I have decided to focus on two majors, molecular biology (cell development track) and cultural anthropology. Cell development is a rigorous and interdisciplinary program that investigates a broad range of biological, specifically developmental, process on the molecular level. It seeks to understand these processes from multiple perspectives: biochemistry, biophysics, genetics, as well as developmental biology. The subjects range from single amino acids to complex macromolecules, from single cells to complex multi-cellular eukaryotes. Additionally, the program requires a solid understanding of chemistry and physics.

Similar to molecular biology, cultural anthropology is a multidisciplinary study that draws from historical, literary, social, as well as psychological perspectives. However, cultural anthropology strives towards its goals with the unique philosophy that both a cultural and the people immersed in that culture can only be understood in their natural environment. That is, cultural anthropology questions statistical analyses because they are too liberally generalized and historical depictions because they tend to have hidden biases and assumptions. Simply put, statistics and historical accounts try to understand their subjects out of context. By questioning these traditional approaches, cultural anthropology has brought profound insights into the analysis of literature, philosophy, history, religious studies, and many other studies.

Cell development and cultural anthropology appear to be strikingly different. In fact, they are strikingly different. One program is grounded in the tradition of the natural sciences while the other is grounded in the humanistic approach. Nevertheless, I see a similarity between these two courses of study. The similarity is the fundamental way in which biology and anthropology ask and answer their questions. Biology, as with any other natural sciences, is a hypothesis, experimental data-driven field. The investigators interpret the data and try to integrate them into the already existing pool of information. Data and interpretations are “scientific,” meaning they adhere to an acceptable level of objectivity. Anthropology, on the other hand, is perceived as “unscientific.” This is a regrettable misconception. I would argue that anthropology is a hypothesis and data-driven field similar to biology. The hypothesis that a good anthropologist generates can be tested and verified. Interpretation, in order to convince a rational individual, must adhere to the rules of logic and rationality. And just as important, it must also draw upon and expand the knowledge of the field. Neither field is completely objective because investigators approach their studies with assumptions and prejudices.