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The National Anthropological Archives has received approximately sixty cubic feet of files of the Program Manager for the Smithsonian's Center for the Study of Man. Working in Washington, D.C. under the Chicago-based Director (Sol Tax), Samuel L. Stanley held this position from the time the Center was created in 1968 until 1976, when he joined the staff of the Director of the National Museum of Natural History.

The records reflect rather broadly the Center's concern with cross-cultural studies and their relevance to problems confronting humanity as a whole. Especially well documented are several international Center-sponsored conferences, including a planning meeting in Cairo in 1972, several presession conferences (on cannabis, alcohol, population, and the transmission of culture) at the Ninth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences at Chicago in 1973, and a 1974 meeting at Bucharest on the cultural implications of population change. Other activities relating to the cross-cultural studies include experiments with computers to control and retrieve anthropological data, an abortive attempt to issue a series of monographs based on cross-cultural studies, and the organization of special task forces concerned with questions of human fertility and the environment. Stanley was also involved in the Center's American Indian program, conceived as an action anthropology effort to help Indians reach goals they themselves defined. He became especially concerned with economic development, coordinating studies of specific tribes that were carried out with funds from the Economic Development Administration, and serving as consultant for economic development on reservations for the American Indian Policy Review Commission. To keep abreast of development in both the field of anthropology and Indian affairs, Stanley also maintained information and reference files of printed and processed material.

It should be noted that the records have limitations. With some of the Center's programs, Stanley's relationship was apparently formal. For example, there is little documentation that relates to the Center's National Anthropological Film Center, and even less about the Research Institute on Immigration and Ethnic Studies. Stanley's file concerning the new Handbook of North American Indians has been turned over to the editor; those concerning the urgent anthropology program have gone to the Smithsonian's Department of Anthropology; and those on the establishment of the Center and its relationship to the spectral Museum of Man, have been retained by the Center's administrative officer.

A second group of materials recently accessioned are nine cubic feet of additional records of the American Anthropological Association. Perhaps the most notable and fully documented of these has to do with the Committee on Research Problems and Ethics. Formed in 1965 in response to growing involvement by federal intelligence agencies in anthropological research, the committee appointed Ralph L. Beals to conduct inquiries among anthropologists in order to determine the extent of this and other problems
related primarily to research in foreign countries. The accession includes not only correspondence, reports, minutes of meetings, and other matter originally accumulated by the Executive Director but also the material gathered by Professor Beals. The AAA accession also contains material on the Committee on Ethics that was formed in 1968, including its work on specific cases. Still other material concerns the Program in Anthropology and Education, which was headed by Frederick O. Gearing through much of its existence from 1967 to 1969; the AAA contract to define areas of anthropological specialization and professional qualifications and to collect data for the National Science Foundations' Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel; and conferences and studies on the uses of and employment potential for anthropologists. Also included are administrative files concerning the American Anthropologist, files concerning special workshops and conferences, and files that document the AAA's relations with other organizations.

A further accession is one and a half cubic feet of papers of northern plains archaeologist Donald J. Lehmer, which have been donated by W. Raymond Nood. The material covers the period from the late 1930s to the mid 1970s and consists largely of correspondence, applications for employment and for grants, contracts for archeological work, reports, and teaching materials. Technical documents produced in the field are represented only by a small file that relates to the Messilla Valley Expedition, sponsored by the Museum of New Mexico and the Arizona State Museum during 1940-41. The rest of the material includes discussions of archeological problems of the plains, Lehmer's work with the Missouri Basin Project of the Smithsonian's River Basin Surveys, and administrative problems of the MBP's early years.

The archives has also received additional papers of Sister M. Inez Hilger relating to her studies of child-rearing and acculturation among the Ainu and Plains Indians. William A. Lessa has made an initial deposit of his papers. Those received concern field work on the atoll of Ulithi. The late Robert F. Heizer left to the archives his papers relating to Olmec archeology, including material he received from Philip Drucker and other colleagues and students. The archives has also gained additional papers of William Duncan Strong that concern his work in Latin America.

Researchers who wish to use the archives' holdings are once again urged to contact the staff before making definite plans for a visit. Some of the material is restricted. The AAA records, for example, are closed to researchers for a period of ten years from the date of their creation unless special permission is obtained. Indications have also been found that records relating to the Beals inquiry may also require special permission. That restriction will be honored until the matter is completely cleared up. In addition, the Lessa papers bear certain restrictions that require discussion with potential users.
One interesting aspect of the history of nineteenth century anthropology is the somewhat tenuous nature of the intellectual channels by which ideas were transmitted from one national anthropological tradition to another—particularly when this involved movement between center and periphery. As late as the 1870s it took almost a decade for Lorimer Fison and A. W. Howitt in the Southwest Pacific actually to get a hold of a copy of one of J. F. McLennan's works in order to confront directly his disputes with their mentor Lewis H. Morgan on matters relating to the evolution of human marriage. Four decades before, adherents of an earlier anthropological paradigm—that of linguistic ethnology—faced similar problems of international communication.

Communication networks were established, however, around nodal figures such as J. C. Prichard, whom many regarded as the representative ethnologist of his age. Two years after Albert Gallatin, the doyen of American linguistic ethnologists, published his *Synopsis of the Indians... East of the Rocky Mountains* (1846), he sent Prichard two copies; in return, Prichard offered Gallatin bibliographical suggestions on philological works which might not yet have crossed the Atlantic. From the point of view of the later history of anthropology, the most interesting aspect of the letter is the passage indicating that Prichard donated one of his copies of Gallatin's *Synopsis* to the Royal Geographic Society. Consulting it several years later in the course of writing his *Journal of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-west and Western Australia* (London, 1841), Lt. George Grey found in Gallatin's *Synopsis* descriptions of maternal kinship groups and "totems" that seemed remarkably similar to the "great families" and "kobongs" of the Western Australian aborigines among whom he had traveled in 1837 and 1838. Thus was established a comparative ethnographic linkage which, picked up later by McLennan, has had theoretical reverberations down to the present.

The letter, dated October 26, 1838 is from the uncalendared collection, New York Historical Society (roll 42, frame 782-3), and was called to my attention by Robert Bieder; it is reprinted with the permission of the Society.

(G.W.S.)

Dear Sir:

I beg you to accept my best thanks for the very valuable present of your most interesting and [learned] work on the American nations in which I perceive that you have made most important additions to the stock of information previously obtained respecting those races of men. I have forwarded the duplicate copy to Capt. Washington, R. N. Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society in London (to be presented to the Society in your name) because it will there be more duly appreciated and more read than in any other library in this country, where, to our shame it must be spoken, far less attention is bestowed on [such]
philological and ethnological researches than in some other countries, as in yours and in France and Prussia. Everything connected with the history of the American Aborigines is to me extremely interesting. I fully concur with the opinion you have expressed respecting their languages, viz that grammatical affinity indicates them to have had a common origin and that if this be allowed the want of resemblance in vocables must not, even in other instances, prevent our ascribing a common origin to languages which display the same fundamental laws of structure. It is however difficult to see precisely how far similar habits of thought may have led man, unconnectedly, to form languages of analogous structures. I should think this cannot carry us very far, nor by any means explain the extensive analogies of the American idioms. By some German writers however an attempt has been made to refer to this principle even the resemblances of languages which have a much nearer relation. Niebuhr thought it possible that languages cognate as the Greek and Latin could grow up on opposite sides of the sea which separates their native countries without communication, as analogous species of plants grow on the opposite shores of a lake or inland water or of the Mediterranean, and Gottfried Müller has some conjecture almost equally absurd and of the same kind in his very [learned] and in general very lucid work, entitled "die Etrusken," in which he has thrown more light than any previous writer on the ancient population of Italy. We have had some later works on languages most resembling the American and I think some light begins to dawn on their mutual relations. Ermann, in his Reise um die Erde durch Nord-Asien, promises to give new information respecting the nations on the northwestern coast of America and from observations scattered thru the volumes of his work already published it [appears] that he fancies stories indicative of affinity between the [Koluschians] and some Siberian tribes. In the language of the Ostiaks there are words ending in "atl" like the Aztecs and in some of the Asiatic dialects the personal pronouns . . . correspond . . . with the American. We have seen new works on the grammatical affinities of the Asiatic languages, the general result of which is that the Manschau, Tungusian, Mongolian and Turkish in Tartar belong to one family, allied also to the Finnish and Ugrian. One of these books is Versuch über die Tatarischen Sprachen, von D. W. Schott, Berlin 1836, another has the whimsical title of Das Sprachgeschlecht des Tartarien etc. von J. Ritter von Kylunder, Frankfort am Main 1837. There is a Grammaire Mandchoue, by Von der Gabelentz, and a Grammatik der Mongolischen Sprache, by Schmidt. Probably these works are already known to you. By means of these six works some decide the question whether the languages of American are grammatically cognate with the [Eastern] Asiatic, at base with the most extensively spread languages of northern Asia. On the Basque we have a new work (Etudes Grammaticales sur la langue Euskarienne, Paris, by Abbadie and Chaho) which adds somewhat to our former knowledge.

I must apologize for trespassing so long on your valuable time by this long letter, but I thought it possible that some of the late attempts in philology which have recently come into this country may not yet have reached you tho you are far from being behind us in such
Researches. Believe me, my dear Sir, with sentiments of sincere respect.

Your faithful and obliged servant
J. C. Prichard

CLIO'S FANCY: DOCUMENTS TO PIQUE THE HISTORICAL IMAGINATION

THE PROBLEM WITH MR. HEWETT: ACADEMICS AND POPULARIZERS IN AMERICAN ARCHEOLOGY, c. 1910

Curtis Hinsley
Colgate University

The current PBS television series on anthropology, Odyssey, raises once again the issue of the relationship between professional anthropologists and the American public. Although anthropology irresistibly attracts, and profits from, public interest, the overt popularizer has always drawn suspicion if not outright hostility from those anxious to uphold professional standards and to fix clear boundaries between professional and public. Such lines began to be emphatically drawn around 1900, with the emergence of important anthropology departments at Harvard, Columbia, and Berkeley. Although the role of boundary-maintainer is usually associated with Franz Boas, who sought unsuccessfully to limit the membership of the American Anthropological Association to a professional elite, Boas' concern was shared by others—and not only in relation to 'outsiders' like the photographer Edward Curtis, but also in relation to nominally accredited academic anthropologists who, catering to popular interests, threatened to acquire undue influence with politicians and financiers whose decisions could affect the professional development of the discipline.

One such figure was Edgar Lee Hewett (1865-1946), who while serving as administrative head of the New Mexico Normal School, undertook in 1904 a survey of the prehistoric ruins of the Southwest for the General Land Office of the Department of Interior. This brought him to the attention of the community of American anthropologists, who were increasingly involved with national legislation to preserve the ruins. When Robert Lowie in 1906 declined appointment at the Central American Fellowship of the Archaeological Institute of America, the Fellowship Committee (F. W. Putnam, C. P. Bowditch, and Franz Boas) turned—with some trepidation—to Hewett, despite the fact that he had no prior anthropological training. Over the next ten years Hewett, working chiefly through the Institute's young and boisterous western branches, established a power base that left the Harvard-Columbia professionals amazed and enraged. With his School of American Archaeology at Santa Fe, Hewett in effect ran away with the Southwest as an archeological field, dividing the loyalties even of such Harvard-trained men as Sylvanus G. Morley and A. V. Kidder.
For most academic anthropologists, however, disgust with Hewett became almost a litmus test of professionalism between 1910 and 1912. The case against him was stated in rather caustic terms in a letter to the Boston financier Gardiner Lane written by Alfred M. Tozzer, who as Bowditch's protege had been Hewett's predecessor as A.I.A. Fellow, and was by 1910 a rising star of Harvard's Central American research. While historical retrospect might credit Hewett with the invigoration of a regional cultural awareness, Tozzer—a close ally of Boas in the American Anthropological Association—saw the issue as one of scientific professionalism against irresponsible popular appeal.

October 28, 1910

My dear Mr Lane,

I am quite willing to give you all the information I can in regard to Mr Hewett's "character and ability."

I wish to say however that I have been strongly prejudiced against the man from the very first time I saw him. His personality is one that is especially distasteful to me. To be honest therefore to Hewett my prejudice on the purely personal side should not be overlooked in my estimate of him as a man and as a scientist.

I consider Mr Hewett first of all a politician. He has shown ability in obtaining money for archaeological work and in influencing people to see his side of any case he wishes to present. His power over a certain class of men and especially over women is very great indeed.

He is ambitious, seemingly for the advancement of archaeological work in America, but in reality for personal aggrandizement. His remarkable press agent, whoever he may be, seems to be always alert in spreading broadcast the account of some new find or new work and usually in a manner most spectacular and unscientific. Especially prominent in this respect was a statement of a lecture delivered by Hewett in Colorado in which he told of the discovery of the chronological development of the art of Copan in connection with the dates of the inscriptions worked out independently by his colleague [Morley]. The dates in question have been known for many years and there is abundant evidence to prove that his ideas in regard to the development of the art were borrowed by him from Doctor [H. J.] Spinden whose thesis for the Doctor's degree from Harvard was upon this topic... Hewett is a man of great and untiring energy and his perseverance and eagerness in making his point are commendable. The methods however by which he obtains his end are often questionable. He rides over all obstructions rough-shod.

I have never heard him acknowledge ignorance of any subject whatsoever connected with [the] field of archaeology either European or American. Where an opportunity has been open to him for advice in regard to special fields of investigations and fields with which he is absolutely unacquainted, he has refrained and in some cases absolutely refused to consult the acknowledged authorities in those fields. This
is especially true in the case of Dr. Boas and the Northwest Coast of America where he planned some work for the Institute. Furthermore, I have never heard him speak other than in the broadest generalities on topics the details of which he pretends to know.

In regard to the character of his work I can speak from experience as I was in the field with him in the summer of 1908 for six weeks. The main criticism in all the excavation made by Hewett is the lack of any well-defined and comprehensive plan of work which would settle once and for all certain broad questions still remaining unanswered concerning the archaeology of the Pueblo region. His work is seemingly done where it will yield the best results from the point of view of collections and spectacular plans and restorations. There has been, as far as I know, little correlation in the many small bits of digging here and there undertaken by Hewett but in almost every case there has resulted a good pottery collection while the work has thrown very little light upon the more important questions of migrations etc. etc. In other words the various pieces of excavation, although in most cases fairly well done, have been made with a view to tangible results for his Museum rather than for scientific data of a more valuable sort. . . .

I must add however that certain of his ideas in regard to a field school of archaeology are excellent, the nightly discussions, strenuous work for the men, and the energy with which the work is done. But his very rigid observance of etiquette and of the superior and exalted position of the "Director" makes the camp seem more like a well disciplined but rigid preparatory school than a place where there was any ease, relaxation and real companionship between the older and younger men. . . .

One of the features of Mr Hewett's work which seems to me especially to be lamented is his influence on the young men whom he has gathered around him. Especially is this the case with Morley and Harrington, the two members, in addition to himself, of the scientific staff of the School. He is said to insist that each member of the staff should turn out six papers each year. These two men have, I think, succeeded in doing this but with questionable results. The papers naturally show the haste of preparation and often amazing immaturity in the treatment of the subject matter. The superficiality of Hewett's own work is to be seen in his writings especially in the article on "The groundwork of American Archaeology" (American Anthropologist, Vol. X, 1908, also published as the first paper of the School of American Archaeology). His thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Geneva shows also imperfect work. It is unnecessary at this time to comment on the amount and character of the work done by Hewett for this degree.

As for Hewett's standing among the American archaeologists I can say, I think, with truth that with the exception of certain people connected with the Bureau of Ethnology and the Smithsonian at Washington together with personal friends in the west there is not a person connected with a scientific institution in the country which is doing work in American anthropology who approves of Hewett's work. I refer, without permission however in every case, to Kroeber of the University
of California, Dorsey of the Field Museum of Chicago, Gordon of the University of Pennsylvania, Goddard and others of the American Museum of Natural History of New York, Boas of Columbia, and Putnam and Dixon of Harvard. These have all expressed at one time or another disapproval of the kind of work Hewett is doing.

The affiliation of the Washington people is easily to be explained by the fact that Hewett who, as I have said, is before everything a politician, has much influence with certain Senators and Congressmen and it is thought that he is thus able to play an important part in the yearly appropriation which makes possible the existence of the Bureau of Ethnology.

I have written thus in detail as I feel very strongly the evil effect of Hewett's work not only upon the good name of the Institute and of Archaeology in general but more especially on that of American Archaeology which has been endeavoring slowly to emerge from the rather forlorn state resulting from unscientific methods and untrained investigators...

Believe me

Sincerely yours

(Alfred M. Tozzer)

(Reproduced from a typed copy, with corrections in Tozzer's handwriting, unsigned, in the Charles P. Bowditch Papers, Peabody Museum Archives. The letter is reproduced here with the kind permission of the Peabody Museum Archives and Mrs. Joan Tozzer Cave.)

HARVARD UNIVERSITY HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY COLLOQUIUM

A Colloquium on the history of anthropology has been meeting since February in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Speakers so far have included:

March 12 Ben Finney (University of Hawaii), "Wind, Sea and Stars: Recreating Ancient Polynesian Navigation"

March 19 Stephen Williams (Harvard University), "The BAE Mound Exploration Division, 1881-1891"

April 2 Michael Hammond (University of Toronto), "Combat Anthropology and Evolutionary Thinking in Late 19th Century France: DeMortillet and His Opponents"

April 2 Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr. (Colgate University), "Digging and Trenching for the 'Boston Men': F. W. Putnam and the Debate over Ancient Man in New Jersey and Ohio, 1875-1900"

April 9 Joan Mark (Harvard University), "Early Studies of American Indian Music"
April 16  Joy Harvey (Harvard University), "Société de'Anthropologie de Paris as a Focus for International Communications on Biological Anthropology"

April 30  Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr. (Colgate University), "'Please Call Me Alfred': The Bowditch-Tozzer Friendship and the Development of Peabody Anthropology, 1900-1920"

May 7  Tina McChesney and Ed Wade (Harvard University), "Early American Anthropology and the Hemenway Expedition"

May 14  Byron Harvey, "H. R. Voth and the Artifacts of Culture"

The colloquium will continue in the fall. If you plan to be in the Cambridge area, please write to History of Anthropology Colloquium, c/o Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge 02138. Participants in history, anthropology, history of science, and related fields are welcome to attend, or to suggest paper topics.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Robert Bieder will be teaching at the University of Mainz during the coming year, and will carry out research on nineteenth century German-speaking ethnologists of the American Indian.

Richard Burghart (Department of Anthropology and Sociology, School of Oriental and African Studies, London) is engaged in research on the professionalization of fieldwork in British anthropology, using manuscript sources in London and Cambridge to study the work of Seligman, Malinowski, Madel and others in the period between 1880 and 1940.

Lester Embree (Professor of Philosophy, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh) is using questionnaires and other methods to carry on studies of "research groups" within anthropology—e.g., "ethnoscientific" and "the new archeology"—as part of a broader project which combines phenomenology and approaches of the human sciences (in the manner of the "new philosophy of science") in order to elucidate the development of science through the study of concrete cases.

Victor Golla (Professor of Anthropology, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.) is using manuscript and other sources to study the development of Edward Sapir's ideas on linguistic interrelationships, typology and the psychology of language.

Greg Marlowe (Doctoral Candidate in History, University of California, Santa Barbara) has National Science Foundation support for research on "W. F. Libby and the Development of Radiocarbon Dating, the Nascent Years, 1945-1954: A Case Study in Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration." The project will use manuscript sources and taped interviews to investigate Libby's early contacts with archeologists and their response to the introduction of the new dating method.
Joan Mark (Research Associate, Peabody Museum, Harvard University) is at work on a biography of Alice C. Fletcher, nineteenth century American ethnographer of the Omaha Indians.

Donald J. C. Phillipson (Hall's Rd., Carlsbad Springs, Ontario) is doing research on the history of the scientific community in Canada, 1882-1962, with attention to the development of new disciplines, including linguistics and the role of Edward Sapir.

Jay Ruby (Professor of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia) is doing research on the history of visual anthropology, focusing on the work of Franz Boas. Ruby is also interested in the use of dioramas in museums at the turn of the century, and in the use of live performers at various international expositions.

Britta Rupp-Eisenreich (Maître-assistant à l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris) is doing research on the specific features and conditions of the emergence of ethnology in German-speaking countries from the eighteenth century to 1885.

William Schneider (Department of History, University of North Carolina, Wilmington) is continuing his research on the Anthropological Society of Paris and anthropology in international exhibitions in the late nineteenth century.

Alexander Spoehr (Emeritus Professor of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh) is doing research on the men in the Pacific Islands area who provided Lewis Henry Morgan with information for his Systems of Consanguinity.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. THE POTLATCH AS EXEMPLAR OF AN HISTORICAL THEORY OF SCIENCE

Signe Seiler (University of Mainz) has just published a book entitled Wissenschaftstheorie in der Ethnologie: zur Kritik und weiterführung der Theorie von Thomas S. Kuhn an hand ethnographischen Materials (Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin, 1980). Mainzer Ethnologica Band I. Using the earlier work of the Frankfort School (Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas) to develop the paradigmatic theory of Thomas Kuhn into an "historical theory of science," Seiler chooses as an example the history of North American cultural anthropology. The substantial core of the book centers on an analysis of the literature pertaining to the potlatch festival of the Indians of the Northwest Coast of Canada. The potlatch has previously been interpreted as a product of historical events, as the expression of an independent psychic configuration, and as part of a culturally-oriented ecological system of adaptation. Seiler's analysis aims to determine how, in addition to the "objective" description of reality, metaphysical and social assumptions predetermined the structure of investigation. The conventional theory structure has been questioned from both a scientifically theoretical viewpoint and from that of ethnology (e.g., Hymes, Scholte, Berreman, Gough, Diamond, Wolf, Despres,
and Worsley). Seiler's goal is reflected in her closing demand for new research techniques and new theoretical approaches which will lead to new insights.

II. POLISH WRITINGS ON AND BY BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI

Peter Skalnik, of the Institute of Cultural and Social Studies, University of Leiden, is editing an English translation of some of Malinowski's anthropological writings in the Polish language, along with writings on Malinowski, some of which have previously appeared in Polish publications. Among the latter are:


III. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS


IV. RECENT DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS


V. SUGGESTED BY OUR READERS

Bell, Michael J. "The Relation of Mentality to Race: William Wells Newell and the Celtic Hypothesis." American Journal of Folklore 92 (1979): 25-43. [Examines Newell's attack on the accepted Celtic origin of Arthurian romance (which Newell considered a sub-species of the Aryan hypothesis) indicating that the campaign against evolutionism associated with Boas (with whom Newell shared intellectual and professional interests), came from several quarters--J.R.H.]

Boon, James A. "Comparative De-enlightenment: Paradox and Limits in the History of Ethnology." Daedalus (Spring 1980): 73-91. [Anthropological ideas during the Enlightenment, from the perspective that "knowledge of other cultures and eras depends on the cultures and eras doing the knowing" (p. 89). Minor correction: Patagonians (here Tehuelche)#Puegians (here Yahgan)--W.C.S.]


Lundbeek, Torben and Henning Dehn-Nielsen, eds. Det Indianske Kammer (Copenhaven: Nationalmuseet, 1979), 71 pp. 25 Kr. [Beautifully illustrated, undocumented. To accompany a temporary exhibition of objects from the Royal Cabinet of Curiosities; articles on the history of the Cabinet (Dam-Mikkelsen), on conservation work (Schmidt), and on the ff. early collections in it: Turkish weapons (Flindt), Indonesian items (Wulff), Greenlandic items, especially two paintings (Meldgaard), Brazilian featherwork (Due), Chinese items (Justesen)--W.C.S.]


the misuse by archaeologists of Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Metzler argues that the changes in archaeological method and design of the 1960s "were wholly commensurate with the metaphysics of the previous 'paradigm,'" and concludes that "There has been no revolution in archaeology"—J.R.H.


GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS


Cheiron (June 19-21, 1980, Bowdoin College). Among the papers scheduled to be given is one by F. Neil Brady (Brigham Young University) on "Whitehead's Influence on Radcliffe-Brown."