



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 36
Issue 1 *June 2009*

Article 1

1-1-2009

Volume 36, Issue 1



**HISTORY OF
ANTHROPOLOGY
NEWSLETTER**

VOLUME 36.1

JUNE 2009



HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 36, NUMBER 1

JUNE 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Whatever Happened to . . . ? An Analysis of the Generation of 1971-1972
Robert V. Kemper 3

Franz Boas and Paul Rivet's Relationship: Militancy as a Scientific Commitment
Christine Laurière 10

Announcements 22

Recent and Forthcoming Bibliography 23

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Henrika Kuklick, Editor hkuklick@sas.upenn.edu
Joanna Radin, Assistant Editor jradin@sas.upenn.edu

CORRESPONDING CONTRIBUTORS

Regna Darnell rdamell@uwo.ca
Nélia Dias nelia.dias@iscte.pt
Christian Feest christian.feest@ethno-museum.ac.at
Andre Gingrich andre.gingrich@univie.ac.at
Robert Gordon rgordon@uvm.edu
Curtis Hinsley curtis.hinsley@nau.edu
Michael Kraus kraus@mail.uni-marburg.de
Edgardo Krebs krebse@si.edu
Esteban Krotz kroqui@prodigy.net.mx
Joyce Ogburn joyce.ogburn@utah.edu
H. Glenn Penny h-penny@uiowa.edu
Joy Rohde joyrhode@umich.edu
Lyn Schumaker lynschumaker@yahoo.co.uk
George Stocking g-stocking@uchicago.edu
Susan Trencher strenche@gmu.edu
Elizabeth Williams williea@okstate.edu

HAN depends very much on our readers to contribute bibliographic notes, research reports, and items for our other departments. Direct all correspondence relating to editorial matters to Henrika Kuklick hkuklick@sas.upenn.edu

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Each volume contains two numbers, June and December.

Individual Subscribers, North America	\$7.00
Student Subscribers	\$6.00
Institutional Subscribers, North America	\$9.00
Individual Subscribers outside North America	\$10.00
Institutional Subscribers outside North America	\$12.00

For students everywhere, as well as members of the American Anthropological Association, the Forum for the History of the Human Sciences of the History of Science Society, and of Cheiron, individual membership rates remain at the 2004 level:

North America	\$6.00
Outside North America	\$10.00

Checks for renewals and new subscriptions should be payable (in U.S. Dollars only) to HAN and addressed to:

Henrika Kuklick — HAN
Department of History and Sociology of Science
University of Pennsylvania
Cohen Hall, 249 S. 36th St, ste 303
Philadelphia, PA 19104 USA

Whatever Happened to . . . ? An Analysis of the Generation of 1971-1972

By Robert V. Kemper, Southern Methodist University

INTRODUCTION

In a 1991 article about the funding of dissertation research in anthropology, Stuart Plattner and Christopher McIntyre concluded their analysis with the intriguing question: "What happens to the majority of cultural anthropology researchers when they receive their PhD?" (1991:208). This question stimulated the research underlying this brief paper, although I should add that the question has puzzled me for years -- usually rising to the point of conscious consideration on the occasion of the annual meetings of the AAA and the SfAA, where I always look forward to seeing old friends from graduate student days. Inevitably, as we would discuss the latest news about our respective professional doings and family affairs, someone would ask: "By the way, whatever happened to ...?" or in more recent years, "Did you hear that ... died?"

In 1991-1992, realizing that I was twenty years beyond the year of my doctorate, I decided to see if I could discover that had happened to members of my academic generation -- and, by inclusion, my classmates from the University of California at Berkeley. First, I compiled a list of all anthropology PhD recipients in the United States and Canada for the academic year 1971-1972. This involved comparing data in the annual Guide to Departments of Anthropology published by the AAA with similar data in Dissertation Abstracts (from University Microfilms International). The combined list contained a total of 325 individuals distributed among the sub-disciplines as follows: 207 in social-cultural anthropology, 61 in archaeology, 27 in physical anthropology, 16 in anthropological linguistics, and 14 in other/miscellaneous domains.

I then developed a computerized database (first using Paradox 3.5 ©, but recently converted to MS Excel 2003©) for the 207 social-cultural anthropologists. I have attempted to gather information about each person's current location and professional career development. In my initial efforts, my main information sources were the annual AAA Guides, the National Faculty Directory (from Gale Research), and other professional directories and membership lists. I also contacted the departments where individuals earned their degrees, called several alumni associations, communicated with former employers, and even contacted a few former spouses. Often, the research reminded me of the problems involved with my long-term fieldwork among the migrants from Tzintzuntzan, Mexico. In a sense, I was doing a longitudinal study of academic migrants from more than fifty origin points to nearly 200 destinations.

In the initial (1991-1992) phase of the study, I identified then current positions of 136 (65%) of the 207 cohort members and current addresses (without knowing professional positions) for an additional 29 persons (14%). During the current (2008-2009) phase of the study, I have lost track of some individuals and found others once unknown to me. The net effect is that I now have positional/location data on 170 (82.1%) of the 207 individuals. I acquired information from direct contacts with individuals, their colleagues, or their workplaces, as well as the Internet, using search engines such as Google™ and on-line information in AnthroSource, university catalogues, and person-centered databases (e.g., ZoomInfo and PublicRecordsPro.com).

Nonetheless, of two facts of life made it difficult to find all members of the cohort: first, some women changed their surnames through marriage (or divorce) after receiving their PhDs; second, some foreigners who received their degrees in the United States have returned home (or gone elsewhere). Consequently, the current analysis remains incomplete, but – like studies of migrant populations – is reaching its limits. In another fifteen years, when the Generation of 1971-1972 has become the “Golden” Generation of 1971-1972, the task will be easier. By then, nearly all of its members will have moved into the categories of “retired” or “deceased.”

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 1971-1972 GENERATION

Sources of PhD Degrees

The 207 social-cultural anthropologists received their doctorates from more than 50 institutions, of which two-thirds are public and one-third private. The proportion of degrees awarded by the public and private universities followed the same 2:1 ratio -- 138 vs. 69. Five universities accounted for 74 (35%) of the doctorates granted in 1971-2: the leading grantor was the University of California at Berkeley (24), followed by the University of Chicago (17), Columbia University (13), Harvard University (11), and the University of Pittsburgh (9). At the other extreme, nine schools gave just two doctorates and eighteen schools gave just a single PhD in sociocultural anthropology. The degree-granting institutions are located in 25 states as well as the District of Columbia and Canada. Five states accounted for 120 (57%) of the doctorates: the leader was California (40 degree recipients), followed by New York (27), Illinois (25), Pennsylvania (15), and Massachusetts (13).

THE 1971-1972 GENERATION IN 1991-1992 AND 2008-2009

Professional Positions: 1991-1992 and 2008-2009

Among the 136 individuals for whom I had been able to obtain career data in 1991-1992, 113 (83.1%) held academic positions, Only eight (5.9%) worked for governmental agencies (ranging from cities to states to the federal government to international agencies), five (3.7%) labored in the private sector, and just two (1.5%) were museum employees. Additionally, three (2.2%) persons were already retired and 5 (3.7%) were deceased. All but one of the retired and deceased individuals had previously been in academe.

Currently, of the 170 individuals for whom I have data, only 67 (39.4%) are employed predominantly in academic institutions, 24 (14.1%) labor in the private sector, nine (5.3%) work for governmental agencies (ranging from cities to states to the federal government to international agencies), and only one (0.6%) has a museum position. By now, 54 (31.8%) of the persons are retired and 15 (8.8%) are deceased. All but two of the retired and deceased individuals had held academic positions.

Academic Positions: 1991-1992 and 2008-2009

In 1991-1992, the 113 persons with active academic positions worked in a wide range of institutions, from first rank research universities to two-year community colleges: 32 people (28.3%), worked in PhD-granting programs, 30 (26.5%) in MA-granting programs, 34 (30.1%) in BA-granting programs, and 6 (5.3%) in academic programs that either incorporated a minor in anthropology or had no type of concentration in the subject (such as in community colleges). In addition,

5 (7.5%) persons had jobs in graduate departments offering such advanced graduate degrees as the EdD, 5 (7.5%) worked at foreign universities, and one person (0.9%) held a university-based administrative appointment.

Currently, among the 67 persons with active academic positions, 18 (26.9%) persons have positions in PhD-granting programs, 10 (14.9%) in MA-granting programs, and 11 (16.4%) in BA-granting programs. In addition, another 5 (7.5%) persons have jobs in graduate departments offering advanced non-anthropological graduate degrees such as the EdD, and 5 (7.5%) work in academic programs allowing either a minor in anthropology or no form of specialization in it. Foreign academic institutions employ 8 (11.9%) individuals.

GENDER ISSUES: 1991-1992 and 2008-2009

Of the 207 persons in the 1971-1972 generation, 133 (64.3%) were male and 64 (30.9%) female; I was unable to identify 10 (4.8%) of them. Data were available for 113 individuals in academic positions in 1991-1992. Of the 66 full professors, 47 (71.2%) were male and 19 (28.8%) female. With regard to advancement to the rank of full professor, there were no gender differences: 59% of both men and women had achieved this rank. In addition, the proportion of men and women in public vs. private academic institutions was the same: 60 of 80 (75%) males and 24 of 32 (75%) females were in state-run institutions.

By 2008-2009, the gender distribution for full professors ($n = 47$) at all types of institutions, domestic and foreign, is as follows: 35 (74.5%) are males and only 12 (25.5%) are females. The differences from the profile fifteen years ago may be due to the different ages when men and women completed their Ph.D. degrees and entered the job market, different rates of retirement, and different rates of abandoning the academy for private sector positions.

CAREER ADVANCEMENT ISSUES

After thirty-seven years, most of the persons in the 1971-1972 generation who have remained in the academy have gained tenure and been promoted to full professor or serve in higher administrative positions. Still, only 10 persons currently serve at the rank of full professor in PhD-granting programs—5 in private institutions and 5 in public institutions—while 29 full professors work outside of anthropology doctoral programs.

In effect, the 1971-1972 generation has spread its members well beyond the PhD-granting programs which generated them. In several cases, individuals were hired (and have remained at or retired from) the same colleges where they had spent their undergraduate years. In these cases, at least, we can see how undergraduate anthropology programs are able to "reproduce" themselves from generation to generation.

The same cannot be said of doctoral programs in anthropology. One of the most striking findings to emerge from the present study is that only 10 of the 67 persons still in academic positions are in positions where they can "reproduce" themselves. Once all of these individuals have retired, we will be able to determine if the relatively small number of individuals at doctorate-granting institutions will have been able to turn out enough

new PhDs to replace the entire 1971-1972 generation.

SINGLE-INSTITUTION VS. MULTIPLE-INSTITUTION CAREER PATHS

The most common career path has been to remain at the same institution throughout one's career, often rising through the ranks from Assistant Professor to tenured Associate Professor to Professor. Numerous individuals have gone on to serve as department chairs, others have been honored with named chairs in recognition of their distinguished service and accomplishments, and a handful have become Deans, Provosts, and University Presidents. A number of persons have completed (or have retired after completing) 30+ years of consecutive service with the same academic employer; relatively few individuals have made many moves during their careers. This stability among the academic members of the 1971-1972 generation stands in contrast to the mobility and academic gamesmanship of anthropologists who received their doctorates during the 1960s, when jobs were more plentiful and new programs were blooming across the country (cf. van den Berghe 1970).

This stability was probably due to the reduced availability of positions at the associate and full professorial ranks from the early 1970s through the decade of the 1980s (D'Andrade et al. 1975). During that period of economic difficulties, anthropology departments in both public and private institutions had difficulty in convincing their administrations to open new positions at ranks above assistant professor, and it was hard to replace retiring senior faculty members with anyone other than a beginning assistant professor.

ACADEMIC VS. NON-ACADEMIC CAREER TRACKS

Following the models of their mentors, most members of the 1971-1972 generation sought to sustain academic careers; few went into full-time work in the private sector or took government jobs. Early in their careers, many academically-based scholars did stints of applied work through contracts with government agencies or NGOs. As time passed, some scholars left the safety of the groves of North American academe for the risks and rewards of the rest of the world. Some took positions at universities beyond the Americas. Others joined for-profit or non-profit organizations. A few started their own consulting firms.

TENSIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Many members of the 1971-1972 generation have played important roles in building anthropology programs, whether at the PhD, MA, or BA levels. Some have had heavy teaching responsibilities (as many as four or five different courses each semester) and some have labored as the only anthropologist on their campus. By contrast, individuals fortunate enough to obtain jobs in the more "elite" anthropology departments often have had lighter teaching loads (usually two courses per term). The effects of these different institutional settings on an individual's professional recognition by anthropologists beyond the local campus has been significant in defining individuals as "locals," "cosmopolitans," or some combination of the two (cf. Merton 1957:387-420).

For instance, a few of the 1971-1972 anthropologists have had campus buildings named for them, while others have had local-level academic awards and prizes created in their honor. Within the profession as a whole, numerous members of the 1971-1972 generation of sociocultural anthropologists have held important elected offices in professional societies or have been appointed as editors of journals and book series, but so far no one among them has been recognized by election to the National Academy of Sciences. The Association of Feminist Anthropology (a unit of the AAA) is now preparing to award its annual "Sylvia Forman Prize, named for Sylvia Helen Forman [who died in 1992], one of the founders of [the] AFA, whose dedication to both her students and feminist principles contributed to the growth of feminist anthropology."

CONCLUSION

Becoming an anthropologist does not end with completion of one's PhD. This is merely the credential for beginning a career. Becoming an anthropologist is a continuing, life-long process in which professional involvement, research, study, teaching (for those in the academic track), publications/reports provide measures of progress as well as personal satisfaction. For most persons in the 1971-1972 generation, the academic career model has been favored over alternative models. Advancement through the traditional stages—from assistant professor to associate professor to full professor to emeritus or emerita status in retirement—offers evidence to other members of the profession and to members of one's own institution about an individual's success over time. (Appendix 1).

However, if success is narrowly defined as having achieved the rank of full professor at a PhD-granting institution of equivalent prestige to that in which one's PhD was earned, then very few have enjoyed success. Among the 90 anthropologists within the generation of 1971-1972 who so far have become full professors and remained in the academy or already have retired at this rank, only 16 (17.8%), finished their careers or continue to work at institutions granting the PhD in anthropology.


Far more common was the pattern of moving "down and out." After reading a draft of this paper, one member of the 1971-1972 academic generation wrote to me, "Let me note in regard to your down and out thesis, that I was the "father of anthropology" in Walla Walla after coming from the Dept. at Arizona which had a faculty roughly the same size as the whole of Whitman College." I can add that he spent his career building up anthropology at this well-known liberal arts institution, which currently has an Anthropology Department with three full-time faculty teaching 29 majors.

In like manner, other members of the 1971-1972 generation played key roles in the expansion of the discipline to many campuses across the United States and Canada, and even to foreign countries – including Australia, Brazil, Egypt, Germany, Great Britain, Korea, New Zealand, Qatar, Sweden, Thailand. We have enabled a new generation of students to become familiar with key anthropological concepts. Moreover, members of the generation of 1971-1972 have also made important contributions beyond the academy. Some have become active in the private sector, others have built on their doctorates in anthropology to go on to success in medicine, law, finance, and the like.

It is not yet possible to measure the full impact of the contributions of the 1971-1972

generation on anthropology as a discipline, as a profession, and as an academic enterprise, as well as on society at large. We also need comparative data on other cohorts from earlier and more recent decades to judge better the experiences of the members of this generation, as well information on those whom I have not been able to locate or contact. I hope that this brief paper will encourage other anthropologists to examine their own cohorts as I have examined my own generation. I look forward to reconsidering the issues raised in this paper in 2022--when the generation of 1971-1972 reaches its 50th year. (Appendix 2)

Appendix 1 – The Generation of 1971-1972 – Career Transformations



Appendix 2 – The Generation of 1971-1972 – In Memoriam

Name	University of Ph.D.
Donald E. Christie	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Rosemary Cochran (Sharp)	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Abdel-Hamid Mohamed El-Zein	University of Chicago
Sylvia H. Forman	University of California, Berkeley
Anthony H. Galt	University of California, Riverside
Frances H. Harwood	University of Chicago
Linda J. M. Hubbell	University of California, Berkeley
Ronald J. Maduro	University of California, Berkeley
Frank E. Manning	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Keith L. Morton	University of Oregon
John G. Peck	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
P. David Price	University of Chicago
Michael Salovesh	University of Chicago
Michael Sozan	Syracuse University
Nancy Tanner	University of California, Berkeley

References Cited

D'Andrade, Roy G., Eugene Hammel, D. Adkins, and C. McDaniel (1975). "Academic Opportunity in Anthropology, 1974-1990." *American Anthropologist* 77:753-773.

Merton, Robert K. (1957). "Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials." Pp. 387-420 in Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*. (Revised and enlarged edition). New York: The Free Press.

Plattner, Stuart and Christopher McIntyre (1991). "The Funding of Dissertation Research in Anthropology at the National Science Foundation." *Human Organization*: 50:203-208.

van den Berghe, Pierre (1970). *Academic Gamesmanship: How to Make a Ph.D. Pay*. New York and London: Abelard-Schuman.

Franz Boas and Paul Rivet's Relationship: Militancy as a Scientific Commitment

By Christine Laurière (Laboratoire d'anthropologie et d'histoire de l'institution de la culture, Paris)

The correspondence between Franz Boas and Paul Rivet (76 letters from Boas and 53 from Rivet), begun in 1919, reveals close ties between two founding fathers of anthropology. Perhaps because the contribution of Rivet (1876-1958) to French anthropology has been slighted, little attention has been paid to the Boas-Rivet relationship. Rivet was a major figure in the discipline during the first half of the twentieth century—general secretary of the Institute of Ethnology at the Sorbonne, occupant of the chair in anthropology at the National museum of Natural History, founding director of the Museum of Man in 1937, and a leader of the Société des Américanistes de Paris. He was also a world-renowned expert on South-Amerindian languages. This essay touches upon only a few aspects of his biography; for extended discussion of such matters as his battles against fascism, racism, and the regime of Marshal Pétain established under the German occupation of France during World War II, see Laurière 2008a.

In this paper, I reproduce a few of the letters Boas and Rivet exchanged and provide some contextualization, stressing how the two men understood the relationship between their scientific and political values as well as Boas's deep concerns about the European political scene. What makes these letters such compelling reading is the strong commitment to action they express—the view that anthropologists have responsibilities as citizens: they must protest, rebel, be activists, fighting prejudice courageously. Anthropologists' emphasis on studying non-western societies does not mean that their knowledge cannot inform action taken in their own societies.

The developing Boas-Rivet relationship was framed by the two world wars. There were three periods of intense interaction. The first was motivated by their desire to restore scientific internationalism immediately after World War I. The second (not represented in the letters printed here) reflected their concern to preserve Native American languages, although they disagreed about how to do linguistic research. Finally, they responded to the rise of Nazi power.

The first three letters show us Franz Boas and Paul Rivet getting to know one another. Their backdrop is the familiar story of Boas's painful wartime experience as an American citizen of German origins (see esp. Hyatt 1990, Lewis 2001a, Darnell 2006). Rivet spent the war as a military doctor, first on the French eastern front and then in Thessalonika. He returned to civilian life a fierce pacifist and socialist, eager to resume scientific relations with his German colleagues, opposed to then-prevailing French feeling, which inclined to revenge for the devastations of war. As an Americanist accustomed to interacting with colleagues all over Europe and America, Rivet placed a premium on scientific internationalism, and battled for it regardless of the consequences for his (still insecure) professional position, opposing the attempt by several members of the Board of Directors of the Society of Americanists to expel German speakers from the society; a vital member of the society and the editor of its journal, he proclaimed that he would resign if this proposal were executed. It is noteworthy that even before Boas and Rivet were acquainted, they minced no words in expressing themselves.

Bolton Landing, Warren Co., New York
August 23, 1919
Dr. Rivet
Société des Américanistes de Paris
61, rue de Buffon
Paris, France

My dear Sir,

I have in mind your invitation to contribute to the journal of the Société des Américanistes and your remark that contributions might be in Spanish or in English. I feel very keenly the need of international cooperation and am anxious to support every enterprise that is likely to further this object. From this point of view nothing has saddened me more than the circular sent out by our anthropological colleagues, principally of the Ecole d'Anthropologie [of Paris], a statement dictated by uncontrolled emotion, not by calm deliberation.

It is impossible to speak of these matters without speaking of the general political situation, and of what I think should be our aspirations as scientists. For more than thirty-five years, I have abhorred nationalism in the sense in which it has dominated the world for more than a century, —a nationalism that is merely a transformation of the old dynastic struggle for power. There is no European nation that has been free of this desire. All the policies of European States, as—alas—of the United States center on this one idea. It is a form of social thought in which all nations have participated, and all to the same extent, that has brought the world to a state of moral and economic bankruptcy. Unless we all turn to new and broader ideals we shall not save the world from further horrors.

If there is any science that teaches the narrowness of national aspirations for domination, it is anthropology. Do we not see the ever widening circles of social groups, beginning with primitive tribes, and leading up to modern nations? Do we not see, how the essence of the life of mankind is first based on the cultural unity of the tribal group, later, on that of the diversified social groups that no longer coincide with geographical and national limits; and how our present feelings are still swayed by the confusion of these two tendencies?

I do not accuse those who are devoted to nationalistic principles, of being criminal offenders, —for how would it be possible to stamp suddenly as a crime what has been praised as the highest virtue for thousands of years, —but I do believe that their ideals must be overcome and I consider it our duty as scientists, to do our share in this battle of ideals.

Let me make myself clear. I do not argue for universal uniformity. Nothing, I believe, could be more detrimental to the advance of mankind than that narrowness of view that seeks to impose its own ideals upon the whole of mankind, as we Americans do. Man will and shall retain individual, national, and social character, that each may contribute his share to the common good. But differences should not mean mutual distrust, hate and wish for domination and suppression

I do not wish to hurt your feelings, but let me say that only one thing is more depressing to me than the shortsightedness of your Statesmen who are doing their level best to pave the way for future horrors, and who cannot see, owing to the cheap flattery bestowed upon France by England, that she has been reduced to the rank of a satellite who lives by her grace. That one thing is the miserable role played by our representatives in the Peace negotiations. I feel I have a right to speak as I do. My sons

served in the American Army, the sons of dear relatives in the French Army, and those of other dear relations and friends in the German Army. I know that all of them abhorred war. How long are we going to fight the wars of Louis XV, of Peter the Great and of voracious England? I dare say the time for an understanding between France and Germany will only come when it is indifferent to whom German Alsace belongs. Now to my point. If I am to contribute to your Journal, I want to write in German. Let me know when conditions are such that you can accept such a contribution and I shall be glad to send you the best I have.

Yours very sincerely

Franz Boas

Société des Américanistes de Paris

61 rue de Buffon

Paris, September 4, 1919

Dear Sir,

I thank you very much for the courageous outspokenness of your letter and I thank you all the more for it given that I am almost unknown to you. I shall answer it in the same spirit.

For five years, I waged war and devoted all my energy to the service of my endangered country and its suffering children. But I never lost my serenity even in the most troubled times and I did not lose the ideal that was mine before the war and is now more important than ever. I think that mankind must strive to abolish all nationalisms, I think that present human wretchedness will find a cure only in the reconciliation of all peoples by all possible means, I shall try to hasten the day when true peace will be in our hearts, not on a document, and I would be ashamed to be a man if I did not feel this unwavering faith deep inside of me.

I saw with sadness the creation of an unsatisfactory peace; I saw with deep sorrow the beautiful idea of the League of Nations subverted; I saw with despair that the great lesson of the dreadful slaughter was understood by only a few, and that they were ignored.

However, I tried my best to win acceptance for my ideas. When one proposed to strike off citizens of the enemy powers from the membership list of the Society [of Americanists], I did not shrink from forceful opposition. I condemned the proposal in the name of scientific internationalism and, when it seemed that I might not prevail, I declared that I would resign my position as assistant general secretary. Confronted, the Society accepted my position.

As soon as possible, I reestablished my scientific exchanges with my German colleagues through my friend [Erland] Nordenskiöld.

Everywhere, on every occasion, I preached hatred of war and I fully share the ideas that [Anatole] France recently asserted to the schoolteachers of France. I . . . repeat the fine words of our great writer: "in every people, at anytime, there are more victims than criminals..." and this other sentence: "All the peoples have a great deal to forgive of each other".

You now know my ideas and my viewpoint. I am not one who is easily discouraged by the enormity of a task; I will work patiently, tenaciously, to persuade my fellow countrymen of my ideas. But one must recognize that this work cannot be achieved immediately or through violence. A war like the one that just devastated the world has mortally wounded so many hearts that one cannot ask those most hurt to forget. Remember that in France as well as in Germany three million families mourn and it

would be foolish to ask them not to feel despair and hatred. These feelings, intensified by the newspapers, fostered by tendentious and often misleading campaigns, shall disappear or at least shall fade with the passage of time. Good sense shall triumph once more and be assured that all my efforts will strive to hasten the moment of triumph. But for the time being one must act with extreme caution; when I face one of these fierce sorrows that demand revenge I usually keep silent, and I wait patiently for the time when I can speak words of peace and sweetness without causing offence. This time has not come: the graves of the dead are too fresh and wounds are still bleeding. Going too quickly one could inflame the feelings one would like to soothe.

For the sake of the human cause that is dear to us one must use infinite tact and discretion. That's what I am trying to do in the small circle where I have influence. As I told you at the beginning when there was an urgent matter that had to be resolved, I did not hesitate to resort to intense pressure in order to have my point of view triumph, and I managed to do so after a month-long fight, but I cannot adopt this behavior consistently because I will stir opposition that will rob me of any authority.

After what I did to prevent the expulsion of German members, the publication of a paper in German in our journal now would be regarded by the vast majority of society members as a blatant provocation, especially when they see that you are the author, since everyone knows that you write in Spanish or in English as easily as in German. The immediate result would be to break the tool of international action I forged.

The time will come when the journal can publish a paper in German, and be sure that if it is up to me this time will come speedily, but it will be written by a German scholar, [Theodor] Koch-Grünberg or [Eduard] Seler or someone else. By asking you to contribute I had a clear purpose: I was working for a return to a completely international review. Everyone knows you have German origins; it would be a step forward to publish a paper by you in our journal and no one could protest.

Under present conditions, trying to do more would defeat my goal.

Needless to say, I am in no way involved in the action of the professors of the School of Anthropology of Paris that troubles you, having nothing to do with this School. Do not forget, by the way, that it is not an official establishment. Remember rather that the Academy of Sciences and the Society of Americanists have retained their German corresponding members. I apologize for the length of this letter. But I wanted to answer your letter as clearly as possible and to leave no point obscure.

Yours very respectfully

Paul Rivet

October 9, 1919

Dr Rivet, General Secretary
Société des Américanistes de Paris,
Paris, France

My dear Sir,

I wish to thank you most cordially for your letter which I received recently and which is the first ray of light in the darkness of international conditions at the present time. I am exceedingly glad to know that we share the same opinions and the same feelings in regard to the aims of scientific work and in regard to the duties of mankind, and you may be certain that I value your communication most highly. In regard to the matter about which I wrote, I think another point should be considered which prompted my suggestion that when conditions in France are sufficiently far advanced, I should be glad to contribute to your journal in German. We must not forget that exactly the same

difficulties which you meet at the present time among your French colleagues must prevail in Germany, and that if a man like Seler, who, I am quite certain shares our opinions, should send you a communication, he might experience considerable personal difficulties among his German colleagues outside of the narrower scientific circle. I am free of these influences, and for this reason, it would be infinitely easier for me to break the ban than it would be for a German. This was one of the principal considerations which I had in mind. As I wrote to you in my first letter, I do not by any means ask you at the present time to accept a contribution in German, but I ask you to let me know when the time has come, and then I shall be glad to send it. I beg you to consider my suggestion from this point of view.

*Yours very sincerely,
Franz Boas*

This epistolary exchange signaled the beginning of a long cooperation. Given prohibitive printing costs in the US, Rivet helped Boas to find a printer in France for his International Journal of Linguistics and acted as a go-between with the printer. Boas invited Rivet to join the editorial board of his review and frequently asked him for advice about papers in South Amerindian linguistics. Fully aware of the international readership of the Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris, Boas several times raised funds from American scholars and institutions to keep the journal going when it suffered from the depreciation of the franc and the increase of paper and printing costs in the mid-twenties. In the 1920's, Boas sought every possible means to alleviate the "intellectual starvation" affecting European scientific life (Hyatt 1990:134). An active member of the Emergency Society in Aid of European Science and Art, he sought Rivet's advice in setting up bibliographical exchanges and subscriptions to French reviews.

Boas and Rivet first met in 1924, during the International Congress of Americanists in The Hague and Goteborg, the first held since 1912 that brought together scholars from formerly enemy nations. It took place partly in a neutral country, thanks to Rivet's suggestion and friendship with Nordenskiöld. As Boas and Rivet's letters show, they were determined that it be a truly international event. At its opening session in The Hague, the Congress president paid tribute to Rivet and his by then well known fight for scientific internationalism. Indeed, in 1919 Rivet had described the German members affair for readers of the Journal de la Société des Américanistes, and he wrote in his 1923 obituary of Eduard Seler (a German Americanist and fellow internationalist), "If a scientist has a country, science can only be international" (Rivet 1923). A headline story in a Goteborg newspaper featured a photograph of the French Rivet shaking hands with the German Karl von den Steinen.

In the 1930's, the issues discussed in the letters changed dramatically. Following his receipt of Boas's courageous open letter to Marshal Hindenburg, Rivet wrote to him in April 1933 about his recent visit in Berlin, three months after Adolf Hitler had become chancellor. His trip opened the eyes of this French German-loving anthropologist, with strong pacifist and socialist opinions. Witness to Nazi anti-Semitism, he began to work on behalf of German intellectual exiles, Jews and non-Jews; together with such figures as Marcel Mauss and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Rivet struggled to find appropriate jobs for them. He hoped for creation of a hospitable institution that would provide good working conditions for elite refugees, but this project came to nothing.

National Museum of Natural History
Laboratory of Anthropology
Rue de Buffon n°61
Paris, April 27, 1933

Dear Mr. Boas,

I spent a fortnight in Berlin for the Easter holidays. I had a lot of research to do in the libraries and Museums of this great city. I also spent two days in Köln.

You know my state of mind when I went to Germany. I was convinced that the French newspapers had exaggerated events. Although I did see in Paris fugitive professors, Salmony, Barruch, artists like Kurt Weill, I thought they were exceptional cases. Furthermore I told myself that the policy pursued since 1919 towards Germany explained or partly excused the Hitlerian excesses. This is still my opinion. I think Hitler is the child [Georges] Clemenceau had by [Raymond] Poincaré .

This point made I must tell you that I was welcomed everywhere with affection by my German colleagues and that I am deeply grateful for the help they gave me and the warmth of their hospitality. [Theodor] Preuss, Walter Lehmann, [Robert] Lehmann-Nitsche, Krickeberg, Quelle, were charming to me.

I wanted to explain my state of mind so that my account will have more value in your eyes. . . . I returned utterly distressed from this country I love so much. All that the papers wrote is true. One night I took a walk on my own in Granadierstrasse and in Dragonenstrasse, the quarter of the small Jew storekeepers. I thought I was in a dead city. All the shops were shut down (it was 8 P.M.), no one or almost no one on the street. On every house and store window it was written: Jude or Lebensgefähr [Jew or Death warning]. The Swastika is everywhere. But on the other hand the Jewish-owned department store Wertheim was open. I was told that the German princes, who have a stake in this store, interceded for Wertheim, who fired all the Jewish employees. It seems that Hitlerism mainly persecuted the little ones, contenting itself with a one-day non-violent boycott of big firms. . . .

What is worse is that there is no reaction among the sensible people I saw. Preuss, Lehmann-Nitsche don't disapprove. In fact the intelligentsia is also anti-Semitic. Preuss spoke to me about the open letter you wrote to Marshal Hindenburg. I had the feeling he did not understand your disapproval. Yet he asked me on the day of my departure to try to find a job for one of his Jewish students who has been removed from his position, Mister [Heinrich] Lehmann. So I think this popular movement is accepted by the non-Jewish intellectual elite.

Walter Lehmann told me that Preuss, who is so powerful today, is trying to have him identified as a Jew in order to have him sacked. You know the hatred these two men have for one another. It is typical that Preuss does not hesitate to hold Judaism against Lehmann to get rid of him. What's certain is that all civil servants receive a questionnaire which asks them to indicate their religion, their parents' religion and their four grandparents' religion. A civil servant married to a Jew is considered a Jew.

In Köln I heard that the dismissals extend to the socialists. Mister [Justus] Lips, the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum curator, was discharged only because of his socialist opinions. I saw him. He is not allowed to go to his museum . . . He is cooped up in his home. His letters have been opened. . . . He was not allowed to go to France as he usually does every year. He was informed that his passport would be taken away if he tried to use a French visa to go.

Only Nazi-leaning newspapers are published. Your letter to the Marshal [Hindenburg] was only known from the people you sent it to.

In short it's obvious that a terror regime rules Germany and that this regime does not tolerate opposition.

I am told that the Nazis polled heavily from the disgruntled, from all the unemployed, from a lot of communists and a good many women. It may be so. But this disparate majority galvanized by its leader seems united so far. I did not perceive any sign of an impending end for the regime anyway and that's also the opinion of German refugees in France. So we must think of them for a very long while. In France, a big effort is being made to find jobs for them. But I am thinking particularly of the intellectuals.

Wouldn't it be possible to create in Switzerland for instance an important research center, like the "Collège de France," where all the talented proscribed (from Germany, Italy and Russia) would find occupations and livelihoods? It's difficult for the League of Nations to carry this out. I think it should be created through private funding. Jewish high financiers and sponsors from all countries could contribute. To me this would have the advantage of not denationalizing these scholars who could go back to their countries when circumstances permitted.

Oddly enough, Salmony is completely hostile to this idea. He left Germany with no hope of return and disowns his country. I cannot believe this is the feeling of all the German Jews or Socialists who emigrated. For me if my country were to pass through a time of madness such as the one Germany is experiencing, I would like to keep open the possibility of returning once the crisis was over. I would like to get your views on this project that would guarantee for everyone the absolute independence that remains essential to me.

I just received your admirable letter to Hindenburg. This very evening I sent it to [the newspaper] Le Temps to have it published. This letter is the cry of human conscience. Thank you for having written it.

*PS: You know that the Angrand Prize couldn't have been awarded yet. [Martin] Gusinde got six votes and [Kaj] Birket-Smith got seven. I asked for a new vote in June and I hope I'll get it. I suspect that the majority might favor Birket-Smith, an excellent worker.
Yours very sincerely,*

P. Rivet

Both absorbed in their scientific and political activities, Boas and Rivet corresponded little in the next few years. Boas reactivated their correspondence in March 1937, accepting Rivet's invitation to attend the International Population Congress soon to be held in Paris (of which Rivet was vice-president), at which Rivet hoped he would challenge the German delegation. Active in the fight against race prejudice and Nazism (Barkan 1988, Hyatt 1990), Boas explained to Rivet what he had been doing and summarized the results of his study *Changes in Bodily forms of Descendants of Immigrants*, which, he knew, had received a cool reception in France in 1910-1912 from both the sociologist Emile Durkheim and the physical anthropologists (Laurière 2008a: 512-514). He reminded Rivet of its significance. Times had changed dramatically, and Rivet was receptive to Boas's message that humans' nature was not determined by physical characteristics. What was at stake was not anthropologists' debate about the accuracy or relevance of measured individual differences. The challenge thrown down by Nazi race scientists demanded a more positive reception of Boas's study, and Rivet fundamentally agreed with Boas. As a founder of *Races et Racisme*, Rivet had two of Boas' papers published in the review, the first of Boas' works translated into French and the only ones available in French for decades (Boas 1937a and b). Boas' trip to Paris

strengthened his relationship with Rivet, although, not surprisingly, the two did not alter German race scientists' views.

*Dr. Paul Rivet
61 rue de Buffon
Paris, France
March 18, 1937*

Dear Dr Rivet,

I just learned that you are interested in a congress to be held at the end of July, organized by the Groupement d'Etude et d'Education (contre les doctrines racistes). I am very much interested in this subject and hope that a congress of this kind can be held in such a way that it will command general confidence. In order to bring this about I think it would be very essential that the congress ought not to be against the race doctrines but for a discussion of the race doctrines and that the German fanatics or hypocrites should be invited. If they do not accept so much the worse for them and if they accept I should hope there would be enough solid material so that they will be squelched. . . . Of course, scientific questions can never be settled by a majority vote but there is the danger which was encountered in the British Congress a few years ago that although the Division on Anthropology wanted a resolution on this subject the Congress as a whole was too timid to accept it.

Last year I tried to get the American anthropologists to make a joint statement but there again I was confronted with the timidity of some and with the race prejudice which is fostered particularly by those interested in eugenics which made it impossible to reach an agreement. Since I am of Jewish descent I did not try to organize the statement myself but I got Prof. Hooton of Harvard to engineer the whole matter. He finally had to give up and made the statement published in Science, a copy of which I enclose. I was asked for a statement later on and I made a statement of which I enclose a copy. I wish you would be good enough to consider these suggestions and let me know in some details what the proposed plans for the congress are. If it is really promising I might be willing to attend.

During the last three years I have devoted a great deal of my time to this question because it seemed to me that with the increasing race prejudice in the United States we have to move in this direction. The object of the work I did here was essentially to show the instability of anatomical, physiological and psychological traits among immigrants and their descendants. I took up again the work on change in bodily type which I carried through in 1910 We also investigated the change in posture and gesture habits, the speed of motor habits which is dependent upon occupation as against the influence of racial descent, the changes of incidence of mental diseases and changes in criminality. All these showed a complete change with adaptation to the American social environment.

Another investigation which I carried through was a very painstaking study of the interrelation between Jewish thought and German thought which shows how intimately the two are associated. It brought out for instance, that when Wagner brought out his "urgermanischen" Parsifal he could not find anyone but the Jew Levy to conduct it and the Jewish Lily Lehmann to sing one of the principal roles. A summary of this absolute unity of German and Jewish thought seems to me particularly striking.

I wish you would be good enough to talk over these matters with some of the other men interested in this movement and let me know just what is going on.

Maybe you knew that Mrs. Irene Harand of 20 Elizabethstrasse, Vienna, is planning a

similar congress for the end of July whose work is obviously going to be propaganda and which is to include also questions of international relations and social security. I think if she could utilize the results of your congress it might be of very great help. I think it would be well if you would ask her in regard to her plans and prospects of success. If it were possible to hold your congress under the auspices of the University or some other highly respected organization it might be of very considerable help.

*Yours very sincerely,
Franz Boas*

*November 15, 1937
Dr Paul Rivet
62 rue de Buffon
Paris, France*

Dear Dr. Rivet,

After a good deal of preparatory talk I got together a Committee consisting of three anthropologists, three psychologists, two geneticists and three sociologists and we are working out a plan of work to explore the whole field of so-called racial behavior. I hope it may be possible to find the funds for such an investigation in this country.

You will remember our meeting of the second of August when after the very enjoyable lunch which you were good enough to tender me, we had a discussion of ways and means to combat the German pseudo-scientific propaganda. We were all agreed that there ought to be some time an authoritative Congress in which this matter should be discussed preferably by invited speakers and co-referents. In order to be successful such a Congress ought to be prepared with very great care and furthermore, in order to make it impressive it ought to be held by invitation of some European government or by the League of Nations.

I do not think it would be advisable to try anything of the sort before 1939 or 1940 but the invitation to such a congress should be sent out long before that time.

I also wrote to Sir Robert Mond that a number of similar committees should be set up in Europe, or if not committees, arrangements should be made that special investigators should be enabled to devote themselves to particular problems that interested them. I presume our friend, Dr. Zollschan would have to be one of these.

At that meeting Sir Robert Mond, practically, offered to form a European Finance Committee in order to make possible further investigations on these problems.

May I hope that you will discuss this matter with your friends in France and see what can be done?

*Yours very sincerely,
Franz Boas*

World War II broke out before this Congress could take place. After the German Army occupied France in June 1940, Rivet wrote three times to Marshal Pétain, saying that Pétain was the wrong man to lead a France in disarray: France did not need the winner of the battle of Verdun in 1917 but a new man (in Laurière 2008a: 665-670). Rivet was one of the twenty-seven "First Class Men" listed by the Rockefeller Foundation as in danger if they stayed in their country (Loyer 2007). But despite the urging of his closest

friends, he refused to leave France. He joined the resistance network created at the Museum of Man by younger colleagues (Blumenson 1977, Blanc 2000 and 2004). In February 1941, he narrowly escaped arrest by the Gestapo, hurriedly leaving France. Others in the network were not so fortunate; seven men were executed in February 1942, and the women were sent to a concentration camp. Rivet took refuge in Colombia, where, thanks to President Santos's support, he created an institute to train anthropologists. In August 1941, he wrote to Boas giving news and asking for his help to get books and funds for fieldwork missions. Boas was "exceedingly glad" to hear from him and promised assistance.

Their final meeting took place in New York, when Rivet was invited to give lectures about the international situation and to speak on a radio program to be broadcast in France. On December 21st 1942, Boas invited him to Columbia University to lunch with some of his former students (Lesser 2005, Herskovits 1953). Rivet was accompanied by Claude Lévi-Strauss (Lévi-Strauss 1996: 58 and 2002). The old friends were moved to see each other, five years after their last meeting in Paris (Rivet 1943). During the meal, Boas inquired about the subject of Rivet's lectures, and Rivet answered apologetically that he would discuss racism, implying that he would not be very original. Boas declared that the crusade against racism could never be abandoned. At that moment, he fell, dying from a stroke. "He died", Rivet wrote, "proclaiming one last time what had been a rule of life for him: his faith in the equality between men." (Rivet 1958) Rivet's presence at Boas's death was symbolically fitting. Indeed, Boas had instructed his children that upon his death his magnificent library was to be sold at a low cost to Rivet's Museum of Man; with Lévi-Strauss acting as go-between, the children tried to arrange the sale, but the necessary funds could not be raised.

Bibliography

Barkan, Elazar. 1988. "Mobilizing Scientists against Nazi Racism, 1933-1939," in George W. Stocking, ed., *Bones, Bodies, Behavior. Essays on Biological Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 180-205.

Blanc, Julien. 2000. "Le réseau du Musée de l'Homme," *Esprit* 261: 89-103.

_____. 2004. "Introduction", in Agnès Humbert, *Notre guerre*. Paris: Tallandier Editions, 9-80.

Blumenson, Martin. 1977. *The Vildé Affair: Beginning of the French Resistance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Boas, Franz. 1908. *Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1911. *The Mind of Primitive Man*. New York: Macmillan.

_____. 1912. *Changes in Bodily Forms of Descendants of Immigrants*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1937a. "L'instabilité des types humains", *Races et Racisme* 4.

_____. 1937b. "Hérédité et milieu", *Races et Racisme* 5.

_____. 1940. *Race, Language and Culture*. New York: Macmillan.

_____. 1945. *Race and Democratic Society*. New York: J. J. Augustin.

Bunzel, Ruth. 1962. "Introduction," in Franz Boas, *Anthropology and Modern Life*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 4-10.

- Cole, Douglas. 1999. *Franz Boas. The Early Years, 1858-1906*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Conklin, Alice. 2002. "Civil Society; Science, and Empire in Late Republican France: the Foundation of Paris's Museum of Man." *Osiris* 17: 255-290.
- Darnell, Regna. 1998. *And Along came Boas. Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J. Benjamin.
- _____. 2001. *Invisible Genealogies. A History of Americanist Anthropology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- _____. 2006. "Franz Boas. Scientist and Public Intellectual," in Jill B. R. Cherneff and Eve Hochwals, eds. *Visionary Observers. Anthropological Inquiry and Education*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1-23.
- Duvernay Bolens, Jacqueline. 2001-2002. "L'oral et l'écrit : de Franz Boas à Claude Lévi-Strauss." *Gradhiva* 30-31: 15-30.
- Evans, Brad. 2006. "Where Was Boas during the Renaissance in Harlem ? Diffusion, Race, and the Culture Paradigm in the History of Anthropology," in Richard Handler, ed., *Central Sites, Peripheral Visions. Cultural and Institutional Crossings in the History of Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 69-98.
- Fournier, Marcel. 1994. *Marcel Mauss*. Paris, Fayard.
- Gravlee, Clarence C., H. Russel Bernard and William R. Leonard. 2003a. "Heredity, Environment, and Cranial Form: A Reanalysis of Boas's Immigrant Data", *American Anthropologist*, 105: 125-138.
- _____. 2003b. "Boas's Changes in Bodily Form: The Immigrant Study, Cranial Plasticity, and Boas's Physical Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 105: 326-332.
- Herskovits, Melville. 1953. *Franz Boas. The Science of Man in the Making*. New York: Scribner.
- Hyatt, Marshall. 1990. *Franz Boas Social Activist. The Dynamics of Ethnicity*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Laurière, Christine. 2008a. *Paul Rivet, le savant et le politique*. Paris, Publications scientifiques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle.
- _____. 2008b. "L'anthropologie et le politique, les prémisses. Les relations entre Franz Boas et Paul Rivet (1919-1942)." *L'Homme* 187-188: 69-92.
- _____. 2008c. "Paul Rivet: hombre político y fundador del Museo del Hombre," *Revista colombiana de Antropología* 44: 481-507.
- Lesser, Alexander. 2004. "Franz Boas," in Sydel Silverman, ed., *Totems and Teachers. Key Figures in the History of Anthropology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1-23.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1943. Review of Paul Rivet, *Les Origines de l'Homme américain, Renaissance* 1: 666-668.
- _____. 2002. "Forward," in Randy Bouchard and Dorothy Kennedy, eds., *Indian Myths and Legends from the North Pacific Coast of America*, a translation of Franz Boas

1895 edition of *Indianische Sagen von der Nord-Pacifischen Küste Amerikas*.

Vancouver: Talon Books, 14-16.

_____ and Didier Éribon. 1996. *De près et de loin, suivi de Deux ans après*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Lewis, Herbert S. 2001a. "The Passion of Franz Boas." *American Anthropologist* 103: 447-467.

_____ 2001b. "Boas, Darwin, Science, and Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 42: 381-406.

Loyer, Emmanuelle. 2007. *Paris à New York. Intellectuels et artistes français en exil (1940-1947)*. Paris: Hachette.

Meyran, Régis. 2000. "Races et Racisme: les ambiguïtés de l'antiracisme chez les anthropologues de l'Entre-deux-guerres." *Gradhiva* 27: 63-76.

Racine-Furlaud, Nicole. 1977. "Le Comité de vigilance des intellectuels antifascistes (1934-1939): antifascisme et pacifisme", *Le Mouvement social* 101: 87-114.

Rivet, Paul. 1923. "Eduard Seler." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 15: 280-287.

_____ 1932. "Nils Erland Herbert Nordenskiöld." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 24: 295-307.

_____ 1943. "Franz Boas." *Renaissance* 1: 313-314.

_____ 1958. "Tribute to Franz Boas." *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 24 (4): 251-252.

Rupp-Eisenreich, Britta. 1996. "Critiques allemandes de la notion de race." *Gradhiva*, 19: 3-24.

Schmidt, Wilhelm. 1920. "Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'ethnologie des derniers temps." *Anthropos* 14-15: 573-575.

Sparks, Corey S. and Richard L. Jantz. 2003. "Changing Times, Changing Faces: Franz Boas's Immigrant Study in Modern Perspective." *American Anthropologist* 105: 333-337.

Stocking, George W. 1992 "Anthropology as Kulturkampf. Science and Politics in the Career of Franz Boas," in *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 92-113.

_____, ed. 1974. *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911. A Franz Boas Reader*. New York: Basic Books.

_____, ed. 1996. *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic. Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Williams, Vernon J. 1996. *Rethinking Race. Franz Boas and his Contemporaries*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Request for information about the Chicago Anthropology Society

Alan L. Bain, Archivist, Director, Technical Services Division, Smithsonian Institution Archives, seeks information on the records of the University of Chicago Anthropology Society, which was founded in 1894 and ended sometime in the 1930s or early 1940s. Anyone knowing about such a group, or knows where its records are located, should contact him at the Capital Gallery Building Suite 3000 MRC 507, 600 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20024-2520, Telephone: 202-633-5903; e-mail: baina@si.edu

New online resource: American Journal of Science

Started in 1818, the American Journal of Science (originally called The American Journal of Science and Arts) is the oldest scientific journal published without interruption in the United States. Today the Journal deals only with geology and related earth science, but for many years it covered a wider range of scientific and artistic endeavors. Recently, staff members at Carnegie Mellon University's library created an online collection, which contains over 140 volumes of the Journal. For historians of science and those with a curiosity about what scientists and others found of importance in the 19th century, this collection will be invaluable. The site is rounded out by a FAQ area and a link to other digital collections created by Carnegie Mellon University. Available at <http://ajs.library.cmu.edu/>

Anthropological Workshop on Digital Preservation and Access Held on May 18-20, 2009

On May 18-20, 2009, a workshop was held in Arlington, Virginia to evaluate and potentially decide on the basics of a strategic integrated four-field plan for digitally preservation and access (DPA) to anthropological research materials (AnthroDataDPA for short). The workshop was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Wenner-Gren Foundation. The principal investigators, Carol R. Ember, Eric Delson, Jeff Good, and Dean Snow, each represented one of the traditional subfields of anthropology. Three groups of people were invited to participate: 1) individuals who are actively involved in and/or planning the creation of digital object repositories; 2) individuals from institutions involved in the creation of international standards and metadata to enhance interoperability and long-term preservation; and 3) representatives of organizations that represent the various fields of anthropology in the United States. There were also observers from political science, NSF, NEH, and Wenner-Gren. Breakout groups discussed data preservation, data access, methods and standards regarding metadata, digitization methods and standards, long-term preservation methods and standards, decisions regarding depositors, privacy and ethical concerns, copyright and intellectual property, and funding/support and field-wide coordination. After presenting the results of their subgroup discussions in a plenary session, breakout chairs received further input from the whole group.

The principal investigators plan to disseminate the workshop results and proposed plan online to the broader anthropological community and ask for commentary and suggestions for revision. They also plan, via appointed representatives, to liaise with major anthropological organizations as well as additional organizations engaged in or planning DPA activities. A revised plan will be posted by the spring of 2010. Future steps, not part of the existing grant, are to seek funding to set up the computer infrastructure to coordinate activities across anthropological institutions and other

distributed libraries using existing data and to begin to integrate new and existing collections of primary anthropological data into the coordinated system.

RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ames, Eric. 2008. *Carl Hagenbeck's Empire of Entertainments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Anderson, Warwick. 2008. *The Collectors of Lost Souls. Turning Kuru Scientists into Whitemen*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bancel, Nicolas, Pascal Blanchard, Gilles Boetsch, Eric Deroo, Sandrine Lemaire, Charles Forsdick, eds. 2009. *Human Zoos: From the Hottentot Venus to Reality Shows, translated by Teresa Bridgeman*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Castro, Daniel. 2007. *Another Face of Empire: Bartolomé de Las Casas, Indigenous Rights, and Ecclesiastical Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Chevron, Marie-France. 2007. "Bastian and the Future of an Ethnological View of the World." In Manuela Fischer, Peter Bolz and Susan Kamel, eds., *Adolf Bastian and His Universal Archive of Humanity: The Origins of German Anthropology*. Hildesheim-Zürich-New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 32-38.

_____. 2008. "Eine wissenschaftliche Kontroverse zwischen Bastian und Ratzel in der deutschsprachigen Ethnologie und ihre Bedeutung für das Werk von Franz Boas." In Marie-France Chevron, ed., *Erscheinungsformen des Wandels*. Wien: LIT-Verlag (Wiener Ethnohistorische Blätter 47/48), 31-57.

Garces, Chris and Alexander Jones. 2009. "Mauss Redux: From Warfare's Human Toll to L'Homme Total." *Anthropological Quarterly* 82: 279-309.

Guest, Harriet, 2007. *Empire, Barbarism, and Civilisation: James Cook, William Hodges, and the Return to the Pacific*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, Dana S. 2008. *Races on Display: French Representations of Colonized Peoples, 1886-1940*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jézéquel, Jean-Hervé. 2006. "Collecting Customary Law': Educated Africans, Ethnographic Writings, and Colonial Justice in French West Africa." In Benjamin N. Lawrance, Emily Lynn Osborn, and Richard L. Roberts, eds. *Intermediaries, Interpreters, and Clerks. African Employees in the Making of Colonial Africa*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Kan, Sergei A. 2009. *Lev Shternberg. Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Lutz, John Sutton, ed. 2007. *Myth and Memory: Stories of Indigenous-European Contact*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Owens, Robert M. 2007. *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer: William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Schmalzer, Sigrid. 2008. *The People's Peking Man: Popular Science and Human Identity in Twentieth-Century China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sen, Satadru. 2009. "Savage bodies, civilized pleasures: M. V. Portman and the Andamanese." *American Ethnologist* 36: 364-379.

Weiler, Bernd. 2008. "Thus Spoke the Scientist: Franz Boas' Critique of the Role of the United States in World War I." Pp. 65-86 in Sven Eliason and Ragenvald Kallberg, eds., *Academics as Public Intellectuals*. Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wokoeck, Ursula. 2009. *German Orientalism. The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945*. London/New York: Routledge.

HAN
c/o Henrika Kuklick
Claudia Cohen Hall 303
249 S. 36th St
Philadelphia, PA 19104 USA