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I. Further Notes on the Alfred Vincent Kidder Papers

Tristram R. Kidder, Ph. D. candidate in anthropology at Harvard University, who has been designated by the surviving children of A. V. Kidder as the family member responsible for the A. V. Kidder papers, offers further information regarding the disposition of these papers (cf. Givens, in HAN XIII:2).

The papers are now archived in two places on the Harvard campus. All personal diaries, papers, correspondence, etc. are housed in the University Archives of Harvard University. Access to these papers will be free to all, with the stipulation that a family member review any requests for publication of quoted material. No restrictions to access have been placed on these papers except those already established by Harvard University Archives. However, the papers may require some time to accession and catalogue. Further information is available from Tristram Kidder, c/o the Harvard University Archives.

Papers relating directly to Kidder's archeological research and/or other scholarly interests have been placed in the Peabody Museum Archives and files, and access is limited only by the needs of the archivist. Information is available by writing the director of the Peabody Museum.

II. Errors in the Sapir-Lowie Correspondence

Piero Matthey (cf. below, "Research in Progress") reports that the Letters from Edward Sapir to Robert H. Lowie, with an introduction and notes by Robert H. Lowie (1965) is marred by a number of errors, which apparently arose in the process of transcription. In the examples below, the underlined errors are corrected in brackets:

(p. 18) Barbeau, who is out in the Lower St. Lawrence country collecting French-Canadian folk-lore, is agile and smart, but strangely uninteresting. Carrying on a conversation with him is often as painful as an ordeal, at least to me. How he delights in the use of [deluges one with] platitudes and how childishly his self-esteem paces, all out of step [oozes all out of him]!

(p. 32) Everyone to his own last [taste]! Problems interest me less and less; impressions and temperaments [impressions of the fleeting moment], more and more. Actually, I am "poetically" getting ready for something. [After all, old boy, "problems" are getting ready for something] Then what?

(p. 63) When I can get round to it, I should rather like to submit to you a paper on general [genetic] classification of N. American Indian languages.
III. Rupert's Land Research Centre

The University of Winnipeg (515 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 2E9) is the home of the newly founded center for research and scholarly cooperation, the Rupert's Land Research Centre, Professor Timothy Ball, Director; Professor Jenifer S.H. Brown, Department of History, General Editor of a newly initiated publication series. A main purpose of the Centre is to encourage research in the Hudson's Bay Company Archives, which since 1974 have been housed in the Provincial Archives of Manitoba. The HBCA contain close to seventy tons of material dating from the late 1600s to the present, including materials on the arctic, subarctic, northeastern North America, the northern plains, plateau, and the northwest coast. Besides countless post journals, correspondence and other business records, many of the holdings pertain to the history of various sciences—since the Company's men carried on researches on many topics, and it gave aid to numerous other institutions (including the Smithsonian). Students and other researchers looking for fresh topics of investigation might usefully consider these resources. The Centre publishes a newsletter in which researchers may place queries or describe their pertinent work. Our first two publications are Shepard Krech III's new Bibliography on Canadian Native History and Anthropology, and Victor Lytwyn's exhaustive study of the fur trade and Lake Winnipeg before 1821. Please address the Centre for details.

IV. Bateson Archive

David Lipset reports that the Gregory Bateson archive has opened at the University of California, Santa Cruz, under the auspices of the Special Collections Department of the university library. We hope to present a report on the contents in a future number of HAN.

V. History in the Anthropology Newsletter

Nathalie F. S. Woodbury reminds us of several components of the A. A. A.'s Anthropology Newsletter which may be of interest to historians of anthropology. She would welcome suggestions for the column "Past is Present," which offers brief treatments of historical topics or episodes (recently, it contained interesting material on the murder of Henrietta Schmerler on the Western Apache Reservation in 1931). In addition, the deaths column is another element of the historic record, the more so since many journals no longer provide obituaries except for a very few anthropologists considered particularly outstanding; by giving the basic facts of individual lives (dates, associations, references), it can provide a starting point for historical research. Woodbury has provided the National Anthropological Archives with a full run of the Anthropology Newsletter, along with a run of the Guide to Departments of Anthropology back to 1968.
Spanish anthropology has experienced a considerable development in the decade since Maria Catedra discussed, in these pages, some of the most significant moments in its history, along with brief commentary on some of the more recent studies (HAN 5, #1, 10-15). But like other anthropologies of the "periphery," Spanish anthropology remains largely unknown to the international anthropological community. Certainly, in many respects the trajectory of anthropology in Spain coincides with the recent evolution of other "national anthropologies" (cf. Diamond 1980; Hannerz 1983). But in this necessarily brief sketch, we can only allude schematically to the more specific aspects of its history.

From a sociological perspective, the circumstances of contemporary Spanish history are important keys for the understanding of the recent history of Spanish anthropology—not surprisingly, in view of the relatively marginal character of the discipline in its academic institutions. The attack on the ideological bases of the regime of General Franco and the slow recuperation of democratic liberties permitted the recovery and expansion of traditions of thought which had long been proscribed in academic life. In particular, the Franco regime had required the reformulation, or had literally forbade the continuation, of many anthropological and ethnographic investigations projected before the beginning of the Civil War in 1936. In the same period, a strong scientific isolationism made it impossible to keep up with the evolution of international anthropology, and for several decades institutional support was given only to folklore studies which legitimated the ideological and political presuppositions of the regime. The situation continued until the middle of the 1960s, when the anthropologist Claudio Esteva introduced a dramatic change of direction.

Returning from exile in Mexico, Esteva became director of the Museo Nacional de Etnología, and in 1966 created in Madrid the Escuela de Estudios Antropológicos. During this first stage, the majority of cultural anthropologists worked in the same departments as prehistorians, archeologists and Americanists, whose strongly diffusionist orientation presented an important obstacle to the development of cultural anthropology. Seeking to separate themselves from physical anthropology and prehistory, and to find an opening next to the older and established tradition of folklore studies, the first Spanish cultural anthropologists committed themselves strongly to the modern theoretical orientations of metropolitan anthropologists. Functionalist, structuralist, neoevolutionary or Marxist approaches, until then ignored if not literally prohibited by the official academic policies, began to be incorporated into this emerging new anthropology. Their introduction, at first largely on the basis
of a voluntary autodidacticism, nevertheless found several avenues of institutional consolidation. Thus, following upon the Escuela de Estudios Antropologicos, several departments of anthropology were created in the principle universities. Those of Barcelona and Madrid, directed respectively by Claudio Esteva and Carmelo Lison, served especially as the first important nuclei of cultural anthropologists.

Bibliographic production is in this case a good indicator of the development of cultural anthropology. As Joan Prat (1977) has shown in a documented study, the number of references with a cultural or social orientation since the 1950s has exceeded 500, with a progressive increment between 1965 and 1977—and this figure has grown significantly in the last few years. Fieldwork in Spain by foreign anthropologists (mostly Anglo-Saxon) has been another important factor in the rapid expansion of cultural anthropology. The monographs of British anthropologists interested in Mediterranean societies, and of Americans preoccupied by the problems of modernization and social change, contributed not only to gaining recognition for anthropological studies of Spain, but also constituted important methodological and theoretical reference points for native anthropologists. Finally, the growth of numbers of investigators in the academic centers of the United States, Britain, and France also contributed decisively to the progressive "internationalization" of Spanish anthropology.

Another defining feature of contemporary Spanish anthropology is its marked character as an anthropology carried on "at home." This tendency has, notwithstanding, important historical antecedents. The evolution of Spanish anthropology has been in important respects similar to that of other European countries where the distinction between Volkskunde and Volkerkunde has divided the discipline into two major orientations (Stocking 1983). In Spain, there has been only a limited production of studies of non-European "others." The combination of a precarious scientific development and the decline of colonial power made possible the realization of only a few overseas expeditions, of uneven ethnographic interest. Nevertheless, in the second half of the nineteenth century the discipline managed to attract the attention of a sector of the more liberal intellectuals who were interested in the Darwinian debates, principally through the Sociedad Antropologica Espanola founded in 1865 by Gonzalez Velasco (Glick 1982; Puig-Samper & Galera 1983). At the same time, studies of the popular traditions of peasants also achieved a notable development. Pursuing the objectives of the Folklore Society of London, A. Machado y Alvarez opened the way for the creation of many societies for the study of folklore throughout the country. But the most ambitious project along this line was a large scale inquiry of national scope into popular customs relating to birth, marriage and death carried on by the Ateneo de Madrid in 1901 (Lison 1971). Present-day anthropology, despite the theoretical rupture already noted, has continued studying communities or domestic social groups within the various Spanish geographical zones. The only exceptions to this line are a few works in South America. In the most recent period, the "crisis" of
international anthropology, combined with the difficulty of financing overseas fieldwork and the reestablishment of sociocultural studies at home, have impelled in practice a "domestic" anthropology. Thus, in Spain, as in many anthropologies of the periphery, the reformulation of the object of study of the discipline has consolidated a tendency toward an anthropology carried on "at home."

In direct relation to the foregoing, one must note finally that the evolution of Spanish politics has itself had a peculiar development. Far from being a monolithic nation-state, Spain is a good example of a multinational state with important ethnic particularisms. State institutions coexist with others circumscribed to specified "autonomous communities," which are established over territories whose populations have to varying degrees maintained historical, economic and cultural differences with respect to the rest of the country. These circumstances have conditioned different lines of the evolution of anthropology in the distinct regions and nationalities, both in their theoretical traditions and their institutional features. In this context, one of the most representative cases is that of Catalonia, with a long tradition of folklore and ethnographic studies, in which there are concentrated today the largest number of professional anthropologists, and which exhibits a major consolidation of academic institutions. The establishment of departments of anthropology in the majority of the universities of these autonomous communities has progressed considerably since 1970. Notwithstanding, this proliferation of regional anthropologies has coincided with growing efforts at the unification of the discipline throughout the country. Many meetings, symposia, and especially the Congresses of Anthropology that have been held since 1977, all demonstrate, at least from a sociological point of view, important thematic and theoretical convergences among Spanish anthropologists. The functioning, over the last year, of the Federacion de Asociaciones de Antropología del Estado Español also reveals a conjunction of interests in the more institutional and academic aspects. Overall, the evolution of anthropology in Spain during the last decades demonstrates an intermingling of factors, revealing that its reformulation as a national anthropology has been based, paradoxically, on a strong "internationalization," simultaneously with a notable consolidation of anthropologies of the "nation building" type in the different areas of the country.

It is in this context that there has been a progressive upsurge of interest in the history of the discipline. Coinciding with the development of national anthropologies, especially in Europe, the historical aspects of the discipline have also constituted for Spanish anthropologists (paraphrasing Hallowell 1965) "an anthropological problem." From the beginning of the 1970s, publications of an historical character have been increasing—with unequal effect, but without any doubt revealing an increasing historiographical preoccupation. After the early isolated investigations, in which the work of Lisón (1971) must be considered the pioneer, there have been a considerable number of historiographical projects, now reaching more than 200 bibliographical citations. In this context, the more than 30
papers presented at the Fourth Congress of Anthropology permit us to expect further increments in the future.

Obviously, the history of anthropology that has been produced in Spain has certain characteristics, some consistent with the general development of national anthropologies, others which derive from its own institutional peculiarities and theoretical evolution. A first characteristic is that, save for rare exceptions, this history has been carried on by anthropologists who do not consider historiographical investigation their principal activity. From this fact follow two effects. On the one hand, a portion of historical studies have been carried on simply because history "was there." Thus, many publications demonstrate a very traditional type of historiography, with little attempt to incorporate present methods of the history of science. On the other hand, the progressive discovery of materials for the history of the discipline has encouraged a certain fetichism of documentary sources. Another characteristic of this historiography, more significant even than the preceding, is that a great part of these studies has been focussed on tracing lines of demarcation between the old and the new strategies of investigation, which gives them a tone of "settling accounts" with the past of the discipline. A clearly "presentist" orientation is the common denominator of this body of work. In view of the theoretical penury of Spanish anthropology until the mid-1960s, and its strongly ideological orientation, one can understand the insistence on this perspective. Despite the risks that accompany "presentism," this was a phase that may be considered necessary for the generation of Spanish anthropologists formed at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, in order to guarantee the theoretical development of the discipline. Given the still fragile institutionalization of social and cultural anthropology in the face of older conceptions of a more folkloristic type, this phase does not seem to have ended. But even so, many of the best historical works have been realized within this orientation (cf. Azcona 1981; Moreno 1971; Prat 1985; Prats 1985; Valle 1981).

Another issue relates to the constitution of the themes of historiographical investigations. Attempting to trace the genealogical lines which make it possible to think in terms of "national tradition," some historiographical studies have been preoccupied with recovering the rich ethnographic materials, principally from the Americas, in the works of the Spanish historians of the 16th and 17th centuries. Concurring in some cases with Rowe (1964) and Hodgen (1964), these studies defend these ethnographic offerings as a foundation moment in ethnology, or at least as immediate antecedents of the discipline. Impinging on the problem of the beginnings of anthropological thought, these studies also insist that this pre-ethnology presupposes the emergence of a Spanish anthropological tradition different from other European traditions (Lisón 1971; Pino 1976, 1980). But the principal efforts have centered on the histories of the different regional or national anthropologies, as a consequence of the influence of the historical, sociological, and institutional factors noted earlier.
This historiographical production stands in direct relation to the level of institutionalization and the number of professionals in the different areas of the country. Thus, here, too, Catalonia is the one offering the largest number of historical studies (cf. Prat 1987). Among the most recent studies in which various traditions are studied in synthetic terms are those of Azcona (1987), Estévez (1987), Galván (1987), Mandianes (1986), Prats et al (1982), and Rodríguez (1986). More than half of the papers presented at the session on history at the recent Congress of Anthropologists were dedicated to these regional anthropologies, although despite their numerical importance, none of them attempted an exhaustive analysis. Instead, most of them were studies on the relation of these traditions to the different types of nationalism to be found in the Spanish state, in many cases themselves serving effectively as cultural diacritics. In this context, it is not surprising that there is little preoccupation with the construction of a history of Spanish anthropology as a unified "national anthropology." In line with this tendency, only a small number of communications to the recent congress raised questions relating to the overall national development. Unfortunately, one of the most recent attempts to present a general picture of the development of anthropological studies in Spain during the last century (Aguirre, ed. 1986) shows important lacunae of information and theoretical obscurities which in large measure limit its historiographical effectiveness. Nevertheless, various works of J. Prat (1977, 1987) reflect a more rigorous approach, both theoretically and methodologically. His examination of the differential development of anthropological studies on the one hand, and of folklore studies on the other, as the two principal "paradigmatic orientations" in the history of the Spanish discipline, opens the possibility of responding to the challenge sounded some years ago by G. Stocking to achieve a history of anthropology "historically sophisticated and anthropologically informed."

Note: I am indebted to Professors A. Galván and J. Prat for much of the information contained in this article, although I am of course solely responsible for whether it has been used correctly.

Translator's Note: A similar caveat applies to the translation and typing of the present rendering [G.W.S.].
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Having spent six months there as a small child, on the eve of the Spanish Civil War, I was extremely grateful to be invited to return to Spain to give two talks at the Fourth Congress of Anthropology in Alicante: one, as the inaugural address ("Anthropology, yesterday and today: reflections on the 'crisis' and 'reinvention' of anthropology"); the other, to the section on the history of anthropology ("Malinowski's models: Maclay, Kubary, and Kurtz as ethnographic archetypes") (to forestall unnecessary correspondence, please note that neither of these is available for circulation at the present time). Having lost my conversational Spanish in the half century since 1935, I must warn readers that it was only by virtue of the excellent translations provided by my hosts that I was able to deliver the talks in Spanish. By the same token, these brief notes—like the early field impressions of ethnographers—are based on a very limited knowledge of the language of the "natives," whose "customs and beliefs," I am embarrassed to say, were previously known to me only through a couple of articles I had read on Spanish anthropology (cf. Catedra 1977), and several very brief conversations with colleagues in the Chicago department. The justification for recording these notes is simply that many readers of HAN will be equally unfamiliar with recent Spanish anthropology, and may find them a useful addendum to Dr. Estevez' more historiographically oriented account.

As an organizing device for my paper to the Congress, I reviewed the history of American anthropology since the publication of Anthropology Today (Kroeber et al., 1953), using the contents of the Biennial and Annual Review of Anthropology, to make some observations about the extent to which the discipline had responded to the issues raised in the call for the Reinvention of Anthropology (Hymes, ed. 1972)—to the general point that the changes of the last decade and a half did not as yet seem to merit
description as "reinvention." Be that as it may, the thing that struck me most about Spanish anthropology, as displayed at Alicante, was the degree to which it could appropriately be described as a "reinvented," or, equally aptly, a "post-colonial" (albeit somewhat dependent) anthropology.

Of the fourteen symposia into which nearly 200 papers were distributed, a large proportion were devoted to topics with a current social relevance: urban anthropology, including ethnicity and nationalism (21); the anthropology of education (20); the anthropology of health (18); the anthropology of fishing (8); anthropology of women (6). With the exception of a few papers on indigenous America (under the heading "the anthropology of transition"--specified, in one of them, as the "transicion al Socialismo"), almost all of papers had "brought anthropology back home." That is to say, they dealt almost exclusively with communities within the Spanish state. On the other hand, there was little evidence of "studying up": within the Spanish state, the groups studied tend to be traditional national or regional minorities, often by people with close ties to the group. In this respect, Spanish anthropology seems less post-colonial or reinvented than following in a characteristic nineteenth century continental European tradition which focussed on the study of "internal others."

Consistent with the notion of a reinvented anthropology, the most immediately obvious thing about the Congress was its youth. Insofar as one could judge visually, the vast majority of those attending were people whose anthropological careers must have taken place in post-Franco, post-colonial Spain. An informant told me that the country's cadre of faculty and other doctorates is about 100; whereas there are about 1000 students, a third of whom must have been at Alicante, often clustered around their correspondingly young instructors. The contrast to the A. A. A., where students flit about the margins of the declining old boy network, or its rising post-feminist replacement, was quite striking--although it should be noted that the proportion of women at Alicante was quite as high.

From a theoretical and methodological point of view, postcolonial reinvention was perhaps rather less manifest. The major influences were those of the three dominant metropolitan anthropologies: American, British and French--a dependent condition which disturbed at least one speaker at the Alicante meetings. The relation between fieldwork and theory also seemed a lively issue: Spanish anthropology was seen as atheoretical, Boasian, still tied to the folklore tradition. Correspondingly, it was the subdisciplinary boundary with folklore whose definition seemed to be of greatest salience. The problem was to pass beyond folklore to theoretically significant anthropology. The difficulty was that there were no fathers to kill within the Spanish tradition ("No tenemos padres a matar"), and therefore no native ground for theoretical debate.

Given the recent signs of stringency in the Spanish political economy, one was inclined to wonder just how these rapidly expanding numbers of young anthropologists would find
research support and jobs ten years from now. But for the present historical moment, the effect was one of great optimism and liveliness--again (to this observer) in notable contrast to the A. A. A.

PAPERS PRESENTED TO THE SESSION ON THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE FOURTH CONGRESS OF ANTHROPOLOGY, ALICANTE, SPAIN, APRIL 1987

I. Theoretical and epistemological problems

David Alvargonzales (Oviedo)--"The cultural materialism of Marvin Harris: between science and philosophy"

Joan Bestard (Barcelona)--"Crested birds and men: regarding a text of Father Feijoo"

J. Bouza--"Criminal anthropology: between biology and law"

Francisco Castilla (Madrid)--"Methodology in the work of Julio Caro Baroja"

Josep Llobera (London)--"The orientalism of Gobineau as a form of cultural relativism"

Inma Querol (Barcelona)--"The beginnings of the institutionalization of anthropology"

P. Valenzuela--"Cultural law and causality"

II. Europe and Others: Ethnohistory

Christian Baque (Paris)--"The invention of the savage: the weight of the medieval heritage in the representation of the New World and the Indian at the beginning of the Conquest"

José Jiménez (La Laguna)--"The return to ethnohistorical sources: the war among the Canarian indigenes"

E. Llanges, A. Sella and M. Casielles--"The conception of the 'new man' in the 16th century: America and Europe"

J. Paniagua (Leon)--"Sources for the study of American anthropology: The Bulletins of the Institucion Libre de Enseñanza"

Luis Sánchez (Madrid)--Spanish colonial administration and the ethnography of the Philippines (1874-98)"

G. W. Stocking (Chicago)--"Malinowski's models: Maclay, Kubary and Kurtz as ethnographic archetypes"
III. History of Anthropology in Spain: General Problems

Alberto Cardin--"Cultural determinism and the history of Spanish anthropology"

Josep Comelles (Barcelona)--"Towards an anthropology of the anthropology of Spain: some methodological reflections"

Carmen Ortiz--"Spanish investigations of the history of anthropology: an essay in classification"

E. Perdigueró et al--"The tradition of physician folklorists and the development of medical anthropology in Spain"

Joan Prat (Tarragon)--"Anthropological discourse and folklorist discourse: an essay in characterization"

IV. Regional and National Traditions

E. Aguilar (Seville)--"The first studies of Andalusian popular culture"

Jesus Azcona (San Sebastian)--"Problems and perspectives in the anthropology of the Basque country"


M. Delgado (Barcelona)--"Folklorists against folklore: scientists and police in the Acts of Soria, 1953"

Ma. Teresa Delgado (La Laguna)--"Juan Bethencourt Alfonso: a contribution to Canarian anthropology"

Fernando Estévez (La Laguna)--"Center and periphery in late nineteenth century Canarian anthropology"

Alberto Galván (La Laguna)--"The diffusionist strategy in twentieth century Canarian folklore"

Maria Llorca et al (Alicante)--"Alicante in the romantic literature of the nineteenth century"

Dolors Llopart (Museo de Artes y Tradiciones Populares)--"Joan Amades and Ramón Violant i Simorra at the Museo de Artes e Industrias Populares de Barcelona (1940-56)"

Ma. Rosalia Martínez (Seville)--"The vision of the Andalusian problem in Betica: Revista Ilustrada"

Llorenc Prats (Tarragon)--"The history of folklore in Catalonia: the state of the question"

Andreu Ramis--"On the the anthropologists, ethnographers, and folklorists of the Balearic Isles: the recent evolution (1970-85)"
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Jennifer Brown (History, University of Winnipeg) is doing research on A.I. Hallowell's records of his field researches in Manitoba in the 1930s, and especially on his relationship with his prime informant, William Berens, drawing on the materials in the Library of the American Philosophical Society. Since Hallowell's papers seem not to include copies of his outgoing letters, she is interested in locating in the files of other anthropologists letters from Hallowell about his Berens River experiences—and would gladly pay for copying costs.

Douglas R. Givens (St. Louis Community College, Meramec) is doing research on the role of biography in writing the history of Americanist archeology.

Hans-Jurgen Hildebrandt (Mainz, West Germany) is working on a comprehensive bibliography of the primary and secondary literature of and on Johann Jakob Bachofen (1815-1887) for the hundredth anniversary of Bachofen's death.

Melinda Kanner (Anthropology, Ohio State University) has been doing research on Margaret Mead, and on the nature of the relationship between biography and anthropology.

Arnold Krupat (Literature Faculty, Sarah Lawrence College) has been doing research on "Anthropology in the Ironic Mode: The Work of Franz Boas."

Marc Manganaro (English, University of Hawaii at Manoa) is interested in the relation of anthropology and modernism in early twentieth century British culture, with special reference to the work of T. S. Eliot—looking beyond the influence of Frazer to the work of Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, Tylor, Codrington, and others.

Piero Matthey (University of Torino) continues his work on a volume to be entitled From Vienna to New York: The Two Worlds of Robert H. Lowie, and is, with Victor Golla (George Washington University) editing the complete correspondence of Edward Sapir and Robert Lowie.

Miriam Meijer (doctoral candidate in history, UCLA) has completed a year of archival research on the 18th century Dutch anthropologist Petrus Camper, and is continuing work on Camper's impact on German anthropologists of the following generation, including S. T. Sommerring in Mainz and J. F. Blumenbach in Gottingen. She is interested in hearing from anyone with similar interests.
Judy Modell (Carnegie-Mellon University) is working on the meaning of "shame" in Ruth Benedict's *Crysanthemum and Sword*.

William J. Peace (10 W. 66th St., #20K, NYC 10023) is doing doctoral research on the influence of Marxism on the academic career of V. Gordon Childe, and also on Childe's influence on American anthropology. He would be interested in obtaining copies of correspondence between Childe and American anthropologists.

Barnett Richling (Mount St. Vincent Univ., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada) is preparing a biography of the Canadian anthropologist Diamond Jenness (1886-1969) and would be grateful for information regarding sources.

Louis Rosenfeld (Pathology, New York University Medical Center) is preparing a manuscript on the life of Thomas Hodgkin, M.D. (1798-1866), which will include material on his work for aborigines and his interest in ethnology.

Hal Rothman (Spokane, Washington) is currently writing a book about the Pajarito Plateau in northern New Mexico, in which Edgar L. Hewett is an important figure, and the evolution of American archeology and anthropology figure prominently.

Frank Spencer (Anthropology, Queens College, CUNY) is doing research on British paleontology (1890-1930) and the Piltdown affair.

George D. Westermark (Anthropology, Santa Clara University) is planning to conduct research on the role of anthropology in the Australian School of Pacific Administration, the institution which trained colonial officers in the post-World War II era for service in Papua New Guinea, and would be interested in locating other scholars who are interested in the relationship between anthropology and colonialism.

Yves Winkin (Verviers, Belgium) is working on an intellectual biography of Erving Goffman.

**BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA**

I. Recent Dissertations
   (Ph. D. except where M.A. indicated)

Avrith, Gale. "Science at the Margins: The British Association and the Foundations of Canadian Anthropology, 1884-1910" (History of Science, University of Pennsylvania, 1986--University Microfilms International #8623971)


II. Recent Work by Subscribers

[Note that we do not list "forthcoming" items. To be certain of dates and page numbers, please wait until your works have actually appeared before sending citations or offprints. Henceforth, we will use the same citational style as that used in History of Anthropology and most anthropological journals]
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---


---


---


III. Suggested by our Readers


, ed. 1985. Giustiniano Nicolucci alle origini dell'antropologia moderna. Isola del Liri (Frosinone, Italy): Editrice Pisani [biographical essays on the holder of the second chair of anthropology in Italy, at Naples, with papers by and obituaries of Nicolucci--G.W.S.]


Tiffany, Joseph (compiler). 1981. The Keyes archaeological collection: A finder's guide. Iowa State Historical Department, Division of the State Historical Society [A. L. C.]


A.L.C.= Andrew L. Christenson
C.F.F.= Christian F. Feest
D.S. = Dan Segal
G.W.S.= George W. Stocking
N. W. = Natalie F. S. Woodbury
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ANNOUNCEMENTS

Modernism and Anthropology. Marc Manganaro, of the Department of English of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, is editing a volume on this topic. Scholars of literature, languages and the social sciences are encouraged to submit proposals of 2-3 pages or completed papers of 15-40 typescript pages until August 15. Of special interest are essays that treat the relation between the literature and culture of 1900-1945 and then-current anthropology, and papers that apply contemporary theoretical considerations are especially welcome. Papers can be previously presented or published (though not in book form).

GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

April 1986—Society for American Archaeology (New Orleans): Edwin Lyon organized a symposium on the preservation of archeological records, with papers by Cal Calabrese, Chris Peebles, Ruthan Knudson, Joseph Tiffany and Lyon.


November 1986—Indianapolis Archaeology Conference: James Madison, of Indiana University, delivered a paper on "Eli Lilly: Patron of Midwestern Archaeology."


May 1987 Explaining Archaeology's Past (Carbondale, Ill.): Nearly sixty scholars interested in the history of archaeology met at Southern Illinois University on May 1-2 for a conference organized by Andrew L. Christenson on "Explaining Archaeology's Past: The Method and Theory of the History of Archaeology." Nineteen historians of archaeology
from the United States, Great Britain and Argentina presented papers (see list below), and the keynote address was given by Curtis Hinsley of Colgate University, who spoke on "The History of Archaeology as Flow: A Critique of Internal vs. External History."

A questionnaire circulated at the conference indicated that of the 33 respondents (26 male), the vast majority were practicing archeologists. Of those responding, 14 had published a book or article in the history of archeology; 23 were currently involved in such research; 16 favored the creation of a journal in the field. Responding (on a five point scale of agreement/disagreement) to a series of statements about the field, they generally supported the positions that history of archeology was relevant to current research, that archeologists were insufficiently aware of it, that it should not be left to professional historians (but that it does require special training), that it is distinct enough from the history of anthropology to be a special research area, that it should be taught at the undergraduate level, that it should not be taught as a cumulative development toward scientific truth, that so far it has established a past which is simply a retrojection of present perspectives, and that more of it should be published in major archeological journals.

Recognizing that unpublished documents and records of past archeology are poorly known and in danger of being lost, the participants signed a resolution to the Executive Board of the Society of American Archaeology to create a national database of archeological records and to encourage private holders of archeological records to donate them to public repositories. They also discussed ways of disseminating research, and several individuals undertook to talk to publishers about the idea of a journal or annual or biennial book. It was also suggested that there be an annual symposium at the Society for American Archaeology meetings—which Jonathan Reyman volunteered to organize for the meetings in Phoenix in 1988.

The papers (which will be published in a volume edited by the organizer), include the following:

Susan Bender: The History of Archeology and the Liberal Arts Curriculum

William Chapman: Towards an Institutional History of Archeology: British Archeology in the 1860s

Christopher Chippindale: 'Social' and 'Theoretical' Archeology in the Nineteenth Century: Is it Right to Look for Modern Ideas in Old Places

A. L Christenson: The 'Immediacy Problem' and Writing the History of Archeology

L. G. Desmond: Of Facts and Hearsay: The Case of A. Le Plongeon
Stephen L. Dyson: Ideology and Institutions in Shaping Classical Archeology in the 19th and 20th Centuries

Lester Embree: Contacting the American Theoretical Archeologists

Douglas Givens: The Role of Biography in Writing the History of Archeology

Marvin Jeter: Methods of Relating Historical Collections of Artifacts and Associated Documents to Known Sites and Current Research

Alice Kehoe: Contextualizing Archeology

Edwin Lyon: A Documentation Strategy for Archeology

Donald McVicker: Prejudice & Context: The Archeologist as Historian

David Meltzer: A Question of Relevance

Jonathan Reyman: The History of Archeology and the Archeological History of Chaco Canyon


Daniel Schávelzon: The History of Mesoamerican Archeology at the Crossroads

Michael Tarabulski: Recording the Past: Capturing the History of Archeology on Videotape

David R. Wilcox: Glyn Daniel and the Professionalization of the History of Archeology