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In the course of his career Julian H. Steward was affiliated with five universities and several federal agencies. Though he is primarily associated with Columbia, his last (and longest) appointment was at the University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign and his papers are now held by the university archive. This is the principal collection of Steward papers and contains much material useful for reconstructing the development of his thought and his activities as an organizer and manager of research enterprises (for biographical material on Steward see Manners 1973 and Murphy 1977; for estimations of his place in the history of anthropology see the relevant sections in Harris 1968, Hatch 1973 and 1973a and Manners 1964).

The Steward papers comprise the fifteen processed and two unprocessed boxes of Record Series 5/2/21. These include his office files, working (home) files, and correspondence materials created and sealed prior to his move to Urbana. They have been sorted into folders (many of them Steward's originals) and a finding aid listing the contents by folder heading is available. The collection is organized into three major categories, correspondence, other materials and departmental and university affairs. Although Mrs. Steward informs me that a few highly personal items were not deposited, there are no restrictions on any of the Steward papers. The archive is open from 8:00 to 5:00, Monday through Friday. Interested researchers should contact William J. Maher, University Archives Room 19, University Library, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

Steward exchanged letters only rarely with his seniors and peers in the profession. He corresponded regularly, however, with a large number of students and juniors and accumulated substantial files on R. McC. Adams, S. Diamond, M. Fried, F. K. Lehman, R. F. Murphy, and the staff of the Puerto Rico project he directed while at Columbia (R. Manners, S. Mintz, E. Padilla, R. Scheele, E. Wolf). Of particular historical interest are an exchange with J. A. Ford documenting Steward's extension of typological classification principles from artifacts to subsistence systems and, regarding the debate over Steward's affinities with Marxism (cf. Harris, 1968; Legros, 1977), a letter to R. F. Millon containing a lengthy and unfavorable appraisal of "mode of production." The vast bulk of the correspondence postdates 1952, the year Steward moved to Urbana, but there is a small collection of earlier letters. Noteworthy among these are a letter from Frank Speck (22 January 1940) concerning the post-contact origin of family hunting territories in Northeastern America, and one to A. L. Kroeber (ca. 1945) detailing Steward's various and, in his opinion, unappreciated efforts as a promoter of the discipline. Incoming and outgoing correspondence is filed together alphabetically by sender, then chronologically.
Though they are not organized this way, the non-correspondence material may be described in terms of the two phases of Steward's career. The earlier, running from the late 1920s to the mid 1940s, was primarily a period of theoretical development and is represented by lecture notes, reading notes, manuscripts and project files. All the lecture notes date from Steward's graduate years at Berkeley. The reading notes comprise citations and summaries from a wide range of sources along with Steward's comments. His principal concerns seem to have been the apparently differential integration of culture elements and the potential for variability within individual culture patterns. Most of the unpublished manuscripts here were drafted as introductions to some of Steward's well-known publications. They define his theoretical position in relation to figures, like Goldenweiser and Klimek, generally not thought to have had any bearing on his thinking. Other notable items are final drafts of two unpublished popular treatments of Southwestern archaeology, a "Humor" file containing a compilation of exasperating exchanges with informants, and Steward's M.A., a distributional study of tambourines. Letters relating directly to an ongoing study were commonly placed in the appropriate project file. Thus, there is correspondence scattered throughout the collection. The petroglyph files, for instance, are interspersed with letters from numerous Christian fundamentalists who saw in petroglyphs evidence of the American Indian's Phoenician origin or confirmation of the Biblical chronology.

Also dating from this earlier period are Steward's records of his year (1936-37) as consultant anthropologist to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau was then in the process of implementing the Indian Reorganization Act, Commissioner Collier's program for revitalizing native American life. Included are Steward's report on the status and prospects of reorganization among the Shoshoni, letters and memoranda. These document Steward's only, and apparently alienating, encounter with applied anthropology. Particularly important in this regard is a letter to M. Herskovits (28 April 1936, coauthored with S. Mekeel) insisting that scientific anthropology be institutionally segregated from social welfare programs, a position Steward maintained throughout his career.

Though Steward's thinking on cultural taxonomy underwent continuing refinement, the years from the late 1940s to the late 1960s were given over largely to organizational and managerial activity. Representing this phase of his career are research proposals, grant applications and original field reports from Steward's two large-scale research projects, the Puerto Rico and the Study of Cultural Regularities projects. Also preserved is his correspondence with the Ford Foundation, which funded the latter project. By this time Steward's research interests focused on the study of complex societies, and his Area Research: Theory and Method (1950) served as an early charter of the area study approach. An early version was widely circulated and Steward collected several files of critical "Area Letters," including lengthy exchanges with O. Lattimore and C. DuBois. Also dating from this period are materials relating to projects never fully worked up,
such as Steward's "Proposal for Research on a Typology of Subcultures in Illinois."

During the early 1950s, Steward was contracted as an expert witness by the Justice Department for several cases before the Indian Claims Commission. The statements he prepared on land use and political organization among the Ute and northern Paiute have recently been published (Steward, 1974 and 1974a). His papers contain a wealth of manuscripts and letters documenting the progress of the hearings and also the angry debate over anthropology's proper commitment which developed out of them. Also bearing on this issue is Steward's "Operation Camelot" file, in which he proposed an organizational response to attacks on anthropology's freedom of inquiry.

Between 1935 and 1946 Steward was an Associate Anthropologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology. His first two major research enterprises, the Handbook of South American Indians and his Institute of Social Anthropology (ISA), were conducted under Smithsonian auspices. The papers from these projects, as well as Steward's field notes on the Carrier of British Columbia, are now at the National Anthropological Archives. Inquiries concerning these materials should be addressed to the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560. Though he left the ISA for Columbia University in 1946, Steward was retained for several years in an advisory capacity. The Urbana collection contains an ISA file comprising letters and memoranda between Steward, the field staff, and the Smithsonian documenting the progress and new directions taken by the ISA during the directorship of George Foster.

The section on university and departmental matters covers Steward's administrative activities at Illinois from 1953 through 1969. Much of the material concerns the establishment, in 1960, of a new anthropology department independent from sociology and Steward's years as chairman.

Harris, Marvin, 1968. The Rise of Anthropological Theory, Thomas Y. Crowell, N.Y.


FOOTNOTES TO THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

SEPARATION AND LINKAGE IN AMERICAN INDIAN LINGUISTICS, c. 1900

Dell Hymes
University of Pennsylvania

In 1956, Dell Hymes, then at the Department of Social Relations of Harvard, wrote to John Swanton (1873-1958) an early student of Franz Boas and long-time member of the Bureau of American Ethnology, inquiring about Boas' and Swanton's early work on Chinookan languages, on which Hymes had completed his doctoral dissertation ("The Language of the Kathlament Chinook," Indiana University, 1955). In the correspondence that ensued, Swanton had occasion to comment on the work of John Napoleon Brinton Hewitt (1858-1937), who had already been at the Bureau for many years when Swanton joined it in 1900. Although not included in the recent volume on American Indian Intellectuals edited by Margot Liberty, Hewitt was one of the first Native Americans to be professionally employed in anthropological research. Swanton's recollections focused primarily upon Hewitt's somewhat unusual individual personality, rather than upon Hewitt as Native American. The extent to which Hewitt's idiosyncratic style and marginal position within the Bureau, or his subsequent neglect, may reflect also his situation as Native American is perhaps a matter for further study. In any case, it is clear that he had important contributions to offer to the study of American Indian linguistics. (Hewitt's linguistic work is discussed briefly in Darnell, 1969:94-101; Stocking, 1974; and also in Judd, 1967).

22 George St.,
Newton 58, Mass., March 14, 1957

Dear Dr. Hymes:

You inquire regarding J. N. B. Hewitt's work on the languages of Oregon and Washington. What I know of the matter is about as follows. Mr. Hewitt was an unusual character. He was, as you probably know,
part Tuscarora in origin. He was taken from civilian life - he told me one time of his experiences as driver or conductor of a street car in New Jersey - taken to assist Erminie Smith with her Iroquoian researches. She died soon afterward and he took up her work and spent almost the entire remainder of his life in Iroquoian studies. He was particularly interested in the esoteric side of Iroquois ceremonies and finally had printed a set of the ritual legends of the Iroquois as they appear in the Bureau Reports. I say "finally" because it was almost impossible to get them out of him. There was always "something more" that had to be done. He was a thorough procrastinator and at times stood in his own light in consequence. He was at one time given charge of the archives and asked to classify them. Repeatedly he put off completing the work. After a time a substantial raise in salary was promised him if he would finish this, but he still put off the work. In this matter as in his linguistic work he acted something like a miser, afraid to let anything out. At one time we were anxious to find a certain map that one of our collaborators had compiled and the existence of which we were certain of. For a long time it could not be located and then one day Hewitt suddenly brought it to me.

He excused his failure to turn in material on the ground that he has been appointed in a peculiar manner as a sort of inside assistant and was not expected to furnish material like the rest of the staff. It is true that he was used for the comparison of certain linguistic vocabularies and this included work comparing some American languages with Polynesian to carry out a theory of Cyrus Thomas! He worked on some of the languages of Mexico as you will see by consulting the administrative sections of the Bureau Reports. He was very much influenced by the social theories of Powell and McGee who were in turn influenced by Morgan McLellan [McLennan] and others of that period, and in his studies of vocabularies he seems to have favored the theories of those he was working for. At that time Powell was opposed to putting stocks together and later, as you remember, he was abetted by Boas before Sapir burst upon the scene. This separationist standpoint was shared also by Gatschet who compiled those volumes on Klamath. An example of Hewitt's separationist tendency is shown by his comparison of McGee's Seri material with Yuman. He reported that Seri must be a distinct stock in line with the ideas of Powell and McGee and in opposition to Brinton, but we know of course, as shown by Kroeber, that Brinton was right.

Yet Hewitt was very jealous of his work, particularly as regards Iroquois. At one time Dixon asked me why in his linguistic map Powell had extended Iroquoian so far I think into Labrador and as I respected Dixon's opinion, in our next issue of the map a change was made. I had not known that the original boundary was set by Hewitt and it was characteristic of him that instead of complaining to me directly of the change I began to hear reports from the other Bureau offices that he had visited around with them and made his complaint. Finally he did come to me directly with it and, as I thought his case was good, the change back was made. But the whole proceeding was absurd. I was not a specialist in that area and had no personal feeling in the matter. But this indirection was a rather amusing side of Hewitt's nature.
Now, regarding the northwestern languages. Hewitt was at an early date given vocabularies of Shahaptian and Waiilatpuan to compare, the last represented by Cayuse I believe. As a result of this comparison he reported that they showed signs of relationship and this was entered in the 15th Annual Report, page XLV. By consulting that reference I see that the Waiilatpuan vocabulary he studied is called "old Cayuse." Of this study the report says: "The results of his study (Hewitt's) tend to indicate that the Waiilatpuan family is really a branch of the Shahaptian. Should further research indicate this to be true, it will be an important addition to knowledge of the distribution of linguistic stocks in northwestern United States."

No further investigation seems to be indicated but I know that Hewitt did prepare two manuscripts in one of which he compared the two languages in question, while the other added to them material from Klamath. When I saw them it struck me at once that relationship was strongly indicated, but I think this did not come out until after one of Boas' pupils [Melville Jacobs], newly appointed to the University of Washington I believe, announced the relationship of at least two of three and ultimately of all three. Hewitt then felt considerably aggrieved that no recognition of his work had been given, but the fault was largely his own in not having pushed the matter when he made the discovery, or thought he had. If Powell and McGee had been on the ball they would have pushed the matter at the time and thrown those three stocks together. I suggested that something be done about it but I was only a kid ethnologist at the time, Hewitt was unable to assert his own claims at the time that should have been done, and the atmosphere of the Powellian attitude and of Gatschet with his great work on Klamath behind him was in opposition.

I myself saw those vocabularies and they should be preserved among the archives of the Bureau but that was a long time ago. All that anyone could say now would be that "although comparative work by Hewitt indicated quite conclusively that there was a relationship between these three sets of languages" the results were never set forth in a conclusive manner. That is about all that could be said."

There is a reference to Hewitt's work in the 19th Annual Report, page 838, but it has no bearing on the above question. Boas, conservative as he was, saw the relationship right away, but he never had access to Hewitt's material. He was in no way responsible for any neglect of Hewitt which was due to Hewitt himself and to his own immediate superiors.

A few items have dropped from my memory, and this is about all that I can recall.

Sincerely yours,

[Signed] John R. Swanton

In the last decade or so, the relationship of anthropology and imperialism has been the topic of both ideological controversy (and more recently) historical research. Despite their frequent grounding in Marxist assumption, controversists have seemed to imply that the undeniable linkage was as much a matter of moral inadequacy as of social determinism: had anthropologists of earlier periods possessed a proper moral sensibility, they would have opposed European imperialism rather than contributing to its ideological base or seeking its support for their anthropological research. The problematic character of retrospective moral judgment on such issues is illustrated in the case of one turn-of-the-century American anthropologist who seems to have been actively involved in the organized anti-imperialist movement: Frederick Starr, who was on the faculty at the University of Chicago between 1892 and 1923.

While the details of Starr's activity on this issue must await the investigation of some future biographer, his papers contain an interesting letter from Erving Winslow, secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League, indicating that Starr on occasion used his anthropology as a weapon in the service of the anti-imperialist cause.

The Anti-Imperialist League
20 Central St., Boston, Feb. 6, 1908

Dear Prof. Starr:

For the evening meeting of the Twentieth Century Club March 26th I will suggest the use of the subject "Field Experiences of an Anthropologist" with a sly introduction of anti-imperialism. I will let you know whether the lantern slides are desired or not later. For the luncheon on the 27th the subject can be "The Natives of the Philippines," with anti-imperialism turned on in full (no slides).
am expecting something too for the evening of Saturday March 28, if it is not working you too hard, but the matter is not settled yet.

I am your obedient servant,

[signed] Erving Winslow
Secretary

Whatever the extent of his commitment, Starr's ideology would seem, from a present perspective, not entirely consistent. Although he was anti-imperialist in relation to U.S. overseas involvement, he was an outspoken defender of Belgian rule in the Congo against the attacks of reformist critics—citing his own experience during fieldwork in 1905-06 to support the relative beneficence of Belgian administration. And like many anti-imperialists of his day, Starr was by no means egalitarian in his racial attitudes. On the contrary, his notions about non-European peoples were strongly tinged with conventional evolutionary assumption.

The contrast with Franz Boas (who was at several points considered as a possible replacement or supplement to Starr on the Chicago faculty) might perhaps be worth pursuing. Although Boas later dated his disillusion with the promise of America to the imperialist aftermath of the Spanish War, and he was perhaps the single most effective critic of the racist assumptions justifying European dominance, his response to American imperialism in 1900 was an attempt to organize businessmen with Far Eastern interests to support anthropological research in that area. Although this particular entrepreneurial effort was rather short-lived, Boas' pragmatic professionalism may have been a factor in the contrasting fates of anthropology at Columbia and at Chicago in this period. Starr loved to see his name in the newspapers (as his numerous scrapbooks testify)—usually on issues with much less present moral resonance; but his highly idiosyncratic personal style was not oriented toward the institutionalization of an academic discipline. During the thirty years in which he was Chicago's anthropologist, the discipline was reduced to the status of an undergraduate adjunct to the work of the world's premier department of sociology.

Without accepting the graduate research department as the necessary historical outcome of Rousseau's call for a comparative study of human nature, one may suggest that Boas' academic critique of racist assumption was perhaps a more significant contribution to the welfare and self-determination of non-European peoples than Starr's "sly introduction of anti-imperialism," before a meeting of New England upper-class reformers. Whether there were other more effective or morally satisfying anti-imperialist stances actually open to those who sought to define themselves as "anthropologists" in this period is perhaps a moot issue. (G.W.S.)

(Letter from the Frederick Starr papers reproduced by permission of the Department of Special Collections, University of Chicago Library.)
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

John Forester, junior research fellow at Kings College, Cambridge, is working on the early history of psychoanalysis and anthropology.

Curtis Hinsley, of the Department of History, Colgate University, has received a National Science Foundation grant for research on "Anthropology at the Peabody Museum."

Lawrence Kelly, of the Department of History, North Texas State University, has received a National Science Foundation grant for research on "The Origins of Applied Anthropology in the United States, 1935-1945."

James S. Reed, doctoral candidate in social science at Ball State University, is planning a dissertation on "Clark Wissler: A Forgotten influence in American anthropology," based on materials Wissler's daughter Mary donated to the Ball State Department of Anthropology in 1976, for which Reed also hopes to provide a research guide.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS


II. SUGGESTED BY OUR READERS


Foster, George, et al., eds. *Long-Term Field Research in Social Anthropology* (New York, 1979). [Essays by fourteen anthropologists covering a range of different types of long-term projects, including work in Chiapas, Tzintzuntzin, Mysore, Nubia, Hungary, Italy, New Guinea, Peru, and among the Navajo and Maya—G.W.S.]

Goldfrank, Esther S. *Notes on an Unexpected Life: As One Anthropologist Tells It* (Flushing, N.Y., 1978). [Autobiographical reminiscences by Boas' secretary, who went on to do important work on Pueblo and Plains Indians—G.W.S.]

Green, Jesse, editor and introduction. *Zuni: Selected Writings of Frank Hamilton Cushing.* Preface by Fred Eggan (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1979). [Introduction and annotations provide historical and biographical contexts; Cushing's writings—some here first published—document his status as the inventor of lengthy participant observation as an explicit ethnographic method—W.C.S.]


the question of Maori origins, e.g., stratigraphic archaeology in 1860s-1870s; effective 1886 parody of misuse of linguistic comparison; nationalism as motive in racial classification—W.C.S.

W[atkins], T. H. "Chroniclers of the Indian Twilight." American Heritage 30 (2, 1979):72-79. [A selection of illustrations of early Smithsonian anthropologists at work and of some of their results; most interesting are eight photos of F. H. Cushing dressed and undressed à la Zuni and Dakota, seven of them here first published. Although not so described, these latter were probably taken to assist designers of U.S. National Museum "life groups"—like those of Boas as a Kwakiutl cannibal dancer published by Hinsley and Holm, AA 78 (2):306-316 (1976)—W.C.S.]

III. THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN ITALY

We had hoped to include bibliography by an Italian scholar, but unfortunately it has not reached us. However, two readers (Roy Miller and Robert Wokler) have suggested several more or less recent works representative of the considerable work in this language:

Giannotti, Gianni. La 'scienza della cultura' nel pensiero sociale american contemporaneo (Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino, 1967).


Moravia, Sergio. La scienza dell'uomo nel Settecento (Bari: Editori Laterza, 1970).

Verri, Antonio. Lord Monboddo, dall' metafisica all' antropologia (Ravenna, 1975).

IV. CAMBRIDGE ANTHROPOLOGY

Cambridge Anthropology: A Journal of the Department of Social Anthropology, Cambridge University, has included a number of articles of historical interest in its first three volumes:


V. AMERICAN DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1977

Approximately 3,400 dissertations in anthropology available from University Microfilms International were included by Joan B. Peebles in Anthropology: A Dissertation Bibliography (Ann Arbor, 1978). A survey of the obviously relevant categories (and a scanning of others less clearly relevant), produced thirty entries relating to the history of the discipline written between 1911 and September, 1977. Although several titles have been previously noted in HAN, we reproduce the complete culling here, as the most inclusive list so far of American doctoral dissertations in the history of anthropology. (Only eight of these are included in Robert Van Kemper and James Phinney, The History of Anthropology: A Research Bibliography [New York, 1977].) It should be noted, however, that the present list includes no titles in linguistics, an area which Peebles did not cover systematically, and that it seems to have omitted doctoral dissertations in history departments (e.g., Curtis Hinsley, 1976; James Clifford, 1978; and George Stocking, 1960).


Berkhofer, Robert Frederick, Jr. Protestant Missionaries to the American Indians, 1787 to 1862 (1960, Cornell University), 544p.


Chandler, Joan Mary. Anthropologists and United States Indians, 1928-1960(1972), University of Texas at Austin), 259p.


Kildahl, Phillip Andrew. British and American Reactions to Layard's Discoveries in Assyria (1845-1860) (1959, University of Minnesota), 224p.


Sozan, Michael. The History of Hungarian Ethnography (1972, Syracuse University), 419p.


LIBRARIES SUBSCRIBING TO HAN

A survey of our subscription records conducted some months ago revealed that the following libraries in the United States and elsewhere were subscribers to HAN. If your local academic library is not among them, or has allowed its subscription to lapse, you might put in a word with the serials department. As a special incentive, we offer a complete file of all ten past numbers for only $8 to all libraries placing standing orders. (This offer is not available to individual subscribers, since the number of copies available for certain issues is limited, and we prefer to make them reach as many potential readers as possible.)

Australia:
   University of New South Wales
   Western Australia Institute of Technology

France:
   Laboratoire de'éthnologie, Université, Paris

Germany:
   Anthropologische Institut, Universität Mainz

Netherlands:
   Historisch Seminarium van de Universiteit van Amsterdam

Canada:
   National Museum of Canada (Ottawa)
   University of British Columbia
Norway:
  Ethnografisk Museum (Oslo)

Spain:
  Universidad de Madrid (Catédra de Antropología Social)

United Kingdom:
  Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (London)
  University of Sussex

United States:
  Arizona State University
  Brigham Young University
  Bureau of Indian Affairs, Cultural Studies Section (Santa Fe)
  University of California (Berkeley)
  University of California (Davis)
  University of California (Los Angeles)
  University of California (Santa Barbara)
  University of Chicago
  Harvard University (Peabody Museum)
  University of Illinois (Urbana)
  Johns Hopkins University
  Library of Congress
  Newberry Library (Chicago)
  State University of New York (Binghamton)
  State University of New York (Buffalo)
  University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)
  Northwestern University
  University of Pennsylvania (University Museum)
  University of Pittsburgh
  Princeton University
  Smithsonian Institution (Washington)
  Syracuse University
  Vassar College
  Yale University
  Yale University (Peabody Museum)
  Wesleyan University
  University of Wisconsin

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The twelfth annual meeting of CHEIRON, the International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences, will be held at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, U.S.A., 19-21 June 1980. Papers are solicited which deal with topics in the history of any of the behavioral or social sciences. Of particular interest are interdisciplinary, methodological, and speculative contributions. Deadline for receipt of submitted papers is 15 January 1980. All submissions must be the complete paper, no longer than eight double-spaced typewritten pages. All submitted papers will be subject to a process of blind refereeing. Submitted papers and queries relating to the program should be directed to:

Rand Evans, Program Chair
Department of Psychology
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas USA 77840