Patterns and Patrons of Culture:
U.S. Anthropological Subjects, Objects, and Knowledge in Motion, 1935–1986

by

Danielle N. Stubbe

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

History

August 13, 2021

Nashville, TN

Approved:

Sarah E. Igo, Ph.D.

Paul A. Kramer, Ph.D.

Laura Stark, Ph.D.

Daniel H. Usner, Jr., Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: "ANTHROPOLOGY'S NATIVE PROBLEMS"

For readers who flipped far enough through their glossy magazine pages, the rhyming words of W. H. Auden introduced an article in the *Harper's Magazine* issue from May of 1986. *Thou shalt not sit / With statisticians nor commit / A social science.*[1] A colorful illustration of two dark-skinned men, adorned with nondescript headdresses, patterned animal skins, spears, and golden jewelry and set against a watery backdrop of palm trees and waves, beamed from the opposite fold. Also in the background lurked three figures: a neon-yellow monkey, a winking tiger, and a light-skinned man with exaggerated blue eyes and a fully buttoned collar worn over another turtleneck shirt. The tiger's tail curled around this third man's back as he watched the landscape with lips pursed.[2]

The article itself is more important for our purposes. It was a report about "Anthropology's Native Problems" from a clinical psychologist currently in the midst of a book project on *madness, modernism, and notions of the primitive*, a blurb informed. "The phenomenon of 'culture,' once the raison d'etre of their field," he explained, "seems to be disappearing before their gaze. Rituals, myths, and kinship systems no longer appear so stable and distinct, or so regulative of human life, as they did in an earlier era."[3] He recounted the story of a young anthropologist couple that had set off to the Philippines in

[1] W. H. Auden, "Under Which Lyre," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* Vol. 48, No. 17 (June 15, 1946), 707.

[2] Illustration by Karen Barbour, *Harper's Magazine* (May 1986), 51.

[3] Louis A. Sass, "Anthropology's Native Problems: Revisionism in the Field," *Harper's Magazine* (May 1986), 50.

the fall of 1967 and soon found that historical records of cultural phenomena found in anthropology books differed from what they observed in the daily lives of people in the Ilongot village that they had arrived to study. A cultural text "'will tell you about as much about the Ilongot as the rules of baseball will tell you about some particular game,'" one of the young practitioners from the 1960s, now a professor, remarked for the article.[4]

This dissertation examines the making and unmaking of that *raison d'etre* of the discipline of anthropology—culture—during the midcentury period in the United States. It is a history of anthropology that asks why American anthropologists embraced and then tempered their dominion over cultural science and also how the native people with whom anthropologists interacted drove that change. It studies how anthropology made its object by rendering research informants, particularly native people, relics of the past, and it explores how those terms of engagement were revised by the struggle of native scholars, activists, and informants in the midcentury period as they laid claim to rights and cultural information and objects in the present during the 1960s and 70s, thereby challenging the anthropological ways of knowing and studying culture. It also shows how the anthropologists' stories intertwined with midcentury American imperialism.

These anthropologists wielded uncommon power in the midcentury U.S., both in the popular imaginary and within the institutions of the state. A very recent book about the famous twentieth-century cultural anthropological students of Franz Boas, including Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Ella Deloria, and Zora Neale Hurston, boasted that

[4] Sass, "Anthropology's Native Problems," 50.

The anthropologist quoted in the story is Renato Rosaldo, who would later write a book of stories that he believed better captured the life of the Ilongot. See: Renato Rosaldo, *Ilongot Headhunting, 1883–1974: A Study in Society and History* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980).

their work *reinvented race, sex, and gender* on a national scale through their cultural eye.[5] Has anthropological culture brought us to "the end of the nature-nurture divide?," Louis Menand mused in his review of this book for the *New Yorker*.[6] Of course not. And yet, midcentury anthropological culture itself and the influence that it seemed to command among the public still capture our own popular imaginary in the twenty-first century.

More importantly, midcentury anthropologists also found themselves useful to the U.S.'s faraway imperial projects abroad and those with sovereign native nations nearby. Many anthropologists trained during the earlier half of the twentieth century cut their teeth, as it were, through fieldwork with native people, and despite their best efforts to the contrary, their relationship to them would continue to define the discipline well into the 1980s. Native people lived not just in the pages of cultural texts written about them but also within the intellectual networks shared by American anthropologists during this period. They corresponded regularly with cultural researchers, travelled to archives, and even demanded a role in the preservation of cultural information and objects within the archives, libraries, and museums that served as repositories of anthropological knowledge.

---

[5] The book is Charles King, *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century* (New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 2019).

This claim that anthropologists, namely Franz Boas and his dozens of students who populated many anthropology departments, reinvented twentieth-century ideas about race has been written many times It emerged from historian of anthropology George Stocking in the 1960s, who argued that Boas's writing had brought about a reinvention of the field around the concept of *culture* rather than race. For Stocking's work, see both the first chapter of this dissertation and: George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968). Others have since continued to write about the racial revolution fostered, as they would have it, by anthropological theory. See also: Lee D. Baker, *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998) and Baker, *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

Other important interventions have challenged the extent to which anthropology actually redefined the idea of race. From an anthropologist, see: Mark Anderson, *From Boas to Black Power: Racism, Liberalism, and American Anthropology* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019).

[6] Louis Menand, "The Looking Glass," *The New Yorker* (August 6, 2019), 81.

As I sifted through the correspondence of one cultural anthropologist, Bryn Mawr's Frederica De Laguna, who had engaged in her earliest fieldwork with the Tlingit along the Northwest Coast, I found hundreds of letters, holiday cards, and other well-wishes from the Tlingit people with whom she had worked decades before. Also among these letters were requests for reproductions of anthropological speeches, books, and articles that might be of interest to their community members. Exchanges of cultural information were multidirectional and continuous throughout the twentieth century. De Laguna received these notes until her death in 2004, although by then many arrived via e-mail.

The subjects of this project are the anthropologists who deployed their studies of *culture*, a historical concept, both a subject and object of inquiry in itself, to many ends. Midcentury practitioners defined the term variously, as we will see. Perhaps most quoted is the idea of culture as a "total way of life of a people," a line from Clyde Kluckhohn's *Mirror for Man* in 1949, borrowed again by his student Clifford Geertz in the 1970s.[7] I show that cultural data, knowledge, materials, and expertise could be rendered valuable in similarly various ways and within many contexts during this time. Culture seemed at once to be able to provide behavioral research on food consumption, familial structures, social welfare, and dreams, and it was also deemed useful to projects of empire.[8] As a few

[7] Clyde Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life* (1949; New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017), 23. Geertz quotes Kluckhohn in defining his own concept of culture here: Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1973), 4.

[8] On anthropologists and dreams, see the body of work by Rebecca Lemov, who blends dream studies with a history of cataloging and big data: Rebecca Lemov *Database of Dreams: The Lost Quest to Catalog Humanity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015); Lemov, "Anthropological Data in Danger, c. 1945–1965," in *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, eds. Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2015): 87–111; and Lemov, "Filing the Total Human Experience: Anthropological Archives at Mid-Twentieth Century," in *Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences*, eds. Charles Camic, Neil Gross, and Michelle Lamont (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011): 119–150.

biographers have demonstrated recently through their intellectual-historical portraits of cultural anthropologists like Mead, researchers during the Second World and Cold Wars who found forms of employment directly within the U.S. Department of State and other federal institutions were said to perform cultural research on what was called the national character and the culture of enemies abroad.[9] The revelations that these imperial projects continued to use anthropological labor even after their personnel had formally resigned would alarm practitioners in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, when the *Harper's* piece ran.[10] Culture appeared coopted by the state, and anthropologists were quick to declare a crisis of their disciplinary practice. This crisis coupled with the epistemic one above. As native people increasingly resisted their role as anthropological subjects, anthropologists found that their power to manipulate culture and redefine it to their own ends had diminished.

We will find anthropologists within many midcentury sites. The ubiquity of anthropological cultural research at this time meant that, in addition to conventional university posts, anthropologists found diverse homes in cultural museums, the military, local welfare programs, and new institutions for U.S. national-cultural identity like the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Smithsonian Institution's always-

---

[9] For a specific biography of Mead, see: Peter Mandler, *Return from the Natives: How Margaret Mead Won the Second World War and Lost the Cold War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013). A similar biography of the cultural anthropologist Cora Du Bois covers her experience with the same subject, as an agent of the state during the Second World War. See also: Susan C. Seymour, *Cora Du Bois: Anthropologist, Diplomat, Agent* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015).

[10] The anthropologist David Price, an early adopter in the history of anthropology of the federal information and document request system that became available to researchers through the Freedom of Information Act in the late 1960s, has written a series of books that detail the covert use of anthropological expertise during the Cold War. See the most recent: David Price, *Cold War Anthropology: The CIA, The Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2016).

For a reflection from an anthropologist, see also: Laura Nader, "The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology," in *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*, ed. Noam Chomsky (New York, N.Y.: The New Press, 1997): 107–146.

evolving consortium of national museums.[11] In this way, their story parallels the history of other midcentury social, behavioral, and human scientific experts. Indeed, many historians have recently addressed the rise of what one has called the *open mind*: a human scientific approach to liberal policy, science, and society that codified around the Second World War and was funded by patrons like the Ford Foundation and the Social Science Research Council.[12] The midcentury history of anthropological culture in part fit within this mold. Their cultural research projects and rhetoric offered a vision for the nation and the world that flattered themselves and their patrons and also cloaked their imperial power within universalizing language of mankind. The anthropologist-designed Man: A Course of Study curriculum, which was installed in public schools during the 1960s and emphasized biological commonalities among different groups of people across the world, even offered to grade school students their sociocultural vision of behavioral differences.[13]

---

[11] Two studies in particular have discussed the concept of culture within the discipline of anthropology and the relevance that it would have to twentieth-century nationalist projects in the U.S. during the twentieth century. Both take as their beginning point the turn-of-the-century approach to cultural research undertaken by anthropologists. See: Susan Hegeman, *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999) and John S. Gilkeson, *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America, 1886–1965* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

On the Smithsonian as a "living museum" that continuously redefined its programs during the midcentury and grappled with complex national projects in cultural pluralism, localism, and diversity at the same time, see a particularly insightful institutional history: William S. Walker, *A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013).

[12] On the concept of the "open mind" and its practitioners and patrons, see: Jamie Cohen-Cole, *The Open Mind: Cold War Politics and the Sciences of Human Nature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2014).

The historian Mark Solovey has also written about the politics-patronage-social science nexus that was buttressed by Social Science Research Council funding during the midcentury period. See: Mark Solovey, "Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution: Rethinking the Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus," *Social Studies of Science* Vol. 31, No. 2 (April 2001): 171–206; Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (Newark, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013); and the edited volume *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, eds. Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York, N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[13] On the MACOS curriculum, see: Erica L. Milam, "Public Science of the Savage Mind: Contesting Cultural Anthropology in the Cold War Classroom," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 49, No. 3 (Summer 2013): 306–330.

And yet, the history of midcentury anthropologists and their study of culture also possessed its own unique character. By following culture and the anthropologists who studied it through these dynamic midcentury sites, I argue that the idea of culture in anthropology exposes a scramble among them to retain their control over cultural knowledge and expertise. Disinclined to name a narrow cast of main characters, I instead portray these actors and their institutions as part of a shared intellectual network that operated on a national scale.[14] Although the history of archival, library, and museum anthropology often remains separate from the story of those with university employment, we will see that personnel of each moved freely between these sites.[15] And although anthropology history appears a genre distinct from native history, we will also see that the latter guided the former and imparted its own meaning on the idea of culture and the authority claimed by a mandate to write about it at this time.[16] Anthropologists wielded their monopoly over cultural knowledge as a means to keep native people at remove from repositories of cultural data and objects that had been taken from them in the past, housed at institutions like the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C., the Newberry Library

[14] This framing invites the comparison to a body of historiographical work on the intellectual history of the U.S. and its treatment of ideas. In the 1970s, David Hollinger famously wrote about the "communities of discourse" that shaped intellectual life. In some ways, this study follows in the tradition offered there, insofar as it traces anthropological culture beyond its published context into the shared networks of some kindred practitioners and administrators. And yet, the construction of this study also shows that these communities are less fixed than practitioners assumed and that ideas are malleable their networks.

See the essay, reprinted somewhat more recently with a new forward from the author: David A. Hollinger, "Historians and the Discourse of Intellectuals," in *In the American Province: Studies in the History and Historiography of Ideas* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982): 130–151.

[15] For an older essay collection on museums and the history of anthropology, see: Stocking, ed., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988). For a more recent treatment of the role of museum bureaucracies, particularly the Smithsonian's, in the colonial history of museums, see also: Hannah Turner, *Cataloguing Culture: Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation* (Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press, 2020).

[16] A reader of Stocking's earliest work might not have even realized that people whose ideas he chronicled worked with native people, so divorced were the two interests in anthropological theory and native history.

in Chicago, Illinois, and the American Philosophical Society Library and Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Repatriation claims for human remains marked some of the earliest change, but the archived cultural information that could potentially be found within non-object collections like field diaries and letters posed a different challenge.[17]

Some of this separation is perhaps derived from the self-fashioning of the actors themselves. Midcentury anthropologists anguished over the boundaries between what they deemed applied and theoretical work.[18] A job for the state department studying the so-called national cultures of the Soviets or the Chinese was an example of anthropology in an applied form; a job with the Navajo or the Haudenosaunee on an ongoing court case or a land claim was not, researchers reasoned at this time. Native people appeared to represent relics of the past, natural-historical subjects whose cultural information bore relevance to the present only in its potential theoretical value for the social science of culture.[19] "The observed is placed in an imaginary, timeless space devoid of the dynamism and unpredictability characteristic of the observer's own experience," the *Harper's* piece would explain of the problem in 1986.[20] Culture will ultimately lead us in this dissertation

[17] The historian Samuel Redman's writing on repatriation of the natural historical collections of skeletal remains by institutions like the Smithsonian and a history of scientific racism is instructive for our purposes. See the epilogue to his monograph: Samuel J. Redman, "Epilogue," in *Bone Rooms From Scientific Racism to Human Prehistory in Museums* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016): 277–290.

[18] A telling article from the anthropologist Melville Herskovits in the 1930s claimed "the application of anthropology to the practical problems of the administration of primitive peoples that has such currency at the present time is a pragmatic problem in the extreme." See: Melville J. Herskovits, "Applied Anthropology and the American Anthropologists," *Science* Vol. 83, No. 2149 (March 1936), 216.

[19] The anthropological theorist Johannes Fabian importantly wrote of the "politics of time" that characterized a divide between social scientific research and their subjects. See: Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1983). From an anthropologist writing at the same time as Fabian, see another clear articulation on ideas of timelessness as they defined colonial anthropology: Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982).

[20] Sass, "Anthropology's Native Problems," 50.

to the anxieties of anthropologists as they recognized that they could no longer relegate native people to the past.[21] The historical treatment of that shift has emerged slowly, but it now promises to render obsolete an older history of anthropology that grasps for the discipline's theories without any consideration of the people subjected to study and the imperial power that accompanied that social scientific relationship.

A recent series of remarkable essays on the *Indigenous Visions* that operated in tandem with Boas's turn-of-the-century cultural research offers many models for such a history of anthropology. The hallmarks of twentieth-century modernism, one historian claims, were found first in the Kwakwaka'wakw masks and ceremonies that Boas observed and wrote about during his trips to the Northwest Coast.[22] Another recounts the story of Archie Phinney, a Nez Perce graduate student of anthropology and political activist who mediated between the categories of historical and modern so often imposed upon the native people whom he knew personally and further encountered in his studies.[23] Beyond this particular series, others have written further of the relationships between anthropologists and their longtime native informants and the attempts by

[21] Especially compelling work also shows how some anthropologists sought new subjects—usually isolated groups—to render historical within native communities abroad and demonstrates how those communities under study deployed anthropology to their own ends. See in particular, on Xavante people in Brazil who used their status as longtime subjects for political means: Rosanna Dent, "Studying Indigenous Brazil: The Xavante And The Human Sciences, 1958–2015," Ph.D. Diss. (University of Pennsylvania, 2017).

This framework draws from other studies in the history of the human sciences to uncover and manipulate research populations in time. See also: Warwick Anderson, *The Collectors of Lost Souls: Turning Kuru Soldiers into Whitemen* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008) and Joanna Radin, *Life on Ice: A History of New Uses for Cold Blood* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017).

[22] The essay from the collection is Isaiah Lorado Wilner, "Transformation Masks: Recollecting the Indigenous Origins of Global Consciousness," in *Indigenous Visions: Rediscovering the World of Franz Boas*, eds. Ned Blackhawk and Wilner (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018): 3–41.

[23] Benjamin Balthaser, "'A New Indian Intelligentsia': Archie Phinney and the Search for a Radical Native American Modernity," in *Indigenous Visions*: 258–276. See also from the same author: Balthaser, "From Lapwai to Leningrad: Archie Phinney, Marxism, and the Making of Indigenous Modernity," *Ab Imperio* Vol. 21, No. 1 (January 2020): 39–58.

anthropologists to portray themselves as friends for self-serving ends.[24] Some have shown how native people under study shaped anthropological research programs like the one in action anthropology that sought to engage directly with the lives of midcentury native people.[25] Anthropologists are reassigned to a secondary role within their narratives.

For our purposes, the theoretical interventions posited by these exemplary studies undergird an argument for our narrative of the career of midcentury culture that native informants were the agents of change within the discipline at this time. Although still often expressly excluded from academic patronage and discouraged from visits to archival repositories, their growing claims to ownership of the cultural objects, data, and materials still carefully guarded by anthropological proprietors within those institutions led to a reconsideration of culture as a meaningful category of analysis within the discipline. To be sure, similar challenges had often been leveled privately between anthropologists and informants for decades within their written correspondence or during face-to-face periods in the field. Our project is to understand why these became public debates in the 1960s and 70s and why anthropologists could no longer ignore them or restrict them to private correspondence or conversations during this decade. It requires us to follow culture

[24] A compelling series of vignettes of such relationships from the cultural anthropologist Margaret Bruchac offers a wide portrait of "potentially collaborative research relationships that devolved into nonreciprocal, nonsustainable harvests of cultural knowledge and patrimony." See: Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2018). She also writes about the erasure of those who were not studied in fieldwork here: Bruchac, "My Sisters Will Not Speak: Boas, Hunt, and the Ethnographic Silencing of First Nations Women," *Curator: The Museum Journal* Vol. 57, No. 2 (April 2014): 153–171.

On the subject of anthropologists as self-described *friends*, see also the classic: Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969).

[25] Judith Daubenmier recounts the activities of the Meskwaki people in Tama, Iowa, the subject of a University of Chicago field school for action anthropology during the 1940s and 50s, in shaping the program through their understanding of reciprocity. See: Judith M. Daubenmier, *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists: Action Anthropology Reconsidered* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

through the many sites that played host to midcentury cultural anthropology, which we will visit in turn throughout each chapter of the dissertation.

We begin in the first part of the dissertation, "Self-fashioning," in a midcentury period when anthropologists coalesced around a theory of culture. Oddly, the theory emerged not from a practitioner but from the historian George W. Stocking, Jr., whose narrative about the turn-of-the-century intellectual life of Boas offered a *charter myth* of sorts for postwar anthropologists.[26] The process through which Stocking developed this myth, which he framed deliberately as a paradigmatic shift in the way that cultural anthropologists should conceive of themselves in the present, is the subject of the first chapter.[27] It recounts the intellectual feedback between Stocking's historical process and contemporary practice, and I argue that the so-called reflexive turn soon to come from revelations about covert intelligence funding for scientific research dovetailed neatly with a sense of historical understanding engendered by Stocking's growing historical catalog.[28]

Stocking's historical writing provided a singular vision of culture that diverged from its messy applications during the same period. This disparity is the subject of the

---

[26] An anthropologist writing about the so-called four-field organization of American anthropology has cleverly used this framework of charter myths, borrowed from the cultural anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, that I too borrow here. See: Dan Hicks, "Four-Field Anthropology Charter Myths and Time Warps from St. Louis to Oxford," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 54, No. 6 (December 2013): 753–763.

[27] Part of the project, as we will see, was also an archive building initiative. On the subject of archives, see also: Nancy J. Parezo, "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records, and the Archival Community," *The American Archivist* Vol. 62 (Fall 1999): 271–306.

[28] On the subject of this ongoing theoretical-historical-methodological feedback between Stocking and contemporary disciplinary actors in the field of cultural anthropology, a phenomenon that emerged contemporaneously with self-reflexive anthropological theory, I draw from the idea of theoretical looping as portrayed by Joel Isaac, which further draws in part on Ian Hacking's writing on the same in the history of the human sciences. See both: Joel Isaac, "Tangled Loops: Theory, History, and the Human Sciences in Modern America," *Modern Intellectual History* Vol. 6, No. 2 (August 2009): 397–424 and Ian Hacking, "The Looping Effects of Human Kinds," in Dan Sperber, David Premack, and Ann James Premack, eds., *Causal Cognition: A Multidisciplinary Debate* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1995): 351–83.

project's second chapter, which finds anthropologists during the Second World War and afterward hard at work providing a clearinghouse of cultural data about peoples on all scales across the globe. Cultural anthropology had been deemed useful for this purpose, and as we will see the contours of culture remained malleable. Culture was therefore less a unifying, singular theory than a reflexive project of its own for anthropologists, deemed useful by their patronage structures that in turn credentialed them to be social scientists.

It is this revelation that brings us to the second part of the study, "Researching, Displaying, Archiving," in which I argue that contests over culture—its boundaries, its materials, and its academic authority—unraveled the status that had been bestowed to earlier midcentury anthropologists. Here, we first examine the historical relationships between the broad cohort of midcentury practitioners and their informants, native people from communities across the country. Through a close reading of case studies between the 1930s and the 1960s, we find perennial calculations performed by anthropologists meant to retain their credibility as arbiters of culture, even as native people explicitly questioned their enterprise and the disparate social scientific authority conferred to each of them. Some anthropologists, for their part, attempted to reimagine the discipline's relationship to the people they labeled *modern Indians*, or organizers preparing to mount a campaign for civil rights on a national scale after decades of termination policy.[29] This third chapter shows how tensions between portrayals of the cultural past and present persisted, and it reveals the stakes that anthropologists had in prolonging the former.

[29] The intervention made by Daniel Cobb about the history of native activism before the turn of the decade is the starting point of this observation, and his exemplary narrative of the work done by native scholars to guide anthropology at this time is a model of such scholarship. See: Daniel M. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2008).

The final two chapters turn to the repositories of cultural knowledge: archives, libraries, and museums. We first enter into an endless schedule of meetings and planning committees organized and reorganized at the Smithsonian for an always-forthcoming Museum of Man, an institutional project that was undertaken between about 1968 and 1984 under the direction of an interested Secretary.[30] It allowed cultural anthropologists involved with the endeavor to project some of their fears and tensions explored in the previous chapter onto a theoretical public-facing exhibition as they debated what the culture displayed at the potential museum would encompass. Administrators explicitly rejected an internal suggestion that they focus their efforts instead on a new National Museum of the American Indian in the early 1970s. This leads us into the final chapter, which explores growing calls for repatriation and the resolve against them from both anthropologists and administrators. They resisted physical and intellectual repatriation, I argue. While most repositories recognized that they should welcome native scholars into their reading rooms, they often tempered this access to preserve their own authority. Ironically, one of the ways that Smithsonian met this goal was to appropriate the defunct Heye Museum of the American Indian for incorporation into the consortium.[31]

In the end, we return to the concept of *culture*, divorced from its research methods and employed yet again in a new project of anthropological self-fashioning. "Younger

[30] Walker writes of museum as an attempt at a "family of man." See Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 196.

[31] Native scholars have offered a very important parallel narrative about the founding of the National Museum of the American Indian and its meaning for native history and heritage. While to Smithsonian administrators a bureaucratic transaction, the museum marked an act of sovereignty for native people. See: Amanda J. Cobb, "The National Museum of the American Indian as Cultural Sovereignty," *American Quarterly* Vol. 57, No. 2 (June 2005): 485–506. See also an edited volume on the history and foundation of the museum and the involvement of native scholars: Amy Lonetree and Cobb, eds., *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

anthropologists," the psychologist observed at the end of the *Harper's* article in 1986, "are striving to make a place for inner experience and individual actions, for unpredictability and historical change."[32] The solution for some was the practice of reflexivity, or an inveterate fixation on the positionality of the researcher during anthropological study that led one practitioner to remark that contemporary anthropologists seemed to possess "an almost narcissistic preoccupation with the self."[33] We conclude with a reflection on this exercise in light of the narrative traced earlier in the project of the development of the history of anthropology and its relationship to the rise of reflexive anthropological theory and practice. Why did Stocking's portrait of Boas survive the reflexive turn?[34]

"Patterns and Patrons of Culture" insists that the distinctions that anthropological researchers drew between what they called theoretical work and other endeavors during the midcentury crumble when we look beyond what practitioners wrote.[35] The epistemic

---

[32] Sass, "Anthropology's Native Problems," 50.

[33] This remark came from a review of a book of essays that meditated on how anthropologists might reinvent their discipline in light of the colonial revelations that emerged around the Vietnam War in the mid-late 1960s. See: David Kaplan, "Review: The Anthropology of Authenticity: Everyman His Own Anthropologist," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 76, No. 4 (October 1974), 826.

[34] In *Indigenous Visions*, one author explains the persistence of interest in Boas as particularly flattering to the conceptions that anthropologists held of themselves and their work. See: Audra Simpson, "Why White People Love Franz Boas; or, The Grammar of Indigenous Dispossession," in *Indigenous Visions*: 166–181.

Perhaps the selection of Boas as a condemnable representative of multiculturalism by conservatives, an accusation leveled in part by the critic Allen Bloom in the 1980s and 90s, also led to resurgence in interest in him among those looking to defend against it in response. See three further reflections on the subject by sympathetic anthropologists: Julia E. Liss, "Diasporic Identities: The Science and Politics of Race in the Work of Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, 1894–1919," *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 13, No. 2 (May 1998): 127–166; Herbert S. Lewis, "The Passion of Franz Boas," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 103, No. 2 (June 2001): 447–467; and Baker, "The Cult of Franz Boas and his 'Conspiracy' to Destroy the White Race," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 154, No. 1 (March 2010): 8–18.

Clifford Geertz offered a spirited defense of relativism in this vein in 1986: Clifford Geertz, "Distinguished Lecture: Anti-Anti Relativism," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 86, No. 2 (June 1984): 263–278.

[35] This is an intervention drawn in part from the framing of intellectual historians of such enterprises as "co-production," found here: Sheila Jasanoff, ed., *States of Knowledge: The Co-production of Science and the Social Order* (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2004).

struggle over their cultural research and its ability to portray the other reverberated both within traditional repositories of cultural knowledge and throughout broader political projects at this time. This is a critique that some self-styled radical anthropologists would make of the discipline during the 1970s. As postmodern methods for writing culture emerged as a response, some practitioners would be left wondering if the concept had lost its utility for anthropologists altogether.[36] This study attempts to show that such a critique had existed all along in the words of anthropology's native subject matter.

[36] Some took issue with the idea of postmodernism altogether. Interestingly, a parallel contest exists between the histories of science and technology, deemed by the historian of science Paul Forman to be theoretical and applied respectively. He laments the elevation of the latter over the former as a reflection of the postmodern in the history of science here: Paul Forman, "The Primacy of Science in Modernity, of Technology in Postmodernity, and of Ideology in the History of Technology," *History of Technology* Vol. 23, No. 1–2 (April 2007): 1–152.

PART I: SELF-FASHIONING

1 | GEORGE W. STOCKING, JR.'S *CULTURE CONCEPT* IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: WRITING THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY, 1952–1976

"If this trip has for me (as a thinking person) a valuable influence, it lies in the viewpoint of the relativity of all *cultivation* [*bildung*] and that the evil as well as strengthening of the value of a person lies in the cultivation of the heart [*herzensbildung*], which I find or do not find here just as much as amongst us, and that all service, therefore, which a man can perform for humanity must serve to promote *truth*."[1]

It was in a community called Anamitung that Franz Boas, huddled in an iglu built by his Inuit guide, Oxaitung, scribbled these words into a letter-diary addressed to his fiancée, Marie Krackowizer, on December 23, 1883. Boas had been traveling along the coast of Baffin Island in what would over a century later become the territory of Nunavut since his arrival to the island's Kekerten Station, a post occupied by Scottish whalers, in August. With the patronage of German geographers and the *Berliner Tageblatt* circular

[1] This reproduction of excerpts from Boas's letter-diary, originally written in German, is here: Douglas Cole, "The Value of a Person Lies in His *Herzensbildung*," in *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983): 33. The letter-diary had been published in various forms before its reproduction in this particular Stocking volume. For an earlier and shorter form of this letter-diary that was excerpted by Boas's daughter for a Franz Boas centennial edition of the *International Journal of American Linguistics*, see: Helene Boas Yampolsky, "Excerpts from the Letter Diary of Franz Boas on His First Field Trip to the Northwest Coast," *International Journal of American Linguistics* Vol. 24, No. 4 (October 1958): 312–320. The diaries would ultimately be published in full, both in the original German and translated to English, in 1993 and 1998 for each respective version. See: *Franz Boas Among the Inuit of Baffin Island, 1883–1884: Journals and Letters*, ed. Ludger Müller-Wille, trans. William Barr (Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

Boas's original diary and his translation are held at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, PA. See: Franz Boas Personal and Professional Papers, Box 2, American Philosophical Society (APS).

and the aide of an assistant, Wilhelm Weike, fluent only in German, Boas had embarked on a yearlong study of the history, behaviors, and relationships among Inuit communities on Baffin Island.[2] Now writing here from one of the northernmost reaches of the island's Cumberland Sound, he remarked on the kinship he felt with the people he had travelled to study, despite differences between what he called their relative cultivation and his own.

"The Eskimo are now sitting around me telling one another tales," he continued on to write in the conclusion of this particular note from Anamitung. "Too bad I cannot understand them. When I return I shall also learn to understand."[3]

Often coupled with his subsequent research among Tlingit and Kwakwaka'wakw communities along the Northwest Coast during the final years of the nineteenth century, these early diaries from Boas on Baffin Island have long drawn the attention of historians of anthropology. It was this first trip to the Arctic in particular, they have written, that encouraged Boas's turn toward the discipline of anthropology—the science of *culture* and the study of man—from his formal training in geography and physics.[4] His year along the Cumberland Sound and Davis Straight of Baffin Island between 1883 and 1884 would prove to be "ultimately one of special significance for the development of anthropology," the editor of the published volume of the diaries from this trip wrote in 1998.[5] It marked

[2] A detailed itinerary of Boas's trip and biographical reflections on how it influenced his thought during this transitional period from geographer to anthropologist is offered in Cole and Müller-Wille, "Franz Boas' Expedition to Baffin Island, 1883–1884," *Études/Inuit/Studies* Vol. 8, No. 1 (1984): 37–63.

[3] Boas in Cole, "The Value of a Person Lies in His *Herzensbildung*," 33.

[4] The origin of this biographical detail about Boas's intellectual move between disciplines is found in an article that will become the subject of this chapter: Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 68, No. 4 (August 1966): 867–882.

[5] Müller-Wille, "Introduction: Germans and Inuit on Baffin Island in the 1880s," in *Franz Boas Among the Inuit of Baffin Island*, 3.

the beginning of a six-decade academic career during which Boas supervised the research of dozens of doctoral students at Columbia University who would themselves in turn found prestigious anthropology departments at the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Pennsylvania.[6] Many others also assumed roles as inter- and postwar intellectuals and state agents whose research was operationalized by the U.S. military.

As the reaches of the Boas diaspora stretched across the country during the first decades of the twentieth century, so too extended the scholarly reflections on both the Boasian influence on anthropology in the U.S. and the history of the discipline. From Boas himself, a piece solicited by *Science* in 1904 noted that "anthropology [had] felt the quickening impulse of the historic point of view" since the mid-nineteenth century.[7] Boas attributed this historical thinking among anthropologists to the recent theory of evolution. As embraced by English and German social scientists, he wrote, evolution had been appropriated to explain shared cultural phenomena in disparate, so-called primitive societies, whose culture—language, customs, folktales—remained, they would have it, in a historical stage through which so-called civilized societies had already evolved.[8] While

---

[6] The earliest example, who has garnered historical-anthropological attention in his own right, is Boas's first graduate student A. L. Kroeber, whose relationship to Boas and establishment of Berkeley's program mark the spread of the Boas academic diaspora. For more, see: Ira Jacknis, "The First Boasian: Alfred Kroeber and Franz Boas, 1896–1905," *American Anthropol*ogist Vol. 104, No. 2 (June 2002): 520–532.

[7] Boas, "The History of Anthropology," *Science* Vol. 20, No. 512 (October 1904), 516.

[8] Here, Boas was responding to prevailing theories of cultural evolution at the turn of the twentieth century, which he found primarily in the writing of two English anthropologists, Herbert Spencer and E. B. Tylor, but had also come to influence American anthropologists during the final decades of the nineteenth century. For a succinct and representative portrait of the evolutionary model from the head of the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, to which Boas himself responded elsewhere, see: John Wesley Powell, "From Barbarism to Civilization," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 1, No. 2 (April 1888): 97–123.

Although Boas would declare evolutionary studies of culture to be passé at the turn of the century, interest in evolution pervaded throughout even the research of his contemporaries. For a philosopher's portrait on the interest in Darwin by cultural researchers, see: Chris Buskes, "Darwinism Extended: A Survey of How the Idea of Cultural Evolution Evolved," *Philosophia* Vol. 41, No. 1 (March 2013): 661–691.

Boas remarked in 1904 that this evolutionary model of culture was "losing much of its plausibility," he reaffirmed that anthropologists were still well-positioned to "throw light upon the history of mankind," so long as they followed other scientists in conducting regular "empirical revision of [anthropology's] theories" and history.[9]

This reflexive process of disciplinary historical writing would continue to prove useful among its practitioners. As the anthropologist Regna Darnell observed in 1977, Boas's students also began to write their own such field reviews with a Boasian bent as early as the 1930s, once anthropology had been established professionally, she argued, within its own university departments rather than ethnological museums.[10] Darnell was careful to note that these earliest histories received scant attention. The same cannot be said, however, of the abundance of historical work written since the 1960s on Boasian anthropology and its legacies. The library of scholarship on Boas himself has mirrored the scope of his vast archival collection, housed fully at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, PA since the mid-1950s, about a decade after his death in 1942.

Entries in the catalog range from conventional biographical sketches to reflections on Boas's ties to other historiographical themes like modernization, race, and wartime.[11]

---

[9] Boas, "The History of Anthropology," 522.

[10] Darnell surveys the interest in the history of anthropology among both historians of science and anthropologists themselves here: Regna Darnell, "History of Anthropology in Historical Perspective," *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 6 (1977): 399–417.

Among the earliest attempts to trace the influences and significant figures within American anthropology, Darnell notes that most were written encyclopedically, without many theoretical arguments, for students in anthropology. For two representative examples from two of the most prominent authors, see: Robert H. Lowie, *The History of Ethnological Theory* (New York, N.Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937) and Margaret Mead and Ruth Bunzel, *The Golden Age of American Anthropology* (New York, N.Y.: Braziller, 1960).

[11] As noted above, the amount of scholarship about Boas is vast, and it defies the ability to be condensed well into a singular footnote. For an attempt to write a biography of Boas, one of the few of its kind, see: Cone, *Franz Boas: The Early Years, 1858–1906* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1999).

His rare correspondence with W. E. B. Du Bois, roughly his contemporary, and frequent writing on early-twentieth-century race relations in the U.S. have led some to celebrate his role as a public intellectual who condemned the popular white supremacist writings of Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard.[12] In turn, more recent corrections have attempted to right the overstatement of Boasian anti-racism and instead focus on what the cultural anthropologist Mark Anderson deemed the "paradoxical legacies" of the racial liberalism practiced by Boas and prominent midcentury figures like his student Margaret Mead.[13] Scholarship from indigenous studies has similarly begun to parse through the complex loops left behind by Boas's turn-of-the-century fieldwork along the Northwest Coast.[14]

This chapter is not a further meditation on Boas's work, however. Instead, it asks how and why he became ubiquitous within the history of anthropology, especially as his popularity ebbed and flowed among cultural anthropologists working in the U.S. during

---

[12] In *The Nation* in 1925, Boas would pen the lead in a series of essays responding to the idea of a great Nordic race as espoused by Grant. See: Boas, "What is a Race?," *The Nation* Vol. 120, No. 3108 (January 28, 1925): 89–91. Other notable entries came from figures like Melville Herskovits, a student of Boas's and an anthropologist concerned with African and Afro-American culture, who argued that such texts offered "a false correlation between physical form and cultural achievement," as he would have it. See also: Melville J. Herskovits, "Brains and the Immigrant," *The Nation* Vol. 120, No. 3110 (February 11, 1925): 139.

Scholarship on Boas and race has a few representative publications. See: Lee D. Baker, *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998) and Julia E. Liss, "Diasporic Identities: The Science and Politics of Race in the Work of Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, 1894–1919," *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 13, No. 2 (May 1998): 127–166.

[13] Anderson underscores Vernon Williams's idea of the specific "Boasian paradox" between the dismissal of racial types but persistence of physical anthropological analysis. See: Mark D. Anderson, *From Boas to Black Power: Racism, Liberalism, and American Anthropology* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019), 9.

[14] Significant interventions that seek both to read the origins of many of Boas's celebrated anthropological contributions within Kwakwaka'wakw culture and to explore the effects that Boasian fieldwork had on the Kwakwaka'wakw themselves, including the origin of the misnomer Kwakiutl, as they were called in Boas's writing, have emerged over the past few years. On the latter point, see: Rainer Hatoum "'The First Real Indians That I Have Seen': Franz Boas and the Disentanglement of the Entangled," *ab-Original* Vol. 2, No. 2 (2018): 157–184. On the former, see: Isaiah Lorado Wilner, "Transformation Masks: Recollecting the Indigenous Origins of Global Consciousness," in *Indigenous Visions: Rediscovering the World of Franz Boas*, eds. Ned Blackhawk and Wilner (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018) and Wilner and Patrick Wolfe, "A Global Potlatch: Identifying the Indigenous Influence on Western Thought," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37, No. 2 (2013): 87–114.

the midcentury. I argue that the balance between disciplinary history and contemporary practice as exercised by a cohort of intellectuals during this time rehabilitated Boas in the eye of historical anthropologists and historians of anthropology. In the process, I contend further, they clarified the murky idea of *culture* as an object of anthropological study.

The writing of one figure from this cohort in particular, the historian George W. Stocking, Jr., who had been trained during the 1950s in the American Civilization program at the University of Pennsylvania under the direction of the anthropologist A. Irving Hallowell, led the charge. Stocking would joke later in an undergraduate lecture at the University of Chicago that he "gave Boas back" to anthropologists.[15] Until his death in 2013, Stocking maintained his own consistent catalog of historical work on Boas and the history of anthropology that ranged from the shorter-form *History of Anthropology Newsletter* distributed by the University of Pennsylvania beginning in 1973 to a book and essay series co-edited with the cultural anthropologist Richard Handler and published by the University of Wisconsin Press since the early 1980s.[16] Stocking claimed an intellectual position as the resident historical interpreter for anthropologists in the 1960s and 1970s, who assigned him authoritative roles within their institutions and kept in close contact

[15] Stocking, untitled/undated introductory lecture, George W. Stocking, Jr. Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 26, Folder "Hist. Anthro. Lectures General n.d.," Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center (SCRC), University of Chicago Library (Chicago, IL).

[16] "More than most disciplines," the tag line for the Wisconsin series in the History of Anthropology suggests, "anthropology pays attention to its own history, because more than most scholars, anthropologists understand that the knowledge they produce is always conditioned by its cultural and historical context."

Like Boas's, Stocking's writing and editorial work spans many decades and therefore reflects a wide array of historiographical trends that emerged throughout his tenure. His first book was a series of his own essays: Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968) that sought to situate American anthropology—led by Boas—as having emerged from both English and German traditions. With his editorial oversight and frequent contribution, the Wisconsin series solicited essays on colonialism, gender, race, and other topics.

with him on theoretical matters in the discipline. He became the representative historical voice for anthropologists' growing reflexive study of themselves and their history.

As Darnell noted in 1977, "the working out of [the] dichotomies"—between an anthropologist and a historian of anthropologists—was "still an ongoing process" during this period.[17] That a credible intellectual historian like Stocking had joined the ranks of anthropologists underscored the utility of such blurred theoretical lines to reinforce their own credibility as anthropological interpreters of culture. "To argue for the importance of understanding oneself at work is…to strengthen each discipline internally," Darnell wrote in an earlier endorsement of the history of anthropology for practitioners in 1971.[18]

Stocking's reading of Boas, first published in 1966 by the *American Anthropologist* in his seminal essay on "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," had served precisely this purpose: It seemed a way, as Darnell would put it, to strengthen the discipline internally. Scholars still committed to Boas studies rationalize the *culture concept* as something worked out, or "tested and elaborated by Boasian anthropologists," his many students, "in the practice of what Thomas Kuhn calls 'normal science' over the ensuing three decades" after his death.[19] This chapter argues, rather, that the intellectual-historical context of Stocking's essay itself on the *culture concept* instead imparted meaning to the anthropological practice of cultural research upon its publication in the 1960s. Further, it allowed a cohort of scholars reared during the height of midcentury racial

[17] Darnell, "History of Anthropology in Historical Perspective," 400.

[18] Darnell, "The Professionalization of American Anthropology: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge," *Social Sciences Information* Vol. 10, No. 2 (April 1971), 85.

[19] Darnell, "Historiographic Conundra: The Boasian Elephant in the Middle of Anthropology's Room," introduction to *The Franz Boas Papers, Volume 1: Franz Boas as Public Intellectual—Theory, Ethnography, Activism*, ed. Darnell (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015), xiii.

liberalism to justify their project, even as its foundations began to crack. This historical mythology of Boas and a purported anti-racist origin of Stocking's turn-of-the-century *culture concept* promised to buttress anthropological authority at just the right moment.[20]

In a tribute that opened a commemorative issue of the *International Journal of American Linguistics* upon the centennial of Boas's birth in 1958, Paul Rivet, the French ethnologist and founder of the Musée de l'Homme in Paris, remarked that Boas "*était mort en proclamant une dernière fois ce qui avait été la régle de sa vie, sa foi en l'égalité des hommes*."[21] This was a faith that midcentury American anthropologists would need to reaffirm could still be found in their own practice. As their ties to colonial enterprises—historical, contemporary, state-sponsored, theoretical, archival—were thrown into sharp relief during the years of the Vietnam War in various ways, the many paradoxes of the discipline were left similarly exposed.[22] Reflexivity as exercised through the history of anthropology and new practices for writing culture sought to keep the faith.

---

[20] The mythology that cultural analysis supplanted racial analysis for anthropologists in a clean theoretical break has a global history as well, and it dovetails in particular with imperial histories of Europe. Wrote the historian Alice L. Conklin on this period in France, "Historians of anthropology everywhere have tended to read backward into their profession a foundational division of the racial and physical from the cultural."

For this observation from Conklin on the French example, see: Alice L. Conklin, *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire, 1850–1950* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2013), 18. On the advent of cultural-historical methods housed German museums and part of a broader anti-humanist intellectual trend among nineteenth-century German human scientists see: Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

[21] Paul Rivet, "Tribute to Franz Boas," *International Journal of American Linguistics* Vol. 24, No. 4 (October 1958), 252.

Rivet and the Musée de l'Homme cast an influential shadow beyond the walls of the museum itself. On the relationship between ethnology, museum collections, race, and the empire, see specifically: Conklin, "Ethnology for the Masses: The Making of the Musée de l'Homme, in *In the Museum of Man*, 100–144.

[22] Zimmerman also importantly underscores that anthropology both relied on colonial activities to make its subject and collect its objects from the "bodies and the everyday objects of the colonized natural peoples" and was a colonizing enterprise in itself: Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism*, 4.

Material in this chapter and the next details the challenges to anthropological work in the 1960s and 70s.

"TYPES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY," read the header for Ruth Benedict's graduate seminar in anthropology during the winter term of 1930 at Columbia University. On the topic of "EVOLUTION," it would be Miss Mandelbaum, Dr. Stern, and Miss Schmerler shepherding the class discussions on the anthropologists E. B. Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan, and Edvard Westermarck of Finland respectively.[23] Half a dozen other students rounded out the roster with presentations on the anthropologists whose theories addressed such topics as the "ENVIRONMENTAL CAUSATIONS," the "ECONOMIC CAUSATIONS," and the "PSYCHOLOGICAL CAUSATIONS" of the generalized laws governing their practice of anthropology, the science of man.[24]

On their reading list were theoretical texts from an array of anthropologists, past and present. Morgan, Briffault, Haddon, and Balfour provided the course's evolutionary material. On the subject of history and its applicability within anthropological research, Tylor, Wissler, and Sapir featured alongside a litany of others, European and American. From Boas, essays on the "Aims of Ethnology," "Methods of Ethnology," and "Aims of

[23] Ruth F. Benedict, "Anthropology Seminar," Ruth Fulton Benedict Papers, Series VI, Box 61, Folder 4, Catherine Pelton Durrell '25 Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.).

While Benedict had no further notes on these students in this particular file, they were likely May Mandelbaum Edel, a first-year graduate student of Benedict and Boas whose later fieldwork would be notable for her time spent alone as a female researcher in Africa, the sociologist Bernhard J. Stern, who had earned a Ph.D. in Sociology at Columbia in 1925 and whose interest in Soviet ethnology during the 1930s would elicit criticism of his work as anti-American propaganda during the 1940s and 50s, and Henrietta Schmerler, who the next year in July of 1931 would be sexually assaulted and then murdered while undertaking research alone among a group of Apache people in Whiteriver, Arizona.

Schmerler's case ultimately came under the jurisdiction of the FBI and also engendered a debate among female anthropological researchers as late as the 1980s over how a proper and well-behaved fieldworker ought to conduct herself while doing research. From her nephew recently on his attempts to retrieve her case file from the FBI and piece together the reaction by anthropologists at the time, see: Gil Schmerler, *Henrietta Schmerler and the Murder that Put Anthropology on Trial* (Eugene, OR: Scrivana Press, 2017).

[24] Benedict, "Anthropology Seminar."

Anthropological Research," all published around the turn of the century and reprinted in the wide-ranging collection of his essays on *Race, Language & Culture*, assigned in full on the syllabus, provided a general framework of analysis for Benedict's students.[25] "We may perhaps best define our objective as the attempt to understand the steps by which man has come to be what he is, biologically, psychologically and culturally," Boas had written in an essay that would guide the students' first discussion and further frame their course's theoretical approach to anthropology. "Thus it appears at once that our material must necessarily be historical material, historical in the widest sense of the term."[26]

This historical study of *how man had come to be what he is* would steep throughout Benedict's lecture materials for this seminar and other courses for her undergraduate students as well. On the "Interrelation of cultural traits," Benedict jotted the following on a notecard before delivering an Anthropology 101 lecture in the spring of 1935:

> Artificiality of separation.
> "Art orig. in rel; Rel. origin in society. Song and dance work in rhythms."
> <u>But</u>.
> Clear cultural thinking
> (handwritten) *Cultural anthro.*
> Individual
> Summary. History of human culture shows diversity and degree to which humans can be conditioned[27]

---

[25] Benedict, "Anthropology 103: Bibliography in Anthropological Theory," Benedict Papers, Series VI, Box 61, Folder 4, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

This particular reading list may actually have belonged to a different iteration of the same course taught at Columbia later in the decade. While contained in a folder labeled "Anthropology Seminar 1930–1931," included on the reading list is also a text from Robert Lowie that would not be published until 1937 and Boas's *Race, Culture & Evolution*, published as a full volume in 1940.

[26] Boas, "The Aims of Anthropology," in *Race, Language & Culture* (New York, N.Y.: The Macmillan Company, 1940), 244.

[27] Benedict, "Interrelation of cultural traits" (undated notecard), Benedict Papers, Series VI, Box 61, Folder 1, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

"Rel" likely refers to religion in the context of this note and other shorthand lecture notes from Benedict.

Other lecture notes clarified her thinking on the matter further. In a later lecture script for a course on the theory and practice of comparative study by anthropologists of cultural groups found widely apart, Benedict continued, "Becoming culture-conscious is first and foremost becoming conscious of our social forms and their consequences. It is the social forms of the culture which write its destiny. No one particular social form is inevitable in human nature; it has grown up gradually and has a complex history."[28]

The portrait of history and culture taught by anthropologists in the 1930s followed many multivalent lines of inquiry. Human psychology, biological data, economic systems, nearby environmental phenomena, and how these dimensions were interwoven with social interactions between people all met the anthropological eye. Undergirding them was a broad interest in what practitioners generally referred to as *culture*, or, as they would have it, a whole system governing human behavior. As the ethnologist Robert H. Lowie, another former student of Boas's now teaching at Berkeley, would have it in a text also assigned during the first week on Benedict's syllabus, culture was a similarly all-encompassing term: "The sum total of what an individual acquires from his society—those beliefs, customs, artistic norms, food-habits, and crafts which come to him not by his own creative activity but as a legacy from the past, conveyed by formal or informal education."[29] It was a system that carried the weight of the past into the present. It was

---

[28] Benedict, untitled/undated lecture notes, Benedict Papers, Series VI, Box 61, Folder 5, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

This document appears to be the first page in a longer lecture that has been separated from it within Benedict's teaching files for this particular anthropology seminar. It is untitled and undated, but contained in a folder also labeled "Anthropology Seminar" alongside some other lecture fragments from the 1930s.

[29] Robert H. Lowie, *The History of Ethnological Theory* (New York, N.Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937), 3.

Lowie here offers perhaps the most straightforward attempt at a definition of *culture* to be found in anthropological writing at this time, although it is mostly retrofitted to label a disparate group of scholars.

the *social* aspects of human behavior with a *complex history* that possessed an almost godlike prescriptive power to affect *destiny*.[30] And within that system, it then compelled the individual to "bear the stamp of a tradition not of one's own making," as one British anthropologist writing about the history of discipline at this time would put it later.[31]

For the student anthropologists in Benedict's graduate course in the 1930s, this social system of culture also guided their orientation toward the groups of people under study within their work. With the system of culture in mind, "we can learn to look upon them"—our anthropological subjects—"objectively," Benedict ended another lecture with optimism.[32] The promises of cultural research in theory and practice were many, even as the term itself elided straightforward or uniform definition.

More approaches to cultural anthropology abounded beyond Columbia's walls. The analytic scope of culture areas, or how to determine the borders and boundaries of cultural systems, perplexed some who sought to quantify shared and divergent traits of different groups living in close proximity to one another.[33] Elsewhere, the social scientific

---

[30] Oddly enough, theologians concerned with the nature of man have often pondered their relationship to cultural anthropological research past and present, with one noting in the 1980s, "Anthropology has long been a part of theological reflection." See: Mark Kline Taylor, "What Has Anthropology to do With Theology?," *Theology Today* Vol. 41, No. 4 (January 1985), 379.

Historical scholarship on the uses of anthropological ideas among theologians also intertwines with work on the Civil Rights Movement. For a portrait of the life of Howard Thurman as a student at Rochester Theological Seminar in the 1920s and Thurman's engagement with anthropological ideas and scholarship, see: Peter Eisenstadt, "'The Sound of Rushing Water': Rochester Theological Seminary," in *Against the Hounds of Hell: A Life of Howard Thurman* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2021).

[31] Tim Ingold, *Evolution and Social Life* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 38.

[32] Benedict, Benedict, untitled/undated lecture notes, Benedict Papers, Series VI, Box 61, Folder 5, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

[33] For a representative publication on the subject of cultural area studies that "sought to establish pernanences which transcended the 'accidents' of history and geography," see: Harold E. Driver and Alfred L. Kroeber, "Quantitative Expression of Cultural Relationships," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* Vol. 31, No. 4 (1932): 211–256.

practices of psychology and its new tests that might aid cultural anthropologists in the supposed measurement of a group's mental faculties and innate personality traits guided many studies conduced in the anthropological subfield of Culture and Personality. With inquiry into memories of the dreams of indigenous people in the Southwest tapping a boundless spring of narrative materials and their responses to the thematic Rorschach inkblots providing similarly deep wells of funding from outsiders, researchers could now "peer into the heads and minds of their subjects, and draw out data amenable to scientific use," the historian Rebecca Lemov put it recently.[34] And yet, this psychological mode of inquiry also met more imperial needs for some anthropological patrons. That a culture and personality study might prove useful to surveil and understand enemies abroad meant that anthropologists could solicit direct and indirect channels of funding for their work from the military, and cultural researchers turned their gaze abroad to study behavioral patterns of whole nations at the behest of these state-sponsored patrons.[35]

Complex and interwoven ideas about culture in anthropology had mutated to signify disparate anthropological pursuits with very different underlying assumptions and many animating academic questions in this period. Were an individual's psychological

---

[34] Rorschach and other thematic apperception testing (TAT) would persist well into the 1940s and 50s, although always with skepticism of its capacity for objective measurement. On the subject and for the source of the quotation above, see: Rebecca M. Lemov, "Towards a Data Base of Dreams: Assembling an Archive of Elusive Materials, c. 1947–1961," *History Workshop Journal* No. 67 (Spring 2009), 44.

[35] Programs in psychological warfare were most actively and openly pursued by a research group at Yale University known as the Human Relations Area Files, still operational in the present with a contemporary mission to "promote understanding of cultural diversity and commonality in the past and present." On the HRAF in its early years in the 1940s and 50s, see: David H. Price, "Counterinsurgency and the M-VICO System: Human Relations Area Files and Anthropology's Dual-Use Legacy," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 28, No. 1 (February 2012): 16–20.

These state-sponsored patronage channels and their effects on the concept of culture and the prestige of postwar cultural anthropology are the subject of the next chapter.

traits the object of cultural anthropological study, or that of the group? How did subjects imbibe the history imparted upon them by their cultural systems? And just how broad were the reaches of a cultural system? Could they provide valuable social scientific data on a national scale, or were they confined to small communities?

Such intellectual paradoxes did not escape researchers in the field of culture within anthropology and without, who by the end of the 1930s had recognized across disciplinary lines the discursive confusion that mired the concept of culture in their work. "Among social scientists the most widely used definitions of culture are not scientific definitions," wrote the sociologist Albert Blumenthal for the *American Anthropologist* in 1940. "They are common-sense definitions and as such are not suitable for science."[36]

Upon the publication of his article, Blumenthal soon hastened to write to Clyde Kluckhohn, a cultural anthropologist at Harvard University, on this matter and the subject of what esteemed social scientific researchers might do about it. Kluckhohn had already joined a Committee of Conceptual Integration with representatives, including Blumenthal and others, from across the social sciences to engage with various concepts and ideas as they appeared in their research programs. "Your committee on the definition of definitions will be ready to make its report to you very soon," Blumenthal told Kluckhohn. "It will present divergent points of view and ask for your reactions to them."[37]

---

[36] Albert Blumenthal, "A New Definition of Culture," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 42, No. 4 (Fall 1940), 571. This version in the *American Anthropologist* was reprinted from the *Marietta College Press* in 1938.

This piece was well received within the field of sociology as well. For a review from two peers on this and other essays from Blumenthal, see: Bronislaw Malinowski and Leopold von Wiese, "Review: Six Essays on Culture by Albert Blumenthal," *American Sociological Review* Vol. 4, No. 4 (August 1939): 588–594.

[37] Blumenthal to Clyde Kluckhohn (March 27, 1940), Papers of Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1930–1960, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, Harvard University Archives (HUA) (Cambridge, MA).

But defining culture proved more difficult than committee members had anticipated. "I am impressed that we must exercise great care not to caught in a blind alley of discussion on the nature of definition," Blumenthal wrote again just a few weeks later.[38]

Soon, a sub-committee dedicated to an even narrower focus on the definition of culture had branched away from the Committee of Conceptual Integration. Kluckhohn joined Blumenthal, Bronislaw Malinowski, and a half-dozen others, and the cohort agreed to meet at the 1942 gathering of the American Sociological Association to discuss their definitional work in greater detail.[39] Blumenthal was quick to circulate through the mail the papers presented by each sub-committee member, attached with a promise that each would be called to expound upon his definitions further within the group's future gatherings. Kluckhohn scribbled a note at the bottom of this letter from Blumenthal: "Where once there was an organic process, there is now a cultural technique."[40]

While the Committee's sub-committee on culture dissolved at the end of that year, the challenge remained on Kluckhohn's mind in the ensuing ones before publication of his *Mirror for Man* treatise in 1949. Meant to advocate for the value of anthropology for everyday people, the book also clarified some anthropological thinking about culture itself. "By 'culture,'" Kluckhohn wrote plainly, "anthropology means the total life way of a people, the social legacy the individual acquires from his group."[41] He continued:

---

[38] Blumenthal to Kluckhohn (May 29, 1940), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[39] Blumenthal to Kluckhohn (May 4, 1942), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[40] Kluckhohn, note on Blumenthal to Kluckhohn (June 23, 1942), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[41] Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life* (1949) (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017), 23.

> There is culture in general, and then there are the specific cultures such as Russian, American, British, Hottentot, Inca. The general abstract notion serves to remind us that we cannot explain acts solely in terms of the biological properties of the people concerned, their individual past experience, and the immediate situation. The past experience of other men in the form of culture enters into almost every event. Each specific culture constitutes a kind of blueprint for all of life's activities.[42]

But this, too, confounded more than it clarified, and those paradoxes of cultural anthropological research persisted. On what scale did culture explain? Was it past or present? And whither the individual within a cultural system?

Kluckhohn himself seemed similarly frustrated, so he wrote widely to colleagues in cultural anthropology in the interest of pursuing again the question of how social science had addressed the meaning of culture. "I have never written a formal definition of culture, so far as I know," Alfred Kroeber responded from Berkeley. "I looked through anthropology and found several passages that make points about culture, or tell what it is not."[43] The pair agreed to read work by their peers and predecessors that addressed the concept of culture and to write an index of the definitions that they found. Drafts of the ensuing manuscript were also circulated to peers, with pages of suggestions for how to refine the authors' summaries of the uses of culture returned from interested scholars across the country. Wrote one anthropologist in his notes on the manuscript, "Two very important objections to the culture concept are introduced: broadness; and vagueness."[44]

The volume would be published in 1952 as a treatise on *Culture* that confirmed in its opening lines that the concept was "one of the key notions of contemporary American

[42] Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man*, 23.

[43] Kroeber to Kluckhohn (January 19, 1949), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[44] Wayne Untereiner to Kluckhohn (November 14, 1951), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

thought," so much so that its practitioners had employed it in reference to very disparate approaches to social scientific research.[45] "It is time for a stock-taking, for a comparing of notes, for conscious awareness of the range of variation," the authors insisted.[46] What followed over the next two hundred pages was an exhaustive attempt to compile an index of references to culture as it guided European and American social scientific, historical, and philosophical writing, with entries ranging from Voltaire to T. S. Eliot to Kroeber and Kluckhohn themselves. Anthropologists and other social scientists fell into one or more of six categories, as the treatise would have it: descriptive, historical, normative, psychological, structural, and genetic. The descriptive practitioners—the authors, Boas, and a dozen others—saw culture to be a "comprehensive totality" wherein the social scientist provided an "enumeration of aspects of culture content."[47] The historical view, on the other hand, with advocates like Margaret Mead, Talcott Parsons, and the authors again, elevated "social heritage or social tradition."[48]

To the frustration of many colleagues, Kroeber and Kluckhohn's *Culture* read much like an index, with excerpts from representative figures and brief expositions from the authors that served to link those excerpts together, but functioned like a theoretical intervention in itself, wherein the authors mobilized their own concept of culture. Wrote one archaeologist, a former graduate student of Kluckhohn's at Harvard from the 1930s

---

[45] Kroeber and Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (Cambridge, MA: Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 1952), 3.

The authors were careful to note that, while they would denote one hundred and sixty-four ideas about culture over the proceeding pages, they would not posit a one hundred and sixty-fifth.

[46] *Ibid.*, 4.

[47] *Ibid.*, 44.

[48] *Ibid.*, 48.

Either one or the other of Kroeber or Kluckhohn, or both, appear under all six of their categories.

who had received advanced proofs of the manuscript, to Kluckhohn, "I am a little disappointed." He continued on: "Despite your statement that you do not intend to propose a definition, you do make definitive statements as to what culture is, although never actually marking those assumptions either as assumptions or as proper definition. To use an old phrase of yours, Clyde, this is 'weasling [*sic*].'"[49] Another inquired whether Kluckhohn might clarify "what you are trying to do for what audience."[50]

Reactions to the published text were mixed to positive. While attendees of that year's proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences lauded the possibility of texts like *Culture* to synthesize theoretical knowledge between social sciences for collaborative purposes, other reviewers further observed that, of the one hundred and sixty-four definitions listed in the treatise, over half had come from the discipline of anthropology itself.[51] A sociologist reviewer echoed the concern voiced above by Kluckhohn's archaeologist colleague about the omnipotence of "the authors' own views on controversial questions."[52] Noted a prominent historical ethicist writing his review from the City College of New York, "Philosophers concerned with the theory of science will find this a welcome addition to source materials for the social sciences."[53]

In fact, this observation would raise questions for philosophers of social science and anthropologists themselves about who ought to theorize culture. "The quest for a

[49] Walter W. Taylor, Jr. to Kluckhohn (January 2, 1952), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[50] Unnamed correspondent to Kluckhohn (undated), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.9, Box 1, HUA.

[51] Laura Thompson, "Some Significant Trends toward Integration in the Sciences of Man," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* Vol. 80, No. 2 (May 1952): 173–186.

[52] David Bidney, "Review of Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions," *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 59, No. 5 (March 1954), 488.

[53] Abraham Edel, "Review of Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions," *The Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 51, No. 19 (September 1954), 559.

theory of culture becomes a metaphysical inquiry distinct from the factual and theoretical questions of anthropology as an empirical science," another philosopher responded.[54] But anthropologists would not yet readily cede this theoretical power to the philosophers of science. The colleague who had written to Kluckhohn asking him to clarify his intentions with the *Culture* treatise offered one further note. While "as yet anthropology has made no important contribution to scientific social theory directly," they said, anthropologists should not neglect "the goldmine beneath their feet—the concept of 'culture.'"[55]

Anthropologists, Sociologists, and Historians of Science at the SSRC, 1962

That their understanding of the history and theory of culture could promise a rich intellectual pursuit of its own would escape neither the cultural anthropologists nor their institutional patrons in the months and years following the publication of Kroeber and Kluckhohn's treatise in 1952.[56] Interest from practitioners and students multiplied, as did new funding for their projects and meetings. At an inaugural International Symposium on Anthropology hosted by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research in June of the same year, Kroeber, Kluckhohn, and a cohort of fifty other anthropologists from "Australia, Japan, Thailand, India, Turkey, Argentina, and many other countries," as Axel Wenner-Gren boasted in his introductory remarks to the group, soon gathered for another appraisal of cultural-anthropological research featuring roundtable discussions

[54] Leon J. Goldstein, "On Defining Culture," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 59, No. 6 (December 1957), 1080.

[55] Unnamed correspondent to Kluckhohn.

[56] Articles and presentations in the vein of the Kroeber-Kluckhohn treatise, often picked up for publication in the *American Anthropologist*, would appear frequently over the following years and decades. See, for example: Fred W. Voget, "Man and Culture: An Essay in Changing Anthropological Interpretation," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 62, No. 6 (December 1960): 943–965 or Gerald Weiss, "A Scientific Concept of Culture," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 75, No. 5 (October 1973): 1376–1413.

between prominent figures on such topics as cultural continuity, physical characteristics as affected culture, and so-called simple versus complex cultures, among others.[57] Culture proved similarly salient in both secondary and university classrooms. "I've just begun a class on Definitions of Culture, with the Kroeber and Kluckhohn monograph as a text," shared one linguistic anthropologist with Hallowell at the University of Pennsylvania in 1955.[58] And this reflexive interest in anthropologists' study of culture grew further still in the final years of the decade and into the 1960s. On a national scale, the American Anthropological Association formed its own Anthropology Curriculum Study Project that sent cultural-anthropological missionaries into secondary school classrooms across the country in order to diffuse better cultural instruction into young American minds.[59]

Hallowell would similarly begin a new initiative in partnership with the Social Science Research Council on the topic of the history of anthropology in the fall of 1960, when advanced planning commenced for a conference that would bring together scholars who had broadly engaged with the history of the discipline. "It is ironic," read a proposal

---

[57] Axel L. Wenner-Gren, "Address of Welcome," reproduced in *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, eds. Sol Tax, Loren C. Eiseley, Irving Rouse, and Voegelin (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953), xiii. The utility of this conference beyond strict disciplinary stocktaking appears in the next chapter.

[58] Charles F. Voegelin to A. Irving Hallowell (February 21, 1955), Alfred Irving Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 10, Folder "Voegelin, Charles Frederick," APS.

[59] The culture program and the role of cultural anthropology teaching was just one of many interests of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project. For a report to the American Anthropological Association on the program's progress, see: "Official Reports: American Anthropological Council Meeting (Saturday, November 17, 1962) (Chicago, Illinois)," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 65, No. 3 (June 1963): 671–682. Reports were also distributed about the project on a smaller scale through a circular from *Anthropology News*. See also: Malcolm Collier, "Report on the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project," *Anthropology News* Vol. 3, No. 9 (November 1962): 2–4 and Collier, "A Report From the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project," *Anthropology News* Vol. 5, No. 1 (January 1964): 1.

The program also distributed essays to interested parties about the idea of interest to anthropologists like culture and civilization. See, stored in Stocking's files: Rachel Reese Sady, ""The Culture Concept and Ethnocentrism" (unpublished paper), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2016-465, Box 77, Folder "Anthro Curric. Study Project, 1963–1964, SCRC.

for the event, "that a discipline such as anthropology has been so little concerned with its own history, or with what one might call the anthropology of anthropology."[60] The irony of this statement, of course, was that such concern had been growing steadily for decades. Nonetheless, Hallowell underlined in his notes that the disciplinary history was to be "inclusively conceived," and participants from anthropology, sociology, and history of science gathered in Manhattan in April 1962.[61] Of three-dozen conference attendees, the introductory speaker boasted with excitement that more than half had elected to deliver papers to their peers.[62] Added the linguist Dell Hymes in a Council circular that lauded the success of the proceedings afterward, their goals for the weekend had been simple and collaborative: "Historians can learn anthropology; anthropologists can learn history."[63]

And yet, unspoken at the conference was also another hidden potential, as the anthropologists would have it, for historical scholarship both to clarify their own concepts and to bolster their own credibility through some reflexive anthropological study of themselves. Hymes observed further that anthropologists would benefit from "turn[ing] some of the informants"—historians of anthropology—"into professional collaborators," an intellectual practice that was "already validated in the history of science."[64] Hallowell

[60] "The History of Anthropology: A Conference Proposal" (draft), Hallowell Papers, Series II, Box 12, Folder "Social Science Research Council Conference on the History of Anthropology, 1961–1962," APS.

[61] Hallowell, Notes from an "Ad hoc advising group to plan conference on History of Anthropology" (October 7, 1960), Hallowell Papers, Series II, Box 12, Folder "Social Science Research Council Conference on the History of Anthropology, 1961–1962," APS.

[62] Rowland L. Mitchell, Jr., "On Studying the History of Anthropology: Reflections of a Historian" (draft), Hallowell Papers, Series II, Box 12, Folder "Social Science Research Council Conference on the History of Anthropology, 1961–62, page 1.

[63] Dell H. Hymes, "On Studying the History of Anthropology: Reflections of an Anthropologist," *Social Science Research Council Items* Vol. 16, No. 3 (September 1962), 26.

[64] Hymes, "On Studying the History of Anthropology," 26.

concurred, affirming in an essay that he had noticed "an upsurge of interest in the history of science" that anthropological practitioners might effectively appropriate for a "sounder appraisal of current trends of thought and further research."[65] Historians heeded this call with enthusiasm. In the reflection from a historian that ran parallel to Hymes's piece for the Council circular after the conference, an appeal for "strengthening existing archives and building new collections" in the history of anthropology seemed a beacon for future collaborative efforts among all attendees, and the libraries, museums, and archives that had housed anthropological material would soon heed the call to publicize the value of their collections for historians and to expand repository shelves.[66] At a new Smithsonian Institution annex in Suitland, Maryland, a National Anthropological Archives collection would soon replace the dated archives of the Bureau of American Ethnology.[67]

Such historical reflexivity was also a practice that the meeting proved to be a challenge for anthropologists now confronting it head on, who in Hymes's recollection of the proceedings became emotional when disagreements over certain topics—namely "the

---

The above note from Hymes was almost anachronistically perceptive about the function of the history of science among his peers in the human sciences during the early 1960s. As Joel Isaac writes, the midcentury social and human sciences embedded science historian Thomas Kuhn well within "the dense interstitial 'microenvironments'" in which they made knowledge at this time. See especially: Joel Isaac, "Lessons of the Revolution: History, Sociology, and Philosophy of Science," in *Working Knowledge: Making the Human Sciences from Parsons to Kuhn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012): 191–226.

Hallowell's notes actually list Kuhn as a potential attendee of the conference, but he appears either not to have been invited or to have declined. Nonetheless, Kuhn does not appear in the proposal for the event or the subsequent reflections. See: Hallowell, untitled/undated guest list, Hallowell Papers, Series II, Box 12, Folder "Social Science Research Council Conference on the History of Anthropology, 1961–1962," APS.

[65] Hallowell, "The History of Anthropology as an Anthropological Problem," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 1965), 37.

[66] Mitchell, "On Studying the History of Anthropology: Reflections of a Historian," *Social Science Research Council Items* Vol. 16, No. 3 (September 1962), 29.

[67] The expansion of libraries, archives, and other repositories of anthropological materials at the Smithsonian, the American Philosophical Society, the Newberry Library, and beyond during the 1960s are the subject of the fourth and fifth chapters of this project.

place of Boas"—arose among them.[68] Contentions on the particular matter of Boas were manifold. Some participants decried the theoretical limitations that had emerged from Boas's fieldwork, particularly in the subfield of linguistics, while others retorted that their judgment of scientists from the past with contemporary notions of best practices was an unworthy pursuit altogether in the history of anthropology.[69] Here, those unspoken goals of the conference had exposed what a British archaeologist in a recent piece about anthropological self-fashioning described tidily as an existing sense of "temporality"—an orientation at once toward the disciplinary past, present, and future—"that was built into twentieth-century anthropological theory."[70] The exact place for the history of their discipline, to be conceived explicitly by conference attendees, would have to be negotiated both among historians of anthropology themselves and also with temporal self-fashioning already found within the work of the historical figures about whom they might write.

The uses to which historical figures like Boas might be put had certainly not escaped the participants, and their ability to find archival proof of concepts within Boas's papers only amplified his utility. From the University of Michigan, the anthropologist Leslie White read extensively from Boas's fieldnotes among the Tlingit written during his research trips to the Northwest Coast. Such detail added a rhetorical flourish to White's presentation. It was meant to illustrate that Boas's work had "focused upon the particular,

---

[68] Hymes, "On Studying the History of Anthropology," 26.

[69] *Ibid.*, 27.

[70] Dan Hicks, "Four-Field Anthropology Charter Myths and Time Warps from St. Louis to Oxford," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 54, No. 6 (December 2013), 754.

Hicks here importantly underscores that the perception among anthropologists that their research presently could be and had historically been divided into four distinct fields—archaeology and biological, cultural, and linguistic anthropology—was reinforced both by anthropological practitioners like Boas and by historians of anthropology like Stocking.

rather than the general," part of a broader critique that White had long leveled against an apparent lack of coherent theory throughout contemporary cultural anthropology because of its proclivity toward the cataloguing of ethnographic minutiae rather than ethnological laws and systems.[71] As White would have it, an evolutionary theory of culture was a needed revision in the present for anthropologists to explain cultural change in the past.[72]

The relationship between evolution and culture would ultimately prove integral to anthropologists' self-fashioning around a concept of culture, but White's critique received only indirect dismissal in the Council circular. It was dwarfed in review by the paper that followed it from Stocking, one of the dozen historians present at the conference, who also presented on the topic of Boas.[73] Stocking disagreed with the diminished role of Boas's thinking found in the Kroeber-Kluckhohn treatise from 1952.[74] He spoke of a discursive move among anthropologists "from culture to cultures," an analytic shift that he argued

---

[71] Leslie A. White, *The Ethnography and Ethnology of Franz Boas* (Bulletin of the Texas Memorial Museum No. 6.) (Austin, TX: Texas Memorial Museum, The Museum of the University of Texas, 1963), 35.

[72] White wrote extensively on this matter beginning in the 1930s. See two collections of his elsewhere-published essays in particular: White, *The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization* (New York, N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1949) and White, *The Evolution of Culture: The Development of Civilization to the Fall of Rome* (New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

His critique of Boas, which began as early as the 1930s upon the beginning of his tenure at Michigan, had earned him few friends among anthropologists. Some have suggested that this critique was ironic, insofar as White's theories often differed little from Boas's. See: Richard A. Barrett, "The Paradoxical Anthropology of Leslie White," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1989): 986–999. Biographers have also noted of his anthropological approach that it was motivated explicitly by interests within the political realm. White often wrote under pseudonym of the synthesis that might be had between this cultural evolutionary theory and a socialist revolution, something he had endorsed since joining the Socialist Labor Party after a research trip to the Soviet Union in the 1920s. On this biographical framework, see: William J. Peace, "Leslie White and Evolutionary Theory," *Dialectical Anthropology* Vol. 18, No. 2 (1993): 123–151.

On the subject of White's critique of Boas, Stocking would say glibly decades later in an unpublished oral historical interview that "White came from a mid-western populist radical tradition" and that there were "anti-Semitic tendencies within that tradition." See: "Talks on the History of Anthropology with George Stocking" (interview), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2016-465, Box 71, Folder "Interview—2002," SCRC.

[73] Hymes dismissed the critique without naming White or mentioning evolution.

[74] Although their *Culture* treatise loomed over the theoretical papers offered at conference, both Kroeber and Kluckhohn had died two years before and therefore were not in attendance.

should mark an intellectual break in the history of cultural anthropology and one that he further implied had been orchestrated by the theoretical interventions of Boas around the turn of the century.[75] With detailed historical lineages to be found within English and German anthropological texts and thousands of pages of both published and unpublished archival material left behind by Boas at the American Philosophical Society, Stocking promised conference attendees a wealth of forthcoming scholarship that could narrate the discipline's past without a demand for their dramatic reassessment of its present practices. "If anthropologists want to talk about it themselves," Hymes said in praise of Stocking's presentation in the Council circular, "they will have to meet similar standards."[76]

From Stocking, a full-length essay in 1966 and a book-length series of essays on *Race, Culture, and Evolution* in 1968 soon followed, along with regular live presentations at anthropological conferences on the same material.[77] "As originally conceived," he wrote to one librarian at the American Philosophical Society about his use of the Boas archival collection in 1964, the book had initially begun as "an analysis of the pattern of social scientific thought on race in the period 1890–1915," but in the process of writing he had been "forced to give a more and more important role to an analysis of Boas' work in changing this pattern."[78] Stocking's 1966 essay began first with a simplification of the

[75] Stocking, "Matthew Arnold, E. B. Tylor, and the Uses of Invention with an appendix on Evolutionary Ethnology and the Growth of Cultural Relativism, 1871–1915: From Culture to Cultures," Stocking Papers, Acc. 2016-465, Box 67, Folder "Stocking Articles, 1962," SCRC.

[76] Hymes, "On Studying the History of Anthropology," 26.

[77] Stocking became a mainstay at the Wenner-Gren conference. For his talk on Boas at the 1968 conference, see: Stocking, "The Boas Tradition in American Anthropology" (unpublished manuscript), Sol Tax Papers, Series VIII, Box 274, Folder 2, SCRC.

[78] Stocking to Gertrude D. Hess (October 21, 1964), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-072, Box 8, Folder "Boas Papers Correspondence," SCRC.

Kroeber-Kluckhohn treatise, from which he borrowed a distinction between the "humanist" and the "anthropological" concepts of culture, wherein the former was "absolutistic" for humankind and the latter "relativistic" to individual groups.[79] Quoting also from Hallowell, he summarized his anthropological culture concept: It was "learned behavior, socially transmitted and cumulative as a determinant of human behavior."[80]

As Stocking would have it, Boas had overseen a shift within anthropological theory from a humanist bent to the contemporary one he defined in Hallowell's words. Alongside a close linguistic examination of a few choice quotations from Boas's published articled and speeches on the terms *culture* and *civilization*, Stocking added the following:

> In extended researches into American social science between 1890 and 1915, I found no instances of the plural form in writers other than Boas prior to 1895. Men referred to 'cultural stages' or 'forms of culture'…but they did not speak of 'cultures.' The plural appears with regularity only in the first generation of Boas' students around 1910.[81]

Within the writing of Boas's theoretical interventions, he continued, this discursive change from culture to cultures had served the purpose of "attacking traditional racial assumptions and positing alternative cultural explanations," and it had also undermined the notion that culture evolved from one stage to the next like the fossilized historic creatures that had captivated nineteenth-century naturalists.[82] Where other turn-of-the-

---

[79] Kroeber and Kluckhohn quoted in Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," 868.

Stocking did not expound much on this distinction, although in context he seemed to imply that culture in the humanistic eye was something analyzed by imposed standards or values whereas in the anthropological eye it was something that imposed upon a group its own values. The distinction between culture in the singular and culture*s* in the plural, repeated in this essay, further underscored this point.

[80] Hallowell quoted in *ibid.*, 868.

[81] *Ibid.*, 871.

[82] *Ibid.*, 875.

century thinkers cited racial difference for their perceived deficiencies in the mental faculties of so-called primitive people, Stocking emphasized that Boas had responded instead with culture as the source of such behavioral difference. For anthropologists, it was the "tyranny of custom," Stocking said, rather than the innate traits determined by race that became the interpretive subject of the American cultural-anthropological lens while under Boas's direction.[83] And Boas, he further underscored, should thus receive proportionate recognition by intellectual historians and historians of anthropology.[84]

"It is good to know that the material at the American Philosophical Society is being used," wrote one of Boas's daughters to Stocking upon leaning about the piece.[85]

The Culture Concept *as a Paradigm*

To anthropological practitioners in the mid-late 1960s, Stocking's writing about Boas seemed both to flatter and legitimize their vision of their contemporary practice, just the right use for the history of anthropology within the discipline. "Anthropologists

---

[83] Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," 876.

Stocking seems to use the phrase "tyranny of custom" here in order to hint that the interpretive move from race to culture mattered only so much and that the contemporary concept of culture as employed by anthropologists in the 1960s was similarly deterministic in its explanation of human behavior. In a historian's review of his book that would later appear in the *Journal of American History*, the historian of science and Louis Agassiz biographer Edward Lurie would note that "a central thrust of Stocking's analysis is that professionalism can be as culture bound, limited, and biased as earlier dogmatisms, even though parading under the banner of informed social science." See: Edward Lurie, "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution," *The Journal of American History* Vol. 56, No. 4 (March 1970), 944.

[84] This intervention—that Boas had not yet received his due intellectual-historical treatment among historians of anthropology—framed both the 1966 article and the 1968 reprint in *Race, Culture, and Evolution*. In the book, Stocking was careful not to overstate the broader influence of Boas. In his reflection that introduced the reprint of "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," he noted that relativistic ideas about culture might also be found upon further investigation of turn-of-the-century German anthropological theory. See: Stocking, foreword to "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," in *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (1968; reprint Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 195–198.

[85] Franziska Boas to Stocking (May 12, 1964), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-072, Box 8, Folder "Boas Papers Correspondence," SCRC.

are very lucky to have George Stocking as their historian," Margaret Mead boasted in the opening lines of her review of Stocking's *Race, Culture, and Evolution* for the *American Anthropologist*.[86] On the topic of Boas's academic censure administered through a formal motion at the 1919 annual meeting American Anthropological Association by the organization's leaders because of his public opposition to the First World War, the story of which appeared in a later essay in Stocking's collection, another anthropologist reviewer remarked of Boas, "Those who today combine an opposition to United States imperialism with a defense of equal rights for all have some excellent ancestry."[87]

Stocking's interest in restoring focus to Boas as a transitional figure in the history of cultural anthropology did not escape his many reviewers from all disciplines, who further noticed and often delighted in the many references to the recent work of Thomas Kuhn on the history of science that framed his intervention. "I think we may speak of the culture concept as a 'paradigm'," Stocking said in an unpublished manuscript circulated to colleagues in advance of the publication of *Race, Culture, and Evolution*.[88] Borrowing a short excerpt from *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* on Robert Boyle's seventeenth-century use of the word element in chemistry for the published version, Stocking had further written that Boas's turn-of-the-century disciplinary writing similarly "provide[d]

---

[86] Margaret Mead, "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 72, No. 2 (April 1970), 374.

[87] Murray L. Wax, "Review: A Scholarly Approach to the History of Anthropology," *Phylon* Vol. 30, No. 4 (1969), 428.

The AAA would formally repudiates its 1919 motion and posthumously retract Boas's censure within the organization at a meeting in 2005, with a full statement affirmed by its members found here: https://www.americananthro.org/ConnectWithAAA/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2134.

[88] Stocking, "Parameters of a Paradigm: Franz Boas, the American Anthropological Association and the National Research Council" (unpublished/undated manuscript), Milton Singer Papers, Series V, Box 199, Folder 3, SCRC.

an important portion of the context in which the word"—culture, that is—"acquired its characteristic anthropological meaning" and "transformed the notion into a tool quite different from what it had been."[89] Kuhn's words on the contextual meaning of scientific terms, Stocking said, might even have served as a meaningful epigraph to his essay on Boas and the culture concept had he been allowed to include it by the publishers.[90]

Such a frame implied that practitioners could expect that the field of social science history would soon become "at least as rigorous as the history of the natural sciences has become," as another reviewer observed.[91] In a more immediate sense, however, the book also seemed to offer a flattering origin myth that at once 1) reified a murky concept from the discipline, 2) cloaked its intervention in the temporal language that characterized anthropological theory past and present, and 3) employed a relevant and popular, albeit somewhat misappropriated, lens from Kuhn's writing to buttress its argument further.[92]

---

[89] Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," 880.

The block quotation from Kuhn reproduced in Stocking's article was from a chapter on the historical invisibility of scientific revolutions as they occurred that refers to changes to ideas about elements in seventeenth-century chemistry. For the Stocking's context, see: Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 142–143.

[90] Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," 880.

[91] Donald G. MacRae, "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution," *The British Journal of Sociology* Vol. 20, No. 4 (December 1969), 465.

Others echoed this sentiment, although in decidedly more critical terms. Of the use of Kuhn in anthropology, the theorist Johannes Fabian would remark that he had "anoint[ed] the fetish of professionalism." See: Johannes Fabian, "Language, History and Anthropology," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* Vol. 1, No. 1 (March 1971), 19.

[92] This observation about the bibliography that borrowed from Kuhn was shared among historians at the time, who cited Stocking's essays alongside the contemporary writing of Nathan G. Hale on the uses of Freudian ideas in an American context as two recent examples of the uses to which Kuhn's ideas had been put by intellectual historians specifically working on the social sciences. See: David A. Hollinger, "T. S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and Its Implications for History," *The American Historical Review* Vol. 78, No. 2 (April 1973): 370–393. Much later, the cultural anthropologist Johannes Fabian would suggest that it was actually a Kuhnian perspective that had allowed for anthropologists to embrace an epistemological critique of their own knowledge construction. See also: Johannes Fabian, "Cultural Anthropology and the Question of Knowledge," *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* Vol. 18, No. 2 (June 2012): 439–453.

"Stocking traces the stages through which Boas finally arrived at the idea of historically determined cultures," Mead summarized neatly, "so that the culture concept became the paradigm of anthropology as a science."[93] With the exception of one passing criticism in a field review essay from a biological anthropologist that his writing "overemphasize[d] the role of Franz Boas in the conceptual separation of culture and race," Stocking had secured his position as the preeminent historian of anthropology in the decade following the Social Science Research Council conference in 1962.[94]

In fact, this had proven true in both a public and private sense. In addition to the warm reception he received for his published material, Stocking had simultaneously taken up a role as a correspondent both to cultural anthropologists themselves and to the heads of their institutions like libraries, museums, and archives during the mid-late 1960s and into the early 1970s.[95] He inquired widely about how they taught the concept of culture and the history of their discipline, and soon he became a regular guest lecturer on these topics within the seminar rooms of kindred anthropology departments. From his then-appointment as a historian at Berkeley in 1966, Stocking even guided a reading group of sorts among the Department of Anthropology's graduate students on the "Evolution of the Culture Concept" using his catalog of excerpts from the writings of Boas as the

---

Even after he stopped speaking about Kuhnian paradigms, this question of the role of Kuhn in the history of anthropology actually seemed also to occupy—or at least strike the curiosity of—Stocking himself later in his career. In the early 1990s, he began to search in scholarly databases for citations of Kuhn in the period about a decade after the publication of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. See: "Kuhn Citations 1971–75 SSCI Cumulative Index (10/28/90)," Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-137, Box 55, Folder "Paradigms in Anthropology + Social/Nat Scis 1980s," SCRC.

[93] Margaret Mead, "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution," 376.

[94] Michael H. Crawford, "Trends in Genetics and Biological Anthropology," *Biennial Review of Anthropology* Vol. 6 (1969), 207.

[95] Material on the extent and effects of Stocking's influence over the founding of the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution in 1966 appears in the fourth chapter.

material for discussion.[96] In 1968, from a new dual appointment in the Departments of Anthropology and History at the University of Chicago, he began another series of talks to undergraduates in the Civilizational Studies Program on the concepts of culture and the ideas about cultural relativism in the writings of Boas and some of his early students.[97]

Correspondence with a diverse body of cultural anthropologists further augmented Stocking's position as anthropologist's historian.[98] "If I were to characterize certain aspects of your thought as neo-Boasian," he joked to an anthropologist colleague at Chicago in a one-line memo in 1971, "would you: a) know what I meant (i.e. what I was referring to in your work) [and/or] b) object violently?"[99] With others, the discussions were more in-depth, and they ranged from their perceptions of the culture concept within their work to the role of Boas in their history to the value of the history of anthropology itself to their practice. One preeminent ethnologist remarked that she had been teaching her own course on cultural theory since 1950 in the interest of preserving "the unique role of anthropology which is to try to consider the totality of man and his works."[100] Another, who noted that she had also been teaching a course in the history of anthropology for

---

[96] Bernard S. Cohn to Stocking (February 17, 1966), Milton Singer Papers, Series I, Box 30, Folder 1, SCRC.

[97] Memo from Milton Singer to Staff and Students (January 18, 1968), Singer Papers, Series I, Box 30, Folder 1, SCRC.

Stocking took this position at Chicago after being denied tenure at Berkeley for ambiguous reasons. He would remain between the Departments of History and Anthropology at Chicago until 1974, when he moved fully into the latter as a historian-anthropologist.

[98] Stocking appears to have sent out a few solicitations to colleague at different times about their uses of the history of anthropology and culture in their teaching and research. The first was in 1966, and he repeated the process in the mid-1970s to a different cohort of scholars. For the 1966 solicitation on behalf of the History of the Life Sciences Study Section and the response letters see the folder marked "History of Anthrop. Survey—1966" in Box 29 of the Stocking Papers at the SCRC.

[99] George Stocking to David Schneider (June 11, 1971), David Schneider Papers, Box 31, Folder 7, SCRC.

[100] Fredericka de Laguna to Stocking (April 1, 1966), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 29, Folder "History of Anthrop. Survey—1966," SCRC.

many years, said that her practice had been guided by "the deepest kind of conviction that knowledge about the field of history [was] necessary for anthropology where all material from ethnography to theory has become irredmedially [*sic*] historical."[101] Yet another added that he had always wedded his "interest in the history of anthropology" with his "interest in the theory of culture in contemporary systematic anthropology" in his work.[102]

Coupled with such theoretical posturing around the history of anthropology, too, was a makeshift archival information exchange that had also begun to flow into and out of Stocking's mailbox within these letters to contemporary disciplinary actors. Particularly from the Boas papers, Stocking had kept his own set of mimeographed documents that he forwarded along to his correspondents at will.[103] Many returned primary documents of their own to Stocking, with one contact writing that he hoped that the letter he enclosed within from Kroeber in 1956 "may be of some interest to someone concerned with Boas."[104] It was precisely in the interest of sharing anthropological materials more broadly that Stocking would in 1973 formally establish a *History of Anthropology Newsletter*, which promised to circulate "information as to archival holdings, bibliographic aids, research in

---

[101] Helen Codere to Stocking (May 21, 1974), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-137, Box 55, Folder "Ethnohistory, Historical Anthro, Anthro. History, 1970s–1980s," SCRC.

[102] Singer to Stocking (October 15, 1974), Singer Papers, Series I, Box 30, Folder 1, SCRC.

[103] Stocking collected hundreds of pages of letters and other documents from the Boas repository while working on his 1966 essay, many of which were relegated into his own archival collection. For his list of documents and notes, see the folder "Franz Boas + the Cult. Concept in Historical Perspective" in Box 29 of the Stocking Papers at the SCRC. In part, this interest culminated in the publication of a collection of Boas's archival materials compiled and edited by Stocking. See: *A Franz Boas Reader: The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883–1911*, ed. Stocking (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

Before the reader, Stocking seemed content to reproduce bits of these materials that he considered relevant to the work of his colleagues regularly. In 1971, for example, he aided Sol Tax in an encyclopedia entry on Boas with the materials. See Folder 2 of the Sol Tax Papers at the SCRC for the full exchange.

[104] Wax to Stocking (November 30, 1966), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-113, Box 45, Folder "Wax, 1960s–1970s," SCRC.

progress, recent publications, and so forth" to all interested parties for just two dollars per issue.[105] Tacked onto the end of each issue was the quarter's Clio's Fancy, or *Documents to Pique the Historical Imagination*. For the readers of the first issue, a reproduced note from the papers of Frederick Ward Putnam, the turn-of-the-century Director of Harvard's Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, caught their eye.[106]

Stocking's culture concept history of anthropology had found him many new correspondents by the early 1970s. As part of their studies in the fall of 1971, students of anthropological theory at Cornell University were directed to consult Stocking's *Race, Culture, and Evolution* "especially for his 'paradigmatic' approach."[107] And yet, a parallel publication on *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* from Columbia anthropologist Marvin Harris, also from 1968, had also begun to appear on syllabi. Students in Cora Du Bois's graduate seminar on the Implications of the History and Theory of Anthropology for Contemporary Problems in the fall of 1971 at Harvard, for example, read two chapters of the book as their framing text before each week's seminar discussion.[108] In the Cornell seminar, Harris's book was the leading text for their week on historical considerations.

Harris reveled in a vision of anthropology concerned with what he called "cultural materialism," with an expressed intention "to advance the theoretical standing of

---

[105] Stocking, "Prospects and Problems," *History of Anthropology Newsletter* Vol. 1, No. 1 (1973), 1.

[106] "Did the Arch-Evolutionist make a Deathbed Recantation?," *History of Anthropology Newsletter* Vol. 1, No. 1 (1973), 10–11.

[107] A. Thomas Kirsch, "History of Anthropological Thought" (syllabus), Cora Du Bois Papers, Series 6, Box 57, Folder "Implications of the History and Theory of Anthropology for Contemporary Problems," Tozzer Library, Harvard University Repository (HUR) (Cambridge, MA).

[108] Cora Du Bois, "Implications of the History and Theory of Anthropology for Contemporary Problems" (syllabus), Du Bois Papers, Series 6, Box 57, Folder "Implications of the History and Theory of Anthropology for Contemporary Problems," HUR.

anthropology among the social sciences" welcoming readers into his book.[109] Beginning with the culture concepts of the Enlightenment and progressing to the end of the nineteenth century at a rapid clip, Harris deemed the Boas school of culture to be one of "historical particularism" that shirked interest in the material world and sociocultural systems in favor of ethnographic minutiae, a change that he cited within Boas's writings about his first research trip to Baffin Island in 1883 during which, he said, Boas had rejected geographical determinism.[110] Also on the subject of Boas, Harris dismissed the notion that Boas's historical particularism had done away with any ideas about evolution in anthropology. Darwinian theory was not incompatible with Boasian anthropology, he said, and in fact many of Boas's students had actually "professed and delighted in the unpredictability of cultural evolution" when considering how culture changed.[111] "It is a misfortune," Harris wrote in the final chapter on cultural materialism, "that the return to diachronic and synchronic generalization has acquired the name 'neoevolutionism.'"[112]

This was a perspective that Stocking himself would soon dismiss as "profoundly unhistorical" in his review of *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* that appeared in *Science*

---

[109] Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture* (New York, N.Y.: Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, Inc., 1968), 7.

[110] This history is the subject of the ninth and tenth chapter of the book, which follow a chapter on the theories of culture that emerged from Marxist dialectical materialism. See: "Historical Particularism: Boas," and "The Boasian Milieu," in *ibid.*: 250–300.

[111] *Ibid.*, 300.

Here, Harris was actually responding directly to the claims made by Leslie White, whom he quotes copiously and who posited his vision of the evolution of culture as expressly opposed, as White would have it, to the damage done by Boasian theory. Both White and Harris have recently been dismissed as "Marxist-tinged neo-evolutionary theory." See: Darnell, "Historiographic Conundra," xiv.

Other reviewers contemporary to Harris noted the importance of his attempt to reintroduce Marxist theory into the discipline and its history, although they remained ambivalent as to its success and to the importance of cultural materialism. See: Various authors, "Review(s) of the Rise of Anthropological Theory," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 9, No. 5 (December 1968): 519–533.

[112] *Ibid.*, 634.

magazine.[113] The line echoed an earlier distinction that he had drawn between what he called the historicist and presentist approaches to the history of the behavioral sciences, wherein he endorsed the former for its promise of more meaningful history of theories in anthropology.[114] Stocking would even offer a course at Chicago in 1970 that paired chapters of Harris's book with his own selected readings from the period to underscore the distinction.[115] Despite the differences in their historical styles, however, Harris and Stocking seemed to agree that Boas and his history-minded method for writing culture was in fact the one still practiced by many contemporary anthropologists. And despite Stocking's reticence toward presentism, he had as much as Harris intervened—and embedded himself—into the disciplinary present, a practice he would not soon forego.

Doing Reflexive History of Anthropology in Crisis during the 1970s

For a multi-generational audience of cultural anthropologists gathered together for a meeting at the Spring Hill Conference Center near Minneapolis, Minnesota in October of 1976, Stocking had been asked to address what panicked organizers deemed a *crisis* that had settled into the discipline in recent years. Reassuring participants about discipline's recent history, he remarked, "[Anthropology] offered an otherwise inaccessible exotic knowledge which commonly found expression in the questioning of generalizations based on European culture alone."[116] While early-nineteenth-century

[113] Stocking, "Review: A Historical Brief for Cultural Materialism," *Science* Vol. 162, No. 3849 (October 1968), 108.

[114] Stocking, "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and 'Historicism' in the Historiography of the Behavioral Sciences," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (July 1965): 211–218.

[115] Robert M. Adams, Raymond D. Fogelson, and Stocking, "Culture History of Culture History" (syllabus), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 26, Folder "Anthro 213—1970," SCRC.

[116] Stocking, "Anthropology in Crisis?—A View from Between Generation" (manuscript), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 29, Folder "1976–7: Spring Hill MS. Anthro in Crisis?," 8.

actors from a bygone evolutionary era had colonial ties, he continued, their "hierarchical conception of race" and "evolutionary view of culture" were later dismissed, "subjected to systematic criticism" by the Boasian concept of culture and its adherents.[117]

Reassurance had become much needed during the preceding years, as first whispers then shouts about the colonial legacies and practices across the anthropological discipline were sounded on multiple fronts.[118] "Under its current name," Hymes had written in 1972 in a framing essay for his edited volume on *Reinventing Anthropology*, anthropology "cannot perhaps escape its history as an expression of a certain period in the discovery, then domination, of the rest of the world."[119] Some other practitioners soon wondered, *Is Anthropology Still Alive*?, while still others asked if the 1960s had marked an *End of Anthropology?* altogether.[120] Such musings were a response to the incisive critique of the discipline's colonial history and practice in the United States and also abroad, "rooted," as one Saudi-born anthropologist critic would describe of the British field in 1973, "in an unequal power encounter between the West and the Third World," which proved increasingly difficult to tune out during a political era of decolonization among

[117] Stocking, "Anthropology in Crisis?," 6–7.

[118] While this chapter primarily details self-directed criticisms by anthropologists in the 1960s and toward their own work, the third and fifth chapters of this project address the critique of indigenous informants, activists, and scholars and argue that it would be their demands that ultimately drove change within the institutions of mid- to late-century American cultural anthropology.

[119] Hymes, "The Use of Anthropology: Critical, Political, Personal," in *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York, N.Y.: Random House, Inc., 1972), 5.

[120] See: Gerald D. Berreman, "Is Anthropology Still Alive?," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 9, No. 5 (December 1968): 391–396.

The "End of Anthropology?" critique was from the British social anthropological context, and it has since encouraged many similar reflections in recent years in American cultural anthropology. See, for example: George E. Marcus and Marcelo Pisarro, "The End(s) of Ethnography: Social/Cultural Anthropology's Signature Form of Producing Knowledge in Transition," *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 23, No. 1 (February 2008): 1–14 or John Comaroff, "The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 112, No. 4 (December 2010): 524–538.

the groups of people under study in anthropological work.[121] "We are rapidly losing our customary relationships as white liberals between the conquerers [*sic*] and the colonized," another chimed in from a circular on anthropology and imperialism that she distributed to colleagues.[122] In fact, the colonial encounter had called the very credibility and value of cultural anthropological knowledge into question: "Understanding produced by bourgeois disciplines like anthropology are acquired and used most readily by those with the greatest capacity for exploitation."[123] Without radical change, some further warned that contemporary fieldwork would fall prey to the same colonial exploits.

These anxieties were exacerbated by ongoing revelations about the uses to which anthropological research had been put in counterinsurgency and other state-sponsored imperial programs, either wittingly or not, particularly in Southeast Asia but also globally. Universities, practitioners learned in the mid-1960s, had collaborated with the Central Intelligence Agency. Anthropological information buttressed Projects Camelot and AGILE. And more stories seemed ready to break at any moment.[124] The need to reinvent anthropology was certainly pressing, and the result would soon be the germ of what one historian described as an "epistemic revolution" within the social sciences, wherein the exposure in the 1960s of a nexus of political, patronage, and social scientific collaboration

---

[121] Talal Asad, "Introduction" to *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter* (London, U.K. and Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Ithaca Press and Humanities Press, 1973), 16.

[122] Kathleen Gough Aberle, "Anthropology and Imperialism" (undated/unpublished manuscript), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-137, Box 58, Folder "Radical Critiques, 1970s," SCRC.

[123] Asad, "Introduction," 16.

[124] This list of revelations are from Berreman, "Is Anthropology Still Alive?," 391. For others, see: Irving L. Horowitz, "Michigan State and the CIA: A Dilemma for Social Science," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* Vol. 22, No. 7 (1966): 26–29 and *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics*, ed. Horowitz (Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1967).

undermined the perception by practitioners that their work could be value-neutral.[125] For cultural anthropologists, even the memory of a decades-old condemnation from Boas that his peers who collaborated with the U.S. government as spies during the First World War had "prostituted science" could hardly suture this epistemic break.[126]

Drawn from a document leak mailed anonymously by an involved anthropologist in California, a particularly damning exposé about the free but covert flows of funding that continued between the military and anthropologist organizations in the wake of the Camelot revelations further alarmed and divided practitioners who could get their hands on the November 19, 1970 issue of the *New York Review of Books*. "Anthropology on the Warpath in Thailand," blared the headline. Inside, excerpted minutes from the advisory board meetings of the Institute for Defense Analysis, the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the American Institutes for Research, and many others housed in outposts across the country detailed the expressly counterinsurgent projects to which anthropological data had been applied. For the purposes of a million-dollar study "as horrifying as it is banal," the authors quoted from a meeting in which anthropologists had been asked to provide information that might exploit the kind of "economic social, and political action…most effective in building national unity and in reducing vulnerability to insurgent appeal."[127]

---

[125] Mark Solovey, "Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution: Rethinking the Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus," *Social Studies of Science* Vol. 31, No. 2 (April 2001), 172.

[126] Boas quoted in Berreman, "Is Anthropology Still Alive?," 391.

[127] Joseph G. Jorgenson and Eric R. Wolf, "Anthropology on the Warpath in Thailand," *New York Review of Books* Vol. 15, No. 9 (November 1970), 28.

The particular bent of late-1960s activism and scholarship that guided the publication of this article has received its own contemporary scholarly attention, particularly from anthropologists hoping to emulate the model. On one of the authors of the piece, see: Josiah McC. Heyman, "Activism in Anthropology: Exploring the Present through Eric R. Wolf's Vietnam-era Work," *Dialectical Anthropology* Vol. 34, No. 2 (June 2010): 287–293.

Among anthropologists, the incident also exposed generational fault lines. "Customarily concerned with the habits of others," read the opening line of a *New York Times* article that ran after an argument erupted on the subject at the next year's general meeting of the American Anthropological Association, "anthropologists…meeting yesterday turned—with what sometimes appeared a vengeance—to the rites of their own colleagues."[128] Their disagreement had arisen over a motion to condemn the actors involved in the Thailand story, which Margaret Mead had roundly rejected to many boos and hisses from the crowd.[129] To some younger anthropologists in the audience, the incident was reminiscent of a similar dismissal by the same chairperson four years earlier, when in one attendee's recollection Mead and another preeminent anthropologist had jointly denied a proposal to oppose the Vietnam War on the grounds that professional anthropologists should abstain from political declarations.[130] With anthropologists now directly implicated, Mead's dismissal seemed woefully limited.

Disciplinary actors were eager to negotiate the role of anthropology in the 1970s, its social scientific value, and the rightful position of an anthropologist respective to the world around them during this time. "'Scientific objectivity,' we believe, implies the estrangement of the anthropologist from the people among whom he works," the authors of the Thailand piece had written by way of introduction in an endorsement of reflexive

---

[128] Israel Shenker, "Anthropologists Clash Over Their Colleagues' Ethics in Thailand," *New York Times* (November 21, 1971), 79.

[129] *Ibid.* and Laura Nader, "The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology," in *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*, ed. Noam Chomsky (New York, N.Y.: The New Press, 1997), 126–127.

[130] Gough, "'Anthropology and Imperialism' Revisited," *Economic and Political* Weekly Vol. 25, No. 31 (August 1990), 1705.

The hypocrisy of such a statement from Mead is explored in the next chapter.

practice.[131] Elsewhere, suggestions for a so-called "reflexive ethnography," a method in which the anthropologist is cognizant both of "human intersubjectivity" and the tendency of researchers toward their own "ethnocentricities of meaning" while doing ethnographic work, seemed the first step toward eschewing anthropology's colonial past.[132] Such was the intellectual milieu of the Crisis in Anthropology gathering in the fall of 1976. With many "political brushfires fueled by the remnants of colonialism, racism, sexism, and exploitation…still burning" and disciplinary "fractionalizing" inducing malaise, as the organizers would have it, over two dozen presenters had headed to Spring Hill.[133]

"The Third World today talks back," one conference participant lamented, "and not only to colonial powers, but also to those who thought they were on its side—the anthropologists."[134] This reflexive concern, coupled with that perennial temporal interest in disciplinary practice past, present, and future, wove throughout the presentations from anthropologists young and old. Reflecting at the end of the meeting, Stocking remarked on the generational divide between those reared before and after the Second World War,

---

[131] Jorgenson and Wolf, "Anthropology on the Warpath in Thailand," 26.

[132] Bob Scholte, "Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology," in *Reinventing Anthropology*, 440. On "human intersubjectivity," Scholte was quoting Johannes Fabian, "Language, History and Anthropology," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* Vol. 1, No. 1 (March 1971), 21, and on "ethnocentricities of meaning," he referred to C. Wright Mills, "Language, Logic and Culture," in *Power, Politics & People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*, ed. Irving Louis Horowitz (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1963).

Noted one reviewer of this part of the edited collection, "We find an almost narcissistic preoccupation with the self." See: David Kaplan, "Review: The Anthropology of Authenticity: Everyman His Own Anthropologist," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 76, No. 4 (October 1974), 826.

Anthropologists would continue to talk about reflexive ethnography throughout the decade. For the seminal essay on the subject, see: Victor Turner, "Dramatic Ritual/Ritual Drama: Performative and Reflexive Anthropology," *The Kenyon Review* Vol. 1, No. 3 (Summer 1979): 80–93.

[133] E. Adamson Hoebel and Richard L. Currier, "Prologue: The Spring Hill Conference—Genesis and Concept," in *Crisis in Anthropology: View from Spring Hill, 1980*, eds. Hoebel, Currier, and Susan Kaiser (New York, N.Y., Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982), xiii.

[134] Owen M. Lynch, "Kuhn and Crisis in Anthropology," in *ibid.*, 80.

who had revealed themselves to be respectively concerned and unconcerned about the crisis. "At the end we all left with a strong solidarity, but it seemed clear enough at many points along the way that the faith of the grandfathers was not enough to cope with the problems of a postcolonial anthropology," he said.[135] Which generation was correct, he continued, would be an anthropology history for someone to write in the future.

The more significant question for Stocking, however, the one on which he closed his talk and thus ended the crisis conference in 1976, was the following:

> whether anthropology offers forms of knowing that may be applied to all human subject matter even to the point of painful self-reflexivity or whether, in some profound sense historically delimited, it has simply been a way Europeans have invented of talking about their darker brethren.[136]

This tension would become a critical paradox of postcolonial anthropology. How could practitioners theorize—anthropologize—their way out of the colonial methodologies of their past with the very methodologies that had colonized in the first place? Would any attempt to do so only engender mere "self-congratulatory complacency," as one older-generation anthropologist put it in a private note to Stocking after the conference?[137] "Crisis and challenge cannot touch the roots of normal science," another skeptic had

---

[135] Stocking, "Anthropology in Crisis? A View from Between Generations," in *Crisis in Anthropology*, 413.

Earlier in the talk, he had actually borrowed a line from Clifford Geertz on the "deepest theoretical dilemma" between universalism and particularism as a critical question in anthropology, which seemed to inspire this framework. See: Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 22.

[136] *Ibid.*, 419. While some of the framing of the paper changed for the published version, the same line appears verbatim in the conference manuscript version of the talk.

It appears that Stocking might also have been reflecting directly on a critique and debate lodged by anthropologists themselves that had attempted to parse through the Enlightenment and the colonial origins of anthropological science. See also, a discussion published along these lines: Diane Lewis, "Anthropology and Colonialism," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 14, No. 5 (December 1973): 581–602.

[137] Du Bois, "Comments on Stocking: Transcript (V.2) of Spring Hill Conference," Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 29, Folder "1976–7: Spring Hill MS. Anthro in Crisis?," 5.

snidely noted.[138] And yet, practitioners would try. They would soon reject apolitical scholarship, envisage anew the practice of ethnography, and problematize culture through increasingly reflexive means.[139] Stocking's history of anthropology still fit neatly within their critique in the meantime. As ever, the history of colonialism within the discipline alongside the theoretical visions for change could be folded into a doubly reflexive mirror for anthropologists to understand themselves through their past written by Stocking and historians of anthropology. By the early 1980s, his graduate seminar on "Europeans and Others" probed students to ask if they had reached the "End of Otherness?," and a unit on the history of "Cultural Relativism and the Struggle Against Racism" invited them at once to consider "the ambiguity of cultural relativism" as it fit within the colonial history of anthropology alongside Stocking's validating history of the culture concept.[140]

Conclusion

In the spring of 1971, a graduate student in a history of anthropology course taught by Marvin Harris at Columbia wrote to a list of Boas's living students in order to inquire about any residual memories they had of their old mentor. The particular subject of the student's letter was Boas's perceived radicalism and whether his early- to mid-twentieth-century work in the field of anthropology and in public might be reimagined as such. "While Boas was certainly not a Marxist," the student wrote in his inquiry, "I find

[138] Fabian, "Language, History and Anthropology," 19.

[139] For a two examples, see: Eds. George E. Marcus and Michael F. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986) and eds. James Clifford and Marcus, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986.

[140] Stocking, "Anthropology 200: Europeans and Others" (syllabus and notes), Stocking Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 26, Folder "Mod. Soc. Sci., 1980s," SCRC.

that he consistantly [*sic*] was a 'boat rocker' who took frequent anti-establishment positions—especially on the issues of racism, nationalism," and others.[141]

On the contrary, "I think of him as a true conservative," a cultural anthropologist taught by Boas at Columbia in the 1930s responded. "For Boas the true establishment was the ideal university of students and scholars dedicated to truth. The boat rockers were those who interfered with or did not support this role."[142] While he might at times have spoken about in favor of racial equality or against fascism in Europe, sometimes to the displeasure of his peers, he had no radical critique of academic work or knowledge.[143] "In short, he was the defender of the faith," the anthropologist concluded.[144]

In this light, Boas was just the right avatar for Stocking's *culture concept* history of anthropology during this period. For true believers and fellow defenders of the cultural anthropological faith, the narrative clarified their purpose and reaffirmed the value of their work in light of growing criticism. For others, even as the many revelations about anthropology's colonial history and wartime present engendered new orientations toward the disciplinary past, present, and future among the next generation of anthropological

---

[141] Mr. Cole to Irving Goldman (March 19, 1971), Irving Goldman Papers, Series 1, Box 1, Folder "Correspondence: 1963, 1967, 1969–74," National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

The second page of this letter is not attached, so the full name of the student is unclear.

[142] Goldman to Cole (April 13, 1971), Goldman Papers, Series 1, Box 1, Folder "Correspondence: 1963, 1967, 1969–74," NAA.

On Goldman's own history within the context of midcentury social science and politics, including scrutiny for communist ties by the Federal Bureau of Investigations, see: Price, "Standing up for Academic Freedom: The Case of Irving Goldman," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 20, No. 4 (August 2004): 16–21. The rift between the treatment of Marxist academics like Goldman and Boas is perhaps why the former responded so firmly to this inquiry from the graduate student, and it is particularly interesting to know that the student was completing an assignment for a course offered by Harris.

[143] In *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, Harris had described this orientation of Boas's anthropology as an ideology of "left-of-center liberalism." In context, see: Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, 298.

[144] Goldman to Cole (April 13, 1971).

practitioners, their sometimes radical critiques derived from such criticisms could still then be enveloped within the historical narrative. "In a sense, all ethnography, is self-ethnography," the President of the American Anthropological Association would declare in his address at their meeting in the fall of 1976.[145] As this perspective of methodological reflexivity continued to pervade anthropological theory and practice during its decidedly postcolonial turn after the 1970s, the reflexivity offered by the history of anthropology would remain above the critical fold.

[145] Walter Goldschmidt, "Anthropology and the Coming Crisis: An Autoethnographic Appraisal," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 79, No. 2 (June 1977), 294.

2 | PATRONS OF CULTURE: A CLEARINGHOUSE OF CULTURAL DATA FOR A "PRACTICAL PURPOSE" IN THE MIDCENTURY LIBERAL WORLD

"Putting ourselves in the year 2887, it seems clear to me that the exploration of the planets is progressing," mused one Smithsonian Institution official to another in a whimsical letter in 1958. In a vision of the field of anthropology as it might exist during the next millennium, his science of man had gone interstellar, with anthropologists now planet hopping on rocket ships to study even more diverse forms of humankind throughout the cosmos. "Most interesting is that Man also turns out to be no accident; from planet to planet he is not nearly as different as Science Fiction once had it."[1]

His musings were a response to a prompt forwarded by the Anthropological Society of Washington, chartered in 1887, as the solicitation letter noted, "for the term of one thousand years."[2] The letter informed readers that the organization had collaborated with the American Anthropological Association on an exhibit about Anthropology and the Nation's Capital to be housed in the Smithsonian's National Museum.[3] Because of an interest that the "founding fathers" of the Anthropological Society of Washington had in

[1] Sol Tax to Clifford Evans, Jr. (February 24, 1958), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 194, Folder 8, Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center (SCRC), University of Chicago Library (Chicago, IL).

[2] Evans to Tax (undated), Tax Papers, Series V, Box 194, Folder 8, SCRC.

[3] Records from the exhibition housed across the Smithsonian's repositories. See: Anthropological Society of Washington Records (MS 4821), Series 13, Boxes 13–14, National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD); Record Unit 312: National Collection of Fine Arts: Office of the Director Records, Box 41, Folder 11, Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA), Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.); and Record Unit 623: National Museum of History and Technology: Office of the Director Exhibition Records, 1948–1965, Box 8, Folder "Anthropology and the Nation's Capital," SIA.

the "future of our science," organizers had decided to invite present-day anthropologists to envision anthropology in 2887. As welcoming decoration for the walls surrounding the museum displays, an artist would then render images of these visions of anthropology's future by practitioners to be contrasted with its past contained within the display cases.[4]

Twenty-ninth-century anthropologists would have improved their curation skills, too, the anthropologist above continued in his response. For interplanetary researchers, because their "earlier racist-colonial interpretations and attitudes were missing from the beginning," gone would be the biases that had characterized nineteenth- and twentieth-century exhibits. In the museum halls of the Smithsonian of the future, "One particularly good exhibit shows the 'universals' contrasted with the 'planetary particulars.'"[5]

Their exchange revealed more about the anthropology of 1958 than of 2887, of course. Anthropologists flying from planet to planet on their rocket ships, all the while securing international peace through their discovery of the universals and respect for the planetary particulars, both flattered the administrators of the Smithsonian, the American Anthropological Association, and Anthropological Society of Washington and reflected some concerns of contemporary practitioners.[6] In fact, that tension between the universal and the particular would not soon be resolved, and it would soon define the discipline's

[4] Evans to Tax (undated).

[5] Tax to Evans (February 24, 1958).

[6] On the subject of space travel at the Smithsonian, the anthropologist's response also reflected the ongoing treatment of science and technology within the consortium and a nationalistic effort by administrators of the consortium to put the United States's scientific accomplishments on display in Washington, D.C. A National Air Museum had been established in 1946, and a Museum of History and Technology was chartered within the National Museum in 1957. See specifically for changes to the institutional history of the Smithsonian along these lines in this period: William S. Walker, "History and Technology: A New Museum, a New Era," in *A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013): 44–85.

"deepest theoretical dilemma" for later cultural researchers theorizing about the nature of their work.[7] In the meantime, however, a question of diplomacy through anthropological science had occupied—literally—many since the advent of the Second World War, when they had been hired directly and indirectly by the United States military to research the behaviors of peoples abroad.[8] Even as their utility to the project of empire was obscured by the 1950s, some retained a belief that they might still assume roles as international ambassadors of sorts. If not directly engaged by the U.S. military, then the science of man could still aid people in the present. As Axel L. Wenner-Gren, Swedish benefactor of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, said in 1951 on the occasion of the organization's first International Symposium on Anthropology, it "is not, as some people think, something abstract and apart from everyday life. To me and to many others anthropology is perhaps the most fundamental of sciences, one which might give a new meaning to life and be instrumental in preventing humanity from committing suicide."[9]

Midcentury anthropologists had long ruminated on the boundaries between what they called applied and theoretical work. In a review of Margaret Mead's *The Changing*

---

[7] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, Inc., 1973): 22.

[8] One estimate from the time purported that as many as half of all anthropologists left their posts at academic institutions to engage in the Second World War effort. See: John M. Cooper, "Anthropology in the United States during 1939–1945," *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* Vol. 36 (1947), 2.

[9] Axel L. Wenner-Gren, "Address of Welcome," reproduced in *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, eds. Sol Tax, Loren C. Eiseley, Irving Rouse, and Voegelin (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953), xiii.

Recently, the role of the Wenner-Gren Foundation in shaping the history of American social and specifically anthropological science since its establishment in 1941 has drawn attention from historians of science and anthropologists themselves, who point out the importance of, as one board member put it in 1978 in meeting minutes reproduced in a recent article, the "mysterious ways" the organization has operated historically while serving as one of the main patrons of anthropological research. See: Susan Lindee and Joanna Radin, "Patrons of the Human Experience A History of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1941–2016," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 57., Supp. 14 (October 2016): S218–S301. This particular article was published on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Foundation for a special supplement to the current issue of *Current Anthropology*, which it finances.

Culture of an Indian Tribe in 1933, for example, Melville Herskovits had remarked on the "deftness" with which Mead "deals with the political life" of her subject matter. "This book essentially seems to fall in the field of applied anthropology," Herskovits said. "In writing it, however, Miss Mead has…accomplished a practical purpose of real value."[10] Although the lines often blurred, such was the basic distinction: Anthropology that had a practical purpose or direct implications within subjects' political lives belonged in its own ever-growing category of applied scholarship.[11] "It has become increasingly difficult for students of humankind to maintain the detachment of the scientist who works with non-human materials," Herskovits remarked further on the subject in 1936.[12] Self-styled applied projects only multiplied in the coming years. Mead soon established a Society for Applied Anthropology in 1941, and in its short-lived flagship journal underscored in a founding editorial statement that the "science of human relations can only be developed if theories are tested in practice." Through their applied anthropology, practitioners "gained a laboratory to test our hypotheses," they said.[13] And the boundaries of their perceived

---

[10] Melville Herskovits, "Review of The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* Vol. 19, No. 4 (March 1933), 595.

In the case of the Plains groups presented anonymously in Mead's study from 1933, the remark that her work with them fell under the category of applied anthropology came from a perceived tension by anthropologists: that their indigenous subjects, heretofore relegated in anthropologists' minds to the past and divorced from so-called modern life, had also now come to experience, as they saw it, the problems of the contemporary world. This theme will resurface in the next chapter.

[11] Anthropologists and historians of anthropology are often still puzzling through the boundaries between what they call theoretical, applied, and a third category of "action" anthropology as practiced by mid-twentieth-century practitioners, although the distinctions have seemed to blur even further in the twenty-first century. From an anthropologist and a historian on the subject respectively, see: John W. Bennett, "Applied and Action Anthropology: Ideological and Conceptual Aspects," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 37, No. 1 (Supplement: Anthropology in Public) (February 1996): S23–S53 and Regna Darnell, "Applied Anthropology: Disciplinary Oxymoron?," *Anthropologica* Vol. 57, No. 1 (2015): 1–11.

[12] Herskovits, "Applied Anthropology and the American Anthropologists," *Science* Vol. 83, No. 2149 (March 1936), 215.

[13] "Editorial Statement," *Applied Anthropology* Vol. 1, No. 1 (October–December 1941), 1.

laboratory walls would only continue to expand, it seemed, as patrons enticed researchers to study groups of people on the municipal, state, national, and even the global scales.

This chapter begins thematically where the last one ended, on the question posed by George Stocking at the Crisis in Anthropology conference in 1976 about "whether anthropology offers forms of knowing that may be applied to all human subject matter" or whether its inward collapse from the weight of its colonial history was imminent in the postcolonial world, as they saw it.[14] The crises of the 1960s and 70s, manifested in part by the revelations that nefarious patrons might be funding anthropological research for their own imperial projects, told a different story from the midcentury realities of employment for anthropological researchers. Without question, midcentury anthropology appeared poised for application to all human subject matter, and many carried the mantle. Its uses big and small further blurred both the boundaries of anthropological culture, which would soon be shrunken and stretched to meet demands for information about human behavior that its patrons believed anthropological practitioners could provide, and the disciplinary self-fashioning that flourished around it at the same time.

While practitioners often distinguished between theoretical and applied projects, for our purposes their work elides strict categorization as such. The interwoven histories of U.S. military interests, ostensibly private foundations like Wenner-Gren, the U.S.'s

---

The language of the founding statement is useful in the context of the history of science, wherein scholars have often noted and complicated scientists' ideas about their laboratory space or, in fact, their attempts to refashion or even unbound a laboratory's walls within the wider world. See, for a classic and somewhat more recent example respectively: Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986) and Rebecca Lemov, *World as Laboratory: Experiments with Mice, Mazes, and Men* (New York, N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005).

[14] George W. Stocking, Jr., "Anthropology in Crisis? A View from Between Generations," in *Crisis in Anthropology: View from Spring Hill, 1980*, eds. Hoebel, Currier, and Susan Kaiser (New York, N.Y., Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982), 413.

Social Science Research Council, and the Ford Foundation, among others, and the midcentury social, human, and behavioral sciences have occupied scholars approaching the time period along many historiographical lines. On the one hand, the entangled interpretations of for-the-state science as complex "skeins of theory and world," as Joel Isaac has put it, render anthropological ideas like culture particularly curious.[15] Portraits of unidirectional dissemination from theory to practice—academic to public—wherein Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead defied the model left behind by Franz Boas earlier in the century by enlisting on the academic front of the Second World War effort neglect a critical detail: Culture absorbed meaning from its porous contexts.[16] Further obscuring these contexts, too, were the foundations supporting anthropological and other social, human, and behavioral scientific research, the lineages of which were often themselves tangled in intricate webs of public-private patronage that in turn supported universities.[17]

---

[15] Joel Isaac, "Tangled Loops: Theory, History, and the Human Sciences in Modern America," *Modern Intellectual History* Vol. 6, No. 2 (August 2009), 400.

[16] Such a suggestion often appears in otherwise complex intellectual-historical portraits of midcentury anthropological culture. For an example, see two examples on Boas, Mead, Benedict, and others: Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, "Science, Democracy, and Ethics: Mobilizing Culture and Personality for World War II," in *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict, and Others: Essays on Culture and Personality*, ed. Stocking (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986): 184–217 and Susan Hegeman, "'Beyond Relativity': James Agee and Others, Toward the Cold War," in *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999): 158–192.

On a further note, this framework of the meteoric midcentury rise of applied anthropology also neglects the long history of anthropologists as advisors, expert contacts, and employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, often deliberately but wrongly separated from so-called applied work, which opens the next chapter.

[17] Mark Solovey offers an essential portrait of how governmental and non-governmental organizations built patronage structures in the wake of the Second World War. See: Mark Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (Newark, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013).

The direct and indirect patronage of American universities by U.S. intelligence has also drawn attention from scholars of the period. On the military-industrial complex at Stanford, see: Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945–1955* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1992) or Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997). For a series of essays from scholars reflecting on its effects on their work, see also: *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*, ed. Noam Chomsky (New York, N.Y.: The New Press, 1997).

Theories and "scientific social inquiries" that were performed by anthropologists and other midcentury social scientists derived their meaning in part from the milieu of "ideology, politics, [and] reform" in which they flourished, as Mark Solovey describes it.[18]

Anthropology's cultural studies fit neatly within their midcentury milieu of the postwar liberal world as well, wherein many have noted the uncommon value of cultural anthropological currency. The study of culture slipped seamlessly into ideas about cultural nationalism among American elites, historian John Gilkeson has argued, which further bestowed status to some as "charter members of the American liberal intelligentsia."[19] This role, along with their longstanding romance with psychological methods, further enfolded anthropologists into a contemporary transformation toward what Jamie Cohen-Cole calls open-mindedness, wherein cognitive scientists and their institutions refracted ideas about their own rationality as a means to redefine what it meant for Americans to be human.[20] Midcentury social science appeared to have something meaningful to say about American—or human—nature, and anthropologists scrambled to meet demand.

This chapter underscores the significance of this intellectual frame to the career of anthropological culture, which would be pulled in many directions: past versus present,

---

[18] Solovey, *Shaky Foundations*, 6.

[19] John S. Gilkeson, *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 3.

Gilkeson also underscores that some of the tensions within the anthropological ideas about culture were derived from its status as not-quite social science and not-quite humanities discipline.

[20] Within this wide-ranging book that, among other things, also ends with an attempt to understand the late-twentieth-century conservative bent as a reaction to open-mindedness, see in particular the third part of the book: Jamie Cohen-Cole, "The Human Mind," in *The Open Mind: Cold War Politics & The Sciences of Human Nature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2014): 141–214.

Cohen-Cole also importantly resists a simple military-to-science dissemination of this particular transformation, which he notes, "operated on a much broader political register than those defined by military concerns." In the context of the introduction to the book, see: Cohen-Cole, *The Open Mind*, 7.

home versus abroad, communities versus nations versus humanity, interpretivist versus positivist, ethnographic versus ethnological, social scientific versus humanistic, and particular versus universal. Simultaneous to anthropologists' historical self-fashioning, the patrons of midcentury culture, a concept broadly defined at the time by practitioners and others, brought further meaning into their work in the present.[21] By examining wartime and postwar deployments of cultural anthropology, I argue that the loops of theoretical meaning engendered by disciplinary self-fashioning compounded within so-called applied projects, compelling anthropologists to employ even more understandings of culture in order to position themselves in social scientific, national, and international worlds.

Cultural Anthropology on the Academic Front

Even before the U.S. declared war, anthropologists in the early 1940s laid in wait for a call to share their cultural expertise with military officials when the moment would soon come. "In peacetime we labor to increase anthropological knowledge, to construct a systematic picture of how human culture works, to provide the scientific basis for building an ever better world," wrote Mead in the first pages of her *And Keep Your Powder Dry*, a reflection on national character and values, in 1942. In wartime, she continued on, "We can say quite simply, with such knowledge and insights as we have, we will now do what we can, as anthropologists to win the war."[22] To write this book, framed as a study

[21] Gilkeson notes that some of this meaning was also derived from a persistent tension between culture and civilization as it applied to the anthropological culture concept at this time. Although practitioners had seemingly done away with the latter, the idea of culture as being representative of the perceived artistic and humanistic achievements of a nation proliferated in the wartime and especially the postwar world, exemplified by events like the National Endowment for the Humanities in the 1960s. See specifically: "America as a Civilization," in Gilkeson, *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America*: 200–249.

[22] Margaret Mead, *And Keep Your Powder Dry: An Anthropologist Looks at America* (New York, N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, 1942), 13–14.

of "the quality of a people; their national character," Mead said that she had sailed home from the South Sea just in time for the dawn of the Second World War in order to train her anthropological eye on a new subject of interest: Americans.[23]

Mead's study of Americans was peculiar for wartime, but the national scale onto which anthropological data had been projected for her work was not. Anthropologists who engaged in so-called culture and personality studies, concerned at once with the use of psychological methods upon the individual and how their results were representative of broader groups, found themselves particularly valuable to the war effort in their ability to determine, they claimed, the psychological traits of national characters.[24] "Psychological warfare requires the most careful reporting on 'the loyalties, habits, fears, hopes, likes and dislikes of the target people,'" Ruth Benedict would write in a memo to another official in the Office of War Information in 1943.[25] Quoting here from her office's Outpost Guide,

---

[23] Mead, *And Keep Your Powder Dry*, 16.

The historian Richard Handler notes that *And Keep Your Powder Dry* was part of a broader trend of cultural anthropology employed to critique American society itself. See: Richard Handler, "Boasian Anthropology and the Critique of American Culture," *American Quarterly* Vol. 42, No. 2 (June 1990): 252–273. On the subject of who was and was not included in Mead's understanding of the national and the broader contexts of how concepts like citizenship were also redefined during the wartime and postwar period, see: Anthony Q. Hazard, Jr., "Wartime Anthropology, Nationalism, and 'Race' in Margaret Mead's *And Keep Your Powder Dry*," *Journal of Anthropological Research* Vol. 70, No. 3 (Fall 2014): 365–383.

[24] The subfield of anthropological study on culture and personality had its own context within twentieth-century social science. On some of the disciplinary history of the 1930s, see: Darnell, "Personality and Culture: The Fate of the Sapirian Alternative," in *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict, and Others*: 156–183.

Elsewhere in the volume, another author points out that some culture and personality adherents even foresaw the method as a way to stop Hitler psychologically without intervention into the war. See also: Yans-McLaughlin, "Science, Democracy, and Ethics," 194–195. The historian and Mead biographer Peter Mandler has further shown how psychological warfare caused tensions among culture and personality researchers. On how agents balanced thought about psychological warfare and cultural relativism in their treatment of Germans, see also: Peter Mandler, *Return from the Natives: How Margaret Mead Won the Second World War and Lost the Cold War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 145–147.

[25] Ruth Benedict to Mr. Katz (July 2, 1943), Ruth Fulton Benedict Papers, Series XIII, Box 112, Folder 3, Catherine Pelton Durrell '25 Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.).

she revealed the object of study and purpose to which it might be put: the psychological inner workings that might contribute, as she noted further, to "moods of defeatism" could be useful to propaganda efforts as a form of warfare in themselves.[26] "Such investigation requires some familiarity with different cultures and some experience in recognizing the mechanisms which operate to produce various kinds of behavior and attitudes," Benedict explained further.[27] Here, the anthropologist lent her expertise. By studying the available crop of people within the U.S. of enemy national origins, she could seemingly manipulate cultural data from individual to national, from émigré to citizen of the home country. On an interview conducted with a person in Belgium for a local newspaper in 1944, Benedict scrawled a few useful observations that might aid in the creation of postwar propaganda: "Fear of neighbors, dependency for life on the people who live near you. Element of uncertainty in terms of the near future. Uncertainty of bodily life. Anxieties."[28]

Benedict had, like many other anthropologists in the early 1940s, accepted an intelligence post, from which she "attempted to predict the behavior of the citizens of nation-states," as one historian has described it.[29] The project often compelled agents to

---

[26] Benedict to Katz (July 2, 1943).

[27] *Ibid*.

[28] Benedict, notes on "Terror in Belgium: Belgian Reaction to Germans," Benedict Papers, Series XIII, Box 112, Folder 7, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

[29] Thomas Patterson, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States* (New York, N.Y.: Berg, 2001), 94. Patterson provides a longer list of who was involved with intelligence and what part of the intelligence state they operated within. See the subsection: Patterson, "Anthropology and the War Years, 1941–1945," in *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*: 92–97. For a full list of anthropologists employed by the Office of Strategic Services, see also: David H. Price, "Gregory Bateson and the OSS: World War II and Bateson's Assessment of Applied Anthropology," *Human Organization* Vol. 57, No. 4 (Winter 1998), 379.

Price's writing is instructive in piecing together which anthropologists were employed by which agency during the Second World War. Price has written extensively about what he calls the "dual use" of anthropology for science and state. See the monograph: Price, *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of Anthropology in the Second World War* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008).

rely on second-hand cultural information like published books, movies and other media when informants were behind enemy lines or otherwise unavailable for the conventional methods of anthropological study during wartime. Alongside peers in the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, and a litany of other intelligence operations, anthropologists put their psychological studies of culture to use to study national culture *at a distance*, they said.[30] Of Mead's methodology in *And Keep Your Powder Dry* in 1942, two reviewers had noted her "almost exclusive interest in culture as a determinant for individual character formation."[31] The intelligence cohort of anthropologists adopted the same method, but also in the reverse. Their study of individual character revealed truths, they insisted, about so-called national culture; their study of national culture then in turn provided details affecting an individual's character, which allowed them to assess their susceptibility to potential psychological warfare.[32] Said Mead of the experience later, "We narrowed the idea of cultural character to cover those aspects of personality that could be referred to national institutions that transcended regional, class, or ethnic subdivisions within the nation-state."[33] These categories often proved to be more obscure than that,

---

Mead would recall later that some had as early as 1940 expressed interest in the war at a meeting of the American Anthropological Association, and they gathered to form a subcommittee. See also: Mead, "The Uses of Anthropology in World War II and After," in *The Uses of Anthropology*, ed. Walter Goldschmidt (Washington, D.C.: Special Publication of the American Anthropological Association, 1979), 148.

[30] This particular turn of phrase would remain relevant in the postwar period as well, as anthropologists and their research programs in so-called "area studies" would rely on indirect means of study, particularly for groups of people who were particularly difficult to access in the postwar period via conventional channels for fieldwork. Mead would write about culture "at a distance" here: Mead and Rhoda Métraux, eds., *The Study of Culture at a Distance* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

[31] Florence Kluckhohn and Clyde Kluckhohn, "Review of And Keep Your Powder Dry," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 45, No. 4 (October–December 1943), 624.

[32] Patterson further notes that this orientation, while intrinsic to the work that anthropologists did for wartime intelligence and their connection to efforts in psychological warfare, also drew skepticism from some participants. See: Patterson, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, 95.

[33] Mead, "The Uses of Anthropology in World War II and After," 148.

especially as anthropologists in California took jobs with the War Relocation Authority and administrated the internment of Japanese-American citizens in 1942.[34]

Elsewhere, anthropologists were shepherded between their intelligence posts and governmental affiliations as necessary for wartime.[35] By the spring of 1942, Smithsonian officials reported that their personnel, comprised of a staff of a dozen anthropologists led by William N. Fenton of the Bureau of American Ethnology alongside a cohort of other Smithsonian-affiliated or employed physical and natural scientists, had received a total of two hundred and twelve inquiries for cultural information from no fewer than thirty-two wartime agencies, per an internal memorandum from the Secretary's desk.[36] By the end of the year, the Secretary would boast that the number of successful military information requests addressed by Smithsonian scientists had multiplied to nearly one thousand in total.[37] Among the many closed inquiry tickets that had specifically been directed to the Smithsonian's anthropologists and ethnologists for their cultural expertise and data were "information on the current political situation in Peru—for a war agency," "data on the language and ethnology of the people of the islands off Formosa—for the Army," and

---

[34] For a more detailed index of the organizations and individuals involved from anthropological backgrounds, see both: *Ibid.*, 93–94 and Orin Starn, "Engineering Internment: Anthropologists and the War Relocation Authority," *American Ethnologist* Vol. 13, No. 4 (November 1986): 700–720.

Starn underscores that anthropologist advisors to the War Relocation Authority were called upon not just to administrate the internment but also to assess the viability of future moves. Said one official quoted in Starn's account, anthropologists wanted to "'predict the course of events and ultimately to control it.'"

[35] At the Smithsonian, for example, regular reports of which anthropological, biological, and physical scientific personnel had been moved to which agency regularly circulated between officials. See, for example: "The Smithsonian Institution and the War Effort," Record Unit 46: Office of the Secretary Records, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort Correspondence, 1941–1945," Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA), Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.).

[36] Charles G. Abbot, "Memorandum to Staff" (May 11, 1942), RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort Correspondence, 1941–1945," SIA.

[37] "The Smithsonian in Wartime," RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort Correspondence, 1941–1945," SIA, 3.

"description and pictures of native Burmese houses—for the Army," a retrospective circular would inform postwar Smithsonian contacts by the spring of 1945.[38]

Smithsonian anthropologists also found themselves engaged in a collaborative project for cultural research that elided the typical boundaries of wartime science. On the advice of the National Research Council, the Smithsonian, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Social Science Research Council agreed to contribute to a project called the Ethnogeographic Board, housed at the Smithsonian. It would function as a new informational "clearinghouse," as they called it, meant to circulate both cultural information and natural resource data about global regions among these institutions and through "other scientific and educational organizations throughout the country, and the Army, Navy, and war agencies within the government."[39] As one historical geographer has since noted, the Ethnogeographic Board served as a regionalizing archive and a tool for geopolitical power in the later Cold War years. Smithsonian cultural experts sorted information into geographical areas, which in turn reified those areas within the archive of the Board's files and through the projects in which archival information was used.[40]

---

[38] "The Smithsonian Institution's Part in World War II" (March 15, 1945), RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort Correspondence, 1941–1945," SIA, 6–7.

Also on this docket were summaries of two requests for physical anthropologists on staff at the Smithsonian, including 1) "information on the scientific concept of race for use in an anti-propaganda motion picture designed to neutralize fallacious racial ideas" and 2) "methods of distinguishing physical features of Japanese and Chinese for use in pamphlet to be distributed among troops."

[39] "The Smithsonian in Wartime," 3–4.

"Clearinghouse" was a term used for internal memos, circulated announcements for the project, and other public-facing material for the project. From the anthropologist head at the Smithsonian, see: William Duncan Strong, " The Ethnogeographic Board," *Science* Vol. 96, No. 2495 (October 23, 1942), 381.

[40] For this complex portrait of the Ethnogeographic Board as an archive-building tool and a geopolitical force in itself, see: Matthew Farish, "Archiving Areas: The Ethnogeographic Board and the Second World War," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* Vol. 95, No. 3 (September 2005): 663–679.

Here, the cultural information offered by midcentury anthropologists operated at once on the local, national, regional, and global scales, with interpretations amplified in tandem with data from natural scientists to aid in future resource extraction projects.[41]

"The present war seems likely to involve eventually every race and every land on earth," a press release announcing the Ethnogeographic Board had declared in 1942. "The economic life of primitive Indians on the Upper Amazon, the food habits of the Eskimo, the religious practices and prejudices of a tribe in the West African jungle may become important in the world struggle."[42] And yet, the project also further marked a cultural-geographical data exchange that would last beyond wartime. Born in part out of a Social Science Research Council committee on Latin America, the Board from its earliest days had been conceived as a long-term project, particularly for the Americas.[43] The Smithsonian during wartime dedicated itself to "Western Hemisphere solidarity," a postwar memorandum would proclaim.[44] In a way, this was true. Initiatives shared by the Smithsonian and its funding institutions, especially the Rockefeller Foundation, had

---

For a full list of the anthropologists employed by the Ethnogeographic Board, see: Price, "Lessons from Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, Persuasive and Ignored Contributions," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 18, No. 3 (June 2002), 17.

[41] Farish marks the Ethnogeographic Board as a precursor to area studies that guided Cold War geopolitics.

From an anthropologist at the time on the subject of renewed interest in culture and area studies and how it would come to affect anthropological education in the postwar years, see: William N. Fenton, "Integration of Geography and Anthropology in Army Area Study Curricula," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* Vol. 32, No. 4 (Winter 1946): 696–706.

[42] "For release afternoon papers, Monday, Sept. 21, 1942. From the Smithsonian Institution," RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort Correspondence, 1941–1945," SIA.

[43] "Memorandum on the Ethnogeographic Board" (May 2, 1942), RU46, Box 10, Folder "Ethnogeographic Board, 1941–1942," SIA.

On the Social Science Research Council's intertwined agenda and a 1943 memorandum on "World Regions in the Social Sciences" that called for "enlarged spatial concepts" across the social and geographical sciences, supported of course by Council funding, see especially: Farish, "Archiving Areas," 663–664.

[44] "The Smithsonian Institution's Part in World War II," 17.

expressed particular interest in Central and South America before, during, and after the Second World War, and cultural anthropological information again proved integral to their operations in those places.[45] For one such initiative, a Project to Study the Human Resources of the Amazon Jungle that was staffed by Smithsonian people and funded by Rockefeller money, officials announced a plan to supply anthropological personnel: "an ethnologist to make cultural studies and a physical anthropologist to make racial studies at each station."[46] For another, a request that passed through the Smithsonian Secretary's office from Nelson Rockefeller, who was designated the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics by President Franklin Roosevelt, soliciting personnel that might assist his office with an upcoming archaeological mission to collect cultural relics and information from one of their outposts in Peru.[47]

The landscape of wartime cultural anthropology certainly demanded much of anthropological culture itself. Deployed at once to explain an individual's psychology, a nation's character, a geographical region's interest in its natural resources, and along many

---

[45] An interest in what practitioners broadly described as Latin America appeared through the *Applied Anthropology* journal at this time as well, with regular reports on academic books and other engagements with Central and South American people, indigenous and not, appearing at the end of nearly every issue.

[46] "Project to Study the Human Resources of the Amazon Jungle," RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort: Inter-American Affairs Coordinator for 1941–1945," SIA, 3.

This particular project had been organized to secure American interest in Amazonian rubber plantations.

[47] Robert G. Caldwell to Charles G. Abbot (March 10, 1941), RU46, Box 52, Folder "Smithsonian War Effort: Inter-American Affairs Coordinator for 1941–1945," SIA.

The particular activities of the Office of the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics received attention from scholars and public intellectuals at the time, and it appears that both the Rockefeller Foundation and the State Department were active in promoting the benevolence of its activities for what it called Pan-American cooperation. For reports from the time, see: "Office of the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* Vol. 21, No. 2 (May 1941): 355–357 and John E. Lockwood and Luther Ely Smith, Jr., "Intra-Governmental Activities of the United States to Foster Hemispheric Trade," *Law and Contemporary Problems* Vol. 8, No. 4 (Autumn 1941): 669–683.

other fronts, it seemed less the "total way of life of a people," as one anthropologist then employed by the Office of War Information would soon put it, than a category that could group and regroup people into convenient units of study as necessary for the practitioner's purposes.[48] Further still, it had also found the company of an "interrelated and complex" network of social sciences that had been declared relevant to solving the world's problems by the Smithsonian and other foundations.[49] What emerged in 1945, then, was a cohort of people whose expertise had been rendered part of a postwar world order, which would necessitate a new host of reflections by anthropologists on themselves and their work beyond the theoretical-applied divide. The obligation of anthropologists now, Mead had written in her acknowledgements at the beginning of *And Keep Your Powder Dry* in 1942, was to "develop a series of systematic understandings of the great contemporary cultures so that the special values of each may be orchestrated in a world built new."[50]

Postwar Patrons for a Clearinghouse of Culture

In the fall of 1945, the members of the American Anthropological Association shared Mead's grand vision for their disciplinary future. "Anthropology is developing a tremendous new role in world affairs," an Association official wrote enthusiastically to members about plans to restructure the organization in the wake of the Second World War and its effects on anthropological science and patronage. "The experience of large numbers of anthropologists in new fields of activity because of the war unquestionably

[48] The "total way of life of a people" characterization comes from Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life* (1949) (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017), 23.

[49] "For release afternoon papers, Monday, Sept. 21, 1942," SIA.

Cohen-Cole also notes that some of this complexity had also been caused by an influx of military money for wartime interdisciplinary studies. See: Cohen-Cole, *The Open Mind*, 101–103.

[50] Mead, Acknowledgement in *And Keep Your Powder Dry*.

have changed the thinking and opinions of many persons," he continued, and he had now written to solicit information about their postwar visions for how such activities might be better served by the Association itself and its training and resources for anthropologists.[51] Interested parties received a short attached questionnaire. The letter tasked them to share for reorganizational purposes, among other information, 1) their current "jobs and duties" (being "as specific and detailed as you are permitted to be," given any confidentiality constraints of their post, the survey noted), 2) whether they "personally," or the "result of [their] work," had in the past or now guided governmental "policy decisions," 3) their ideas about what "anthropology has to offer that other social sciences do not have," and 4) "what contributions anthropology can make to the other social sciences."[52] For the anthropologists at the top of the organization, such information promised to strengthen anthropology's scientific standing among the social, human, and behavioral sciences.

For some who received and responded to the survey, discussion of change within the Association further posed the possibility of a new wing of the organization "devoted to the problems of professional"—applied—"interest," as Mead described it elsewhere.[53] Such an interest had tempted Association members for years. Mead had founded a small Society for Applied Anthropology in 1941, and had further involved herself in other

[51] Ralph L. Beals to colleagues at the Smithsonian (June 19, 1943), Papers of Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1930–1960, HUG 4490.3, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Assoc., Reorganization of," Harvard University Archives (HUA) (Cambridge, MA).

[52] Beals, "Suggested Problems for Discussion," Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Assoc., Reorganization of," HUA.

[53] Mead to Fay Cooper Cole *et al.* (October 5, 1945), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Assoc., Reorganization of," HUA.

Here, the designation of anthropological work in the "professional" interest was used like "applied," meant as a category distinct to theoretical or academic work, as Mead and others saw it. Policy and wartime advisory work had become the model for such activity, but some foresaw other potential applicability.

proposals to expand and multiply its ranks in the subsequent months and years. In the summer of 1944, for example, Mead, Benedict, Clyde Kluckhohn at Harvard University, Julian Steward at the Smithsonian, and a dozen others circulated yet another proposal for an organization of self-designated "professional" anthropologists to work in tandem with sympathetic social scientists from geography, psychology, and elsewhere. Their goals, this particular cohort declared, included a "more effective means of mobilizing professional effort in meeting national and international needs," to be established by the organization through public relations, interdisciplinary collaboration, and international cooperation.[54]

Encouraged by this solicitation from the Association, the anthropologists who had drafted a proposal the year before soon adjusted the document and recirculated it to colleagues as a suggested step in the process of postwar restructuring for the discipline. Their peers' response, however, was heated criticism of the suggestion that a separate organization be formed, might it detract from the Association. In Stocking's narrative of the series of meetings that followed the incident in the fall of 1945 and spring of 1946, tensions arose between scholarly cohorts affiliated with universities and those employed in Washington, D.C. by the federal government.[55] "Why revolution?," one preeminent cultural anthropologist hastened to write in defense of the current organization of the

---

[54] "Proposal for an Organization of Professional Anthropologists," Alfred Irving Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Association, Reorganization Committee #1," American Philosophical Society (APS) (Philadelphia, PA), 4.

[55] Stocking, "Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology: Thoughts Toward a History of the Interwar Years," in *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 170–171.

Others have written about the lineages of postwar thought of Association-affiliated anthropologists and present these options as a binary choice. For a source that draws a distinction between anthropologists interested in applied work and those dedicated to what the author calls a positivist or scientific vision during this period, see the first pages of: Susan R. Trencher, "The American Anthropological Association and the Values of Science, 1935–70," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 104, No. 2 (June 2002), 450–451.

Association to a signatory of the proposal.[56] In the end, Association members voted to dismiss the proposal, and instead they passed a few clerical changes in official personnel.[57]

While this particular proposal failed within the American Anthropological Association, some of its broader implications for anthropology in the same period and during the coming years would still prove prescient. In the closed-door discussions of the proposal in 1946, a detractor had suggested that the anthropologists interested in applied projects would find better success if they instead operated within kindred foundations and institutions. "I cannot see that professional anthropologists as such will pull more weight working by themselves than by working though other organizations," he said in response to a defendant of the proposal, who had underscored its viability on the grounds that it would serve to strengthen anthropology's standing among the social sciences. "The more we work in cooperation with other social sciences" within organizations like the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, both of which he noted had reaffirmed their interest in collaboration, "the more weight we will pull."[58]

---

[56] Alfred L. Kroeber to Kluckhohn (October 13, 1945), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Assoc., Reorganization of," HUA.

[57] Stocking, "Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology," 172–173.

Also at stake for some involved in the debate was the particular organization of the Association and the many perceived subfields contained within the discipline, particularly whether physical anthropologists could find sufficient representation. See also, from the steering committee members: "Questionnaire Regarding the Organization of Anthropology," Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Association, Reorganization Committee #1," APS.

[58] "Meeting of the Committee of Nine Held in New York City on Friday and Saturday, 22 and 24 of February, 1946" (minutes), Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Association, Reorganization Committee #1," APS, 2–3. Alfred I. Hallowell is the anthropologist speaking.

In fact, steering committee members noted elsewhere that it was partly because of "a feeling that we"—anthropologists—"were not pulling our weight in the three Councils (NRC in particular, SSRC and ACLS)" that the American Anthropological Association needed restructuring at all. See also: Regina Flannery, Frank Setzler, and John Cooper to Members of the American Anthropological Association (December 10, 1945), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Assoc., Reorganization of," HUA.

Such cooperation among the social sciences and their institutions, the committee agreed, was the "main boulevard to anthropology's status in the scientific world in general and in our educational system and to recognition and support in the general public."[59]

Of particular interest to anthropologists in the immediate postwar years was the pending legislation to establish a National Science Foundation, which the Association members and other practitioners monitored closely before the Foundation ultimately opened its doors in 1950. An endorsement from a sociologist, excerpted and reproduced in an Association circular in 1946, boasted of the potential that a forthcoming National Foundation for the sciences, broadly construed, offered to the social sciences in particular:

> National Foundation support will make indispensable and will provide a central clearing house of social science research activity which should greatly facilitate the funding of knowledge—the accumulation and widespread dissemination of…findings. The substance of science is in essence funded knowledge. In many respects it has been more difficult to pool the results of social science than of natural science research. A strong central clearing house for the programming and planning of research activity should result in increased uniformity and standardization of some types of activity—not to deaden and routinize research—but to make it comparable, additive and cumulative.[60]

Anthropologists concurred.[61] So, too, did their leading sources of private foundation support from the Social Science Research Council, which worked within its vast network

---

[59] Flannery *et al.* to AAA (December 10, 1945).

[60] Philip M. Hauser, "Are the Social Sciences Ready?" (published lecture), *American Sociological Review* Vol. 11, No. 4 (August 1946), 383–384.

Anthropologists reproduced and circulated the above quotation and a few other calls to action for the social sciences from Hauser's speech. See also: Flannery *et al.* to the Executive Committee of the American Anthropological Association (May 13, 1946), Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Association, Reorganization Committee #2," APS.

[61] Stocking underscores that the pressures of ensuring that anthropology be included in NSF legislation caused some of the tensions involved in the Association restructuring between 1945 and 1947. He further suggests that inter-social science competition also undermined some of the push for a professional wing. See: Stocking, "Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology," 173–174.

of university, philanthropic, and governmental contacts to ensure that the social sciences would be included in the legislative push for the National Science Foundation.[62] On the practitioners' side, the proposal meant that they should seek to frame their practice as relevant to a broader collaborative spirit among all scientists, social and beyond, in order to secure the continued employment of their knowledge for similar purposes within the postwar world. "All social scientists will have to yield some self interest to the common good," wrote one enthusiastic practitioner to a cohort of anthropologists who had held military employment in an endorsement of collaborative social science in 1946. "Every method that has demonstrated any promise of being able to yield data permanent to the better understanding of human relations should be fostered and encouraged."[63]

These two ideas, interdisciplinary collaboration and social science for the benefit of what was increasingly called *human relations*, operated in tandem for anthropologists and their peers in the social sciences, as Solovey has shown recently.[64] Just like during wartime, a broad clearinghouse of social scientific information, both federally funded and

[62] Solovey has recently written more about the complex historical relationship between the social sciences and the National Science Foundation, evident from its earliest days as a legislative proposal in the mid-1940s. On particularly the role of the Social Science Research Council in legitimizing anthropology in the organization, see: Solovey, "To Be or Not to Be Included: Uncovering the Roots of the NSF's Scientific Approach," in *Social Science for What?: Battles over Public Funding for the "Other Sciences" at the National Science Foundation* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2020), 19–49. Also on the subject of the SSRC from Solovey, see: "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 40, No. (Fall 2004): 393–422.

The first NSF funds disbursed for cultural anthropological project were in 1956. For an article that traces the projects in cultural anthropology and their NSF funding to the late 1980s, see further: Stuart Plattner, Linda Hamilton and Marilyn Madden, "The Funding of Research in Social-Cultural Anthropology at the National Science Foundation," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 89, No. 4 (December 1987): 853–866.

[63] Ashley Montagu to Kluckhohn (December 7, 1946), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3, Box 3, Folder "K," HUA.

[64] For a note on how this history intertwines further with how cultural anthropology, alongside other social sciences like psychology and sociology, navigated its distinction between a scientific and humanistic discipline, see specifically: Solovey, *Social Science for What?*, 60–61.

centralized through their shared institutions and common projects to solve the world's problems, promised in turn to lend further strength and legitimacy to the discipline itself. "If we are ever to relate our interest in understanding human behavior and its by-products; if we are ever to tie symbols, ideas, and values into that kind of systematic order required by science," cultural anthropologist Cora Du Bois told members of a University of Michigan supper club whom she had been invited to address in 1952 on the subject of the culture concept in postwar anthropology, collaboration was essential and any residual resistance to so-called applied research should be disregarded.[65] "There is ample evidence that the questions raised by practical administrative personnel have greatly stimulated the thinking of so-called pure research men," she concluded the lecture.[66] The notions of theoretical and applied anthropology had certainly been further obscured by the wartime science of man, and even the concept of culture itself had neatly fallen into the systematic order of cultural data mapped onto the world's regions that anthropology could supply.

Du Bois had clarified this point further in a letter to the proprietor of the supper club before her lecture. "It is precisely in trying to see the concept of culture in terms of

---

[65] Cora Du Bois, "Michigan Lecture" (October 27, 1952), Cora Du Bois Papers, Series 7, Box 68, Folder "Concepts of Culture and their Bearings on Problem Solving; typed drafts," Tozzer Library, Harvard University Repository (HUR) (Cambridge, MA), 8.

This position from Du Bois is particularly interesting, because, as a recent biography from one of her former students has pointed out, Du Bois in the late 1940s and early 1950s witnessed firsthand both red, the purge of communists, and lavender, the purge of gay and lesbian personnel, scare scrutiny of her friends and colleagues who remained in government employ in the early years of the Cold War. See specifically: Susan C. Seymour, "Disillusionment in the Cold War Era," in *Cora Du Bois: Anthropologist, Diplomat, Agent* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015), 205–248.

[66] Du Bois, "Michigan Lecture," 7.

Du Bois actually made this observation to resolve a tension between her position and what she called "scientism," or the temptation to model the postwar social sciences too closely after the natural sciences. Solovey argues that the resolution between these two positions was an essential step for developing the liberal postwar human sciences and that some of the critiques of scientism would not reemerge until the 1960s and 70s. See: Solovey, ""Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier," 415.

the social sciences and problems solving research that both personality and culture and the primitives are being re-evaluated," she said when organizers questioned her choice to advocate for a "social science model" for anthropologists in the talk.[67] This particular diagnosis of the state of the field from Du Bois reflected a series of wartime changes to the discipline that had assumed a more permanent status among postwar researchers by the late 1940s and early 1950s.[68] Anthropologists had affirmed their commitment to what was called area studies, a collective research program shared between them and, as a Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research within the American Anthropological Association listed widely in 1946, allies in "geography, history, economics, language and literature, philosophy, political science, the natural sciences, etc., etc."[69] These area studies mirrored the systematizing work of the Smithsonian's Ethnogeographic Board during the Second World War, with a catalog of experts assigned to supply research about specific regions, nations, and other culture groups around the globe as required.

---

[67] Alvalyn E. Woodward to Du Bois (June 23, 1952) and Du Bois to Alvalyn E. Woodward (August 21, 1952), Du Bois Papers, Series 7, Box 68, Folder "Concepts of Culture and their Bearings on Problem Solving; corresp. early drafts," HUR.

What Du Bois meant when she referred to "the primitives" here will be explored in the next chapter.

[68] Historian David Engerman has importantly written that many of these postwar projects, sometimes characterized as part of a program of Cold War science, had Second World War origins, and that their frameworks and patronage structures are better understood in this light. See specifically in the article: David C. Engerman, "Social Science in the Cold War," *Isis* Vol. 101, No. 2 (June 2010), 396–398. For more on the question of the utility of the Cold War frame for midcentury science, see also: Isaac, "The Human Sciences in Cold War America," *The Historical Journal* Vol. 50, No. 3 (September 2007): 725–746.

[69] "First Meeting of the Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research (February 23, 1946)," Hallowell Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder "American Anthropological Association, Reorganization Committee #2," APS.

Per the footnote above, the continuity of area studies from the preexisting institutions of war cannot be overstated too strongly, and practitioners recognized it in their discussions about the postwar discipline. The exploratory committee would next continue on to emphasize that anthropologists already had secured funding and institutional support for their work: "The NRC, the SSRC, and the ACLS have become interested in…acting jointly as an intermediary between the Navy and individuals who wish to undertake research on islands under the Navy's administrative control."

Their foundational patronage had continued unabridged from wartime to postwar as well.[70] Explained a circular from the Social Science Research Council from 1943, "In order that we may fulfill our postwar role as a member of the United Nations our citizens must know other lands and appreciate their people, cultures, and institutions."[71] Both then and in the postwar period, the Council had ensured that social scientists would serve as intermediaries, with their growing indexes of cultural information about global peoples providing, as the patrons framed it, a social scientific diplomacy of sorts. "The laws and generalizations of the social sciences are relevant to time, place and culture; and much can be gained by the concreteness derived from the regional approach," the Council circular concluded had concluded in 1943.[72] This vision guided the earliest postwar patronage as well. At a Council-hosted and Carnegie-funded conference on the Study of World Areas in the spring of 1948, attended by over one hundred social scientists housed in university and government posts, the participants again affirmed their commitment to the project of interdisciplinary social science that universalized through its regional approach. Social scientists ought to seek "a universal and general science of society and behavior," to be achieved by collaborative goals that would be met by a global cohort of social scientists trained in "differing cultural perspectives," a sociologist declared after the 1948 meeting.[73]

---

[70] Price has argued that the funding sources, particularly covert ones funded indirectly by intelligence organizations since the early Cold War years, tempted anthropologists toward this type of research after the Second World War. See: Price, "Subtle Means and Enticing Carrots: The Impact of Funding on American Cold War Anthropology," *Critique of Anthropology* Vol. 23, No. 4 (December 2003): 373–401

[71] Committee on World Regions of the Social Science Research Council, "World Regions in the Social Sciences" (circular), quoted in Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies," in *The Cold War and the University*, 196.

[72] *Ibid.*, 197.

[73] Charles Wagley, "The Study of World Areas: A Report on the National Conference," *Social Science Research Council Items* Vol. 2, No. 1 (March 1948), 1–2.

Researchers involved at the time have since documented well how widely this universal-science-in-service-of-regional-data-indexes model pervaded among both the patrons and academic sites for area studies that emerged at their hand during the 1940s and 50s.[74]

Historians have also written extensively about the research programs begat by this institutional-intellectual postwar nexus of interdisciplinary and international science as well, especially of its service to state-led Cold War intelligence. At Harvard in 1948, for example, cultural anthropologist Kluckhohn was selected to lead a new Department and affiliated Laboratory of Social Relations, a research group that earned its public financial support from Carnegie money and would soon be renamed the Russian Research Center. The Center became a self-professed hub for social scientific research in service of the new Cold War: Researchers studied Soviet "institutions and behavior in an effort to determine the mainsprings of [its] international actions and policy," as Kluckhohn would put it in a published report on the project.[75] At Columbia University, another Russian Institute had also opened with Rockefeller money in 1945 to "meet the needs of the United States in a critical field."[76] The utility of postwar social science was not just limited to Soviet studies, however. At Yale University, a broader Human Relations Area Files project, born out of a wartime Institute for Human Relations, employed dozens of cultural anthropologists to

---

[74] Wallerstein's full essay in *The Cold War and the University* offers wide-ranging portraits. See: Wallerstein, "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies," in *The Cold War and the University*, 195–231.

[75] Kluckhohn, "Russian Research at Harvard," *World Politics* Vol. 1, No. 2 (January 1949), 266.

The history of the Russian Research Center and its reflection of the trends in postwar social science—collaborative, international, and of course in service of a state project—is the subject of the following chapter: Engerman, "Social Science Serves the State in War and Cold War," in *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2009): 43–70.

[76] "Columbia's Russian Institute," *The Russian Review* Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring 1946), 97.

The Russian Institute is the subject of Engerman's first chapter and he further notes that its output lagged behind the research performed at Harvard. See: Engerman, "The Wartime Roots of a Russian Studies Training," in *Know Your Enemy*: 13–42.

index ethnographic data, ostensibly for the purpose of "cross-cultural research" meant to be consulted and used "by any qualified scholar at the seventeen member universities," as an advertisement for the project would later boast in an anthropological journal in 1960.[77] Like most, this project was buttressed further by direct and indirect intelligence money.[78]

Across campus from the Russian Institute at Columbia, Benedict and Mead had also begun their own Research in Contemporary Cultures program with Office of Naval Research funding in 1947. The initiative promised, in the professed interest of promoting what it called cross-cultural understanding, to provide cultural data on the "behavior of American minorities of foreign origin," wrote an affiliated student in anthropology in a later history of the project.[79] "Because cultural behavior is more easily understood in terms of the parent culture which gave rise to it," she continued, "the study led to research in the national character of various countries of Europe and Asia."[80] Their inquiries often adopted a similarly comparative stance that employed the data provided by several dozen researchers assigned to the project. For two weeks at the beginning of December in 1947, for example, the seminar topic at hand was the "Father-Son relationship" as it appeared in in the behaviors of "China, Jewish, French, and Russia," as the schedule described it.[81] The program combined ethnographic interviews and fieldwork among its local subjects of

[77] "The Human Relations Area Files," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 1, No. 3 (May 1960), 256.

[78] Price has written extensively about how the Human Relations Area Files in particular were used as counterinsurgency tools, even while purporting to address only "strictly theoretical questions," as Price would have it. See also: Price, "Counterinsurgency and the M-VICO System: Human Relations Area Files and Anthropology's Dual-Use Legacy," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 28, No. 1 (February 2012): 16–20.

[79] Mary Jean Kennedy, "Research in Contemporary Cultures: A History of the Project," The Papers of Margaret Mead, Series G, Box G8, Folder 3, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (LOC) (Washington, D.C.), 1.

[80] *Ibid.*

[81] "Table of Contents: General Seminar Minutes" (September 18, 1947 to December 16, 1948), Mead Papers, Series G, Box G13, Folder 11, LOC.

foreign national origin with "the checks and tests of psychology and the insights of psychiatry" to the effect of a successful "systematic approach, voluminousness of data, and methodological rigor," one participant researcher boasted of the group's cultural catalog.[82]

As ever, postwar cultural anthropology promised data that could be sorted by national origin and then compared as required by the practitioners and others involved. While their interest was often in Soviet character and further funding for the Research in Contemporary Cultures project eventually flowed to it from patrons of Soviet studies, the group also focused on China, Jewish people of Eastern European origin, and a few other national groups for comparative purposes in the interest of resolving what Benedict called postwar "problems of human relations" through their study of shared cultural behaviors and traits.[83] Mead biographer Peter Mandler has argued further that her and Benedict's project fashioned its own approach to the patronage landscape of postwar anthropology. Keenly aware of the obligations that the other organizations above had to intelligence operations, and despite Navy funding, Benedict in Mandler's account instead promoted "an internationalist and intercultural perspective" through her organization.[84]

---

[82] Weston La Barre, "Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures," *The Scientific Monthly* Vol. 67, No. 3 (September 1948), 239.

[83] Benedict here is quoted in Gilkeson, *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America*, 143.

The Soviet studies funding was provided by the RAND Corporation and accepted by Mead after Benedict's death in 1948. See: Patterson, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, 108. Their studies of Soviet character had caused some internal conflict among the researchers involved in the project as well, according to an involved anthropologist who contributed to their Chinese database. See also: Esther S. Goldfrank, "Another View: Margaret and Me," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 30, No. 1 (Winter 1983): 1–14.

[84] Mandler, *Return from the Natives*, 197.

Mandler has written elsewhere on the complex relationship that researchers in the Research in Contemporary Cultures project, particularly younger anthropologists, had toward their startup funding from the Office of Naval Research. See also: Mandler, "Deconstructing 'Cold War Anthropology,'" in *Uncertain Empire: American History and the Idea of the Cold War*, eds. Joel Isaac and Duncan Bell (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2012), 253.

And yet, this too fit well within the landscape of early postwar social science, patrons, and politics. Cultural anthropologists promised what they portrayed as a universal language of mutual understanding that could operate on multiple fronts. While their catalogs of data would prove increasingly useful for so-called counterinsurgency tactics and economic development interests of empire, the humanistic and diplomatic language that blossomed to justify the creation of those catalogs also became the public relations dimension of the discipline that practitioners had requested in the wake of the Second World War.[85] A Committee on International Cooperation in Anthropology, established in 1945 with Herskovits at the helm, even undertook a mission to secure "the resumption of international relations between scientists after the war."[86] This web of early postwar social science, with its interwoven state and foundation funding sources and ranks of cross-disciplinary researchers, engendered its own rhetorical frameworks that would further manipulate the scale and utility of the anthropological culture concept.[87]

Peacetime Anthropology for the World Community

In her presidential address to the members of the American Anthropological Association in the fall of 1947, Benedict spoke about importance of the humanities to

[85] For a perspective on anthropology and the broad discipline of modernization theory that encompasses the economic development dimension of the Cold War, see: Howard Brick, "Neo-Evolutionist Anthropology, the Cold War, and the Beginnings of the World Turn in U.S. Scholarship," in *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, eds. Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York, N.Y." Palgrave Macmillan, 2012): 155–172. For a broader portrait of modernization theory, see further: Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

[86] Minutes of the First Meeting of the Committee on International Cooperation in Anthropology (June 2, 1945), Henry B. Collins Papers, Box 150, Folder "Committee on International Cooperation in Anthropology (NAS-NRC): General Papers: Printed Materials," NAA.

[87] The historian of science Nadine Weidman has described this postwar rhetorical framework adopted by anthropologists and others as one of the "second order" effects of the Cold War on the social sciences. See: Nadine Weidman, "An Anthropologist on TV: Ashley Montagu and the Biological Basis of Human Nature, 1945–1960," in *Cold War Social Science*, 215.

anthropological research. In the past, she said, it had been the humanities and not the social sciences that provided "experience in cultures other than their own" for historical Europeans.[88] And although the anthropological discipline that they now practiced was born from a nineteenth-century scientific tradition and had therefore "arrive[d] at certain generalized, theoretical statements about culture," practitioners might also simultaneously embrace a humanistic perspective in order to improve their work, she concluded.[89]

Anthropological studies of culture could at once generalize and particularize about mankind for a useful purpose, Benedict's rhetoric suggested here. This was a perspective that would also echo around the growth of area studies and cultural data collection more widely during this period. Wrote a historical researcher involved in Columbia's Russian Institute on the subject in 1955, area studies fit into a grand theoretical tradition. They:

> are an out-growth and a continuation of a great educational tradition of Western civilization, the study of the Graeco-Roman world… Classics, the great nucleus of humanistic education, represent, in my view, a very high level of area studies. Today, in educating both experts and intelligent people generally to live and work effectively in the modern world with its complex cross-currents, area studies aim to promote a similarly imaginative and scholarly understanding of peoples of diverse traditions and cultures, whose fate is bound up with the strength of the free world.[90]

While this portrait was offered by a historian, his appeal to an understanding of peoples of diverse traditions and cultures at the end fit neatly into the self-fashioning project of anthropologists within this patronage network during the period as well. Anthropologists during the postwar period often framed their research in these humanist—and Cold

---

[88] Benedict, "Anthropology and the Humanities," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 50, No. 4 (October–December 1948), 586.

[89] *Ibid.*, 593.

[90] Philip E. Mosely, "The Russian Institute of Columbia University," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 99, No. 1 (January 1955), 38.

War—terms, especially as it purported to address broader groups of people.[91] Midcentury anthropological culture adopted its own unique character of international diplomacy, and its researchers further envisaged themselves and their work as relevant to an international mankind taking shape within the institutions of the liberal postwar world.[92]

In the fall of 1947, the American Anthropological Association submitted its own Statement on Human Rights to the United Nations in advance of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in which the Association noted the importance of "respect for the cultures of differing human groups" to be found in anthropological studies. "How can the proposed Declaration be applicable to all human beings, and not be a statement of rights conceived only in terms of the values prevalent in the countries of Western Europe and America?," organization leaders asked of the proposed document.[93] Any universalizing declaration about human rights would need to make room for culture.

The Association's statement stood in stark contrast to the ideas and approaches of its membership during this period, however, which oscillated between rhetorical positions

---

[91] Gilkeson suggests that the rhetorical confusion between "culture" and "civilization," which earlier generations had been careful to separate, was engendered again by the challenges that the Second World War brought to the relativist ideas that had undergirded earlier practice. See: Gilkeson, *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America*, 200–201.

[92] In fact, various concepts of culture have also been used to explain international relations during this period. See, on one author's vision of the shift from humanism to pragmatism: Julie Reeves, *Culture and International Relations: Narratives, Natives and Tourists* (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2004).

[93] "Statement on Human Rights," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 49, No. 4 (October–December 1947), 539.

Human rights discussions and anthropologists have had a complicated relationship, scholars have written. The Association's ambivalence on the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights took many years to resolve. See on the subject: Karen Engle, "From Skepticism to Embrace: Human Rights and the American Anthropological Association from 1947–1999," *Human Rights* Quarterly Vol. 23, No. 3 (August 2001): 536–559 and Sally Engle Merry, "Human Rights Law and the Demonization of Culture (And Anthropology Along the Way*)," Political and Legal Anthropology Review* Vol. 26, No. 1 (May 2003): 55–76.

On the history of human rights in this particular period, see also: Samuel Moyn, "Death from Birth," in *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012): 44–83.

that sought at once to speak to the general and also to the particular of mankind. Two scathing critiques of the Association's Statement immediately appeared in the next issue of the *American Anthropologist* and rejected the idea of relativism on the question of rights.[94] More widely, too, anthropologists enmeshed themselves and their studies into international associations for cultural activity like the new United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and similar programs of their own invention.[95]

For example, Benedict participated in a UNESCO-led project hosted at Columbia that sought to train domestic schoolteachers in approved methods for better international understandings of culture in the fall of 1947.[96] For a society dedicated to international affairs at the University of Chicago, Mead delivered a keynote speech to a gathering of anthropologists in the spring of the same year about the new horizons for

---

[94] See both critical responses to the American Anthropological Association's Statement on Human Rights here: Julian H. Steward, "Comments on the Statement on Human Rights" and H. G. Barnett, "On Science and Human Rights," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 50, No. 2 (April–June 1948): 351–355.

Anthropologists since have reflected on this conflict over the Statement on Human Rights in the years following, especially as human rights intervention (or, intervention justified by the language of human rights) has grown in the mid- to late-twentieth century. See also: Mark Goodale, "Toward a Critical Anthropology of Human Rights," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 47, No. 3, (June 2006): 485–511.

[95] The relationship between postwar culture, bodies like the United Nation and its cultural wing UNESCO, and anthropology is a well-explored topic among both historians and anthropologists themselves. On the subject of culture as an international agent, see, for example: S. E. Graham, "The (Real)politiks of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in Unesco, 1946–1954," *Diplomatic History* Vol. 30, No. 2 (April 2006): 231–251 and Bjarke Nielsen, "UNESCO and the 'Right' Kind of Culture: Bureaucratic Production and Articulation," *Critique of Anthropology* Vol. 31, No. 4 (December 2011): 273–292. For a defense of anthropology and a call to renew its values as an approach to World Heritage, see the recent: Christoph Brumann, "Anthropological Utopia, Closet Eurocentrism, and Culture Chaos in the UNESCO World Heritage Arena," *Anthropological Quarterly* Vol. 91, No. 4 (Fall 2018) 1203–1233. For another reading of the tensions between the universal and the relative in anthropological culture, see: Thomas Hylland Erikson, "Between Universalism and Relativism: A Critique of the UNESCO Concept of Culture," in *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives*, eds. Jane K. Cowan, Marie-Bénédicte Dembour, and Richard A. Wilson (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001): 127–148.

For a survey of UNESCO projects by an anthropologist during the period, see also: Alfred Métraux, "UNESCO and Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 53, No. 2 (April–June 1951): 294–300.

[96] "UNESCO Seminar, 1948," Benedict Papers, Series XIII, Box 112, Folder 15, Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College.

developing a world community through the tools and teachings of cultural anthropology, a community "within which each people could see themselves and all other peoples as understandable and tolerable whole, to which each, in a different way, owed a comparable and reliable, but not uniform, identical, or necessarily even similar loyalty."[97] UNESCO would in turn adopt this language, too, and anthropological researchers began work on an affiliated project in "education for the world community," which aimed to provide what it called culturally relevant social scientific resources that addressed "political problems (health, nutrition, social welfare, agriculture, trade and finance, collective security, etc.)," per its internal documents circulated to involved anthropologists in 1953.[98] Lecturers in anthropological classrooms swapped their "sources of materials for teaching intercultural democracy."[99] Elsewhere, participants at the Wenner-Gren Foundation's first annual meeting of international anthropologists declared their work "a new and important experiment in the public and intellectual currents of Western civilization" in "universal categories of culture" in 1951, and another group gathered in the spring of 1952 to parse the relationship between the anthropological science of culture and human nature.[100]

These early postwar projects of culture for anthropologists in the 1940s and 50s complemented their contemporary data-gathering enterprises, or perhaps served to justify

[97] Mead, "The World Community," Mead Papers, Series I, Box I38, Folder 11, LOC.

[98] U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, "Recommendations on U.S. Policy Concerning the 1953–1954 Policy of UNESCO," Tax Papers, Series II, Box 68, Folder 1, SCRC.

[99] May Mandelbaum Edel, "Sources of Materials for Teaching Intercultural Democracy," May Mandelbaum Edel Papers, Series7, Box 5, Folder "Teaching Files 1 of 2," NAA.

[100] Kroeber, "Introduction," in *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, 1.

Participants in conference talked explicitly about a "universal world view" that could be identified across different societies and peoples. See: Melford E. Spiro, "Human Nature in Its Psychological Dimensions," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 56, No. 1 (February 1954), 26. Historian Erika Milam argues that this period of postwar optimism gave way to darker visions of human nature. See also: Erika L. Milam, *Creatures of Cain: The Hunt for Human Nature in Cold War America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2019).

them. As in the anthropologist's fantastical vision of the discipline's future that opened this chapter, anthropology's scientific humanism promised to blend ideas about universal human nature and culture that also balanced the diversity of humankind to a peaceful end.[101] With anthropology professing to have absolved the conflicts that had arisen from racial difference in the immediate past, cultural diversity studied in intelligence operations or in public international initiatives like UNESCO could be absorbed into the whole.[102] This attitude pervaded even into municipal cultural endeavors in this period. Said one trained cultural anthropologist, who had been hired to improve adoptions of non-white children in the San Diego area in the late 1950s and early 60s to a group of local social workers, "The élite will be content with guiding instead of dominating, and will learn to invite clients, or minorities to join it instead of subserving its status. This will oblige every trained social worker to discover the cultural values he incarnates personally."[103]

Even as the residual patronage structures from the Second World War mutated as the war became increasingly distant, these manifold uses of culture and the tensions they brought to the fore persisted well into the 1960s. An anthropologist-designed curriculum

---

[101] Stocking has called this a vision of "general anthropology" that emerged during the postwar period. See: Stocking, "Delimiting Anthropology: Historical Reflections on the Boundaries of a Boundless Discipline," *Social Research* Vol. 62, No. 4 (Winter 1995), 951.

[102] The anthropologist Alfred Métraux contributed to UNESCO's statements on race. On the complex relationship between anthropology and race in the midcentury international project of UNESCO, see two particularly useful articles: Hazard, "A Racialized Deconstruction? Ashley Montagu and the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race," *Transforming Anthropology* Vol. 19, No. 2 (October 2011): 174–186 and Michelle Brattain, "Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public," *The American Historical Review* Vol. 112, No. 5 (December 2007): 1386–1413.

Donna Haraway's writing on biology, race, culture, and nation at this time also seeks to balance these ideas. See further: Donna J. Haraway, "Universal Donors in a Vampire Culture: It's All in the Family. Biological Kinship Categories in the Twentieth-Century United States," in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, ed. William Cronon (New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995): 321–377.

[103] Ruth Landes, "Workshop on Cultural Factors," Ruth Landes Papers, Series II, Box 5, Folder "Letters Received: So–St," NAA. The emphasis is Landes's.

for grade school students, Man: A Course of Study, stressed that mankind possessed a "universal capacity for culture," as one historian has described it.[104] Mead still lectured on the interconnected roots shared by "the cultures of living peoples, primitive, exotic, and modern."[105] At UNESCO, affiliated social scientists, whose resumes now included new development projects in Latin America and Southeast Asia that had adopted explicitly the language of modernization that had proliferated during this period, still pondered the relationships between particulars and universals.[106] Wrote an economist to a preeminent anthropologist at Chicago about a project for rural development administrated through UNESCO, their work had secured "the universal development of the superculture. This can exist with a wide variety of exotic traditionalisms."[107]

This economist's observation was surprisingly prescient for our purposes. Ready to admit without hesitation that their work had served a particular end for those in control of the superculture, as he called it, he recognized too that UNESCO had a visible hand in both the "de-exoticization (oh, what a horrid word!)" but simultaneously "preserving

---

[104] Milam, "Public Science of the Savage Mind: Contesting Cultural Anthropology in the Cold War Classroom," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 49, No. 3 (2013): 319.

[105] Margaret Mead, "Anthropology and American Civilization" (October 27, 1963) (unpublished), Rhoda Metraux Papers, Box 4, Folder 5, Modern Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (LOC).

[106] These programs were both UNESCO-affiliated and not. For a report from a UNESCO subcommittee with an anthropologist as its leader that emerged from an ongoing interest in rural development, see: Harvey M. Choldin, "Development at the Grass Roots: A Report of a Panel Discussion," *Community Development Journal* Vol. 2, No. 6 (April 1967): 39–45. For two recent portraits from historians about similar programs sponsored by the Ford Foundation in Latin America, see also: Mariano Ben Plotkin, "US Foundations, Cultural Imperialism and Transnational Misunderstandings: The Case of the Marginality Project," *Journal of Latin American Studies* Vol. 47, No. 1 (February 2015): 65–92 and Patrick Iber, "Social Science, Cultural Imperialism, and the Ford Foundation in Latin America in the 1960s," in *The Global 1960s: Convention, Contest, and Counterculture*, ed. Tamara Chaplin and Jadwiga E. Pieper Mooney (London, U.K.: Routledge, 2017): 96–114.

For the anthropologist's files on the subcommittee, see also Boxes 71, 72, and 73 of the Tax Papers, SCRC.

[107] Kenneth E. Boulding to Tax (February 23, 1965), Tax Papers, Series II, Box 70, Folder 8, SCRC.

the exotic" of different groups of people throughout the world.[108] Midcentury culture for anthropology and its institutions wielded a peculiar power. It could group and regroup global people into different categories—as practitioners would have it, variously primitive, exotic, modern, simple, complex, historical—as a way of ordering the whole of mankind, and it also intervened into the lives of those it purported to study by doing so. As subjects increasingly challenged such interventions in the 1960s and 70s, anthropological order would too begin to fracture. In UNESCO's future, the economist concluded, "I am quite in favor…of what one might call cultural sectarianism, provided, of course, that it does not get out of hand, and that it exists within a broad cultural ecumenical framework."[109] This would prove a difficult vision to actualize for those who controlled the superculture.

Conclusion

In this light, the historical self-fashioning that would soon flourish around a similarly historical *culture concept* at the hand of George Stocking and his cohort of anthropologists in the 1960s and 70s takes on new meaning. The Stocking narrative of anthropology's history allowed practitioners to pretend that their recent engagement with intelligence agencies and international bodies had little to do with their actual practice in either the present or the past.[110] As we will see, it also prolonged for just a little while more the sense that anthropology's subjects were themselves historical, representatives of groups somehow divorced from the realities of so-called modern life. This explained the

[108] Boulding to Tax (February 23, 1965).

[109] *Ibid*.

[110] This has perhaps engendered some of the writing from anthropologists themselves in the wake of the revelations discussed in the previous chapter, which have often been framed in a way that suggests practitioners were fooled into their participation in intelligence operations after the early postwar period discussed in this chapter.

ongoing dissonance surrounding the concept of applied anthropology and indigenous people, whom Herskovits had implied were too scant and too historical to merit the label of applied work in the 1930s. Anthropologists would soon recognize that they could no longer compartmentalize indigenous people in this way, however, and the very enterprise of studying culture through fieldwork, museum displays, and other archival studies further crumbled further along the domestic front.

PART II: RESEARCHING, DISPLAYING, ARCHCHIVING

3 | "AFTER ALL YOU HAVE LIVED IN THE CULTURE": CALCULATION, CREDIBILITY, AND ANTHROPOLOGY'S CHANGING MIDECENTURY TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT

A patron who strolled northward along Riverside Drive on Manhattan, New York's Upper West Side on an afternoon sometime between December 4, 1966 and February 6, 1967 would have passed a tall art deco building with its doors opened wide to them on the corner of the block as they crossed W 103rd Street to continue uptown. The building housed the now-defunct Riverside Museum, still open and free of charge then for all local attendees.[1] Lining the gallery walls over this particular winter were hundreds of paintings and crafts depicting pueblo life for native people in the Southwestern United States, and among the most well known artists featured in the show were San Ildefonso Pueblo's Tse-Ye-Mu, Oqwa-Pi, and Awa Tsireh.[2]

At the center of the gallery hung nearly one hundred watercolor paintings from an unknown indigenous artist named Joe B. Lente of Isleta, New Mexico. Lente's paintings had been commissioned by a cohort of cultural anthropologists at Columbia University led by Elsie Clews Parsons over thirty years before they arrived to this exhibition at the

[1] In fact, the museum was soon to close in 1971 when, after years of declining attendance that proprietors would blame on "neighborhood changes," its benefactors sold the building and donated its permanent collections to the Rose Art Museum at Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts. See: Sanka Knox, "Brandeis Merger Is Set For Riverside Museum," *New York Times* (June 17, 1971), 48.

[2] "Pueblo Indian Art" (press release), Esther S. Goldfrank Papers, Box 6, Folder "Isleta Paintings," National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

For another write-up that appeared in the *New York Times* during the exhibition, see also: Grace Glueck, "Art Notes: … And an Arty New Year," *New York Times* (January 1, 1967), 76.

Riverside Museum. Lente himself, whom curators believed by 1966 to be deceased, had until the beginning of the event remained just an anonymous contact of a few bygone anthropologists. Now, advertisements for his work spread his name publically across the pages of the *New York Times*, the *New York Post*, and the *East Village Other*. "The artist is self-taught and definitely primitive," an NBC reporter remarked during a brief television segment that aired on the paintings, "but as a collection it is incredibly valuable indeed."[3] A supplementary press release from the museum added that they were "the only such detailed pictorial record of ceremonial life in existence."[4]

Lente's watercolor paintings reside today at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, whence they are often transported on loan and displayed for new audiences more than fifty years on from his debut at the Riverside Museum.[5] His appearances in the archival papers of the anthropologists with whom he interacted also now provide for historians an uncommonly well-documented voice of an indigenous person who worked as a covert research informant at this time. "Did you tell any people there about my name and drawings, because here was some people were looking for me by my name," Lente wrote in a letter insisting that he remain anonymous in Parsons's future published writings in 1937. "I told this boy that I am not doing no drawings for

[3] "REPORT ON PUEBLO INDIAN ART" (December 16, 1966) (transcript), Goldfrank Papers, Box 6, Folder "Isleta Paintings," NAA.

[4] "Pueblo Indian Art."

[5] They were also published in a book at the time by another anthropologist who had been involved as an assistant to Parsons in the 1930s. See: Esther S. Goldfrank, *Artist of 'Isleta Paintings' in Pueblo Society* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1962). In an interview with NBC's Today Show on the press tour for the exhibition in 1966, Goldfrank would add further than Lente's name, along with other identifying photographs that they had taken around the area during the 1930s, had been withheld from the initial publication in order to maintain his anonymity. See also a transcript of her appearance: "SECRET INDIAN RITUALS MADE PUBLIC AT RIVERSIDE MUSEUM" (December 20, 1966) (transcript), Goldfrank Papers, Box 6, Folder "Isleta Paintings," NAA.

C.U. of New York City."[6] He also appears elsewhere in Parsons's papers negotiating with her for more money in exchange for the cultural information that his artwork provided to her anthropological writing. "If you send prayer stick paintings with more detail," Parsons responded to one such request from Lente, "I will send you the rest of the $5.00."[7]

The historian of anthropology Henrika Kuklick wrote about what she called the "personal equations" calculated by anthropologists during participant observation for their turn-of-the-century fieldwork. Kuklick borrowed the term from Bronislaw Malinowski, whom she credited with an early and also an unrelenting "psycho-physical understanding of himself" in the field that would come to define relativist anthropology and its methods for the twentieth century.[8] And yet, as much a part of participant observation and broader interactions between anthropologists and the people who served as their informants were different equations as well, beyond the constructed field as anthropologists would have it.[9] Calculated by both parties involved, such equations, like the financial one in the letters between Lente and Parsons quoted above, set the terms of their social scientific engagement, and they facilitated an exchange of cultural information between them.

---

[6] Joe B. Lente to Elsie Clews Parsons (January 10, 1937), Elsie Clews Parsons Papers I, Series II, File Box 5, American Philosophical Society (APS) (Philadelphia, PA).

[7] Parsons to Lente (October 1, 1937), Goldfrank Papers, Box 12, Folder "Navajo and Pueblo," NAA.

[8] Henrika Kuklick, "Personal Equations: Reflections on the History of Fieldwork, with Special Reference to Sociocultural Anthropology," *Isis* Vol. 102, No. 1 (March 2011), 22–23.

Other scholars had, before Kuklick's piece about a decade ago, also picked up on Malinowski's language. One cultural anthropologist has written about what one calls an "erotic equation" that was absent from the reflexive ethnography that gripped the field after the 1980s. See: Esther Newton, "My Best Informant's Dress: The Erotic Equation in Fieldwork," *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 8, No. 1 (February 1993): 3–23.

[9] The concept of "the field"—the construction of it by practitioners, their behaviors within it, its integral role in the development of the anthropological discipline itself, and even its importance to scholarship in the history of science—has in itself proven a significant object of study for the history of anthropology and beyond. On its utility in anthropology in particular, see the useful essay collection: Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds., *Anthropological Locations Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997).

For anthropologists, this relationship meant that they regularly calculated the perceived cost to extract information that would bolster their own scientific credibility.[10] In the 1930s, Parsons had wavered between threats to Lente's anonymity and to withhold his monetary payment in order to solicit the images of religious traditions and ceremonies depicted in the paintings that he mailed to her.[11] For Lente's responses to about a dozen other questions mailed earlier in the year, Parsons had continued in the letter above, she had attached seventeen dollars for now. Those five more dollars would soon follow if he obliged her further request.[12] Such credibility calculations performed by anthropologists extended beyond the monetary as well.[13] This chapter explores how cultural researchers in different temporal and physical situations positioned themselves in order to solicit cultural information and how they responded to the changes—both imagined and real—to their connection to informants between the inter- and postwar periods. As an older guard of midcentury anthropologists would have it, the interactions between Lente and

[10] For a broader discussion of the history of scientific credibility, see Steven Shapin's classic essay here: Steven Shapin, "Cordelia's Love: Credibility and the Social Studies of Science," *Perspectives on Science* Vol. 3, No. 3 (Fall 1995): 255–275. See also the more recent: Shapin, *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as If It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).

[11] Parsons's earlier work in Taos had also brought trouble to other informants in the past, according to lore within the discipline. Various accounts recall that informants either found her *Taos Pueblo*, written from fieldwork in the late 1920s and published in 1939, in a bookstore or it otherwise arrived in the village, and that elders had subsequently punished the informants who agreed to cooperate with her. For a recollection of the story from one ethnologist in the 1950s, see: William N. Fenton, "Factionalism at Taos Pueblo, New Mexico," *Bureau of American Ethnology* Bulletin 164, Anthropological Papers No. 56 (1957), 310.

For a recent historical reflection on the clandestine relationships between anthropologists and informants like the one between Lente and Parsons, see also: Adam Fulton Johnson, "The Price of Fear: Shifting Valuations of Information and Clandestine Exchange Relationships," in "Secretsharers: Intersecting Systems of Knowledge and the Politics of Documentation in Southwesternist Anthropology, 1880–1930" Ph.D. Diss. (University of Michigan, 2018): 132–159. Johnson recounts a moment between Parsons and a Zuni informant, Billí, likely a pseudonym, who asked her "What will you pay me for my fear?"

[12] Parsons to Lente (March 4, 1937), Goldfrank Papers, Box 12, Folder "Navajo and Pueblo," NAA and Parsons to Lente (October 1, 1937).

[13] The ethics of payment for informants is still under debate. See: Vinay Kumar Srivastava, "Should Anthropologists Pay Their Respondents?," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 8, No. 6 (December 1992): 16–20.

Parsons had embodied the perfect informant-scientist bond. Lente remained anonymous, but also preserved in historical time, only gaining some narrow public recognition decades after both he and Parsons had died. The television spots that advertised his paintings at the Riverside Museum featured the cultural anthropologist Esther Goldfrank, not Lente himself, speaking about him and his artwork on his behalf.[14] Lente appeared to pose no threat to the anthropological eye for recording and interpreting culture.

In the decades between the Lente-Parsons letters in the 1930s and the Lente exhibition in the 1960s, however, something changed. Cultural researchers returning to the communities of people whom they had studied decades before now perceived that their cultural research was no longer welcome, if it ever had been to begin with. They lamented that native people in the U.S. had relinquished their role as representatives of history, subjects of the past, useful for their cultural anthropological ends. To audience members at a symposium on Anthropology and the American Indian at the American Anthropological Association meeting in 1970, Margaret Mead insisted:

> We have tried to find those members of the Indian community who knew most and cared most about their past; we have treated them as colleagues, worked with them, sat at their feet (literally) listening to what they had to say; and have regarded our primary task to be the preservation of knowledge of Indian cultures *in the past*.[15]

Now, Mead suggested here, this relationship, recalled rosily without acknowledgement of anthropology's growing colonial encounter, was similarly bygone. Of course, Mead's account of her relationship to the communities whom she had studied in the past was

[14] "SECRET INDIAN RITUALS MADE PUBLIC AT RIVERSIDE MUSEUM." According to the transcript of this spot, Goldfrank was seated in front of a selection of Lente's paintings.

[15] Margaret Mead, "The American Indian as a Significant Determinant of Anthropological Style," in *Anthropology and the American Indian: Report of A Symposium* (San Francisco, CA: The Indian Historian Press, Inc., 1973), 70. The italicized emphasis is Mead's.

fictional, but her generation of anthropological fieldworkers whose cultural research had been with native people in the U.S. had begun to lose its influence by the postwar period. Scientific researchers who were seeking new groups of human subjects to render historical increasingly turned abroad.[16] At home, Mead continued on to claim, "There's been a change in that Indians are very much concerned with the well being of their people and less concerned with the preservation of vestigial and ancient parts of ancient cultures."[17]

This, too, was fictional, of course. In the presentation that followed Mead's at the symposium in 1970, the Lakota anthropologist Bea Medicine suggested that new Native American Studies Departments could be a "possible first step to *relevant* education" for native students of culture, still interested in the past but not themselves "cultural relics," as another discussant observed.[18] For the indigenous people whom anthropologists had historically designated as informants, the relationship had similarly changed throughout the mid-twentieth century. This chapter explores how they navigated what one researcher called the "collective memory of imperialism" imposed by anthropological research, and how anthropological information itself proved at once harmful and useful to the process.[19]

---

[16] The historian of anthropology Rosanna Dent has written about how this perspective shifted abroad and into the realm of physical anthropology. See two published articles: Rosanna Dent and Ricardo Ventura Santos, "'An Unusual and Fast Disappearing Opportunity': Infectious Disease, Indigenous Populations, and New Biomedical Knowledge in Amazonia, 1960–1970," *Perspect Sci.* Vol. 25, No. 5 (September 2017): 585–605 and Dent, "Subject 01: Exemplary Indigenous Masculinity in Cold War Genetics," *The British Journal for the History of Science* Vol. 53, No. 3 (September 2020): 311–332.

[17] Mead, "The American Indian as a Significant Determinant of Anthropological Style," 71.

[18] Bea Medicine, "Anthropologists and American Indian Studies Programs," in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 77 and a comment from Mary Halpern, 103.

Medicine would write elsewhere about the patronage structures that such departments relied upon, which appeared in jeopardy just a few years after this symposium. See also: Medicine, *Learning to be an Anthropologist and Remaining 'Native': Selected Writings* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2001).

[19] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York, N.Y.: Zed Books, 2012), 1.

Native people calculated which interactions with anthropologists could be deployed to their own ends, and this in turn drove changes to the historical relationships that they had shared with anthropological researchers in the past.[20]

For their part, most anthropologists would resist this change. "We have been very polite," Mead insisted in defense of cultural anthropologists at the end of her speech in 1970, with the added recollection that her mentor Franz Boas had always remarked that his informants from among the Kwakwaka'wakw communities that he wrote about at the turn of the century were more so his *friends* than they were his research subjects.[21] It was a trope that some anthropologists would still attempt to use to their advantage throughout the twentieth century, even as their claims to friendship wore increasingly thin.

"40 cents is no price to my ability"

"Do not let me influence your thinking when you write," the anthropologist and ethnohistorian of the Iroquois William N. Fenton wrote in a note of encouragement to his informant, the Seneca leader and World War I veteran Jesse J. Cornplanter, over the winter of 1935. "After all you have lived in the culture."[22] During this time in 1935, Fenton was enrolled as a doctoral student in the Department of Anthropology at Yale University, and he had undertaken fieldwork among the Seneca, one of the Six Nations of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) people of Western New York State, in order to study

[20] Dent writes importantly about this phenomenon as exercised by the group of indigenous people externally categorized as "Xavante" in Brazil in the 1950s, who transformed this tool of anthropological research imposed upon them in order to level with the Brazilian government for other rights up to the present. See the full dissertation: Dent, "Studying Indigenous Brazil: The Xavante And The Human Sciences, 1958–2015," Ph.D. Diss. (University of Pennsylvania, 2017).

[21] Mead, "The American Indian as a Significant Determinant of Anthropological Style," 70.

[22] Fenton to Jesse J. Cornplanter (February 2, 1935), William N. Fenton Papers, Series I, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #1," APS.

their customs of ceremonialism and herbalism.[23] Cornplanter, a perennial contact who had corresponded with many bygone cultural researchers for decades, was no stranger to anthropology.[24] "My only regret is my inability to do the very thing you are doing due to lack of proper education and training," Cornplanter responded to a note from Fenton.[25]

This remark from Cornplanter is especially significant for our purposes. While he had not received a formal education like Fenton, first Dartmouth College and now Yale educated, Cornplanter's expertise had become "much sought after" by Fenton, along with the earlier anthropologists J. N. B. Hewitt, Frank G. Speck, Merle H. Deardorff, and Arthur C. Parker before him, a state archaeological bulletin would remark upon his death in 1957.[26] In fact, soon after he began this new line of correspondence with Fenton in the 1930s, Cornplanter would publish his own anthropological book that recounted religious stories and legends told among Seneca.[27] And yet, Cornplanter recognized the difference between his wealth of cultural knowledge and the characteristic of scientific credibility that could be bestowed upon an anthropologist. To Fenton, he continued:

> I read quite a lot, especially about our people. So if you have any manuscript, Booklet, History, or Article that you know is of any good you can aid me by sending it to me. I can repay you in a way by you writing

[23] Some of this biographical detail can be found in an obituary of Fenton from 2005. See: Regna Darnell, "William N. Fenton (1908–2005)," *Journal of American Folklore* Vol. 102, No. 475 (Winter 2007): 73–75. Fenton would also reflect on the time in a memoir here: Fenton, "At Yale and Among the Senecas," in *Iroquois Journey: An Anthropologist Remembers* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2007): 21–40.

[24] Fenton himself wrote an intellectual biography of Cornplanter later. See: Fenton, "'Aboriginally Yours': Jesse J. Cornplanter, *Hah-Yonh-Wonh-Ish*, the Snipe, Seneca, 1889–1957," in *American Indian Intellectuals*, ed. Margot Liberty (Saint Paul, MN: American Ethnological Society, 1978): 199–222.

[25] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 14, 1936), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

[26] Charles E. Bartlett, "Jesse J. Cornplanter," *New York State Archeological Association: The Bulletin* No. 10 (July 1957), 2.

[27] Cornplanter, *Legends of the Longhouse: Told to Sah-Nee-Weh, The White Sister* (Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938).

> and asking me any subject you may be wanting to know, and if I know it I will tell you, if not I will say so, how is this?[28]

Here, Cornplanter established a knowledge exchange of sorts with Fenton that would continue over the next two decades of their correspondence. If Fenton forwarded along the latest published anthropological texts to which he as an academic had easier access, Cornplanter would in turn respond with more stories and data, the transaction went. "I am pleased to be able to assist you in your work as I understand you are writing a book on Seneca—in in it will be my contribution—my knowledge," he said.[29] Cornplanter had established similar exchanges with other anthropologists with whom he had worked in the past, and he regularly wrote to the researchers whom he knew at different national institutions for their publications. To a colleague at the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology, he sent a yearly request for the organization's latest bulletins.[30]

As the release of his book on the *Legends of the Longhouse* in 1939 approached, Cornplanter offered more thoughts on the nature of anthropological work in his letters to Fenton. "You see Bill I've written this book because it is time that I rake the reward myself instead letting [*sic*] some wise guy get all the credit and me with only a little line or name on the bottom of the page. Many times my name is never mentioned."[31] To

---

[28] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 14, 1936).

[29] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 15, 1935), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #1," APS.

[30] Cornplanter to J. N. B. Hewitt (October 2, 1935), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #1," APS.

Cornplanter also had a correspondence relationship to the anthropologist Clark Wissler of the American Museum of Natural History, to whom he wrote a long and friendly letter upon the publication of *Man and Culture* in 1940 to request a copy. See: Cornplanter to Clark Wissler (February 12, 1940), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

[31] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 23, 1938), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

others in his network, he wrote with glee upon the completion of a successful radio set for a local station in Albany. As Cornplanter recalled it, particularly exciting for him was a moment during which a state employee had pulled him aside in order to share a recent magazine article that included a printed photograph of Cornplanter himself.[32] Although he would remark later in a letter to the anthropologist Clark Wissler that his profit from the book's sales were "not very encouraging," he remained satisfied with the feeling that "I did something worth doing towards preserving the knowledge."[33]

Monetary payment changed hands between Fenton and Cornplanter as well. "I have been delaying the payoff waiting for the other information you mentioned you intended to send along as you got time," Fenton continued to Cornplanter in the series of letters from 1935 that opened this section. "I know you are busy. I did not think there was enough to make a dollar's worth and I did not want to make change. I do want to be fair."[34] The fair price for cultural information would fluctuate, however, depending on the particular mood of those involved or the particular materials that they discussed at a given moment. In his letter to Wissler, Cornplanter had asked about the etiquette of informant payment. "What would be the right renumeration [*sic*] for any professional information to another writer, such as acting as an informant," he asked. "Suppose I came to you in a sort of commercial manner and asked you to tell me things that you are writing yourself

[32] Cornplanter to Arthur C. Parker (May 13, 1938), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

This particular contact was both an academic and a personal one, as Parker was also a Seneca. For a reflection on his career, see: Joy Porter, "Arthur Caswell Parker, 1881–1955: Indian American Museum Professional," *New York History* Vol. 81, No. 2 (April 2000): 211–236.

[33] Cornplanter to Wissler (June 11, 1940), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

[34] Fenton to Cornplanter (February 2, 1935).

or in that same line of work, what do you think would be the right amount, if giving away valuable information could be counted in terms of dollars and cents?"[35] From Fenton, he had accepted as little as fifty cents per hour in the past, he admitted.

On Cornplanter's mind were the clear differences in compensation that he and his anthropologist correspondents received for their work. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, he had taken a job recreating historical Seneca arts and crafts from the collection photographs housed at the Rochester Museum.[36] Sponsored in part by funds from the Works Progress Administration, this daily job proved exhausting to Cornplanter, who lamented often to his contacts that it detracted from his ability to write more cultural books, which also paid him very little. Recording his cultural knowledge was "just like being a member of the Salvation Army," Cornplanter fumed in his next letter to Fenton. "The difference with you and I, is that you get paid for this, and get probably travelling expense on top of it. We call it Research and Preservation of this or that. 40 cents is no price to my ability."[37] Wissler had responded that he should receive at least one dollar and fifty cents per hour for his expertise as an informant, and Cornplanter told Fenton that this would become his new rate if they were to continue their relationship.[38]

Cultural anthropologist Margaret Bruchac has written recently of the "vulnerable, liminal position" that Cornplanter and other informants had to inhabit while recounting

[35] Cornplanter to Wissler (June 11, 1940).

[36] This particular detail comes from Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 121–122.

[37] Cornplanter to Fenton (1940), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS. This particular letter from Cornplanter is undated, with only "Saturday A.M." written at the top. Another person, likely Fenton, added that it had been sent in 1940.

[38] Cornplanter to Fenton (July 8, 1941), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

their oftentimes-sacred knowledge to researchers like Fenton.[39] Cornplanter needed the money—however scant it was—that he earned by doing so, as he was quick to admit to anthropologists in his letters. But further, he also sometimes lacked the authority to share this tribal information with outsiders, and he brought great personal risk to himself in the process.[40] "Neither man held exclusive rights to Seneca knowledge," Bruchac observes of Cornplanter and Fenton's relationship, "but each behaved as though they had free rein."[41]

Cornplanter may have represented an unusually well documented informant, but many of the interactions that he shared with Fenton through their correspondence echoed within other midcentury relationships between anthropologists and native people as well. Rebecca Lemov notes that in the 1940s the anthropologists Fred and Dorothy Eggan paid their informant, Don C. Talayesva of the Hopi, seven cents per page for a dream diary that he kept and thirty-five cents per hour for his discussions with them.[42] Among her Tlingit contacts for a summer fieldwork performed during the early 1950s, the cultural anthropologist Frederica de Laguna paid informants by each page of cultural detail that they could record for her, although she could sometimes tempt an informant with a photograph or a sound recording that she had taken within the community instead of payment.[43] These relationships continued into the hundreds of letters that she received

[39] Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 125.

[40] In one letter to Fenton, Cornplanter remarks that he was "being punished for some remark that [he] had made." See: Cornplanter to Fenton (June 18, 1943), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #2," APS.

[41] Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 118.

[42] Rebecca Lemov, "Anthropology's Most Documented Man, Ca. 1947: A Prefiguration of Big Data from the Big Social Science Era," *OSIRIS* Vol. 32, No. 1 (2017), 26.

[43] De Laguna repeats this detail throughout her diaries kept from the fieldwork. See specifically the diaries contained here: Frederica de Laguna Papers, Series II, Box 3, Folder "Yakutat August 1952," NAA.

each year from informants past and present. Among the holiday cards, birth and wedding announcements, and general well-wishes that reached her mailbox, frequent requests to forward published information like articles and books about them also arrived.[44] In the mid-1960s, another cultural anthropologist who returned to Western New York in order to study the Tonawanda Seneca Nation remarked that she "tried to give Dorothy," her informant, "$20—which she would not take," instead opting for a gift of a copy of the notes that she had recorded during her studies within the community earlier that day.[45]

To Clyde Kluckhohn at Harvard University in the 1950s, the Navajo contacts with whom he had worked variously wrote to him for a new pair of eyeglasses, a bicycle, small sums of money ranging from one to fifty dollars, and Kluckhohn's help with a son's discharge from the Army.[46] "Well, I'll sign off here and go to bed and dream about the $30 to night," a schoolboy scrawled at the end of his letter in the hope that Kluckhohn might send him a check in return.[47] This contact's suggestion perhaps stemmed from the piecemeal system of payment that Kluckhohn had developed with a few members of the community who were participating in a population study administrated by Kluckhohn in the early 1950s. Kluckhohn wrote regular letters with detailed questions to his contacts, and sent back money in return when he felt that they had responded sufficiently. "Please send me full answers to these questions, including a careful answer to each part of each

[44] On this note, see specifically her correspondence with a longtime informant Helen Bremmer: Frederica de Laguna Papers, Series I, Box 26, Folder "Bremmer, Helen," NAA.

[45] Elisabeth Tooker, untitled field diary (August 12, 1965), Elisabeth Tooker Papers, Series V, Box "P—Tonawanda #6," Folder 3, APS.

[46] Jose Apache to Clyde Kluckhohn (undated), Papers of Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1930–1960, HUG 4490.15, Folder "ABC," Harvard University Archives (HUA) (Cambridge, MA).

[47] Ronald Lorenzo to Kluckhohn (September 8, 1953), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.15, Folder D, HUA.

question," he wrote at the end of a particularly long letter to Bertha Lorenzo, whom he had known since the early 1940s. "Under no circumstances will I send you more money this year until I get full and satisfactory answers."[48] For the copy of a birth certificate that she had mailed, he sent her twenty-three dollars, and for a list of names of people in the community supplied by her husband, he sent fourteen more "as a kind of present."[49]

The relationships between native people and the anthropologists who had arrived within the community or written via the post to study them were governed by a peculiar economy. While the anthropologist often controlled the flows of money between them, deeming what was and was not considered sufficient information for scientific purposes, some contacts accepted payment in the form of the cultural knowledge that had been taken from them in the past. "You know my hobby, taking notes on our rituals, songs, speeches and anything that may soon be lost," Cornplanter had written to one of his contacts in the 1930s.[50] It was a mission that he believed cultural researchers like Fenton shared, however unfairly the social scientific credibility and academic patronage was distributed between them. To an indigenous friend, Cornplanter wrote that he liked anthropologists. "They are working from Science and not just personal fancy," he said.[51]

A cultural song- and memory-recording project undertaken by Fenton and the American Philosophical Society in 1951 would soon compel Cornplanter to question

[48] Kluckhohn to Bertha Lorenzo (undated, 1950 or 1951), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.15, Folder "Lorenzo, Bertha & Thomas," HUA.

[49] Kluckhohn to Lorenzo (June 2, 1949), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.15, Folder "Lorenzo, Bertha & Thomas," HUA.

[50] Cornplanter to Hewitt (October 2, 1935).

[51] Cornplanter to Gabor (February 9, 1951), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #5," APS.

Fenton's motives, however.[52] Cornplanter had recently accepted an occasional advertising job "just being Indian," as he put it, for the local homebuilders association, which paid him ten dollars per weekend of work plus travel expenses to speak to customers at a new model home in Buffalo, New York.[53] When the offer arrived from Fenton for a recording project, Cornplanter wrote excitedly to his contacts about this additional revenue stream. "First they bought my scripts or texts and now they want to have me record all the songs for them at a fixed rate of hourly pay," he told a friend.[54] But the project soon soured, and ambivalence on Fenton's end about Cornplanter's compensation was the cause. The two eventually agreed on an hourly rate for the time that Cornplanter would spend recording his songs and an additional one hundred dollars for a few original manuscripts of them that Cornplanter had already sent. A delayed check for the manuscript, resistance from Fenton to send duplicates of the original pages that Cornplanter had mailed to him, and confusion over the expected recording process led Cornplanter to cancel the project in the fall of 1951.[55] "My people can easily say that I am selling my Beliefs and Religion this time they'd be right. Compree?," Cornplanter wrote to Fenton.[56]

To the Tonawanda Reservation where Cornplanter lived, Fenton eventually sent a colleague, cultural anthropologist Anthony Wallace, with the machines, blank tapes, and

[52] Cornplanter explained elsewhere to another contact that he had recorded some songs and memories for Fenton in the past, but it was "not enough to suit me." See: Cornplanter to Kenneth H. Mynter (1949), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #4," APS.

[53] Cornplanter to Gabor (November 8, 1950), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #5," APS.

[54] Cornplanter to Gabor (February 7, 1951), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #5," APS.

[55] Cornplanter to Fenton (December 21, 1951), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #5," APS.

[56] Cornplanter to Fenton (November 24, 1951), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 7, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #5," APS.

other recording accouterments in tow order in to right the project over the next winter.[57] Cornplanter accepted the materials with reluctance, and he soon wrote to Fenton with renewed frustration. "This is a two man job and you know it," he said after a particularly exasperating attempt to control the machine while holding an instrument in each hand.[58] Ongoing annoyance toward the recorder, coupled with cataracts and worsening effects of heart failure, meant that Cornplanter sent three recordings before canceling the project for good at the end of the year. He recalled to Fenton how straightforward the process to publish his book in the 1930s had been, how it was his name and not another researcher's on the cover, and how unsatisfying his informant role was in comparison. "And you guys try to tell me 'that's Science.' Well Bud, any time I get ready to donate my time and talent I'd join the AMERICAN RED CROSS," Cornplanter signed off with a flourish.[59]

Anthropologists and Other Friends in the 1960s

In many ways, Cornplanter embodied an ideal midcentury informant to the mind of an anthropologist as much as Lente did. He wrote generously, several hundreds pages of letters filled without line breaks or any other distractions to Fenton alone from the 1930s until his death in 1957. And while he articulated a clear critique of the enterprise of academic anthropology, often directed toward his anthropologist contacts themselves, he did seem to share their interest in recording cultural material. "I know what I know, that's my heritage and no more," Cornplanter told a new anthropologist contact after the

[57] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 7, 1952), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 8, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #6," APS.

[58] Cornplanter to Fenton (February 24, 1952), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 8, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #6," APS.

[59] Cornplanter to Fenton (1952), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 8, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #6," APS.

end of the recording project at the American Philosophical Society.[60] Bruchac notes that this perspective was representative of a particular generation of Haudenosaunee leaders, who accepted their concert with anthropologists like Fenton and those who predated him to be one manner of preserving their knowledge, however imperfect.[61]

By the final years of Cornplanter's life in the 1950s, however, this relationship had begun to change. "Behind each policy and program with which Indians are plagued, if traced completely back to its origin, stands the anthropologist," Vine Deloria, Jr. would famously declare in 1969.[62] Other scholars and historians of anthropology also began piecing together the historical involvement of anthropologists in the policy decisions and implementations of recent midcentury past, especially during the so-called Indian New Deal of the 1930s.[63] Margaret Mead had been hired as an "anthropological adviser" to the Commissioner John Collier of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, when in the months before the passage of the Wheeler-Howard Bill the Bureau had contracted many "field workers and teachers of anthropology throughout the country," as a solicitation sent to her said.[64]

---

[60] Cornplanter to Harold C. Conklin (October 3, 1953), Fenton Papers, Series II, Box 8, Folder "Cornplanter, Jesse J. #6," APS.

[61] Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 128.

[62] Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 81.

[63] See, for example, a selection of early pieces that sought to uncover the role of anthropologists here: David L. Marden, "Anthropologists and Federal Indian Policy Prior to 1940," *Indian Historian* Vol. 5, No. 4 (Winter 1972): 19-26, D'Arcy McNickle, "Anthropology and the Indian Reorganization Act," in *The Uses of Anthropology*, ed. Walter Goldschmidt (Washington, D.C.: Special Publication of the American Anthropological Association, 1979): 51–60, and Lawrence C. Kelly, "Anthropology and Anthropologists in the Indian New Deal," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 16, No. 1 (January 1980): 6–24.

For a more recent examination of the education policy of the Indian New Deal in particular, see also: Gabriella Treglia, "Cultural Pluralism or Cultural Imposition? Examining the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Education Reforms during the Indian New Deal (1933–1945)," *Journal of the Southwest* Vol. 16, No. 4 (Winter 2019): 821–862.

[64] W. Duncan Strong to Mead (August 3, 1934), Mead Papers, Series E, Box E51, Folder "Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.," LOC.

The program quickly employed a broad network of cultural researchers known to the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology, and it would partner with anthropology departments around the country to educate its workforce in the cultural customs of native people whom they would soon receive a federal stipend to study further.[65] "The era of making discoveries has just begun," Collier mused in a letter distributed to personnel.[66]

The Wheeler-Howard Bill passed as the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which purported to reverse the longstanding position of assimilation administrated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As one historian has observed, a "considerable gap between [the Collier] administration's rhetoric and its actual achievements" would follow.[67] As one Choctaw wrote to Collier, they had taken him "at his word," followed the provisions of the law in establishing a new constitution and bylaws for their formal recognition by the federal government, and still had not been recognized. "It makes us Choctaws wonder if the Government ever makes its promise good to the Indians," he concluded.[68]

Anthropologists, for their part, soon began to regret their eager participation in the administration. "Hindsight is easier than foresight," one admitted in an article for the

[65] BIA officials circulated a training document for the summer of 1935 that listed several dozen courses that involved anthropologists could take at the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Harvard, and elsewhere. See specifically: "1935 Summer Study Opportunities in Anthropology, Sociology and Related Field" (March 30, 1935), Mead Papers, Series E, Box E51, Folder "Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.," LOC.

[66] This particular quotation comes from what appears to be a newsletter that Collier distributed to Ruth Benedict through another mutual contact. See specifically: John Collier to Lawrence K. Frank (February 13, 1941), Ruth Fulton Benedict Papers, Series I, Box 9, Folder 2, Catherine Pelton Durrell '25 Archives & Special Collections Library, Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.).

[67] Kelly, "The Indian Reorganization Act: The Dream and the Reality," *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 44, No. 3 (August 1975), 292.

[68] Joe Chitto to Collier (August 20, 1934), reproduced in *Say We Are Nations: Documents of Politics and Protest in Indigenous America Since 1887*, ed. Daniel M. Cobb (Durham, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 77. In this letter, Chitto quotes from a letter written decades before by an elder that outlined many of the same problems to another bygone administrator of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

American Anthropologist in 1944 in which he called for further study by anthropologists of the "social and economic effects" that the act had imparted upon the people it governed.[69] Among native people, the legislation had further engendered a sense that an intertribal political body would serve their best interests, especially as the threat of termination to some existing tribal recognition and organization loomed by the early 1950s.[70] From the anthropologist D'Arcy McNickle, a Salish-Kootenai citizen and employee of the Bureau since the 1930s, a National Congress of American Indians founded in 1944 promised to advocate for those groups facing termination and more broadly for native well being. The Congress declared that it would "enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian race; to preserve cultural values; to seek an equitable adjustment to tribal affairs; to secure and to preserve rights under Indian treaties with the United States; and to otherwise promote the common welfare of the American Indians," as the preamble to its founding constitution written by a diverse body of attendees at its first meeting read.[71]

The threat of termination had led to further interest in economic development on reservations. "I have also suggested how, through lack of material development of Indian resources, Indians have remained in communities apart, communities of rural slums,"

---

[69] Scudder Mekeel, "An Appraisal of the Indian Reorganization Act," American Anthropologist Vol. 46, No. 2 (April–June 1944), 217.

[70] The history of termination policy, its ties to other twentieth-century legislation, and its long history in the United States have a rich historiography that extends beyond the scope of this chapter. See, among many others: Kenneth R. Philp, "Termination: A Legacy of the Indian New Deal," *Western Historical Quarterly* Vol. 14, No. 2 (April 1983): 165–180, Edwin C. Valandra and Deloria, *Not Without Our Consent: Lakota Resistance to Termination, 1950–59* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2006), Cobb "Indian Politics in Cold War America: Parallel and Contradiction," *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* Vol. 67, No. 2 (Winter 2006): 392–419, and Laurie Arnold, *Bartering with the Bones of their Dead: The Colville Confederated Tribes and Termination* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2012).

[71] This excerpt from the preamble can be found on the National Congress of American Indians' website, here: https://www.ncai.org/about-ncai/mission-history/the-founding-meeting-of-ncai. For more on the subject, see also: Thomas W. Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians: The Founding Years* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

McNickle insisted to colleagues at a meeting of the Congress in 1951.[72] He brought more detailed plans to the Bureau soon afterward, and then assumed a secondary post as an administrator of the new non-profit American Indian Development, Inc. through the Congress.[73] In collaboration with tribal representatives, anthropological researches, federal support, and other patronage, the initiative set about enacting a multi-point plan offered by McNickle and adopted by the Congress to foster commercial development led by native people living on reservations in industries such as timber production.[74]

Anthropologist involvement in this program and others like it exposed rifts among practitioners about their rightful role in so-called applied projects between the 1930s and the 1960s. Writing in 1936 about the potential uses for anthropology beyond the academy that had proliferated recently, Melville Herskovits had claimed:

> The Indian is no longer a social or political force to be reckoned with. There are not enough Indians to allow large-scale economic exploitation, nor do they afford enough potential man-power for industry or the army to allow these factors to enter. This combination of circumstances makes it possible for the American anthropologist to work whole-heartedly with the Indian Office.[75]

---

[72] D'Arcy McNickle, "Point Four Program for American Indians," in *Say We Are Nations*, 95.

[73] The report of the terms between American Indian Development, Inc. and the Bureau of Indian Affairs can be found here: "Memorandum Agreement between American Indian Development and Bureau of Indian Affairs," D'Arcy McNickle Papers, Series 5, Box 21, Folder 172, Newberry Library (Chicago, IL).

[74] The history of "development" and involvement of anthropologists perhaps appears to connect this non-profit with a parallel history of development used as a tool of empire during the period. In fact, some researchers seem to have been involved in programs for native development in the U.S., including one initiative by a group at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that also involved Kluckhohn, who received a series of solicitations to undertake "objective research and study of the human and natural resources" of an array of tribes in the late 1950s. See: K. Blyth Emmons to John P. Donohue (September 4, 1959), Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.6, Box 4, Folder "Fund for the American Indian," HUA.

The program developed through the National Congress of American Indians appears to be unconnected from the systems of patronage that buttressed development projects abroad, although further review of the records at the National Museum of the American Indian Archive Center may prove instructive.

[75] Melville J. Herskovits, "Applied Anthropology and American Anthropologists," *Science* Vol. 83, No. 2149 (March 1936), 221–222.

Anthropologists need not worry that their work with native people be considered applied research, Herskovits had suggested here, as these people remained subjects relegated to the past by the anthropological eye, no longer able to muster any *social or political force* in the present. To Herskovits, it meant that anthropologists who accepted positions within the Bureaus of Indian Affairs or American Ethnology would retain their "purely scientific anthropological character," he concluded with a plea for anthropological service.[76]

Anthropologists would continue to discuss the contours of their so-called applied work throughout the 1940s.[77] As they did, Herskovits's dissonance became increasingly difficult to sustain, and some felt a pressure to reinvent their professed orientation toward native people. For the University of Chicago's Sol Tax, the answer would soon be found in a program that he would name action anthropology, which had grown in part out of his involvement with a university-sponsored research project that studied the Meskwaki (Fox) people of the Great Lakes Region and had commenced in 1948.[78] Tax had long expressed interest in "applying, as social philosophers, the findings of [anthropological] science to the formulation of policy," as he put it.[79] And yet, he also shared Herskovits's concern about the messy distinction between pure scientific research and the material that might be generated by an applied project. According to Tax's recollection, the distinction

[76] Herskovits, "Applied Anthropology and American Anthropologists," 222.

[77] A series of articles would be published especially in the early 1940s, perhaps a result of anxieties over the applied work in which anthropologists had engaged at the beginning of the Second World War. See, for example: Laura Thompson, "Some Perspectives in Applied Anthropology," *Applied Anthropology* Vol. 3, No. 3 (April–June 1944): 12–16, Margaret Lantis, "Anthropology as a Public Service," *Applied Anthropology* Vol. 4, No. 1 (Winter 1945): 20–32, and E. E. Evans-Pritchard "Applied Anthropology," *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* Vol. 16, No. 2 (April 1946): 92–98.

[78] For a more detailed history of this particular project, see: Judith M. Daubenmier, *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists: Action Anthropology Reconsidered* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

[79] Sol Tax, "Anthropology and Administration," *América Indígena* Vol. 5, No. 1 (January 1945), 33.

had continued to blur for him when he began fieldwork with the Meskwaki in Tama, Iowa. The historian Judith Daubenmier recounts the memories recorded by the students who accompanied Tax on the trip. They expressed disappointment that the people whom they met in Tama appeared *modern*, and then found themselves so moved by the levels of poverty on display that they had "asked Tax if they could help in some way," which began to alter his own thought on the matter.[80] Daubenmier suggests that this account is likely fictional: It was the Meskwaki themselves who perhaps prodded this bunch of young Chicago anthropologists and their mentor into changing their minds.[81]

From Tax, the program in action anthropology sought "to understand the cultures and the needs and wants not only of the Indians but of the government bureaus and others who are part of their situation."[82] Action anthropologists positioned themselves at once as arbiters, teachers, and students. As they learned about the cultures of the people whom they studied and the institutions that governed their lives, they would develop new theories of culture that could in turn affect change within those institutions. "After a

---

[80] Daubenmier, *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists*, 114–115.

The historian Jean O'Brien has written eloquently about the tactics employed to deny native people a place in the modern world. See her chapter: Jean M. O'Brien, "Lasting: Texts Purify the Landscape of Indians by Denying Them a Place in Modernity," in *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010): 105–144.

[81] *Ibid.*, 115–116.

For more on the Meskwaki project in particular, see: Douglas E. Foley, "The Fox Project: A Reappraisal," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 40, No. 2 (April 1999): 171–192. For more on this suggestion in a broader sense, see also: Trevor W. Purcell, "Indigenous Knowledge and Applied Anthropology: Questions of Definition and Direction," *Human Organization* Vol. 57, No. 3 (Fall 1998): 258–272.

[82] Tax, "Action Anthropology," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 16, No. 4 (December 1975), 515. This is a published version of a lecture that he delivered in 1958, according to Tax.

Even after the so-called reflexive turn within the field during the 1970s and 80s, student of Tax and others would employ this understanding of themselves as a way forward after the decolonization of anthropology. See two pieces in particular: Michael Asch, "Anthropology, Colonialism and the Reflexive Turn: Finding a Place to Stand," *Anthropologica* Vol. 57, No. 2 (2015): 481–489 and Joshua J. Smith, "Standing with Sol: The Spirit and Intent of Action Anthropology," *Anthropologica* Vol. 57, No. 2 (2015): 445–456.

good deal of experience with other tribes, it finally hit me that *anthropology* had to take the lead in countering an idea that we had helped perpetuate for years!," a historian recalls Tax exclaiming of the project.[83] He had reconsidered his thoughts about science as well:

> One simply cannot wait to act until he knows enough to calculate the statistical probabilities that he knows what he is doing. So we have cast off the straightjacket of a model of science that looks like high-school physics as at least it was once taught, and accept one that is a little more clinical.[84]

Among the Meskwaki in Tama, a new initiative for veterans of the Second World War became one of the students' earliest action items.[85] Tax himself also soon joined the ranks of American Indian Development, Inc. alongside McNickle, and he wrote widely to his colleagues about the potential for a "Myrdal-type study" of native people that might be undertaken by anthropologists in the coming years as a guide for future policy.[86]

For our purposes, at the root of this ideological shift marked by the turn by some toward so-called action anthropology was the attitude of its practitioners toward cultural change. Native people no longer represented immutable relics of the natural historical past, and the anthropologist's role had been expanded to aiding them as they confronted change in the present.[87] Few embraced the new role as fully as Tax. At the 1960 meeting of the National Congress of American Indians in Denver, Colorado, he enthusiastically

---

[83] Foley, "The Fox Project," 174.

[84] Tax, "Action Anthropology," 515.

[85] Foley details the creation of a local veterans' club as one of the action items for this particular social problem. See: Foley, "The Fox Project," 173–174.

[86] Tax, "Proposal to Develop Long-Range Programs in the Human Sciences," to S. Dillon Ripley (n.d. 1966), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 196, Folder 2, Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center (SCRC), University of Chicago Library (Chicago, IL).

[87] Interestingly, the program of action anthropology emerged at the same time as work by anthropologist Anthony Wallace, the colleague of Fenton's mentioned above, on what he called "revitalization movements," or attempts to enact cultural change from within. See: Anthony F. C. Wallace and Raymond D. Fogelson, "Culture and Personality," *Biennial Review of Anthropology* Vol. 2 (1961): 42–78.

announced that he had just secured funding for a conference of American Indian people to stake a position on federal policy, and the Congress agreed that they would meet the following year in Chicago to issue a declaration of their rights.[88]

Organizers, including Tax, McNickle, the anthropologist Nancy Lurie, and the Chicago-area coordinator Robert Reitz, worked frantically between the meeting of the Congress in the fall of 1960 and the anticipated conference scheduled for the summer of 1961 to invite representatives of several hundred native tribes and bands to contribute to a Declaration of Indian Purpose that would emerge from the conference. In one of his regular status reports to attendees in the months leading up to the conference, Tax noted that the document would adopt an "Indian point of view," not his own. "Some people got the idea that I was under the influence of one group of Indians or that I had some point of view of my own and wanted to make it seem as if it is coming from Indians. None of this is true," he insisted.[89] In fact, organizers would host several trial runs of the process of statement drafting in the months that led up to the conference. At one such mock session in April, a focus group declared, "WE BELIEVE in the inherent right of all people to retain spiritual and cultural values and that the exercise of these values is necessary to the normal development of any people."[90] With continuous feedback from all involved, a

---

[88] Daniel Cobb recounts the story using D'Arcy McNickle's diaries here: Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2008), 30–32.

Cobb argues further that the Congress perhaps so willingly agreed to follow Tax's lead because of the onslaught of termination attempts that had occurred during the 1950s. For more on the Congress at that time, see also: John Fahey, *Saving the Reservation Joe Garry and the Battle to Be Indian* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2015).

[89] Memorandum from Tax to "All American Indians" (March 31, 1961), Tax Papers, Series VI, Box 216, Folder 11, SCRC.

[90] American Indian Chicago Conference, "Preliminary Statement" (April 26–30, 1961), Tax Papers, Series VI, Box 217, Folder 2, SCRC.

message to conference attendees added when this draft Declaration circulated to them in the spring newsletter, the document would continue to evolve until the summer.

The historian Daniel Cobb describes the final Declaration as a "tempered call for a definitive break with the past."[91] After a pledge to their own sovereignty and also their dedication to the United States, attendees listed a series of legislative proposals, including funds for economic development, relocation assistance, provisions for health, welfare, housing, and education, and a litany of other visions for their future. They wrote an addendum to the statement from the preliminary draft, and its opening creed now read:

> WE BELIEVE in the inherent right of all people to retain spiritual and cultural values, and that the free exercise of these values is necessary to the normal development of any people. Indians exercised this inherent right to live their own lives for thousands of years before the white man came and took their lands. It is a more complex world in which Indians live today, but the Indian people who first settled the New World and built the great civilizations which only now are being dug out of the past, long ago demonstrated that they could master complexity.[92]

Alongside their work on the Declaration, the weeklong gathering would also allow for smaller focus group meetings for the tribal officials and other community members to draft their own complementary resolutions about local policies. On the construction of a proposed Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania that would flood vast acres of Seneca territory, a panel listed a series of policy proposals that would halt the start of the project.[93] Other

---

[91] Cobb, "Indian Politics in Cold War America," 415.

[92] American Indian Chicago Conference, "Declaration of Indian Purpose: The Voice of the American Indian" (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1961), 5.

[93] "Proposed Resolutions" (draft), Native American Education Services Records, Box 1, Folder 3, SCRC.

Ultimately, the proposals of this particular working group were unsuccessful. Fenton was actually involved in the ongoing legislation regarding the Kinzua Dam project in Western Pennsylvania. For two different accounts of his involvement with the project, see: Laurence M. Hauptman, "On and Off State Time: William N. Fenton and the Seneca Nation of Indians in Crisis, 1954–1968," *New York History* Vol. 93, No. 2 (Spring 2012): 182–232 and Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 125–127.

attendees also gathered to discuss the ongoing implications of attempts at Menominee termination in Wisconsin.[94] Yet another session of local attendees addressed the ongoing relocation of Chicago-area native people into and out of the city.[95] While the conference had affirmed the importance of cultural history, its eyes faced decidedly forward in time.

The anthropologists involved were quick to claim their part in the success of the conference after the week concluded. One commented that it had proven a remarkable "experiment in social science planning," a model to be emulated in the future.[96] In his editorial for the *Chicago Sun-Times*, Tax remarked that their work had ensured that "the 'vanishing Indian' is here to stay."[97] Tax soon assumed a position as a proprietor for the *Indian Voices* newsletter that would continue to circulate after the conference, and he wrote frequently to potential patrons with echoes of the success of the conference. To a contact at the Fold Foundation, he explained, "Another opportunity now presents itself to help the Indians take another long step in their struggle to relate positively to the modern world."[98] As the political landscape of the 1960s shifted, he further established roles for himself as an advisor to President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty legislation

---

[94] "Statement on Menominee Termination: AICC Research Material" (June 8, 1961), Native American Education Services Records, Box 1, Folder 3, SCRC.

[95] "Chicago Indian's Fact-Finding Committee" (June 10, 1961), Native American Education Services Records, Box 1, Folder 8, SCRC.

[96] Joan Ablon, "The American Indian Chicago Conference," *Journal of American Indian Education* Vol. 1, No. 2 (January 1962), 22.

Others would echo this claim, about the success of the conference and the suggestion that it represents an early expression of tribal sovereignty that would come to characterize the following years of indigenous activism, well into the following decades. See also: Nancy Oestreich Lurie, "Sol Tax and Tribal Sovereignty," *Human Organization* Vol. 58, No. 1 (Spring 1999): 108–117. Much of Cobb's book, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, underscores that this vision overestimates the contributions of anthropologists. On the subject, see both the full monograph and also: Frederick E. Hoxie, *This Indian Country: American Indian Activists and the Place They Made* (New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books, 2013).

[97] Tax, "What The Indians Want," *Chicago Sun-Times* (June 11, 1961), Section 2, 1.

[98] Tax to S. M. Miller (May 15, 1967), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 152, Folder 7, SCRC.

and a special federal task force for native people and the Economic Opportunity Act.[99] A new Tax-led initiative housed at the Smithsonian would also keep a watchful eye over the group of native people who marched to Washington, D.C. as part of the Poor Peoples' Campaign in 1968, and it even kept sound reel of their speeches delivered at the steps of the building where the latest Commissioner of Indian Affairs worked.[100]

In her report on the American Indian Chicago Conference, organizer Nancy Lurie remarked that the event had come about because of three serendipitous factors: 1) the collective "aggravated state" among native people, 2) an interest in the "development of new skills on the part of scholars and scientists in resolving social problems," and 3) the "timeliness" of the first two points to "effect changes" within the current political climate.[101] It certainly marked a moment of optimism for anthropologists, who caught a glimpse of potential to assert their continued relevance in native affairs. And yet, not all shared in the vision. As the decade wore on, some still clung to the myths of past and present that had defined the anthropologist-informant relationship for decades.

Return to the Six Nations, 1969

In the spring of 1969, Fenton would return to the borderlands between Western New York and Canada in order to visit the Six Nations of the Grand River in Brantford,

---

[99] On Tax and the War on Poverty, see: Tax to Sidney Woolner (November 6, 1964), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 152, Folder 3, SCRC. For his native task force involvement, see also: Joseph A. Califano, Jr. to Tax (October 7, 1966), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 152, Folder 7, SCRC.

[100] This was a particularly odd archival find. Within the papers of an organization called the Center for the Study of Man, a group established at the Smithsonian in the late 1960s and discussed in the next chapter, an unmarked file box of about two hours of speeches delivered by native people from across the country seems out of place, and no corresponding discussion from Center personnel exists. For the reels, see: Center for the Study of Man Records, Series 39 (Sound Recordings), Box 188, NAA.

[101] Lurie, "The Voice of the American Indian: Report on the American Indian Chicago Conference," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 2, No. 5 (December 1961), 478.

Ontario, home to a diverse group of Haudenosaunee people. As he would have it, a chill seemed to have settled between him and the people he had traveled to study. "It seems that the Council has become progressively more particular about investigators staying on the Reserve and the subjects of their inquiries," he jotted quickly into his research diary upon arrival. From what he could gather, he continued, a stroke of luck had befallen him, in that one elder who usually lived on the reserve, Mrs. Hill, appeared to be out of town for the week. "Mrs. Hill is the one who has most recently objected to studies made there by anthropologists," Fenton explained further.[102] Later in the trip, a discussion with another community member, Howard Sky, shed little light for him on why white people were no longer allowed inside of the Onondaga longhouses nearby.[103]

Fenton busied himself by talking to those who would listen to him. "This research in no way concerned itself with present conditions on the reserve," he would insist to his contacts—and perhaps also for himself—in his research notes later that day. He further noted that, in order to gain access to a formal community meeting within a longhouse, he had been required to justify himself to another cohort of leaders. "Indeed, as it is often alleged, 'Fenton has made his living off us Indians,'" he portrayed their conversation later. "I owe my whole career to them and I would be less than human not to acknowledge my debt to them." The leaders had allowed him into the community meeting, but he found the observations that he was able to record unproductive with him in their presence.[104]

---

[102] Fenton, untitled research notes (April 3, 1969), Fenton Papers, Series V, Box 5, Folder "Six Nations Reserve, Brantford," APS.

[103] Fenton, untitled research notes (June 16, 1969), Fenton Papers, Series V, Box 5, Folder "Six Nations Reserve, Brantford," APS.

[104] Fenton, untitled research notes (April 3, 1969).

A week later, Fenton detailed an evening that he had spent showing historical photographs of some cultural materials that had found their way into European museum collections to the community members. It was a tactic that he had employed to generate discussion of historical materials, but conversation strayed quickly from the images, he recalled. One at the table "questioned me about my role as an anthropologist and accused me of making money from recordings made in 1941 at the expense of the Six Nations and not recompensing my sources—at least, not enough." This comment had apparently soured the evening, and the photographs that he had brought along soon became just "another exhibition of what the White man gets out of the Indcians [*sic*] or out of his Indian experience." Some at the dinner used the moment as "a spring board for venting their aggression and hostility," Fenton lamented further. "I recognized in the disturbed young people what we face in the young militants at the universities." With tribal elders, "adherents to the old system of life," as he would have it, and a few other sympathetic community members, Fenton claimed to have shared an "element of frustration" during the whole event. "Those who were sympathetic characteristically remained silent and only revealed themselves privately in approaching me afterward," he assured himself later.[105]

Fenton also found himself justifying his research methods both to the community members and to another anthropologist who would also visit the reservation during his stay. A proponent of "the older ethnology," as he described it, "I made the point that I was simply interested in certain types of humanistic inquiry." Such research methods "did not touch the present situation," Fenton continued, "except as the younger longhousers

[105] Fenton, untitled research notes (April 14, 1969), Fenton Papers, Series V, Box 5, Folder "Six Nations Reserve, Brantford," APS.

feel that it is a kind of colonialism." He insisted that he had no objection to research that purported to address the present, as long as it was "done with rigor."[106]

As ever, Fenton maintained his control over what counted as rigorous research, and he held little in reserve when expressing this to the Haudenosaunee in 1969. He had traveled to Brantford, he admitted, in search of an *old system of life* to record, but found that even what little of his fictitious image of such a system remained was hostile to him, a sentiment that he attempted to share with tribal elders with whom he spoke during the visit to no avail. Despite his insistence that he staked no claims to their present situation, his perceived subjects rejected him with a more sophisticated rebuke of the colonial nature of his work than he would ever grasp. Cornplanter had died only a decade before this research trip. To Fenton, he embodied a bygone era of the cultural anthropological research that had eschewed concern with the present. "In Jesse Cornplanter I had at last found Boas's George Hunt," Fenton would claim of their relationship in an intellectual biography of him presented at the American Ethnological Society in 1976.[107] This, too, lent himself too much credit; Boas and Hunt had at least co-published some materials.

Conclusion

In her talk at the Anthropology and the American Indian conference the next year in 1970, Bea Medicine soon remarked, "Anthropologists always study someone else,

[106] Fenton, untitled research notes (June 9, 1969), Fenton Papers, Series V, Box 5, Folder "Six Nations Reserve, Brantford," APS.

[107] Fenton, "'Aboriginally Yours,'" 212.

George Hunt was a Tlingit advisor to Boas during his research career along the Northwest Coast. The historian Isaiah Lorado Wilner has written extensively about this chapter of Boas's fieldwork, but on his relationship with Hunt, see specifically: Isaiah Lorado Wilner, "Friends in this World: The Relationship of George Hunt and Franz Boas," in *The Franz Boas Papers, Volume 1: Franz Boas as Public Intellectual-Theory, Ethnography, Activism*, ed. Regna Darnell (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015): 163–190.

but, despite this, are not able to make generalizations that are useful for students to apply to contemporary Indians."[108] She understood that the very enterprise of anthropology, the credibility of its scientists, and its study of culture still oriented itself toward the past. "We are judged on the body of knowledge that you have preserved and not what we are today," Vine Deloria added in his response at the end of the panel before the chair invited comments from members of an audience that included native and non-native scholars.[109]

In the decade since the American Indian Chicago Conference, native activism had flourished while the organizers' parallel goal to bolster the practice of anthropological science in service of contemporary problems had stalled.[110] It was a strike against Tax's program of action anthropology, which had sought to teach practitioners as much as it aided their subjects. Anthropologists would soon find that native activism had coalesced around the material of their discipline, but that they had little to say in response.

[108] Medicine, "Anthropologists and American Indian Studies Programs," 83.

[109] Deloria, "Some Criticisms and a Number of Suggestions," in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 94.

[110] Cobb recounts how activists actually left the conference and immediately took their next steps in organizing for broader political campaigns for the rest of the decade. See, on the immediate wake of the conference: Cobb, "Dilemmas," in *Native Activism in Cold War America*: 58–79.

4 | A NATIONAL MUSEUM OF MAN ON THE MALL'S LAST PLOT: ANTHROPOLOGY AND CULTURE AT THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, 1965–1976

A researcher who travels to Washington, D.C. in order to consult the Smithsonian Institution's records from between approximately 1960 and the 1980 will encounter frequent references to a Museum of Man in the letters and memoranda of officials during this period but no corresponding museum building along the National Mall to visit.

Its absence is particularly curious for our narrative. On December 23, 1969, the Congressman Frank Bow from Ohio, also a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian, introduced legislation to the House of Representatives to appropriate the block of land on the southeastern edge of the Mall, an oblong triangular plot bounded on its sides roughly "by 3rd Street, Maryland Avenue, 4th Street and Jefferson Drive," as a site for a future Museum of Man as part of the Smithsonian's consortium.[1] The plot was valuable: Its geographical footprint near the Capitol was "the last remaining building site on the Mall," the Smithsonian's Regents had claimed a month earlier at their most recent meeting, during which they also drafted this first legislative proposal.[2] And the vision

[1] Frank T. Bow "Museum of Man," Congressional Record Vol. 115, Pt. 30: House of Representatives (December 23, 1969), 41000.

The proposed location of the Museum of Man is in itself also curious. This is the plot that would in 1989 be legislated for the National Museum of the American Indian, which would eventually open on the spot in 2004. The tensions between these two proposals are explored here and in the next chapter.

[2] "Proceedings of the Board of Regents Meeting held on November 5, 1969," Record Unit 1: Board of Regents Minutes, 1846–1995, Box 9, Folder 8, Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA), Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.), 37.

that officials had for the proposed Museum of Man was valuable as well, they insisted. "For the first time," such an institution would "put in a single worldwide context all studies and exhibits of cultures and peoples from the earliest time to the present."[3] In the Senate, William Fulbright of Arkansas proposed a similar bill with the same language.[4]

Other justifications for the construction of a national Museum of Man stemmed from the increasingly outdated organization of the Smithsonian's flagship United States National Museum, which had been renamed the National Museum of Natural History earlier that year in the spring of 1969. Regents, curators, administrative officials, and Smithsonian-affiliated anthropologists alike recognized that a museum displaying natural historical specimens like rocks, fossils, and animal replicas alongside centuries of collected cultural materials—pottery, clothing, other art and artifacts, and human remains—of indigenous groups that also comprised the museum's specimens had outlived the vision of its turn-of-the-century grand design.[5] The Smithsonian had in turn lost its status as a leading institution for anthropological science in recent decades, and Congressional approval for this allotment to build the Museum of Man would serve to "re-establish the

[3] Bow, "Museum of Man," 41000.

[4] J. William Fulbright, "Introduction of Bills Relating to the Smithsonian Institution," Congressional Record Vol. 115, Pt. 27: Senate (December 4, 1969), 36972–36974.

[5] William Walker has written about the institutional efforts that fostered the vision of the Smithsonian's National Museum as what those involved called a universal museum: with this perceived history of the natural world and mankind side by side. See specifically: William S. Walker, "The Universal Museum: Shaping Cultural Exhibition at the Smithsonian," in *A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013): 11–43.

The turn-of-the-century context of the Smithsonian's museum and its anthropological collections was also connected to the broader history of anthropology and the displays of racialized and historicized others at the flurry of world's fairs that proliferated at the time. See also, for example: Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986) and Nancy J. Parezo and Don D. Fowler, *Anthropology Goes to the Fair: The 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2007).

Institution's primacy in the field of anthropology," Secretary S. Dillon Ripley testified further in a letter that he forwarded to Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona and others that was subsequently printed into the Congressional Record for consideration during their 1970 summer session.[6] Because the broader discipline of anthropology was "a field that is rapidly undergoing a fundamental change," he continued, "both in the attitudes of its practitioners and in their sightings of new scholarly objectives," the Smithsonian, with its catalog of hundreds of thousands of relevant specimens, should seek to lead the change with a new institution for anthropology that could serve both science and the public.[7]

When it eventually reached the desks of the members of the House Committee on Appropriations in 1974, the Smithsonian's appeal to assume control of the Mall plot specifically for the purpose of a Museum of Man floundered.[8] While this space would be preserved for future Smithsonian use, the Museum of Man itself proved a more difficult sell to Congress. Perhaps because it was always accompanied by an endless list of other projects to be completed within the Smithsonian consortium or because concrete plans about the organizational restructuring that it would require never quite materialized, administrators who secured the Smithsonian's yearly funding in Congress would speak of the Museum of Man project as forthcoming until the mid-1980s when it faded away.

Internally, the Smithsonian's plans remained even less concrete than they appeared in the Congressional Record from the same time. At an executive meeting in

[6] S. Dillon Ripley to Barry M. Goldwater (June 5, 1970), Congressional Record Vol. 116, Pt. 9: Senate (July 22, 1970), 25418.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] The Smithsonian budgetary meetings were often relegated to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that dealt specifically with the Department of the Interior and similar agencies, and it appears that the Museum of Man never progressed further than subcommittee discussions and testimony.

the spring of 1973, administrators discussed further possibilities for "the last remaining site on the Mall," and among them at the meeting it was "suggested that [the site] might become a Museum of the American Indian," an administrative assistant reminded the group in a memo later.[9] One recipient, the Director of the National Portrait Gallery, enthusiastically agreed. The museum could "deal with the subject in an absolute way—the unique achievements of each tribe on its own terms," he wrote to Secretary Ripley on the subject. "I think it is high time that the American Indian was seen primarily on his own terms, rather than solely through the eyes of ethnologists, sociologists, historians, art historians, etc." He further noted that he had been enlightened by a recent trip to the new Museo Nacional de Antropología in Mexico City, which made him "cognizant" of the "values of these various cultures," because they had opted for such an arrangement.[10]

Others disagreed. "I believe that the American Indian could be one major focus within a broader Museum of Man concept," an undersecretary responded to the group.[11] "I suggest as an appropriate theme 'Man and the Environment,'" another added.[12] "I must say I am extremely cool to the idea of developing a Museum of the American Indian," an administrator who oversaw the Office of Museum Programs chimed in on the matter. "Haven't they been on the reservation long enough? Even though the location is one of

[9] Dorothy Rosenberg to Members of the Executive Committee (Memorandum) (May 2, 1973), Accession 82-089: Office of the Secretary Records, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA), Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.).

[10] Marvin S. Sadik to Ripley (May 4, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974," SIA.

[11] Robert A. Brooks to Rosenberg (May 7, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974," SIA.

[12] Julian T. Euell to Rosenberg (May 22, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" SIA.

the most dignified in the country, wouldn't that just again underline their separateness?," he continued in yet another endorsement of the Museum of Man concept.[13] The empty plot, which sat just to the side of the foot of the Capitol's steps, seemed to bestow special meaning to whichever group might come to be represented in the future museum there, the administrators argued among themselves. "I can't see the justification for a museum of the size we're considering devoted solely to the American Indian…any more than to any other ethnic group, " another undersecretary detractor said in response. "We could certainly have an entire hall in the new museum as a tribute to our American Indians."[14]

This, too, exposed a point of contention, even among the many administrative detractors from the Museum of the American Indian proposal. "There appears to be no serious difficulty with a charge of divisiveness, as I had earlier feared, growing out of the dedication of a museum to this one ethnic group," yet another undersecretary added, disagreeing with the characterization above. Instead, he warned the group, "there are militants who are actively protesting the display of Indian icons and skeletal remains."[15] The Director of Government Relations concurred with the observation. "Indian tribalism and identity is so fluid at this moment and historical perspective is so slight that in creating a specific museum we might find ourselves in continued negotiations with

---

[13] Paul N. Perrot to Rosenberg (May 8, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" SIA.

[14] Richard L. Ault to Rosenberg (May 4, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" SIA.

[15] James Bradley to Ripley (May 10, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" SIA.

The negotiations between Smithsonian officials and indigenous scholars and representatives who were variously protesting and advocating for the repatriation of such materials are the subject of the next chapter, in which curators and other museum administrations from the Smithsonian and beyond will again level the "militant" label against all indigenous groups in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

elected tribal governments and the usurpers over exhibits, employment, and scholarship," she said.[16] Both concurred that the plot would best serve the Smithsonian as a Museum of Man with a special wing of American Indian materials, with the undersecretary adding that the site should represent an "eclectic museum of excellence and diversity."[17]

Still, the question of what to do with the vast repository of indigenous material that currently occupied the National Museum of Natural History remained on the minds of administrators. One jotted a short handwritten note to Ripley that any Museum of Man proposal would have to address the issue. A universal cultural museum was needed to "take them and others out from among the animals in Natural History," he insisted.[18] Within the halls of the Museum of Man, "their beliefs and customs, their origins, and their accomplishments could be shown with impartiality as part of the great pilgrimage of man from continent to continent and from the cave, to the cathedral, to the laboratory."[19]

This chapter situates these administrators' discussion about how to fill the Mall's last plot within the broader discussions about and changes to the Smithsonian's programs

---

[16] Margaret Gaynor to Rosenberg (May 7, 1973), Acc. 82-089, Box 1, Folder "Museum of Man, 1964–1974" SIA.

This administrator continued on to suggest that a program designed in collaboration with the "Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Arts and the Humanities endowments, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the tribes themselves" would better suit multiple potential museums of the American Indian across the country.

[17] Bradley to Ripley (May 10, 1973).

[18] Perrot, note on Rosenberg to Members of the Executive Committee (May 2, 1973).

Walker has written elsewhere about the exhibitions of indigenous materials and culture that had begun to take shape through the Festival of American Folklife at this time, and suggests that this would become the lasting model for the Smithsonian's treatment of indigenous material. See also: Walker, "'We Don't Live Like That Anymore': Native Peoples at the Smithsonian's Festival of American Folklife, 1970–1976." *American Indian Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 4 (Fall 2011): 479–514.

[19] Perrot to Rosenberg (May 8, 1973).

Interestingly, this respondent also noted that the Mexican Museo Nacional de Antropología model could not be replicated in the U.S. on the same terms, as the Museo Nacional was "trying to recapture some of the might and creativity [Mexico] had in pre-Columbian days" as part of a contemporary project in nationalism in a way that a Museum of the American Indian would not.

in anthropology during the late 1960s and early 1970s. The period marked one of major change within the institution both for the discipline of anthropology and for studies of culture. Ripley had in 1964 announced his decision to cease all future activity of the Smithsonian's longstanding Bureau of American Ethnology, which had been established in 1879 as a direct way to transfer information between U.S. government agencies so that the Smithsonian could archive the American Indian object and archival records collected by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[20] In 1965, the Bureau of American Ethnology merged with a separate Department of Anthropology to form a short-lived Smithsonian Office of Anthropological Research, which would then become the National Anthropological Archives in 1968. At the same time, a Center for the Study of Man was established in early 1968, just in time to follow the institution's first Festival of American Folklife that celebrated the theme of performance in 1967.

As the administrators' discussion about the Museum of Man in 1973 revealed, questions about cultural universality, plurality, and diversity proliferated as they so often did during the midcentury period in the background of these changes to the Smithsonian. The museum historian William Walker has noted that commentators and administrators puzzled between "therapeutic portrait[s] of pluralism" and the "complexity of diversity" in the Smithsonian's national vision at this time, both in discussions about the Museum of Man and other new and evolving programming.[21] This chapter considers this dichotomy as a manifestation of the intellectual-historical climate of midcentury anthropological

[20] For a definitive history of the career of the Bureau from the 1870s to the 1960s, see: Richard B. Woodbury and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury, "The Rise and Fall of the Bureau of American Ethnology," *Journal of the Southwest* Vol. 41, No. 3 (Autumn 1999): 283–296.

[21] Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 154.

culture. Just as anthropologists were considering the boundaries of their work, the nature of their subjects, and their discipline's history, currents of change at the Smithsonian, an institutional body with which many anthropologists were either directly or indirectly involved, allowed for further discussions of culture as it might be displayed back to the nation in a Museum of Man, sometimes called in passing a Museum of Cultures.[22]

Residue of salvage talk among anthropologists and their institutions permeated through the discussions as well. Contemporary practitioners warned of the "threat of the extinction of cultures," a fear that had motivated—or, been employed to validate—both anthropological research and its data and object collection for decades if not centuries.[23] The anthropologist-historian of science Rebecca Lemov has also identified and written widely about a collective sense of what she calls a "second-order endangerment" that pervaded the discipline of anthropology in this period. Not only were their subjects in danger of disappearance, some practitioners feared, but so too were their very methods of

[22] The French historian Marie Plassart has also noticed an odd series of earlier references to a "Museum of Man" in Smithsonian records during the 1950s, contemporary to when Smithsonian officials began to plan an American history museum. It appears that this was a temporary name given to what would become the Museum of History and Technology, now the National Museum of American History, when it opened in 1964. See: Marie Plassart, "Narrating 'America': The Birth of the Museum of History and Technology in Washington, D.C., 1945–1967," *European Journal of American Studies* Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring 2007): 2–19. Smithsonian historian Pamela Henson also suggests that some anthropologists considered a potential move from the National Museum, which contained natural historical and anthropological materials, to the new Museum of History and Technology, which may explain the early references to the Museum of Man in this context. See also: Pamela M. Henson, "'Objects of Curious Research': The History of Science and Technology at the Smithsonian," *Isis* Vol. 90, Supplement: Catching up with the Vision (1999), S262.

[23] Jacob W. Gruber, "Ethnographic Salvage and the Shaping of Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 72, No. 6 (December 1970), 1290.

An important discussion has recently arisen among ethnohistorians and other scholars of native history and anthropology about how to work with the materials left behind by so-called salvage ethnographers like Franz Boas, whose cultural writing is often riddled with misinformation but also represents some of the few remaining records of linguistic or other cultural detail. On the subject, see the recent: Stephen Warren and Ben Barnes, "Salvaging the Salvage Anthropologists: Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin, Carl Voegelin, and the Future of Ethnohistory," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 65, No. 2 (April 2018): 189–214.

preserving them and the physical documents that they had left behind through their ethnographic work.[24] Lemov argues that this engendered a "particular way of arranging objects and ordering systems" among these midcentury anthropologists.[25] The archival and museum arrangements organized at the Smithsonian for anthropology at this time would share the same effect: Even real estate along the Mall appeared endangered.[26] The contemporary endeavors in archiving and displaying the institution's vast repository of cultural materials compelled Smithsonian-affiliated administrators and anthropologists to frame and justify their work deliberately, and the evolution of their ideas between about the mid-1960s and mid-late 1970s often absorbed meaning both from this disciplinary milieu and from a broader national public that the Smithsonian served.

The series of bureaucratic changes to the Smithsonian at this time reflected these ideas as well. As the Secretary arranged and rearranged the Smithsonian's new cultural departments and other initiatives during the decade, competing impulses surfaced, and the tensions between cultural universality, pluralism, and diversity as envisaged both by practitioners and the public challenged institutional officials. This chapter explores yet again how many of these bureaucratic changes and the discussions that surrounded them interwove with how those involved understood midcentury anthropological *culture*.

---

[24] Rebecca Lemov, "Anthropological Data in Danger, c. 1945–1965," in *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, eds. Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2015): 87–111.

Lemov writes further about a type of cataloging card that a certain cohort used to preserve memories of dreams, themselves perceived to be ephemeral data, that did actually disappear at this time here: Lemov, *Database of Dreams: The Lost Quest to Catalog Humanity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015).

[25] Lemov, "Anthropological Data in Danger," 89.

[26] Adrianna Link has written about the new program in "urgent anthropology" developed and instituted at the Smithsonian during this time, which she identifies particularly in the work of a film center established to record ethnographic data on video and also in the rise of ecological programming. See: Adrianna Link, "Documenting Human Nature: E. Richard Sorenson and the National Anthropological Film Center, 1970–1984," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 56, No. 4 (September 2016): 371–391.

Fiscal year 1964 to 1965 was an eventful one for the Smithsonian. Ripley, an ornithologist who had previously headed Yale University's Peabody Museum of Natural History, started his tenure as the Secretary. Upon assuming the new post, he promptly began to inquire among staff about the utility of the Bureau of American Ethnology, an internal organization that had supported a network of anthropological researchers with funding and as an informational repository for nearly a century. The Bureau operated separately from the organization's Department of Anthropology, which conserved the objects and materials that populated the so-called Indian halls of the National Museum.

Ripley told reporters at his first press conference that he planned to expand the "guts behind the façade" of the consortium of museums and institutions now under his care.[27] The Bureau perhaps attracted his attention on these grounds because of its latent contributions to the public-facing exhibitions of the National Museum. Ripley was hardly the first midcentury Smithsonian Secretary to order an inquiry into the organization, and Bureau anthropologists had written to the Secretary's office for years pleading for more funding and stronger support of their work. In response to a late-1940s investigation, an affiliated anthropologist told the then-Secretary, "Field work demands funds for travel and for hire of informants and subsistence in the field," which he estimated to be "about $500 per scientist per year."[28] Those funds had diminished as the Smithsonian instead diverted its budget to wartime research, he added further. When Ripley again inquired to

[27] Jean M. White, "Smithsonian's New Director Proposes to Put 'Guts Behind Façade' of Museum," *Washington Post* (February 7, 1964), C1.

[28] William N. Fenton to Matthew W. Stirling (May 19, 1947), Record Unit 50: Office of the Secretary Records, Box 41, Folder "B.A.E.," SIA.

Bureau-affiliated personnel about the function of their work in 1964, an official mailed back a long report that informed him that the Bureau's "functions are the conducting and encouraging of research, especially on Indian customs, language, and history." Although it housed what the report claimed was among "the world's most extensive collection[s] of manuscripts and photographs on American Indians," its prestige had certainly lapsed.[29]

The following year would also mark the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of the Smithsonian's namesake, its founding donor James Smithson, an early-nineteenth-century English chemist who had upon his death in 1829 left the whole of his estate to the United States government for a new institution that would promote the *increase and diffusion of knowledge among men*. In 1965, officials saw the anniversary as an opportunity to bolster the institution's twentieth-century prestige among scientists. With a promise that Smithson's ideal "ignored considerations of nationality, private interest, and narrow scholarly specialization," they secured additional funding from Congress for a multi-day event.[30] The Bicentennial saw Smithsonian scholars marching in robes, per a participant's recollection, with banners and bagpipes waving and blaring as they walked along the Mall in an act of true pageantry. The event served as a sort of "intellectual show business," he observed.[31] Nearly two thousand prominent external scholars, including perhaps most notably the French ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss and the nuclear physicist J. Robert

[29] Functions of the Bureau of American Ethnology," RU 50, Box 41, Folder "B.A.E.," SIA.

[30] The quoted language comes from the joint resolution passed in August of 1965, Public Law 89-124.

[31] Wilton S. Dillon, *Smithsonian Stories: Chronicles of a Golden Age* (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017), *iv*. On the Smithsonian's preparation for and pageantry during the Bicentennial, see also an instructive blog post about the event from a former Smithsonian intern that details the specific marketing and regalia redesigns that the institution undertook for the event: Elaura Dunning, "Marketing and the Smithson Bicentennial" (November 6, 2012): https://siarchives.si.edu/blog/marketing-and-smithson-bicentennial.

Oppenheimer, joined the procession.[32] Lévi-Strauss and Oppenheimer gave speeches, as did President Lyndon Johnson, who lauded Smithson as "our nation's first great benefactor" whose nineteenth-century interest in learning must still be "the first work of a nation that seeks to be free."[33] The Smithsonian Institution had carried the torch since its formal establishment in 1846, a reporter for the *New York Times* added, with its scientists and scholars now "assembling, preserving and making available to the world artistic and technological accomplishments of many epochs and civilizations."[34] A new Smithsonian flag, a goldenrod sun symbolizing scientific achievement and worldwide enlightenment that had been designed specifically for the event by the up-and-coming graphic artist Crimilda Pontes, even waved over the crowd in its debut as part of the ceremony.[35] In contrast with the celebrations of the centennial of the opening of the National Museum that officials and curators had designed in the 1940s, which had featured static displays and drawings of native materials from the collections, the fanfare of the Bicentennial in 1965 delineated a new era of collaborative research and programming at the institution.[36]

Ripley used the occasion to position the Smithsonian as an institution that could again assume a prominent position in the anthropological sciences. "Museum laboratories can play a most valuable part as adjuncts in higher education," he had told the museum scholars and administrators gathered for the annual meeting of the American Association

---

[32] A fuller list of preeminent attendees can be found in the write-up from *Science* magazine: "International Gathering to Mark Smithsonian Bicentennial," *Science* Vol. 149, No. 3687 (August 1965), 954.

[33] "Text of President's Remarks at Smithsonian Fete," *Washington Post* (September 17, 1965), A7.

[34] "Mr. Smithson's 'Establishment,'" *New York Times* (September 16, 1965), 46.

[35] Meryle Secrest, "Her Flags Will Wave On the Mall," *Washington Post* (September 16, 1965), A1.

[36] For a description and drawings of the displays from the 1940s centennial, see: Record Unit 46: Office of the Secretary Records, Box 51, Folder "Description of Proposed Exhibits," Folder "Smithsonian Centennial Great Hall and Children's Room Exhibit, Report, 1940s," SIA.

of Museums the year before.[37] He would affirm this sentiment again at the Bicentennial, when in his Secretary's address to the crowd he insisted that universities "include museum objects as a vital part of higher education."[38] The assembled parade of scholars looking up at Ripley in their academic regalia reinforced the suggestion visually. It was a plea for the relevance of the vast material collections of the Smithsonian's museums, and this vision would further come to characterize the new programs, internal initiatives, and events that commenced over the next decade across the consortium in anthropology and beyond.

Lévi-Strauss spent his allotted time celebrating the history of the Bureau, the nineteenth-century Annual Reports of which he fondly recalled stumbling across as a young anthropologist at a used bookstore in Manhattan that oddly sold old government documents and manuals. "That these sacrosanct volumes, representing most of what will remain known about the American Indian, could actually be bought and privately owned was something I had never dreamed of," he exclaimed to the crowd.[39] Lemov reads this speech as a model of her concept of second-order endangerment.[40] As Lévi-Strauss continued on, he lamented in turn both the rapid disappearance of the anthropological discipline's "traditional subject matter: the so-called primitives" and further the possible perception among scholars that the Bureau volumes that he had discovered and preserved in the used bookstore so many years before held little valuable information for them.[41]

---

[37] Ripley, "Where do we go from here?," Accession 84-219: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 1, Folder "Where do we go from here? American Association of Museums, 5/28/1964)," SIA.

[38] Ripley, "Museum as an Enigma," Acc. 84-219, Box 1, Folder "Bicentennial Speeches," SIA.

[39] Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Anthropology: Its Achievements and Future," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 7, No. 2 (April 1966), 124.

[40] Lemov, "Anthropological Data in Danger," 87.

[41] Lévi-Strauss, "Anthropology," 124.

This particular frame from Lévi-Strauss was perhaps driven by a fear on his part that the cultural anthropological work of the Bureau might be relegated to the past, slid onto a repository shelf and forgotten. Ripley had recently absorbed the Bureau into a new Office of Anthropological Research at the Smithsonian and thereby ceased its publication wing, but within the annals of its historical publications, anthropologists "should seek in these achievements a living inspiration," Lévi-Strauss continued.[42] Their work with so-called primitive people remained as significant as—if not now more important than—ever. Because memories of this cultural information increasingly faded in the modern world, as he would have it, "Anthropology itself must undergo a deep transformation in order to carry on its work among those cultures for whose study it was intended because they lack a written record of their history."[43] This new Office appeared poised in the minds of administrators and affiliated scholars to lead new cultural programs that could operate at once in the past and the present. This balance would, of course, prove more difficult in practice than in the rhetorical flourishes of a speech.

Ripley also noted in his speech that he had bigger plans for the Smithsonian's cultural programs in his upcoming tenure at the institution. "It is our Institution's desire to contribute to the cultural scene," both of the capital and beyond, he concluded.[44] It was a sentiment that he would echo again just two weeks later to fellow museum leaders at an

[42] Lévi-Strauss, "Anthropology," 124.

[43] *Ibid.*, 126.

[44] Ripley, "Museum as an Enigma."

What exactly he meant by "culture" here is ambiguous, as is often the case during this period. Ripley at once seemed eager to meet the demand for historical record keeping as envisaged by Lévi-Strauss and also in inviting programs for folk life and performance, which would soon be enacted during the first Festival of American Folklife during the summer of 1967.

International Council of Museums event, where he spoke about the sense of "rapid change" spreading across the world and the demand for museum leaders to ensure that members of the public "have the same opportunity to imbibe culture, for understanding of the arts, and for familiarity with science, as part of their heritage as Americans."[45] This vision would further come to define the next decade as well, often bringing with it further conflicts between other simultaneous impulses toward academic prestige, an interest in cultural record keeping, and conservation of man's environment at the Smithsonian. As ever, tensions between our familiar binaries—the past and the present, the universal and the particular, the local and the national and even the international—would characterize the treatment of culture, and in the case of the Smithsonian they would eventually doom the Museum of Man and other contemporary projects in the study of culture undertaken by the institution during the decade. By the time of the national Bicentennial celebration in 1976, anthropology's dominion over culture had begun to slip.

Smithsonian's Folklife and Mankind

In the last week of June in 1967, a facilities crew arrived at the section of the Mall across from the Smithsonian's Museum of History and Technology to erect a crafts tent, a sales tent, and a performance stage for a novel event to be held the following week on the site. The occasion was the Smithsonian's first Festival of American Folklife. A small cohort of musicians, artisans, and crafts people had received an invitation to perform their cultures and sell their wares in Washington, D.C. during the year's Independence Day celebrations. Although Congress had declined to fund the venture, which it denounced as

[45] Ripley, "Museums in Today's Changing World," Acc. 84-219, Box 1, Folder "Museums in Today's Changing World—ICOM 9/27/1965," SIA.

a series of "frivolous festivities," Ripley held the event anyway as part of his plan for the Smithsonian to regain its status as the proprietor of cultural livelihood within the nation's capital and particularly in and around the Smithsonian's buildings downtown.[46]

By all accounts, the endeavor would succeed on this front. Over the long weekend of the Fourth of July, visitors could walk in one direction and see a sheep shearing, in another direction and see a basket weaving, and then across the street to watch rotating performances of drumming and dancing on the stage.[47] "One man in a Brooks Brothers suit watches with total fascination while a blacksmith from upstate New York struck his forge in a musical rhythm as he hammered out a fire tong," a reporter observed from amidst the crowd.[48] Inside the marble-walled museums, another said, folk materials are all "discreetly displayed, precisely labeled, and dead," but outside under the trees that lined the greenway, they could "burst into life before the astonished eyes of hundreds of visitors."[49] Appalachian metalworkers, native potters, and Irish-American step dancers all, to the Smithsonian's eye, were exemplars of the U.S's folk culture, and their presence at the Festival of American Folklife had bolstered the Smithsonian's "long range effort to define the nation's cultural heritage," as another reporter described it.[50]

The Secretary's office received a folder full of praise from participants, both members of the public and the performers and craftspeople themselves. "We have heard

[46] Mary McGrory, "Washingtonians Have A Ball on the Mall—Despite Congress," *Boston Globe* (July 4, 1967), 12.

[47] Boris Weintraub, "Folklore Fete to Enliven Washington," *Chicago Tribune* (June 11, 1967), 70.

[48] McGrory, "A Cultural Center For Washington," *Atlanta Constitution* (July 10, 1967), 4.

[49] Paul Richard, "Folk Art Show Opens at Mall," *Washington Post, Times Herald* (July 2, 1967), D1.

[50] Weintraub, "Folklore Fete to Enliven Washington."

from members by word of mouth that they thought the Folk Festival was 'just great,'" an assistant relayed to Ripley in a memo from the weeks after the event.[51] A grade-school-aged attendee, with the added flourish of an original doodle of herself, her siblings, and their mother on the Mall from the weekend drawn in blue ballpoint pen in the middle of the page, chimed in with her own handwritten note of agreement:

> I think having all the craftspeople on the Mall was just wonderful. Please do it again next year. I think you should have a few more crafts people—like the Indians. I loved the Indian woman who wore such pretty belts.[52]

In a letter mailed to the Division of Performing Arts, another visitor had "articulated a good theme for us," an official remarked to Ripley.[53] The Festival had "let us (Americans) really discover ourselves with the help of a great institution—the Smithsonian," she said.[54] Yet another attendee echoed her sentiment further: "I hope that the artists who took part in the festival will go home feeling more a part of these United States and that we who were entertained by them will appreciate our great heritage more."[55]

By all counts, the Smithsonian's interest in shaping ideas about national cultural heritage had similarly been a success, with relatively little expenditure on the institution's end. Mr. and Mrs. Cochwytewa, a basket maker and a silversmith, Mr. Edd Presnell, a dulcimer and banjo maker, and the Homer Miracle family, bowl makers and doll makers, among the few dozen other folk life representatives, had had their expenses covered to

---

[51] Lisa Suter to Ripley (August 14, 1967), Record Unit 99: Office of the Secretary Records, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[52] Lila Fendrick to Ripley (August 7, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[53] James R. Morris to Ripley (July 24, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[54] Commander and Mrs. Sylvan Tanner to Morris (July 5, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[55] Mrs. Irwin O. Bryant to Ripley (July 10, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

and from the capital in order to attend the event, where they performed without further payment.[56] "I do not think we can again convince people to perform free of charge," an official confided to Ripley after the weekend while planning for next summer's festival.[57] This all seemed within reason, however, as Ripley and other administrators had during their planning phase designated themselves patrons of folk culture. "Deprived of support of any kind," they had written in an initial proposal, folk culture, distinguished both from what they called academic or fine arts culture and further from popular culture, was "essentially dependent on oral tradition for transmission and upon its own intrinsic merit for its existence." It therefore needed this institutional support that "must originate at the highest level while working directly at the grass roots level of our culture," the proposal had insisted further.[58] The Festival, along with a supplementary "year-round program for the collection, preservation and encouragement of these traditional arts" hosted within various sites at the Smithsonian, would meet the need for now.[59]

The triumph of the first festival was enough to secure Congressional funding for the next few years. After two more festivals held in the same fashion over the subsequent summers, with hundreds more folk artists invited to participate and tens of thousands more visitors flocked to the capital for Independence Day weekend, Ripley soon found himself testifying before Congress about a proposed American Folklife Foundation Act, which sought to establish a formal folk life wing of the Smithsonian, in 1970. "Each

[56] "Festival of American Folklife: Participant Expenses," RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA. Total expenses for participant travel were estimated here at $43,000.

[57] Morris to Ripley (October 20, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[58] "Proposal: A Festival of American Folk Life," RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

[59] "Smithsonian Plans Folklife Festival: Scholarly Seminar also Scheduled" (press release) (July 1–4, 1967), RU 99, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

American enjoys the distinctive ways of his family, ethnic group, region, and occupation which comprises his traditional or folk culture as well as sharing with all Americans a common body of customs and traditions which is our national culture and heritage," the legislation text declared of the importance of folk culture.[60] It seemed in keeping with the vision of the Smithsonian's Festival of American Folklife. Oddly, this version of the bill stalled for several more years, as first Ripley and then two other Smithsonian-affiliated academics undermined its prospects on both institutional and scholarly grounds during these hearings in 1970.[61] Proponents of the folk life foundation eventually regrouped with a revised proposal, and the foundation found a home at the Library of Congress in 1976.

Nonetheless, for our purposes the initial proposal and its subsequent iterations were justified on terms familiar to salvage anthropology. "As we become a people as well as a nation, we are losing many of these diverse strains of our cultural heritage," the legislative text read.[62] This closely echoed Ripley's own thinking on the matter. "Rather than feeling that they have walked through some invisible barrier to the past," he would recall to an interviewer later about his vision of folk culture at the Smithsonian, "they should enter without any such barrier, carrying the present with them and realizing that the past is alive."[63] The cultures of the diverse folk, now designated important relics of the

[60] U.S. Congress, Senate, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to Establish a U.S. Folklife Foundation (S. 1591), 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. (May 18. 1970).

[61] This is the recollection of a folklorist speaking of the events at a conference many years later, who said that Ripley was influenced by the two other scholars behind the scenes before the hearing. See: Peggy A. Bulger, "Looking Back, Moving Forward: The Development of Folklore as a Public Profession," *The Journal of American Folklore* Vol. 116, No. 462 (Autumn 2003), 380–381.

[62] Hearing before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to Establish a U.S. Folklife Foundation.

[63] "Folklife and the Smithsonian Institution" (interview with Ripley), Acc. 84-224, Box 3, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

nation's past, could and should be preserved in the present, the Smithsonian's and broader folk life programs insisted at this time.[64] This attitude was mirrored within the Smithsonian's museum laboratories as well, although mobilized to different ends.

Walker writes of the Smithsonian's earliest Festivals of American Folklife as experiments in "open education," an impulse found in Ripley's ideas about the future of the Smithsonian to engage the public even beyond museum walls with its educational programs.[65] Aesthetically, the festivals certainly stood in stark contrast to the museum buildings around them; they were "dusty and hot but also exciting and alive," Walker writes, unlike the dark and climate-controlled halls of static objects inside.[66] Their open-air setting, too, differed from the intricate web of tight corridors connecting conservation laboratories and cluttered offices inhabited by Smithsonian-affiliated scholars beyond the public's eye. And yet, contemporary projects undertaken for the study and preservation of culture by affiliated scholars often sounded more similar to justifications for the festivals than their aesthetic appearance would suggest. In 1966, the year before the first Festival of American Folklife, University of Chicago cultural anthropologist Sol Tax, who had upon Ripley's arrival to the Smithsonian been appointed to a new special advisory role,

---

[64] The study of folk life—music, art, lore—has its own history and historiography in the twentieth-century U.S., from the collection of folklore by Works Progress Administration agents and other researchers for the federal government to the rise of folk festivals since the 1930s. The ethnomusicologist Alan Lomax, who was one of the earliest agents in charge of ethnomusicology recordings, was also directly involved in the Smithsonian's festivals. On the subject of federal folklore projects, see: Burt Feintuch, ed., *The Conservation of Culture: Folklorists and the Public Sector* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky 1988).

Folklorists have also further importantly explored the tensions between ideas about "tradition" and the nation at folk life festivals like the Smithsonian's. See, for example, Laurie Kay Sommers, "Definitions of 'Folk' and 'Lore' in the Smithsonian Festival of American Folklife," *Journal of Folklore Research* Vol. 33, No. 3 (September–December 1996): 227–231. Walker also underscores the fact that indigenous participants expressly challenged these ideas at the festival. See: Walker, "'We Don't Live Like That Anymore,'" 493.

[65] Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 91.

[66] *Ibid.*, 111.

hosted a conference of forty-five cultural anthropologists from the U.S. and beyond, including Lévi-Strauss, Margaret Mead, and other prominent international names, on the subject of cultural change.[67] Organized with longtime Smithsonian anthropological curator William Sturtevant, the event allowed participants to share their "awareness that there are too few anthropologists to keep up with culture change," as they put it.[68]

Attendees further agreed to establish a new program for the most "urgent" cultural research through the Smithsonian. Anthropological participants differed in how they framed the problem: the initiative intended variously to decelerate the rate of change or at least to record as much disappearing cultural data as possible before it vanished for good in what they called the rapidly modernizing world, depending on who described it.[69] "Fieldworkers," they declared collectively, "have felt that in a sense they were producing primary historical documents on a unique cultural situation which would never again be quite the same if indeed it would not soon be totally unrecognizable."[70] While some lamented that informants had begun to reject their treatment in anthropological research past and present, all agreed also that that their international body of collaborative work between cultural scholars of different national origins could again render the discipline "more palatable to such societies."[71] The Smithsonian soon joined with the Wenner-Gren Foundation to begin a small grants program that would aid anthropological researchers

[67] Some of the details about Sol Tax's relationship to the Smithsonian and its anthropology programs, including his designation as a special consultant in 1965, can be found here: Link, "(Re)inventing Urgency: The Case of the Smithsonian's Center for the Study of Man, 1968–1976," *Bérose: Encyclopdie Internationale des Histoires de l'Anthropologie* (May 2021), 4.

[68] "Smithsonian-Wenner-Gren Conference," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 8, No. 4 (October 1967), 355.

[69] This framing was taken explicitly from the speech that Lévi-Strauss gave at the Bicentennial in 1965.

[70] *Ibid*.

[71] *Ibid.*, 356.

engaged in sufficiently urgent research. "It is assumed that recipients of grants in most cases will be nationals of the country where the urgent research is needed," read a short solicitation for applications that ran alongside a summary of the conference presentations in the next issue of *Current Anthropology* for Wenner-Gren contacts.[72]

Ripley had lent his support to the urgent research program a year earlier, when he announced the Smithsonian's plans in an address to attendees at the annual American Anthropological Association's conference in 1965. "What is required is something in the nature of a crash program, and to such a program the Smithsonian is prepared to offer its organization and facilities," he shared.[73] After two more meetings, where anthropologist participants discussed further the contours of urgency, the Smithsonian formally declared the creation of a Center for the Study of Man in 1968 with Tax as a temporary director.[74]

That affiliated anthropologists never quite settled on a shared definition of urgent anthropology or a singular course of action for the program dedicated to it foreshadowed the management of the Center, which would be plagued from its inception by competing interests and projects. Formally, the Smithsonian anthropologists and other personnel of the Center, including Tax, had committed themselves to an "improved understanding of

---

[72] "Smithsonian-Wenner-Gren Conference," 359.

Link has also reproduced the line items of every grant administered through the Smithsonian and the Wenner-Gren as part of this program. They total around fifty grants, with an average amount of around $1000. See the tables here: Link, Appendix 1: "Smithsonian Institution, Urgent Anthropology Small Grants Program, 1966–1978," in "Salvaging a Record for Humankind: Urgent Anthropology at the Smithsonian, 1964–1986," Ph.D. Diss. (The Johns Hopkins University, 2016), 273–287.

[73] Ripley, "Address to the Council of Fellows of the American Anthropological Association" (November 20, 1965), Acc. 84-219, Box 8, Folder "Anthropological Society of D.C., 1980," SIA.

[74] Link, "(Re)Inventing Urgency," 7.

For negotiations on definitions of urgency stemming from various conferences, see: "Associates' Views on the Definition of 'Urgency,'" *Current Anthropology* Vol. 12, No. 2 (April 1971): 243–254.

man's interactions with his total physical, social, and cultural environment."[75] This proved both a tall and broad order, especially given the residual confusion and overlap within the Smithsonian that had followed the merger between former Bureau personnel and the rest of the institution's anthropological staff earlier in the decade. Some of these Smithsonian anthropologists also resented Tax's temporary leadership and his "distressingly vague set of ideas about what he calls the study of man," which had already "virtually defined" urgent anthropology "out of existence," one official wrote to Ripley after the Center's first year in 1969.[76] In fact, an initiative for the study of man attracted the attention of the institution's researchers from beyond the discipline of anthropology. "We cannot turn a blind eye," a primatologist wrote to an anthropologist who had been hired at the Center full time, "however much some of us would appear to deny it, to the biological roots of human behavior."[77] Interests in biology, ecology, and culture all burgeoned at the Center, with little organization to channel those disciplines into a collective effort.

The Center did involve itself directly in a few Smithsonian initiatives, chief among them the longstanding and ongoing effort to publish a cultural *Handbook of North American Indians*, which would contain multiple volumes of ethnographic data compiled by anthropologists and serve to complement a *Handbook of South American Indians* that

---

[75] Sidney R. Galler to Ripley (April 4, 1969), Acc. 84-224, Box 3, Folder "Center for the Study of Man," SIA.

[76] Charles Blitzer to Ripley (March 20, 1969), Accession 84-224: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 3, Folder "Center for the Study of Man," SIA.

Tax attracted further criticism from staff at the Museum of Natural History, who complained that he had taken over their recently renovated exhibition space within the museum for "the development of an office suite without any substantial work or expense," a curator complained to Ripley. See: Robert C. Engle to Ripley (January 10, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

[77] John Napier to Samuel Stanley (October 31, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

had been released in the 1940s.[78] Tax also began to organize a new reference list of the specializations and contact information of many global anthropologists, which he saw as one manner of establishing the Center as a stronghold of "world anthropology," done in collaboration with international scholars to meet the needs of changing cultures in other countries as well.[79] This, too, found resistance from Smithsonian staff. "I really do believe we should improve our own performance before we become involved in world data banks and the like," the official continued to Ripley in his note of complaint in 1969.[80] Other suggestions, including one in particular from Tax to bring historian George Stocking on as a full-time administrator of an archival initiative to be hosted within the Center, were met with further ambivalence.[81] A History of Anthropology seminar hosted by Stocking proposed for the summer of 1970 at the Center similarly stalled after appeals both the National Science Foundation and the Smithsonian had failed to secure funding for it.[82] Not only were Center administrators overwhelmed by obligation to many departments

---

[78] The volumes, twenty in total, would not be published until 1978 here: William C. Sturtevant, *Handbook of North American Indians* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).

[79] Tax, "Center Meeting: A Modest Proposal," RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

Tax would write privately to the Secretary about his disappointment in the resistance from the rest of the Smithsonian's staff toward this particular vision for the Center, which to him appeared to be the founding mission of the group dedicated to urgent anthropology. See specifically: Tax to Galler (March 21, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

[80] Blitzer to Ripley (March 20, 1969).

[81] Sol Tax to Saul H. Riesenberg (August 24, 1967), Sol Tax Papers, Series V, Box 196, Folder 1, Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center (SCRC), University of Chicago Library (Chicago, IL).

Some Smithsonian staff and archivists did keep this channel of communication between them and Stocking open, and Stocking signed on as an informal advisor to the growing archival efforts of staff, who had already begun an "effort to collect the personal and scientific papers of anthropologists," as one contact had informed Stocking in 1966. See: Sturtevant to George W. Stocking, Jr. (March 30, 1966), George W. Stocking, Jr. Papers, Acc. 2009-094, Box 29, Folder "History of Anthrop. Survey—1966," SCRC and Sturtevant to Stocking (January 2, 1970), Acc. 2009-113, Box 48, Folder "CSM 1970 Seminar," SCRC.

[82] Howard D. Kramer to Stocking (December 8, 1969), Acc. 2009-113, Box 48, Folder "CSM 1970 Seminar," SCRC.

and multi-disciplinary scholars, but also its proposed activities faced immense scrutiny coupled with limited funding from within the Smithsonian.

Some of this indirection perhaps stemmed from the Center's role as a placeholder for a future Smithsonian Museum of Man. Over the summer of 1968, Ripley's office had considered a new name—the "Museum of Nature and Man"—or, perhaps, the "Museum of Man and Nature," or the "Museum of Man and Natural Sciences," an administrator wrote—for the Museum of Natural History.[83] "I realize that changing the name itself may be deemed an artificial act, a stratagem, but on the other hand it may be many years before we can do much about our 'Museum of Man,'" Ripley replied.[84] For now, the new moniker became the cumbersome "Museum of Natural History/Museum of Man," with an eye toward a separate space for the material affiliated with the latter soon. "In years to come, as we may perhaps achieve the new separate building, we would simply change the labels," Ripley said of the decision in a memorandum to staff.[85]

Discussing an ongoing search for a permanent Director for the Center for the Study of Man and later the tentative Museum of Man, Ripley and Tax agreed that any successful candidate for the position would require strong administrative support as they "begin to plan the Museum of Man."[86] The longtime Smithsonian curator of American Indian materials John Ewers had volunteered to draft preliminary plans, and Tax and Ripley added that "a fund should be set aside to implement some of the experiments he

[83] Frank A. Taylor to Ripley (July 22, 1968), RU 99, Series II, Box 239, Folder "Museum of Natural History," SIA.

[84] Ripley to Taylor (July 16, 1968), RU 99, Series II, Box 239, Folder "Museum of Natural History," SIA.

[85] Ripley to Taylor (no date), RU 99, Series II, Box 239, Folder "Museum of Natural History," SIA.

[86] Tax to Ripley (May 16, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

has suggested."[87] Other early ideas also filtered through the Center's communications. Wrote another Smithsonian anthropologist to Ripley and Tax, "Some weeks ago I spent about four hours watching the people who were looking at the exhibits at the Smithsonian."[88] The afternoon had given ideas for the Museum of Man. He continued:

> Think how different an American Indian exhibit would look if (say in the southwest) it included the competition with settlers and had a reservation scene explained by an Indian. This would show the relation of ecology, technology, and social system over time. The aim of the exhibit would be to present history so that the viewer could understand the present."[89]

Ripley expressed his support for this configuration as well. "I could not agree with you more that basic biological or cultural themes are the sorts of things that should be used in exhibits," he responded.[90] After puzzling for a moment about whether or not the museum would be grouped according to geographical origin, Ripley forwarded the letter to Center and other anthropological staff in order to index the potential exhibitions. Ewers added that he worried that such a proposal might undermine the anthropological character of the displays. "We have the finest Plains Indians collections in the world," he said. "We would be severely and properly criticized if we relegated nearly all of them to storage."[91]

And yet, administrators had not agreed that anthropology should serve as the sole organizing discipline for a Museum of Man. At one of the many planning committee meetings hosted by the Center between 1968 and 1970, a group including Tax and other

---

[87] Tax to Ripley (May 16, 1969).

[88] Sherwood L. Washburn to Ripley and Tax (May 12, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

[89] *Ibid*.

[90] Ripley to S. Washburn (May 19, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

[91] John C. Ewers to Ripley (May 22, 1969), RU 99, Series III, Box 276, Folder "Centre for the Study of Man," SIA.

Center-affiliated anthropologists had settled on one point: "Although all members of the committee are anthropologists, one of our earliest conclusions was that a 'Museum of Man' was not, and should not be, only a Museum of Anthropology."[92] What that would mean for concrete museum plans was certainly less resolute. "The theme of the Museum of Man might be the unity of mankind, the fundamental characteristics of our species," one official said broadly, with a goal "to help man understand himself."[93] The potential museum programs remained similarly vague. "At least once a week," another Smithsonian anthropologist added, the museum could perhaps host "a program of native dances, or whatever, correlated with a monthly continuing show centered around one particular country, area, tribe, or whatever."[94] Yet another diagram drawn by Center staff contrasted the past, present, and future of "Culture" with "Man the Animal" as a potential exhibit.[95] A Museum of Man seemed to be at once a venue for folk life performances, biological information, and the Smithsonian's vast collection of cultural-historical specimens, all organized in a yet-undetermined scheme that would fulfill the lofty goal of species unity.

"We have not so far created a plan which will hold water," Ripley wrote with frustration to Center staff after yet another planning meeting in the spring of 1970.[96]

---

[92] Irven DeVore to Members of the Center of the Study of Man (undated), Center for the Study of Man Records, Sam Stanley Papers, Box 141, Folder "May 1970 Meeting," National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

[93] S. Washburn, "Appendix 1: Office of Man," John C. Ewers Papers, Series IX, Box 12, Folder "Museum of Man 1968," NAA.

[94] Lucile E. St. Hoyme to Ewers (March 28, 1968), Ewers Papers, Series IX, Box 12, Folder "Museum of Man 1968," NAA.

[95] Untitled/undated diagram, Gordon D. Gibson Papers, Series 9, Box 129, Folder "Museum of Man," NAA. This particular write-up is attached to a memorandum detailing the latest *ad hoc* meeting at the Center in the fall of 1969, and it appears to have been drawn up during that period.

[96] Memorandum from Ripley (July 31, 1970), RU 99, Series IV, Box 357, Folder "Admin. Confidential—Center for the Study of Man," SIA.

"We have created a line item—Center for the Study of Man, and a proposed piece of legislation—National Museum of Man."[97] With various interests swaying administrators toward different visions for the latter, additional Center meetings abounded, and those involved looked toward the upcoming national Bicentennial celebrations as a moment to clarify their plans and, perhaps, begin to actualize the new museum.

Bicentennial, 1976

In the early days of the Center for the Study of Man, administrators had expected that the Smithsonian's Museum of Man would materialize within the next decade, just in time for July 4, 1976. "Nothing could be more appropriate to the Bi-Centennial than the opening of the National Museum of Man," Tax had written to Center colleagues at in the wake of one of their earliest meetings. "The U.S.A. has assumed responsibility and has taken leadership for showing off the whole perspective of mankind," he reasoned.[98] As it happened, however, the Center would be dissolved in the months leading up to the event.[99] The institution had received Congressional approval to appropriate the last plot on the Mall for a future building, but for now the Museum of Man was relegated back to the formal Department of Anthropology and still trapped in perennial limbo.[100]

As he departed his temporary leadership role at the Center, Tax would offer one last suggestion for the Center and thus the Museum to be nested under the Smithsonian

---

[97] Memorandum from Ripley (July 31, 1970).

[98] Tax, "'USA 200' and the National Museum of Man" (July 31, 1969), Tax Papers, Series V, Box 195, Folder 5, SCRC.

[99] Link, "(Re)Inventing Urgency," 13.

[100] Walker notes that Ripley had chosen to designate the open plot as the site of a future museum that would have "broad, interdisciplinary, institution-wide character," although not a Museum of Man under strictly that label per say. See: Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 209.

division in charge of the Festival of American Folklife. The proposal, Ripley shared with other administrators when he relayed Tax's last message, had been made in the interest of "involving our anthropologists across the Mall more deeply in our folk life program."[101] It marked a point of departure from earlier ideas shared in the Center about how to design a Museum of Man for the Smithsonian's consortium. The project had often been framed as a site of collaboration between internal Smithsonian departments for human and natural sciences, with cultural objects and information to be displayed alongside biological and ecological collections. Here, the museum took a decidedly cultural turn.

Sturtevant had offered a similar vision in a proposal circulated internally to those involved in advance of the Bicentennial as well. "The Museum of Cultures," his preferred name for the future building, "should be a celebration of ethnicity."[102] This theme of ethnicity could resonate on both a national and a global level, he continued:

> For the United States, where it can mark the rise of the ethic of cultural pluralism, the demise of the melting pot ideal…, and for the world, where it can emphasize the past and present persistence of cultural diversity despite the growth of communications, industrialization, and of international political and economic interdependence. We need a show case for our multiple roots and our multiple contributions.[103]

Sturtevant further noted that the collaboration should be between anthropology and kindred researchers in "linguistics, folklore, (culture) history, art history, musicology, and

---

[101] Ripley to Euell (undated), Acc. 84-224, Box 3, Folder "Center for the Study of Man," SIA. This undated memo appears to be in a sequence with others from April 1976, to which it was clipped.

[102] Sturtevant, "Notes Toward a New National Museum of Cultures" (September 25, 1974), Gibson Papers, Series 9, Box 130, Folder "Draft version of report," NAA.

This was part of a broader vision of the future of museum anthropology as articulated by Sturtevant during this period. See: Sturtevant, "Does Anthropology Still Need Museums?," *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* Vol. 82 (1969): 619–650. Other curators had been considering similar questions about anthropology and natural history. See also: Stephan F. de Borhegyi, "A New Role for Anthropology in the Natural History Museum," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 10, No. 4 (October 1969): 368–370.

[103] *Ibid.*

sociology," and that it could draw both from the vast American Indian collections already under the Smithsonian's position and also from "an active campaign for gathering new objects and new documentation, particularly as regards Blacks and the newer streams of immigration over the last 100 years."[104] He, too, cited Mexico's Museo Nacional as a successful model for the use of anthropological objects within a cultural museum.

Administrators rejected the idea from Tax to place the residual unit of the Center within the Division of Performing Arts, the office in charge of folk life, but the broader shift toward the Museum of Man as a cultural museum stuck. Personnel of the Festival of American Folklife concurred that potential collaboration between them and Smithsonian anthropologists could prove generative, especially for the upcoming festival in the year of the Bicentennial.[105] The 1976 Festival of American Folklife would soon celebrate a family of mankind, with a bright red pamphlet welcoming visitors to find "Your Own American Experience" throughout the institution's "Kin & Communities" materials highlighted for the occasion.[106] Publically, Ripley also continued to commit the Smithsonian to a sense of "diversity which is innate and implicit in every aspect of human culture," as he described it.[107] In his monthly columns circulated to *Smithsonian Magazine* subscribers, he affirmed

---

[104] Sturtevant, "Notes Toward a New National Museum of Cultures."

Sturtevant actually further used this subsection to underscore that his vision did not endorse a Museum of American Indians, which he described as "too narrow" in terms of its subject matter and also divisive among the Smithsonian's staff, insofar as some anthropologists would need to be separated from their other duties in order to care for the American Indian materials. He did, however, see the need to remove American Indian materials from the Museum of Natural History. See: Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 211.

[105] Ralph Rinzler, Robert Byington, and Bess Lomax Hawes to Euell (May 6, 1976), Tax Papers, Series V, Box 200, Folder 10, SCRC.

[106] "Your Own American Experience" (pamphlet), Center for the Study of Man Records, Sam Stanley Papers, Box 141, Folder "Bicentennial," NAA.

[107] "Folklife and the Smithsonian Institution" (interview with Ripley), Acc. 84-224, Box 3, Folder "Folklife Festival," SIA.

and reaffirmed the same. "There is in mankind today a fear of a loss of identity," he said, and "in the context of ethnicity we would be wise to steep ourselves in knowledge of folkways before we risk the thought of another crusade."[108] "The purpose of our festivals" is for the public to find "a reaffirmation of identity," he soon insisted further.[109] By the mid-1970s, editors remarked, Ripley had "pretty well exhausted his idea of pluralism."[110]

In private, however, Ripley's memoranda to staff portrayed less optimism about the Smithsonian's programs. Despite a decade of rapid expansion to the consortium, including most notably among others the construction and opening of the National Air and Space Museum and a smaller community museum in Washington, D.C.'s Anacostia neighborhood, he expressed to officials that he believed the Festival of American Folklife to be doomed and its experiments in pluralism similarly obsolete.[111] "I do not know if my feelings are based on intuition, the temporary mood of the country, or more broadly the sense of failure of strong cooperative support from the roots of ethnic cultures and the native Americans about which we manage to talk so much," he had written in advance of the Bicentennial.[112] These anxieties perhaps further stemmed from an increase in scrutiny of the Smithsonian's financial operations by Congress. Questions about the institution's public-private patronage structure, coupled with a possible interest among some members

---

[108] Ripley, "View from the Castle" (draft) (April 1975), Acc. 84-224, Box 1, Folder "Smithsonian Magazine, 1975 [1 of 2]," SIA.

[109] Ripley, "View from the Castle" (draft) (April 22, 1977), Acc. 84-224, Box 2, Folder "Smithsonian 1977 [2 of 2]," SIA.

[110] E. K. Thompson to Mary Lynne McElroy (April 15, 1975), Acc. 84-224, Box 1, Folder "Smithsonian Magazine, 1975 [1 of 2]," SIA.

[111] On the creation of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum in particular, see: Walker, "Inclusion or Separation? The Anacostia Neighborhood Museum and the Festival of American Folklife's American Indian Program," in *A Living Exhibition*: 118–152.

[112] Ripley to Brooks (April 14, 1975), Acc. 84-219, Box 10, Folder "OPA," SIA.

of the House and the Senate to render the Smithsonian a fully public institution, meant that funding requests were met with a more critical eye than in the past.[113] For now, the Festival of American Folklife would continue each summer, but plans for a higher-cost endeavor like the Museum of Man had to remain dormant.

Some Smithsonian personnel who had been involved with the Center maintained hope in the meantime. "Politically I think [a Museum of Man] would be timely due to the increasing interest in this country in studies of sub-cultural units ('ethnic minorities') and non-Western art," which could perhaps market the idea to Congress, one curator of anthropology petitioned unsuccessfully to Ripley in 1977.[114] In the end, it would be a series of separate bureaucratic moves that revitalized interest in the Museum of Man. Ripley had for many years sought funding and real estate for a museum depository that would allow the collections of the Museum of Natural History and others to move offsite, which he and other officials insisted would "protect the growing national collections" and "preserve them for the future."[115] Contractor proposals had begun to arrive as early as 1969.[116] With additional land secured near an existing facility in Suitland, Maryland by the end of the decade, the plan received Congressional funding in 1979.[117]

---

[113] Constance Holden, "Smithsonian: 'The Nation's Attic' Undergoing New Federal Scrutiny," Science Vol. 196, No. 4292 (May 1977), 858. This also perhaps explains the failure to secure unconditional funding for the Museum of Man project at the same time.

[114] Gordon D. Gibson to Ripley (September 26, 1977), Gibson Papers, Series 9, Box 129, Folder "Statement by Gibson on rationale for separate museum of cultures," NAA.

[115] "Report Prepared at the Request of Minority Staff for Distribution to Subcommittee Members" (undated), Record Unit 620: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 1, Folder "Museum Support Center, P.L. 95-569, Nov. 2, 1978," SIA.

[116] "Feasibility Study & Master Plan: Museum Depository & Support Facility," Accession T90110: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 1, Folder "Museum Depository and Support Facility," SIA.

[117] Claiborne Pell to Ripley (June 14, 1979), RU 620, Box 1, Folder "Museum Support Center, P.L. 95-569, Nov. 2, 1978," SIA.

The prospect of relocated collections sparked interest again in reorganization for a Museum of Man, personnel insisted to Ripley. "An expansion of the Museum of Man is timely because of the opportunity for spatial consolidation of Museum of Man activities that is afforded by the move of our archeology and ethnology collections to the Museum Support Center," one explained.[118] Another proposed that the move could also allow the Department of Anthropology to "[sever] from Natural History and [join] other Museum of Man types," including the Smithsonian's existing Museum of African Art and its folk life division.[119] Ripley agreed, and he appointed a new Museum of Man exploratory committee with representatives from anthropology and elsewhere in the spring of 1980.

These meetings reflected the Museum of Man's cultural turn from around the Bicentennial. Personnel involved with this planning group without exception viewed the Museum of Man as separate from the other biological, ecological, and natural historical collections at the Smithsonian. "What are the implications for overall Smithsonian anthropology? Should man be removed from nature?," one asked boldly in a report to the committee.[120] Members agreed that their plans should seek to interweave existing cultural materials from within the collections with further information and new resources from historical, sociological, folk life, psychological, and anthropological backgrounds.[121] "Ethnological and archaeological findings are no longer natural—they are cultural and

[118] Richard S. Fiske to Ripley (October 8, 1982), Record Unit 329: Assistant Secretary for Science Records, Box 3, Folder 1, SIA.

[119] "Anthropology severs from Natural History and joins other Museum of Man types under Blitzer" (undated), RU 329, Box 3, Folder 1, SIA.

[120] Robert L. Farrell, "Looking Ahead: Museum of Man, Folklife, and Related Activities," RU 329, Box 3, Folder 2, SIA, 7.

[121] Wilcomb E. Washburn to Gibson (March 21, 1980), Gibson Papers, Series 9, Box 130, Folder "Draft version of report," NAA.

this is a basic and fundamental distinction," Tax had insisted a decade before upon the establishment of the Center for the Study of Man.[122] By the early 1980s, this *cultural* label had come to intertwine fine and performance arts with the social sciences, and a potential Museum of Man could therefore claim a role as a leading "center for the interpretation of material culture," another exploratory committee member added in 1980.[123]

Conclusion

Eventually, this exploratory committee for the Museum of Man faded away within the Smithsonian bureaucracy. Regents appointed a new Secretary upon Ripley's retirement in 1984, and he brought a separate host of initiatives to the position that excluded a Museum of Man.[124] In 1980, the Smithsonian had also leveled a successful bid to own the collection of indigenous materials contained within the defunct Heye Museum of the American Indian, housed in New York but soon to be transferred into Smithsonian care, which renewed discussion of what to build on the southeastern Mall plot that the Smithsonian had acquired over a decade before. Among personnel in anthropology, the likelihood that this acquisition would sway Congress toward a National Museum of the American Indian led to a chorus of renewed advocacy for a Museum of Man. Ewers, now retired, wrote to the Secretary in 1987 to insist, "I think that now should be the time for Anthropology to seek a future of its own plantwise, distinct from Natural History, in a fine new Museum of Man."[125] Others echoed the idea in the same

[122] Tax, "Progress Report for Office of Anthropology," RU 99, Series I, Box 104, unmarked folder, SIA.

[123] Douglas H. Ubelaker to Ripley (November 19, 1980), RU 329, Box 3, Folder 1, SIA.

[124] Walker, *A Living Exhibition*, 223–224.

[125] Ewers to Robert McCormick Adams (May 20, 1987), Ewers Papers, Series IX, Box 12, Folder "Museum of Man 1969, 1987," NAA.

tired language. "The entire thrust of cultural evolution has been to free man from nature," a curator added, and this should be replicated by removing anthropological materials from the National Museum of Natural History into a Museum of Man.[126] Another anthropologist explained that the expanded cultural studies spread across the institution's "folk life, ethnographic film studies, archeometry, and anthropological and historical programs" over the last decades had poised it for "an integrated approach to the study and interpretation of cultures and lifeways of mankind" within a Museum of Man.[127]

The urgency among these curators and researchers was still linked to the sense of disappearing space on the Mall. Reporting on the renewed Museum of Man-Museum of the American Indian debate for the *New York Times* in 1988, a writer summarized:

> Some say a new national museum devoted to American Indians should be built there, while others would like a national museum devoted to Afro-Americans. Still others, trying to please several groups at once, are backing a previously proposed Museum of Man. Another alternative that has been proposed is a Hemispheric Museum that could embrace Hispanic contributions as well as black and Indian culture.[128]

The Smithsonian personnel fit somewhere within that last broad category. Oddly, much of the sense of urgency within the rhetoric that they employed to justify the Museum of Man had waned since the 1960s. The records no longer appeared endangered. Instead, the late-1980s debate over how to fill the Mall's last plot had mutated into how the preserved materials might best serve both the public and the Smithsonian itself. Appeals

---

[126] Gibson, "The Rationale for a Separate Museum of Cultures," Ewers Papers, Series IX, Box 12, Folder "Museum of Man 1969, 1987," NAA.

[127] Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, "Draft Principles for a Museum of Mankind" (May 19, 1987), Ewers Papers, Series IX, Box 12, Folder "Museum of Man 1969, 1987," NAA.

[128] Irvin Molotsky, "Washington Talk: The Mall; An Empty Space Inspires Battle of the Museums," *New York Times* (April 19, 1988), A28.

to Ripley's old pluralist language of mankind now fell upon deaf ears, and Congress soon passed an act to fund a National Museum of the American Indian on the site in 1989.

Recalling the failure of the Center for the Study of Man later on the occasion of Tax's death in 1995, Sturtevant would write in an e-mail to Stocking, who had just been assigned a book chapter on the subject, that "a longstanding jealousy of Dept people for the greater freedom BAE people had" 1) undermined Tax's leadership, 2) obscured the Museum of Man concept, and 3) ultimately scared away the folk life personnel from a collaborative museum endeavor with Smithsonian anthropologists.[129] Stocking replied that "the CSM was the accidental conjunction of internal SI politics" and "ST's world reforming anthropological vision," which had proven incompatible.[130] And yet, the Center had also coincided with the end of a particular vision for anthropology, within museums like those found within the Smithsonian's consortium and also beyond. The discipline's claims to universal truths about humankind and its culture, even in a pluralist sense, rang increasingly hollow during this period. And as we will see, growing challenges from indigenous activists and scholars were at the forefront of that change.

[129] Sturtevant to Stocking (September 17, 1998), William C. Sturtevant Papers, Series 1, Box 76, Folder "Stocking, George, 1997–2003," NAA.

[130] Stocking to Sturtevant (September 13, 1999), Sturtevant Papers, Series 1, Box 76, Folder "Stocking, George, 1997–2003," NAA.

5 | "MUSEUMS CAN BE VERY LIVE INSTITUTIONS": ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL OWNERSHIP IN THE 1970s

Peering into the glass cases of historical objects and constructed dioramas of scenes from past lives in the museum's South Hall, a visitor to the New York State Museum's exhibitions on the native people of New York in the spring of 1967 might not have realized that the belts made from purple and white shell beads inside were the object of an anthropological controversy. The displayed belts were wampum. They and dozens more like them, then in the possession of the New York State Museum and other museums, archives, and private collections, would remain contested in their ownership for decades. "INDIANS DISPUTING STATE ON WAMPUM," read the headline of the article that ran in the *New York Times*. "The Indians—disillusioned, bitter, and frustrated over what they regard as another failure by government to grant them what belongs to them—do not understand why they are forbidden to access the belts."[1]

"Wampum Market Is Tight, Too," quipped the *Hartford Courant*.[2]

The conflict had stemmed from a question about ownership by museums and archives of cultural objects, often sacred and almost always historical. In the case of these wampum belts, which were interwoven with living histories spoken to them throughout

[1] Ronald Maiorana, "INDIANS DISPUTING STATE ON WAMPUM," *New York Times* (March 25, 1967), 25.

[2] "Wampum Market Is Tight, Too," *Hartford Courant* (March 26, 1967), 36A.

the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) people, the state staked its claim to the belts on an exchange from over half a century before. In 1898, went the story repeated by the state, a bygone group of leaders of the Six Nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy had transferred possession of the belts from the Onondaga, one of its constituent nations, to a chancellor of the New York State Museum for safekeeping from nefarious actors within the federal government.[3] A law passed by the legislature soon codified the transfer. It secured the state's possession of these particular belts, along with other wampum that the Onondaga might obtain.[4]

Among the Onondaga in 1967, however, this historical chain of proprietorship and the permanence of the state's ownership of the wampum belts had been called into question by leadership. "'When I was a little boy I was told that the wampum was taken to Albany for safekeeping and that we could get it back,'" Chief George Thomas told the *Times* reporter who visited the reservation for the story.[5] In reality, Thomas continued, the Onondaga often travelled north to Canada instead of across the state to the capital to access wampum, as the wampum stored in Albany was inaccessible to them.

It was this tension between past and present—embedded within the beads of the wampum belts on display at the New York State Museum—that would raise questions of proprietorship, ownership, and cultural knowledge and object preservation within

---

[3] Martin Sullivan, "Return of the Sacred Wampum Belts of the Iroquois," *The History Teacher* Vol. 26, No. 1 (November 1992), 9–10.

[4] Margaret Bruchac, "Broken Chains of Custody: Possessing, Dispossessing, and Repossessing Lost Wampum Belts," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 162, No. 1 (March 2018), 70–71. Bruchac's above history of wampum and the Onondaga provides further critical context from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for the particular exchange mentioned within this chapter in 1898, among other many exchanges that similarly took placed at the end of the nineteenth century.

[5] "INDIANS DISPUTING STATE ON WAMPUM."

institutions of cultural anthropological knowledge like museums, libraries, and archives across the United States during the mid- to late-twentieth century. "Museums," the Secretary of the Smithsonian S. Dillon Ripley would state on the eve of the first Festival of American Folk Life just a few months after the beginning of the Onondaga case in 1967, "can be very live institutions."[6] Although offered to an audience that had gathered to observe cultural dances and craft-making by representatives of indigenous groups and union members along the National Mall in Washington, D.C., Ripley's comment would prove prescient to looming changes within other institutions of cultural anthropological knowledge and objects like the New York State Museum as well. Repositories across the U.S. increasingly found themselves engaged in contests with indigenous groups over the right to own the physical objects and cultural knowledge stored within their walls. And these contests served to render historical art, objects, and knowledge, so often locked behind glass exhibition cases or even deep in repository storage, *live* within the daily activities of claimants, curators, and the public in the present.

Contests like this further reveal the manifold interconnected stories that stem from histories of repatriation, which appear at a rapid clip today.[7] The Onondaga's

---

[6] S. Dillon Ripley, "Smithsonian Plans Folklife Festival" (press release) (July 1, 1967), Record Unit 99: Office of the Secretary Records, Series I, Box 76, Folder "Folklife Festival," Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA), Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.).

[7] The examples here are numerous. For representative monographs on the repatriation of skeletal remains from various museums and archaeological sites in particular, see: Kathleen S. Fine-Dare, *Grave Injustice The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), Ann Fabian, *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010), or Samuel J. Redman, *Bone Rooms: From Scientific Racism to Human Prehistory in Museums* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).

These histories are, of course, ongoing to the present day, and they address objects beyond skeletal remains. For an account from a contemporary curator, see: Chip Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017).

repatriation story bridges two oftentimes-separated histories: 1) narratives of indigenous cultural history, political rights, and legal rights in the 1960s and 70s and 2) institutional records of anthropological archives and people who administrated them during the same period.[8] This chapter situates the Onondaga's story in conversation with work on the creation and preservation of archives of cultural objects and knowledge.[9] I demonstrate that the administrative actors opposing the Onondaga held powerful influence over other institutions of anthropological knowledge. Further, these actors adopted this particular wampum repatriation case as precedent for a series of changes across many institutions to abate similar claims to ownership of objects and information from indigenous groups.

This is meant to show that repatriation claims like the Onondaga's to these wampum belts in 1967 were also intertwined with contemporary challenges to scientific authority in the histories of anthropology, cultural knowledge, and public historical sites. The story of anthropology in the 1960s and 70s in particular is one of crisis, reinvention, and waning social influence. Anthropologists and administrators of the repositories of cultural knowledge recognized that their role in American society and the value of their

[8] Daniel M. Cobb, the historian of indigenous politics and activism during the Cold War and beyond, does begin to address the significant interactions between American anthropologists and indigenous leaders, particularly in Chicago, during this time. Cobb's work importantly underscores the broader view that historians ought to take of indigenous activism in the mid- to late-twentieth century, i.e. that the movement was not just bracketed by the occupation of Alcatraz in 1969 and the Longest Walk in 1978, but rather embedded within a deep history of native-led change that both intersects with and departs from the Civil Rights Movement(s) contemporary to it.

See in particular his report on the American Indian Chicago Conference, here: Cobb, "Indian Politics in Cold War America: Parallel and Contradiction," *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* Vol. 67, No. 2 (Winter 2006): 392–419, or his full monograph, here: Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008).

[9] A foundational example is Amy Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2012). For a recent example on the significance of the history of cataloging to this process, see: Hannah Turner, *Cataloguing Culture Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation* (Vancouver, B.C., Canada, UBC Press, 2020).

work had declined precipitously since the Second World War.[10] Their grasps at authority over object preservation and archival repositories reveal how they retained power within cultural institutions that seemingly no longer needed their expertise.

Albany, N.Y., 1970

One hundred and fifty miles away from the Onondaga Reservation, state administrators hoped that the *Times* article from 1967 would mark the end of the Onondaga's claims to the wampum belts. As they realized that Thomas and the other chiefs would not cease their claims to these and other collections, however, a panic soon settled among the curators of the New York State Museum. A referendum on the return of the belts reached the state legislature in the spring of 1970, prompting further protest from ethnohistorian and former Director of the New York State Museum, William N. Fenton, in particular. "Vine Deloria seems to be stirring up trouble in the West," an Assistant Commissioner warned Fenton in response to a series of notes to the museum about wampum.[11] From anthropologists across the country and concerned citizens within the state, museum officials had received dozens of letters concerning the return of the wampum and its resonance for native people outside of the Onondaga Reservation. "Several young American Indians in this area have brought to my attention the struggle

[10] Among anthropologists during the 1970s, challenges to their authority and decline in their influence manifested within the discipline as a series of ongoing crises, named explicitly as such by anthropologists themselves. In an address to the American Anthropological Association in 1977, President Walter Goldschmidt spoke directly to the confused role of a mid- to late-twentieth century anthropologist: "I believe that anthropology has the choice between being relevant or being very little indeed. I do not mean that we must discard our pursuit of theory [or] our investigation of native customs and behavior…"

For this quotation in the context of full address, see: Walter Goldschmidt, "Anthropology and the Coming Crisis: An Autoethnographic Appraisal," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 79, No. 2 (June 1977), 303.

[11] John G. Broughton to William N. Fenton (April 9, 1970), William N. Fenton Papers, Series I: Correspondence, Box 4, Folder "Broughton, John G.," American Philosophical Society (APS) (Philadelphia, PA).

of some Iroquois to reclaim their sacred belts," wrote an anthropologist from Sacramento, California, who continued on to encourage Fenton to broker an agreement between the state, the museum, and the Onondaga that might set a precedent for repatriation cases.[12]

Museum official response to such inquiries was to reemphasize the legal precedent and to undermine the religious claims to the wampum belts. "'It is useful to have the law," Fenton had told the same reporter for the *Times* in 1967, "because it gives us the sanction to keep the Indians from changing their minds."[13] Like-minded administrators soon joined Fenton and the New York State Museum in protest of the return of the belts. "State property should not be legislated away lightly in the illusion of religiosity or as capital in the civil rights movement," insisted five curators from the Smithsonian Institution, the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, and elsewhere in a bulletin directed toward anthropologists and museum officials that circulated among the recipients of *Anthropology News* and *Indian Historian* in 1970.[14] The state had purchased the collection legitimately, they contended, and the Wampum Law of 1898 had further codified it.

Letters from officials to those who had expressed concerns over the wampum controversy often adopted a similarly procedural tone. "We are deeply interested in the preservation of Iroquois culture and feel bound by the solemn treaty entered into by the Iroquois and the State of New York in the 1890s for the preservation of the evidence of forest diplomacy," wrote an official on the behalf of the Commissioner and Governor's

[12] Warren A. Snyder to Fenton (March 30, 1970), Fenton Papers, Series I, Box 4, Folder "Broughton, John G.," APS.

[13] "INDIANS DISPUTING STATE ON WAMPUM."

[14] William C. Sturtevant, Donald Collier, Phillip J. C. Dark, and Fenton, "CARM Concerned at Proposed Wampum Return," *Anthropology News* Vol. 2, No. 4 (1970), 4.

Offices in response to another inquiry from a woman who had weighed in on the matter all the way from Carmichael, California.[15] The belts had been "sold outright" by the Haudenosaunee to the state, echoed Fenton in his return letter to the anthropologist from Sacramento.[16] In fact, both responses continued on to insist, the wampum belts instead represented a historical political agreement between the Haudenosaunee and the State of New York. "They are political documents which originated here in Albany," Fenton noted in conclusion.[17] The implication, of course, was that any contemporary claims to religious significance, malfeasance by nineteenth-century officials, or general discontent with the New York State Museum by the Onondaga and their representatives was misplaced, and that state officials would have the matter sorted soon.

Within the Commissioner's Office, however, the panic over wampum had not subsided. The curators' bulletin shared with readers of *Anthropology News* and the *Indian Historian* had been met with public and scholarly opposition, and officials now faced a response issue of the journal that condemned the its position on wampum belts. Wrote one scholar-activist for the journal, "We"—native scholars—"are the best interpreters of our people." On the proprietorship of objects and the Onondaga's wampum belts in particular, she continued, "There is a tremendous revitalization movement opening up among the Native peoples of this land… It exists and breathes, and will grow."[18] Indeed,

---

[15] Hugh M. Flick to Nancy Hotchkiss (April 8, 1970), Fenton Papers, Series I, Box 4, Folder "Broughton, John G.," APS.

[16] Fenton to Snyder (April 17, 1970), Fenton Papers, Series I, Box 4, Folder "Broughton," APS.

[17] *Ibid*.

[18] Jeanette Henry, "A Rebuttal to the Five Anthropologists on the Issue of Wampum Return," *Indian Historian* Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring 1970), 17. Quoted in Mary B. Davis, "Interpreting Native American Art and Culture: Transformations and Changes," *Art Documentation*. 9, No. 4 (Winter 1990): 183–186.

something about this wampum case and claims to authority wielded by anthropologist curators in response to it had enlivened criticisms of practices for cultural object and knowledge keeping, and those criticisms would not soon fade from curators' minds.

State officials knew that they needed to respond further. "It will probably ruin my reputation as a scholar," Fenton lamented to the Assistant Commissioner following the publication of this critical issue of the *Indian Historian*.[19] He and other officials soon gathered at a closed-door meeting, where they agreed to four new memoranda for the department that might ease public criticism and shore up their authority were the case to reach the state legislature: 1) internal documentation for their legal and political claims to the wampum belts, 2) a leaflet for the public that answered their most-received questions about the belts, their history, and the state's ownership, 3) a specialist on staff, preferably a native person, who would serve as a liaison between the office and other native people in the state for cultural programs like "craft activities," and 4) a travelling exhibition on contemporary issues for the Onondaga and the wampum issue.[20] Despite their insistence on the legal precedent for their claim, the Commissioner's Office prepared to mount a cultural-historical response to the Onondaga's case, one that underscored the New York State Museum's position, as part of their argument before the state legislature.

Fenton, now a Research Professor of Anthropology at the State University of New York at Albany, continued to refine the museum's position on cultural grounds.

---

[19] Fenton to Broughton (August 14, 1970), Fenton Papers, Series 1, Box 4, Folder "Broughton," APS.

[20] Flick to Broughton (May 1, 1970), Fenton Papers, Series 1, Box 4, Folder "Broughton," APS.

A cultural anthropologist contemporary to this time has also argued that this moment represented a much broader codification of and reckoning by the authoritative bodies in New York State toward native policy in general during this decade and the next. See: Laurence M. Hauptman, *Formulating American Indian Policy in New York State, 1970–1986* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, Albany, 1988).

Entitled "Red Power and Wampum" in early drafts, his further remarks were delivered to a group of museum curators and fellow anthropologists the American Philosophical Society. The position was ultimately published as part of their proceedings under a new headline: "The Case for the Integrity of Cultural Treasures." "What is Wampum?," Fenton asked readers and listeners. "Who invented it? How old is it? How did it get to Onondaga? Are the claimants representative of a viable government? What is the state's responsibility? Is anyone really being deprived of his rights?"[21]

The implied answer to that final question was no, of course. Fenton's intent, the cultural anthropologist Margaret Bruchac has argued recently, was to justify his and the New York State Museum's proprietorship on cultural-historical grounds to colleagues in anthropology and anthropological museums across the country and the world.[22] "It should be a lesson to us in ethno-history as to what happens when tradition is construed to suit the convenient memory of present advocates in a way that is not substantiated by the facts which are all available in the public press of the day, in early reports of the New York State Museum, and documents signed by the Indians themselves," Fenton had written in return to the anthropologist in Sacramento to dismiss his concern for the claims of native activists.[23] It was his duty, he further suggested, to contradict "myth-making" efforts of

---

[21] Fenton, "The New York State Wampum Collection: The Case for the Integrity of Cultural Treasures," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 115, No. 6 (December 1971), 438.

[22] Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 179.

Bruchac's writing importantly underscores the cultural dimension of this story. Fenton's case, she suggests, proceeded by calling into question the very idea of Haudenosaunee culture or history altogether. Echoing the lines from the New York State Museum, he said that wampum was more so a facet of American (or New York) history rather than Haudenosaunee history, and that the state's claims to the belts—in addition to the legal precedent—was also justified by its claim to the belts as its own cultural object.

[23] Fenton to Snyder (April 17, 1970).

the group he called "Indian militants" who now laid claim to the wampum and other objects in his museum.[24] The case made in the rest of the talk began with a dismissal of the Onondaga's framing of the wampum as a centuries-old cultural and spiritual object and the chiefs' contemporary demands to have them moved closer to the Onondaga. It had been the New York State Museum, he argued, that "performed its role as trustee" of the belts during a restoration project in 1956.[25] They had been fitted with a linen backing to prevent further damage. They were rotated out regularly and stored appropriately in the interim as required by standard curatorial practice. That the belts had survived to the present was because of the care of the New York State Museum, Fenton implied. They were safe—and would continue to be, he said—in the state's possession in Albany.

"The return of the wampum collection is an emotional issue, the resolution of which does nothing for the Indians beyond diverting them from their real needs and assuaging the guilt of white people," Fenton added emphatically.[26] That the wampum keepers of 1898 had given custody of the belts to an official of the State of New York, he argued, should quiet repatriation activists and further undermine any other interest in an Onondaga community museum on their own land.[27] With a purported claim to authority

[24] Fenton, "The New York State Wampum Collection," 437.

[25] *Ibid*., 456.

[26] *Ibid*., 457.

[27] Bruchac offers another important observation on the idea of Haudenosaunee wampum-keepers or custodians, which she distinguishes from the idea of a proprietor or owner. Underlying the claims of Fenton, the New York State Museum, and other administrators in response to this controversy were implications that Onondaga had only sought ownership of the belts for monetary gain. In fact, the high prices garnered by collectors at auction had generated interest among curators themselves at this time. (The New York State Museum's belts were estimated to be worth $280,000.) Bruchac notes that she has found little evidence to support this implication, and that the Onondaga were positioning themselves as the rightful cultural *keepers*—not *owners* with intent to sell—of the wampum belts.

See in particular: Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 183.

on historical, cultural, and curatorial grounds, Fenton offered his own answer to the question of the ownership in anthropological collections: Historical anthropologists should and would continue to serve as the mediator and proprietor of indigenous culture.

"To all of my Onondaga critics," he concluded, "*Skenon* (Peace)."[28]

Cultural Historians as Arbiters

Despite Fenton's claims, the state legislature voted in favor of the Onondaga soon after that, and the two-dozen belts that had been waiting in museum storage were scheduled to be transferred from the New York State Museum. Just a year later in 1971, however, five particular belts were again litigated before the state assembly. These belts were found to have been sold outright to a state representative in 1898, and the scheduled transfer of the museum's belts to the Onondaga was cancelled.[29] For now, the wampum remained in Albany. Ongoing contests between anthropologists, administrators, and the Haudenosaunee over wampum belts would not come to an end so quickly, however. Dozens more belts from private museum collections came to auction at Sotheby's and elsewhere during this decade and the next, and similar rippling arguments over the politics of historical material ownership for native people, cultural history and authority, curatorial expertise, and the monetary value of cultural objects resurfaced in their wake.

---

[28] Fenton, "The New York State Wampum Collection," 437.

[29] The timing of this wampum case is drawn from a collection of sometimes-contradictory primary and secondary sources with the intention within this particular chapter of demonstrating that the exact litigation of cases like this one have often been re-enlivened by new scholarship in the decades since.

See: Fenton, "The New York State Wampum Collection," 438; Bruchac, "Broken Chains of Custody," 76–86; Ray W. Gonyea, "Give Me That Old Time Religion: A story of a successful wampum repatriation," *History News* Vol. 48, No. 2 (March/April 1993): 5–6; and for legal context of New York State's Indian Law, "Robert B. Porter, "Legalizing, Decolonizing, and Modernizing New York State's Indian Law, *Albany Law Review* Vol. 63 (1999): 130–131 and Bowen Blair, "Indian Rights: Native Americans versus American Museums: A Battle for Artifacts," *American Indian Law Review* Vol. 7, No. 1 (1979): 125–154.

The Onondaga case had not quite revealed the breadth of institutions into which wampum belts had travelled. In 1978, a Seneca group matched a bid of $5,000 for four belts that had "been dug up by an amateur archaeologist," the *Washington Post* reported. In fact, the article continued, proprietors of the hundred or so tribal museums across the country often faced similar financial strains and questions about provenance, ownership, and cultural safekeeping by their community members before receiving donations from their own collections.[30] Still, the Seneca displayed their belts alongside several more on loan from the New York State Museum in an exhibition at their tribal museum.

Perhaps the most triumphant repatriation story would not come until 1988, however, when a dozen wampum belts, which had been sold to a private collector in 1899 and then resold to the investment banker and amateur ethnologist George Gustav Heye as part of his growing collection of native objects in 1910, were returned in a ceremony at an Onondaga longhouse on the Grand River in Canada. In the interim years, during which Heye's collection had been transformed into the Museum of the American Indian, these belts had been displayed intermittently. At the ceremony in May of 1988, Fenton and others looked on as Roland Force, Director of the Museum of the American Indian, unwrapped the belts and handed them over to Kevin Deer of Caughnawaga. That these belts were being returned, Fenton observed later that year in *Ethnohistory*, "[was] a tribute to native persistence and cooperation among the chiefs of the Confederacy, their lawyer, Paul Williams, and trustees of the museum."[31] Fenton's tone on repatriation had certainly

[30] Jean M. White, "Tracking Down Indian Artifacts," *Washington Post* (November 2, 1978), B10.

[31] Fenton, "Return of Eleven Wampum Belts to the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy on Grand River, Canada," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 36, No. 4 (Autumn 1989), 393.

changed in the two decades since the initial claim by the Onondaga in 1967, and the moment seemed to signify a new precedent for the procedures that would govern any further repatriation claims to wampum in New York in the future.[32]

And yet, this affair was similarly not over. After nearly ten years spent combing through the records of the Museum of the American Indian, Sotheby's and other auction catalogs, and photographic evidence in the Smithsonian's National Anthropological Archives, the cultural-historical anthropologist Elisabeth Tooker of Temple University, a colleague of Fenton's in Iroquois studies from the 1970s, published an even further clarification in *Ethnohistory* about the provenance of the belts that had been returned in 1988. The Museum of the American Indian, Tooker noted snidely, had conceded in order to retain favor among the Onondaga at the time, despite "a highly sensitive and emotionally charged case. Yet I believe that it is at the same time an example of the kind of embarrassment that may follow on repatriation."[33] It appeared to Tooker that the belts in question had actually been in the possession of a different chief at a different time, and their path to Heye's possession at the Museum of the American Indian was in fact more roundabout than the two dubious sales used to justify their return in 1988. "Documentary evidence inadvertently overlooked by the various principals involved in the return suggests that these belts are not those they were presumed to be, pointing to another type

[32] On the return of the Heye belts in 1988, Bruchac notes that the precedent for cooperation was not as clear as Fenton made it seem above. She underscores that, while a dozen belts were indeed returned on this occasion in 1988, the provenance of thirty more remained in question and therefore within the possession of the Museum of the American Indian.

See: Bruchac, "Broken Chains of Custody," 93.

[33] Elisabeth Tooker, "A Note on the Return of Eleven Wampum Belts to the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy on Grand River, Canada," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 45, No. 2 (Spring 1998), 220.

of issue that this case illustrates," Tooker concluded.[34] Repatriation, she suggested here, with renewed echoes of the frustrations of curators and museum officials two decades before, had been embraced as cultural capital in the civil rights movement. Conveniently for Tooker and others whose academic authority rested upon such matters, her piece argued that historical anthropologists should continue to be called upon as experts.

Mediation of repatriation projects and efforts would certainly come to define the work of many cultural anthropologists, historians, and native scholars over the next decades, especially following the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990.[35] Of course, the presence of anthropologists before the court or legislative bodies on behalf of native groups or the government, most often at the state level, had reoccurred for decades.[36] As he was writing tirades against repatriation from the museum in 1970, for example, Fenton was simultaneously engaged in a land rights case on behalf of the Haudenosaunee in with the courts in upstate New York.[37] The stakes of repatriation itself seemed different to academic participants, however. Precedent set by the wampum case with the New York State Museum "could destroy the concept of

---

[34] Tooker, "A Note on the Return of Eleven Wampum Belts," 220.

[35] Scholars rightly mark the passage of NAGPRA, which mandated that all institutions receiving federal funds return what it calls "cultural items" to the descendants of the item' American Indian or Native Hawaiian originators (although with the burden of proof on the descendants), as a turning point for the success of repatriation cases, including the ownership of the Onondaga wampum that frames this chapter.

For a reflection from two contemporary curators on NAGPRA's significance to indigenous cultural identity, see: Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Jami Powell, "Repatriation and Constructs of Identity," *Journal of Anthropological Research* Vol. 68, No. 2 (Summer 2012): 191–222.

[36] Nearly every anthropologist's papers from this time, regardless of subfield or region of expertise or preeminence, contains at least one subsection with court files and proceedings in which the anthropologist served on behalf of an indigenous group. Anthropologists still debate best practices while serving as expert witnesses. See: Leila Rodriguez, "A Cultural Anthropologist as Expert Witness: A Lesson in Asking and Answering the Right Questions," *Practicing Anthropology* Vol. 36, No. 3 (Summer 2014): 6–10.

[37] Fenton's preparations for this trial, in which he served on behalf of the Oneida, another Haudenosaunee constituent nation, are strewn throughout his papers at the American Philosophical Society.

museums and libraries being collectors of anything," New York State officials had told the *Times* when the Onondaga's first case reached the legislature.[38] Such cases questioned the authority of government, museum, and academic officials. Their expertise, Tooker lamented in her response piece above, was valued less than political stakes.

Although anthropologists, historians, and scholars of native history have since adopted a new tone toward museum repatriation, similar questions remain for scholars about the value of their academic expertise. Wampum belts still arrive at auction in the twenty-first century. A representative body for Haudenosaunee people that includes tribe members and other academic experts, the Haudenosaunee Standing Committee on Burial Rules and Regulations, even wields authority as a watchdog organization when a belt appears at Sotheby's.[39] Many advocate groups have found roundabout ways to solicit donations of objects that would otherwise have been brought to auction. State and federal governments, too, have established channels for repatriation and offices to undergird it. "Representatives of any other Indian tribe which believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these objects should contact Ms. Faith G. Bad Bear, NAGPRA Project Manager," read a 1996 bulletin sent to the Haudenosaunee from the Department of the Interior about wampum contained in the collections of the Science Museum of Minnesota.[40]

What it meant to be *culturally affiliated* with an object, however, required a complex set of assumptions and base of knowledge about the material in question, mid-

[38] "Iroquois Are Seeking Return of Wampum Belts Held by State Museum," *New York Times*, April 17, 1970, 33.

[39] Bruchac, "Broken Chains of Custody," 57–58.

[40] U.S. Department of the Interior, "Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items in the Possession of the Science Museum of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN," Federal Register Vol. 61, No. 58 (Monday, March 25, 1996), 12097.

to late-twentieth century anthropologists and museum officials had historically insisted. In fact, as recent and still-ongoing attempts by historians to piece together the complex story of Haudenosaunee wampum have shown here, scholars still have yet to reconcile such questions. "Can Indigenous Oral Tradition be Reconciled with the Documentary Record?," colonial-era historian of native people Jon W. Parmenter questioned of the historical record on wampum in the *Journal of Early American History* 2013.[41] Parmenter's article re-litigates the Two Row Wampum Treaty with the Dutch in 1613.

The questions around which Parmenter frames his piece on the Two Row Wampum Treaty serve as a useful interpretive framework for understanding the stakes for mid- to late-twentieth-century anthropological archives and museums. He asks:

> Should we simply agree to disagree, acknowledging the "inherent right of tribal peoples to interpret events and time in their worlds according to their aesthetics and values," and that there is "more than one way to understand, present, and record history"? Should variations, gaps, and shortcomings in the European-authored record assume precedence over an arguably unbroken line of Native oral tradition concerning a particular phenomenon? Or should we place the two lines of evidence into dialogue with one another to try and determine whether and how they may be integrated?[42]

Anthropologists and museum officials like Fenton, Tooker, and their many colleagues at the Smithsonian, the Southwest Museum, the Field Museum, and other similarly

---

[41] Jon W. Parmenter, "The Meaning of *Kaswentha* and the Two Row Wampum Belt in Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) History: Can Indigenous Oral Tradition be Reconciled with the Documentary Record?," *Journal of Early American History* Vol. 3 (2013): 82–109.

Bruchac's "Broken Chains of Custody" offers a native perspective in response to this question. She explores the idea of the personhood of wampum belts as it appears in oral records. See page 69 in particular.

[42] Parmenter, "Can Indigenous Oral Tradition be Reconciled with the Documentary Record?," 83.

Parmenter here quotes from Anna Lee Walters, *Talking Indian: Reflections on Survival and Writing* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Firebrand Books, 1992): 86. Much has been written on this subject from the perspective of historians and science studies scholars. For more on this subject of native ways of knowing history in particular, see further: Peter Nabokov, *A Forest of Time: American Indian Ways of History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

powerful institutions across the country balked at the earliest implications of such questions. What would become of the academic proprietors of native cultural objects and information like the U.S. government, state officials, anthropologists, and longtime museum administrators after repatriation? How might they reconcile with increasingly *militant* activists, as Fenton had described the Onondaga, who had arrived at Albany in protest in 1970? And how would the very terms of what culture was and how it operated academically, socially, and politically be renegotiated by scholars and native people?

Within the context of this chapter, the wampum case study, as it was litigated continuously throughout the past and present over many decades, reveals to historians the much broader stakes for anthropological actors and a series of broader institutional changes implemented within in museums and archives that sought to reckon with those stakes. That New York State Museum officials, Fenton, and Tooker characterized their political arguments as appeals to what they wrote off as presentist *emotion* should suggest that ideas of cultural ownership resonated beyond just a museum setting. Within the walls of archives and museums, however, concurrent collections projects, changes to archival structures and personnel, and diversity initiatives reflected the external cultural environment. In part because of protests and in part because of a dynamic cultural milieu, institutional spaces had to respond to nascent demands for repatriation through broader programs. Their limitations, of course, demonstrate the resistance of many to change.

Wampum was just one of the many museum specimens from native people that were repatriated in the early 1970s. Other historical objects in material culture, medicine bundles, and scattered skeletal remains similarly became the subject of contests between

museum officials, anthropologists, and native people in the U.S. at this time. Because of the prevalence of bones in natural history collections in particular, many museums had to develop new protocol. As activist protests broke out at the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles, California, for example, officials called in police to arrest the demonstrators who had chained themselves to cases inside.[43] "'How would you feel if the bones of your ancestors were on display?,'" a spokeswoman for the protestors asked reporters who had gathered outside of the museum.[44] At the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History, the Office of the Secretary would also receive dozens of new requests each week for the return of specific materials in their collections. Their procedure, generally, was to conduct an internal inquiry, and then to send a tidy rejection letter to the claimant a few weeks later. "The major principle is the dignity of man," the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian wrote in one such rejection of an inquiry submitted by a U.S. Senator on behalf of a constituent tribal museum in 1973. "We treat our collection of skeletons as if they were people who had offered themselves for scientific study."[45]

The history of the museums of this period and their peer cultural institutions such as cultural libraries and archives has only come to confirm Smithsonian Secretary Ripley's comment about *live institutions* during the half-century since. The story of wampum repatriation to the Onondaga in 1970 was an early example of a broader, tenacious,

---

[43] Many historians and native scholars have offered portraits of the long-term connections of these protests to mid- to late-twentieth civil rights action by native people in the United States. On the subject of protest in museums in particular, see: Troy R. Johnson, *The Occupation of Alcatraz Island: Indian Self-Determination and the Rise of Indian Activism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1996) and Karen Coody Cooper, *American Indians Protest Museum Policies and Practices* (Latham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2008).

[44] "Indians Jailed in Protest," *New York Times*, January 14, 1971, 41.

[45] Robert A. Brooks to Senator Bob Packwood (November 27, 1973), Record Unit 108: Assistant Secretary for Science Records, Box 16, Folder "Bureaus in SI under Challinor," SIA.

ongoing struggle over cultural ownership and material exchange and the contemporary—*live*—debates that reanimated these objects for claimants in the present.[46] And yet, while ownership of such cultural *objects* could be and often was legislated and transferred on seemingly concrete grounds in the historical record, the debates over ownership and exchange of cultural *information* between anthropologists and their subjects remained more abstract.[47] Thus, anthropological archives, museums, and other institutions had to embrace a role of mediator at this time in order to retain their authority with scholars and the public, and they served both as receptors of the political undercurrents of the time and as occasional agents of change—via funding, archival programs for native scholars, and other programming developed in response to the culture of the time—themselves.

In the Archives

The New York State Museum's third agenda initiative to invite the participation of a native expert and arbiter, which it had nominally adopted before the legislature's ruling in favor of the Onondaga in 1970, would soon also be refracted throughout other cultural institutions in the 1970s. "Presumably he or she would be an Indian," their brief had read, "and have some training in anthropology, but the main thrust would be in the area of informed public relations and encouragement of Indian cultures."[48] This twofold tack attracted the attention of many other archives and museums as well. An institution could solicit approval among those who were invited to participate and might otherwise

[46] On this note, see in particular the Epilogue to Redman, *Bone Rooms*, 277–290.

[47] For a contemporary note that frames this question as one of intellectual property and the legal ramifications that might arise in the contemporary world around the questions of the legal ownership of cultural ideas and materials, see in particular: Michael F. Brown, "Can Culture Be Copyrighted?," *Current Anthropology* Vol. 39, No. 2 (April 1998): 193–222.

[48] Flick to Broughton (May 1, 1970).

seek to undermine the authority of the archive's proprietors. For indigenous scholars, it also seemed to promise increased access to anthropological archives.

Among some anthropologists, this promise to change their archival structures was genuine. "Hindsight suggests that over the years [we] took Indians for granted, helping them as friends whenever they could; identifying with them completely at times; but by and large feeling that recording the culture was itself a service justifying their research," one sympathetic Smithsonian anthropologist would admit in an internal bulletin to colleagues at the National Museum of Natural History in 1973.[49] For others, however, object return was an exhausting strain on the livelihood of museums themselves. "Our problem has been 'nativism' of late," a curator at the Museum of the American Indian in Manhattan, New York wrote to a colleague at the Smithsonian in 1970 in response to the recent increase of return requests from museum affiliates and patrons over the last several months and the promise of forthcoming agitation from Hopi advocates in particular. "I am certain that this reaction is going to increase."[50] Still others had been lamenting the total end of the postwar cultural anthropological program for nearly a decade in response to repatriation demands. Upon the Bicentennial of Smithsonian beneficiary James Smithson's birth in 1965, the French ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss had remarked to a crowd of curators that, while contemporary cultural anthropology had, he believed, been

[49] Sol Tax to George Spindler (February 25, 1972), Records of the Center for the Study of Man (CSM), Series 8, Box 65, National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

[50] Frederick Dockstader to John C. Ewers (August 15, 1970), John C. Ewers Papers, Series 1: Correspondence, Box 18, Folder "Museum of the American Indian," NAA.

For a defense of the perspectives of earlier-generation curators like Ewers, who had been employed at the Smithsonian since 1946, see: William S. Walker, "John C. Ewers and the Problem of Cultural History: Displaying American Indians at the Smithsonian in the Fifties," *Museum History Journal* Vol. 1, No. 1 (2008): 51–74.

developed through the "deep feeling of respect toward cultures other than our own," now "the very people on whose behalf [cultural relativism] was upheld" had rejected it.[51]

Most curators and administrators had generally offered an agreeable face outward toward both broad initiatives for diversity in the museum's exhibitions and other archival projects meant to achieve the same, however. Within the National Museum of Natural History's Indian Halls, which had not undergone any renovations in over a decade, one recommendation that that Smithsonian administrators invest in a modernization effort to correct "the complete absence of any present-day Indian culture or any present situation in any respect" passed across Secretary Ripley's desk.[52] While he agreed, his response was tepid. One small exhibition that showed photographs of the ongoing occupation of Alcatraz Island by native activists was added to the entrance of the Indian Halls.[53]

"Cataloguing is not in the spirit of the times," Ripley would reflect on this moment of change later in his introductory remarks to an early institutional history of the Smithsonian.[54] Traditional museum collections and displays—with their taxonomical catalogs of tools, distant exhibitions of so-called primitive art, and cultural data—were dated: uninteresting to attendees and dishonest toward the subject matter. Behind closed

---

[51] Claude Lévi-Strauss, Remarks at the James Smithson Bicentennial (untitled), Accession 84-219: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 1, Folder "Bicentennial Speeches," SIA, 4.

[52] Sturtevant to Ripley (August 24, 1966), RU 99, Series I, Box 106, Folder "MNH Exhibiting," SIA.

[53] Walker has also suggested that the portrayal of native culture at the Festival of American Folk Life, which would begin in 1967 with a program that featured cultural performances from three different groups, represented its own form of modernization to the Smithsonian's treatment of native people.

See both Walker, "'We Don't Live Like That Anymore': Native Peoples at the Smithsonian's Festival of American Folklife, 1970–1976," *American Indian Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 4 (Fall 2001): 479–514 and Walker, *A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013).

[54] Ripley, "Foreword" to Paul Oehser, *The Smithsonian Institution* (New York, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1970), *ix*.

doors at the National Museum of Natural History and the National Anthropological Archives, administrators responded both to repatriation demands and the lag in public-facing display material with new initiatives to support work of native scholars. "Numerous discussions have been held in recent weeks regarding an office at the Smithsonian Institution which could address itself, full time, to interacting with the Native American Community," a memorandum sent around the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs read.[55] The proposal was to found a yet-unnamed secretarial role that would liaise between the Smithsonian and all native communities in the U.S.

As with most Smithsonian initiatives at this time, this new Assistant Secretary position would never materialize.[56] The Office of Museum Programs instead expanded its hosting duties for native leaders and other community representatives in collaboration with the Department of the Interior and administrators of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. "'It was a religious experience,'" remarked one employee in a thank-you note addressed to the Governor of the Zuni Pueblo after the latter's weeklong visiting residence at the Smithsonian.[57] The Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs wrote in his own letter to another BIA official that the visit had given him "vivid insight into the poignant desire of a people to retain its cultural identity so that it could be truly shared with the rest of society," and it further encouraged him to seek "ways by which we can provide to them the basic know-how, so that <u>they</u> can preserve and interpret the material testimony of

[55] Clyda Nahwoosky to Paul Perrot (November 28, 1973), Record Unit 342: Records of the Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs, Box 7, Folder 20, SIA.

[56] Indirectly, the forthcoming change in proprietorship of the Museum of the American Indian collections to the Smithsonian's consortium in 1989 did fulfill this promise, but this chapter will argue that the actual transfer of the museum had more to do with bureaucratic coincidences than anything else.

[57] Dave Warren to Robert E. Lewis (October 31, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 20, SIA.

their past and present."[58] Without the physical ownership of museum objects at stake, collaborative programs in cultural knowledge—always administrated by the traditional bodies of authority over native people like the Smithsonian, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs—solicited few objections.

Programs like this were also mirrored within the Smithsonian's new National Anthropological Archives, which had offered a pilot training program for native people interested in archival preservation over the summer of 1973. In a report presented to archival staff at the end of his summer in the program, Southern Ute Tribal Historian Jim Jefferson noted that similar initiatives in the past at other institutions had failed because selection "criteria leaned toward scholars who had the credentials only but no serious knowledge about the people he was studying."[59] Jefferson offered five further suggestions for future iterations of the training program:

> 1. A place is needed where Indians can identify and feel at home when doing research.
> 2. Indian room where paintings can be displayed.
> 3. Training for young Indian archivists, anthropologists, librarians, museum technicians, historians, and editors.
> 4. Provide diplomas or certificates upon completion of training.
> 5. Train an Indian to work on the Smithsonian staff.[60]

On the third point, he would be required to look elsewhere, although other participants proposed the same. "The Indian people have so much to learn and do research on their history. They want to do their own writing, their own teaching, and run their own museums," confirmed attendee Sarah Yazzie in her report to officials after her month in

[58] Perrot to Dave Warren (October 25, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 20, SIA.

[59] Jim Jefferson, "Report from Jim Jefferson," RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA, 2.

[60] *Ibid*.

residence the next year.[61] One summer of funded access to the vast boxes of archival collections housed at the Smithsonian seemed barely to scratch the surface.

Requests for further resources to do just what Yazzie suggested above soon began flooding in from Smithsonian contacts across the country after the first summer of the training program. From a leader of the Cheyenne River Sioux in South Dakota, archivists received a note seeking a temporary residency for the community's Cultural Center Director in Washington, D.C. so that he might be able to learn about "artifact curation, museology, and ethnological interviewing" for his work on the reservation.[62] Like most requests, this one received a short rejection citing limited funds. But the reason was more so embedded within the history of cultural authority than administrators let on in their letters. "Conservation is not learned in a brief time, and it is a disservice to teach a person this skill for only a few days of a few weeks," one staff conservationist at the National Museum of Natural History wrote to Herman J. Viola, the Director of the National Anthropological Archives, in response to one solicitation forwarded to her.[63] The contours of the training program remained tightly bound: native people could visit the archive as guests, but no further authority would be conferred on the Smithsonian's dime.

Viola himself spent much of the next few years repeating the same to potential participants in the training program in response to their inquiries. "At the present time, no training in museum administration, the care of artifacts, or exhibits design is included in our training program," he wrote to a community leader of the Puyallup in Washington

[61] Sarah Yazzie, Untitled report on the American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program," RU342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA, 1.

[62] Mark St. Pierre to Herman J. Viola (December 12, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA.

[63] Beth Gibson to Viola (September 26, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA.

State requesting assistance in the administration of her community museum. However, he continued, she was certainly welcome to travel to Washington, D.C. to attend one of the Smithsonian's many public courses on museum administration at her convenience.[64] Throughout the 1970s and even into the next decade, the same attitude would soon be mirrored in other repositories with their own expansive collections of native materials. In response to the open requests from local indigenous organizations and museums for "any information concerning Indian cultures," as one correspondent writing in to them from Worcester, Massachusetts put it, the Museum of the American Indian developed a form letter promising the development of a forthcoming Indian Information Center for visitors to the museum.[65] "Recent public awareness of the Indian has created a demand for a wide variety of information services and demonstrated the need for the reorganization and improvement of our current services," the photocopied note explained in return.[66]

"The crying demand among contemporary Indians is that of 'more information,'" Vine Deloria would observe from a position as a Museum of the American Indian board member in 1978.[67] At his museum and elsewhere, Deloria knew, their options to find this

---

[64] Viola to Ramona Bennett (October 28, 1975), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA.

[65] Kent Hoover to the Museum of the American Indian (March 14, 1978), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 15, Box 545, Folder "Indian Information Center: Copy of Materials from Registration Repatriation Files," National Museum of the American Indian Archive Center (NMAI), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

[66] Nancy Henry to Clara Moon (December 28, 1977), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 15, Box 545, Folder "Indian Information Center: Copy of Materials from Registration Repatriation Files," NMAI.

Notes promising the same or similar to the many inquiries directed toward the Museum of the American Indian can be found throughout this particular folder in their repository records. Many historians, museum leaders, and other organization members wrote requesting free or accessible materials that could be mailed to them from the museum's library.

[67] Vine Deloria, "Echoes of the Drums" (unpublished manuscript), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 2, Box 108, Folder 6, NMAI.

information were limited, even as occasional trickles of federal funding for library and information services training appeared on occasion at the time.[68] And yet, such limitations would not stop the National Anthropological Archives from trumpeting the success of their program. Viola's new newsletter detailing the lives of participants since leaving the training program lent it a further positive public face. Among a dozen or so others in the first program bulletin, Harry Walters, Navajo and Curator of the tribe's vibrant cultural center, had completed another internship under the direction of a curator at the Museum of Natural History in Manhattan. Juan Montoya, San Ildefonso Pueblo, had started an initiative for construction of a Pueblo cultural center. Rose Marie Pierite Gallardo, Tunica-Biloxi, had employed the cataloging knowledge she obtained through the program to undertake legal research and advocate on her people's behalf in front of their legislature in Louisiana in order to obtain formal tribal recognition from the state.[69] To Jefferson's proposal that the archive actually employ a native person, however, two of Viola's bosses sneered in private that they might only consider such a hire in the future if a native applicant for such a position had received a formal education at Harvard or

---

Deloria would write meaningfully elsewhere on "The Right to Know," or the potential that the vast amounts of untapped information that was held within libraries and museums could hold for indigenous people in the late 1970s. See also: Deloria, "The Right to Know" (manuscript), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 2, Box 108, Folder 6, NMAI. For a contemporary article on the subject, see: Jennifer R. O'Neal, "'The Right to Know: Decolonizing Native American Archives," *Journal of Western Archives* Vol. 6, No. 1 (2015): 1–17.

[68] The Department of the Interior's Office of Library & Information Service did host a series of talks near reservations in the fall of 1968 in the interest of "rais[ing] awareness among Indian people of potential benefits of library/media/information services and their relevance to Indian concerns."

See: "Observer Invitation to Attend and Participate in The White House Pre-Conference on Indian Library and Information Services On or Near Reservations" (memorandum), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 2, Box 108, Folder 6, NMAI. For a librarian's article from the period, see also: "Implications of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services for Library Education," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* Vol. 21, No. 3 (Winter 1981): 246–262.

[69] Viola and Stephanie Koziski, "American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program" (Bulletin) (December 12, 1975), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA, 1.

Yale.[70] Even with friendly faces forward from the administrators and a well-received schedule for participants, training initiatives like this still codified conventional academic credentials, authority, and claims to cultural knowledge, and at that they barely began to repatriate the vast amounts of information collected in the past about native people stored away within their repository walls. They served, as Viola put it, to "interest Indian Americans in becoming professional archivists and historians," but often little more.[71]

New collaborative projects at the Smithsonian, the Newberry Library in Chicago, and the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia revealed further tensions hidden within kindred initiatives. Since their acquisition of the archival materials and papers of Franz Boas in the 1950s, American Philosophical Society librarians had been concerned with also bolstering their own holdings of native records, soliciting new scholarship, and further encouraging academics to engage with their collections. The institution's Phillips Fund, earmarked for new anthropological research with indigenous people, had generated by 1970 a sizable body of cultural material for the library. "There are valuable…and important collections of letters, unpublished manuscripts, and other documents from outstanding students of the American Indian such as Franz Boas, Frank Speck, and Elsie Clews Parsons," Clyde Kluckhohn had boasted of the collections to colleagues in 1959.[72]

---

[70] Clifford Evans to Perrot (July 27, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 24, SIA.

[71] Viola, "American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program at the Smithsonian Institution," *The American Archivist* Vol. 41, No. 2 (April 1978), 144.

It appears that the program did pique interest. For a measured endorsement of the program from a former attendee that details both the opportunities available to other tribal leaders through it and some of the limitations of the program, see also: George P. Horse Capture, "Some Observations on Establishing Tribal Museums," *History News* Vol. 36, No. 1 (January 1981): 21–28.

[72] Clyde Kluckhohn, "The Library's New Program in American Indian Linguistics and Ethnohistory," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 103 No. 6: Studies of Historical Documents in the Library of the American Philosophical Society (December 1959), 768.

Curators, archivists, and anthropologists would also continue to develop collection guides to native materials in these repositories throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s. At the American Philosophical Society, Kluckhohn's enthusiastic case for the potential hidden within the library's collections led a decade later to a conference at which scholars presented on value of its collections like the Boas papers to anthropologists, historians, and other proprietors of native culture.[73] Echoing this sentiment at the Smithsonian, two curators in 1974 proposed the development of a further resource in which scholars would present the contributions of indigenous people to American anthropology. "These would be intellectual biographies of North American Indians who have been important sources of ethnograph[y]," they suggested, and the short scholarly portraits would seek to credit indigenous informants for their contributions to cultural knowledge.[74]

While these cataloging projects rarely raised objections from administrators, the Smithsonian biography proposal struck a nerve. Among the many prominent scholars who received the document was Fenton, who dismissed the framework outright.[75] "I must

---

A companion piece to Kluckhohn's note about archival holdings on historical manuscripts in the possession of APS would follow the next year. See: John Finley Freeman, "The American Indian in Manuscript: Preparing a Guide to Holdings in the Library of the American Philosophical Society," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1961): 156–178.

[73] The intention of this conference at APS was to celebrate the amount of yet-undiscovered cultural information waiting within historical anthropological collections and to encourage scholars to visit the institution for their research. On the Boas papers in particular, the presenter was the preeminent historian of anthropology George W. Stocking, Jr., whose own writing from the Boas papers had transformed the field in its own right.

For the full conference proceedings, see: *The American Indian: A Conference in the American Philosophical Society Library* (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society Library Publication, 1968).

[74] Margot Liberty and Sturtevant, "Prospectus for a Collection of Studies on Anthropology by North American Indians," William C. Sturtevant Papers, Series 4, Box 361, Folder "Indians as Anthropologists (Liberty Project)," NAA, 1.

[75] Liberty and Sturtevant, "Mailing List," Sturtevant Papers, Series 4, Box 361, Folder "Indian Ethnographies," NAA.

confess that I was somewhat irked by the slant that scholars have exploited Indians without due credit to the sources who are often cooperative and intelligent Indians who would not have written a book about it themselves," he wrote in return.[76] Nonetheless, the curators did compile a small panel of presenters, who delivered papers on indigenous intellectuals at the annual conference of American Ethnological Society in 1976.[77]

Renewed proposals to hire an indigenous staff member also began to circulate on occasion from archival administrators, and they were met with the same ambivalence. At the Museum of the American Indian, a proposal to establish a new advisory council of indigenous scholars was quickly reduced to a nominal "Fellows" list of *ad hoc* contacts who might potentially advise curators on future projects.[78] In advance of the publication of a new collections guide detailing the extent of their archival holdings about indigenous groups in North America, prepared jointly in 1974 about the institutional holdings of the Smithsonian, the American Philosophical Society, and the Newberry Library, Newberry official D'Arcy McNickle suggested to his collaborators that the team might also hire a native editor to review the guide before its publication. Meant to encourage patronage of their institutions by native people, McNickle's proposal was soon dismissed by two senior Smithsonian curators.[79] "The Sturtevant-Washburn statement that they do not want an

[76] Fenton to Liberty and Sturtevant (August 28, 1974), Sturtevant Papers, Series 4, Box 361, Folder "Indians as Anthropologists (Liberty Project)," NAA.

[77] The panel proceedings were collected and published in a volume on important indigenous people representing various regions around the U.S. Fenton did contribute a piece on Jesse Cornplanter. See the published volume: *American Indian Intellectuals of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (1976 proceedings of the American Ethnological Society), ed. Liberty (St. Paul, MN: West Press, 1978).

[78] Deloria to Roland W. Force (March 19, 1978), Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 2, Box 108, Folder 6, NMAI.

[79] This rejection would not delay the release of the guide, which was published here: *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. Sturtevant (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).

Indian co-editor as 'mere window-dressing' and that they cannot think of an Indian who would make 'a serious contribution to the project' raises a question in my mind as to whether we are on the same wave length," McNickle hastened to write to the Director of the Newberry upon learning of the rejection.[80] That his collaborators had so readily echoed the language to dismiss repatriation claims undermined the project itself.

McNickle's concern was not surprising. Himself a Salish-Kootenai citizen, his role at the Newberry over the last two years had been as the library's Founding Director of the Center of the History of the American Indian, which provided to native and non-native scholars a growing repository of manuscript material regarding native people of the U.S. Broadly concerned with "the planning of a program [at the Newberry] that will help to prepare and train Native Americans and give them a sense of confidence in their ability to affect and influence positive change in the world around them," his goal was threefold: 1) to increase the holdings of native materials and manuscripts within the Newberry, 2) to foster increased access to these dynamic collections, especially for native people whose cultural histories were represented, and 3) to offer outreach programs and events for native people nearby to the library in Chicago and beyond.[81]

The first and second of these three policies had compelled him and the Newberry to agree to the collaboration on the 1974 Guide to North American Indian Studies with

---

The project had deep roots within the intellectual history of American anthropology. Since the turn of the twentieth century, the Smithsonian had been involved with the publication of various handbooks that compiled anthropological information and data from disparate scholars working across many subfields. Perhaps the most famous was the *Handbook of American Indian Languages* in 1911 and 1912, edited by Boas and published by the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology.

[80] McNickle to Towner (May 29, 1974), 1.

[81] McNickle, "Draft Proposal for a Consortium for Native American Research and Cultural Development" (undated), D'Arcy McNickle Papers, Series 9, Box 28, Folder 226, Newberry Library: 1.

the Smithsonian and the American Philosophical Society. From his own personal history and efforts on behalf of the third policy for the Newberry, McNickle continued on to offer a further critique of the program explored above. He noted later in his letter:

> For the present Indians are experiencing a kind of xenophobia; they are distrustful of all outside experts, and they are especially resentful of the outsider who offers himself as an expert in Indian history…
>
> The contribution of an Indian member—a Roger Buffalohead, a Dave Warren, possibly a Will Antell—would be in terms of speaking for the Indian community, and speaking to the Indian community. I would consider this a valuable contribution, not window dressing.[82]

In harmony with contemporary claims staked by native actors to participate in archival processes so that their culture *could be truly shared with the rest of society* and their desire to *do their own writing* on the subject of their cultural histories and practices, McNickle here reemphasized the need for a native arbiter between the institutions like libraries and archives and those whose patronage they now sought. In order for archivists to preserve their authority, he suggested, they would be required to cede some of it to native scholars.

McNickle could lay some credible claim to authority on the matter, both because he had long worked as an advocate for cultural programs among native people in the U.S. and Canada and because the Newberry had under his direction established a successful grant program that allowed for reoccurring funded visits from native people interested in ongoing engagement with its archival material.[83] "I always leave the Newberry Library with a good feeling," one participant would exclaim in a note to the staff after her most

[82] McNickle to Towner (May 29, 1974), 1–2.

[83] McNickle's life spanned from the beginning of the twentieth century to the end of the 1970s, and he had a hand both in literature and in broader cultural community building among indigenous people throughout that time. For a reflection from his longtime collaborator and colleague at the Newberry, see: Dorothy R. Parker, *Singing an Indian Song: A Biography of D'Arcy McNickle* (Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1994).

recent archival trip to review the Newberry's collections in 1980.[84] Save one disgruntled fellowship recipient in 1977, the response was overwhelmingly positive, and McNickle generated interest from a wide pool of national applicants who represented a diverse body of native groups with materials stored in on Newberry's shelves.[85]

In spite of this promise of diversifying access to funds and information, Bruchac notes of this moment that traditional vestiges of academic power still wielded influence over native claims to cultural authority. Patrons could discover long-concealed archival material more so than ever. Beyond archival walls, however, curatorial and archival power brokers, who were almost always enmeshed in these broader networks of anthropological interest, still dictated access to academic conferences and other venues through which new participants might claim scholarly authority. At his yearly Iroquois Conference, for example, Fenton tightly controlled who spoke for how long and on what subject. He was particularly hostile to native presenters, whom he still believed lacked the requisite training—not the archival access—to offer an anthropological claim.[86]

For archival administrators, cultural knowledge still required an arbiter, and in fact the increased presence of living indigenous actors within their archival repositories had seemed almost to fracture the enterprise of anthropology itself for some of the older

---

[84] Jenny L. Alowa to the Staff of the Newberry Library (August 14, 1980), Records of the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian (CHAI) (unprocessed), Box 39: Tribal Historians, Folder "Jenny Alowa," Newberry Library.

[85] See Box 39, Tribal Historians, for a year-by-year breakdown of applicants and participants.

The disgruntled academic was the cultural anthropologist Bea Medicine, who wrote to officials at the Center in 1977 with the claim that it was "'Indian politicians'" rather than "'tribal historians'" who had been receiving the fellowship money. See: Bea Medicine to Francis Jennings (December 10, 1977), Records of CHAI, Box 1: Fritz Jennings Files, Folder "Bea Medicine," Newberry Library.

[86] Bruchac, *Savage Kin*, 186.

guard.[87] Like museum proprietors responding to repatriation claims to objects, archivists and their institutions thus positioned themselves as the rightful proprietors of cultural information. Their control over who could access it through collections catalogs or grants programs was an exercise of authority within this landscape.

Toward a (National) Museum of the American Indian

For many native people who during the 1970s visited anthropological archives and museums for the first time, however, handwringing and credibility protectionism by the academics in charge usually mattered little. They had ventured to Washington or to Chicago or to Philadelphia in the interest of learning about an object in their possession, perhaps, and to unearth as much material as possible about their kin and their history before the fellowship term ended. In spite of the deliberate restrictions to the museum programs, they made use of the material they found. In fact, those who had served in the past as research subjects for anthropologists often wrote later to seek more information, request access to an article, or even to invite their contact to a community dinner.

Many visited these institutions from posts within their own community museums. Since the passage of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act in 1935, federal patronage had supported some amateur exchange of native cultural objects and art in the Southwest and beyond, the material from which often landed in local museums administrated by native

[87] My framework for this tension is derived from the groundbreaking theoretical intervention offered in Johannes Fabian's *Time and the Other*, which was born out of the American and French anthropological milieus of the 1970s and would be published about a decade later in 1983. Fabian's argument that the *other* of anthropology was necessarily a historical subject and never "immediate partners in a cultural exchange," as noted by the anthropologist Matti Bunzl in a foreword to a more recent edition of the book, is integral to understanding the contradictory actions and reactions of archival administrators at this time.

For the quotation from Bunzl above, see Matti Bunzl, "Foreword: Syntheses of a Critical Anthropology," in *Time and the Other* by Johannes Fabian (New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 2014), *viii*.

groups with little money to spend at auctions.[88] The Indian Arts and Crafts Board itself, led for much of its tenure by the Museum of Modern Art's Rene d'Harnoncourt, usually served merely as a catalog of the traders of native goods that the U.S. government could find. One bulletin from 1977 celebrated the installation of three especially industrious trading posts into museums administrated by the Board in South Dakota, Oklahoma, and Montana, but it noted little by the way of monetary support for those museums.[89] At its worst, the Board actually bolstered the trading networks of non-native counterfeiters. Mostly, though, its role was bureaucratic, like a secondary wing of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that kept a watchful eye over the lives of native craftspeople and museum leaders.

In contrast, the National Museum Act of 1966, which would offer funding for tribal and other community museums throughout the U.S. beginning in 1972, fostered the mutual interest of local museum proprietors and the Smithsonian in each other throughout the 1970s. As the National Anthropological Archives was searching for financial support for its modest training initiatives, the Office of Museum Programs eagerly claimed this additional source of federal funds that had been routed into its coffer. Upon his return from a short trip to the local Museum of the Plains Indian in Browning, Montana, one longtime curator and ethnologist encouraged administrators to consider a

---

[88] For a portrait that offers a reading of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board as a facet of the Indian New Deal programs of the 1930s, see: Robert Fay Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy* (Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico Press, 1983).

The policy would be updated after the passage of a corresponding Indian Arts and Crafts Act in 1990, which moderated a rampant 'Indian-made' cottage industry of counterfeit (white-made) goods. For more on the subject, see: Jon Keith Parsley, "Regulation of Counterfeit Indian Arts and Crafts: An Analysis of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990," *American Indian Law Review* Vol. 18, No. 2 (1993): 487–514.

[89] Myles Libhart to Rose Robinson (August 26, 1977), Record Group 435: Records of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Box 3, Folder "Authors and Publishers, 1977–1978," National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Washington, D.C.

renewed joint venture with the Museum of the Plains Indian and the Smithsonian using Museum Act funding.[90] Under the direction of bygone administrators in the West, the curator remembered fondly, "Indian carpenters and artists were involved in the building of cases and fixtures, painting of illustrations and murals lettering of labels, etc." during the construction of the museum decades earlier in 1946.[91] To some curators in the 1970s, the promise of a contemporary, local living museum built alongside indigenous actors was not threatening, so long as the money flowed from the federal budget.

Native leaders and proprietors of community museums sought Smithsonian aid on their own terms, too. (If anyone wrote to the Office of Museum Programs for a tip on carpentry employment in local native museums, however, their letter was relegated to a different archive.) From the Governor of New Mexico on behalf of the administrators of the Museum of New Mexico, a polite invitation arrived to attend a co-sponsored talk on historical pottery restoration to honor "the earliest American culture."[92] Still others wrote for advice on object identification, for tickets to Museum Act-sponsored tours, and with proposals for exhibits that celebrated each collection's precious materials.[93] Because these solicitations never ventured into talk about formal repatriation from the Smithsonian's repository, the Office of Museum Programs was happy to host its own wide network of loans, information exchanges, and general camaraderie with community museums.

---

[90] Ewers to Evans (May 29, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 20, SIA, 1.

[91] Ewers to Perrot (June 15, 1973), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 20, SIA.

[92] Jerry Apodaca to Perrot (March 20, 1975), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 22, SIA, 1.

[93] In my archival research, I found at least a dozen of these scattered throughout the correspondence of the Office of Museum Programs in the Record Unit 342 at the Smithsonian Institution Archives. They were concentrated in the mid-1970s, and often contrasted particularly with correspondence contemporary to them about the NAA's training program that had also reached the same administrators.

The Office of Museum Programs was perhaps operating here with a patient eye toward a future archive-building project for the Smithsonian. News had circulated among administrators of the Smithsonian that the Heye collection, which was comprised of thousands of art pieces, artifacts, and archival papers at the Museum of the American Indian, would soon seek a buyer for the defunct museum after other options to relocate the museum or find a new beneficiary had failed.[94] On the additional note of the potential collaborative success between the Smithsonian and native community museums, early whispers about a possible merger between the Smithsonian and the Heye Museum using National Museum Act funding were exchanged in private. "I am well aware of the views of some Indians regarding the ownership of certain materials now in the possession of various public institutions," the Director of the National Portrait Gallery wrote to Secretary Ripley in 1974. "But I feel confident that this problem could be overcome."[95]

The promise was that the Heye collection could be part of the Smithsonian's consortium with its own location on the National Mall. Despite bylaws that prohibited a move out of Manhattan, clipped to his note of encouragement was a *Times* piece, which detailed an internal review conducted by Heye administrators that had recently explored its options for other wealthy benefactors in the Southwest, a wink that the Smithsonian might be able to encourage a move to D.C. rather than Arizona.[96] "A National Museum

[94] That Smithsonian curators had caught word of this was not a surprise. The Heye/MAI business proved uncommonly public, with news outlets local and national running frequent stories about its attempts to solicit a buyer for its materials. Over the next decade, stories would run in the *New York Times* about the collection's forthcoming transfer to the American Museum of Natural History, the billionaire H. Ross Perot, the Lilly Endowment, and other fleeting offers before its move to the Smithsonian in 1989.

[95] Marvin S. Sadik to Ripley (September 3, 1974), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 24, SIA.

[96] Grace Glueck, "Indian Museum Weighs Move to Southwest" *New York Times*, July 31, 1974, found in RU342, Box 7, Folder 24, SIA.

of the American Indian could go a long way towards enhancing public awareness of the magnificent cultural achievements of the first Americans," he ended his case to Ripley.[97] Of course, it would also bring an expansive wealth of indigenous cultural objects and information under their care, and the Smithsonian seemed poised to win the bid.

Ripley agreed. "I suggest that we explore gently the future of the Museum of the American Indian in New York without making any overt moves which would imply Smithsonian "power grabs," he responded in 1974.[98] A small task force assembled quietly behind the scenes among Smithsonian administrators would keep a watchful eye over the politics of a potential bid for the collection over the next few years.[99] It would not be until the National Museum of the American Indian Act in 1989 that the move formalized.[100]

These new structures of patronage between the Smithsonian and local museums again revealed the complexities of cultural ownership for historical actors in the 1970s. The Office of Museum Programs maintained authority on the national level. It embraced its role as arbiter between federal funding and community museums, and it never allowed

---

The politics and legalities of the Museum of the American Indian's move to the Smithsonian are complex, bureaucratic, and will be mentioned again in the conclusion. For an account from a participant in the move, the Director of the institution in the 1980s, see: Force, *Politics and the Museum of the American Indian: The Heye & the Mighty* (Honolulu, HI: Mechas Press, 1999).

[97] Sadik to Ripley (September 3, 1974).

[98] Ripley to Sadik (September 10, 1974), RU 342, Box 7, Folder 24, SIA.

[99] David Challinor to Ripley (October 8, 1976), Record Unit 620: S. Dillon Ripley Papers, Box 1, Folder "Heye Foundation Museum 1976," SIA.

[100] The implications of the establishment of the National Museum of the American Indian from the perspective of native writers and scholars has importantly been explored in the context of native knowledge-making and preservation. One scholar notes that NMAI was designed deliberately as a living museum, with historical objects interwoven into the present through native curators and community projects.

See: Patricia P. Erikson, "Decolonizing the 'Nation's Attic': The National Museum of the American Indian and the Politics of Knowledge-Making in a National Space," in eds. Amy Lonetree and Amy J. Cobb-Greetham, *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015).

a repatriation case—and dozens did pass through the Assistant Secretary's hands between 1970 and 1979—to undermine that position. For the proprietors of local museums, too, this structure allowed them to grow their museum collections and obtain conservation and curatorial skills via the National Museum Act's framework. While they were rarely successful in their campaigns for the return of objects, the Smithsonian loan program fostered their movement, and it increased access to the historical archives, reinforced their credibility to visitors, and ultimately assisted successful endeavors in cultural heritage.

Conclusion

And yet, those exchanges about the National Museum of the American Indian in 1974 demonstrate that national institutions like the Smithsonian operated with their own authority as a guide. Over the next decade, even before NAGPRA, ubiquitous favor of the courts would turn toward repatriation advocates seeking the return of skeletal remains in particular. Museums circulated suggestions for how to respond well to new repatriation claims, and they provided specific instructions for maintaining a cordial relationship with tribal elders during the process.[101] "There was more goodwill to be gained by returning the belts to their original owners than by resisting the claim," Fenton would admit upon the return of wampum from the Museum of the American Indian to the Haudenosaunee in 1988.[102] That was precisely the calculus that administrators and other museum and archive officials had begun to perform in our timeframe of the 1970s. As their cultural

[101] One such guide emerged from the North American Indian Museums Association, which circulated its early-1980s repatriation notes to the Smithsonian, the Museum of the American Indian, and elsewhere and provided them a list of contacts within tribal museums. See: "Suggested Guidelines in Dealing with Requests for Return of Native American Materials," Museum of the American Indian & Heye Foundation Records, Series 15, Box 545, Folder "Indian Information Center: Copy of Materials from Registration Repatriation Files," NMAI.

[102] Fenton, "Return of Eleven Wampum Belts," 407.

objects and information were again rendered live in the mid-late-twentieth-century, what public-facing concessions might preserve their academic, institutional, or legal authority?

Tensions that arose between administrations, curators, archivists, and claimants have shown that, while the answer to this question varied between institutional sites and individual personalities involved, anthropologists, curators, and other archive, library, and museum officials continued to position themselves as arbiters. As such, repatriation advocates would have to solicit their expertise as objects were guided home.

CONCLUSION: WRITING CULTURE, c. 1986

"'Culture' is a mystical and indefinable element in the science of man," Cora Du Bois told a room full of anthropologists at a supper club at the University of Michigan in the fall of 1952.[1] The year should catch our eye. The cultural anthropologists Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn had just offered two hundred and sixty-four meanings of the word that sought to do just that: demystify and define *culture* as employed by scientists of man and others with academic interests both humanistic and scientific. It had been adopted lately as an analytic term by psychologists, philosophers, social workers, literary scholars, and, yes, "even some economists and lawyers," the authors observed with bemusement.[2] To be sure, the commodity of culture research had never been more valuable.

As we have seen, the midcentury contexts that rendered anthropologists' cultural knowledge valuable were various. Within the burgeoning history of anthropology, it served as a charter myth for the discipline that now allowed practitioners to conceive of themselves as disciples of Franz Boas, who had single-handedly erased the discrimination based on race in anthropological science and replaced it with cultural relativism, as some had put it neatly for them. At the same time, it promised a catalog of all data on all global peoples on all scales, a potential deemed particularly useful to military intelligence during

[1] Cora Du Bois Papers, Series 7, Box 68, Folder "Concepts of Culture and their Bearings on Problem Solving; typed drafts," Tozzer Library, Harvard University Repository (Cambridge, MA).

[2] A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (Cambridge, MA: Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 1952), 3.

the Second World War and the other imperial projects of the U.S. state that preceded and followed it. Within stuffy attics of museum collections and tight, box-lined archival corridors that housed hundreds of thousands of material objects and cultural details stolen from native people over hundreds of years, it represented an unrecognized source of cultural heritage and native sovereignty or prestigious publications, depending on who sought it. And within the relationships between native people and anthropologists, it was a power wielded in the ability to portray and represent the other, to preserve them in time in service of one's own intellectual projects. For midcentury anthropologists, their study of culture was all of the above, operating in tandem.

When anthropologists in the 1960s heard news of Project Camelot and Project AGILE and recognized that the ongoing American military aggression in Vietnam meant that they, too, might soon be implicated unwittingly in other imperial tasks, the whole enterprise appeared doomed to collapse. "The fact of the matter is that if the study of man were being invented now, there would be no apparent need for the entity corresponding to anthropology as we have it in the United States today," Dell Hymes admitted from his post at the University of Pennsylvania.[3] In archives, libraries, and museums, some clung desperately to the last vestiges of their credibility as native critique condemned their colonial ways of knowing across multiple sites. The legal and museum bureaucracies that governed their institutions protected their status for now.

By the 1980s, anthropologists grappled with their continued faith in the idea of culture. In an oft-cited line, the historian James Clifford remarked that culture was a

[3] Dell Hymes, "The Use of Anthropology: Critical, Political, Personal," in *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York, N.Y.: Random House, Inc., 1972), 5.

"deeply compromised idea that I cannot yet do without."[4] He believed that a historical vision of "paths through modernity" was in fact possible for cultural subjects who were still characterized as "endangered authenticities," the people who had historically been designated others by the practice of cultural social science.[5] Clifford was a fellow traveler in the history of anthropology. After completing a dissertation on the French pastor and ethnographer Maurice Leenhardt, he recalled a month in the fall of 1977 spent in the audience at the federal courthouse in Boston, Massachusetts, where descendants of the Wampanoag now living in Mashpee on the southern arm of Cape Cod had to prove their lineages from the natives of the past with painstaking legal detail.[6] They spoke in "New England-accented English about the Great Spirit," Clifford recounted.[7] The contrast between their outward appearance and their words was only underscored by the fact that they faced an all-white jury. And the contrast between Clifford's doctoral work and this experience also confirmed, he noted, his sense of the "postcolonial crisis of ethnographic authority" that pervaded disciplines in the business of culture, history included.[8]

Clifford's project here and elsewhere was to reimagine how researchers might continue to write about culture in the late-twentieth century in light of the critiques that had revealed its colonial power during the midcentury. After a series of seminars held at

---

[4] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 10.

[5] Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture*, 5.

[6] Relevant to the Mashpee Wampanoag people's legal case here, Jean O'Brien's book masterfully details the history of this subject, the work of colonial New Englanders in rendering themselves modern while confining native people to the past and ultimately writing their presence in contemporary times out of existence. See: Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

[7] Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture*, 8.

[8] *Ibid.*

the School of American Research, today the School for Advanced Research, in Santa Fe, New Mexico in the spring of 1984 with a group of kindred "textual critic[s] and cultural theor[ists]," he joined the anthropologist George Marcus and a half-dozen other scholars in writing for a publication about the new horizons for the writing of culture, a program that he described as "reinterpret[ing] cultural anthropology's recent past and open[ing] up its future possibilities."[9] Much of their work was decidedly deconstructionist, a critique of "ethnographic rhetoric," as one historian has put it since.[10] Renato Rosaldo, the cultural anthropologist whose formative experiences within an Ilongot village in the Philippines inspired the *Harper's Magazine* article that began this study, detailed what he described as both the uses and abuses of ethnographic authority and thick description in two famous anthropological-historical texts that exhibited, he claimed, a particularly egregious "lack of accountability to the political context of [their] fieldwork."[11] Talal Asad wrote of the complexities that befell ethnographic translation of foreign discourses into legible texts.[12] A few others pondered the role of postmodern notions of thinking in their own writing and asked how their texts might have colonial structures embedded within them.

Marcus added that the collaborators had sought "possibilities in past ethnographic writing that make it relevant to the current spirit of experimentation," literary models

---

[9] Preface to *Writing Culture: The Poetic and Politics of Ethnography*, eds. Clifford and George E. Marcus (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), *vii*.

The setting for these discussions was ironic considering the School's history in the colonial project of anthropology in the Southwest. See: Don D. Fowler, *Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846–1930* (Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press, 2000).

[10] William H. Sewell, Jr., "The Concept(s) of Culture," in *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 163.

[11] Renato Ronaldo, "From the Door of His Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor," in *Writing Culture*, 91.

[12] Talal Asad, "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology," in *Writing Culture*: 141–164.

from the past that might help to guide them for the future.[13] They praised experimental works, those that constructed their narrative with a "textual baroque," as Marcus would describe it in a reflection on *Writing Culture* twenty years on.[14] The postmodern era now required them to eschew their systems of meaning and provide a clearinghouse of detail that would lay bare any epistemic biases, a practice that permeated the very narrative of their texts themselves. "Consider the penchant of Parsonian and Marxist sociology alike for reducing cultural differences to surface phenomena covering more dynamic social functions that promote forms of solidarity or conflict identifiable in any society," Marcus wrote in defense of this method.[15] Cultural anthropologists should still care about the particulars of cultural difference, he here insisted, and their narratives should reflect that belief in their construction on the syntactic level. This narrative work was also deeply personal, as fieldwork was a practice over which the anthropologist was "autonomously in charge."[16] The self-reflexive mode of anthropological research had certainly triumphed.

Other veteran anthropologists balked at the approach and the postmodern milieu that undergirded it. Marvin Harris, the author of *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, the Marxist history of anthropology published in parallel with Stocking's essays in 1968, soon hastened to write to a young conference panelist in the field of philosophy whom he had recently heard present on the subject of postmodernism and scientific knowledge:

---

[13] Marcus, "Afterword: Ethnographic Writing and Anthropological Careers," in *ibid.*, 266.

[14] Marcus, "Ethnography Two Decades after Writing Culture: From the Experimental to the Baroque," *Anthropological Quarterly* Vol. 80, No. 4 (Fall 2007), 1131.

[15] This particular line comes from another Marcus-edited critique of anthropological fieldwork at the time that posited the potential for anthropological research to offer a broader cultural critique through its practice. See: Ed. Marcus and Michael F. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 38.

[16] *Ibid.*, 21.

> It is Alice-in-Wonderland talk to invoke local knowledge as the source of sound empirical checks—what knowledge? whose knowledge?"
>
> Please tell me how resisting the pressure to adopt a general epistemic stance in the conduct of scientific research will not dissolve knowledge into the kind of idiotic relativisms advocated by the Hodderites in their crazier moments.[17]

For the American Anthropological Association meeting in 1989, he gathered together a group of presenters who would reject those *idiotic relativisms*, a panel on "Anti-anti Science" that criticized the gradual creep, as they saw it, of postmodernist theory into anthropological science at the expense of its scientific value.[18] Despite the undeniable influence of reflexivity on anthropological practice, the new approaches to writing culture that had arisen in its wake seemed to leave an epistemic gap for further self-fashioning.

Harris struck up his own correspondence network of kindred anthropologists and other social scientific researchers, with whom he discussed the future of the discipline and how they might position a theoretical response to the postmodern. To the contacts who wrote to him in order to inquire about how they might teach anthropology in the wake of such theoretical changes enacted by the hands of postmodernists, he suggested:

> Students should know about the history of racism and Social Darwinism in the 19th century and its refutation by anthropological and related sciences in the first half of the 20th Century (Harris 1968).

---

[17] Marvin Harris to Alison Wylie (October 19, 1994), Papers of Marvin Harris, Box 22, Folder "Anti-postmodernism," National Anthropological Archives (NAA), Smithsonian Institution (Suitland, MD).

[18] Details of the panel can be found here, a reflection on the conference: Jerry Eades, "Power, Paradigms and Poverty," *Anthropology Today* Vol. 6, No. 2 (April 1990), 15.

Harris's title played on a lecture delivered by Clifford Geertz at the American Anthropological Association in the early 1980s on "Anti-Anti-Relativism," in which he insisted that anthropologists would need to confront the sentiment of anti-relativism within the discipline. See: Clifford Geertz, "Distinguished Lecture: Anti Anti-Relativism," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 86, No. 2 (June 1984): 263–278.

The philosopher who received the castigation from Harris above was quick to portray this anti-anti-science as a part of the broader so-called science wars at the time. See also: Wylie, "Questions of Evidence, Legitimacy, and the (Dis)Unity of Science," *American Antiquity* Vol. 65, No. 2 (April 2000): 227–237.

> Students should be able to discuss the scientific evidence offered by Boas and others for affirming that race, language and culture constitute separate and not necessarily correlated aspects of human social life.[19]

Harris further insisted that his own understanding of culture, defined at this time in a longer, published meditation on culture and postmodernism as "the socially learned ways of living found in human societies that [embrace] all aspects of social life, including both thought and behavior," was a well-trodden historical path for the turn-of-the-millennium discipline to turn back toward.[20] Culture still offered a shared episteme, valuable for its universal ability to affect the social life of humankind and interesting to contemporary anthropologists because of that universality. Such were the terms of the debate at the "Anti-anti Science" panel at the American Anthropological Association in 1989, which in one attendee's recollection erupted into an argument between Harris's camp and the spectating postmodernists, who in turn lamented that, like marginalized anthropological subjects, they themselves had been "denied a voice" as a result of the critiques offered by the panel.[21] The colonial crisis of the 1960s and 70s had long since subsided, but this intellectual one remained up for debate for anthropologists at the end of the century.[22]

These divergent paths forward have yet to be reconciled, even today. Both spirited critiques and defenses of the concept of culture and its utility as a universal instrument of anthropology still lend practitioners an opportunity to fashion themselves and theorize

---

[19] Harris to Gerald Holton (May 7, 1995), Harris Papers, Box 22, Folder "Anti-postmodernism," NAA.

[20] Harris, *Theories of Culture in Postmodern Times* (New York, N.Y.: AltaMira Press, 1998), 19.

[21] Eades, "Power, Paradigms and Poverty," 15.

[22] The historian of anthropology Matti Bunzl argues that the effect of this postmodernist moment in the 1980s actually served to reposition the discipline of anthropology as humanities discipline rather than a social science within the academy, and he roots it in a broader shift away from positivist thought during this time. See: Matti Bunzl, "Anthropology Beyond Crisis: Toward an Intellectual History of the Extended Present," *Anthropology and Humanism* Vol. 30, No. 2 (December 2005): 187–195.

about their practice in the twenty-first century.[23] "As to Grand Theory," Johannes Fabian wrote recently on the contemporary state of the discipline, "culturalism runs around like the proverbial headless chicken."[24] It has now lost its greatest proponents, perhaps, but to this storied cultural anthropologist, who had lived through—and theorized eloquently about—the years of crisis in the 1970s, the enlivened remains of anthropological culture still seemed to have some motion in them yet for more reflexive thinking.

In the interest of some historical clarity, we might pause here at the end to ask: Whither the historian of anthropology George Stocking? Before his death in 2013, Stocking published his own *Glimpses into My Own Black Box*.[25] An autobiographical story of his position in relation to the last half-century of the anthropological discipline that drew in part from the ethnographic methods of the researchers he studied, the book only further validates the ubiquity of the reflexive project. Even Stocking, so insistent as he was during the 1960s and 70s that his contributions to the field were historicist and therefore not implicated in contemporary practice, seemed poised to learn something through the exercise. He even admitted that the graduate students whom he supervised at Chicago in the discipline of anthropology, "interlocutors in [his] research," had in fact

[23] Books and articles that take up the issue of culture appear regularly between the postmodernist turn and the present. See, for example: Adam Kuper, *Culture: The Anthropologists' Account* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Marshall Sahlins, "'Sentimental Pessimism' and Ethnographic Experience; or, Why Culture Is Not a Disappearing 'Object,'" in *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, ed. Lorraine Daston (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000): 158–202; and Martin Palecek, "The Evolution of 'Culture': Juggling a Concept," *Anthropological Theory* Vol. 20, No. 1 (March 2020): 53–76.

[24] Fabian, "Cultural Anthropology and the Question of Knowledge," *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* Vol. 18, No. 2 (June 2012), 442.

[25] Actually, the resulting book reads more like an autobiography of Stocking's experiences, from his flirtation with Communist politics during the 1950s to his tenure at the University of Chicago from the late 1960s until his death, than a self-ethnography in the style of something like *Writing Culture*. See: George W. Stocking, Jr., *Glimpses into My Own Black Box: An Exercise in Self-Deconstruction* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010).

"enriched [his] understanding of the ethnographic process" through the letters they wrote to him from the field during their extended trips away from the university.[26]

Stocking's earliest histories of anthropology seemed to speak to the disciplinary actors of an already-bygone era. That it was an anthropologist like Margaret Mead, one committed to anthropology's colonial ways of knowing until her death in the 1970s, who eagerly praised his essays and celebrated his Kuhnian lens in the 1960s should not have escaped us. Stocking wrote for the defenders of the faith. He flattered their conceptions of themselves, and he offered a steady hand throughout the mounting crisis engendered by decolonization. In his earliest essays, he allowed anthropologists to conceive of their work as purely theoretical and moreover as divorced from the lives of native people whom they studied. No trace of George Hunt, turn-of-the-century Tlingit collaborator and co-published author with Franz Boas, appears in his essays on Boas from the 1960s. That his self-fashioning practice of history, so useful to some midcentury anthropologists, also complemented the new reflexivity toward which practitioners turned in the 1970s perhaps reveals that even decolonizing projects carried onward the legacies of culture.

[26] Stocking, *Glimpses into My Own Black Box*, 116.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Repositories

American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA)
Catherine Pelton Durrell '25 Archives and Special Collections Library
at Vassar College (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.)
The Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center
at the University of Chicago (Chicago, IL)
Harvard University Archives (Cambridge, MA)
Library of Congress Manuscript Division (Washington, D.C.)
National Anthropological Archives (Suitland, MD)
National Archives Research Center (Washington, D.C.)
National Museum of the American Indian Archive Center (Suitland, MD)
Newberry Library (Chicago, IL)
Smithsonian Institution Archives (Washington, D.C.)
Tozzer Library
at Harvard University (Cambridge, MA)

Published Primary Sources

Ablon, Joan. "The American Indian Chicago Conference." *Journal of American Indian Education* Volume 1, Number 2 (January 1962).

Anthropology and the American Indian: Report of A Symposium. San Francisco, CA: The Indian Historian Press, Inc., 1973.

Barnett, H. G. "On Science and Human Rights." *American Anthropologist* Volume 50, Number 2 (April–June 1948).

Bartlett, Charles E. "Jesse J. Cornplanter." *New York State Archeological Association: The Bulletin* Number 10 (July 1957).

Benedict, Ruth F. Benedict, "Anthropology and the Humanities." *American Anthropologist* Volume 50, Number 4 (October–December 1948).

Berreman, Gerald D. "Is Anthropology Still Alive?" *Current Anthropology* Volume 9, Number 5 (December 1968).

Blumenthal, Albert. "A New Definition of Culture." *American Anthropologist* Volume 42, Number 4 (Fall 1940).

Boas, Franz. "The History of Anthropology," *Science* Volume 20, Number 512 (October 1904).

_____. *Race, Language & Culture*. New York, N.Y.: The Macmillan Company, 1940.

_____. "What is a Race?" *The Nation* Volume 120, Number 3108 (January 28, 1925).

de Borhegyi, Stephan F. "A New Role for Anthropology in the Natural History Museum." *Current Anthropology* Volume 10, Number 4 (October 1969).

Choldin, Harvey M. "Development at the Grass Roots: A Report of a Panel Discussion." *Community Development Journal* Volume 2, Number 6 (April 1967).

Cooper, John M. "Anthropology in the United States during 1939–1945." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* Volume 36 (1947).

Cornplanter, Jesse J. *Legends of the Longhouse: Told to Sah-Nee-Weh, The White Sister*. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. "Applied Anthropology." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* Volume 16, Number 2 (April 1946).

Fenton, William N. "Factionalism at Taos Pueblo, New Mexico." *Bureau of American Ethnology* Bulletin 164, Anthropological Papers Number 56 (1957).

_____ "Integration of Geography and Anthropology in Army Area Study Curricula." *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* Volume 32, Number 4 (Winter 1946).

_____. *Iroquois Journey: An Anthropologist Remembers*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

_____. "The New York State Wampum Collection: The Case for the Integrity of Cultural Treasures." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Volume 115, Number 6 (December 1971).

_____. "Return of Eleven Wampum Belts to the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy on Grand River, Canada." *Ethnohistory* Volume 36, Number 4 (Autumn 1989).

Freeman, John F. "The American Indian in Manuscript: Preparing a Guide to Holdings in the Library of the American Philosophical Society." *Ethnohistory* Volume 8, Number 2 (Spring 1961).

Goldfrank, Esther S. "Another View: Margaret and Me." *Ethnohistory* Volume 30, Number 1 (Winter 1983).

_____. *Artist of 'Isleta Paintings' in Pueblo Society*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1962.

Goldschmidt, Walter. "Anthropology and the Coming Crisis: An Autoethnographic Appraisal." *American Anthropologist* Volume 79, Number 2 (June 1977).

Goldstein, Leon J. "On Defining Culture." *American Anthropologist* Volume 59, Number 6 (December 1957).

Harris, Marvin. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York, N.Y.: Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, Inc., 1968.

Hauser, Philip M. "Are the Social Sciences Ready?," *American Sociological Review* Volume 11, Number 4 (August 1946).

Henry, Jeanette. "A Rebuttal to the Five Anthropologists on the Issue of Wampum Return." *Indian Historian* Volume 3, Number 2 (Spring 1970).

Herskovits, Melville J. "Applied Anthropology and the American Anthropologists." *Science* Volume 83, Number 2149 (March 1936).

_____. "Brains and the Immigrant." *The Nation* Volume 120, Number 3110 (February 11, 1925).

_____. "Review of The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* Volume 19, Number 4 (March 1933).

Hoebel, E. Adamson, editor. *Crisis in Anthropology: View from Spring Hill, 1980*. New York, N.Y., Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982.

Holden, Constance. "Smithsonian: 'The Nation's Attic' Undergoing New Federal Scrutiny." *Science* Volume 196, Number 4292 (May 1977).

Horowitz, Irving L. "Michigan State and the CIA: A Dilemma for Social Science." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* Vol. 22, No. 7 (1966).

_____. *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1967).

Horse Capture, George P. "Some Observations on Establishing Tribal Museums." *History News* Volume 36, Number 1 (January 1981).

Hymes, Dell H., editor. "On Studying the History of Anthropology: Reflections of an Anthropologist." *Social Science Research Council Items* Volume 16, Number 3 (September 1962).

_____. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York, N.Y.: Random House, Inc., 1972.

Jorgenson, Joseph G. and Eric R. Wolf. "Anthropology on the Warpath in Thailand." *New York Review of Books* Volume 15, Number 9 (November 1970).

Kaplan, David. "Review: The Anthropology of Authenticity: Everyman His Own Anthropologist." *American Anthropologist* Volume 76, Number 4 (October 1974).

Kluckhohn, Clyde. "The Library's New Program in American Indian Linguistics and Ethnohistory." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Volume 103 Number 6: (December 1959).

_____. *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017 (1949).

Kluckhohn, Florence and Clyde Kluckhohn. "Review of And Keep Your Powder Dry." *American Anthropologist* Volume 45, Number 4 (October–December 1943).

Kroeber, A. L. and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, MA: Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 1952.

Lantis, Margaret. "Anthropology as a Public Service." *Applied Anthropology* Volume 4, Number 1 (Winter 1945).

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "Anthropology: Its Achievements and Future." *Current Anthropology* Volume 7, Number 2 (April 1966).

Lewis, Diane. "Anthropology and Colonialism." *Current Anthropology* Volume 14, Number 5 (December 1973).

Lockwood John E. and Luther Ely Smith, Jr. "Intra-Governmental Activities of the United States to Foster Hemispheric Trade." *Law and Contemporary Problems* Volume 8, Number 4 (Autumn 1941).

Lowie, Robert H. *The History of Ethnological Theory*. New York, N.Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937.

Lurie, Edward. "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution." *The Journal of American History* Volume 56, Number 4 (March 1970).

Lurie, Nancy Oestreich. "The Voice of the American Indian: Report on the American Indian Chicago Conference." *Current Anthropology* Volume 2, Number 5 (December 1961).

Mead, Margaret. *And Keep Your Powder Dry: An Anthropologist Looks at America*. New York, N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, 1942.

_____ and Ruth Bunzel. *The Golden Age of American Anthropology*. New York, N.Y.: Braziller, 1960.

_____. "Review of Race, Culture, and Evolution." *American Anthropologist* Volume 72, Number 2 (April 1970).

_____ and Rhoda Métraux, editors. *The Study of Culture at a Distance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Mekeel, Scudder. "An Appraisal of the Indian Reorganization Act." *American Anthropologist* Volume 46, Number 2 (April–June 1944).

Métraux, Alfred. "UNESCO and Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* Volume 53, Number 2 (April–June 1951).

Mitchell, Rowland L., Jr. "On Studying the History of Anthropology: Reflections of a Historian." *Social Science Research Council Items* Volume 16, Number 3 (September 1962).

Mosely, Philip E. "The Russian Institute of Columbia University." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Volume 99, Number 1 (January 1955).

Powell, John Wesley. "From Barbarism to Civilization." *American Anthropologist* Volume 1, Number 2 (April 1888).

Rivet, Paul. "Tribute to Franz Boas." *International Journal of American Linguistics* Volume 24, Number 4 (October 1958).

Sass, Louis A. "Anthropology's Native Problem: Revisionism in the Field." *Harper's Magazine*, May 1986.

Spiro, Melford E. "Human Nature in Its Psychological Dimensions." *American Anthropologist* Volume 56, Number 1 (February 1954).

Steward, Julian H. "Comments on the Statement on Human Rights." *American Anthropologist* Volume 50, Number 2 (April–June 1948).

Stocking, George W., Jr. "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective." *American Anthropologist* Volume 68, Number 4 (August 1966).

_____. "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and 'Historicism' in the Historiography of the Behavioral Sciences." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 1, Number 3 (July 1965).

_____. "Review: A Historical Brief for Cultural Materialism." *Science* Volume 162, Number 3849 (October 1968).

Strong, William Duncan. " The Ethnogeographic Board." *Science* Volume 96, Number 2495 (October 23, 1942).

Sturtevant, William C. "Does Anthropology Still Need Museums?." *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* Volume 82 (1969).

_____, editor. *Handbook of North American Indians*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.

_____, Donald Collier, Phillip J. C. Dark, and Fenton. "CARM Concerned at Proposed Wampum Return." *Anthropology News* Volume 2, Number 4 (1970).

Tax, Sol, Loren C. Eiseley, Irving Rouse, and Charles E. Voegelin. *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Tax, Sol. "Action Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* Volume 16, Number 4 (December 1975).

_____. "Anthropology and Administration." *América Indígena* Volume 5, Number 1 (January 1945).

Thompson, Laura. "Some Perspectives in Applied Anthropology." *Applied Anthropology* Volume 3, Number 3 (April–June 1944).

Tooker, Elisabeth. "A Note on the Return of Eleven Wampum Belts to the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy on Grand River, Canada." *Ethnohistory* Volume 45, Number 2 (Spring 1998).

Turner, Victor. "Dramatic Ritual/Ritual Drama: Performative and Reflexive Anthropology." *The Kenyon Review* Volume 1, Number 3 (Summer 1979).

Viola, Herman J. "American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program at the Smithsonian Institution." *The American Archivist* Volume 41, Number 2 (April 1978).

Voget, Fred W. "Man and Culture: An Essay in Changing Anthropological Interpretation." *American Anthropologist* Volume 62, Number 6 (December 1960).

Wagley, Charles. "The Study of World Areas: A Report on the National Conference." *Social Science Research Council Items* Volume 2, Number 1 (March 1948).

Wallace, Anthony F. C. and Raymond D. Fogelson, "Culture and Personality." *Biennial Review of Anthropology* Volume 2 (1961).

Weiss, Gerald. "A Scientific Concept of Culture." *American Anthropologist* Volume 75, Number 5 (October 1973).

White, Leslie A. *The Ethnography and Ethnology of Franz Boas*. Austin, TX: Texas Memorial Museum, The Museum of the University of Texas, 1963.

_____. *The Evolution of Culture: The Development of Civilization to the Fall of Rome*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

_____. *The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization*. New York, N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1949.

Yampolsky, Helene Boas. "Excerpts from the Letter Diary of Franz Boas on His First Field Trip to the Northwest Coast." *International Journal of American Linguistics* Volume 24, Number 4 (October 1958).

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Mark. *From Boas to Black Power: Racism, Liberalism, and American Anthropology*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019.

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

Arnold, Laurie. *Bartering with the Bones of their Dead: The Colville Confederated Tribes and Termination*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2012.

Asad, Talal. *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. London, U.K. and Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Ithaca Press and Humanities Press, 1973.

Asch, Michael. "Anthropology, Colonialism and the Reflexive Turn: Finding a Place to Stand." *Anthropologica* Volume 57, Number 2 (2015).

Baker, Lee D. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

_____. "The Cult of Franz Boas and his 'Conspiracy' to Destroy the White Race." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Volume 154, Number 1 (March 2010).

_____. *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998.

Balthaser, Benjamin. "From Lapwai to Leningrad: Archie Phinney, Marxism, and the Making of Indigenous Modernity." *Ab Imperio* Vol. 21, No. 1 (January 2020).

_____. "'Travels of an American Indian into the Hinterlands of Soviet Russia': Rethinking Indigenous Modernity and the Popular Front in the Work of Archie Phinney and D'Arcy McNickle." *American Quarterly* Volume 66, Number 2 (June 2014).

Barrett, Richard A. "The Paradoxical Anthropology of Leslie White." *American Anthropologist* Volume 91, Number 4 (December 1989).

Bennett, John W. "Applied and Action Anthropology: Ideological and Conceptual Aspects." *Current Anthropology* Volume 37, Number 1 (February 1996).

Blackhawk, Ned and Isaiah Lorado Wilner, editors. *Indigenous Visions: Rediscovering the World of Franz Boas*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018.

Blair, Bowen. "Indian Rights: Native Americans versus American Museums: A Battle for Artifacts." *American Indian Law Review* Volume 7, Number 1 (1979).

Brattain, Michelle. "Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public." *The American Historical Review* Volume 112, Number 5 (December 2007).

Brown, Michael F. "Can Culture Be Copyrighted?" *Current Anthropology* Volume 39, Number 2 (April 1998).

Bruchac, Margaret M. "Broken Chains of Custody: Possessing, Dispossessing, and Repossessing Lost Wampum Belts." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* Volume 162, Number 1 (March 2018).

_____. "My Sisters Will Not Speak: Boas, Hunt, and the Ethnographic Silencing of First Nations Women." *Curator: The Museum Journal* Volume 57, Number 2 (April 2014).

_____. *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2018.

Brumann, Christoph. "Anthropological Utopia, Closet Eurocentrism, and Culture Chaos in the UNESCO World Heritage Arena." *Anthropological Quarterly* Volume 91, Number 4 (Fall 2018).

Bulger, Peggy A. "Looking Back, Moving Forward: The Development of Folklore as a Public Profession." *The Journal of American Folklore* Volume 116, Number 462 (Autumn 2003).

Bunzl, Matti. "Anthropology Beyond Crisis: Toward an Intellectual History of the Extended Present." *Anthropology and Humanism* Vol. 30, No. 2 (December 2005).

Buskes, Chris. "Darwinism Extended: A Survey of How the Idea of Cultural Evolution Evolved." *Philosophia* Volume 41, Number 1 (March 2013):

Chomsky, Noam, editor. *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. New York, N.Y.: The New Press, 1997.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus, editors. *Writing Culture: The Poetic and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Cobb, Amanda J. "The National Museum of the American Indian as Cultural Sovereignty." *American Quarterly* Volume 57, Number 2 (June 2005).

Cobb, Daniel M. "Indian Politics in Cold War America: Parallel and Contradiction." *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* Volume 67, Number 2 (Winter 2006).

_____. *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2008.

_____, ed. *Say We Are Nations: Documents of Politics and Protest in Indigenous America Since 1887*. Durham, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Cole, Douglas and Ludger Müller-Wille. "Franz Boas' Expedition to Baffin Island, 1883–1884." *Études/Inuit/Studies* Volume 8, Number 1 (1984).

Cole, Douglas. *Franz Boas: The Early Years, 1858–1906*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1999.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

_____ and Jami Powell. "Repatriation and Constructs of Identity." *Journal of Anthropological Research* Volume 68, Number 2 (Summer 2012).

Conklin, Alice L. *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire, 1850–1950*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Cooper, Karen Coody. *American Indians Protest Museum Policies and Practices*. Latham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2008.

Cohen-Cole, Jamie. *The Open Mind: Cold War Politics and the Sciences of Human Nature*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2014.

Comaroff, John. "The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline." *American Anthropologist* Volume 112, Number 4 (December 2010.

Cowger, Thomas W. *The National Congress of American Indians: The Founding Years*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Darnell, Regna. "Applied Anthropology: Disciplinary Oxymoron?" *Anthropologica* Volume 57, Number 1 (2015).

_____. "Historiographic Conundra: The Boasian Elephant in the Middle of Anthropology's Room." Introduction to *The Franz Boas Papers, Volume 1: Franz Boas as Public Intellectual—Theory, Ethnography, Activism*, edited by Regna Darnell. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015.

_____. "History of Anthropology in Historical Perspective." *Annual Review of Anthropology* Volume 6 (1977).

_____. "The Professionalization of American Anthropology: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge." *Social Sciences Information* Volume 10, Number 2 (April 1971).

_____. "William N. Fenton (1908–2005)." *Journal of American Folklore* Volume 102, Number 475 (Winter 2007).

Daubenmier, Judith M. *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists: Action Anthropology Reconsidered*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.

Dent, Rosanna and Ricardo Ventura Santos. "'An Unusual and Fast Disappearing Opportunity': Infectious Disease, Indigenous Populations, and New Biomedical Knowledge in Amazonia, 1960–1970." *Perspect Sci.* Volume 25, Number 5 (September 2017).

Dent, Rosanna. "Studying Indigenous Brazil: The Xavante And The Human Sciences, 1958–2015." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2017.

_____. "Subject 01: Exemplary Indigenous Masculinity in Cold War Genetics." *The British Journal for the History of Science* Volume 53, Number 3 (September 2020).

Diamond, Sigmund. *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945–1955*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Dillon, Wilton S. *Smithsonian Stories: Chronicles of a Golden Age*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2017.

Eades, Jerry. "Power, Paradigms and Poverty." *Anthropology Today* Volume 6, Number 2 (April 1990).

Eisenstadt, Peter. "'The Sound of Rushing Water': Rochester Theological Seminary." In *Against the Hounds of Hell: A Life of Howard Thurman*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2021.

Engerman, David C. *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2009.

_____. "Social Science in the Cold War." *Isis* Volume 101, Number 2 (June 2010).

Engle, Karen. "From Skepticism to Embrace: Human Rights and the American Anthropological Association from 1947–1999." *Human Rights Quarterly* Volume 23, Number 3 (August 2001).

Erikson, Thomas Hylland. "Between Universalism and Relativism: A Critique of the UNESCO Concept of Culture." In *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Jane K. Cowan, Marie-Bénédicte Dembour, and Richard A. Wilson. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Fabian, Ann. *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Fabian, Johannes. "Cultural Anthropology and the Question of Knowledge." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* Volume 18, Number 2 (June 2012).

_____. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1983.

_____. "Language, History and Anthropology." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* Volume 1, Number 1 (March 1971).

Fahey, John. *Saving the Reservation Joe Garry and the Battle to Be Indian*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2015.

Farish, Matthew. "Archiving Areas: The Ethnogeographic Board and the Second World War." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* Volume 95, Number 3 (September 2005).

Feintuch, Burt, editor. *The Conservation of Culture: Folklorists and the Public Sector*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky 1988.

Fine-Dare, Kathleen S. *Grave Injustice The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Foley, Douglas E. "The Fox Project: A Reappraisal." *Current Anthropology* Volume 40, Number 2 (April 1999).

Force, Roland L. *Politics and the Museum of the American Indian: The Heye & the Mighty*. Honolulu, HI: Mechas Press, 1999.

Forman, Paul. "The Primacy of Science in Modernity, of Technology in Postmodernity, and of Ideology in the History of Technology." *History of Technology* Volume 23, Number 1–2 (April 2007).

Fowler, Don D. *Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846–1930*. Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press, 2000.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1973.

_____. "Distinguished Lecture: Anti-Anti Relativism." *American Anthropologist* Volume 86, Number 2 (June 1984).

Gilkeson, John S. *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America, 1886–1965*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Gilman, Nils. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Goldschmidt, Walter, editor. *The Uses of Anthropology*. Washington, D.C.: Special Publication of the American Anthropological Association, 1979.

Gonyea, Ray W. "Give Me That Old Time Religion: A story of a successful wampum repatriation." *History News* Volume 48, Number 2 (March/April 1993).

Goodale, Mark. "Toward a Critical Anthropology of Human Rights." *Current Anthropology* Volume 47, Number 3, (June 2006).

Gough, Kathleen. "'Anthropology and Imperialism' Revisited." *Economic and Political Weekly* Volume 25, Number 31 (August 1990).

Graham, S. E. "The (Real)politiks of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in Unesco, 1946–1954." *Diplomatic History* Volume 30, Number 2 (April 2006).

Gruber, Jacob W. "Ethnographic Salvage and the Shaping of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* Volume 72, Number 6 (December 1970).

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson, editors. *Anthropological Locations Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

Hacking, Ian. "The Looping Effects of Human Kinds." In *Causal Cognition: A Multidisciplinary Debate*, edited by Dan Sperber, David Premack, and Ann James Premack. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Handler, Richard. "Boasian Anthropology and the Critique of American Culture." *American Quarterly* Vol. 42, No. 2 (June 1990).

Haraway, Donna J. "Universal Donors in a Vampire Culture: It's All in the Family. Biological Kinship Categories in the Twentieth-Century United States." In *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, edited by William Cronon. New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995.

Harris, Marvin. *Theories of Culture in Postmodern Times*. New York, N.Y.: AltaMira Press, 1998.

Hauptman, Laurence M. *Formulating American Indian Policy in New York State, 1970–1986*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, Albany, 1988.

_____. "On and Off State Time: William N. Fenton and the Seneca Nation of Indians in Crisis, 1954–1968." *New York History* Volume 93, Number 2 (Spring 2012).

Hazard, Anthony Q., Jr. "A Racialized Deconstruction? Ashley Montagu and the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race." *Transforming Anthropology* Volume 19, Number 2 (October 2011).

_____. "Wartime Anthropology, Nationalism, and 'Race' in Margaret Mead's *And Keep Your Powder Dry*." *Journal of Anthropological Research* Volume 70, Number 3 (Fall 2014).

Hegeman, Susan. *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Henson, Pamela M. "'Objects of Curious Research': The History of Science and Technology at the Smithsonian." *Isis* Volume 90, Supplement: Catching up with the Vision (1999).

Heyman, Josiah McC. "Activism in Anthropology: Exploring the Present through Eric R. Wolf's Vietnam-era Work." *Dialectical Anthropology* Volume 34, Number 2 (June 2010).

Hicks, Dan. "Four-Field Anthropology Charter Myths and Time Warps from St. Louis to Oxford." *Current Anthropology* Volume 54, Number 6 (December 2013).

Hollinger, David A. "Historians and the Discourse of Intellectuals." In *In the American Province: Studies in the History and Historiography of Ideas*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

_____. "T. S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and Its Implications for History." *The American Historical Review* Volume 78, Number 2 (April 1973).

Hoxie, Frederick E. *This Indian Country: American Indian Activists and the Place They Made*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books, 2013.

Iber, Patrick. "Social Science, Cultural Imperialism, and the Ford Foundation in Latin America in the 1960s." In *The Global 1960s: Convention, Contest, and Counterculture*, edited by Tamara Chaplin and Jadwiga E. Pieper Mooney. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2017.

Ingold, Tim. *Evolution and Social Life*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Isaac, Joel. "The Human Sciences in Cold War America." *The Historical Journal* Volume 50, Number 3 (September 2007).

_____. "Tangled Loops: Theory, History, and the Human Sciences in Modern America." *Modern Intellectual History* Volume 6, Number 2 (August 2009).

_____. *Working Knowledge: Making the Human Sciences from Parsons to Kuhn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Jacknis, Ira. "The First Boasian: Alfred Kroeber and Franz Boas, 1896–1905." *American Anthropol*ogist Volume 104, Number 2 (June 2002).

Jasanoff, Sheila, editor. *States of Knowledge: The Co-production of Science and the Social Order*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2004.

Johnson, Adam Fulton. "Secretsharers: Intersecting Systems of Knowledge and the Politics of Documentation in Southwesternist Anthropology, 1880–1930." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2018.

Johnson, Troy R. *The Occupation of Alcatraz Island: Indian Self-Determination and the Rise of Indian Activism*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Kelly, Lawrence C. "Anthropology and Anthropologists in the Indian New Deal." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Volume 16, Number 1 (January 1980).

_____. "The Indian Reorganization Act: The Dream and the Reality." *Pacific Historical Review* Volume 44, Number 3 (August 1975).

King, Charles. *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century*. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 2019.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Kuklick, Henrika. "Personal Equations: Reflections on the History of Fieldwork, with Special Reference to Sociocultural Anthropology." *Isis* Volume 102, Number 1 (March 2011).

Kuper, Adam. *Culture: The Anthropologists' Account*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Latour, Bruno and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Lemov, Rebecca. "Anthropological Data in Danger, c. 1945–1965." In *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, edited by Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2015.

_____. , "Anthropology's Most Documented Man, Ca. 1947: A Prefiguration of Big Data from the Big Social Science Era." *OSIRIS* Volume 32, Number 1 (2017).

_____. *Database of Dreams: The Lost Quest to Catalog Humanity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

_____. "Filing the Total Human Experience: Anthropological Archives at Mid-Twentieth Century." In *Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences*. Editors Charles Camic, Neil Gross, and Michelle Lamont. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

_____. *World as Laboratory: Experiments with Mice, Mazes, and Men*. New York, N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Lewis, Herbert S. "The Passion of Franz Boas." *American Anthropologist* Volume 103, Number 2 (June 2001).

Liberty, Margot, editor. *American Indian Intellectuals of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. St. Paul, MN: West Press, 1978.

Liss, Julia E. "Diasporic Identities: The Science and Politics of Race in the Work of Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, 1894–1919." *Cultural Anthropology* Volume 13, Number 2 (May 1998).

Lindee, Susan and Joanna Radin, "Patrons of the Human Experience A History of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1941–2016." *Current Anthropology* Volume 57, Supplement 14 (October 2016).

Link, Adrianna. "Documenting Human Nature: E. Richard Sorenson and the National Anthropological Film Center, 1970–1984." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Volume 56, Number 4 (September 2016).

_____. "(Re)inventing Urgency: The Case of the Smithsonian's Center for the Study of Man, 1968–1976." *Bérose: Encyclopdie Internationale des Histoires de l'Anthropologie* (May 2021).

_____. "Salvaging a Record for Humankind: Urgent Anthropology at the Smithsonian, 1964–1986." Ph.D. Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 2016.

Lonetree, Amy and Amanda J. Cobb, editors. *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.

Lonetree, Amy. *Decolonizing Museums Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

Lurie, Nancy Oestreich. "Sol Tax and Tribal Sovereignty." *Human Organization* Volume 58, Number 1 (Spring 1999).

Mandler, Peter. *Return from the Natives: How Margaret Mead Won the Second World War and Lost the Cold War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.

Marcus, George E. and Michael F. Fischer, editors. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Marcus, George E. and Marcelo Pisarro. "The End(s) of Ethnography: Social/Cultural Anthropology's Signature Form of Producing Knowledge in Transition." *Cultural Anthropology* Volume 23, Number 1 (February 2008).

Marcus, George E. "Ethnography Two Decades after Writing Culture: From the Experimental to the Baroque." *Anthropological Quarterly* Volume 80, Number 4 (Fall 2007).

Marden, David L. "Anthropologists and Federal Indian Policy Prior to 1940." *Indian Historian* Volume 5, Number 4 (Winter 1972).

Medicine, Bea. *Learning to be an Anthropologist and Remaining 'Native': Selected Writings*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Merry, Sally Engle. "Human Rights Law and the Demonization of Culture (And Anthropology Along the Way)." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* Volume 26, Number 1 (May 2003).

Milam, Erika L. *Creatures of Cain: The Hunt for Human Nature in Cold War America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2019.

_____"Public Science of the Savage Mind: Contesting Cultural Anthropology in the Cold War Classroom." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Volume 49, Number 3 (2013).

Moyn, Samuel. *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012.

Nabokov, Peter. *A Forest of Time: American Indian Ways of History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Newton, Esther. "My Best Informant's Dress: The Erotic Equation in Fieldwork." *Cultural Anthropology* Volume 8, Number 1 (February 1993).

Nielsen, Bjarke. "UNESCO and the 'Right' Kind of Culture: Bureaucratic Production and Articulation." *Critique of Anthropology* Volume 31, Number 4 (December 2011).

O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

O'Neal, Jennifer R. "'The Right to Know: Decolonizing Native American Archives." *Journal of Western Archives* Volume 6, Number 1 (2015).

Oehser, Paul. *The Smithsonian Institution*. New York, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Palecek, Martin. "The Evolution of 'Culture': Juggling a Concept." *Anthropological Theory* Volume 20, Number 1 (March 2020).

Parezo, Nancy J. "Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records, and the Archival Community." *The American Archivist* Volume 62 (Fall 1999).

_____ and Don D. Fowler. *Anthropology Goes to the Fair: The 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

Parker, Dorothy R. *Singing an Indian Song: A Biography of D'Arcy McNickle*. Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1994.

Parmenter, Jon W. "The Meaning of *Kaswentha* and the Two Row Wampum Belt in Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) History: Can Indigenous Oral Tradition be Reconciled with the Documentary Record?" *Journal of Early American History* Volume 3, Number 1 (2013).

Parsley, Jon K. "Regulation of Counterfeit Indian Arts and Crafts: An Analysis of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990." *American Indian Law Review* Volume 18, Number 2 (January 1993).

Patterson, Thomas. *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*. New York, N.Y.: Berg, 2001.

Peace, William J. "Leslie White and Evolutionary Theory." *Dialectical Anthropology* Volume 18, Number 2 (1993).

Philp, Kenneth R. "Termination: A Legacy of the Indian New Deal." *Western Historical Quarterly* Volume 14, Number 2 (April 1983).

Plassart, Marie. "Narrating 'America': The Birth of the Museum of History and Technology in Washington, D.C., 1945–1967." *European Journal of American Studies* Volume 2, Number 1 (Spring 2007).

Plotkin, Mariano Ben. "US Foundations, Cultural Imperialism and Transnational Misunderstandings: The Case of the Marginality Project." *Journal of Latin American Studies* Volume 47, Number 1 (February 2015).

Porter, Joy. "Arthur Caswell Parker, 1881–1955: Indian American Museum Professional." *New York History* Volume 81, Number 2 (April 2000).

Porter, Robert B. "Legalizing, Decolonizing, and Modernizing New York State's Indian Law." *Albany Law Review* Volume 63 (1999).

Price, David. *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of Anthropology in the Second World War*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008.

_____. *Cold War Anthropology: The CIA, The Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2016.

_____. "Counterinsurgency and the M-VICO System: Human Relations Area Files and Anthropology's Dual-Use Legacy." *Anthropology Today* Volume 28, Number 1 (February 2012).

_____. "Gregory Bateson and the OSS: World War II and Bateson's Assessment of Applied Anthropology." *Human Organization* Volume 57, Number 4 (Winter 1998).

_____. "Lessons from Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, Persuasive and Ignored Contributions." *Anthropology Today* Volume 18, Number 3 (June 2002).

_____. "Standing up for Academic Freedom: The Case of Irving Goldman." *Anthropology Today* Volume 20, Number 4 (August 2004).

_____. "Subtle Means and Enticing Carrots: The Impact of Funding on American Cold War Anthropology." *Critique of Anthropology* Volume 23, Number 4 (December 2003).

Purcell, Trevor W. "Indigenous Knowledge and Applied Anthropology: Questions of Definition and Direction." *Human Organization* Volume 57, Number 3 (Fall 1998).

Radin, Joanna. *Life on Ice: A History of New Uses for Cold Blood*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Redman, Samuel J. *Bone Rooms From Scientific Racism to Human Prehistory in Museums*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Reeves, Julie. *Culture and International Relations: Narratives, Natives and Tourists*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2004.

Rodriguez, Leila. "A Cultural Anthropologist as Expert Witness: A Lesson in Asking and Answering the Right Questions." *Practicing Anthropology* Volume 36, Number 3 (Summer 2014).

Rosaldo, Renato. *Ilongot Headhunting, 1883–1974: A Study in Society and History*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980.

Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Sahlins, Marshall. "'Sentimental Pessimism' and Ethnographic Experience; or, Why Culture Is Not a Disappearing 'Object.'" In *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, edited by Lorraine Daston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Schrader, Robert F. *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy*. Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico Press, 1983.

Sewell, William H., Jr. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Seymour, Susan C. *Cora Du Bois: Anthropologist, Diplomat, Agent*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015.

Shapin, Steven. "Cordelia's Love: Credibility and the Social Studies of Science." *Perspectives on Science* Volume 3, Number 3 (Fall 1995).

_____. *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as If It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Smith, Joshua J. "Standing with Sol: The Spirit and Intent of Action Anthropology." *Anthropologica* Volume 57, Number 2 (2015).

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York, N.Y.: Zed Books, 2012.

Solovey, Mark. "Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution: Rethinking the Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus," *Social Studies of Science* Volume 31, Number 2 (April 2001).

_____. "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* Volume 40, Number 4 (Fall 2004).

_____. *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America*. Newark, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013.

_____"To Be or Not to Be Included: Uncovering the Roots of the NSF's Scientific Approach." In *Social Science for What?: Battles over Public Funding for the "Other Sciences" at the National Science Foundation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2020.

Solovey, Mark and Hamilton Cravens, editors. *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human*. New York, N.Y." Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Sommers, Laurie Kay. "Definitions of 'Folk' and 'Lore' in the Smithsonian Festival of American Folklife." *Journal of Folklore Research* Volume 33, Number 3 (September–December 1996).

Srivastava, Vinay Kumar. "Should Anthropologists Pay Their Respondents?" *Anthropology Today* Volume 8, Number 6 (December 1992).

Starn, Orin. "Engineering Internment: Anthropologists and the War Relocation Authority," *American Ethnologist* Volume 13, Number 4 (November 1986).

Stocking, George W., Jr. "Delimiting Anthropology: Historical Reflections on the Boundaries of a Boundless Discipline." *Social Research* Volume 62, Number 4 (Winter 1995).

_____. *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

_____. *Glimpses into My Own Black Box: An Exercise in Self-Deconstruction*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010.

_____, editor. *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict, and Others: Essays on Culture and Personality*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.

_____, editor. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

_____. *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

_____. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Sullivan, Martin. "Return of the Sacred Wampum Belts of the Iroquois." *The History Teacher* Volume 26, Number 1 (November 1992).

Taylor, Mark Kline. "What Has Anthropology to do With Theology?" *Theology Today* Volume 41, Number 4 (January 1985).

Treglia, Gabriella. "Cultural Pluralism or Cultural Imposition? Examining the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Education Reforms during the Indian New Deal (1933–1945)." *Journal of the Southwest* Volume 16, Number 4 (Winter 2019).

Trencher, Susan R. "The American Anthropological Association and the Values of Science, 1935–70." *American Anthropologist* Volume 104, Number 2 (June 2002).

Turner, Hannah. *Cataloguing Culture: Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation*. Vancouver, B.C., Canada: University of British Columbia Press, 2020.

Valandra, Edwin C. and Vine Deloria, Jr. *Not Without Our Consent: Lakota Resistance to Termination, 1950–59*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

Walker, William S. *A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

_____. "John C. Ewers and the Problem of Cultural History: Displaying American Indians at the Smithsonian in the Fifties." *Museum History Journal* Volume 1, Number 1 (2008).

_____. "'We Don't Live Like That Anymore': Native Peoples at the Smithsonian's Festival of American Folklife, 1970–1976." *American Indian Quarterly* Volume 35, Number 4 (Fall 2001).

Walters, Anna Lee. *Talking Indian: Reflections on Survival and Writing*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Firebrand Books, 1992.

Warren, Stephen and Ben Barnes. "Salvaging the Salvage Anthropologists: Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin, Carl Voegelin, and the Future of Ethnohistory." *Ethnohistory* Volume 65, Number 2 (April 2018).

Wilner, Isaiah Lorado and Patrick Wolfe. "A Global Potlatch: Identifying the Indigenous Influence on Western Thought." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Volume 37, Number 2 (2013).

Wilner, Isaiah Lorado. "Friends in this World: The Relationship of George Hunt and Franz Boas." In *The Franz Boas Papers, Volume 1: Franz Boas as Public Intellectual-Theory, Ethnography, Activism*, edited by Regna Darnell. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2015.

Wolf, Eric R. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982.

Woodbury Richard B. and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury. "The Rise and Fall of the Bureau of American Ethnology." *Journal of the Southwest* Volume 41, Number 3 (Autumn 1999).

Wylie, Alison. "Questions of Evidence, Legitimacy, and the (Dis)Unity of Science." *American Antiquity* Volume 65, Number 2 (April 2000).

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001.