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FACE-LIFTING HAN

Our new cover design (layout by David James on the basis of suggestions from G.W.S.) incorporates the figurine chosen as the logo for the XVIth International Congress of the History of Science, in Bucharest, Romania (August 1981). Recovered from the Cemovodă necropolis in Romania dating from 5000-3000 B.C., the exquisitely pensive figure, poised on the aesthetic balance point between the "primitive" and the "modern," evokes a universal attitude of retrospective self-reflection particularly appropriate for a newsletter in the history of anthropology.

FORTHCOMING INTELLECTUAL TOPOGRAPHY

Due to the length of this issue, and the fact that the response to last fall's questionnaire still includes only slightly more than two-thirds of our total active individual subscribers, we are postponing the presentation of the resulting data for one more issue. If there is a red mark in the margin to the left, it means that we have not yet received a completed questionnaire from you. Drop us a note, and we will be glad to send along another copy of the questionnaire.

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

I. ADDITIONAL REDFIELD MATERIALS

The Special Collections Department of the Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, has received further materials relating to the life and career of Robert Redfield, as well as the papers of his wife Margaret Park Redfield. The former include especially documents relating to Redfield's family background, childhood, experiences in World War I, and his anthropological career prior to 1930, as well as numerous photographic materials. In addition to correspondence with her husband and letters relating to the biography of her father (the sociologist Robert Park), Mrs. Redfield's papers include materials produced in the course of her own anthropological research. Brief descriptive catalogues have been prepared.

II. MARGARET MEAD PAPERS

Margaret Rossiter reports having been informed by the Library of Congress that the bulk of the papers of Margaret Mead were received by the Library in three installments during 1980. Ac. 17,788 (Ca. 350,000 items) includes correspondence, memoranda, financial papers, writings, reports, printed matter, notes and notebooks, minutes of meetings, itineraries, and other papers, dating from 1924 to 1979. Ac. 18,046 (Ca. 275,000 items) includes correspondence, subject files, writings, motion picture film, audio tapes, photographs, notes, printed material, and other papers comprising additional papers of Margaret Mead; field material; papers of colleagues including Rhoda Metraux and Gregory Bateson; and project files. Ac. 18,060 (Ca. 300 items) includes chiefly family papers and correspondence, school notebooks, scrapbooks, clippings, printed matter, and other
papers, dating from 1880-1972. Smaller additions are expected in the future. Processing the papers will take at least a year; as yet there is not even a preliminary inventory. As a result, they will not be open for research for some time to come.

III. MICROFILM EDITION OF THE J. P. HARRINGTON PAPERS

Kraus Microform (Route 100, Millwood, New York) announces the publication of more than 750,000 pages of materials collected by the ethnologist John Peabody Harrington over his fifty year career. Housed in the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, the Harrington papers will be issued over a three-year period on more than 350 reels of microfilm organized in geographical units.

FOOTNOTES TO THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

INVISIBLE COLLEGIAL DISCUSSION AMONG THE SOCIAL EVOLUTIONISTS: J. F. MCLENNAN ON THE REDEFINITION OF CIVILIZATION AND PROGRESS

Some of the most cherished historical/theoretical categories of anthropology are to a large extent retrospectively constituted, with little appreciation of how the historical actors whom they associate terminologically may actually have interacted with one another—the extent to which they were in fact linked by invisible collegial relations, or the ways they may have exchanged ideas outside the medium of the printed word. Even so provocative a work as Burrow's Evolution and Society leaves us with no real sense of how E. B. Tylor, John Lubbock and J. F. McLennan (who are considered together in a chapter on the growth of anthropology) actually related to each other personally and intellectually. From this point of view, there is considerable interest in the short sequence of letters from McLennan to Lubbock written in the fall of 1867 (and briefly referred to in Peter Riviere's introduction to the reprinted edition of McLennan's Primitive Marriage).

The intellectual network which these letters evoke has both a hierarchical and a center/periphery structure. From what we know of his class background, national origins, and career pattern, it is not surprising to find McLennan in the role of outsider and petitioner. One is less prepared to find Lubbock (a figure of only secondary retrospective rank in the history of social anthropology) at the focal point. While Tylor, like Lubbock, might also be regarded as one of the "intellectual aristocracy" that emerged in Britain in the mid-nineteenth century, he spent most of his time in Somerset, and had neither the scientific nor the political connections which Lubbock could command.

Lubbock's contemporary status among biological scientists—signalized here by McLennan's attempt through him to include Huxley in the proposed cooperative project—suggests (contrary to Burrow) the overriding importance of the Darwinian context to McLennan's evolutionism, an inference supported also by McLennan's somewhat surprised dissatisfaction with his pre-evolutionary work on the Hill Tribes of India. The role of
Aufrecht (a German-born comparative linguist) is rather more problematic; perhaps he was to be the Scottish equivalent of Friedrich Max Müller.

From the point of view of intellectual content, the most suggestive aspect of the sequence is McLennan's proposed redefinition of the idea of civilization in social rather than cultural terms, as well as his attempt (stimulated by Lubbock) to achieve a more systematic treatment of the idea of progress. These were of course two of the points where evolutionary theory was most at the mercy of unexamined ethnocentric assumption, and while it seems unlikely that McLennan (a man who had no qualms accepting Victorian marriage norms as the basis for cross-cultural comparison) would have provided criteria that we would accept today, his concern does suggest a certain sensitivity at the methodological soft spot of Victorian evolutionism.

The letters, which form Add. 49640 of the papers of John Lubbock (Lord Avebury), are reproduced by permission of the British Library. Readers interested in the political linkages of this intellectual network may wish to consult the letter of January 6, 1870 in Add. 49641 (unreproduced here for reasons of space), in which McLennan asked Lubbock to use any influence he might have with Gladstone to secure him a position as Queen's Remembrancer. To clarify McLennan's "tentative scheme" we have, however, reprinted a later version of the chart which he suggests inspired it. (G.W.S.)

South Park
Reigate 12 Sept. 67

Dear Sir,

Some months ago, when I was very busy pushing a book thro' the press, I received ... your book on Prehistoric Man which I had previously read with much interest & profit. I called at Messrs Williams & Norgate in Edinbr ... but I could not learn by whose direction it had been sent. Pardon me presuming to think it may have been sent by you.

The inquiries in which you are engaged are to me most interesting & I am longing for the time when I can myself resume studies ... in a cognate branch of early human history. Circumstances, however, have of late been against my making progress. I have now had the materials for a paper on "Exogamy in Ancient Greece" by me for two years ... I am able, however, at odd times to read what appears bearing on early history & I have been watching with special interest for all that issues from your own pen and that of Mr. Tylor. If you print your late address to the British Association -- of which I have seen merely the imperfect abstract in the "Scotsman"--I shall deem it a great favour if you let me have a copy ... In return I shall be most happy when I get back to Edinburgh to forward to you some papers of mine.

I am, Dear Sir, Yrs. truly,

J. F. M'Lennan
Dear Sir John,

South Park  
Reigate  
11 Oct. 67

Your note of the 9th addressed to me at Edinburgh has just found me here. . . . The paper which I think I could prepare without much trouble is "A Note on the Disposal of the Dead"—but this is a mere impression as I have not at present with me any of my note-books bearing on these subjects. I shall be in Edinburgh on Tuesday . . . & let you know. The suggestion for the proposed note lies in an article "Hill Tribes in India" which I wrote for the North British Review in 1862 or spring of 1863. I trust I may find the materials up to my recollection of them which is that they give a singular proof or at least indication of development in regard to customs usually sacred and unchanging.

Having got-out-of-hand the work which occupied me here I have been employed for the last three days on the paper which I shd be most anxious to bring out through yr society [the Ethnological Society of London], viz: "A Tentative View of Human Progress". I have been thinking over it at intervals for a year back, & possibly it may take me another year to adjust it. Indeed my impression is that the final adjustment must be the work of several persons, in other words that it ought to be a joint work altogether. When I have got far enough on with it to submit it to you, perhaps you will be good enough to consider whether between yourself & Huxley in the South and Professor Aufrecht (an excellent philologist) & myself in Edinburgh, a tentative scheme might not be adjusted which might serve for some years to come as a guide for enquiry in regard to the history of the race—at the same time that it would mark for the time the results of such enquiry as has been made. It wd. be too long a story to explain to you the conception I have formed of the way in which the view should be presented. I can only say that I am aiming at the formation of a table with a classification of stages of progress depending on the grouping [sic]—the table exhibiting all the stages of progress in the Arts & Sciences etc. that have been found concurring with each phase of the development of social organization. The post I find is just going out.

Believe me very sincerely yours,

J. F. M'Lennan
My dear Sir John,

... My fit of work on the tentative scheme is interrupted as I find law-work waiting for me. But I trust soon to be able to resume it, when I shall submit my views to you. It seems to me that to solve the difficulty you point out a new or sharper definition of Civilization must be hit upon. The word, which has its root in civis, wd appear to denote grouping before anything else. I mean that is the leading idea among the several ideas which it connotes. The relations of these ideas to one another & the precise definition which, for scientific use, shd be given to the word, may, however, not clearly appear till considerable progress has been made in tabulating the states of progress in the different fields. This is why any attempt we could now make must be strictly regarded as tentative merely.

I send you Major (now Col.) M'Culloch's report on the Hill Tribes round Munnipore; also "Kinship in Ancient Greece" --a short paper on the form of capture which I wrote last spring for a light literary periodical. The latter paper will show you the progress made in collecting examples of the form up to its date.

... The good Williams I find is Thomas Williams "Fiji & Fijians 1858". The bad I think is "20 Years of a Missionary Life in Polynesia."

We are on a visit for a few days at a house a little out of town & I can find no paper here but this sheet. I shall look up the materials for the Note on Burials today.

Excuse this letter as want of sleep has left me very stupid.

Yrs very sincerely

J. F. M'Lennan

22 Hill Street
Edinbr 28 Oct. 1967

Dear Sir John

I find I cannot send you the Note on the disposal of the dead. We are in what is called here "Sacrament Week"; our libraries have been closed since Wednesday last... . This it is that has thrown me out, as I have not reexamined my references. The Note relates to the modes of disposing of the dead which are transitional between Exposure and Inhumation. I hope to furnish the paper sometime hereafter.
I am also laying aside my "tentative scheme," of which I now suspect the suggestion was derived from yr table at p. 447. This I had forgotten till I met it again on rereading your book, which I have just lately done. My topheading, corresponding to the column on the left of yr table, is 2 yards long in manuscript—the entries ranging from Marriage, property & succession, etc., etc., to the Arts of Subsistence, Defense & Amusement, and being classed & subclassed so as to appear in the order of their probable development. This heading, on revising it sometime after this, I shall have printed & sent out for opinions.

Putting business etc. aside I am now settling to a paper on "Exogamy in Ancient Greece" which I fancy will occupy me for the winter. I sent you a copy of the "Kinship". Shd you read it wd like much to know what you think of the argument.

I was shocked on reading "Hill Tribes in India" to find it abominably poor & bad. It was a first draft, was printed from the draft & published without proof being sent to me and I never saw it since it appeared till the other day. I beg you not to read it or mention it to any one.

I trust you are all well. With my best compliments to Lady Lubbock & your brothers believe me yours very truly

J. F. M'Lennan

[Chart from Lubbock's Prehistoric Times, 2nd ed., p. 541]
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

I. ETHNOGRAPHERS IMPERIAL: ANTHROPOLOGY
AND BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

Charles Morrison
Michigan State University

[The following condensation of a longer research proposal is printed here with an eye to encouraging comment; Dr. Morrison plans to initiate the research on an SSRC grant in England this summer. G.W.S.]

District officers of the Raj were frequently required to produce detailed reports on social, cultural, and political conditions of a kind nowadays the province of academic specialists in the social sciences. Much of this administrative reporting was theoretically unsophisticated; but much of it reflects at least some familiarity with the intellectual traditions of the social sciences as they existed at the time, and Marx, Weber, Spencer, and Durkheim all made use of the reports on castes, tribes, and Indian social customs that British administrators produced so copiously. But what ethnological information did colonial servants perceive as relevant to their work? How did their personal and official interests affect the collection and presentation of that information? Especially, how did the imperial enterprise of ethnography connect with the academic enterprise of anthropology in centers of learning in Britain during the first half of this century? To the extent that the latter relationship has been studied previously, the flow of influence has been regarded as predominantly one-directional, outward to empire, rather than reciprocal; and although the racist implication of anthropology's relationship with colonial rule has been the subject of much polemic since the 1960s, the institutional contexts of the relationship and the ways changing colonial and academic polities affected each other in the study of Indian society during the Raj have not been much examined.

One hypothesis to be tested in this research is the idea that during the last fifty years of British rule in India, ethnological information occupied a different and more ambiguous place in district and provincial administrations than it had in the nineteenth century. Such information was always of some bureaucratic concern; but by the 1920s, much of its compilation had become routine; its use was increasingly remote from what B. S. Cohn has argued was the original nineteenth century one of symbolically strengthening the legitimacy of British rule through an elaborate categorization of native subjects. In the eyes of the majority of twentieth century district administrators, the Victorian forerunners had done the ethnographic work so thoroughly that little more than an occasional updating of figures seemed necessary. The problem of why the job has been done so thoroughly in the first place continues to invite academic explanation: was it that the training and outlook of Victorian civil servants predisposed them to the collection of such material; or did the issues and policies of nineteenth century administration themselves necessitate its collection; or was it simply that native recruitment to the lower echelons so facilitated these undertakings as to engender them under some variant of Parkinson's law? Whatever the reasons, the best imperial ethnography in the nineteenth century seems to have been
done as a central part of routine administration. In the twentieth century, the ethnographic enterprise was often an individualistic one, carried out on the margins of administration; the ever tiny minority of district officers who were intellectually disposed to inquire into native customs sought rather different literary forms for the expression of these interests.

In part, the change reflected the burgeoning professionalization of anthropology in the centers of learning at home where the administrators had been trained and where some anthropological ideas were gaining a small measure of popular currency; paradoxically, this new academic outlook encouraged individualistic investigation and a holistic viewpoint. In part, the change reflected the increasingly strident demands of Indian nationalism. The older imperial ethnography had been the product of great self-assurance on the part of the colonial power. The doubts about the permanence of British rule that nationalism raised in the minds of many younger administrators undermined the assumptions of the nineteenth century ethnographers. Was there a decline in the quality of imperial ethnography? If so, was this an aspect of the decline in orientalism or the product of other factors, academic as well as administrative? Research by students of Anglo-Indian literature and British colonial policy charting the changing nature of British attitudes of India has shown an oscillation between faith and doubt concerning the development of Indian society. The role of scholarly ideas in this oscillation is well known for the late nineteenth century, but less well studied for the twentieth century, especially the role of ethnological ideas. For example, Cohn has suggested there was a shift in the 1930s and the 1940s in the ethnographic focus of imperial ethnography—from villages to the tribes. The point is of some comparative interest in the history of anthropology: at about that time, American ethnology was beginning to make the opposite shift.

Two new varieties of imperial ethnography emerged in the twentieth century. Neither of these was strictly speaking official, although often produced by officials, but analysis of their development can be linked readily, I believe, to the oscillations mentioned above. One of the two varieties (e.g., the work of M. Darling, P. Moon, P. Mason) involved journalistic, literary, fictional, or autobiographic accounts of Indian society, often mildly critical of the regime of the colonial power. The second genre was the final link between anthropology and imperial administration in India and was anthropological in a strictly professional sense. Towards the end of the Raj, a few officials had either obtained formal training in anthropology or had produced formal studies that enabled them to pass easily into professional circles in England. The ethnographies of Archer, Heimendorf, Hutton, Mills, Stevenson, and a few others compare reasonably well with the work of Radcliffe-Brown on the Andaman Islands and Rivers among the Toda.
II. RESEARCH NOTES

Louis Attinasi (Higher and Adult Education, Arizona State Univ.) is carrying on research on the history of the place of anthropology in the American undergraduate curriculum.

Wilfrid C. Bailey (Anthropology, Univ. of Georgia) is working on a history of textbooks for introductory anthropology published in the United States.

Burton Benedict (Anthropology, Univ. of Cal., Berkeley) is currently working on an exhibit on the Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915 for the Lowie Museum.

Douglas Cole (History, Simon Fraser Univ.) is finishing a manuscript on the history of Northwest Coast anthropological artifact collecting. When that is completed, he will turn to a study of the early life and career of Franz Boas, focusing especially upon the German background and influences.

Patrick Danaher (St. Mark's College, James Cook Univ., Queensland, Australia) is collecting materials for a biography of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown.

Ralph Dexter (Zoology, Kent State Univ.) is developing an article entitled "Contributions of Frank G. Speck (1881-1950) to Ethnobiology."

Douglas Givens (Behavioral Sciences, St. Louis Community College at Meremac), is working on a doctoral dissertation in anthropology at Washington University, St. Louis, entitled "Alfred Vincent Kidder's Impact and Contributions to American Archaeology."

Joy Harvey (History of Science, Harvard), is working on a doctoral dissertation on the "Société d'Anthropologie de Paris."

Janet Hermans (3311 Rittenhouse St., S.W., Washington, D.C.) is working on the development of official and unofficial policies toward the Basarwa or San of Botswana (formerly called Bushmen).

Dell Hymes (Education, Univ. of Pennsylvania) is planning a collection of essays on the history of linguistic anthropology.

Benjamin Kilborne (164 Moore St., Princeton, N.J.) has been working on theories of language and society in the writings of De Gerando and other members of the Société des Observateurs de l'Homme.

Nandani Lynton-Grotz (Anthropology, Cornell Univ., currently in Germany at Draehslstrasse 1, 8000 Muenchen 90) is doing a doctoral dissertation testing the applicability of Kuhn's theory of paradigm building (as amended by Hymes to "cynosure" or focus) to the history of anthropology, using the development of Indic studies by the early German Romanticists as a case study.
Andrew and Harriet Lyons (Wilfrid Laurier Univ.) are doing a study of anthropologists' notions and observations on the sexuality of "primitives."

Joan Mark (Peabody Museum, Harvard Univ.) is working on a biography of Alice C. Fletcher (1838-1923).

David J. Meltzer (Anthropology, Univ. of Washington) has been awarded a predoctoral fellowship at the Smithsonian Institution for research on the development of Early Man studies.

Michael M. Sokal (Humanities, Worcester Polytechnic Institute) is preparing a monograph on American Mental Testing in the nineteenth century, for which he is examining the studies of physical anthropologists relating physical traits to psychological characteristics.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN FRANCE

Britta Rupp-Eisenreich
EHESS, Paris

[These remarks, originally prepared as a preliminary paper for the symposium to be held in November, are presented here in slightly revised form because of their general interest to historians of anthropology elsewhere. Full responsibility for errors introduced in translation is assumed by G.W.S.]

The first conference of the French Association of Anthropologists (founded in 1979 and known by the acronym AFA), which will be held in Paris November 19-21, 1981, will include among its fifteen topics that of the history of anthropology. (The term "anthropology" is understood here in the broad sense--contrary to one prior French tradition--as including ethnology, as well as prehistory and biological anthropology.) The preliminary abbreviated schedule is put forth in this perspective: the goal is to evaluate what has been accomplished so far in this relatively dispersed domain, to pose current problems and to open debate. A more thorough resume with fuller information will be given at the opening of the conference.

1. The Present Situation

Large-scale studies in the domain of the history of anthropology are relatively few in France. There are two pocket books (Mercier, Poirier), and overview in the Encyclopédie de la Pléiade (Poirier), Duchet's book on the philosophes, Lombard's on British anthropology, a translation of Lowie's History of Ethnology published by Payot, and M. Panoff's Ethnologie: le deuxieme souffle, as well as several articles. A critical overview of the principal theoretical currents is to be found in one of the recent works of M. Auge. No book, to our knowledge, retraces this history for France in particular. The situation thus contrasts
sharply with the United States. There have been neither large conferences (with the exception of the Durkheim conference organized by a group of sociologists in 1980, and the Conference on "Anthropology in France" organized in 1977 by G. Condaminas and S. Dreyfus-Gamelon to evaluate the present situation) nor has there been a concerted policy of reeditions or biographies of the "founding fathers," or full bibliographic resources, or specialized reviews, or other instruments of information.

Discussion is not absent in France, but it is contained either in debates of a general order—theoretical or epistemological reflections (Foucault and many others), vast compilations on the emergence of the human sciences (Gusdorf)—or in more specific works such as books on the history of method (LeClerc); on the origins of anthropology in DeGrendo (Copans/Jamin); on the iconographic aspect of the vision of the "other" in the sixteenth century (Bucher); on the image of the savage, the native, and the colonized (P. Brasseur, Clastres, Jamin, Mahn-Lot). Still others concern the genesis of economic ideology (Dumont), of psychiatry (Gineste, Postel), or of historical discourse and the conditions of its production (M. de Certeau). In regard to physical anthropology one must note works on the history and philosophy of the life sciences (Canguilhem, Jacob), and on the history of Darwinism (Conry), as well as the analysis of racism (Guillaumin, Oelender). Two books treat the relationship of colonialism and anthropology (LeClerc, Copans) and the role of missionaries is analysed by Fr. Raison, M. Panoff, D. Defert and others; historians have been attracted by the notions of nature (Ehrard) and work (Lemay). A certain number of books are consecrated to the writings of "founding fathers": Herodotus (Hartog), Rousseau (Lévi-Strauss), Buffon (Duchet), Las Casas (Mahn-Lot), J. Deubenier (Lemay), and A. von Humboldt (Minguet); and closer to us, to the works of Morgan (Makarius, Terray, Godelier), Malinowski (Panoff), Durkheim (Lévi-Strauss), Marcel Mauss (Karady, Lévi-Strauss, Condominas) and Arnold Van Gennep (Belmont). There are some editions of complete works: Marcel Mauss (Karady), Paul Delarue (M.-L. Teneze). Also to be noted is a lively editorial activity making available older texts: accounts of discoveries, explorations, world travels, voyages, captivities, and shipwrecks follow each other at an accelerated pace, reeditions often supplied with substantial introductions. Most often these relate to the Americanist domain, which in other respects too, is one of the best studied (Duviols, Julien, Laming-Emperaire, Mahn-Lot, Wachtel, etc.).

Numerous additional researches are in process, not only on themes which are part of the history of anthropology narrowly speaking, but also in bordering domains: archeology (Schnapp), the anthropological current in linguistics (S. Auroux), the analysis of literary texts (C. Basuel, Ch. Minguet, M. Izard). Certain researches correspond to territorial or national divisions: the anthropology of Great Kabylia (C. Lacoste-Dujardin), of the Maghrib (D. Brahimi), of the Soviet Union (B. Chichio), of Germany (B. Rupp-Eisenreich), of Oceania (Panoff), of Haiti (L. Hurbon). Still others isolate themes: degeneration (C. Benichou), race and sociobiology (O. Ducros), criminal anthropology (R. Harris, C. Bénichou), artifacts and museology (F. Lupu), legal anthropology (R. Verdier, A. Kremer-Marietti). We are promised important theses on anthropology in the time of Broca (C. Blankaert) and on the
conditions of the birth of ethnology in France (H. Clastres). Lastly, the field of historical anthropology is so vast that it must be the object of a separate presentation.

A brief description of teaching will complete the tableau. Certain university programs provide partial, rapid instruction intended for future anthropologists, but this is not the rule. Two seminars, the one at the Ecole normale supérieure, the other at the Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) treat very specific problems relating to the history of the enlightenment (M. Duchet) and of cosmography (W. Randles); another, entitled "The Sources of Ethnography," sparked by historians (Burgièrè, Chartier, Revel, Klapisch) has unfortunately not had the response it deserves among ethnologists; a fourth treats "the history of biological debates from Cuvier to Pasteur" (J.-P. Aron). The most specific is without doubt the introductory course which is part of a research program being established at the EHESS (L. Bernot). No doubt because of this fragmented situation, an analysis of the problems posed by instruction in the history of anthropology is in process (E. LeRoy). Also to be noted are various formal (e.g., the CNRS team on "Myths of Origin in African History and Historiography," J. Devisse) and informal (C. Blankaert) study groups scouting the field this way and that.

In summary, many elements relative to the history of anthropology, but no real specialization within the field as in the United States.

2. Two Preliminary Questions

Why should one be interested in the history of anthropology?--is this necessary or self-evident? And if it is, how are we to conceive it?

Accepting the recent terminology of T. Kuhn, anthropology--like sociology and psychology--has not yet found its paradigm. Because it is pre-paradigmatic, with a plurality of theories held, a broad field of thought is opened to all who seek to define their identity as anthropologists--in the same way that Hazard's "Crisis of the European Consciousness" has opened up in the last thirty years an extremely fertile field of thought as to the roots of the human sciences in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In view of the interdisciplinary nature of the field, one is well aware of the difficulties of defining it, tracing its boundaries, ascribing to it a set of appropriate concepts and particular methods (other than fieldwork itself) or even more so of giving it any set of regulations: once more there are more questions than answers. A retrospective turn, if it cannot entirely resolve the problems posed, can at least place them in a new light; this does not mean that we should wish to adhere to the idea formulated by R. Darnell: that history of anthropology justifies itself by the simple fact that anthropological identity and practice are inscribed in a cultural tradition which is itself historically constituted. But according to that writer, along with others (Hymes, Stocking) this too purely historical vision must be complemented by two other points of view: in the first place, to be done in such a way that the history of anthropology can provide something like a matrix of evaluation for prior theories, to the end of separating that which stands accomplished from that which is definitively surpassed, from the point of view of a sophisticated practice of the anthropologist's métier; secondly,
to create by the study of the history of anthropology, the necessary distance towards its present theoretical or methodological preoccupations, which themselves are only a stage in the science of man, capable of being surpassed by those which will succeed them in time.

Along side the epistemological dimension of the history of anthropology there is a certain deontological interest. For as long as concepts and notions which are already demystified at the level of scientific reflection (nature, progress, race, aggression, man-as-object [l'hommeobjet]—redoubtable spectres, all) continue to haunt our disciplines, and we still meet them again today, perverse reflections of the first half of the twentieth century, in the public opinion of the society which engendered them, we present anthropologists will always have that task. In a general way, the knowledge of the advances of anthropology, as well as of its errors and oversights, can contribute usefully to ethical questions.

How can, how should the history of anthropology be written? Here is the second preliminary question, moreover a rather perilous one, studded with snares. The possible points of view are various: the history of ideas, the history of sciences and disciplines, the sociology of knowledge or the scientific theory providing privileged frameworks and determining methods and procedures. Those who are so inclined assess the greater part of previous attempts, insofar as they concern anthropology, as not very satisfactory. These are, in turn:

---strictly chronological, anecdotal, presenting only a delusively linear sequence of theories;
---thematic, in isolating only a single aspect;
---presentist, that is to say, brought in relation to the present state of the discipline, with the problematic of today which, itself, is necessarily partial, if not partisan;
---or, on the other hand, conceived from the point of view of historical sociology, each stage, each author, being studied in the light of the social context in which they were enclosed, and in relation to the intellectual currents which enfolded them. This last presents the inconvenience of not realizing at the outset a confrontation with the living problematic of today’s anthropology.

This history—and here the controversy is heated—can only be written, according to some, by anthropologists themselves, giving thereby an internal vision, in vivid colors, a sort of “ethnoscience” of the “tribe” of anthropologists (Hymes)—or, according to others, only by external observers, historians not implicated and as a result more supposedly objective. The question remains open, unless one adopts the wise solution of a convergence of all the preferred possibilities.

How are we, in reconstituting the history of anthropology, to break out of the closed circle of the occidental viewpoint? This is one of the most difficult questions, on which opinions now and always will diverge. What is at stake, in effect, is a particular chapter of our
history, projected into another cultural realm which, nevertheless, bears our imprint. Many are conscious that the history of this unequal encounter, to be complete, must not only be criticized, but also conceived by those who have been subject to it through modern history. It is a problematic which returns to the debates around the questions of the relations between history and anthropology, of anthropology within history (C. Lévi-Strauss, M. Auge and others) which probably constitutes the fundamental issue. It is a problematic which has led others to consider the history of anthropology as itself an anthropological problem (Hallowell), as the systemized (and therefore unique) form of a popular, spontaneous anthropology common to all societies.

Bibliography


- "Naissance de l'observation anthropologique. La Société des Observateurs de l'Homme (1799-1805)," *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 67, 1979, pp. 313-335.


- "La notion du travail à travers la littérature de voyages au XVIIIe siècle," in *Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle*, Bruxelles, II, 1975.


- "Introduction à l'oeuvre de Marcel Mauss," in M. Mauss, *Sociologie et..."


II. RECENT BOOKS FROM THE HAN NETWORK

During the eight years of our existence, HAN has reported on a great deal of work relating to the history of anthropology. Only a portion of it, however, has been by our subscribers, and most of that has been in the form of articles, edited volumes, dissertations, or "research in progress." Now, suddenly there are several books appearing which were written by readers whose scholarly careers are more or less contemporaneous with HAN itself. While the Newsletter can take no credit for the individual scholarly efforts of its readers, it is perhaps a sign that the research network which it has helped to articulate has now reached a new level of maturation. What we see emerging is a group of younger scholars whose primary research interest is in the history of anthropology, and who have pursued that interest to the point of significant publication in book form. Within recent months, three such works have appeared, and two more will be forthcoming before the end of the year:


Our congratulations to the authors, and our hope that they (and other readers) will continue to sustain this new level of scholarly interest in the history of anthropology. (G.W.S.)

III. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS


Hoxie, Frederick, and Mark, Joan. Introduction to With the Nez Perces: Alice Fletcher in the Field, 1889-1902, by E. Jane Gay. University of Nebraska, 1981.


IV. RECENT DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS


Reed, James S. "Clark Wissler: A Forgotten Influence in American Anthropology" (Ball State University, 1980).

V. SUGGESTED BY OUR READERS


Heine, Peter. "Leo Frobenius als politischer Agent: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Biographie." Paideuma 26 (1980):1-5. [LF's military intelli-
gence work in the Sudan in 1914 while leading the German Inner Africa Research Expedition.--W.C.S.]

Miller, Virginia P. "Silas T. Rand, Nineteenth Century Anthropologist among the Micmac." *Anthropologica* n.s. 22 (2) (1980):235-49. [Biographical sketch, evaluation of his linguistic and ethnographic research, based in part on his MSS.--W.C.S.]


GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

*Berkshire Conference on Women's History* (June 16-18, 1981, Vassar College) The program for the fifth Berkshire Conference included a paper by Judith Modell (Univ. of Minnesota), "Looking at Them and Changing Ourselves: Ruth Benedict, Anthropology, and American Culture" given in a session chaired by Joan Mark (Peabody Museum).

*Cheiron: The International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences* (June 10-13, River Falls, Wisconsin). The thirteenth annual meeting of Cheiron included papers by Raymond Fancher (York Univ.) on "Francis Galton's African Ethnography," by Douglas Caulkins (Grinnell Coll.) on "Eilert Sundt and the Idea of Social Networks in 19th Century Norwegian Ethnology" and by Paul Erickson (St. Mary's Univ.) on "Charles Caldwell, M.D.: Anthropology on the American Frontier," as well as an invited address by George Stocking (Univ. of Chicago) entitled "Books Unwritten, Turning Points Unmarked: Notes for the Anti-History of a Social Scientific Discipline."

*Northeastern Anthropological Association* (March 26-29, 1981), included a paper by Robert Gordon (Univ. of Vermont) on "Nikolai Mikloucho-Maklay: Who Was He and What Is His Relevance to Anthropology?"

Government"; K. C. Chang on "Characteristics of Chinese Archaeology from a Historical Perspective"; Marjorie Mandelstam Balzer on "History of Russian Anthropology"; Stephen Williams on "Frauds and Fantasy in the Name of Archaeology"; Joy Harvey on "Anthropology and Colonialism in the Nineteenth Century"; and Tina McChesney on "First Person Narratives from the Hemenway Expedition." Those interested in the fall program should contact Joan Mark (Peabody Museum) or Joy Harvey (History of Science, Harvard Univ.).

Southern Anthropological Society (Fort Worth, April 2, 1981). The program included a paper by Wilfrid C. Bailey (Univ. of Georgia) on "Life among the Sociologists: How Not To Be the Lonely Anthropologist."