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OBITUARY: WILLIAM C. STURTEVANT AND THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Jason Baird Jackson
Indiana University

The discipline of anthropology lost a leading figure with the March 2, 2007, passing of William C. Sturtevant, Curator of North American Ethnology at the National Museum of Natural History of the Smithsonian Institution. This essay updates the biographical sketch I published previously (Jackson 2002), and also provides specific observations on Sturtevant’s work as a historian of anthropology. Further information on Sturtevant’s life and career can be found in Merrill and Goddard (2002).

William Curtis Sturtevant was born July 26, 1926, in Morristown, New Jersey, the first of three children of Alfred Henry Sturtevant and Phoebe Curtis Reed. His father was a pioneer in genetics, and in 1928 moved his family to Pasadena, California, where he was appointed a professor in biology at the California Institute of Technology. His father’s older brother, Edgar Howard Sturtevant, was a leading professor of linguistics at Yale University, where he specialized in Hittite and Indo-European languages.

Sturtevant earned his bachelor’s degree from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied between 1944 and 1949. His progress was interrupted by a year’s service in the U.S. Naval Reserve, during 1945-1946, when he was stationed on Guam. This represented only a delay in studies that were focused and progressing well. His was awarded his degree in anthropology with Highest Honors. Reflecting on his Berkeley training, he judged particularly important the courses he took with John Rowe, Mary Haas, Robert F. Heizer, David Mandelbaum, and Robert Lowie (1955:3). Sturtevant’s commitment to Native American studies was steadfast, dating to lessons on Indian life and history he had as a third grader. While he was an undergraduate, he participated in an archaeological field school at Chaco Canyon and a UNAM summer school in Mexico City. These experiences contributed to his later interest in Spanish ethnohistorical sources.

Immediately after earning his B.A., Sturtevant began graduate studies in anthropology at Yale University, receiving his Ph.D. in 1955. At Yale, anthropological linguist Floyd Lounsbury especially influenced him. Lounsbury’s example, together with his training under Haas at Berkeley and Bernard Bloch at Yale, solidified Sturtevant’s commitment to linguistic approaches within anthropology. Such methods and theories were already at the core of Americanist anthropological scholarship as consolidated by Franz Boas, but Sturtevant became an exemplar of this tradition during a period when it was transforming on some fronts and being de-emphasized on others. Sharing Sturtevant’s commitment to linguistically sophisticated ethnography was his friend and fellow student Harold Conklin; together, they wrote the first article he published, a thorough study of Seneca musical instruments (Conklin and Sturtevant 1953). Beyond its ethnographic significance, this paper was an early example of rigorous ethnosemantic method, an approach to which both scholars later contributed theoretical works.
Sturtevant’s interest in the West Indies derived from work at Yale with Irving Rouse (Sturtevant 1960b).

In 1950, Sturtevant began a life long research relationship with the Seminole people of Florida. During his doctoral research, he worked most closely with Josie Billie, an important Seminole “medicine maker” (1960a). This early research generated a steady stream of essays in ethnography, oral history and ethnohistory that established him as a leading figure in the anthropology of the Eastern United States. Most important among these contributions is his dissertation, an ethnoscience/neg ethnography of Seminole medicine, ritual and botany (1955). It stands among the most comprehensive and sophisticated studies of ethnoarchaeology produced in the 20th century, and it remains crucial to the study of Woodland Indian cultures.

Sturtevant’s Seminole work was complemented by research among the Iroquois, which he began while he was a Yale student (e.g., 1984). He also spent relatively brief periods doing fieldwork throughout the Eastern Woodlands and undertook broad study of the ethnoarchaeological sources about it, which provided background for his comparative studies. His research also informed his advocacy, in congressional testimony and other forums, for federally unrecognized Indian groups in the region (1983). Furthermore, he was actively engaged in library and archival work throughout the Americas, from Amazonia (1998) to the Arctic (Sturevant and Quinn 1987). Outside the Americas, he did ethnographic fieldwork in Burma, making extensive ethnographic collections for Yale’s Peabody Museum of Natural History (Harold Conklin, personal communication, 2007) and the Smithsonian (Merrill 2002a:21).

Soon after receiving his Ph.D., Sturtevant left an instructorship at Yale and a curatorship at its Peabody Museum, to take up positions at the Smithsonian Institution’s Bureau of American Ethnology, first as Ethnologist and later General Anthropologist, from 1956 until 1965. Then, the Bureau was merged with the Department of Anthropology in the U.S. National Museum (later the National Museum of Natural History), and Sturtevant became Curator of North American Ethnology. He remained an active participant in Smithsonian anthropology up until the time of his death. Most prominent among his Smithsonian projects was the *Handbook of North American Indians*, of which he served as general editor (1978–2007). The handbook is an exhaustive, multi-volume reference work on anthropological, linguistic and historical knowledge about native peoples north of Mexico, an essential resource for those interested in Native American societies.

Working throughout his career in museum contexts, Sturtevant was active in the fields of museum anthropology and the study of material culture. He insisted that museums were important to general anthropology (1973), developed methods for anthropological museology (1977), and conducted research on museum collections (1967). In 1979–1981, he served as president of the Council for Museum Anthropology.

Sturtevant was also a central participant in the development of ethnohistory as an interdisciplinary field of study. He served as President of the American Society for
Ethnohistory in 1965–1966, and his essays helped to frame and solidify this developing field (1968, 1971). His work in the development of ethnohistorical methods, along with the breadth of his anthropological interests, provided the foundation for his work as a historian of anthropology.

His service as a member of the Editorial Committee for the *History of Anthropology Newsletter* was just one of the many ways in which Sturtevant contributed actively to the advancement of this research field. The frontier separating Sturtevant’s work as an ethnohistorian and historical ethnologist from his work in the history of anthropology is difficult to isolate in any non-arbitrary way. He saw understanding the history of anthropology as prerequisite for sound anthropological practice, but his work on the history of the discipline was linked to his other research in complex ways. Sturtevant’s interests in historical ethnography and ethnology led him to consider particular moments in the long history of contacts linking the peoples of the Americas with the rest of the world after the Columbian encounter. This work led, in turn, to both his development of refined methods for assessing diverse forms of ethnohistorical data and to his efforts to understand proto-ethnography, both contextually, as an unfolding process of cross-cultural encounter, and as a means to ethnological ends.

This thread in his work as a historian of anthropology is represented by his significant contributions to the study of early documents recording encounters between Europeans and the peoples of the New World. His work in this type of research is truly remarkable in its breadth and depth. Examples of his writing include “John White’s Contribution to Ethnology” (1964b), “Louis-Philippe on Cherokee Architecture and Clothing” (1978), “Patagonian Giants and Baroness Hyde Neuville’s Iroquois Drawings” (1980), and (with David Beers Quinn) “This New Prey: Eskimos in Europe in 1567, 1576, and 1577” (1987). The full corpus of such studies, when combined with his general historical analyses of intercultural topics running from the most hostile (“Scalping” [with James Axtell], 1980, and “Cannibalism,” 1991) to the most pacific (“Black Drink and Other Caffeine-Containing Beverages among Non-Indians,” 1979), provides a comprehensive picture of European-Native relations over a vast expanse of time and space. Contemporary anthropology, for Sturtevant, was part of a broader, continuous and much longer history of cross-cultural documentation and engagement.

The largest and perhaps most influential body of work in this vein, within Sturtevant’s oeuvre, specifically concerns the complex historical problems associated with European pictorial images of New World peoples, societies and customs. Sturtevant produced a remarkable corpus of studies examining particular bodies of visual imagery, and he identified many themes grounded in general historical processes. He tracked genealogical influences over time, as illustrators drew upon earlier images in addition to first-hand observations. Such findings led to deeper understanding of the nature and origins of visual stereotypes. This work provided techniques for using historical images in research, and demonstrated that historical images must be carefully contextualized in order to insure that generalizations based on them are sound. He himself provided an array of insights and information from his own study of thousands of images. This
aspect of his work was carefully examined by Merrill (2002a: 28-30), who also compiled a useful bibliography of Sturtevant's writings through 2001 (2002b) that includes a vast range of works on such matters.

Another kind of contribution to the history of anthropology are the numerous biographical sketches and obituaries that Sturtevant authored over a career in which he was centrally placed in the field's professional networks. Examples of such work include his obituaries for "John Mann Goggin" (1964a) and (with Harold C. Conklin) "Floyd Glenn Lounsbury (1998), as well as his assessment of "Mary R. Haas and Ethnology" (1997) and his festschrift contribution "R. F. Heizer and the Handbook of North American Indians" (1981).

Sturtevant was a meticulous and widely read scholar, one who always seemed open to engaging in active scholarly debate. He also favored the essay and the note as genres. These characteristics converged in a predilection for contributing scholarly corrections and commentaries to the literature. One can see these impulses at work, and their relevance for the history of anthropology, in writings such as "Royal Incest: A Bibliographic Note" (1981), "Asians Before Columbus?" (1994), and (with James B. Griffin, David J. Meltzer, and Bruce Smith) "A Mammoth Fraud in Science" (1988), which chronicled the forgery of an archaeological artifact, supposedly a Paleoindian artifact of Pleistocene age picturing a woolly mammoth or mastodon. Such writings play a particularly useful role in the historiography of anthropology. Similarly, Sturtevant was a prolific reviewer of books and exhibitions, including many works on the history of anthropology. Doubtless, future workers in this field will draw upon his erudite assessments of books published during the half-century in which he was an active reviewer of publications. His exhibition reviews will offer a glimpse of this much more ephemeral medium of scholarly production during an era of remarkable change in professional museum practice.

An additional field of historical research is represented by Sturtevant's contributions to the history of research in linguistics and linguistic anthropology. Here he notably contributed to describing the history of work in Southeastern North America. Examples of such studies include his "Siouan Languages in the East" (1958) and his synthetic "History of Research on the Native Languages of the Southeast (2005).

The question of William Sturtevant's place among historians of anthropology can be viewed from a very different perspective if one considers him as himself a subject for historical study. Here one can return to a few biographical facts for orientation. In addition to his presidency of the American Anthropological Association (1980–1981) and of those organizations already discussed, Sturtevant served as President of the Anthropological Society of Washington (1992–1993) and the American Ethnological Society (1977). He also received numerous grants and fellowships. Brown University awarded him the degree of L.H.D. in 1996. The Smithsonian's National Anthropological Archives will house his voluminous collection of professional papers. These will constitute a major resource for several fields of inquiry, from the social history of anthropology to the historical anthropology of Native North America.
The rich collection of essays edited in his honor by William L. Merrill and Ives Goddard in 2002 included a personal biographical essay by his sister Harriet Sturtevant Shapiro, a detailed professional biography compiled by Merrill (2002a), the list of his published work through 2001 (Merrill, 2002b), as well as essays by leading anthropologists who drew inspiration and insight from Sturtevant's work and personal influence. This edited volume will long remain a key document for situating his professional activities within the wider history of 20th century anthropology. Thankfully, while this work can be found in research libraries worldwide, it is also currently available for free online, and can be downloaded from the webpage for “Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology,” a program of Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press (see www.si.sedu/smithsoniancontributions/Anthropology, accessed June 4, 2007).

In 1952, Sturtevant married Theda Maw with whom he raised three children, Kinthi D.M., Reed P.M. and Alfred B.M. (deceased). They divorced in 1986. In 1990, he married Sally McLendon, also a leading anthropological linguist and Americanist. On June 5, 2007 a ceremony celebrating William C. Sturtevant’s life and work was held in the Baird Auditorium of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.
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EVANS-PRITCHARD AND MALINOWSKI: THE ROOTS OF A COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP

Christopher Morton
Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford

Students of the history of British social anthropology will no doubt be wholly familiar with Helena Wayne’s two fascinating volumes of letters between Bronislaw Malinowski and Elsie Masson (Wayne 1995). Although barely mentioned in the correspondence, the few references to Edward Evans-Pritchard, probably the most brilliant anthropologist to emerge from those important early years at the London School of Economics (LSE) in the 1920s, offers us a tantalizing glimpse of a complex relationship that was personally strained from the very beginning.

On 2 February 1928, soon after writing up a PhD thesis based on only six months’ fieldwork among the Azande during 1927, Evans-Pritchard presented a paper on “The Morphology and Function of Magic” at Malinowski’s Thursday seminar at the LSE. A year later, in a letter to Masson, Malinowski remembers the event distinctly:

LSE. Saturday, 19 January, 1929

My own darling,

... I went to the School this morning and joined Yates who had to scrutinize Evans-Pritchard’s article on Magic. You remember the paper he read to us last winter – you were present and then we all went to the flat and Evans-Pritchard got offended with me. Or was it in the autumn term? Somehow I think you were there. Anyhow, he gave me the paper, I commented on it, he has now just sent it back to me and asked me to pass it finally for press... we ‘passed’ it this morning, Cicely [Bevan, Bronio’s Sec.] has taken it with her home to type it. I shall send it to Lowie to print in the American Anthropologist.

To which Elsie Masson replied three days later from their home in Gries, Italy:

Gries
22 January, 1929

... I was of course there when Evans-Pritchard was so beleidigt [offended]. That was a year ago exactly. That

term was made rather ugly by Pritchard and Driberg quarrels ...

It is clear from this correspondence that for it to be so bitterly remembered a year later, the 'offence' taken by Evans-Pritchard at Malinowski's basement flat in Doughty Street after the seminar must have been severe, and seems to be the first documented falling-out between the two, leading to an enduringly strained personal relationship. But until recently it had been entirely unclear just what happened at Malinowski's flat that Thursday afternoon in February 1928. Researching correspondence in the Malinowski Papers at the LSE, I came across two letters from Evans-Pritchard to Bronislaw Malinowski, in a folder marked "Battles", the first written the day after the Doughty Street incident, the second presumably a day or so after that. The first letter is typed, brief and certainly offended, but not hastily written since it was composed the next day:

3 February, 1928 42 Guilford Street, W.C.1

Dear Prof. Malinowski

With reference to your statement last night that you believed that I had "cooked" and "faked" field-work material, I think that you owe me some kind of explanation.

I have never been more deeply wounded in my life and you should have been the first to realize what bitterness such an insinuation must cause in a person engaged in & with a strong sentiment towards scientific work.

Yours, E. E. Evans-Pritchard

The second letter, hand-written and undated, shows signs of being much more hastily composed, and is contrite in the extreme:

42 Guilford Street, W.C.1

Dear Dr Malinowski,

I unreservedly apologise for my letter. I was certainly under the impression you had made the statement I referred to & Schapera also was under this impression too.

However, I am very sorry indeed. I was angry not because it is by any means inconceivable that I should

cook my facts but just because there is an incessant desire to do so which has to be rigourously [sic] repressed. I have to ask myself again & again everyday “are you certain this is really so or are you simply selecting part of the facts to fit them in with your theory?” We are always angry when we think that we are accused of a line of conduct which we would like to take but have to repress - so please regard my letter in the light of Freud’s teaching! I did not send you my M.S. to Italy partly because I did not think you would read it and partly because I did not think it was much good. I fully appreciate the compliment you paid me in coming to my lectures & was grateful for your praise. Your teaching was my great source of inspiration in the ‘field’. I consider my work to be deplorable, my material being inadequate, fragmentary, insufficiently checked- & I had hoped, & still keep on hoping, that you will help me reformulate the problems, gather up the uneven strands & make clear the objectives. Far from wishing to quarrel with you my desire is & has always been to learn from you & to be as friendly as possible. What infuriates me is that when I am anxious for your help about some problem you are completely inaccessible. However in future I shall take you at your word a bombay you with M.S. and hope for the best.

Yours, E. E. E-P. 6

So the Doughty Street incident becomes clearer. Even if Evans-Pritchard and Isaac Schapera did misconstrue a characteristically forthright remark by Malinowski as a personal attack on E-P’s academic methods, it is evident that the criticism of ‘cooking’ data struck at the heart of the younger anthropologist’s insecurity. The contrition of the second letter seems to address a number of rebuttals made by Malinowski, presumably in a reply letter soon after. There are at least two other important contextual points to make about this incident. The first is a highly personal one for Malinowski. By the end of January 1928 Elsie Masson, whose health had deteriorated over recent years, had eventually received the diagnosis that they must have been dreading – multiple sclerosis (Wayne 1995: 110). This recent hard news provides a highly emotional context to the meeting at their Doughty Street flat only a few days later. In addition, and perhaps in combination, Evans-Pritchard’s paper was a direct critique of Malinowski’s work. ‘I shall attempt to demonstrate in this paper’, he wrote, ‘that the principles of magic deduced from Melanesian data and formulated as general laws for all societies have, in view of a study of African peoples, to be reformulated and

possibly modified. I shall show how this is so by a comparison between the magic of a Melanesian society described by Professor Malinowski and the magic of an African society investigated by myself (Evans-Pritchard 1929: 619-620). In other words, Evans-Pritchard's paper would expound a scientific 'comparative method', whereas Malinowski's theoretical generalizations would be seen to have been drawn from only one example. No doubt Malinowski did feel, when listening to E-P's counter-examples of magical practice from Zandeland, that this student's six months' as opposed to his two years' worth of fieldwork did not entitle him to 'reformulate' his own functional analysis of magic. There seems little doubt on the face of it that it was Evans-Pritchard's critique of the 'scientific' basis (the comparative method) of Malinowski's theory of magic presented in the seminar paper that prompted the Doughty Street incident. It appears that one of Malinowski's complaints to E-P was that he hadn't passed him a copy of his paper before his presentation, to which E-P responds that he didn't think Malinowski would read it, or that it was good enough.

Evans-Pritchard's second, apologetic, letter was possibly advised by his supervisor Charles Seligman, who understood how important a professional relationship with Malinowski would be to E-P's future career. Indeed this sort of ongoing mediation by Seligman between the two anthropologists was crucial in gaining E-P his first teaching position in Cairo in 1931. Although Seligman was against E-P applying for the post at King Fuad I University, he knew full well that his student would need a reference from Malinowski to gain a position, and that the absence of one would look bad. In a letter to Malinowski in Sept 1931, Seligman writes that E-P "feels you have so strong a feeling against him that it would not be fair" to ask Malinowski for a reference. Despite the bad blood between them, Seligman's insistence on a professional relationship based on academic ability rather than personality, meant that Malinowski provided the crucial reference. In response to Seligman's request, Malinowski reiterated his own position:

4/10/1931

Soprabolzano

"I perfectly well remember the gist of our conversation at the school and my promise to you to assist E-P in his career, and you will see from the enclosed testimonial that I am redeeming my promise. You will remember also the two caveats I made: first that I could not very well co-operate with E-P in the same place, considering the bitter hostility which he has shown to me and is showing me, openly and above all underground...I naturally do not like motives of dishonesty being imputed to me and that is what he has been doing constantly."

7. Malinowski Papers. Letter from Malinowski to Seligman, 27 April, Soprabolzano; letter from Malinowski to Seligman, 4 October, 1931.
Although the strained relations between the two did not end with Evans-Pritchard's departure for his new position in Cairo in 1932, their relationship did enter a new phase, partly characterized by an enduring mutual intellectual respect. This new understanding of the Doughty Street incident shows it to be more than a clash of personalities, since it illuminates something essential about the combative intellectual atmosphere at the LSE. This atmosphere was to produce some of the formative figures in the British tradition, not just Evans-Pritchard, but Isaac Schapera, Raymond Firth, Audrey Richards and Jack Driberg among others. The atmosphere was a critical one in the positive sense, and drove the discipline on to new standards of theory and methodology. But it was also a charged atmosphere, in which rivalry and competition over the 'scientific' status of anthropological fieldwork and subsequent theoretical argument was on the increase.
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**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CALLS FOR PAPERS**

**CHEIRON: THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Cheiron will hold its 40th Annual Meeting, June 26–29, 2008, Ryerson University (Toronto, Ontario)

Papers, posters, symposia, or workshops may deal with any aspect of the history of the behavioral and social sciences or with related historiographical and methodological issues. All submissions must conform to the length limitations listed below (references, tables, etc. may be appended). To facilitate blind review, please include a cover sheet indicating: a) title; b) the author’s name and affiliation; c) the author’s address and phone number; and d) audio/visual needs.

All submissions must be received by January 11, 2008. Authors are strongly encouraged to send submissions electronically as attachments (.doc or .rtf), although three printed copies of a submission may be sent by post to the address below.

Papers: Submit a completed paper (7–8 double-spaced pages plus a short abstract), or a 700–800 word abstract plus short bibliography. Papers should be original, i.e., not previously presented at other conferences.

Posters: Submit a 300–400 word abstract.
Symposia: Submit a 250–300 word abstract describing the symposium as a whole, and a 500–700 word abstract plus short bibliography from each of the participants. A cover letter should include the names and institutional affiliations of each of the participants, which should not be revealed in the abstracts.

Workshops: Contact the program chair (farreras@hood.edu).

Student Travel Awards: Available to help defray travel expenses of students who present papers and posters. Please indicate if you are a student and wish to be considered for an award.

Program submissions should be sent to: Ingrid Farreras at farreras@hood.edu.

If necessary, submissions can be sent by regular mail to Ingrid Farreras at:

Department of Psychology
Hood College
401 Rosemont Ave
Frederick, MD 21701
Fax: 301-696-3863

Cheiron website: people.stu.ca/~cheiron
Andrew S. Winston, Executive Officer, awinston@uoguelph.ca
Wade Pickren, Local Host, wpickren@psych.ryerson.ca
Ingrid Farreras, Program Chair, farreras@hood.edu

WEB PRESENSES AND DIGITAL MEDIA

INSTITUTE FOR INTERCULTURAL STUDIES

The Institute for Intercultural Studies, established by Margaret Mead in 1944, has a Web presence at interculturalstudies.org. For a list of current projects see interculturalstudies.org/current-projects.html. The Institute’s latest newsletter is available at interculturalstudies.org/newsletters/spring2007.pdf. Recent projects of note include the processing of the Don D. Jackson Archive, interculturalstudies.org/DonJackson-archive.html, which draws together documents from mid-20th-century research on systemic psychotherapy associated with the work of Gregory Bateson and the Palo Alto Group.
ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND OTHER "ANCESTORS"

Cambridge-based anthropologist Alan MacFarlane has assembled a collection of filmed interviews with anthropologists, ethnohistorians, and ethnomusicologists. The series was initiated in 1982 by Jack Goody and has continued under MacFarlane’s direction with the help of a number of people, notably Sarah Harrison and Mark Turin. Early subjects included Audrey Richards, Meyer Fortes, and M. N. Srinivas. At present there are more than forty subjects in the collection.

The older interviews have been digitized and are hosted together with the newer, digitally-recorded ones, on Alan MacFarlane’s website: alanmacfarlane.com/ancestors

A complete list of subjects is available here:
alanmacfarlane.com/ancestors/complete_list.htm
alanmacfarlane.com/ancestors/audiovisual.html

In this article, “Anthropology and other ‘Ancestors’: Notes on Setting up a Visual Archive”, which appeared in truncated form in Anthropology Today (December 2004), MacFarlane gives an account of the history of the project and discusses technical details of the digital archiving process; alanmacfarlane.com/TEXTS/ancestors.pdf

CARNIVALESQUE FILMS

Carnivalesque Films, carnivalesquefilms.com, is a Brooklyn, New York–based documentary production company, founded in 2004 by David Redmon and Ashley Sabin, whose films use close observation of the lives of individuals not often represented in movies as a point of entry into a critique of broad social transformations.

Their film Mardi Gras: Made in China, mardigrasmadeinchina.com, traces the beads used at Mardi Gras in New Orleans from the factory in China where they are produced. In January 2007 it won a Special Mention award at the fourth annual Nürnberg Filmfestival der Menschenrechte, humanrightsfilmfestival.org/index2.php.
THE ANTHROSOURCE CONTROVERSY

Our readers may have heard about the recent decision by the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association to move AnthroSource, anthrosourcetest, the umbrella organization for the fifteen major peer-reviewed journals published by sections of the AAA, from the University of California Press to Wiley-Blackwell. The move has generated controversy and speculation as to the integrity of AnthroSource as an experiment in open-access publishing and as to the future of fee-for-access as a model of revenue generation for scholarly publications in the social sciences.

Jason Baird Jackson has been writing about the AnthroSource move and related matters on the online blog for Museum Anthropology:

museumanthropology.blogspot.com/2007/09/on-prism.html
museumanthropology.blogspot.com/2007/09/more-on-prism.html

Inside Higher Ed has also covered the story, as has Savage Minds:

insidehighered.com/news/2007/08/22/anthro
savageminds.org/2007/08/19/anthrosource-drops-uc-press-for-wiley-blackwell

For a broader discussion of open-access publishing in anthropology, see

OpenAccessAnthropology.org
blog.openaccessanthropology.org