaknesses in their research procedures, which formulate conclusions speculatively. The main weakness is that comparisons do not start from cultures that are close to each other, but are based on the availability of data on cultural elements, the second weakness is that field research is not carried out to obtain the necessary cultural data (Ball, 1987).

Despite these weaknesses, what the German anthropologists are doing is on the right track. They have used comparative analysis accompanied by the principles of quality and quantity, to determine the area of distribution of one or several cultural elements (Koentjaraningrat, 1980; Ball, 1987). This method was developed by American anthropologists who agree with the basic view of the cultural diffusion paradigm. Boas rejects the theory of evolution and diffusion because according to him the available cultural data have not allowed anthropologists to formulate such theories or laws. Therefore, according to Boas, the main task of anthropologists is to conduct field research and collect cultural data as detailed as possible. This school of thought became known as

"historical particularize" and dominated anthropological studies in the United States in the early 20th century (Harris, 1968; Ahimsa, 2011).

With the framework of historical particularize, the followers of Boaz conducted field research to reconstruct the cultural history of various ethnic groups in the world, especially the culture of the Indians in North America. This effort is then no different from the study of diffusion of cultural elements, because the historical problem includes the problem of the origin of the various elements. From the history of culture, it can be seen the relationship and mutual influence between cultures, or the process of spreading culture in the past, so that a map of cultural areas can be drawn up, namely areas with various cultures that have many similarities to each other (Ahimsa, 2011).

### **3.3 Cultural Development Analyzed from Structural Functional**

#### **a. Structural Functionalism**

In the structural-functionalist perspective, each individual occupies a status in the structure of society. Status in this case is not the prestige of the individual, but social status. Individuals who occupy social status have certain rights and obligations. Status and roles tend to be together. Therefore, the social structure is the relationship between the statuses that result when actors carry out their functions and roles in interactions with others. The social structure for structural functionalists includes not only the interaction of status and roles, but also the specific rules and general beliefs, "norms" and "values", which govern these interactions (Malinowski, 1983). The view among structural-functionalists is that norms and values are not structural but "cultural", which surrounds the social structure. In other words, norms and values are actually ideas or symbols that reside in individuals' minds as codes and sanctions despite their interactions (Levi Strauss, 1969; Radcliffe Brown, 1979).

#### **b. Function**

The concept in structural-functionalism is the idea of function that emphasizes the interrelationships between social systems in society. If structural functionalists describe the tasks of society as functions, they are actually promoting the view that the existing structures and institutions of society are good and ideal, functioning to meet the needs of society. The implication is that any change in the established order in this context, inevitably becomes dysfunctional. Another problem involves the notion of function, which concerns how to decide if something works or doesn't work (Person, 1953; Strauss, 1969).

Durkheim's work, which was integrated into British anthropology by Radcliffe-Brown (1881-1955) until Levi-Strauss appeared, is considered the greatest theorist on which Marx, Durkheim, and Weber (Kuper, 1996).

Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown (1979), are structural-functionalists in anthropology. Malinowski emphasizes function, while Radcliffe-Brown in his perspective, which holds that everything has a function and emphasizes function (system). Malinowski views the world as an extension of one ethnic group or nation, a very broad social phenomenon that occurs in the discipline of anthropology. While Radcliffe-Brown firmly refuses to make generalizations that come from one case (one community), no matter how familiar a researcher is with the area he is studying (Keeper, 1996; Saifudin, 2006).

#### **c. Social Structure and Organization**

Social structure is used to refer to the social context, or rather to analyze the set of social relationships that intertwine individuals in society. Social action tends to focus on social organization, which defines the role that each individual plays in their relationship to



one another. The social structure defines the status of the actors who carry out these roles. Thus, it can be said that social organization is the target of greater interest for functionalists who follow Malinowski's thinking, and to some extent, whereas social structure is a greater target for people who use approaches derived from the structural-functionalist and classical structuralist traditions. (Radcliffe Brown, 1979; Malinowski, 1983).

The difference in the concept is contained in the book Radcliffe-Brown (1979). *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, In "On Social Structure" social structure is a structural form. For Radcliffe-Brown, social structure includes the relationships between individual human beings with one another. Structural form is a higher level of abstraction that is the position occupied by A, B, and C in relation to each other. A may be the father-in-law of B, so the structural form defines the relationship between father-in-law and son-in-law, for certain communities. Radcliffe-Brown views social structure as a network of real people in a real society. The structural form containing the cultural constant makes it possible for one to say that the grandchildren of these people live in a society with the same social structure. Functional relationships as opposed to structural relationships are part of the social organization that enables social structures to work (Radcliffe Brown, 1979).

Levi-Strauss (1969) and other anthropologists consistently use the term "social structure" to refer to the "structural form" of Radcliffe Brown. Levi-Strauss uses the term "social structure" to refer to a high level of abstraction. The structure of social relations in all societies, as well as in a particular society in Radcliffe-Brown's terms, is a structural form. Levi-Strauss constructs a kind of universal cross-cultural comparison that Radcliffe-Brown has been doing for a long time, but never put into practice, and instead Radcliffe-Brown uses the term "social structure" to refer to what should be meant as "structural form". What distinguishes the two is their understanding of the locus of structure. Levi-Strauss's conception of the locus of structure is in the human mind. Levi-Strauss's focus is the structure of all possible structures, for example, the study of kinship. Radcliffe-Brown, on the other hand, has always viewed structures as accessible empirically, for example from individuals A, B, and C upwards, to a level of generalization based on comparing their status with the status of other individuals, in the same society, or in any society at large.

The structuralism promoted by French anthropologists, during the 1950s and 1960s, was closely related to the structural functionalism of Radcliffe-Brown and his followers. LeviStrauss' structuralism and Radcliffe-Brown's structural-functionalism were heavily influenced by Durkheim's theories. The main difference is, Radcliffe-Brown studies order in social action, is seen as an expression of social structures formed by networks and groups, while Levi-Strauss argues that the structure resides in the human mind, and views social interaction as an outward manifestation of cognitive structures. (Levi Strauss, 2013). In the United States, cognitive anthropology developed a parallel approach to the analysis of cultural structures during the 1960s and 1970s seeking to reveal such as kinship, symbolic communication, and original classifications of nature. D'Andrade argues that the development of artificial logic in computer languages in the 1950s stimulated the interest in discovering the natural logic of the human brain (Van Ball, 1988).

Structural-functionalist Levi-Strauss adopts Radcliffe Brown's three forms of cross-cousin marriage (bilateral, matrilineal and patrilineal) by reanalyzing Australia's kinship system in his ethnographic book, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Radcliffe-Brown and Levi-Strauss are interested in social systems, not individuals, and individual needs are subordinated to system needs. One of the shortcomings of the Radcliffe-Brown typology approach is that there are no clear boundaries for the types and subtypes of society that can be used. Levi-Strauss illustrates that there is a logical limit to the number of types referred to as elementary social systems (Van Ball, 1988; Levi-Strauss, 2013).

Structuralism thought developed in England in the 1960s. The structuralism analysis of the most influential British anthropologist was Mary Douglas, through her writings *Purity and Danger* (1966). Douglas suggested that the biblical notion of impurity could be illumined by studying the position of the “pure” and the “impure” in the religion of small-scale societies. Douglas argues that beliefs about what is pure and how it is managed should not be understood as evolution stored in a structural system. This is true even with our dirty self-concept, that our polluting behavior is a reaction that “accuses” an object or idea of confounding or contradicting an idealized classification” (Douglas, 1966).

Leach developed the application of Douglas structuralism to the concept of scripture in his book, *Culture and communication*. Like the American cognitive anthropologist, Leach was also influenced by the work of Jakobson (Leach, 1976). He explicitly compared the binary opposition of human cognition to a binary code (Leach, 1976). Structural thinking in various places turned out to influence each other in the following period. One example is the growing influence of Jakobson's structural linguistic thought, known as the school of linguistics, and influencing structuralism in the United States. During the 1920s, Jakobson and his colleagues developed Saussure's theory of (language structure). Jakobson argues that the sounds of language are organized into pairs of opposites. He pointed out that English-speaking people intuitively distinguish fitter from sitter, or fitter from fibber by identifying alternatives to f/s or t/b articulated by speakers (Jakobson and Halle, 1956).

Levi-Strauss structuralism bridges nature and cultural development that cannot be separated from one another by using cross-cultural methods. By emphasizing the commonalities of all cultures, structuralism improves the picture of the range of cultural variations. In times of scientific and technological progress, structuralism brought anthropology into the modern world by building a foundation for scientific research. Neo-evolutionism and cultural ecology are considered as literature orientations rather than guidelines for conducting field research (Saifudin, 2006).

#### IV. Conclusion

- a. The evolution of EB culture. Taylor is divided into three stages, namely: Savegery, Barbarism and Civilization, describing the characteristics of the development of community culture from simple to complex. LH. Morgan is the same as EB. Taylor divides the evolution of society into three with three levels.
- b. The evolution of culture is ethnocentric, marked by the development of culture and the influence of the Old Testament and the New Testament. The evolution of culture according to Leslie White is based on the formulation  $C = E \times D$ , meaning that cultural evolution is a change in the system by means of energy transformation and technological assistance.
- c. The evolution of culture according to J. Steward is related to environmental conditions, the process of adaptation and every culture has a culture core, and namely technology, work organization, and what determines the direction of evolution is the environment.
- d. The birth of cultural diffusion is responding to the weaknesses of the theory of evolution and at the same time stating that cultural change occurs because it is found that the spread of culture from one place to another through human migration.
- e. Cultural diffusion appears to reconstruct the history of culture due to external factors, while evolutionists emphasize internal factors.
- f. The functional paradigm assumes that everything that has a function can explain the development and socio-cultural changes of society tend to be stable and gradual.

## References

- Ambaretnani. (2015). Paradigma Evolusi, Difusi dan Struktur Fungsional. Bandung : PPs Unpad.
- Gregor, Neonbasu. (2016). Citra Manusia Berbudaya: Sebuah Monografi tentang Timor dalam Perspektif Melanesia. Jakarta : Antara Publishing.
- Havilan, A. William. (1998). Antropologi. Jilid 1. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(1993). Antropologi. Jilid 2. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- Ihromi, T.O. (1987). Pokok-pokok Antropologi. Jakarta : Yayasan Obor.
- Keesing, M. Roger. (1999). Antropologi Budaya Suatu Perspektif Kontemporer. Jilid 1. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000). Antropologi Budaya Suatu Perspektif Kontemporer. Jilid 2. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- King, T. Victor, dkk. (2012). Antropologi Modern di Asia Tenggara. Jakarta : Kreasi Utama.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1958). Metode Antropologi dalam Penyelidikan Masyarakat dan Kebudayaan Indonesia. Jakarta : Universitas.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). Beberapa Pokok Antropologi Sosial. Jakarta : Yayasan Obor.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(1990). Sejarah Teori Antropologi. Jilid 1. Jakarta : UI Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(1990). Sejarah Teori Antropologi. Jilid 2. Jakarta : UI Press.
- Kupar, Adam. (1996). Pokok dan Tokoh Antropologi Mazhab Inggris Modern. Jakarta : Bharatara.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. (1969). The Elementary Structure of Kinship. Boston : The Bacon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2009). Antropologi Struktural. Bantul : Kreasi Wacana.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1983). Dinamika Bagi Perubahan Kebudayaan. Kualalumpur. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Martozet and Nurwani. Sentimental Values in Tor-Tor Parsiarabu in Tomok Toba Samosir Village. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 167-171.
- Pals, L. Daniel. (2012). Seven Theories of Religion. Jogjakarta : IRCiSoD.
- Putra, ASH. (2011). Paradigma Epistemologi dan Etnografi dalam Antropologi. Jogjakarta : Gama Press.
- Radcliffe-Brown. (1979). Structure and Function in Primitive Society. London : Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Ritzer, George. (1985). Sosiologi Ilmu Pengetahuan Berparadigma Ganda. Jakarta Rajawali Press.
- Sanderson, K. Steven. (2003). Sosiologi Makro. Jakarta : Rajawali Pers.
- Sarumpaet, Riris K. Toha, ed. (2016). Krisis Budaya: Oasis Guru Besar Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya UI. Jakarta : Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Sayfuddin, FA. Antropologi Kontemporer: Suatu Pengantar Kritis Mengenai Paradigma. Jakarta : Kencana.
- Steward, Julius H. (1979). Theory of Culture Change. Urbana: university press
- Suyono, Aryono. (1985). Kamus Antropologi. Jakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Syam, Nur. (2007). Mazhab-mazhab Antropologi. Yogyakarta : Gama Press.
- Sztompka, Piotr. (2007). Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial. Jakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Turner, S. Bryan. dkk. (2010). Kamus Sosiologi. Jakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Van Ball, J. (1987). Sejarah dan Perubahan Teori Antropologi Budaya. Jilid 1. Jakarta : PT. Gramedia.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1988). Sejarah dan Perubahan Teori Antropologi Budaya. Jilid 2. Jakarta : PT. Gramedia.
- Wirawan, IB. (2012). Teori-teori Sosial Dalam Tiga Paradigma. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Zulkifli and Ridwan, Muhammad. 2019. Revitalization of the traditional values lost due to the commodification of art/crafts: a case study of Batakese traditional Ulos. Asian Ethnicity, 541-554