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The ascendance of acculturation studies during the late interwar period signified an expansion of the anthropological subject and a refocusing of disciplinary identity. American anthropologists could not easily overlook the continuous first hand contacts between cultures that was transforming them the world over. Invasion, migration and the rise of mass communications brought about interpenetrations of cultures on a global scale unprecedented in world history. Few preindustrial societies remained untouched by colonialism. Taking stock of a growing body of ethnographic accounts of acculturation, the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Acculturation delineated research problems and methodological approaches. In its programmatic "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation," published simultaneously in five journals, the Committee suggested an agenda for acculturation scholarship which incorporated several currents of anthropological thought. To the present-day reader of the "Memorandum" it seems as if any human culture in contact with another had become a fit subject for anthropological acculturation scholarship. At the time, however, there were traditionalists within anthropology who resisted the rising tide of interest in acculturation. Among them was Leslie Spier, the editor of the American Anthropologist, who rejected an article on acculturation among the Bakxatla written by Isaac Schapera and submitted on his behalf by Melville J. Herskovits. A heated encounter between Spier and Herskovits placed in sharp focus critical issues of disciplinarity, the relevance of acculturation studies to anthropology and the validity of the study of cultural contact involving complex societies as an anthropological enterprise.

"Acculturation Among the Bakxatla of South Africa" impressed the members of the Committee on Acculturation when it was submitted as one of several analyses of acculturation situations the Committee had solicited in the spring of 1935. When Schapera submitted the paper, he asked if Herskovits could either publish it in the Committee's report or submit it to an American journal (NUHP: IS/MJH 6/6/35). Responding on the Committee's behalf, Herskovits indicated to Schapera that they were delaying publication of a final report because they had discovered that the field of acculturation studies "is quite a bit larger than we had expected." He therefore offered to submit it to the American Anthropologist, suggesting that it might be published in two installments because of its length (NUHP: MJH/IS 7/9/35). In response, Schapera asked Herskovits to try to have it considered as a Memoir of the American Anthropologist (NUHP: IS/MJH 10/18/35).

Spier, however, refused to go along, and in a letter of rejection written directly to Schapera he stated categorically that he viewed such an acculturation study as outside of the purview of anthropological scholarship:
I have read the paper with interest and feel that of its kind it is excellent and clearly presented. There are two considerations, however, which make it unsuitable for inclusion in the American Anthropologist and I am accordingly sending it back to you under separate cover.

The first is the matter of length. I estimate it would occupy 32 printed pages. It is out of the question for the Anthropologist to print long articles (unless special provision is made for them) since we have available for articles only about 110 pages in each issue. If your manuscript were to be considered for the Memoir series, there would arise the matter of financing. The Association set aside a relatively small sum for the printing of Memoirs with the understanding that the authors would be asked to find about half the sum needed in each case. Your paper, if printed as a Memoir, would cost roughly $125. Naturally, I would need to know your wishes before considering it for a Memoir.

But there is another and more important consideration. It seems to me that such a study as yours - admirably presented though it is - treats of a subject which is not ordinarily considered their concern by anthropologists in this country. It would be an impertinence if I were to imply that you were to be guided by this consideration–but I am. As editor I have to bear in mind where the center of interest lies for the majority of my colleagues here. It seems to me that in general their concern is with cultures and culture change on the purely aboriginal level; that where they have to deal with cultures no longer wholly primitive, they are concerned to separate out those aspects which belong to that level; that questions of the integration of aboriginal cultures with our own had best be left to the sociologists. It may not be true in South Africa or in England, but in this country there has long been a practical division of labor between sociologists and anthropologists. The theoretical reasons for this differentiation of subjects may not be too substantial, but there are sound practical reasons. I think most of us hold that present day life on native reserves is part of the picture of our own society in its manifold phrasings, and as such, by our traditional division of effort, not our especial concern. I think further that we are interested in conserving our efforts and funds, small as they are, for the investigation of cultures historically unconnected with our own--for if we do not give our attention to this, who will?

Please do not misunderstand me; I am not lecturing you. But I respect your intelligence too much not to write frankly what is in my mind.

(NUHP: LS/IS 2/26/36).

This response enraged Herskovits on several counts. Ever aggressive in defense of his academic positions and sensitive to perceived affronts, he took umbrage at Spier’s having communicated with Schapera without first contacting him, since he had submitted the article on Schapera’s behalf. For Herskovits, acculturation scholarship lay in the center rather than the periphery of contemporary anthropological interests. Like most of the other acknowledged leaders of the discipline, he saw himself as Boasian–as indeed did Spier. But in contrast to
Spier’s narrow construction of the boundaries of anthropology, Herskovits took an expansive view, contending that anthropology was distinguished from sociology by approach and method as much as by subject. After an opening statement of personal outrage, he proceeded to more substantive matters:

I had to read the copy of your letter to Schapera twice before I could bring myself to realize that it had actually been written to him. I can understand a possible annoyance with me for having asked you to consider a paper on acculturation, apparently a tabooed subject. But it is difficult for me to understand why you should have taken the occasion to express yourself directly to him as you did. From a purely personal point of view I cannot tell you in what an embarrassing position your letter has placed me. It was I who invited Schapera to write this paper for our Committee; it was I and not he who submitted it to you. If the paper was too long to be taken care of in the *Anthropologist*, that is another matter entirely in your hands. But when I asked you to let him have your editorial comments, I could not have been expected to imagine that they would have taken the form of an *obiter dictum*, delivered to a competent anthropologist in another country, concerning what constitutes proper material for anthropological research and publication here.

I must register vigorous disagreement with you not only as to the question of whether acculturation is a competent problem for anthropologists to study, but also as to your estimate concerning the place of acculturation in the interests of American anthropologists. I do not believe that Boas, Sapir, Wissler, Cooper, Benedict, Cole, Hallowell--to name but a few of us and not to include Redfield, Linton and myself--regard the problem of acculturation as outside the proper interests of anthropologists. In any event, it seems to me that if you had wished to indicate your stand, the time to have done this would have been when our acculturation memorandum was before you and not in the case of Schapera’s paper.

I was particularly struck by your assertion that the study of culture-contact between European and primitive groups belongs to the sociologists. May I ask just what sociologists are occupied with the study of acculturation? As I see it, the difference between sociology and anthropology is the difference in techniques as well as data. Anthropological method is what has made it possible for us to study primitive peoples, wherever they are found, and in whatever condition; while the methods and interests of sociology, as I see them, essentially concern what may be spoken of as the social organization of our own civilization. Certainly, the difference between anthropology and sociology is more than the difference between a loin cloth and a pair of trousers.

This contestation of disciplinary boundaries by Spier and Herskovits occurred at a time of heightened interdisciplinarity for anthropology (cf. Stocking 1976:10-13). Spier may have longed for a lost (or vanishing) disciplinary unity in which the study of tribal societies viewed as relative isolates facilitated greater intellectual coherence. In contrast, a central problematic
of Herskovits' own scholarship involved the consequences of cultural contacts between European and African cultures for the retention and transformation of African cultural elements in the Americas (cf. Jackson 1986). He practiced an anthropology which embodied multiple influences from different disciplines. In an essay he had recently published on "The Social History of the Negro," and a manuscript he was preparing on Life in a Haitian Valley, Herskovits incorporated ethnohistorical studies of the encounters of colonizers and white settlers with slaves, analysis of the impact of acculturative contact on personality, and assessment of the differential effects of acculturation upon different social institutions.

Initially, Herskovits reacted to Spier's rejection of Schapera's article by submitting his resignation as Associate Editor of the American Anthropologist. But Spier, and the Association's secretary John M. Cooper, writing on behalf of its president, Herbert Spinden, persuaded him to suspend his resignation until the annual meeting December. If the Association decided then that acculturation studies "are within the sphere of our interests" and papers on the topic could be published in AA, Herskovits would continue as Associate Editor (NUHP: MJH/JMC 3/5/36, 3/16/36). In this context, he took up the cudgels for acculturation studies, developing further arguments for how they might integrate seemingly divergent anthropological paradigms.

Writing to John Swanton, he described the paper on "The Significance of the Study of Acculturation for Anthropology" which he planned to deliver at the 1936 Association meetings. In it, he would argue that acculturation studies, by reconciling different conceptual approaches, were in fact perfectly suited for a time of marked theoretical pluralism in anthropology:

I am afraid that it will not be possible for me to complete writing the paper until just before the time for the meetings, since I have been and continue to be so busy with a book on Haiti that it will be a couple of weeks before I can get at the paper. However, in view of the stand taken by Spier concerning the publication of papers on acculturation -- a matter concerning which Cooper can give you full information -- I think the paper I suggest is very much in order. In it I plan to discuss the place of acculturation as bridging a gap between the position of those who hold to historical 'reconstructions' on the one hand, and those who on the other insist on studying culture as though it stood still at a given moment and therefore could be adequately considered on a single time plane. The point I plan to make is that in most studies of acculturation that can be made at the present time we not only have scientifically ascertainable historic control of our data, but are in a position to study both the dynamics of cultural change and integration, and the behavior of human personality under conditions of stress, in a way that can not be done in any other type of situation available to the student (NUHP: MJH/JS 10/17/36).
Herskovits clearly had high ambitions for acculturation studies as an integrative force in a fragmenting discipline, "mediating between the historical and the functional orientations" (Stocking 1976:20), and incorporating also analyses of the relationship between culture and personality. Although acculturation studies did achieve considerable popularity on through the early postwar years, they did not in fact stem the "centrifugal tendencies" operating in the discipline. But on the matter of their legitimacy as anthropological topics, Herskovits was clearly vindicated in his dispute with Spier. The publication of his paper in 1937 marked the recognition of acculturation studies as a fit topic for the American Anthropologist. More generally, the study of cultural contact involving complex societies was accepted as falling within the purview of anthropology, without any compromise to its disciplinary identity.
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This article is based on research carried out in 1990-94 for my dissertation in Folklore and Folklife at the University of Pennsylvania (Baron 1994). I am grateful to John F. Szwed for his comments.
Footnotes for the History of Anthropology

"When the Monkey-Type Stopped and the Human Began":
Lorimer Fison on the Bottom Rung of the Ladder of Human Evolution

by Mark Francillon

Lorimer Fison, Methodist missionary to Fiji and co-author, with A. W. Howitt of influential works on the social organization of the Australian Aborigines, was a convert to Lewis Henry Morgan's scheme of social evolution, which his anthropological writings were intended to confirm and elaborate. But unlike Morgan, who in private came to accept the Darwinian hypothesis, and Howitt, who was a confirmed Darwinian, Fison remained unwilling to take the last (or first) step of all, and at one point expressed his ultimate reservation in rhyme:

Man comes from a mammal who lived up a tree,
And a thick coat of hair on his outside had he,
Very much like the dreadnoughts* we frequently see.

He had points to his ears, & a tail to his rump
[& unless Darwin fail]
To assist him, when up in the branches to jump
[In his estimate of him, he'd also a tail]
In some cases quite long, but in some a mere stump.
[which to help him when up in the trees did avail]

This mammal, abstaining from mischievous pranks,
Was thought fit at length to be raised from the ranks,
And with some ado came to stand on two shanks.

Thus planted, his course he so prudently steered,
That his hand was improved, & his intellect cleared.
Then his forehead enlarged, & his tail disappeared.

Tisn't easy to fix when man became man,
When the monkey-type stopped & the human began.
But some very queer things are involved in the plan.

The women had beards & huge whiskers at first
And the man furnished milk when the baby was nursed,
[did the nursing when baby]
With some other strong facts I could not tell if I durst.

*before it was the name of a battleship, "a coat made of thick woolen cloth"
This mammal, 'tis said, had a pedigree too.
The marsupial order here comes into view.
Se we'll trace him, I think, to a big kangaroo.

This kangaroo's sire was most likely a bird
Or an ornithorhyncus would not be absurd;
Then to frogs & strange fishes we're backwards referred.

Thus far Darwin says. But the root of the tree,
What it was, when it came, & what caused it to be,
Is a puzzle to him quite as much as to me.

The text, from Fison's "Extracts Book" in the Fison Papers, Tippett Collection, St. Mark's Library (Canberra) is not dated, but on the evidence of adjacent entries would seem to be 1872 or 1873—at a point when Fison had not yet become seriously engaged in Morgan's project. The phrases bracketed above are alternative passages interlineated in the original manuscript. There is also a version of this (basically the same text, minus verses 2, 5, and 6), in Fison's unpublished manuscript, Study of Ancient Society (also in the Tippett Collection, but probably mid 1890s). A letter from Fison to Howitt, dated 5/20/1876 (Fison letterbook 5:64-65) offers a prose elaboration of his position:

I believe in Evolution. Only I don't believe in the Evolutionists. And moreover I cannot find proof that a number of successive stages forming an ascending series compels me to accept a lower than the lowest. There may have been—in all probability there was—a lower than the lowest I have yet seen, but was there a lower than that? Who can say? I see the upper part of a ladder reared against an adjoining building, & take it for granted that there are a number of rungs below the lowest which my window allows me to behold; but I know there is a foot to the ladder, & that the rungs end somewhere... Evolution must begin somewhere, & the farther back we push that somewhere the greater the wonders which lie within it, & as it seems to me, the stronger the proof of Somebody (if on may so speak) behind it. An atom with the certainty of a Universe within it proves to me the existence of a God).

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

I. Frederick Ward Putnam Papers—The papers of Ralph W. Dexter in the Kent State University Archives contain six boxes of important materials relating to the career of Frederick Ward Putnam, who was the subject of numerous short publications by Dexter during several decades before the latter's death. Among the Putnam materials are a cache of wonderful photos of Putnam, his family, and the houses they lived in; sketches, and letters (1858-60) from Putnam to his first wife, Adelaide, before they were married. There is also material (originally in the American Museum of Natural History Department of Anthropology, and transmitted to the Harvard University Archives in 1944) relating to Putnam's career at the AMNH. These include
many letters from Franz Boas (notably a series written from British Columbia in 1897, which 
was almost certainly not copied anywhere else) There is also at least one very long letter, written 
in 1895 from South America, from Adolphe Bandelier, and much more—including Putnam's 
personal scrapbook of newspaper articles and notices about himself, his work, and anthropology—
—C. H. Hinsley.

II. Lewis Henry Morgan's Library--Thomas Trautman, intellectual biographer of Lewis H. 
Morgan, and Karl Kabelac, Manuscripts Librarian of the Rush Rhees Library, Rochester 
University, where the Morgan papers are preserved, have recently published a 336 page volume 
describing The Library of Lewis Henry Morgan and Mary Elizabeth Morgan. The volume 
(which constitutes parts 6 and 7 of volume 84 of the Transactions of the American Philosophical 
Society) includes a preface by Trautman, a 57 page "Introduction," an "Inventory" prepared 
by Morgan himself, a "Catalogue" with full bibliographic information on each of the 1196 items, 
and a "Register" of the Morgan papers in the Rare Books and Special Collections department 
of the Rush Rhees Library.

III. Preservation of the Anthropological Record--belatedly, we note that papers from the 
conference held early in 1992 (HAN 19, #2:11-12) were published later that year by the 
Wenner-Gren Foundation. Edited by Sydel Silverman and Nancy Parezo, and entitled 
Preserving the Anthropological Record, the volume includes papers on specific archives (The 
National Anthropological Archives and the Melanesian Archive), on "Discipline History Centers 
in the Sciences," on the role of museums, and on the preservation of records in archeology and 
in applied anthropology. There are also "guidelines" for individuals and institutions, as well as 
discussions of problems of physical preservation, the role of computers, the future uses of the 
record, and "the next steps" in its preservation.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Claude Blanckaert of the Équipe de Recherche "Les institutions anthropologiques en France de 
1800 à 1940" is planning a volume on this subject, to appear in 1996. The address is: Dr. 
Claude Blanckaert, Centre Alexandre Koyré, Histoire des Sciences et des Techniques, EHESS - 
MNHN, UMR 48 du CNRS, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Pavillon Chevreul, 57 rue 
Cuvier, 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France.

Hilary Lapsley, Senior Lecturer in Women's Studies, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New 
Zealand, is writing a book about the friendship between Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, from 
the point of view of their bisexual and lesbian identities.

H. Glenn Penny III, a graduate student in history at the University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign, is working on a dissertation treating German ethnographic museums as the site of 
an investigation into the process of "identity formation" in Wilhelmine Germany, in which 
"scientific schemes of classification were used to reorder the world and to fashion tangible 
identities for Germans as well as other peoples."
I. History of Ethnology in Germany

The first issue of the *Mitteilungen der Arbeitsgruppe 'Geschichte der Ethnologie' (DGV)* was published by the speaker of this group, Adam Jones (formerly in Frankfurt, now in Leipzig) in July 1994. The group resulted from the sessions at the last conference of the German Ethnological Society (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde, DGV) in Leipzig, Oct. 1993. The newsletter contains the programs of the workshops held in Munich (Oct. 1991) and in Leipzig (Oct. 1993), as well as plans for two further sessions in 1995. It also contains a bibliography of recent work in the history of German ethnology, an address list of the members of the workgroup compiled by H.F. Vermeulen on the basis of questionnaires distributed in 1992-93 (pp. 9-21), and information on the biographical database of German anthropologists established by Prof. Berthold Riese in Bonn (pp.22-25). Current plans of the group are to organise two sessions on the history of anthropology in the German-speaking world: (1) a conference in five sections on the history of research on Africa, to be held in Leipzig, 2-4 March 1995; (2) a session at the biannual conference of the DGV in Vienna, on 29 Sept. 1995, divided over four sections: Geschichte der Ikonographie, Geschichte des ethnographischen Sammelns, Mission und Ethnographie im späten 18. Jahrhundert, Deutsche Ethnologie 1900-1950. The address is: Prof. Dr. Adam Jones, Institut für Afrikanistik, Augustusplatz 9, 04109 Leipzig, Germany (tel./fax: +49-341-7193286). (HFV)

II. Recent Dissertations

(Ph.D. except where otherwise indicated)


Baron, Roger. "Africa in the Americas: Melville J. Herskovits' Folkloristic and Anthropological Scholarship, 1923-41" (Folklore and Folklife, University of Pennsylvania 1994).

Bunzl, Matti. "From Historicism to Historical Particularism: Franz Boas and the Tradition of Nineteenth Century German Anthropology and Linguistics" (Anthropology, Stanford University, 1993--Master's thesis)

Fernlund, Kevin J. "William Henry Holmes: Explorer of the Americas from the Yellowstone to the Yucatan" (University of New Mexico, 1992).

III. Recent Work by Subscribers

[Except in the case of new subscribers, for whom we will include one or two orienting items, "recent" is taken to mean within the last two years. Please note that we do not list "forthcoming" items. To be certain of dates and page numbers, please wait until your works have actually appeared before sending offprints (preferably) or citations in the style used in History of Anthropology and most anthropological journals]


_____________. 1993. Multi-paradigm discipline, inter-disciplinary field: Peering through and around the interstices. Western Folklore 52:227-45.


IV. Suggested by our Readers

[Although the subtitle does not indicate it, the assumption here is the same as in the preceding section: we list "recent" work--i.e., items appearing in the last several years. Entries without initials were contributed by G.W.S.

Note: once again, we call attention to the listings in the Bulletin of the History of Archaeology, only some of which are included here.]


Hughte, Phil. 1994. A Zuni artist looks at Frank Hamilton Cushing: Cartoons by Phil Hughte, with foreword by T. N. Pandey, discourse by Jim Ostler, and commentary by Krisztina Kosse. Zune, New Mexico: Pueblo of Zuni Arts & Crafts [Rather sympathetic view, based on Zuni oral tradition, published anthropological and historical record, and historic Smithsonian photographs--W.C.S.]


C.F.F. = Christian F. Feest
D.S. = Dan Segal
R.D.F. = Raymond D. Fogelson
W.C.S. = William C. Sturtevant

GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

I. **American Anthropological Association**--Based on a somewhat cursory review of the program by someone who did not attend, it would seem that history of anthropology was not heavily represented at the 93rd Annual Meeting, November 30-December 4, 1994, in Atlanta. There was one session devoted to "American Perspectives in the History of the Anthropology of Europe," but judging from the titles they seemed to have had a rather shallow time depth--save for an analysis of "Trends in the history of anthropology of Europe [in the] American Anthropologist, 1888-1994" by Susan Parman (Cal State, Fullerton). There was also a double session on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology, which included historical papers by David Givens (AAA), Naomi Quinn (Duke) and Joan Mencher (CUNY-New York). Other papers with evident history of anthropology relevance included: Karen Dohn and Valery Pinsky (Smithsonian), "Archaeology and photographic images of the past"; Robbie Ethridge (Georgia), "The US government's civilization plan for the Creek Indians: A late 18th century experiment in development"; Ives Goddard (Smithsonian), "J.W. Powell’s 1891 classification and map"; Charles Laughlin (Carleton), "The relevance of William James' radical empiricism to the anthropology of consciousness"; Andrew P. Lyons (Wilfrid Laurier), "The neotenic career of Ashley Montague"; Eugenia Shanklin (Trenton State), "Old and new directions in the study of racism" [the last two at a session honoring Montagu]; Lynn M. Schmelz (Harvard), "Over 70 years of indexing the literature of anthropology: A case study"; Robin Sewell (UCBerkeley) "Europe's construction of Egypt’s past: The making of Egyptology"; Joan Vincent (Barnard), "Marxism and anthropology: An intellectual history"; Darrell Whiteman (Asbury Seminary), "Human rights and missionary response: The case of the South Pacific labor trade."

II. **American Society for Ethnohistory**--The 1994 annual meeting, at Tempe, Arizona, 10-13 November, included papers by Patricia Albers (Utah) on visions of ethnicity in postcards of the American Southwest since 1898; Benay Blend (Louisiana School for Mathematics), on Ruth Underhill; Walden Browne (Stanford) on Sahagun’s *Universal History*; Dagmar Frerking (Purdue) on Boas, Germany and American anthropology; Andie Palmer (U. of Washington) on James A. Teit; Nancy Shoemaker (SUNY-Plattsburgh) on how Indians got to be 'redskins'; Brian Thom (British Columbia) on Harlan Smith and the Jesup Expedition; Christopher Vaughan (UCBerkeley) on the Philippine exhibit at the 1904 World’s Fair.
III. European Association of Social Anthropologists—At the third biannual conference of the EASA in Oslo, 24-27 June, 1994, sessions were held on the History of European Anthropology for the third time. They were convened by Jan de Wolf (Utrecht) on behalf of the History of European Anthropology Network (HEAN) established in Prague, August 1992. Fifteen papers were presented during two afternoon sessions, the first a general session, the second on ethics and anthropology from a historical perspective. The former included papers by I. Strecker, Mainz (constraints on anthropological discourse); H. Vermeulen, Leiden (plural origins and multiple paradigms in late 18th century European anthropology); K. Fink, Northfield (Kant’s dialogue with storm and stress anthropology); B. Jezernik, Ljubljana (18th century discovery of a savage people in Europe); J. Leopold, Los Angeles (Tylor and the concept of survivals); H. Garcia Valencia, Bristol (ethnography in the British Museum); J. Stagl, Salzburg (the Austrian roots of Malinowski). The ethics session included J. Llobera, London (Rousseau and Herder); R. Parkin, Krakow (Robert Hertz); J. de Wolf, Utrecht (H. Junod); P. Pels, Amsterdam (British colonial administrators, 1890-1940); J. van Bremen, Leiden (Japanese colonial anthropology); L. Soysal, Harvard/Berlin (the state and anthropology in early republican Turkey); D. Knezevic-Hocevar, Ljubljana (Bozo Skerlj, Slovene anthropologist); M. Kempny Warsaw (roots of contemporary Polish anthropology). Speakers from Spain, Portugal and Italy who had expressed interest were unable to participate, due to the high cost of travel. Although publication of the proceedings is not foreseen, a selection of papers may be offered to the journal History and Anthropology. Further sessions of the HEAN network are planned for the next EASA conference, to be held in the summer of 1996, probably in the South of Europe. The address of the HEAN secretary is Dr. Jan de Wolf, Department of Cultural Anthropology, University of Utrecht, PO Box 80.140, 3508 TC Utrecht, the Netherlands. (HVF)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Future of the History of Anthropology—Volume eight of the History of Anthropology series ("Völksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition"—which has just gone into production), will be the last in the series under the editorship of George Stocking. The series will continue under the editorship of Richard Handler, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Virginia, who has contributed several essays to the earlier volumes, and who has been chosen as editor-designate. There will be a transition volume, to be edited jointly by Handler and Stocking, devoted to the historiography of anthropology. Although the volume will include retrospective views of the development of the history of anthropology since its efflorescence in the 1960s, and critical evaluations of the series itself, the emphasis will be on discussions of possible future directions (and redirections) that may broaden and enrich the historiography of anthropology, without sacrificing the commitment to historiographical craft which has been a hallmark of the series. In addition to generalized historiographic and critical material, the editors are particularly interested in including substantive essays which exemplify, in relation to specific historical issues and materials, alternative approaches to the history of anthropology. Anyone who would like to submit or to propose such an article should communicate with either Handler (Cabell Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903) or Stocking (as indicated on the second page of this issue).