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NOTES ON A PARTIALLY CHARTED INTELLECTUAL TERRAIN

Our attempt to define an intellectual topography of HAN readers (via the questionnaire sent last September) has met with only partial success. So far, we have received 67 responses to 160 questionnaires. The rate is thus 42 percent (or 51 percent, if one disregards 29 sent to lapsed subscribers), which is not very good for a group which is not randomly, but self-selected. Of those 67, 20 (or 30 percent) define themselves as historians, 39 (or 58 percent) as anthropologists, and 8 (or 12 percent) as some variety of others (sociologists, philosophers, biographers). Seventy-five percent of the historians and 41 percent of the anthropologists have published at least one article in the history of anthropology—a measure of serious research interest that does not include a number of recent Ph.D.s whose research is in the history of anthropology, but who have not yet published.

The more recent of the published items are listed in the Bibliographica Arcana of this number. However, we are not including any other information from our “topography”, because we hope we will be receiving many more responses. Those who did not respond last time will find another copy of the questionnaire with this number of HAN. Please take the time to fill it out and return it, and we will attempt in future numbers to present the results in both tabular and directory form. (G.W.S.)

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

I. ARCHIVES OF THE PEABODY MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

C. M. Hinsley, Jr.
Colgate University

During the past year the Peabody Museum has taken the first steps toward organizing its disparate and very rich holdings in the history of the Museum, Harvard anthropology, and American anthropology more generally. Sally Bond, the cataloguer of the Museum, has gathered most materials in a central, protected location, and it is hoped that over the next few years outside funding will permit further development of the Archives. In the meantime researchers wishing to use the materials listed below should inform Ms. Bond well in advance of any planned trip, so that proper arrangements can be made.

The archival materials of the Peabody Museum fall into several general categories: 1) records of the Institution; 2) papers of individuals, including field notes, maps, correspondence, etc.; 3) the Museum's accession files, which contain written materials regarding specific collections; 4) records of the Carnegie Institute of Washington and those of the American Society for Prehistoric Research.

1. Most of the Museum's official records from its founding in 1866 are in the Peabody Museum Papers in Harvard University Archives (Pusey Library). However, the early letterbooks (1868-1880) and the daily log of activities, visitors and accessions up to about 1900 are
in the Museum Archives, as are some original Trustee minutes and all accession catalogues. In addition, correspondence of Directors since World War II is at the Museum.

2. The Archives contain some correspondence, notes, etc., from virtually every anthropologist who has been connected with the Museum over the past century, but major collections include: J. O. Brew, Sam Lothrop, F. W. Putnam, Donald Scott, John Ladd, Sylvanus Morley, H. J. Spinden, A. M. Tozzer, Lloyd Cabot Briggs, Henry Ware Eliot, Jr., E. A. Hooton, David I. Bushnell, Jr., and Charles P. Bowditch.

3. The Museum's accession files remain an invaluable historical resource stretching back to the first year. These contain correspondence, diagrams, maps, and other descriptive material relating to specific accessions, arranged by year. While they are well indexed, the accession files constantly yield surprises. Last year, for example, I stumbled upon a file of the 1940s which contained considerable correspondence relating to the 1909 murder of William Jones, the Sac-Fox Indian who was a Boas-trained Harvard student, along with rare photos of Jones as a student. The accession files should be a first stop for most investigations into the history of Peabody/Harvard anthropology and figures associated with it.

4. The anthropology program of the Carnegie Institute of Washington, which went forward in the Yucatan under Sylvanus Morley and Alfred Kidder from 1914 until after World War II, was closely associated with the Peabody Museum. The original maps, diaries (including Morley's diaries), and field notebooks of the men and women of the Carnegie Institute have come to the Museum as an important element of its archival holdings. Also, the Archives include some records of the American School for Prehistoric Research, founded by Mr. and Mrs. George Grant MacCurdy in 1921 and operative until the early 1950s, when it became part of the Peabody Museum.

It should be stressed that this is only a partial account, as new materials are being discovered regularly. More importantly, most of the Peabody's archives have not ever been used by scholars and are generally not organized for such use. When fully prepared and protected, the Peabody Museum Archives will present a major new addition to resources in the history of anthropology.

II. PAPERS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

The papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, founded in Boston by Charles Eliot Norton in 1879 (and running to about 1950), are in the temporary custody of Curtis Hinsley at Colgate University. Hinsley will be studying and ordering the papers, and preparing them for permanent archival storage.
FOOTNOTES TO THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

JULIAN STEWARD AND THE RISE OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY

Joseph Hanc
University of Chicago

Anthropologists have rarely had occasion to relate their work to the history of anthropology. Marvin Harris's book The Rise of Anthropological Theory presented Julian H. Steward with an occasion to do so. His congratulatory letter to Harris, reproduced below, can be taken as Steward's own account of the history of his anthropology. Steward's reminiscences of Kroeber and of the intellectually catalytic effect of his field work confirm two well-circulated anecdotes (Manners 1973:889; Steward and Murphy 1977:6). His dismissal of Carl Sauer eliminates one proposed influence on his thinking (Manners 1964:2). His acquaintance with Marx suggests that the "reinvention" of Marxist principles claimed for Steward merits more systematic scrutiny than it has yet received (Harris 1968:665; see Legros 1977).

The most interesting thing about this letter, though, is its tone. Until rather late in his career Steward saw great continuity in the history of American anthropology. To his mind his work represented "a diversification of the [Boas] tradition, not a break with it" (1955b:323). But Steward was clearly impressed with Harris's argument that cultural ecology should be placed in opposition to the work of the early Boasians. That this book led him to "ponder some of [his] past statements" suggests that he now saw his work in this light. Indeed, at the very end of his life Steward noted that the "scientific" quality of historical particularism lay in "precise scholarship and constant empiricism rather than in a purpose or method" (1973:viii). Rather than stand as the final word on Steward and the Boasians, this should serve as a reminder of the extent to which the contrast between them may be construed as a retrospective imposition.

The following document (a carbon copy) may be found in Box 3 of the Julian H. Steward papers at the archive of the University Library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (see Hanc 1979 for details). Titles are not highlighted in the Urbana draft. Underscoring for books and journals and the citation marks setting off articles have been added. All references to Steward's works (except Steward 1973 and 1977) have been keyed to the bibliography in Manners 1973. Steward's citations of Kroeber's work are amplified in Steward 1973:52. I would like to thank Jane C. Steward for permission to reproduce this letter.

Fithian, Ill(inois)
March 8, 1969

Dear Marvin:

I just got hold of your monumental book and hasten to congratulate you on a terrific job, even before I have more than scanned it. You are more than generous to me and make me ponder some of my past statements.
I am writing, however, not only to congratulate you on developing the basics of anthropology but to tell you a little of the early background you could not have known, especially to give you a few asides to your section on Kroeber and Steward.

As a student of Kroeber and Lowie, my first year, 1925-6, was loaded with area courses which lacked anything nomothetic. Despite the Boasian orientation of Kroeber and Lowie, which I did not know at that time, I entered anthropology hoping to find a means of explaining cultural development. At the end of the first year I asked Kroeber when I would learn about explanation, upon which he said in some horror, "What do you mean? I deal with cultural phenomena, not explanations." Lowie was actually far more sympathetic to my interests, as shown by his support of my still unpublished thesis "The Ceremonial Buffoon of the American Indian" [1931b] which ventured reductionism in tracing recurrent themes of humor to inherent human psychological constants or potentials. Kroeber argued vigorously against my endeavor.

It was not until the early thirties, when I turned attention to primitive bands and did field work in the Great Basin that cultural ecology became an inescapable concept. It took years to sell this, however, and I well remember a long evening with Linton attempting to explain it only to be answered with "Environmental Determinism has long since been abandoned."

I was very much alone in my view during this period, and when the Handbook [of South American Indians, 1946c] fell into my lap there was not a chance of organizing it in other than traditional area terms. In fact, this organization carried over into Native People of South America [1959c] far more than I recognized, and many teachers, I am told, have trouble with it as a text because students try to see it organized in evolutionary terms. I am trying to clear up this matter in a Festschrift article [1970b].

Of course I was overwhelmed by Kroeber's erudition and in my OB(ituary) [1962a] I tried to treat him kindly. My point about his anticipation of problems and even hypotheses is that he did again and again amass data only to stop short of drawing any conclusions. For example, in his "Primary and Secondary Features of Australian Social Organization" [possibly Kroeber 1938] the nature of his distinction implies causality. His several pages comparing Old and New World achievements in Anthropology [1948] lays out rather precise parallels but then stops. I think you would say of these and other cases that the pull of the Boasian relativism was too great.

Your speculation about how I got that way is only partly correct. First, I was interested in causes before I really got into anthropology and was quite disturbed that Kroeber repudiated this interest. Second, the key factor of the national intellectual climate was the depression which started after I finished my studies at Berkeley in 1928. I had taught at Michigan two years, 1928-30, and Utah 3 years (1930-33), by the time the depression became so acute that everyone was asking Why?, and thinking generally took a sharp Marxist turn. It was during the
thirties that Columbia became a communist cell far more than people knew, and, curiously, many adopted the political and economic orientations yet remained thorough-going relativists in their anthropological work. I too read Marx and others but it was dangerous to proclaim a Marxian po(s)ition.

Carl Sauer contributed nothing to my thinking. He has always been no more than an intellectual iconoclast, bent on baiting anthropologists, whatever their views. In fact, geography has never gotten off the ground intellectually.

I should add that I am still unhappy about evolutionism, mainly because it is still fraught with confusion. I did not think of myself as a cultural evolutionist until Kroeber suggested a paper on the subject for the Wenner-Gren World Conference of 1952 [1953d]. I accepted the designation but tried to adapt the concept. How many is "multi" [see Harris 1968:656] is unimportant, for two or more different lines is more than one. The important thing, as I have suggested in an article in Christian Century [1967b] is that qualitatively new forms emerge from old ones for potentially identifiable reasons.

Some time ago I abandoned Wittfogel's irrigation hypothesis. My review [1966] in Science of Adams' Urban Society [1966] was one statement on this. In an unpublished paper I have gone beyond Adams in attempting to formulate the preconditions in terms of closely placed and interrelated, interdependent microenvironments [1977].

Enough for now. I wish I had the chance to discuss this with you, especially some of the substantive applications. Your book cheers me up because the confusions of the New Anthropology, which seem to me to consist mostly of a jargon, are rather depressin(g).

Best

Julian H. Steward

Forgive the typing. A stroke a few years ago raise(d) hell with my coordination


Less than four months before his death in February, 1939, the brilliant American linguistic anthropologist Edward Sapir wrote what may be regarded as his last will and testament on the study of culture and personality—a subject to which he himself had contributed much of the fundamental theoretical groundwork over the preceding two decades. The occasion itself is indicative: then Sterling Professor at Yale, Sapir was responding to an unsolicited manuscript on culture and personality theory sent to him by a nineteen year old graduate of City College—the honors essay of Philip Selznick, now professor of Law and Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. Sapir nevertheless took time for a considered response which expressed in a condensed and almost epigrammatic fashion viewpoints that might have gone into his never-finished book on "The Psychology of Culture." Although the methodological points were more extensively sketched (in some cases in very similar language) in an article published the preceding year in the American Journal of Sociology on "The Contribution of Psychiatry to an Understanding of Behavior in Society," the more informal context of the letter elicited reflections on related matters which are extremely suggestive. Sapir's comments on the unconscious psychological motivation of more extreme advocates of cultural relativity, as well as his thoughts on "the law of diminishing returns" in anthropology, may still today provoke both the historian's imagination and the anthropologist's self-reflective consciousness of the historical development of the discipline.

The letter is reproduced here (with the elision of one personal passage) by the kind permission of Professor Selznick and Professor J. David Sapir. (G.W.S.)
Mr. Philip S. Selznick,
3099 Brighton 6th Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Selznick,

I have read your essay with very great interest and am returning it to you under another cover. I believe that you have assimilated the culture and personality point of view very successfully. I find myself in substantial agreement with you at practically every point and I sincerely hope that you are planning to deepen your acquaintance with the problems suggested.

While the point of view which you discuss has largely been advanced by what might be described as the radical wing of anthropology, I believe that further work in this field, if it is to be truly significant and not merely philosophical in tone, is destined to come largely from those that are immediately concerned with psychiatric reality, that is from people who take seriously problems of personality organization and development. Practically, this means that the younger people like yourself who aim to contribute significantly to a clarification of problems of personality and culture should plunge boldly into personality problems. Specific cultural problems are of course of the greatest value, but I have come to feel that the law of diminishing returns operates rather quickly in anthropology. I mean to say that such ideas as cultural relativity and psychological reinterpretation of cultural forms are assimilated readily enough by an intelligent person on the basis of a comparatively slight knowledge of the ethnographic field. An extended knowledge of exotic cultures deepens of course our sense of cultural history, but it does not, after a certain point of sophistication has been reached, help very much with the clarification of the more fundamental question of the meaning of personality organization in cultural terms. Psychiatric insight can, I feel, not be obtained by the mere reading of a great deal of literature. Clinical experience and a patient analysis of actual case material are indispensable.

I judge from a number of passages in your essay that you share my feeling that there is danger of the growth of a certain scientific mythology in anthropological circles with regard to the psychological interpretation of culture. I believe this comes out most clearly in Ruth Benedict's book, "Patterns of Culture". Unless I misunderstand the direction of her thinking and of the thinking of others who are under her influence, there is altogether too great readiness to translate psychological analogies into psychological realities. I do not like the glib way in which many talk of such and such a culture as "paranoid" or what you will. It would be my intention to bring out clearly, in a book that I have still to write, the extreme methodological importance of distinguishing between actual psycholo-
gical processes which are of individual location and presumptive or "as if" psychological pictures which may be abstracted from cultural phenomena and which may give significant direction to individual development. To speak of a whole culture as having a personality configuration is, of course, a pleasing image, but I am afraid that it belongs more to the order of aesthetic or poetic constructs than of scientific ones.

The only critical reaction that I have had in reading your pages is a certain misgiving as to whether you were not stretching the idea of cultural relativity too much. Like many young people who are obviously exhilarated by symbols of revolt and seem to tend to fear the establishment of universals in behavior, you tend to hold off the establishment of the "normal" as much as possible. I am sure that this is a healthy tendency at the beginning of one's scientific career, but I think you will find that it may lead in the long run to superficiality. In this very sphere patient psychiatric work is destined to give us a more and more profound respect for the recognition of certain fundamental normalities regardless of cultural differences. Meanwhile it is perfectly true that anthropology has had a healthy effect in forcing the psychiatrist not to identify his ill-defined conception of normality with specific cultural forms. It will be our not too easy task to redefine normality on a broader cultural and psychiatric basis. There is one point that may possibly not have escaped your observation, and that is that there is often an unconscious or at least an unacknowledged motive for the denial of normalities which transcend the compulsions of culture. . . . One could write a very interesting paper on the usefulness of the concept of cultural relativity as a sophisticated form of what the psychiatrist somewhat brutally refers to as a flight from reality. Certainly this is not the whole story, but I have come to feel that there is far more in it than a liberal intelligence might wish to grant in the first place.

Anyway, I want to congratulate you on your intelligent grasp of the problems that you discuss and to thank you for giving me the opportunity of reading your interesting essay. Under another cover I am sending you a few reprints that you may be interested in.

Yours sincerely,

Edward Sapir

ES:MZ

CORRECTION(S).

We apologize for a number of errors of proof-reading in HAN VII:1. Gallatin's Synopsis (p. 5) was published in 1836, not 1846 as printed. In addition, there were some minor mistakes in German, Danish and Russian entries in the Bibliographica Arcana. We will try to avoid errors in the future, but make no guarantees.
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

James Boon (Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University) is completing a book entitled Other Tribes, Other Scribes: Meaning and Method in Semiotic Anthropology, which will include material on ethnography in historical perspective.

Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz (Folklore Department, University of Pennsylvania) is doing doctoral research on Jaime de Angulo, who was a linguist, anthropologist, and folklorist trained by Boas, Sapir, and Kroeber, and active in California Indian linguistics in the 1920s and 1930s.

Grant McCall (School of Sociology, University of New South Wales) is conducting a survey of all departments of anthropology in Australia for a special fiftieth anniversary number of Mankind, in which there will also be contributions by a number of anthropologists about their involvement in Australian anthropology during this period.

Kathleen Mooney (Department of Anthropology, University of Victoria) is working on a biography of George Hunt, who served as the informant and collaborator for Franz Boas and other ethnographers of British Columbia.

Timothy Stroup (Professor of Philosophy, City University of New York, John Jay College), has received A.C.L.S. support for an intellectual biography of Edward Westermarck.

Robert Thornton (Lecturer in Anthropology, University of Capetown) is carrying on research on "The Early Ethnography of Eastern and Southern Africa, 1880-1920: The Rise of a New Genre," focusing on the work of John Roscoe and H. A. Junod.

Lynn Varner (graduate student, University of New Mexico) is doing a study of the photography of Jesse Nusbaum, who accompanied Sylvanus Morley on field-trips sponsored by the Archeological Institute of America between 1908 and 1914.

Yves Winkin (Research Fellow, Belgian National Science Foundation) is working on an analysis of the "invisible college" that developed the "structural approach" to communication in the 1950s: Birdwhistell, Goffman, Hall, etc. (as an introduction to a reader to be published next May in Paris).

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS


________, and Elaine Jahner, eds. Lakota Belief and Ritual, by James R. Walker (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1980) [includes lengthy introduction concerning Walker's collaborative work with Clark Wissler and reproduces texts of materials Walker collected while working for Wissler and the American Museum].


Porter, J. S. "John Gregory Bourke: Biographical Notes." Appendix to Carol Condie, "Vocabulary of the Apache or 'Inde' Language of Arizona and New Mexico. Collected by John G. Bourke in the 1870s and 1880s" (Greeley: University of Northern Colorado Museum of Anthropology, 1980)


II. RECENT DISSERTATIONS


Hetler, Carol. "Otis Tufton Mason and the Organizing of Washington Anthropology, 1870-1895" (George Washington University, 1978, Anthropology M.A.)

Peirano, Mariza G. S. "The Anthropology of Anthropology: The Brazilian Case" (Harvard University, 1980, Anthropology Ph.D.)


III. SUGGESTED BY OUR READERS


Miller, R. Berkeley. "Anthropology and Institutionalization: Frederick Starr at the University of Chicago, 1892-1923," Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Numbers 51 and 52 [nominally 1975, actually appearing Fall, 1979--based on materials in the Special Collections Department, Regenstein Library --G.W.S.]


[Guide to Suggesting Readers Identified by Initials in the Last Few Numbers:

A.H.-G. = Anna Hohenwart-Gerlachstein
C.M.H. = Curtis M. Hinsley
G.W.S. = George W. Stocking
J.R.H. = Joseph R. Hanc
R.D.F. = Raymond D. Fogelson
R.W. = Robert Wokler
W.C.S. = William C. Sturtevant

IV. MORTON'S M.D. THESIS

Frank Spencer has recently completed a translation (from the Latin) of the M.D. thesis (De Corpore Dolore) written by the American physical anthropologist Samuel George Morton at the University of Edinburgh, 1823. Interested scholars may arrange to consult both original text and translation by writing to Spencer at the Department of Anthropology, Queens College, Flushing, New York 11367.

GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS


American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Fiftieth Anniversary. On December 11 and 12, 1980, a symposium organized by Noel Boaz and Frank Spencer was scheduled to be held at the University of Virginia with the title "American Physical Anthropology Fifty Years after Charlotte." The listed speakers included Elwyn Simons ("Paleoprimatological Research: Foci and Trends"), Noel Boaz ("History of Paleoanthropology"),

There will also be a symposium "On the History of American Physical Anthropology, 1930-1980" at the A.A.P.A. meeting in Detroit next April.


ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cheiron--The 13th Annual meeting of Cheiron, The International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, will be held June 10-13, 1981, at the University of Wisconsin, River Falls, Wisconsin (near the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport). Papers, proposals for symposia, workshops, etc. may be submitted up until February 1, 1980, to the Program Chairman, Dr. Theodora J. Kalikow, Department of Philosophy, Southeastern Massachusetts University, North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747, U.S.A. All materials must be submitted in five copies. Papers should be approximately seven double-spaced typewritten pages, and will be subject to a process of blind reviewing. George W. Stocking (University of Chicago) will give an invited talk on "Books Unwritten, Turning Points Unmarked: Notes for the Anti-History of a Social Scientific Discipline." Inquiries as to local arrangements should be directed to Dr. Donald Charpentier, Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, Wisconsin 54022.