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FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Burckhardtian Culture History and the “Durkheim-Mauss Bug”
in Paul Radin’s Letters to Edward Sapir

Paul Radin was one of the most heterodox anthropologists among the first generation of Franz Boas’ students. His primary theoretical works, Primitive Man as a Philosopher (1927) and Method and Theory in Ethnology (1933), reflect a characteristic interest in the role of individuals in “primitive” cultures (a description he used with a degree of irony), and in a humanistic, rather than scientific form of ethnology. Two letters from Radin’s correspondence with Edward Sapir provide insight into the development of his idiosyncratic approach to anthropology. Written during the period (1913-1917) when Radin was employed through annual contracts by the Geological Survey of Canada (then headed by Sapir) to do research on the Ojibwa Indians of southeast Ontario (DuBois 1960:xi, Sacharov n.d.), they anticipate the key themes of Radin’s main published theoretical works. The first letter, from early 1914, contains a critique of Boas, not unusual among the first generation of students in this period, but one which Radin would later elaborate (and extend to Sapir and other Boasians) in Method and Theory of Ethnology (1933). The letter provides a succinct introduction to Radin’s notion of “culture history,” a research agenda very different than the contemporary approaches of other Boasians such as Sapir, or than that subsequently developed in recent decades by proponents of historical anthropology or ethnohistory. Radin’s criticism of Boas for having “not once told [his students] to study the Indian as individuals” in the first letter is picked up and elaborated in the second letter, written two years later. Judging by the letter’s contents, the occasion seems to have been the publication in Science that week of Clark Wissler’s “Psychological and Historical Interpretations of Culture” (1916). Radin’s critique of “the French school” is pertinent for its unique framing of his interest in the individual in sociological terms. In the later Method and Theory, Radin programmatically distinguished his own culture historical approach from “sociological” and other approaches to ethnology. His suggested temperamental typology of the “intellectual, emotional and man of action” later appeared much more prominently in Primitive Man as Philosopher (1927). The second typology of “the religious, moderately religious, and non-religious” temperaments had already appeared in his “Religion of the North American Indians” (1914) and is an important presupposition of his analysis of the text he published as Crashing Thunder: the Autobiography of a Winnebago Indian (1926). Radin’s discussion of the “intellectual whims” of the “four Semites” (Sapir, Lowie, Goldenweiser, and himself) in the introductory paragraph of the second letter adds to our awareness of the already recognized propensities of the early Boasians to look to the
humanities for respite from the "tyranny of modern science." It is, moreover, as characteristic a statement of Radin the man as the remainder of both letters is of Radin the theorist.

Hotel Vendome, Sarnia, Ontario
Jan. 27, 1914

Dear Sapir,

I sent you a business letter this morning—this is intended as an intellectual feast! I will wade right into my subject.

What you say about Boas doesn’t surprise me. After careful reflection, during the last year I have come to the conclusion that it is not legitimate to regard Boas’ faults of commission and omission as little foibles. On the contrary, they are basic characteristics and affect and have affected his work at all times. If in this letter, I dwell almost exclusively on Boas’ faults, you will of course not forget that I appreciate keenly his achievements and that we all have paid him his [mede] of praise, even hero worship. I sincerely believe that Boas’ work is done. He was at his best in opening up vistas and applying a commonsense method to ethnology. The originality of his method has it is true been over estimated, as anyone trained in modern history can see, but considering the conditions in which he found scholarship in the 1880s and 90s—really then an apparent adjunct of biology—his work was both opportune and effective. He touched on every phase of ethnology and achieved wonders in suggesting problems, working one out here & there, but then he stopped. I maintain that he stopped not because one man could not do more, but emphatically because he does not possess the genius required for that kind of work. What is needed now is an historian, a man with a sense of historical growth and a man with constructive inspiration. Boas has neither of these talents, as is manifest by his attitude towards languages and the fact that in ethnology he has not once insisted on the dynamic aspects of the subject. He is an anatomist, but not a physiologist. Indeed I have never heard him in his lectures express the slightest desire “to see the wheels go around.”

Another defect is that he lays too much stress on establishing the truth of certain general factors, like dissemination, convergent evolution, independent origin, etc. No real historian ever worries much about these things in the rough. What he wants to obtain is an intimate picture of how a people lived, worked, ate—for my part urinated—but it should be intimate. To imagine for one minute, that a real historian is—or should be—interested merely in the development of a culture is lop-sided. Many of course do think so & Boas shares this trait with them. But unfortunately that is the one thing in which ethnology differs from history. It may be deplored, but it is nevertheless a fact that chronology is and will always be impossible in primitive culture and any attempt to reconstruct one will be artificial & what is worse vague. It is essential to recognize this fact and the corollary it entails, that corollary being—that chronology being—turn to the other aspect of ethnology—that of complete, comprehensive and sympathetic interpretation. From this point of view ethnology can be made a real human science instead of one of bones and dust. It is only from this angle likewise that she can stimulate history, for naturally with the small number of individuals to be dealt with, as a rule—a picture can be obtained of individual variation, of the play of individual forces, that is wholly impossible in history of the past but that will unquestionably play a great role in the new history of the present & the future.

To all these things Boas has been indifferent. He has insisted on analytical examinations, warned us against taking an analysis as historical demonstration, yet he has not once told us to study the Indians as individuals. Thus all the real points of social organization, religion, mythology—as a literary product, have escaped him. “Methodology” is excellent, his insistence
upon the fairly correct one that he formulated will constitute one of his achievements—but it is only the beginning. Goldie [Alexander Goldenweiser], if he doesn’t look out, will follow in his footsteps without having Boas’ justification.

There is also one other thing about Boas and for that matter about Goldie & Lowie. They are afraid to be wrong, & being afraid to be wrong, they will not hazard interpretation. If they do not put this out of their constitutions, they will fall short of ever even remotely understanding primitive people. You must have the ability to put yourself in another man’s place—knowing nevertheless that you are not the other man—and try to feel like him. Your data must of course he kept separate from your interpretation, but you must have the guts to interpret. I’m going to do it with the Winnebago and shall consider myself engaging in a legitimate enterprise, if I get as near the truth as Burckhardt did in his “Cultur der Renaissance.” Wish me luck!

My critique of Boas sounded to my ears, at first, like an obituary notice, but the line I improved toward the end gave it something of the nature of an epitaph. However, even I cannot stand the strain of further literary output, so will close, with love to your wife, your reading of her “love” as regard to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yours,
Radin

Dear Edward;

I just received your letter and it made me think of the fact that we anthropologists, i.e. the four Semites who graduated under Boas, are either an unusual aggregation of men or a self-centered set who insist upon giving in to their intellectual whims whenever the spirit prompts them. Here I am inveighing against the tyranny of modern science which insists that you do original research and hack work, when it is so much better for your soul and your mind to lie on your back and gaze into a New Mexican sky, walk into the mountains, or, still better, read history of Greek and Latin, while Lowie until recently wanted to write and read philosophy and Goldie wanted to read books like Levy-Bruhl and Durkheim. Now come you with your composing and delight in modern literature! Thank the lord it is so. I, for my part, would far prefer to live on $600 a year “somewhere in France or Italy” than be compelled to work at Anthropology at six times that salary. To cultivate anthropology in the old way has not, as you know, appealed to me for the last two years and the only thing that makes the study of primitive people of interest to me is the possibility I vaguely desery of writing an interpretive study of the Winnebago or Ojibwa or, (unless the European War ends too soon), of the Bella Coola. Whether such an undertaking would be of any permanent scientific value to the world I do not know, and I do not much care, but I know that it would be of permanent value to me and satisfy certain aesthetic cravings of mine that field-work threatened for a time to dull. What I would most like to devote myself to is a history of the unintellectual class of Europe and I believe that the training I have had in anthropology and my enduring affection for history ought to stand me in good stead. Naturally I would want to do this in Italy or southern France, where one does not resent the passing of the years as here in America.

However let me sober up a little. Have you read Wissler’s vice-presidential address? It disappointed me keenly. His separation of what is to be left to the professional psychologist and
what to the anthropologist seems to me to be puerile in the extreme. Why should a man who can
define accurately what constitutes the process of thought, of imagination etc. be more correct in
his interpretation of the individual than a thoughtful anthropologist? And barring certain technical
information, is not every thoughtful anthropologist as good a psychologist as the psychologist,
even although he does not know the difference between the modern and the older theories of
color perception, for instance? And again what is all this metaphysics about the activity of
complexes of human groups from which the "permanent individualities and the equipment by
birth" are excluded? To say that the question of the behaviour of man as an individual is a
problem for the psychologist to determine, that any anthropologist’s contribution thereto is, from
the nature of the case, as naive as the psychologist’s interpretation of cultural phenomena
appears to be to the anthropologist, seems to indicate that Wissler has been bitten by the
By what magical process has Wissler arrived at an understanding of the group activities, if he, not
being a psychologist, has no moral or other right to investigate the behaviour of the individual?
The fundamental question involved here is to determine the relation of the individual to the
group, to discover in how far the group is really the mere union of individuals described in terms
of certain individualities, intellectual, emotional or men of action or in how far it transcends them.
Before he discusses this preliminary problem his definition of cultural phenomena as "the
acquired activity of complexes of human groups" is rather meaningless and represents no
improvement over those advanced by the "meddling psychologist." For me the nature and origin
of human culture can only be approached in one way and that is the following. I do not much care
at which end you begin, whether with the individual or the group. It is admitted that the problem
to be discussed is the nature and the origin of the group. We know that group activities are
performed by a number of individuals, therefore, the first thing to study is the information
possessed by these individuals and the manner in which they act. We know however that an
individual living apart from other individuals is more or less an abstraction[,] that it does not
occur in fact. All this is of course admitted. But this does not at all prevent the activities of a
dozen people performing a ceremony from being merely the activities of twelve distinct
individuals. Now whether each one of these individuals has the identical feeling, while
performing the ceremony, is one of the questions to be determined. From the few observations
that I have made, this is not a fact. Every individual has a characteristically different way of
emotionally approaching the ceremony, due to his peculiar temperament, or lack of it, or his
particular experiences in life. The unity that is so frequently predicated of the group while
performing a ceremony is, in reality, merely apparent and consists very likely in a marked
similarity in the performance of certain purely external functions. For purposes of general
description it may be necessary to discard many of the details of individual behaviour, both
objective and subjective, but we must never forget that such a description is extremely defective.
It is an average and contains, or ought to contain, as much truth as an average. That is the first,
perhaps rather trite point that I wish to make. But does it even contain as much truth as an
average? I doubt it. One of the essential characteristics of an average is that the majority of cases
should approximate, within certain degrees, to this average. If, to give an example, I take a deeply
religious individual and study him, how near am I to understanding the average attitudes of two
dozen men performing a ceremony, or to the average point of view on religious matters? I insist
that I am not very near. For that reason, it seems to me, only that description which takes at least
three types of temperaments into consideration—adhering now to the case of religion—, the
intensely religious man, the intermittently religious man and non-religious man, can make any
claim toward being even a moderately acceptable average. In other aspects of culture it may be
necessary to make either more or fewer divisions. That will have to be determined upon. My
second point then is that the average used be not so general as to be meaningless.
Now group activities, it will be admitted by all, are the activities of individuals. We know however that the French School claims that when acting in groups, the activities transcend those of the myriad individuals who actually compose the groups. Let us admit that this is true, for the moment. The real difficulty with which, in my opinion, this school is confronted is not so much the proof of this general proposition as the manner in which they try to demonstrate it in detail. I don't care to go into too great detail in this letter, but in general it may be said that the French theorists adopt a method of proof that sins against the point I made before, they do not employ acceptable averages. They as a matter of fact, go even further, water their average and forget completely that they are averages. As for the general proposition as such, all it means is that the relations of men and women living in a state of society are capable of so many permutations and combinations that no accurate description is possible, that all we can possibly hope for is an approximation. We must then, once and for all, give up any attempt to treat Anthropology as a natural science, to seek for laws. If that means, as friend Lowie once insisted, that anthropology and history are consequently merely branches of belles lettres, we will have to let it go at that.

Well, that'll [sic] be all for today. It has taken me three weeks to finish this letter. Please send on the two pieces of music you spoke of and, if you can, your manuscript on Method.

Now that the new fiscal year is fast approaching I am anxiously awaiting the arrival of my new contract.

Love to Mrs. Sapir.
Yours, Radin

Acknowledgements: The two Radin letters are reproduced by permission of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Correspondence Edward Sapir Paul Radin, cat. Number I-A-236M
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SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Archives of the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL)—Dedicated to the preservation of archeological records “from Texas and adjacent areas,” TARL (at the University of Texas, Austin) contains materials “documenting the history of anthropology and archeology in Texas dating back to the early 1900s. A 93 page Guide to the historic materials of the TARL edited by Gail L. Bailey, published in 1997, includes text and illustrations relating to the history of TARL, as well a detailed inventory of 180 linear feet of manuscript collections relating to the
activities of particular individuals, institutions (including the WPA, the University of Texas department and museum of anthropology, and the Central Texas Archeological Society), as well as the TARL itself. Not included in this publication are inventories of 650 linear feet of records documenting the projects and sites in the 254 counties of Texas, which will be in part later this year through the Texas Historical Commission’s Texas Historical Sites Atlas Project.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS:

Julia J. Smith (New School of Social Research) is doing research for a master’s thesis on the early years of anthropology at the New School, and would greatly appreciate hearing of relevant sources, or from people doing related research.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. The History of Anthropology in the Netherlands

Han F. Vermeulen
University of Leiden

The history of anthropology in the Netherlands and its former colonies in the East and West Indies has been studied by many scholars in the Netherlands and abroad. Because there are no research institutes and few postdoctoral grants available for the subdiscipline, conditions for research are not optimal. Even so, there is an abundance of material, and a dozen doctoral dissertations have been defended or are now in progress. A full bibliography would take up 60 pages of text, only a selection of which can be presented here. Before discussing some of this material, a brief outline of the history of anthropology in the Netherlands may help set the stage.

Development of Dutch Anthropology:

Anthropology in the Netherlands developed in the wake of Oriental studies and in cooperation with geography and sociology. Relations with physical anthropology and prehistoric archeology have been weak and are even today virtually non-existent. Similarly, sociology has also been independent, particularly since the institution in 1963 of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Dutch universities. From the beginnings, anthropology has had a strong regional orientation towards the study of Indonesia. The first anthropological chair was established at the University of Leiden in land-en volkenkunde or ‘geography and ethnography’ of the Netherlands East Indies (1877). The first four occupants were P.J. Veth, G.A. Wilken, J.J.M. de Groot, and A.W. Nieuwenhuis (Heslinga 1975, Locher 1978c, de Josselin de Jong & Vermeulen 1989, de Wolf & Jaarsma 1991).

The study of the ethnography of Indonesia was closely connected with a training course for colonial civil servants called Indologie, first given at an intermediate level at Delft (1843-1900) and Leiden (1864-1891), then at university level at the universities of Leiden (1902-1956) and Utrecht (1925-1955). In Batavia (now Jakarta), courses were also given in Indonesian languages, history, geography, Islam, colonial and customary law, although generally the training of colonial civil servants and lawyers took place in the motherland rather than in the colonies (Warmenhoven 1977, Feddema & van den Muyzenberg 1978, Fasseur 1993).

In 1907 a chair in general volkenkunde was established at the University of Amsterdam, to which S.R. Steinmetz, who had studied at Leiden, was appointed (Fahrenfort 1933, 1963; Köbben 1992, 1996). In contrast to Leiden and Utrecht, the students entering the curriculum at Amsterdam
were mainly students in geography, a situation that lasted until after World War II. After the independence of Indonesia (1949) general ethnology was renamed 'cultural anthropology,' and Indologie was transformed in 1952-53 into 'non-western sociology' or 'sociology of non-western peoples' (Schoorl 1967a, 1970; Kloos 1988, 1989). Earlier described as applied anthropology (Held 1953, Schoorl 1967b, 1996; Jongmans 1976), and now recast as development sociology, “non-western sociology” developed in close connection with cultural anthropology, as departments that combined both courses were established. This implied a fundamental change insofar as anthropology, formerly only one of the subjects in the Indology curriculum, was now on a par with non-western sociology, a transformed version of Indology.

In addition to those mentioned, chairs in ethnology were established at the Agricultural University of Wageningen (1946), the Catholic University of Nijmegen (1948), the University of Groningen (1951) and the Free University of Amsterdam (1956). Chairs in non-western sociology were established at the universities of Amsterdam (1947 and 1965), Utrecht (1955) and Leiden (1956), at Wageningen (1955), Nijmegen (1958), the Free University of Amsterdam (1962) and at the Economic University of Rotterdam (1964).

Prior to World War II, anthropology was pursued not only at the universities, but also in learned societies, specialized research institutes and ethnographical museums. Such museums were established at Batavia (1836), Leiden (1837, by P.F.B. von Siebold, a German physician who had worked for the Dutch in Japan), Delft (1864), Rotterdam (1885), Amsterdam (1926) and, more recently, at Groningen (1968) and Nijmegen (1969). The history of these museums has been scantily discussed, mostly in expensive volumes on ‘masterpieces’, but recently a trend to publish specialized volumes on collections and collectors has become manifest.

The Historiography of anthropology (part 1):

The study of the history of Dutch anthropology (including non-western sociology) has reflected these developments. During the nineteenth century ethnography was practised in relation to Oriental studies (Boele van Hensbroek 1875) and to geography (Tiele 1884). But when during the early twentieth century attempts were made to develop a general ethnology, founding fathers of modern Dutch anthropology such as S.R. Steinmetz (Amsterdam), J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong (Leiden) and H.Th. Fischer (Utrecht) started to teach history of anthropology as part of their efforts to formulate new paradigms. Steinmetz published a ‘History of Ethnology’ in 1917, followed by a ‘History of Sociology’; van Eerde wrote a review of ethnological investigations in Indonesia (1923); de Josselin de Jong located his subject within a genealogy going back to Linnaeus in his (second) inaugural lecture on Indonesia as ‘a Field of Ethnological Study’ (1935) and distributed stencilled lecture notes on ‘The origins of scientific ethnology’ among his students around 1938; Fischer dealt with the history of ethnology in his inaugural lecture (1936) and in an encyclopaedia entry on ethnology (1938); Schrieke (1948) published a report on scientific work done in the colonies during the period 1918-43.

During the 1940s and 1950s the first studies on the history of Dutch anthropology were published, dealing mainly with the subdiscipline of applied anthropology as practised within the Indology curriculum. In 1944, the American Indonesiologist Raymond Kennedy stated that the Dutch East Indies civil service was ‘the only official body in the world that has made the study of ethnology, native language, and native law compulsory for all its staff,’ and in 1945 Kennedy published a substantial bibliography. That same year there was brief reference to Dutch contributions in Malinowski’s posthumous Dynamics of Culture Change. A fuller account was given by G.J. Held (1953) in a paper on ‘Applied Anthropology in Government’ presented at the Wenner-Gren conference in New York. Following a precedent set by Herskovits (1946) to associate
Dutch research with that in Belgium, A.A. Gerbrands published a overview of the situation in ‘The Netherlands and Belgium’ in 1953, a linkage repeated two years later A.J. van Bork née Feltkamp (1955). The latter presented anthropology in the broad sense, including ethnology and folklore studies, but concentrated on physical anthropology (a subject on which she had written a major monograph in 1938; see also Constandse-Westermann 1983). Gerbrands published a more detailed overview of cultural anthropology in Holland (1959), which, significantly, was written in French, reflecting Gerbrands’ participation in the ‘mouvement structuraliste’ between Leiden and Paris—although he mentioned all the other centers in the Netherlands as well.

The first serious review of the history of ‘Cultural Anthropology in The Netherlands’ was published by P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1960), a successor to his uncle at Leiden. He pointed out that the development of Dutch anthropology had been determined not only by a relationship with the colonial state, but also by an intimate relation with Oriental, mainly linguistic, studies—a field surveyed by G.W.J. Drewes on ‘Oriental Studies in the Netherlands’ (1957), which also carried a ‘Selected Bibliography of Oriental Studies’ by E.M. Uhlenbeck. In his later historiographical articles P.E. de Josselin de Jong discussed ‘the anthropological tradition in the Netherlands’ from a structuralist point of view, beginning with a paper for the 1968 Wenner-Gren Conference on national traditions in anthropology, which (at the editor’s suggestion) appeared under a quite different title in 1980. There he traced the origins of structural anthropology in Leiden to the work of van Hien, van Ossenbruggen, Rassers and J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, at the same time underlining the fundamental importance of the work of Marcel Mauss and Emile Durkheim. Later publications included an important essay on ‘Marcel Mauss et les origines de l’anthropologie structurale Hollandaise’ (1972); and the introduction to de Jong’s collection of translated essays on ‘Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands’ (1977). These studies of Leiden structuralism were complemented by Locher (1978a-b, 1981, 1982, 1988), van Baal (1977, 1986-89) and Jaarsma (1984).

Meanwhile, Henri Claessen and Peter Kloos, both from Amsterdam but working in Leiden, had joined in an effort to make Dutch anthropology in general better known. With the financial support of the Ministry of Education and Science they edited two volumes entitled Current Anthropology in the Netherlands (1975) and Current Issues in Anthropology: The Netherlands (1981). Both were published by the Anthropological Branch of the Nederlandse Sociologische en Antropologische Vereniging and were distributed to participants at two international conferences held at Amsterdam. A third volume was published as Contemporary Anthropology in the Netherlands (1992). Each of the two volumes carried a number of thematic and regional reviews of Dutch research, and was introduced by an historiographical essay by Kloos on the origins and institutional structure of anthropology and non-western sociology in the Netherlands (1975); a second (1981) on ‘Themes of the ‘Seventies,’ in which he analysed 96 recent doctoral dissertations. The 1992 volume was of a different nature, but had an interesting piece by Kloos on ‘Anthropology in the Netherlands: The 1980s and Beyond’.

In the mid-1970s, the close interrelations between ethnology and the administration of the colonies also caught the attention of several foreign scholars (Hirano 1975, Koentjaraningrat 1975, du Toit 1975, Ellen 1976), although a thorough critical study is not yet available. A serious study of the transformation of the Indology courses was published by Kloos in 1989, which, however, discusses only the outcome of the development and does not touch upon the intrinsic relations between ethnology and Indology. A book on the history of the Indology training courses, written by the historian Fasseur (1993), somewhat neglects the part played by anthropology in these courses. Aspects of this relationship are covered in de Josselin de Jong and Vermeulen (1989). Since the 1970s, the interrelation of anthropology and colonialism has been taken up in a number of studies, as we shall see in a later issue.
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II. Recent Dissertations
(Ph.D. except where otherwise indicated)

Tina Campf (Cornell University, 1996), "Afro-Germans: The convergence of race, sexuality, and gender in the formation of a German ethnic identity (1919-1960)."

Lisa Gates (Harvard University, 1996) "Images of Africa in late 19th and 20th century German literature and culture."

Christopher Kenway (UCLA, 1997), "Kraft und Schönheit: Regeneration and racial theory in the German physical culture movement, 1895-1920."

Catherine Lavender (University of Colorado, Boulder, 1997), "Storytellers: Feminist ethnography and the American Southwest, 1900-1940."

Andreas Motsch (University of Montreal, 1997), "Lafitau et l’emergence du discours ethnographique."

Oliver, Robert (Vanderbilt University, 1997), "Sex, anger, and confusion: The use of Freudian theory by American historians and anthropologists."

Jane Sequoya (Stanford University, 1997), "The symbolic functions of the figure of the Indian for the modern imagination."

Charles Stuart (University of Hawaii, 1996), "Blue spots, idiots, barbarians and tiffin in the dark heart of Asia: Mongols in Western consciousness."

III. Recent Work by Subscribers

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


IV. Suggested by our Readers

[Although the subtitle does not indicate it, the assumption here is the same as in the preceding section: we list "recent" work—i.e., items appearing in the last several years. Entries without initials were contributed by G.W.S. Occasionally, readers call our attention to errors in the entries, usually of a minor typographical character. Typing the entries is a burdensome task (undertaken normally by G.W.S.), and under the pressure of getting HAN out, some proofreading errors occasionally slip by. For these we offer a blanket apology, but will not normally attempt corrections. Once again, we call attention to the listings in the Bulletin of the History of Archaeology, the entries in the annual bibliographies of Isis, and those in the Bulletin d'information de la SFHS [Société française pour l'histoire des sciences de l'homme]—each of which takes information from HAN, as we do from them—although selectively]


Ginkel, Rob van. 1997. Notities over Nederlanders. Antropologische reflecties. Amsterdam/Meppel: Boom [Includes Dutch translation (pp. 87-97) & the original version of Ruth Benedict's...
'Note on Dutch Behavior' (225-234); two chapters on her study of Dutch 'national character' & review of literature under the title 'Ethnologia Neerlandica' (199-223) [H.V.]


GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

Cheiron—At the June 1998 meeting at the University of San Diego, there are to be two sessions on topics in the history of anthropology. “Anthropologists, Empires and Indigenous Peoples” will include papers by David Hoyt (UCLA) “Indirect rule in the British Empire as Analogue to Structural-Functionalism in Pre-WWI Britain”; Andrew Zimmerman (UCSD) “Natural Humans and Human Nature: Berlin Anthropology and the Humanities”; and Audra Wolfe (U. Penn.) “The Human Diversity Genome Project and the Tradition of ‘Salvage anthropology’”. A symposium on anthropology and history will include papers by John Gilkeson (Ariz. St. U., West) “Kroeber and ‘Style’ in the Natural History of Civilizations”; Clifford Wilcox (Bolles School, Jacksonville) “Redfield and the Interwar Debate over Culture and Civilization”; and Willow Roberts Powers (U. New Mex.) “Fields for Thought: Anthropology and History.”

Torres Straits Expedition—A conference entitled “Anthropology And Psychology: The Legacy Of The Torres Strait Expedition (1898-1998)” is scheduled for August 10-12 at St John's College Cambridge. The opening session on “Psychology, Anthropology, The Genealogy Of Science Studies” will include papers by David Bloor, Diederick Raven, and Simon Schaffer. A session on W.H.R. Rivers “as psychiatrist” will include papers by Roland Littlewood and Allan Young. Henrika Kuklick and Keith Hart will offer papers on “Rivers as Anthropologist.” Anita Herle and Jude Philp will present a paper on “The continuing significance of the Expedition’s work for the Torres Straits Islanders” Two sessions on “Case Studies In The Relation Between Anthropology And Psychology” will include papers by Graham Richards, Alan Costall, and Barbara Saunders. The final session on “Anthropology And Psychology: Prospect And Retrospect” will include papers by Michael Cole and Gillian Gillison. Further information may be obtained from Paul Caldwell, Department of Social Anthropology, Free School Lane, Cambridge CB2 3RF.