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Anthropology at Chicago is intended not so much to display the riches of the Department of Special Collections' holdings, but rather to give the viewer a sense of the way in which they may be used in the construction of a history—a history of a somewhat unusual type, with special historiographical problems.

The type is suggested by the subtitle: "Tradition, Discipline, Department." Given the fact that so much of the modern intellectual tradition is molded within university departments, compartmentalized by academic disciplines, the relative dearth of departmental histories is indeed striking. This exhibit derives from such a history still in process: that of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago, which this year celebrates its Fiftieth Anniversary as an independent entity.

As history, Anthropology at Chicago has, however, obvious limitations. Although the manuscript materials in Special Collections are currently being enriched by Sol Tax's donation of his personal manuscripts, they do not yet encompass all aspects of the Department's activities. Particularly for the recent years—where the sources are still lodged in the active files of the participants—the materials available to me have a rather different character than for earlier periods. Furthermore, a history carried close to the present by a member of the community being described is a difficult undertaking (even if it were not presented in a celebrational context). Despite these limitations, I have tried to touch upon themes which are presently problematic, and it is perhaps a measure of the Department's strength and esprit that their handling has been left entirely to my discretion. In other contexts, and with other source materials, such issues would doubtless be treated more fully or in different ways, but many of them are at least suggested here.

In the present context, the nature of this publication placed limitations on how much could be said about the topic of each exhibit case. As a result, my style is even more condensed than usual. Hopefully those who are able to peruse the documents displayed may savor more of the stuff of history. Though chosen from a particular perspective, these will still elicit varied interpretations. Within the limits of my bricolage (and a two-dimensional display) each viewer may thus be his own historiographer.

Given these various constraints, it is inevitable that there will be many whose contributions to the history of the Department are inadequately represented here. To them I can only apologize and offer the hope that a later, fuller history will seem truer to their experience. For the present, I would like to thank all those who helped in the preparation of this exhibit, including several student assistants, the Special Collections staff, and of course my colleagues in the Department of Anthropology. Many of the latter have graciously given up their traditional anthropological role for that of informant—with all the risks of misinterpretation that interchange entails. Particular thanks are due to Sarah Robinson, who contributed to several phases of the exhibit's preparation, and to Edith Brinken, without whom the exhibit cabinets might have looked even more like so many departmental bulletin boards. The research for the exhibit was in part supported by the Adolph and Marian Lichtsire Fund for Anthropological Research. I also would like to thank Gertrude and Sol Tax whose generosity made this publication possible.

October, 1979 George W. Stocking, Jr.
Professor in the
Department of
Anthropology and
in the Morris Fishbein
Center for the Study
of the History of
Science and Medicine
It appears, from the ridiculous prejudices... even among men of letters, that under the pompous name of the study of man everyone does hardly anything except study the men of his country... Shall we never see reborn those happy times when philosophers undertook the greatest voyages solely to inform themselves, and went far away to shake off the yoke of national prejudices, to learn to know men by their likenesses and their differences...? We ourselves would see a new world come from their pens, and we would thus learn to know our own.

Rousseau's Discourse (1755): frontispiece and pp. 23ff.

MAMMALIA.

ORDER I. PRIMATES.

Fore-teeth cutting; upper 4, parallel; teats 2 pectoral.

1. HOMO.

Sapiens. Diurnal; varying by education and situation. 

2. Four-footed, mute, hairy. 

3. Copper-coloured, choleric; cleft.

Hair black, straight, thick; nostrils wide; face barb; beard scanty; oblate, content free. Paints himself with fine red lines. Regulated by customs.

4. Fair, sanguine, brawny.

Hair yellow, brown, flowing; eyes blue; gentle, acute, inventive. Covered with close velments. Governed by laws.

5. Sooty, melancholy, rigid.

Hair black; eyes dark; sullen, haughty, covetous. Covered with coarse garments. Governed by opinions.


Hair black, frizzled; skin silky; nose flat; lips tumid; crafty, indolent, negligent. Paints himself with grease. Governed by caprice.

Mammalia

Varying by climate or art.

1. Small, active, timid.

2. Large, indolent.


4. Beardless.

5. Head conic.

6. Head flattened.

The anatomical, physiological, natural, moral, civil and social histories of man are best described by their respective writers.

Vol. I.-C 2. SIMIA.
Although an interest in the causes of the physical, linguistic, and cultural differences among men can be traced to antiquity, practitioners of the modern discipline of anthropology usually find their ancestors in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. A more secular view of man provided a new context in which to interpret the information about human variety generated by the experience of European expansion. New views of human history charged the confrontation of European and non-Western man with ambiguity and ambivalence. The notion of Enlightenment implied a self-congratulatory sense of the historical development of European “civilization” (a term which assumed its modern meaning only about 1760); on the other hand, the cultural self-criticism which Enlightenment made possible contributed to the vogue of the “Noble Savage” free from civilization’s corrupting influences. The episodes which provided data for “anthropological” speculation were themselves both experienced and represented in terms of these cultural ideologies—as witnessed by two versions of the same encounter between “civilized” and “savage” man: Captain James Cook’s published account of the landing at Tonga (“The Friendly Isles”) in 1777, and a pictorial representation of the same event in the Noble Savage mode.

“Anthropology” in the modern sense of the word was still a century in the future. Nevertheless, by Cook’s time there were already emerging two frameworks of discourse in which to incorporate information about non-European man. By mid-century, the taxonomic impulse of “natural history” was moving beyond the classification of plants and animals to encompass also human variety. But when the genus homo was included in Linnaeus’ great systematization of the natural world, there was no clear differentiation between physical and cultural taxonomy. Furthermore, Linnaeus’s essentially static creationist view of plant and animal species did not yet permit natural variety to be viewed in evolutionary terms.

A developmental view of man was first applied not to his physical form but to the products of his cultural capacities. After 1750 social theorists attempted to place European progress into a broader historical framework by comparing the subsistence modes, social institutions, and religions of existing human groups, and arranging them in presumed sequences of development from the savage to the civilized state. Henry Home, Lord Kames, departed from most of his contemporaries in adopting the heterodox view that the American Indians had been separately created, but his Sketches of the History of Man is in other respects a characteristic example of later eighteenth-century “conjectural history.”

In general, the anthropological thought of the Enlightenment treated the variety of human cultural forms as expressions in historical sequence of all the capacities of “The Human Mind.” Despite Linnaeus’ correlation of government and color, “race” was not yet a major anthropological category. One can, however, distinguish egalitarian and inequalitarian trends, the one associated with eighteenth-century social theory, the other with the emerging systematic interest in the physical differences among men. The frontispiece of Rousseau’s Discourse on Inequality, with the naked savage being welcomed back among his civilized equals, contrasts dramatically with the hierarchical representation of primate facial anatomy in Peter Camper’s Treatise on the Natural Difference of Features in Persons of Different Countries. By the end of the century, the political reaction against the French Revolution, the development of more differentiated biological classifications, and the tendency of Romantic thought to emphasize the uniqueness of national cultural forms had laid the basis for a heightened concern with differences among groups which were later indiscriminately called “races.” While the revival of Christian religious orthodoxy discouraged the idea of any radical plurality within the human species, it also inhibited a tolerant view of the cultural forms of non-Western man. Savages, no longer noble, were regarded as degenerate offshoots of the human race who could not be civilized without being reclaimed for Christianity.
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On the American continent, the contrast between "savage" and "civilized" man was experienced not as a representation of events at the ends of the world or an interpretation of national ancestral relics, but rather in the active and often violent expropriation of an existing aboriginal population. In this context, the physical and moral presence of the American Indian was the dominant influence on anthropological inquiry in the United States until the middle of the twentieth century. Since the Bible postulated the original unity of all men, the basic problem of American anthropology was to establish an Old World origin for the aborigines of America. Until well into the nineteenth century, anthropological writers took quite seriously the arguments of such works as John Adair's *History of the American Indians*. Alleging numerous similarities between the cultural forms he had observed during long residence among southeastern tribes and those of the ancient Hebrews in the Old Testament, Adair attempted to prove the derivation of the Indians from the "ten lost tribes of Israel."

After 1800, the expansion of the new American nation toward the Pacific opened new vistas of anthropological inquiry, to which Thomas Jefferson contributed both as president of the United States and president of the American Philosophical Society. Although his instructions to the Lewis and Clark expedition reflect traditional biblical concerns, they may be taken as the start of a continuous empirical tradition. From this time on, the ethnological data collected by explorers, missionaries, and settlers in the American West was subject to systematic reinterpretation by men with ties to scholarly and scientific institutions on the Eastern seaboard. New issues of scholarly controversy emerged; old ones were transformed in the context of new developments in biological and philological inquiry.

One long-standing debate centered around the large earthen mounds of the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, which many writers besides Caleb Atwater had difficulty attributing to the Indians then being driven from the Northwest Territory. For decades after Atwater's "Mounds of the Ohio" was published in the proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society in 1820, scholars disputed the problem of the "mound-builders"—whether or not these ceremonial centers and defensive structures had been built by an intellectually superior race which had been replaced by more vigorous barbarian intruders.

By the 1830s, the study of human skeletal remains had developed beyond the limited comparisons possible in the later eighteenth century. Following the lead of European comparative anatomists and influenced by the newly fashionable "science" of phrenology—the physiological psychology of its day—Samuel Morton of Philadelphia pursued cranial researches that by 1850 had established an "American School" of physical anthropology, which argued the separate creation of distinct races in the various major geographical regions of the earth. Against this "polygenist" viewpoint, "monogenists" turned to European comparative philology, which, by showing the common source of a number of apparently divergent languages, offered a methodological model for reducing human diversity to the unity postulated by Christian orthodoxy. On the American continent, where a relatively uniform physical type contrasted with a wide diversity of languages, the attempt to define the natural history of man in strictly physical terms was unsuccessful. "Ethnology" (as the study of human variety came to be called) remained an embracive inquiry, and the classification of human groups tended to be done on the basis of language.

From the time of Albert Gallatin's *Synopsis* in 1836, a series of attempts were made to synthesize the growing body of ethnographic data. By 1879, the geologist John Wesley Powell, who had collected ethnographic data during government-sponsored explorations of the Great Basin area, was able to win permanent government support for ethnographic inquiry with the founding of the Bureau of Ethnology. While the Bureau did not realize Powell's promise that "anthropologic science" would provide a more rational basis for the implementation of reservation policy, by 1889 Powell had produced a classification of American Indian linguistic families which was to provide the basic framework for the subsequent investigations of academic anthropologists.
Kwakiutl encampment on the Midway, Chicago, 1893
The intellectual atmosphere in which academic anthropology emerged was heavily conditioned by the assumptions of late nineteenth-century evolutionism. Although clearly an ideological affirmation of the power and values of Victorian culture, cultural evolutionism may be viewed also as a solution to problems posed by Darwin's doctrine of natural selection, the simultaneous realization of the great antiquity of man, and the consequent abandonment of biblical views of human history. Called upon by Darwin's traditionalist critics to demonstrate that the human capacity for culture could have developed by purely natural processes over an indefinite time period, Darwinians like John Lubbock resurrected the comparative method of the eighteenth century in order to reconstitute Prehistoric Times on the basis of the customs and manners of modern "savages." In a Darwinian milieu, however, the inferiority of savages was not merely cultural; they were in fact assumed to represent biologically intermediate forms between white European man and the higher primates. In this context, pre-Darwinian "ethnology" was transformed into a more "scientifically" oriented discipline in which contemporary physical, linguistic, and cultural variation was encompassed within the broader evolutionary development of the genus homo—Anthropology, as it had come to be called in the Anglo-American tradition by the time Edward Burnett Tylor's classic textbook appeared in 1884.

In the hands of Herbert Spencer, who had developed the doctrine independently of Darwin, evolutionism provided a frame both for the comparative presentation of a large amount of cross-cultural data and for the analysis of human social order in its static and developmental aspects. Like other evolutionists, Spencer saw human culture in utilitarian terms as a series of directly adaptive solutions to problems posed by the natural world: "primitive" men—exemplified by such living "representatives" of the Paleolithic as the contemporary Australian aborigines—did as well as their smaller brains and more limited intelligence would allow. As the leading American evolutionary anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan, described it in the early 1870s, human cultural evolution was on the one hand a regular sequence of subsistence modes and on the other a regular growth of a series of universal ideas: the idea of government, the idea of language, etc.

By the end of the century the combined influence of more systematic empirical investigations and changing intellectual trends had begun to call into question the assumptions of "classical" evolutionary anthropology. Baldwin Spencer and Frank Gillen's study of the Arunta of central Australia was the stimulus for more than a decade of anthropological debate about the principles of "primitive" social and religious organization, culminating in 1912 with the publication of Emile Durkheim's Elementary Forms of Religious Life. Durkheim's own extended critical reevaluation of Spencerian assumptions provided much of the theoretical basis for the modern British tradition of synchronic functional analysis. Although still viewed in positivistic terms within a broadly evolutionary framework, primitive (and by extension, civilized) cultural forms were interpreted as complex manifestations of the "collective consciousness" of distinctive social groups.

During the same period a more radically relativistic critique of evolutionary assumptions was undertaken in the United States by the German immigrant anthropologist Franz Boas. Over several decades beginning in 1886, Boas carried on extended ethnographic fieldwork in the Canadian Northwest, working most extensively among the Kwakuitl Indians of Vancouver Island—a group of whom camped on the Midway at the Chicago Columbian Exposition in 1893. Between 1894 and 1911 Boas published a series of essays calling into question the assumption that civilization was an indicator of racial capacity, and that contemporary human cultural manifestations could be arranged in regular sequences of evolutionary development. Arguing that there was no evidence to sustain the view that any living group of non-European men represented an intermediate form between man and some primate ancestor, he insisted that the formulation of scientific laws of cultural development must await upon the detailed historical reconstruction of the development of particular human cultures. As brought together in The Mind of Primitive Man, Boas' critique of evolutionism laid the basis for the modern anthropological concept of culture. Human cultures are conceived not simply as utilitarian responses to the pressures of environment, but in pluralistic relativistic terms as different worlds of thought in terms of which the external world is interpreted. Despite its antievolutionism, Boas' anthropology retained a natural historical orientation which embraced all facets of human variety—in sharp contrast to the purely social theoretical approach of the Durkheimian tradition. Having achieved by World War I a dominant position within the profession of American anthropology, Boas was the most powerful single intellectual influence on its methodological and theoretical development until his death in 1942.
Anthropological cabinets in the Walker Museum, ca. 1900
By 1890, anthropology was beginning to find a niche in the system of graduate education then emerging under the influence of German academic traditions. In 1888, the newly founded journal of the anthropological society organized by government anthropologists in Washington announced the world's first doctorate in the subject—at a German university. The next year, anthropology was introduced at Clark University when Franz Boas was appointed Docent in the psychology department. Before leaving in 1892 to take charge of anthropological work at the Chicago Columbian Exposition, Boas trained the first American Ph.D. at Clark. However, for a discipline still largely based on the collection of skeletal material, archaeological remains, and items of material culture, the most likely institutional milieu was one connected to a museum—as the Bureau of Ethnology was tied to the Smithsonian Institution. Such a connection existed at Harvard University, where Frederick W. Putnam had long been in charge of anthropological work at the Peabody Museum. With the reorganization of its academic structure in 1890, Harvard soon became one of the two major producers of doctorates in anthropology. The other was Columbia, where Boas was hired in 1896, when he also accepted a position as anthropological curator at the American Museum of Natural History.

When William Rainey Harper accepted the challenge of converting Rockefeller millions into a major university in the Midwest, one of his first acts was to appoint an anthropologist. Rather than reflecting a clearly defined sense of the role of anthropology in the University, Harper's choice seems to have been the result of personal association. Frederick Starr had been registrar at the summer school in Chautauqua, New York, where Harper served as principal. Although Starr was an effective popular lecturer in anthropology and had just undertaken a year's postgraduate work in anthropologically-related topics at Yale, the doctorate granted him by his undergraduate alma mater (Lafayette) was honorary, and his scientific experience was primarily in geology.

Starr's appointment was originally in the "scientific department," but when the University opened, other arrangements had been made. Harper had committed himself to the development of "social science" (or sociology) under Albion W. Small. Having second thoughts about how much of the University's limited resources should be committed to anthropology, Harper decided for the time being to include Starr's work within Small's department. Given the rather marginal position anthropology held between the natural historical and social theoretical traditions, it was not an unjustifiable choice. But in this period the more typical connection, as Starr insisted, would have been with the natural sciences. He certainly would have rejected Small's suggestion that anthropology was to sociology as arithmetic was to mathematics. Despite Starr's insistence that the connection was to be only temporary, and that his position was in no sense subordinate, Harper's judgment of administrative convenience was to have important consequences for the history of anthropology at Chicago.

Starr's situation was further complicated by the failure of hopes he shared with Harper that the University might include a major museum of natural history, in which anthropology would have found what was then a more normal institutional home. Although Harper made an attempt to attach to the University the new museum planned to house the exhibits from the Columbian Exposition, his efforts were frustrated. The intended museum building, which was donated by a University trustee, George C. Walker, did receive certain anthropological collections, but the main body of the Exposition's anthropological materials went to the new Field Columbian Museum. To Walker's irritation, the building bearing his name was used primarily for faculty offices and classroom space. Given the rather traditional orientation of Starr's anthropology, his institutional situation was unpromising; a natural scientist by training, he was attached to what was to become the nation's premier department of sociology: a museum anthropologist in style, he was deprived of an effective working relationship to a museum of natural history.
Frederick Starr receiving a farewell visit from Baluba tribesmen, 1906

The pygmy chief was brought around. He is a little man. He presents the pot belly, abundant big hair, sortish gray body hair, &c., usually attributed to his race. He is from the Mambute country, & is a chief among his people and because he gave the best trouble has been defeated. He was well behaved and ready to do anything we desired. His voice was soft and low as appendant when we tried to secure a vocabulary. We were totally unable to make him comprehend what we wished in the way of sky, his pubic hair was abundant; his penis was remarkably short like a boy of 12 years. I am not sure about circumcision. His legs were uncircumcised. His hands were large and prominent in the line and hand. He had rather an absurd chin beard and mustache. We measured him graphed and vocabularied him.
Before anthropology was a recognized academic discipline, the route to a professorship was necessarily circuitous. Frederick Starr's career took him from Pennsylvania through Illinois to Iowa, where he taught biology at Coe College and did research on thunderstorms for the Davenport Academy of Natural Sciences—a regional organization whose ambitions for national status were tarnished by disputes over the authenticity of moundbuilder artifacts later proven to be forgeries. After becoming interested in the Iowa Indians, Starr began including lectures in Indian costume among his repertoire as a public lecturer to Iowa farmfolk; he also introduced the first course in anthropology in the state. In 1888 he returned East to qualify for a more serious pursuit of his scientific interests, studying with William Graham Sumner and James Dwight Dana at Yale and travelling under the latter's sponsorship to other natural history institutions. After helping to prepare anthropological collections at the American Museum of Natural History, he eventually took a professorship of geology at Pomona College in California.

Following Harper's invitation to Chicago, Starr further prepared himself by conducting surveys of the major anthropological institutions of the eastern seaboard and Western Europe; he also did physical anthropological work among the Cherokee as part of the investigations Boas organized for the Columbian Exposition. Coming upon anthropology just before its intellectual transformation, Starr's efforts at self-professionalization had the effect of rooting him permanently in late nineteenth-century evolutionism. His first major anthropological work—a publication of his summer lectures by the Chautauqua Press—was little more than a reworking of Tylor's *Anthropology*, which Starr continued to use as a textbook until the end of his career.

Starr, however, was not the stereotypic "armchair" evolutionist. At a time when American anthropologists rarely worked outside the United States, he made two trips to Africa, a half dozen to the Far East, and fifteen to southern Mexico. However, his Congo field notes suggest that the data he collected were rather superficial: characteristically, he "measured, vocabularied and photographed." Primarily interested in physical anthropology, he was preoccupied with exotica such as albinism and polydactylysm. His proudest anthropological production was an extended series of plaster busts, collected by means which, according to one account, required Starr to establish himself almost as village dictator, threatening reluctant subjects with jail if they did not submit to the arduous and anxious procedure. His most representative publications were travel accounts and photographic albums, and he seems to have had little awareness of the linguistic and textual approaches which Boas was using to move anthropology from the museum to the academy.

To a great extent Starr's anthropology was oriented outward from the University, from which he was gone much of the time. His personal eccentricities and his interest in anthropological oddities made him a frequent figure in the public press. Even his serious political concerns had a paradoxical character. Although he was an active Anti-Imperialist, he defended Belgian rule in the Congo against reformist criticism—for which the Belgians awarded him one of the various citations and medals which he had accumulated by the end of his career.
The honors of a lifetime, ca. 1920
Anthropology did well enough in its early years in what was soon called the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Given the evolutionary orientation which still prevailed in sociology, anthropology had indeed a certain priority, insofar as it provided a comparative developmental framework for the study of Western social forms. The early announcements still looked forward to the quick establishment of an independent department, and Starr even undertook a series of Bulletin of the University of Chicago Department of Anthropology—though he was the only author represented. For a time, Small apparently forwarded Starr’s undertakings with President Harper. The fellowship granted in 1897 to David P. Barrows (whom Starr had previously taught at Pomona, and who was later to be President of the University of California), produced the first Chicago Ph.D. in anthropology. It was followed in short order by a second doctorate for Merton Miller, who also served briefly on the department’s staff, covering Starr’s courses during one of his many absences in the field.

By 1900, however, the fortunes of anthropology had fallen as those of sociology rose. The joint department grew along lines which either led away from or competed with Starr’s interests. By 1904 William I. Thomas (whom Starr himself described as in effect an anthropologist) wrote to Harper proposing a reorganization of anthropological work. Later on, Small apparently toyed with the idea of getting Boas from Columbia as Head Professor—although Harper had long since rejected Boas because he did not “take instruction well.” Although Harper seems to have stood by his chosen anthropologist, he was sometimes sorely tried. In 1897, he berated Starr for having had a brochure describing the Department of Anthropology published by a press back in Davenport, Iowa; in 1904, he suggested that Starr’s newspaper notoriety was helping neither his own nor the University’s reputation.

By 1910 it was clear even to Starr that his hopes to establish a graduate department of anthropology had been frustrated. When Boas wrote in connection with an American Anthropological Association survey of university programs in the discipline, Starr—answering from Tokyo—explained that his work was by now primarily oriented toward undergraduate instruction. Increasingly, Starr found solace in external activities such as his debates with Clarence Darrow, or in his great popularity as an undemanding undergraduate lecturer. When the “Lone Starr” retired in 1923 some of his students raised enough money to buy him a home in Seattle, from which he could easily continue his travels to the Far East.
November 26, 1928.

Professor Frederic Woodward, Acting President, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Mr. Woodward-

I have your note of the 17th concerning the proposal to set up a separate Department of Anthropology and am pleased that it is to be considered soon.

Our relations with Sociology have been most cordial and we feel especially indebted to Prof. Park for his lively interest and help. As a matter of fact, we have delayed several months in bringing this matter to your attention because of the feeling of indecision on Prof. Park's part and our reluctance to do anything which might reflect on him. In this request for a separate department nothing of a personal nature is involved. We do believe, however, that the time has come when Anthropology at the University of Chicago would be greatly strengthened by being made independent, and we do not think that Sociology would suffer by its separation. It has always been recognized that the present arrangement was purely tentative and until a year ago the University announcements so stated.

In cultural anthropology we have close ties not only with sociology, but with psychology and to a lesser extent with economics and political science. Coming to archaeology we are much closer to history, geology, and paleontology. On the diachronetic side we again tie up closely with psychology and the various linguistic departments, while in physical anthropology we are intimately related to the zoologists and paleontologists. We emphasize field work, and in general we are closer to the methods of the Oriental Institute than to any other division of the University, but even here we deal with quite different materials. Our work is unified by the fact that we focus it on man and his culture, but it must be recognized that we have these four methods of approach, only one of which is intimately related to Sociology, and even there, we use, in the main, different materials and techniques. We believe that students should be required to have a good grounding in the related fields, and we would, if separate, still send our students to Sociology, Psychology, another department, but it appears to us that as long as departments exist, there is every justification for Anthropology being independent.

...There is every justification for Anthropology being independent.

Prof. Woodward.

11/26/28

In nearly all other universities, such as Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, California, Washington, Anthropology is separate and it is a matter of surprise and comment among other anthropologists that we are here connected with Sociology. In placing our men we are at a certain disadvantage since we are forced to explain that despite the name of our department here, we still offer complete training in anthropology. We are, in fact, maintaining a fiction rather than a fact, when we call it a joint department, for aside from our chairman and a lunch once a week, we have little more in common than we would have if separate. That we cannot have the same requirements from candidates for higher degrees is shown by the fact that in the announcement of courses there is one set of requirements for sociology and another for anthropology, and these two lists have little in common. The majority of students who now take degrees in the department have practically all their work in one branch or the other. Whatever there is of interchange would be continued under the new arrangement. We have separate library accounts, and in the plans for the new Social Science Research building there is no closer relationship with Sociology than with any of the other of the social sciences.

In the Social Science Research Council we are separate. We have our independent national organizations, and our own publications. Anthropology is represented in the National Research Council, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, while Sociology is in neither.

A year ago the University approved the establishment of a Citizens' Committee on Anthropology, a group which now includes some of the leading citizens of Chicago. It is the belief of Mr. Haynes and of all of us that Anthropology will secure considerable financial support, and that it is quite possible we may be able to carry out a research program which will place us in the lead among American institutions. But here again, we are embarrassed by the fact that we are compelled to act independently of one another. Sociology, for it is practically impossible to devise with them details of plans in which we have little in common.

The whole situation can be summarized by saying that Sociology and Anthropology are so different that we in Anthropology are not competent to judge in matters relating to Sociology, nor is it possible for them to pass on matters strictly anthropological.

For these reasons we believe that a separation is desirable and we hope that it can be accomplished without friction or delay.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Professor of Anthropology.

Fay-Cooper Cole and Edward Sapir wishing bon voyage to Paul Martin and John Blackburn (in the Department's archaeology truck), 1926
Foreseeing the eventual realization of an independent department, Small recommended that Starr's place be filled by the part-time appointment of Fay-Cooper Cole, who had been employed at the Field Museum since his graduation from Northwestern University. Accompanied by his wife, Cole had done extended fieldwork in the Philippines in 1906, from which he later produced a thoroughly Boasian dissertation for his Ph.D. at Columbia.

A genial, self-effacing man of no great intellectual pretensions, Cole was an able lecturer and a remarkably effective organizer and administrator. He quickly took advantage of the resources available to the social sciences at Chicago to consolidate his own position and that of his discipline. When his prompt success as a teacher suggested the need for additional personnel, Cole, with the aid of money from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, brought to Chicago the brilliant linguist-anthropologist Edward Sapir, whom he had known as "the shark of the lot" in Boas' seminar.

Although Sapir's appointment placed Chicago anthropology firmly in the Boasian tradition, it also reflected a change in American anthropology from a museum-oriented discipline to one that would contribute to knowledge of "the essential patterns and mechanisms of social behavior." Sapir continued to study the historical relationships of contemporary Indian language groups, but he was also concerned with the psychological problems of the way in which different languages created "distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached." His ultimate goal, he suggested at one point, was a "social psychology of the symbol." The fact that Chicago anthropology was tied to a sociology department with a strong interest in the cultural assimilation of immigrant groups in contemporary America clearly contributed to this reorientation. Cole had early introduced a course on "Our Alien Peoples," and several of his research proposals reflected a concern with contemporary social issues.

In many respects, however, anthropology at Chicago remained quite traditional, and when Cole and Sapir applied to the Spelman Memorial for money to support field research as an essential component of graduate training, they criticized museum anthropology on the grounds that traditionally important anthropological activities were suffering from the unevenness of museum interest. Once Sapir's presence freed Cole from certain teaching burdens, he reactivated a long dormant interest in archaeology, which he saw as a means to mobilize support for an easily accessible and inexpensive form of field research. From 1926, under the auspices of the National Research Council Committee on State Archaeological Surveys, a reconstructed Reo "camper" travelled to sites all over Illinois, and the summer dig in an Indian mound became a regular feature of the Chicago anthropology student's career.

As Robert Redfield's graduate program suggests, the rapidly growing number of students who specialized in anthropology had little time for sociological training, and when Leslie White took his Ph.D. orals in 1927, one of the sociologists seems to have given him a rather bad time. By then, Redfield's addition to a staff of eight converted a pair of anthropologists into a distinct faculty grouping—housed together in the physiology building some distance from the sociologists. When it seemed that funding and job opportunities would sustain their independence, Cole proposed a separation on the grounds that anthropology's ties to sociology were no closer than those to a number of other social and natural scientific disciplines.
Dear [Name],

Deliberations do not begin for another hour, and writing to you makes me feel good.

The place is overrun with pedants and potentates. The potentates are the executive secretaries of the big foundations —, and they represent huge — staggering — amounts of money that has been set aside for research. The pedants have invited the potentates so that the potentates may see how pedants do their most effective thinking, and how they arrange to spend that money. But we are mentioning money; one speaks of "research," "set-up" and "significant results." Yes, its useful
On February 18, 1929, Acting President Woodward sent letters to Cole and Ellsworth Faris (chairman of the joint department), establishing a separate Department of Anthropology under Cole's chairmanship. By this time, Cole and Sapir were both important members of an emerging national network of elite academicians and foundation bureaucrats who helped to define the research priorities of the social sciences—"pedants and potentates" as Robert Redfield called them when he first attended the Social Science Research Council Hanover Conference in 1930. Within six weeks of the department's founding, the three anthropologists had sent off to the Rockefeller Foundation a five-year plan for anthropological research, which was quickly funded to the tune of $75,000.

In addition to various archaeological and linguistic projects in the United States, the proposal included work in northwestern Mexico—provoking a brief flurry of concern among the University of California anthropologists, who considered this an encroachment on "their" ethnographic preserve. The plan extended beyond Mexico to include a substantial sum for research which Sapir was supervising in Africa—in connection with which Mark Hanna Watkins was later to become the first black Ph.D. in anthropology. For a brief moment before the economic roof fell in, Chicago students were involved in research all over the world, and the opportunities for their subsequent academic employment seemed very bright indeed.

Cole's fund-raising activities were not limited to the "potentates" of the eastern seaboard. He was also active locally among a group of well-heeled members of a "Citizen's Committee on Anthropology" which he organized in 1927. Within several years, one of them, Mrs. Adolph Lichtstern, established a $300,000 endowment for ethnological research. Another, the retired grain-broker Dr. Frank Logan, was on the verge of giving an amount sufficient to build a separate anthropology building next to the Oriental Institute when he was "hit by the whirlwind" of a crashing stock market, forcing the Department to retreat into space in the newly opened Social Science Research Building.

Cole's plans for a separate building had been justified in terms of a three-part conception of the role of anthropology: the reconstruction of the "long struggle man has waged in building up our present civilization"; the "study of existing cultures" in the context of changing sources of American immigration; and the study of "present day problems relating to human heredity, race crossing and adaption of immigrants to American conditions." However, his hopes for a permanent appointment for Wilton M. Krogman as physical anthropologist were forestalled by the onset of the depression, and by the more serious personnel problem resulting from Sapir's increasing dissatisfaction with the teaching load he was forced to carry. When Sapir received a virtually unmatchable offer from Yale, the University did all it could to speak to his concerns, anticipating that as a Jew he would "find life difficult in the Ivy League." However, the two appointments made to fill his place until he might return—one (his student Harry Hoijer) as linguist and the other (A. R. Radcliffe-Brown) as departmental "star"—turned out to be more than temporary. The latter, particularly, was to have a strong influence on the Department, turning it back toward "social science" in the aftermath of its separation from sociology.
Dr. F. C. Cole
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Cole:

The very temperate and reasonable tone of your letter of May 25th makes me wonder if I have not been too vehement in my statement. I think what emerges more than anything else was Radcliffe-Brown's rather cool suggestion that the present manuscript of Father Herard's be turned into a general historical monograph on Navaho rituals in general; at least his remark sounds like that to me. You see, from my standpoint that meant that not only was the priceless linguistic material as such to be disregarded but that no adequate provision was ever to be made for the publication of Navaho texts, that all my own Navaho field work was, by implication, judged a waste of time, that I might, so far as he was concerned, never have trained Father Herard to do the kind of work that he is doing now, that nobody cared for elaborate accounts of specific Navaho rituals anyway, and that we in America had better get busy and learn something from Functionalisms as to how a truly readable volume should be prepared. It was perfectly obvious, also, that he had not the remotest idea of what was generally known here in America about Navaho rituals, that he was not in the least familiar with the work of Washington Matthews, of The Franciscan Fathers, and other Navaho authorities.

It was all very much as though some Smart Aleck were to put the proffered texts of the Homeric poems aside with a supercilious remark about how much more interesting it would be if the author of these useless formae could only be persuaded to prepare a monograph on the Greek mystery cults for us. Of course my action was much the same about nothing, I suppose, but, frankly, I do not like this high and mighty method of passing quick judgment on matters that are necessarily alien to one's own interests and training.

Suppose, however, that we get down to brass tacks. You raise the question first of all as to the purpose of this publication. I think its purpose is, as you indicate, twofold. In the first place it serves as a body of source material for linguistic reference. In the second place it presents an authentic first hand version of important legendary and ritualistic materials. It is true, as Harry Hoijer says, that my own volume of Navaho texts will be the primary basis for linguistic study, particularly as there will be appended to it, in all likelihood, a detailed list of stems. But Navaho is an extraordinarily sneaky language that the comparatively small body of text material which I have in my hands is not enough to serve as a completely satisfactory point of reference for future work in Athabaskan linguistics. As a matter of fact, however, I do not think that the linguistic and ethnological purposes of such text materials should be thought of as disconnected.
At the time he left Chicago, Sapir was supervising an extensive research program with funding from five different sources. The problems ranged from "phonetic symbolism" and the relation of voice to personality to Athabaskan ethnology and the comparative linguistics of Yucatan—the latter carried on by Manuel Andrade, who had a joint appointment in the Department and the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Although a number of his best students accompanied Sapir to Yale, the momentum of his interest continued to be felt in Chicago anthropology after his departure, particularly in relation to the American Southwest, where Sapir himself had carried on fieldwork in 1929. At the same time, a sense of theoretical disorientation was manifest in at least one prominent Chicago student (John Province), as he tried to orient himself to the various anthropological viewpoints then impinging on American historical ethnology. The impact of one of them was more directly felt when the Chicago anthropologists succeeded in bringing from Sydney, Australia, one of the two leading representatives of the British "functionalist" school—which their sociological colleague, Robert Park, described as "nothing more or less than sociology, with the qualification that it is mainly concerned with primitive peoples."

Still affecting an Edwardian Cambridge style, Radcliffe-Brown had a more narrowly focused intellectual personality than Sapir, and his undeniable charisma tended to polarize response. But for students interested in a more "scientific" study of social and cultural phenomena, his finely honed recension of Durkheim had a great appeal. R-B (as he came to be known during his American years) rejected historical ethnology as based largely on conjecture. He sought instead to develop a taxonomy of social forms which would make possible the derivation of "general laws" governing the "synchronic" functioning of human society, as a necessary prerequisite for any "diachronic" study of social change or evolution.

Soon after his arrival R-B embarked on the project of bringing order to the materials of Boasian ethnography. He undertook a comparative study of American Indian kinship terminologies, interpreting them in terms of sociological principles ("the equivalence of siblings," etc.) which had been "proposed and tested" in his recent Australian work. Employed as Research Assistant under the Rockefeller grant, Fred Eggen set about abstracting information on social organization for a series of typescript volumes on different cultural regions. He and other students began to collect field data in terms of problems posed by R-B's project—which "turned out to be somewhat greater in magnitude than was anticipated."

The contrast between R-B's rather ahistorical scientism and Sapir's humanistic search for symbolic "meaning" was quite dramatic. It became an issue in relation to the publication of Navajo materials collected under Sapir's auspices by the missionary Berard Haile—one of a number of Research Associates whose work was supported by the Department in this period. R-B, who had "never used such texts to contribute to wider problems, either historical or scientific," wanted to be shown "just how" they might add to our understanding of Navajo "thought and culture." Sapir, on the other hand, had no doubt that "there is an enormous amount of misunderstanding in current ethnological literature for the very reason that source materials are not obtained and published."

In this context, Chicago students tended to relate to Radcliffe-Brown in various ways other than complete conversion. Morris Opler, who had published a paper criticizing R-B on the relation of kinship terms and social behavior, had to be convinced by Robert Redfield that it was not inappropriate for him to be represented in the Festschrift presented to R-B prior to his departure for Oxford in 1937. Even Fred Eegon, who edited The Social Organization of North American Tribes, and who was later to be viewed as the chief spokesman of British social anthropology in the United States, conceived his work in retrospect as an attempt to synthesize the historical and scientific approaches in terms of a "Method of Controlled Comparison." Nevertheless, as Redfield pointed out, R-B's insistence on the possibility of a "strictly non-historical scientific method" was an important factor in a more general reorientation then going on in American anthropology.
Dear Pop,

This morning Mom received from you a letter written just after Thanksgiving, a letter so full of interest in us and support for us, that I feel that I cannot help sitting down and writing to you, even if it is only a few words.

We are at last on the brink of our exploit, because tomorrow very early we intend all of us to go down to Tepoztlan together. Boxes of supplies, the necessary beds and cooking utensils, a small kerosene stove and a charcoal brazier are up at the pueblo, and this afternoon I will check a suitcase and a small trunk to the railway station from which runs the little steep rocky path, about three miles in length, which is the road to Tepoztlan. Sr. Gondo, the educated Indian, has promised to meet us with four horses. We shall make an unusual evasion.

So far this trip has been so much what I had for so long imagined it, that it sometimes feels like a repetition of an experience in some earlier avatar. There it all is, the difficulties and the interest, the minor sicknesses, the unavoidable expense, the weakness one feels at this altitude, the difficulty and delay in getting into the graces of the Tepoztecos, the innumerable problems involved in getting into the pueblo those things which can make it possible for us to live there.

Liza is recovering from an upset stomach, but she is old enough to have resilience, and today she seems very well. The cold of long duration MMM from which the baby has suffered has caused his digestion to be upset, and he is now on a diet which is being gradually increased to normal for his age—a slow business. But he cannot be said to be sick; and I think it probable that the much more salubrious climate of Tepoztlan, with all the sunlight there is down there, will help him and all of us.

On the other hand our interest in the job has been very brightly reminded by my two glimpses of Tepoztlan. The whole history of Mexico appears in the walls, the streets, the talk of the people. Over the ancient foundations of the pre-columbian Indians stand an old and crumbling colonial town, with its church and ruined monastery. The adobe houses, built as they were built five hundred years ago, are about one-third in ruins due to the revolution of 1910. In those years Tepoztlan was perhaps the most dangerous place in Mexico, MMM a center of Zapataist warfare. The people have their lands now, and the town is the mildest, quietest, place I have ever seen. The barefoot people move in the crooked lanes, where never runs a wheel, like figures in a dream. They are still very Zapataist in sentiment, but it is going to be difficult to get them to talk about it. Coming back up the trail I met an stranger—w fat man with a blonde mustache—

...Like an experience in some earlier avatar—

Tepoztlan. 1926
The Folk Culture of Yucatan

Under the influence of Robert Park, who was both his teacher and his father-in-law, Redfield himself had already moved away from Boasian historicism toward a sociological anthropology with strongly evolutionary undertones. His fieldwork in Tepoztlán, Mexico (which Cole viewed as one of a series of “background” studies on the sources of American immigration), was the first anthropological study of a modern “peasant” community. Despite the fact that he was forced by revolutionary activity to remove his family to Mexico City, Tepoztlán became for Redfield the typical representation of the harmoniously integrated “folk society” which was the foundation of his subsequent work. Transposing the Tepoztecan descriptive adjectives *tonto* and *correcto* into social psychological types illustrating the diffusion of urban values, Redfield suggested that the “disorganization and perhaps the reorganization” of Tepoztecan culture under “the slowly growing influence of the city” exemplified a general process by which “primitive man becomes civilized man, the rustic becomes the urbanite.”

Early in 1930 Redfield went to Yucatan, where the Carnegie Institution of Washington was considering plans to broaden its ongoing archaeological research to include the ethnology and linguistics of present-day Yucatan. Despite strong fears that “sociological” research might jeopardize its “delicate” position in the area, the Institution decided to fund Redfield’s plan for a comparative study of four contemporary communities at different points along a scale of modernization. The most intensive work was done in Chan Kom, where the local school teacher, Alfonso Villa Rojas, was hard at work “civilizing” the Mayans—introducing among other things the foxtrot and the “Black Bottom.” Recruited by Redfield to collect ethnographic data and to keep a diary of daily events, Villa Rojas subsequently became the first in a long series of Latin American and Third World anthropologists to receive graduate training in the Department.

In 1935 the Mayan project was extended to Guatemala by Sol Tax. Unexpectedly he found himself working among Indians who, “far from resembling” Redfield’s typical folk-culture, “actually fit the criteria by which a city-type is judged.” Responding to these and other issues raised by Tax’s work, Redfield himself carried on extensive fieldwork in Guatemala, where he wrote much of the manuscript for *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*. His basic model of cultural change along a folk-urban continuum—an intellectual inheritance from Park which he shared with Louis Wirth in sociology—was not substantially modified. At the same time, Redfield had become increasingly interested in the analysis of culture as an ideational phenomenon, emphasizing “the quality of organization and inner consistency” unifying the “mental world of the participant in a well-established community.”

At the end of World War II, changes in Carnegie Institution policy brought the Yucatan project to an end. By that time, Redfield felt that his work had played a major role in establishing modern Middle American social anthropology, both in terms of the training of personnel and the collection of ethnographic data—although publication lagged consistently behind. The status of the whole venture as a contribution to “the scientific study of society,” however, was questioned by various critics in the early 1950s after a restudy of Tepoztlán by Oscar Lewis, who emphasized internal community conflict and the hardships of peasant life. Having retreated from his earlier scientism toward a more humanistic anthropology which recognized the role of the investigator’s own value commitment, Redfield suggested that his “emotional involvement” in Tepoztlán was perhaps less than Lewis’, since “my glands are older.”
Lloyd Warner among the Murngin, northeastern Arnhem Land, Australia, 1928
To the surprise of the University community, Redfield in 1934 became the third (and longest-tenured) Dean of the Social Sciences Division, which had been created by the University reorganization four years earlier. With its internal affairs under Cole’s benignly paternal supervision, the young Department of Anthropology was in a good position to take advantage of such opportunities for growth as the depression years offered. When the death of Roland Dixon upset the tenuous balance between innovation and tradition in the Harvard department, Redfield moved quickly to recruit one of the most dynamic figures in mid-twentieth-century American social science: William Lloyd Warner.

After a traditional Boasian training at the University of California, Warner had come under Radcliffe-Brown’s influence while doing fieldwork with Australian aborigines. From the beginning, however, his ultimate goal was “to get to know modern man better,” and when he took a job at Harvard after his return to the United States, he was able (by affiliation with Rockefeller-funded industrial researches at the Harvard Business School) to initiate major projects in Newburyport, Massachusetts, in Natchez, Mississippi, and (under different auspices) in western Ireland. Although Warner saw these as modern case studies for Radcliffe-Brown’s “comparative sociology,” they seemed to Redfield an obvious complement to his own work on communities within the orbit of modern civilization.

After speaking in the Divisional “Seminar in Race and Culture Contacts,” Warner concluded that Chicago would provide a supportive milieu for his broadly ranging interests. He soon accepted a joint appointment in the Departments of Anthropology and Sociology—although the transfer of his rather heavily-staffed and technologically complex projects required further negotiation. The analysis and publication of the earlier research results by Warner and his co-workers continued at Chicago—the Newburyport study producing five volumes in the “Yankee City Series” between 1941 and 1960. Warner, however, was not a man to rest on his entrepreneurial or intellectual laurels. Having initiated the study of what he called (somewhat controversially) the “caste” system of the American South, he was instrumental in organizing work in the Latin American and Black communities of Chicago—out of which came St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton’s widely-acclaimed Black Metropolis.

Warner seems to have found even a joint appointment confining to his intellectual energies. Unlike his mentor Radcliffe-Brown, who during his Chicago stay focused ever more narrowly on the analysis of social structure, Warner moved out from Durkheim via Freud to encompass a range of processual, psychological, and symbolic problems—all of them unified by his underlying interest in the way in which traditional American social institutions and cultural values functioned in modern industrial society. He always defined himself as a social anthropologist and continued to play an influential intellectual role in the Department, involving a cadre of his students in his researches for the Committee on Human Development. However, his interdisciplinary ventures did not always meet with his colleagues’ whole-hearted approval. In 1947, Redfield responded to a proposal for a Committee on Human Relations with queries as to whether it would not conflict with existing departmental interests. Over time, there was a tendency for Warner’s association with the Department to become diluted by his multiplex involvements, particularly when he initiated a downtown business venture in applied social science (Social Research, Inc.). Back in 1935, however, the effect of his appointment—along with that of Fred Eggin as instructor the same year—was to stamp the Chicago Department as the stronghold of a “social anthropological” viewpoint.
SKELETON IN SITU

I. GENERAL DATA

Date discovered: 8/15/30
Recovered by: W. A. Lessa
Exposed by: Left in situ

II. STRATIGRAPHICAL DATA

Type of soil above burial: Loose brown soil with yellow patches

III. BIO-Archaeological DATA

Type of burial: Extended on back

Positions:
A. Right arm: Folded over abdomen
B. Left arm: Folded over abdomen
C. Right leg: Extended over abdomen
D. Left leg: Extended over abdomen
E. Trunk: Extended on back
F. Head: Resting on left side

IV. ODONTOLOGICAL DATA

Age: Adult
Sex: Male
State of preservation: Poor
Bone breaks: All

Bones absent (or preserved): Hand and foot bones, fibulae, patellae, and other bones not easily observable, particularly of the vertebral column.

Initial comments and observations on bones in a poor state of preservation (before removal):

Drummond. 6/19-1930

Skeleton in situ,
Kincaid, 1939
Never dogmatic in insisting on his own conception of the discipline, Cole seems to have encouraged the social anthropological mutation at Chicago. He continued, however, to push archaeological work in Illinois, which during the 1930s accounted for a third or more of the departmental research budget. The emphasis in the early years was on surveying potential sites for intensive work. The "Pictorial Survey of the Mississippi Valley" brought together photographic materials from sites all over the region to provide a basis for systematic comparative study. More intensive work was carried on during several field seasons in Fulton County, from which Cole and his archaeological aide-de-camp, Thorne Deuel, published Rediscovering Illinois in 1937. Basing their interpretation on the "Midwest Taxonomic System" proposed by W. C. McKern at a conference at Chicago in 1932, they differentiated two "cultural patterns" in the Mississippi drainage: the Woodland and the Mississippi.

Although such monographs had little appeal to non-academic readers, Cole's archaeology was oriented outward from the University. His representation of Grant Park as a potential archaeological site at the Century of Progress comes from a scrapbook full of press notices. His appeal to Stirling Morton to support a "Foundation for American Archaeology," although unsuccessful, reflects his continuing efforts to involve members of the Chicago business community—who at one point were organized into a "Catfish Clan" for fish fries on site visits in southern Illinois.

In 1934 Cole succeeded in purchasing 302 acres on the Ohio River for the University, and for the next few years the archaeological work of the Department focused on the Kincaid site. Following a pattern established before 1930, Cole used Kincaid as a training school for students from various institutions, who suffered chiggers, an intestinal trouble jokingly called "The Black Death," and even malaria while learning the careful digging methods which became the hallmark of Chicago archaeology in this period. Cole's own role tended to be organizational and advisory. From Deuel and a series of advanced graduate student camp supervisors he received weekly reports on the progress of the work. At critical points he organized site conferences or invited an outside expert to take charge of a field season. The culminating season was the summer of 1941 when Cole overcame deeply rooted Republican scruples to take advantage of WPA labor, which was widely employed in American archaeology in the late 1930s.

Cole approached archaeology in the "direct historical" terms characteristic of this period. One of his projects at Chicago was the Committee on Ethnohistory, which filmed thousands of pages of early American historical documents in order to locate sites for archaeological investigation and thus bridge the gap between the prehistoric cultural record and the ethnographic present. At the same time, he was also receptive to the needs of methodological advance in dating techniques and intra- and inter-site classification. He brought Florence Hawley from Arizona as Research Associate to work on dendrochronological problems in the departmental laboratories at the Lorado Taft Studio and encouraged his student Kenneth Orr to make a statistical analysis of pottery fragments to reveal artifact change at Kincaid. Cole's main contribution, however, was the organization of midwestern archaeology and the training of most of its leading students. Appropriately, the Kincaid volume, which finally appeared in 1951, was a cooperative effort. The contributors to Cole's Festschrift the following year included most of the major contributors to The Archaeology of the Northeastern United States.
The following expressions of my reactions to Thor's comments on our syllabus:

1. In my opinion the assumption of leadership in the clarification of anthropological method requires us to distinguish quite explicitly between the scientific study of societies and cultures and the one used in the historical study of these on the other. I therefore think it will be a mistake to abandon the distinction between ethnology and social anthropology. I grant that our use of the term ethnology and social anthropology is not consistent with their correct use. However, there is some anthropological literature in which the terms are used in this fashion. The paper on "Ethnology" devotes a major article to social anthropology. It seems to me to confer the field we mean by the term. I see no serious objection against using the term social anthropology as a term synonymous to cultural anthropology. There is first the distinction between those branches of ethnology which treat of man's social or ethnic nature on the one hand and on the other those which treat of man's societies. Now we sometimes use characteristically very largely in terms of culture. So doubt a more logically distinguishable term than social anthropology could be found. Ethnology is available and if it were not for the established usage of ethnology to represent a different semantic tradition, and for the degree of economy which social anthropology already has, we might use "ethnology" or "ethnological sociology" in opposition to ethnology.

2. I think Thor is quite right in pointing out the responsibility we have to set down immediately with prevailing notions. I propose that we might simply state that: In our syllabus a proposal to the following effects could be included, perhaps to follow the diagram on page 3:

It should be understood that in this syllabus "ethnology" is used to mean the historical study of societies and cultures, and "social anthropology" to mean the societies and cultures with reference to general "anthropological" problems. In much anthropological literature the word "ethnology" serves both sorts of inquiry. In the distinction is one of objective and fundamental method it is thought best to separate the two and to name them distinctly.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Date: October 19, 1987

To: Mr. Frederick Actor

From: Robert Fielding

In RE.

I think Thor is quite right in pointing out that the language of the section called "Ethnology" apparently makes our subject-writer culture, while the language in the section on social anthropology apparently says that we are dealing with society or societies. Something must be done to align these two sections in this regard. The influence of Debithe's thrown emphasis on society as the ultimate subject-writer is apparent in the section on social anthropology. In view of the lack of clarity and agreement as to the distinction between culture and society as the basic concepts, would it not be possible to use both words where necessary in both sections?

3. I think the criticism as to the order of sections is justified and recommend changing the syllabus as to place the fields of anthropology in the following order:

Physical Anthropology

Archaeology

Ethnology

Social Anthropology

4. I agree that the phrase "in order to understand the historical processes of cultural growth and development" should be dropped.

5. The observations made by Thor in this section of his comments seem to me to call attention to one of the greatest defects in the syllabus. I do not think the two "tangents" which be sections are properly placed in the field of social anthropology even as it is represented by current thought and research. Certainly I would be in favor of deleting the sentence beginning "Particularly" and ending with "society" on the top of page 35. Perhaps we can ask Thor to offer a revision of the section on social anthropology as a basis for further discussion and improvement.

...Leadership in the clarification of anthropological method. 1937
Debate on the nature of social science was part of the crackling intellectual milieu at the University in the mid-1930s. President Hutchins' neo-Thomist protégé Mortimer Adler, who was causing some to worry that students might convert to Catholicism, argued that "systematic social science" must be grounded in the categories of Aristotelian psychology. In response, Radcliffe-Brown gave a valedictory seminar in the spring of 1937, in which he defended the possibility of a "theoretical natural science of society" which "was in no sense a psychology." Although for some years his chef d'oeuvre had been a course called "The Comparative Science of Culture," R-B decided (at Eggan's urging) that it was necessary to distinguish his enterprise from that of the American "ethnologists," who also studied an encompassing set of phenomena which they called "culture." Criticizing the looseness of prevailing American usage, R-B argued that culture should be restricted to "a set of rules for behavior," "a body of accepted symbols," and associated "sentiments and beliefs." He insisted that "culture" could not be studied scientifically except in relation to social structure (from which, nevertheless, it must be conceptually distinguished).

The "nature of culture"—on which A. L. Kroeber lectured as visitor in the year after R-B's departure—was a matter of some concern at Chicago in this period, as Redfield's contribution to the general examinations of 1936 suggests. Although not inclined to follow R-B in subordinating culture to social structure, American anthropologists were becoming dissatisfied with the trait-distribution approach popular in the 1920s. Suggesting a Sapirian distinction between "function" and "meaning," Redfield in 1934 defined culture as the organized totality of "the conventionalized meanings characteristic of groups." However, his usage of the term "culture" elicited a charge of inconsistency from Warner's student Leo Srole, who was disturbed by Redfield's tendency to see it in implicitly quantitative terms as something that was progressively lost in the transition to its polar opposite, civilization. But if Redfield resisted the attempt to develop systematic conceptual terminology "faster than it is needed," he defended Radcliffe-Brown's distinction between ethnology (which was historical) and social anthropology (which was scientific). Upon R-B's departure, this distinction was embodied in the definition of anthropology at Chicago as consisting of five, rather than the traditional four, fields.

In replacing Radcliffe-Brown, Cole moved to redress imbalances which he felt had developed among the subfields of the discipline. In 1937, he finally succeeded in bringing back Krogman, who had spent the years since his Chicago Ph.D. carrying on work in human growth at Western Reserve, to develop a program in physical anthropology. On several occasions, Cole tried unsuccessfully to find a position elsewhere for his junior linguist, Harry Hoijer, in order to open up a position in Old World archaeology, in which Hoijer was regularly forced to double. In politely rejecting the proposal that Hoijer might succeed Sapir at Yale, George Murdock suggested that the Chicago graduate program was "doing the best job of any in the country." Although the departmental secretary's feeling that social anthropologists were "rarely much good in an archaeology camp" was doubtless reciprocated by members of Warner's cadre, there were some, like John Bennett, who had no trouble working in both fields. In general, the sense of shared commitment to a "science of man" seems to have been quite strong on the eve of the world crisis—if one can judge from an account of the Department's activities published in the Maroon.
The hope that grows large out of the very bigness of the fear, 1945
Within a week after Pearl Harbor, Dean Redfield circulated to all social science departments a memo asking for reports on the "national defense activities" of their staffs retroactive to the summer of 1940. The most notable contribution of the Department of Anthropology was the Food Habits and Dietary Study of the Southwest, which Fred Eggan was directing as a pilot study for an ill-fated hemispheric project on Indian nutrition developed by Warner and Redfield for John Collier's Inter-American Indian Institute. Although several of the faculty noted honorific or consultative activities as "service in Washington," the Chicago anthropologists did not have much wartime involvement in what one of them called the "Washington pressure cooker." This did not imply, however, that they carried on anthropological business as usual.

In retrospect, a striking focus of the wartime activity of the Chicago faculty is the concern with attitude and policy in the treatment of the Japanese, both in the United States and in postwar Japan. Early in 1942 President Roosevelt approved the recommendation that all Japanese be removed from the Pacific Coast and relocated in camps on Indian reservations and reclamation projects in the West—a move which Cole later attacked as a response to self-interested pressure groups rather than to the needs of national security. In the summer of 1942, after a visit to the camps, Redfield made basic policy recommendations to the War Relocation Authority (in which several Chicago Ph.D.'s played important roles). Arguing that the vast majority of American Japanese were loyal, Redfield urged the prompt reintegration of the native-born into American life.

Early the following year, negotiations were completed with the U.S. Army Provost Marshal General to establish training schools at the University of Chicago for officers and technical specialists who would serve in administrative posts in captured territories in the Far East. Commissioned as Captain, Fred Eggan became director of the Chicago Civil Affairs Training School, in which Cole, John Embree, and Abraham and Mary Fujii Halpern also served. Although Eggan's suggestion that the officers be taken for training at the WRA camps was not implemented, the program turned out most of the civil affairs officers for the Far East by the time it ended in 1945. In the meantime, members of the Department were active on other issues affecting the morale of the American public. During 1944, graduate speakers spoke to more than 50,000 high school students on the problems of race and minority group relations—which were the topic also of several of Redfield's contributions to the University of Chicago Roundtable radio broadcasts.

Although the regular graduate program continued on a reduced scale throughout the war years, a large number of students were on active duty in the armed services. Their letters back to "Bingey" helped to fill the pages of Euphoria, the occasional newsletter produced by Ernestine Bingham, who as departmental secretary did a great deal to create the spirit of its title. This overseas activity symbolized the beginning of the end of the long tradition of North American Indian insularity in American anthropology. The attempt made to organize anthropological expertise on Oceania early in 1942 foreshadowed a turn toward overseas research after the war. By 1944, Redfield was suggesting to one of the Department's graduates that Brazil—where R-B had spent the war years—might become a major field of departmental activity. The circumstances of the war's end, however, deposited a fall-out of anxiety on the hopes entertained for the postwar world. Writing to his daughter Lisa shortly after Hiroshima, Redfield wondered how to bring under control "this cancer-cell of human invention."
Fay-Cooper Cole was my Chairman, I did not want.
He made me to lie down in a five-foot trench.
He led me to the Ryerson Laboratory.
He restored my scholarship. He led me in the paths
of righteousness for the Department's sake.
Yea, though I mess with the Mississippi Valley Death Cult,
I will fear no criticism: for thou art with me:
thy counsel and thy wisdom they comfort me.
Thou preparedest an M.A. for me with the assistance of
thy colleagues: Thou sent me to Michigan on the first
open Fellowship.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of
my life for I struggled in the Chicago Department
for four years.

From the after-dinner remarks of
James Griffin
Despite the anxious shadows cast by an "exploding technology," the professional prospects of the Department seemed very hopeful at the end of World War II. Universities all over the country were reevaluating and expanding programs in anticipation of a wave of returning GIs. Employment opportunities in anthropology had never been so bright—though Cole found it difficult to place Jewish students in some of the midwestern American schools which formed the basis of the Chicago network. At Chicago, too, there were changes in personnel and program.

After Hoijer took a permanent position at U.C.L.A. in 1940, Cole was able to establish regular instruction in Old World archaeology by bringing in Robert Braidwood of the Oriental Institute. Although the appointment of Kenneth Orr as Cole's successor in American archaeology in 1946 proved to be short-lived, some of the archaeological slack was taken up by Chicago-trained personnel at the Field Museum, with which Cole established a formal cooperative arrangement in 1945. Andrade's death in 1940 and the reorientation of his successor's interests toward the Far East left the status of linguistics in doubt. After some discussion the future of linguistic anthropology in the Department was assured by the appointment of Norman McQuown in the waning months of the Carnegie Mayan project. In contrast, several initiatives of a more social anthropological character fell through. Claude Lévi-Strauss returned to France after his wartime stay in New York City. Clyde Kluckhohn felt obligated to remain at Harvard to represent anthropology in the Department of Social Relations which he, Talcott Parsons, and several Harvard psychologists had just established. Thus when Cole reported to Ralph Tyler in December, 1946, on the dissertations supervised in the Department, social anthropology was strikingly underrepresented in what had been considered its American stronghold.

Several of those whom Cole classed as "ethnologists" had of course felt the influence of Radcliffe-Brown. However, when Sol Tax was brought in full-time from the Carnegie project in 1944 to organize a postwar program in anthropology, social anthropology was incorporated into a framework in which human diversification and the evolution of culture had priority of place. In consultation with specialists both inside and outside the University (including the British prehistorian V. Gordon Childe), Tax, Krogman, and Braidwood played the major role in defining the course in "Human Origins" which introduced the new program in 1945. Equipped with bound syllabi and volumes of selected readings, students were treated to a varied sequence of special lectures, round tables, laboratories, field trips, and discussions—with numerous written assignments and examinations. Although the second course in the series, Eggan's encyclopaedic review of world ethnology, was much more an individual tour de force, the course in social anthropology introduced in 1947 was again a team-taught venture. For more than a decade, the 220-230-240 sequence provided the comprehensive training in "general anthropology" which was a hallmark of Chicago students in this period. It also provided part of the context in which certain issues of a broadly evolutionary character became the focus of major research projects—a development marked by the participation of Redfield and Braidwood in a 1947 Oriental Institute symposium on "The Birth of Civilization."

The end of that year saw the retirement of Cole after more than two decades as organizer of Chicago anthropology, an event which was celebrated with a dinner, at which the mock-up of a forthcoming archaeological Festschrift was presented by James Griffin. The Department's more dominant intellectual figures in these early decades had not always been sympathetic to investigations of what Redfield had once referred to as "stones and bones." Nevertheless, Cole had succeeded in giving the Chicago Department an unusually strong sense of primary-group solidarity, and stamped it with a traditionally embrace "sacred-bundle" conception of the discipline—both of which were to endure for some time after his departure.
Kishan Singh and his servant Gafura Manihar wish farewell to McKim Marriott. Kishan Garhi, India, 1952
Responding to war-born anxieties about the fate of modern civilization and to wartime "area programs" which seemed to him intellectually insubstantial—as well as to the inner development of his own inquiry—Redfield in the late 1940s moved beyond the study of "folk societies" to the "great traditions" in which these societies were encompassed. Redfield defined civilization in terms of the displacement of the characteristics of an ideal-typical "primary" society (isolation, homogeneity, etc.) by their opposites. He hoped that a comparative study of the actual "constellations of characteristics" produced historically by this transformation would permit generalization about the circumstances "that tend to give rise to a civilization." Alongside (and to some extent in tension with) this neo-evolutionary approach, he was also interested in characterizing cultures as wholes in terms of their fundamental values or modes of thought. With the help of Milton Singer, a philosopher and social psychologist with whom he had been associated in the social science program of the College, Redfield spent the year 1950-51 studying recent works on national character and cultural values as well as the writings of sinologists and other scholars of non-Western civilizations. That spring, he submitted a proposal for the comparative study of "great traditions" to his friend Robert Hutchins, who had left the University for the Ford Foundation.

Funded by the Foundation, Redfield's "Program in Intercultural Studies" sponsored a wide range of activities, as the proposed titles in the monograph series "Comparative Studies of Cultures and Civilizations" suggest. After establishing "lines of communication" with scholars in America and Europe, several interdisciplinary conferences were held on problems in the study of major non-Western civilizations. Harking back to the interests of his teacher and colleague Sapir, Redfield also prompted Harry Hoijer to organize a symposium on language and culture, at which the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on the correspondence of language patterns and world views was the focus of a provocative if inconclusive discussion. By this time, the concept of "world view"—"the very outlook of men on their own world"—had become central to Redfield's project. Several of his students were sent to Middle America in an "attempt to stimulate investigations which would not impose upon primitive societies our analytical categories," but which would produce instead "the most other-centered ethnology of which we can conceive."

Meanwhile, Redfield and Singer had instituted a seminar on "The Comparison of Cultures," which was successfully devoted to general methodological issues, to the applicability of the world view concept to folk cultures in the process of transformation, and to the comparison of Islamic and Western civilizations. In the spring of 1954, a number of anthropologists who had recently worked in India, including Bernard Cohn and Warner's student McKim Marriott, were invited to treat the "problem of the relation of a small community like the village to the larger civilization of which it is the periphery." As the project began thus to encompass independent ethnographic studies of particular villages within a larger civilization, the broadly comparative neoevolutionary approach of Redfield's *Primitive World and Its Transformations* tended to be transformed into more historical or synchronic studies of civilization "from the bottom up." By 1955, Singer, urging that "what is now needed...to advance the work in the characterization and comparison of civilizations is a concrete and detailed example of developed method for at least one civilization," suggested a five-year study of India.

Although the onset of Redfield's fatal illness forestalled his own participation in the Indian research, and the proposed manual for a comparative social anthropology never appeared, the Ford project left enduring fruit. New courses in non-Western civilizations were introduced into the University's undergraduate programs; furthermore, a strong South Asian Studies center was established at Chicago. Eventually, this broadly inclusive enterprise encompassed the Philippine Studies Program which Fred Eggan had founded in 1952—a more modestly budgeted outgrowth of the wartime area studies movement.
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The Dilemmas of Utilitarian Anthropology

Although Redfield argued that his "Program in Intercultural Studies" might help in the establishment of a peaceful world community, its practical value, like that of humane scholarship or liberal education, inhered not in the determination or implementation of specific policy but in its effect on the attitudes of men. At various times in the history of discipline, anthropologists and others have entertained the hope that it might offer more directly utilitarian benefits to society. Cole, who had first-hand experience with the Dutch colonial administration in Malaysia, was quick to respond to the reorientation of United States Indian policy following the appointment of John Collier as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933. He and Radcliffe-Brown met with Collier in the spring of 1934 and in June sent a memo suggesting ways in which "the Indian Bureau might make use of Anthropology." Subsequently, Chicago-trained anthropologists played a prominent role in various experiments in "applied anthropology" during the New Deal and wartime years.

The attempt to create a more utilitarian anthropology has been plagued from the beginning with serious problems, some of which are hinted at in a letter from John Provinse to Redfield in 1937. Government personnel were often doubtful of the practical value of the research proposed by academicians, who in turn were subject to the temptations of the greater security and freedom in a university position—though Provinse himself chose to spend much of his career in government service. In the case of the large-scale research project on "Personality Development in Six Indian Tribes," which Lloyd Warner organized for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the early 1940s, clashes between academic and Bureau personnel and disagreements over the control of research data led to the termination of the cooperative arrangement under which the project was conducted.

After the war, Warner's applied interests shifted from government back toward the business community, and the rest of the Chicago faculty returned to more traditionally academic pursuits. Although Redfield went to Texas in 1947 to testify in one of the major cases challenging the legality of educational segregation, such service as an expert witness was quite consistent with an essentially academic conception of the anthropologist's role. It was simply a matter of disseminating a basic postulate of modern anthropology: the equal potentiality of all human groups as participants in modern civilization.

Ethical and methodological issues of a less traditional sort were raised when the Department set up a field school in Tama, Iowa, to study the acculturation of the Fox Indians, among whom Sol Tax had worked in the early 1930s. Prodded by a group of students uncomfortable with a posture of non-commitment on issues affecting the future welfare of the Fox, Tax concluded that the traditional anthropological role of "participant observer" should better be thought of as "interferer observer." Reversing his earlier position on the necessary separation of pure scientific research and the solution of practical problems, he became the proponent of what he called "action anthropology." During the early 1950s a number of Chicago students spent their summers working with the "Fox Project." Although his daughter Lisa Peattie played a leading role, Redfield seems to have had his doubts about "action anthropology." In general, the academic and political atmosphere of the 1950s was not a supportive one. U.S. Indian policy had moved toward "termination" of the special relations of Indians to the federal government, which was more interested in applied anthropology that sustained American interests overseas.

By the end of the decade, when its major activities were an Indian handicraft cooperative and a day school, the Fox project had ended. But Tax played a major role in 1961 in organizing a meeting in Chicago of representatives from ninety tribes, whose "Declaration of Indian Purpose" marked an important stage in the emergence of a pantribal Native American consciousness. By that time, however, Tax's own entrepreneurial energies were heavily involved in the establishment of Current Anthropology as a medium of communication for anthropologists all over the world. When the Vietnam War raised the methodological and ethical issues of utilitarian anthropology in a new and agonistic form, the response of the Chicago Department was to insist once more on "the need to maintain a separation between academic research in the social sciences and mission-oriented activity under government control"—a position it has maintained to the present day.
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Toward the Darwin Centennial

Of the numerous major conferences organized by Sol Tax, the one most representative of the Department (in a certain phase of its history) was that held in celebration of the Centennial of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. Insofar as the subdisciplines of anthropology have a more than accidental historical unity, their integration is grounded in a broadly evolutionary view of man which, despite the early twentieth-century reaction against cultural evolutionary assumption, was variously reasserted in the postwar period. From this perspective, the Darwin Centennial was the culmination of several trends: the concerns articulated in the course on “Human Origins” which Tax, Braidwood, and Krogman had designed in 1945; the neo-evolutionary civilizational interests which Redfield pursued in the early 1950s; and the intellectual dynamism of Sherwood Washburn, who came to the Department as Krogman’s successor in the fall of 1947.

Although focusing on problems of human growth, Krogman was in some respects a traditional physical anthropologist, measuring skeletal characteristics for purposes of human racial taxonomy. Sharply critical of many traditional approaches, Washburn advocated the application of experimental laboratory methods—modest support for which was quickly forthcoming as a result of his already established relations with the Viking Fund in New York. Washburn’s most important contribution to an evolutionary physiological anthropology was the observation of primate behavior in natural situations, which he first undertook on a field trip to Southern Rhodesia in 1955. Among those stimulated by Washburn’s attempt to coordinate biological and social anthropological research in the study of the evolution of human cultural capacity was Irven Devore, who combined primate behavioral research with the study of contemporary hunting populations. Although Washburn left for the University of California, Berkeley, in 1958, his interests were clearly manifested in the symposia of the Centennial, to which he and his student Clark Howell contributed a paper on human biological and cultural evolution in the Pleistocene period—an area which was to be the focus of Howell’s subsequent research.

What Howell later came to call “paleoanthropology” was bounded at the end of the Pleistocene by the interests of Robert Braidwood, whose research focused on the establishment of an effectively produced agricultural food supply as the “germplasm of the Western European cultural tradition.” From 1947 on, Braidwood carried on field work at Jarmo and other sites on “the hilly flanks of the fertile crescent” in order to fill in the blank period in the “gap chart” he had prepared for the “Human Origins” course in 1945. Although the gap chart was drawn up just prior to Willard Libby’s development of Carbon-14 dating, the subsequent application of nuclear techniques suggests the broadening natural scientific context in which archaeology was to be increasingly embedded. Requiring the participation of geologists, zoologists, and botanists, Braidwood’s research was one of the very first anthropological projects to be funded by the National Science Foundation—which in the early 1950s was seeking politically uncontroversial ways to broaden its coverage to include what were then being called the “behavioral” (as opposed to the “social”-ist) sciences.

Among the field party during the first full season at Jarmo was Robert McCormick Adams, who went on to formulate a dissertation project comparing the emergence of civilization in the Old and New Worlds—an investigation which Redfield clearly considered relevant to his own interest in “how simple village life gave way, in several parts of the world, to theocratic states.” Adams’ later Centennial paper categorizing the attitudes of social anthropologists toward evolutionism elicited his fellow panelist A. L. Kroeber’s comment that most of them “continue to think of themselves as anti-evolutionist.” Nevertheless the ecological orientation characteristic of the neo-evolutionary movement is clearly reflected in another major departmental research project organized by Norman McQuown in the highlands of southern Mexico. Although its funding was divided into components underwritten respectively by the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation, and the project reports tended to fall into clearly differentiable subdisciplinary modes, the “Chiapas Project” was conceived as an investigation of “Man-in-Nature,” unifying “within the framework of a natural history approach the contributions of all the anthropological sub-disciplines.”
Graduates of the Department at the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Reunion, 1955

From left to right:
- R.G. Armstrong (1952)
- St. Clair Drake (1954)
- G.H. Fathauer (1950)
- S. Tax (1935)
- R.G. Birdwhistell (1951)
- A.W. Whiteford (1951)
- Fey-Cooper Cole
- J.B. Watson (1948)
- F. Eggan (1933)
- B.W. Starr (1951)
- T. Deuel (1935)
- M. Collier (1951)
- E.Z. Vogt (1948)
- D. Collier (1954)
The belated celebration, in November, 1955, of the Twenty-Fifth anniversary of the Department, was the occasion for considerable nostalgia, as thirty-five Ph.D.'s and former students returned for festivities which included an honorary degree for Cole. The conjunction with the anniversary of the Social Sciences Building dictated a social anthropological focus. Round tables were held on “The Comparative Approach to the Study of Culture” and “The Analysis of Social Structure.” Although reactions to the discussions are unrecorded, there are evidences elsewhere of a sense of theoretical malaise in the early 1950s. Half a century of inquiry into “the nature of culture” had left the notion buried in a conceptual morass which took Kroeber and Kluckhohn a full volume to categorize analytically. Although Milton Singer’s five “‘models’ for characterizing cultures as wholes” were more succinctly presented, his own evident preference for the “symbolic” left for future solution the problem of cultural comparison. Returning from the 1952 Wenner-Gren conference assessing the state of “Anthropology Today,” Washburn shared with Redfield his disappointment at the “conservatism” of their discipline, and the lack of any “systematic body of theory.” In this context, some of the rising generation of anthropologists, seeking perhaps a middle way between neo-evolutionary scientism and a humanistic study of world view, began to turn to sociology and more sociological orientations within anthropology. At the reunion symposia these were symbolized respectively by the presence of Talcott Parsons of the Harvard Department of Social Relations and by the invitation, forestalled by his death, to Radcliffe-Brown to address the session on social structure.

Despite incipient schismatic tendencies and despite its focus on “social structure” rather than “culture,” the British social anthropological tradition offered a methodologically self-confident and theoretically coherent approach to synchronic holistic analysis which seemed very attractive to many young anthropologists in the 1950s. Given the prior link represented by Radcliffe-Brown, it was natural for Chicago students to join the transatlantic movement opened up by Fulbright Fellowships and by the establishment of new research positions in the British colonies. Most prominent among them was perhaps Lloyd (“Tom”) Fallers, whose work at the East African Institute of Social Research so favorably impressed Audrey Richards that he was subsequently invited back to succeed her as director.

Returning to the United States in 1957, Fallers joined two students of Parsons and Kluckhohn, Clifford Geertz and David M. Schneider, at the University of California, Berkeley—across the Bay from the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto, the Ford Foundation-funded social science Shangri-la to which the Chicago anthropologists resorted sequentially in the later 1950s. Aside from such manifest functions as clarifying conceptual distinctions and sharpening “cutting edges,” a year at the Center often facilitated institutional mobility among the rising social scientific elite. From the point of view of the Chicago Department, 1958-59 was a vintage Center year, as Eggan and several other Chicago social scientists joined a group of anthropologists which included not only Fallers and Geertz, but also the British social anthropologists Raymond Firth and Meyer Fortes. At the end of the year, the ten Center anthropologists drafted a proposal for an Anglo-American Journal of Social Anthropology which in Fallers’ words would serve as the organ for “that part of anthropology which is part of modern social science.” Although the Journal did not get off the ground, the Center year was fruitful in other ways. With Washburn’s departure, Redfield’s death, and the news that Warner, too, was leaving, the Department faced a personnel crisis as serious as Sapir’s departure for Yale. The eventual decision, through Eggan’s intermediacy, of Schneider, Geertz, and Fallers to come to Chicago was to have an impact on the Department quite as strong as that of Radcliffe-Brown.
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**COLE**
- Ronald Singer
- Russell Tuttle
- Albert Dahlberg
- William Krogman
- Sherwood Washburn
- E. Sedgwick
- Charles Merbs
- F.C. Howell
- Leslie Frazer
- Richard Klein
- M. Elisha
- Robert Braidwood
- Robert McC. Adams
- Frederick Eggan
- George Stocking
- Samuel Nash
- Robert Redfield
- L. W. Wolf
- Pitt Rivers
- Seth Leacock
- E. F. Conklin
- S. Forman
- L. Shapiro
- Terry Turner
- Raymond Smith
- Lloyd Fallers
- Victor Turner
- Robert Levine
- Milton Singer
- McKim Marriott
- Bernard Conner
- Geza Reisch
- Mer Yalman
- Stambek
- M. Spino
- Clifford Geertz
- N. Valeri
- H. Munro
- A. Radcliffe-Brown
- L. Emric
- Lloyd Warner
- David Schneider
- Marshall Sales
- Edward Sapir
- Harry Holzer
- A. Halpern
- Manuel Andrade
- Norman McQuown
- Michael Silverstein
- Emeritus

*With several exceptions, this table includes only regular full-time appointments in the Department, and not Visiting Professors, Lecturers, College Faculty, and Research Associates, whose number is too large for easy representation.*
During the depression decade, graduate enrollment in the Chicago Department averaged fifty-one students each year. After falling off during the war, annual enrollment during a short post-war upsurge averaged seventy-five, from which the number of students dropped to forty-four in 1953. The following year, enrollment entered a long boom period, peaking in 1968 at one hundred and twenty-three “currently registered students”—a category which excludes some students in the field or writing up their research. Until 1955-56, the customary listing of departmental fellows in the University Announcements never included more than a handful. From then on, however, the number of NSF, NDEA, NIMH, and other acronyms increased each year, especially after the Department received a training grant from the Public Health Service in 1963. Over the next ten years, this source provided a million and a quarter dollars to support students whose course of study the Department considered to be “health-related.” By 1966-67, the last year for which a list was printed, the number of fellowship holders reached ninety-one.

In this context, the size of the regular departmental faculty, which in 1953 totalled no more than the seven it had numbered in 1935, began a period of rapid and sustained growth, doubling in size by 1960-61 and peaking in the early 1970s at twenty-seven. Until 1969, this group was exclusively male, although a number of women anthropologists served as Research Associates, temporary instructors, or members of the College faculty. Until the late 1950s, recruitment was predominantly from the ranks of the Department’s own graduates and in relation to the activities of its central figures—as the appointments of Adams, Howell, and Marriott testify. From the time Cole began redressing the balance after Radcliffe-Brown’s departure, the “separate but equal” subdisciplines remained proportionately about the same.

Although the appointments resulting from the 1960 “raid” on Berkeley were seen by some as filling particular needs of the Department, they clearly had a somewhat opportunistic character, offering several disafflicted young social anthropologists a more supportive intellectual environment. Coming in the aftermath of several other additions in social anthropology, the Berkeley appointments upset the traditional subdisciplinary balance in the Department and provided a model for personnel policy in the following years. Recruitment was conceived universally as an attempt to capture potential “stars” in a rapidly expanding anthropological firmament, without regard for particular “slots” defined in ethnographic, theoretical, or subdisciplinary terms. Nevertheless, hiring was given some direction by the vicissitudes of funding and by the developing anthropological orientations and the relative influence of individuals previously hired. Although important appointments were made in archaeological and biological anthropology, the inadequacy of the laboratory facilities established in Walker Museum around 1960 hampered recruitment. In contrast, appointments in sociocultural anthropology were sustained by joint arrangements with the Committee for the Comparative Study of New Nations and other units in the Social Sciences Division.

Despite the inevitable frustrations accompanying these shifts in the make-up of the Department, the traditional Gemeinschaft spirit of Chicago anthropology was by no means lost. Reflected in the continuation of an unarticulated policy of alternation between “insiders” (Chicago Ph.D.’s) and “outsiders” in the chairmanship, it was expressed also in the “pool principle” established in the early 1960s. Instead of being regarded as matters of specific individual responsibility, teaching loads were treated informally as a collective (and an internal) departmental matter—thereby allowing flexibility for individual research activities. Although there were departures as well as arrivals throughout the decade, the continuing success of the Department’s recruitment efforts was attested by outside observers. Evaluations by the American Council on Education, based on rankings by anthropologists throughout the country, rated Chicago highest in “quality of graduate faculty” in 1964 and again in 1969.
NOTES ON COURSES

Discussions thus far suggest that a principal part of the core of a graduate program might consist of two three-quarter sequence courses, one organized "historically", the other "scientifically", both cutting across the "fields" of anthropology. Thus the historical course would be organized around the "human career" (Redfield's phrase) and would be concerned with those aspects of human behavior which we find it convenient to view in terms of such ideas as "evolution", "growth", "accumulation", "revolution", "diffusion", etc. To put it another way, this course would be concerned with those phenomena, or aspects of phenomena, whose "explanation" we feel requires some attention to their place in time. Included here would be human evolution, the growth of tool-using and food-producing, the development of civilization, historical linguistics, recent world cultural history, etc. Braidwood, Howell and others are working on this course.

The other course, and the one with which these notes are primarily concerned, would be organized in terms of those aspects of human behavior which we feel are in some sense involved in, or make up, determinate systems, and thus are best thought of about with the help of such ideas as "structure", "function", "equilibrium", etc. It would include some consideration of man as an organism as well as the concepts of personality, society and culture as systems. It would also appropriately include discussion of ecological, economic and linguistic systems.

Mapping the intellectual terrain of the Department, 1961
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Adapted from: Robert Redfield, "Anthropology: Unity and Diversity," 1946
The tradition of "general anthropology" was still quite strong at Chicago in 1960. Although the exigencies of staffing had begun by the mid-1950s to loosen the structure of the old 220-230-240 sequence, the number of required core courses was raised from nine to fifteen during McQuown's chairmanship. At the end of their second year, students continued to be subjected to a grueling two-day written examination covering all the five subdisciplines. Nevertheless, the centrifugal forces of intellectual specialization had for some time been unraveling the bindings of the traditional "sacred bundle" of general anthropology. In 1954, Washburn was already complaining that inadequately trained social anthropologists were accepting positions in which they were asked to teach "modern physical anthropology." With the arrival of the new group of social anthropologists in 1960, the problem of what constituted appropriate training for a Chicago Ph.D. became the subject of a prolonged reevaluation.

An attempt to reduce the five subfields to four by the creation of a new category "socio-cultural anthropology" was unsuccessful. However, the eventual disappearance (in 1971) of "ethnology" was foreshadowed in May, 1961, when the core was reduced to nine courses largely by eliminating the requirements in "areal ethnology." Over the next year, Fallers was responsible for coordinating the design of a new core program, which was built around two three-quarter sequences, "one organized historically, the other scientifically." Since "all the aspects of man" were "understandable partly in terms of systematic analysis and partly in terms of historical analysis," each course would crosscut the various fields of anthropology. "The Human Career" was a revised version of the old 220, with Howell's Braidwood's and Adams' interests each represented in one quarter. In contrast, "Systematic Analysis in Anthropology" (or "Systems") was a Parsonian revision of the old 240, with quarters devoted respectively to "the social system," the "cultural system," and "personality systems." Although the revised core recognized the methodological legitimacy of historical ethnology by including a course in the "interpretation of evidence in the more historically oriented aspects of anthropology," it was taught only once.

In retrospect, Fallers' attempt to map the cognitive territory of the Department in terms of an opposition between history and science, with "pleistocene-ecology" on one side and "behavioral science" on the other, does not adequately represent the changing intellectual orientations of its subdisciplines. These were the years when Lewis Binford was advocating the "application of laboratory methods... to the solution of archaeological problems." Although he did not win tenure at Chicago, Binford and his students made the Department for a time the center of a self-consciously scientific "new" archaeology. Indeed, the general trend in both archaeology and physical anthropology was to look to the natural sciences for methodological models and sources of specific expertise. In 1962, both Howell and Braidwood complained about their inadequate relations with the natural science departments of the University. And while the reorientation of "archaeo-biology" also involved a stronger interest in the "behavioral sciences" side of Fallers' grid, the other wing of the Chicago Department was developing along quite different lines, which heightened rather than reduced the sense of methodological and substantive opposition.

Hints of this development are evident in comments Schneider offered in 1964 on Parsons' paper "Clyde Kluckhohn and the Integration of the Social Sciences." Discussing Kluckhohn's alleged antipathy to certain British social anthropologists and his distaste for sociology in general, Schneider emphasized his feeling that linguistics was the "constant source of the theoretical innovation in...Anthropology's fundamental intellectual task, the study of culture." Increasingly, "systematic analysis" at Chicago did focus on the concept "culture" rather than on those of "society" or "personality," and on symbolic structures rather than on patterns of behavior. The comparative macrosociological orientation represented in the New Nations Committee did not disappear entirely, and there was a continuing interest among some faculty in prosocial or historical problems. But the increasingly dominant interest, although synchronic, was relativistically humanistic rather than "scientific" in outlook. It was oriented less to the behavioral or social sciences, than to linguistics, philosophy, and certain currents within sociocultural anthropology itself—notably French structuralism and the American Boasian tradition.

In this context, there seemed no reason why aspiring sociocultural anthropologists should carry a burden of "stones and bones." By 1968 they were able largely to avoid it, although archaeologists were still required to take "Systems." By 1971, however, the only trace of a graduate requirement in "general anthropology" was a phrase "encouraging" students to take courses "in all the fields of anthropology."
1. From a level of close to $500,000 as of three years ago, our funds for student support at all levels and from all sources will be this year around $150,000. Yet we continue to admit the same number of students. Our total number of graduate students has been constant over the last eight years—around 120 in any given year.

2. The most serious problem in funding of graduate students is in their last two phases of graduate training—field and write-up. In the period 1965 to the present, the major source of field funds for our students were (1) NIH, (2) the USPHS training grant (3) NDEA language fellowships which were used in the field (4) Fulbright and American Institute of Indian Studies. Of these sources, 1, 2, and 3 have been completely eliminated as of July 1, this year. And 4, if it continues, will be at a reduced level. The only other major source of funds left is NSF thesis completion awards, which do not pay stipends, only travel and direct field expenses, and do not pay for write-up. At the same time there are increasing difficulties in field access, which have the effect of running up the cost of field work—students have increased waiting time here and in the host countries before getting into their field areas, students have at the last minute to change plans and there is increased faculty time necessary to help students through entry into the field.

3. Over the past year it has taken more work and time to place our students in increasingly attractive jobs, often in institutions in which they may be overly trained to be effective in the kind of teaching which they are expected to do, hence leading to high levels of frustration on their part and friction in these institutions. Until this year, the job shortage has not been absolute but relative. This year, however, not one of our students looking for a job has been placed yet. In fact, this year the shortage may be absolute in relation to the number of students looking for jobs. As usual, the very best students, especially if they have their dissertations finished, will have relatively little trouble, but the average or marginal students will have considerable trouble (as will their supervisors).

4. External sources of faculty research funds are becoming more difficult to obtain.

---

The problems of funding in the 1970s
The elimination of core requirements in general anthropology, although long in coming, was finally effected in the context of larger social issues reverberating through the American academy in the late 1960s. For aspiring anthropologists—by tradition a culturally alienated group identifying with their subject peoples—the war in Vietnam had a conscience-wrenching symbolic significance. In a period witnessing the withdrawal of European colonial power from the world of subject peoples generally, many students felt themselves implicated in a massively bloody but ultimately futile attempt to reverse the tide of history. At Chicago, as elsewhere, political issues were stirred into a turmoil with those of academic structure and purpose. In the aftermath of a student sit-in over the denial of tenure to sociologist Marlene Dixon, the early spring of 1969 was a period of intense debate among both students and faculty in the Anthropology Department. Although the outcome was scarcely a "reinvention" of Chicago anthropology, it was in the period encompassing this ferment that its modern mold was set.

Despite the underlying issues of global political and moral concern, the "position papers" produced by the "workshops" of that spring tended to focus on matters closely related to graduate training as preparation for a career in anthropology. Although the faculty proved unwilling to accept regular student participation in the Department's governance, both groups were, from somewhat different grounds, opposed to a rigidly structured "core" program. By the end of the spring quarter, a new set of "departmental procedures" had been adopted. Students, in consultation with faculty advisory committees, were encouraged to "marshal" the resources necessary to tailor their own individual programs. Although there have been subsequent calls for the reintroduction of elements of a more rigid pedagogical structure, the prevailing departmental ethos continues to be at once permissive (in terms of requirements) and demanding (in terms of expectations).

The concomitance of antistructure in the realm of pedagogy and structure in the realm of cultural theory was not the only paradoxical aspect of the emerging modern situation. The demands of a "large and complex" enterprise involving more than two hundred people and "funds of over $800,000 going through our books each year" were beginning to be reflected in the internal structure of the Department. Although the "perquisites" proposed in October 1968 to facilitate the selection of a new chairman were by no means all achieved, the end of that academic year saw the formalization of a "committee structure for the management of Department Affairs"—which did not, however, seriously inhibit the rampant individualism of its faculty.

The internal structural evolution of the Department reached its current form just at the point when the long boom which had nourished it came to a close. The 1968-69 year marked the beginning of a precipitate withdrawal of federal funding from the support of graduate education, and a redefinition of priorities in the support of social science research. By 1973, the funds available for student support in the Department had fallen by two-thirds, and the attempt to renew the Public Health Service training grant had run aground against the insistence that such support must contribute directly to medical education in this country. But despite clear signs of a rapidly shrinking job market for anthropologists, Chicago students continued to fare relatively well in the academic marketplace. Sustained by University policy and by the continuing reputation of the Department, enrollment throughout the decade has remained on a plateau approximating what it was in 1968. Notwithstanding the loss of important faculty members between 1970 and 1975, and the successive retirements of the Department's elder generation, important new appointments have been made, including several women. And despite the failure to win federal funding for the "comparative study of meaning systems," these appointments have tended to sustain and develop the intellectual orientations which had been defined by the early 1970s.
Wàath nu Rang
and David Labby.
Yap Island, 1971
At any given time, it is primarily the faculty who define the Department. However, there is a sense in which its historically enduring community is composed of its graduate degree holders, in particular the Ph.D.'s who bear the permanent stamp of certification permitting them to enter a profession which, more than most, has been located in colleges and universities. At once offspring and product, the Department's doctorates are a convenient measure of what it has been doing in the reproduction of scholars and the production of knowledge.

The most immediately striking thing about the 346 Ph.D.'s completed in the Department since 1929 is that until quite recently they have been overwhelmingly male. Although thirty-five per cent of those currently "admitted to candidacy" are women, the proportion of women Ph.D.'s did not rise above twenty per cent until after 1970. In terms of intellectual interests, the most obvious characteristic of the doctorates as a whole is their easy distinguishability by subdiscipline. With a few exceptions, they can be quickly sorted into one of four (rather than five) categories—"ethnology" being perhaps more readily separable in theoretical discussion than in the titles of doctoral dissertations. Although there has been a continuing historical decline in the relative number in archaeology, it was only after 1970 that the proportion in sociocultural anthropology began to rise above a long standing two-thirds. Among current candidates, over eighty per cent are engaged in sociocultural research. And despite the recurrent commitment to a theoretically oriented comparative enterprise, another striking thing about Chicago doctorates is the extent to which they are grounded in the descriptive ethnographic study of particular communities. There was a brief tendency around 1950 to define projects in more general terms. Characteristically, however, it has been the "social organization of the Kiowa Apache," "industrialization in Cantel, Guatemala," or the "conceptual structure of Karimpur religion" which is the subject of descriptive analysis.

The geographical focus of ethnographic concern has shifted with the development of faculty interests and the exigencies of funding. In the 1930s Native and European North America accounted for the overwhelming proportion of dissertations in both sociocultural anthropology and archaeology. Africa emerged as an area of continuing interest around 1950; the Chiapas and Philippine projects are reflected in doctorates of the late 1950s and early 1960s; more recently, the areas of predominant concern have been the Moslem and Hindu worlds, with a secondary interest in Oceania and Melanesia. Despite the difficulties of gaining entry into postcolonial nations anxious to shed the image of "primitivism" and dubious of the practical utility of anthropology for national development, there has been no reversal of the massive shift to overseas fieldwork accomplished by the post-Sputnik revolution in funding. While the legitimacy of historical dissertations based on library research has been recognized since the 1930s, a period of extended fieldwork continues to be the normal rite of initiation. At least three quarters of those currently admitted to candidacy have been or are involved in research outside the United States and Canada.

Until the 1960s, almost half of Chicago Ph.D.'s found jobs in the Middle West—where the Department for many years played the leading role in the Central States Anthropological Society. Their more recent success in a national market was attested by a study in the early 1970s indicating that Chicago graduates were (second only to Yale, which had produced only half as many doctorates), the most heavily represented in other "elite" Ph.D.-granting departments. With the beginning of what promises to be a second modern academic "long depression," some Chicago doctorates have taken academic positions which in the 1960s they might have rejected. A few have gone into nonacademic, nonmuseum jobs, most often with governmental agencies. So far this has not led to the opening of major new fields of anthropological employment. But in a society heavily dependent on the "management of meaning," even such a principledly nonutilitarian activity as "symbolic anthropology" could perhaps find a nonacademic market. For the immediately foreseeable future, however, Chicago's Anthropology Tomorrow—if one may judge from a sampling of publications by graduates of the 1970s—promises to be primarily an academic intellectual enterprise, seeking in the study of specific human communities an "understanding of man and his society with reference to both biological and cultural aspects and in the widest historical and comparative framework."
Two centuries after Rousseau issued the call for its existence, and nearly a hundred years after anthropology began to win status within the University, this ambitious union of several traditions of inquiry about the meaning of human variety has entered a troubled period. Just as resources finally became available to make feasible the study of the full range of variety, the rapidly accelerating historical transformation of the non-European world called into question relationships between anthropology and its traditional subject peoples—out of whose "otherness" a conception of the generically human was to be constructed. With the discipline finally attaining independent departmental status in large numbers of colleges and universities, the intellectual evolution of its component inquiries called into question the viability of "general anthropology." A small network of academic "little communities" still capable of anniversary reunions in the mid-1950s has grown into a variegated, multi-layered and sometimes controversy-ridden profession, whose traditional elite have since 1970 tended to withdraw from active participation in professional affairs.

In a period when the program of the American Anthropological Association sometimes seems spotted with the topics of pop sociology, the primary intellectual concerns of the Chicago Department are rooted in both departmental and broader anthropological traditions. Bridging the interface between archaeology and biological anthropology, and tracing its ancestry through Washburn, Braidwood, and Anthropology 220 back beyond to nineteenth-century evolutionism and natural history is the study which Clark Howell christened "paleoanthropology." It seeks an understanding of human evolution in the fullest sense, incorporating changes through time in the human organism, as reflected in bones, and in human behavior and ecology, as reflected in artifacts and associated data (animal bones, sediments, pollen, etc.). Carried on after Howell's departure for Berkeley in the work of Freeman, Klein, and Butzer, paleoanthropology provides one nucleus for the current activity of the Department—to which the primrate researches of Russell Tuttle and the early civilizational studies of Adams and Rice may be loosely associated.

Standing in a certain philosophical and methodological tension with paleoanthropology is the dominant movement among the Department's linguistic and sociocultural anthropologists. While many of them would not be comfortable with the label "symbolic anthropology," the principal focus of much of their work has been the reevaluation of culture as a symbolic phenomenon. Going beyond the Radcliffe-Brownian notion that the symbolic sphere is a reflection of social structure, conceived as a utilitarian formation of relations between persons, this movement—embodied particularly in the work of Schneider, Silverstein, and Sahlins—insists that social structure, economic life, politics, ritual, and art are all encompassed within an ordered structure of meaning. Although its intellectual lineage is not so easily sketched, this viewpoint resonates with certain themes in the Boasian and Durkheimian traditions and finds a departmental ancestry in Sapir, Redfield, and Warner. On the other hand, the manifestly diachronic and processual interests which these three departmental ancestors also had are still evident in the work of many in the Department, and comparative sociological concerns not unrelated to the tradition of Radcliffe-Brown are also represented. Even those whose primary preoccupation has been the synchronic analysis of symbolic structures are not unconcerned with the problems of relating cultural meaning and social action, or "structure" and "event." Diversity within the clan thus qualifies the external perception of Chicago sociocultural anthropology as a unified "school." At the same time, it clearly is not ecletic; in a period when many departments seem to lack a sense of direction, the reevaluation of culture provides a focal point for many of the Department's inquiries.

Having finally realized Cole's hopes for a separate building, the Department celebrates its Fiftieth Anniversary in more satisfactory quarters than it has ever enjoyed. With only one of its current members over 55, and all but three of them tenured, it seems likely (given an advanced retirement age and a reduced rate of academic mobility) that they will be housed together in Haskell Hall for quite some time. How this will affect their collective intellectual discourse, only time will tell. But their continuing individual intellectual vitality—attested in works published in recent years—should guarantee that their interaction will be a lively one. Certainly, the topic of their discourse, although transformed by history and contained for decades within the field of academic inquiry, is no less central now to human understanding than it was in the era of Rousseau.
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3 J. D. Dana, Yale University, to E.W. Putnam, Peabody Museum, Harvard University, November 24, 1889; from the Starr Papers.
4 Frederick Starr. Some First Steps in Human Progress. New York, 1895; frontispiece and title-page.
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Pedants and Potentates Case 8
1 R. Redfield to his wife Margaret, August, 1930; from the Redfield Papers.
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7 E. Sapir to F.-C. Cole, June 2, 1932; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.
8 R. Redfield to M. E. Opler, February 8, 1937; from the Redfield Papers.

The Folk Culture of Yucatan Case 10
1 R. Redfield to R. Park, December 2, 1926; from the Redfield Papers.
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1 R. Redfield to W.L. Warner, December 18, 1936; from the Redfield Papers.  
2 Edith Rosenthals, notes from Radcliffe-Brown’s “Comparative Science of Culture,” 1933; lent by Edith Rosenthal Nash.  
4 R. Redfield to F. Eggen, May 8, 1936; from the Redfield Papers.  
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2 F.-C. Cole to Governor John Bricker, May 16, 1944; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
3 R. Redfield, draft of a statement concerning the Japanese relocation camps, [1942]; from the Redfield Papers.  
4 Photograph of F. Eggen at the presentation of degrees to the CATS students, [1944]; lent by F. Eggen.  
5 R. Redfield to F. Eggen, May 10, 1943; from the Redfield Papers.  
6 F.-C. Cole to L. Spier, February 14, 1945; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
7 Euphoria. Volume 2, No. 4, July 21, 1944; lent by A.K. Guthe.  
8 G. P. Murdock to F.-C. Cole, December 12, 1942; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
9 R. Redfield to J. B. Watson, September 6, 1944; from the Redfield Papers.  
10 R. Redfield to his daughter Lisa, August 19, [1945]; from the Redfield Papers.  

A Program for Postwar Anthropology Case 15  
1 F.-C. Cole to I. G. McAllister, July 8, 1946; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
2 C. Kluckhohn to R. Redfield, March 18, 1946; from the Redfield Papers.  
3 F.-C. Cole to Dean R. Tyler, December 3, 1946; from the Redfield Papers.  
4 R. J. Braidwood to V. G. Childe, July 14, 1945; lent by R. J. Braidwood.  
7 R. Redfield to F. Hawley, January 23, 1947; from the Redfield Papers.  
9 Photograph of F.-C. Cole and R. Redfield at F.-C. Cole’s retirement dinner, May 24, 1947; lent by S. Tax.  
10 Speeches in honor of F.-C. Cole, May 24, 1947; lent by W. M. Krogman.  

From Folk Societies to Great Traditions Case 16  
2 R. Redfield to R.M. Hutchins, June 7, 1951; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.  
3 “Monograph Series: Comparative Studies of Cultures and Civilizations,” [1954]; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.  
4 M. Singer to R. Redfield, April 1, 1953; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.  
5 R. Redfield to C. Tardits, March 3, 1953; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.  
6 Photograph of M. Marriott with Kishan Singh and Gafaura Manihar, India, 1952; lent by M. Marriott.  
7 “Anthropology 342—Redfield, Singer. Comparison of Cultures: The Indian Village;” lent by B.S. Cohn.  

The Dilemmas of Utilitarian Anthropology Case 17  
2 F.-C. Cole to J. R. Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, April 4, 1934; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
3 F.-C. Cole, memorandum, June 5, 1934; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.  
4 J. Provine to R. Redfield, February 23, 1937; from the Redfield Papers.  
5 W. L. Warner to F.-C. Cole, July 13, 1944; from the Redfield Papers.  
9 R. Redfield to S. Tax, January 29, 1952; from the Redfield Papers.  
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13 Members of the Department of Anthropology to J. R. Goldsmith, Chairman of the Faculty Committee on I.D.A., November 7, 1968; lent by R. McC. Adams.  

Toward the Darwin Centennial Case 18  
1 W. M. Krogman to R. Redfield, May 2, 1947; from the Redfield Papers.  
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2 F. Eggan and S. Washburn to P. Fejos, 1949; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series I.

3 S. Washburn to R. Redfield, August 20, 1955; from the Redfield Papers.

4 S. Washburn to R. Redfield, April 20, 1957; from the Redfield Papers.

5. J. DeVore to S. Tax, September 29, 1959; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.


7 W. F. Libby to R. J. Braidwood, April 25, 1949; lent by R. Braidwood.


10 R. Redfield to R. McC. Adams, June 29, 1954; from the Redfield Papers.


12 J. A. Pitt-Rivers and N. A. McQuown, Social, Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Highlands of Chiapas. Chicago, 1964; lent by F. Eggan.

From the Paleolithic to Palo Alto Case 19

1 Photograph taken at the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Department of Anthropology, Chicago, 1955; lent by F. Eggan.

2 M. Singer to R. Redfield, February 21, 1952; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.

3 R. Redfield to his wife Margaret, 1952; from the Redfield Papers.

4 S. Washburn to R. Redfield, July 28, 1952; from the Redfield Papers.

5 R. Redfield to Surajit Sinha, December 17, 1956; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.

6 E. M. Mendelson to R. Redfield, October 26, 1953; from the Ford Foundation Cultural Studies Papers.

7 A. Richards to R. Redfield, August 23, 1952; from the Redfield Papers.


9 Montage of materials from Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 1958-59, Palo Alto, California; gift of the Center.

10 F. Eggan to "Dear Colleague" [N. A. McQuown], November 1, 1959; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.

11 L. Fallers to F. Eggan, March 6, 1960; lent by M. Fallers.

The Boom Years Case 20

1 The Chicago Anthropologist, No. 6, February, 1957; chart on title-page; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.


3 The Faculty of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago, 1929-1979; chart prepared for the exhibit by Joseph Schultenedrein on the basis of information compiled by G. Stocking.

4 N. A. McQuown to Dean C.D. Harris, November 10, 1959; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.

5 J. H. Rowe, "Substance of a Statement made to University Public Information, [Berkeley, California], May 5, 1960," lent by D. M. Schneider.

6 N. A. McQuown to C. Kaut, February 9, 1960; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.

7 D. M. Schneider to Dean D. Gale Johnson, February 2, 1965; from the Department of Anthropology Papers, Series II.


9 D. M. Schneider to Dean D. Gale Johnson, July 13, 1966; lent by D. M. Schneider.


Unifying the Sacred Bundle Case 21

1 General Examination in Anthropology," May 24-25, 1961; lent by F. Eggan.

2 S. Washburn, "relative to physical anthropology," enclosure in a letter to R. Redfield, July 24, 1954; from the Redfield Papers.

3 Unsigned memorandum, "Proposals Regarding the Program of Graduate Study of Anthropology at Chicago," [Spring, 1961]; lent by F. Eggan.


5 [L. Fallers], chart [1961] illustrating the interrelations between the subdisciplines of anthropology, adapted from R. Redfield's "Anthropology, Unity and Diversity," lent by F. Eggan.


7 D. M. Schneider to T. Parsons, December 16, 1964; lent by D. M. Schneider.

Setting the Modern Mold Case 22


4 Department of Anthropology. "Memorandum to all students on new departmental procedures," March 1971; lent by R. T. Smith.


6 D. M. Schneider, "In Faint Praise of Written Examinations," December 14, 1970; lent by G. Stocking.


8 B. S. Cohn, "Committee Structure," May 12, 1969; lent by R. T. Smith.


10 B. S. Cohn, "Cultural Drift," February 8, 1973; lent by G. Stocking.


13 R. D. Fogelson to NIMH Research Training Program, "Training Grant Application," April, 1974; lent by G. Stocking.

The Production of Knowledge and the Reproduction of Scholars Case 23

1 Photograph of D. Labby in Yap, 1970; lent by D. M. Schneider.

2 Faculty and Student Research of the Department of Anthropology, 1929-1979; chart prepared for the exhibit by Joseph Schultenedrein on the basis of information compiled by G. Stocking.

4. J. Friedlander, "Reactions of Graduate Students in the Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago," [1970]; lent by D.M. Schneider.

5. Anthropology Tomorrow. Volume 12, Number 1, Spring, 1979.

6. Some books by graduates of the 1970s:


Toward the 1990s: Case 24
1. Photograph of F. C. Howell at the 1962 excavations at Torralla, Spain; lent by R. Klein and L. Freeman.
2. Three castings of Torralba artifacts; lent by R. Klein.
3. Photograph of R. Tuttle and Inake [Pan Gorilla gorilla] during habituation and experiments; lent by R. Tuttle.

8. Longitudinal section of Haskell Hall; courtesy of the architects: Booth, Nagle and Hartray, Ltd.; Associate Architect, Harold Hellman, A.I.A.
10. Some recent books by members of the Faculty of the Department: