RECENT TRENDS IN AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY

By BETTY J. MEGGERS

AMERICAN anthropology as an organized science is only one hundred years old. The American Ethnological Society of New York, founded in 1842, was the first organization of its kind on the continent. In 1851 "the first scientific account of an Indian tribe" appeared—Lewis H. Morgan's *League of the Iroquois*. In 1866 the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology was founded in Cambridge. In 1879 the Bureau of American Ethnology was organized as the first agency to be supported by a national government for the systematic study of the aboriginal groups under its jurisdiction. In the same year the Anthropological Society of Washington was founded. The first number of the American Anthropologist appeared in 1888 and the Journal of American Folklore began the following year.

These early milestones were conceived and set up by men who, for the most part, had begun in other fields such as geology (McGee), medicine (Matthews) or law (Morgan). Some, like Matthews, subsisted from their original profession and practised anthropology as an avocation. Others, like Powell and Putnam, became affiliated with the Bureau of American Ethnology or with a museum. The universities were slow in adding anthropology to their course of study. The first Ph.D. (1892) was awarded to Chamberlain by Clark University only a little over fifty years ago and exactly fifty years after the founding of the first American society for anthropology.

In this first half century the foundations were laid and the pioneer work in American archeology, linguistics, physical anthropology and ethnography was done. This did not stop at simple description. These men were interested in interpreting what they saw, although the facts they possessed were few compared with the number available today.[1] The outstanding efforts in this direction were made by Morgan. In *Systems of consanguinity and affinity* (1870) he attempted to classify kinship systems and relate them to each other. *Ancient society* (1877) is one of the most substantial attempts in Europe or America to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of our social system. In *Houses and house-life of the American aborigines* (1881) he tried to show the correlation between architectural forms and social organization. This is the true scientific attitude: facts are of value only for the generalizations that can be derived from them and applied to a better understanding of our own life.

From 1892 to about 1925 Boas and his students dominated American anthropology. They found much to criticize in the evolutionary approach. When they tried to apply the evolutionist's sequences of development to particular tribes or peoples they discovered that the history of few if any of them con-

[1] See for example Powell's articles, "From savagery to barbarism," SI-MC 34: 173–196, 1885 (1893) and "From barbarism to civilization," *American Anthropologist* 1: 97–124, 1888.

formed to the evolutionist's formulae. They concluded, therefore, that diffusion made a theory of evolution inapplicable to the field of culture[1a] and devoted themselves to exhaustive studies of individual societies. As they proceeded they became more and more convinced that no generalizations were possible that could encompass all the differences. They went so far in the direction of specificity that one member of the group, Sapir, declared that "there are as many cultures as there are individuals in the population."[2]

In the recent period, since about 1925, the road has turned once more. As Kroeber pointed out in his review of *Primitive society* in 1920, "As long as we continue offering the world only reconstructions of specific detail, and consistently show a negativistic attitude toward broader conclusions, the world will find very little of profit in ethnology. . . . That branch of science which renounces the hope of contributing at least something to the shaping of life is headed into a blind alley."[3] The younger anthropologists have sought exits from this blind alley. They have been taught that culture is only a "construct," an "abstraction" from the ultimate reality, the behavior of individuals, and this outlook has made it impossible for them to turn back to the study of culture. They have escaped in other ways: by devoting themselves especially to psychology, acculturation and modern community studies.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the origin and growth of these recent trends. The study began with the collection of an extensive bibliography covering the period from 1934 to 1944. This was divided into as many distinct categories as possible and the titles that fitted into no general subdivision were discarded. It is always a question how many individuals make a trend, and this discussion has been limited arbitrarily to the topics that are occupying the attention of a substantial number of anthropologists at the present time. Since we are interested in what they are doing rather than how they are doing it, no discussion of the evolutionary, historical and functional methods of approach has been included. When the main trends had been selected, they were traced back to their origin.

In all but one case, psychology, the survey has been limited to American anthropologists. Both of these terms are capable of more than one definition. In this case "American" has been used to mean "trained and professionally active in the United States." The only notable exception is Bateson who was included on the basis of his extensive collaboration with Mead. If a person was listed in the *International directory of Anthropologists* he qualified for inclusion as an anthropologist. A few individuals, Dollard and Kardiner for example, do not fulfill this condition. Dollard, however, is affiliated with the

[1a] For a discussion of this point see "'Diffusion vs. Evolution': an Anti-Evolutionist Fallacy" by Leslie A. White in the *American Anthropologist*, 47: 339–356, 1945.

[2] Benedict, Ruth, "Obituary of Edward Sapir." *American Anthropologist* 41: 465–468, 1939, p. 467.

[3] *American Anthropologist*, vol. 22, pp. 380 and 381.

Department of Anthropology of Yale University and has worked on problems like those occupying the Yale anthropologists. To exclude him on the grounds that he is a sociologist does not seem justifiable. Similar reasons could be given for the other exceptions. In the description of the growth of interest in psychology, some non-Americans and non-anthropologists were included. This was done for the sake of completeness, since some of the significant early steps in this direction were taken in England. Physical anthropologists and archeologists have been omitted for the most part, physical anthropologists because as biologists they might legitimately practice psychology, and archeologists because the nature of their evidence gives them no choice but to study culture. The ethnologists, who come in contact with people, with culture and with society, and who cannot make up their minds which to study, are responsible for the many-facetted science that is anthropology today.

The bibliography that concludes this article is an important part of it, and has been arranged to show the trends most clearly. In order to make the relative magnitude of a trend apparent and to indicate which anthropologists are participating in it, the primary division was made by subject. It is interesting to observe the overlapping of personnel. Extent in time has been emphasized by listing the titles according to year, beginning with the earliest. The articles have been numbered consecutively and the numbers are used for the references made in the text. Although all the readily accessible sources were used in assembling the bibliography, it by no means includes everything that has been published on these topics. I believe, however, that nothing of outstanding importance has been overlooked, and that the number of titles listed for each trend is a rough indication of its importance relative to the others.

PSYCHOLOGY

The oldest of our recent trends, and the most important in terms of membership and number of publications, is psychology. Many attempts have been made by both anthropologists and psychologists to clarify the relationship between the two sciences. As early as 1910 Boas discussed "Psychological problems in anthropology." He saw anthropology as the sum of history and psychology:

> The science of anthropology deals with the biological and mental manifestations of human life as they appear in different races and in different societies. The phenomena with which we are dealing are therefore, from one point of view, historical. We are endeavoring to elucidate the events which have led to the formation of human types, past and present, and which have determined the course of cultural development of any given group of men. From another point of view the same phenomena are the objects of biological and psychological investigations . . . . We are . . . trying to determine the psychological laws which control the mind of man everywhere, and that may differ in various racial and social groups. In so far as our inquiries relate to the last named subject their problems are problems of psychology, though based upon anthropological material (1, p. 371).

In 1915 Lowie wrote an article called "Psychology and sociology" in which he showed that some of the phenomena of culture were comparable to individual behavior observed by psychologists.

The association between a blue bottle design and sweetness does not seem to differ generically from the Dakota's association of a lozenge with the whirlwind. If an Englishwoman thinks of Tuesday in association with a gray sky color, while Friday suggests a dull yellow smudge, why should not the Indian associate the north with blue and the south with white? And if numbers are endowed with individual personalities by Europeans, what is marvelous in the fact that primitive tribes attach a preferential estimate to one (or, it may be, more than one) particular number? To be sure, the nature of *all* the associations, individual as well as sociological, is obscure, i.e., irreducible to a *logical* basis. But we have at least classified the sociological phenomena with those phenomena of individual psychology that are akin to them (3, p. 227).

He warns, however, against expecting too much of psychology.

There can be no doubt that the psychological interpretation of cultural data is fraught with serious difficulties. . . . Scientific psychology will not solve all our sociological problems, nor many at the present time, but while not omnipotent neither is it powerless. It will not only act as a corrective in speculative interpretation, but will lend greater rigor to our formulation of fact and open new prospects of inquiry and explanation (3, p. 229).

In "Ethnology and psychology," also published in 1915, Hocart explains that every event is the product of two factors, the psychological and the cultural, each describable independently of the other.

Ethnology may be compared to a moving picture; psychology to the operator and his lantern. If a boy wants to know how moving pictures are produced, we expound to him the camera with which they are taken, the lantern with which they are projected on the screen, and the law by which retinal impressions fuse into one continuous sensation. But all this mechanism belongs to no particular time and place, but to any moving picture-show at any time in any part of the world, and it is continually in action from the beginning to the end of the film. Improvements may from time to time be made in the machinery, and these will be described in answer to the question why moving pictures are better now than they used to be. When, however, the boy wants to know why the hero of a particular film went up in an aeroplane, we do not go into the mechanism of the lantern and film, but merely tell him that it was to win the $100,000, without which the hard-hearted father would not allow him to marry his charming daughter. It does not follow that the mechanism does not cause the picture, but only that it is irrelevant.

Let epistemologists explain how it is possible to give two so utterly different and independent accounts of one event, one casual and universal, the other logical and particular, and both independent of one another: the fact remains. We can conceive a psychology of Parliament which would study the frame of mind of M.P.'s under the influence of collective deliberation and traditional party animus; there are histories of debates in which each speech or repartee appears as the logical outcome of preceding statements and situations. A psychology of the stage would investigate the mentality

of actors in general; but it cannot explain the particular action of a player at a particular time; that is conditioned by the logic of the play (2, pp. 134–135).

And Hocart concludes:

The conflict between psychology and history for the possession of ethnology is not merely a theoretic conflict, it is of the highest practical importance (2, p. 137).

In an article called "Psychological and historical interpretations for culture" the following year, Wissler called psychologists to task for attempting to explain cultural phenomena by psychology. These are two separate fields of investigation, each with its own techniques:

It is thus clear that when we are dealing with phenomena that belong to original nature we are quite right in using psychological and biological methods; but the moment we step over into cultural phenomena we must recognize its historical nature (5, p. 200). We often read that if culture phenomena can be reduced to terms of association of ideas, motor elements, etc., there remains but to apply psychological principles to it to reveal its causes. This is a vain hope. All the knowledge of the mechanism of association in the world will not tell us why any particular association is made by a particular individual, will not explain the invention of the bow, the origin of exogamy, or of any other trait of culture except in terms that are equally applicable to all (5, pp. 200–201).

Further discussions of "History, psychology and culture" by Goldenweiser (6) and "Psychology and culture" by Willey and Herskovits (9) appeared in 1918 and 1927 respectively.

In 1924 in England psychoanalysis entered the picture. In an address to the Royal Anthropological Institute called "Psychoanalysis and anthropology" (7), Jones explained how the doctrines and discoveries of the former might be applied to an explanation of such phenomena in culture as symbols and rules of incest. This same subject was discussed by Malinowski (8) in the same year. These discussions were followed by Seligman's article "The unconscious in relation to anthropology" in 1928 (10) and "Common problems in psychoanalysis and anthropology" by Glover in 1932 (11).

The first American to venture into this discussion was Sapir who in 1932 wrote on "Cultural anthropology and psychiatry." His point of view is exactly opposite to that of Lowie and Wissler. For him

The concept of culture, as it is handled by the cultural anthropologist, is necessarily something of a statistical fiction (12, p. 237). That culture is a superorganic, impersonal whole is a useful enough methodological principle to begin with but becomes a serious deterrent in the long run to the more dynamic study of the genesis and development of cultural patterns because these cannot be realistically disconnected from those organizations of ideas and feelings which constitute the individual (12, p. 233).

In 1933 Mead entered a plea for "More comprehensive field methods" (13) which would include the observation and description of the unformalized everyday social intercourse and psychological experiences of the people whose culture is being studied.

Opler, in 1935, observes with regret that "anthropology and psychology have traveled far from positions once held in common, and in opposite directions" (15, p. 149). He believes that these two sciences are actually dealing with the same things but calling them by different names: biological man and id, individual personality and ego, total culture and ego-ideal.

If one reads ego and ego-ideal for Sapir's anthropological terms ["individual sub culture" and "culture as a whole," (12)], the explanation of the psychoanalyst and the anthropologist does not differ a whit. In the Freudian version, too, we have the conflict between ego and super-ego, the sense of guilt precipitated by the condemnation of the ego on the part of the super-ego, and the flight from reality when that gnawing reproach becomes unbearable (15, p. 157).

Opler continues:

Unless this analysis is gravely in error, it follows that a significant and fruitful understanding between anthropology and psychoanalysis is now possible. Because such psychological concepts have not been present to make aberrations, anomalies, change and instability in individuals and in culture intelligible, anthropologists have concerned themselves primarily with the ideal cultural patterns of preliterate peoples and not with the actualizations of them. We anthropologists have plotted the extent of the ocean but know little concerning its depth. In fact, many anthropologists, discouraged with the slight help they could expect from psychology, decided that their province was the study of culture, as such, and not its individual carriers. These anthropologists are cheerfully abstracting from their notes word pictures of cultures which exist only in some anthropological limbo, and the loss to psychology and psychiatry of the refusal to explore rich anthropological fields for psychology on the part of the only workers who are in a position to do so, is incalculable. It is to be hoped that such concepts as the ego and ego-ideal and an interest in their interaction will stimulate the anthropologist to scrutinize the behavior of the individual, both normal and pathological, in response to the pressure of his culture, and to give us vital data of a broadly comparative nature for the establishment of a meaningful social psychology (15, p. 155).

Here again we have an expression of the idea that culture is not the subject matter of a science, but rather an abstraction from the only reality, the behavior of individuals.

The importance of psychological doctrine in anthropology by 1937 may be measured by the fact that at least five articles by anthropologists dealing with this subject appeared in that year. DuBois, in "Some psychological objectives and techniques in ethnography" (18), suggests some reasons for the growing interest of anthropologists in psychology.

Given anthropology as a point of departure, we see that the specifically minded person has drifted toward psychology where he feels he can deal with the least common denominator or, as he expresses it, the ultimate reality in the realm of culture (18, p. 286).

She describes the development of the movement as follows:

In ethnography, the departure from naïve type descriptions has come from a number of sources and has expressed itself in various forms. . . . Names of informants are given.

Direct quotations have been introduced more generally. Contradictory data are indicated. Discrepancies between theory and practice are noted. Anecdotal material is used more freely. All of these devices serve to stress the individual as a variant in the type picture of culture. Simultaneously, with the growing interest in the range of material and the individual who represents that range, the influence of the case history approach has made itself felt (18, p. 285).

In another article, "Some anthropological perspectives on psychoanalysis" she attempts to distinguish the valid from the false assumptions involved in the application of psychoanalysis to anthropology. The translation of cultural phenomena into psychological terms and the explanation of culture by analogy with the individual "may be interesting but solves no problems in either field" (17, p. 249).

It is necessary for anyone dealing with the highly speculative matter of man's psychical evolution to bear in mind (1) that evidence is very slim, (2) that there are dangers in analogic reasoning and (3) that once culture was invented by the human animal, a process with its own special qualities was introduced into the world of nature which is not organic—however close may be the interplay between the organic, psychic and cultural (17, p. 251).

She believes that psychology and anthropology can cooperate in the solution of such problems as (1) Are the psychic mechanisms formulated by Freud and widely accepted today universal? (2) Do universal dream symbols exist? (3) Do average normal individuals in all cultures pass through oral, anal and latency phases before arriving at adult genital sexuality? (4) Is the Oedipus complex universal? (5) What are the various processes and means by which the child can be socialized? (6) Which sex characteristics are innate in a biological sense and which are culturally engendered? (7) What is the bearing of anthropology on abnormal psychology? Are psychoses problems in psychic or social pathology? (8) Is ritual a group catharsis? Does a heavily ritualized life drain off anxieties by a multiplicity of cultural behavior comparable to that devised in compulsion neuroses and thereby produce a sense of safety and security?

Sapir agrees that the psychiatrist "cannot tell us what any cultural pattern is 'all about' " (21, p. 869). He believes, however, that

If we could only get a reasonably clear conception of how the lives of A and B intertwine into a mutually interpretable complex of experiences, we should see far more clearly than is at present the case the extreme importance and the irrevocable necessity of the concept of personality. We should also be moving forward to a realistic instead of a metaphysical definition of what is meant by culture and society (21, p. 870).

Mekeel also feels that the use of

the Freudian conceptual schema of human behavior may possibly clarify an understanding of cultural processes and perhaps reach a deeper level of meaning for culture itself (20, p. 232).

In "Why cultural anthropology needs the psychiatrist," in 1938, Sapir reiterates his conviction that it is psychology that will provide the answers to the basic problems of social science.

In spite of all that has been claimed to the contrary, we cannot thoroughly understand the dynamics of culture, of society, of history, without sooner or later taking account of the actual interrelationships of human beings. We can postpone this psychiatric analysis indefinitely but we cannot theoretically eliminate it (22, p. 11). Anthropology, sociology, indeed social science in general, is notoriously weak in the discovery of effective consistencies. This weakness, it seems, is not unrelated to a fatal fallacy with regard to the objective reality of social and cultural patterns defined impersonally. . . . An effective philosophy of causation in the realm of social phenomena seems impossible so long as these phenomena are judged to have a valid existence and sequence in their own right. It is only when they are translated into the underlying facts of behavior from which they have never been divorced in reality that one can hope to advance to an understanding of causes (22, p. 12).

Linton in 1940 takes much the same position.

It seems to me that without his [the psychologist's] work we can never arrive at a more than superficial understanding of cultural processes. We talk glibly of the phenomena of cultural change and are prone to forget that such change consists, in the last analysis, of changes in the attitudes and habits of the individuals who compose a society. We do not know, and will not know until the psychologist tells us, how these changes are brought about. . . . As long as the anthropologist is content to describe and analyse cultural phenomena in static terms he can get along without the psychologist. As soon as he turns to dynamic studies he finds himself confronted with a series of problems which cannot be solved without him. Many of these will have to wait on further developments in psychology and, if only for his own purposes, the anthropologist should do his best to speed these. The ultimate goal of both sciences is the same; the control and conscious direction of human existence, and any gain in knowledge that either can make is a gain for both (24, pp. 125–126).

Hallowell too feels that

Once the socially derived constituents of human behavior and experience are recognized as coordinate in importance with organic determinants . . . the relations between psychology and anthropology will be much closer in terms of a common interest in a large variety of problems (25, p. 297).

In these discussions covering the thirty-two years between 1910 and 1942 we can see clearly how anthropologists have changed their orientation. In 1915 it was felt that psychology might contribute to an explanation of certain cultural phenomena (Lowie), but it was recognized that the two sciences dealt with distinct aspects of reality (Hocart, Wissler). In 1924 psychoanalysis was introduced to anthropologists and by 1932 the tide had turned. Since that time anthropologists have maintained either that culture is a statistical fiction and the individual the only reality and therefore the only proper focus of study, or that psychology and anthropology are actually dealing with the same

thing under different disguises, with psychology's offering the better of the two. This about-face is discernible not only in theory but also in practice, as the discussion which follows will show.

The field work of anthropologists that falls into the category of psychology has been divided into four groups to facilitate a description of the trends. These are psychological tests, biography and personality studies, and general articles on normal and abnormal psychology.

One of the first attempts to administer psychological tests to primitive peoples was made by the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits at the end of the 19th century. Volume 2 of the Reports, entitled "Physiology and psychology" was published in two parts, the first in 1901 and the second in 1903. Tests were given for visual acuity, color vision, visual illusions, acuity and range of hearing, rhythm, smell and taste, tactile acuity and localization, temperature spots, reaction time, memory, motor accuracy, blood-pressure changes under various conditions (28).

In America the psychologists were the first to administer tests of this kind to primitive peoples. The St. Louis Fair gathered together individuals from many races and cultures, and Woodworth and others took advantage of this opportunity to get comparative data on visual acuity, color vision, visual illusions, hearing, reaction time, threshold of pain, handedness, and intelligence (29).

Probably the first American anthropologist to work in this field was Mead who in 1928 reported the testing of Samoan children in color naming, rote memory for digits, digit symbol substitution, word opposites, picture interpretation, and ball and field (30). Further results have been reported by Steggerda for Jamaicans in 1929 (31) and 1935 (35), for Navahos in 1936 (37) and 1941 (43), for racial differences in the threshold of taste in 1937 (38), for Maya in 1939 (39) and 1941 (44). All of these tests are directed toward the measurement of special aptitudes or aspects of mentality.

In 1932 Mead made a pioneer attempt to study the thought and imagination of primitive peoples in "An investigation of the thought of primitive children, with special reference to animism" (32). It was followed in 1935 by the Bleulers' article on "Rorschach's ink-blot test and racial psychology" (34). In 1941 Hallowell (40, 41) and Henry (42) discussed the value of the application of the Rorschach test to the study of primitive peoples. Since that time other anthropologists have made use of it, and results are available from the Hopi, Wisconsin Ojibwa, Yakima, Kwakiutl, Coast Salish, Athabaskan-speaking groups in Canada, and Mexican Indian groups, as well as from peoples in Polynesia, Melanesia and India (49, p. 201 footnote). The administrators of these tests are concerned with answering such questions about the relationship between personality and culture as : Does the range of variability in personality organization differ with the culture? Is the incidence of psy-

choses and neuroses related to the culture pattern? Is the role the individual plays related to his personality?

The present interest in personality in primitive society began with the collection of autobiographical material. The purpose of the early anthropologists in gathering such reminiscences was not to illuminate the individual but to give a more complete and understandable record of the culture. Possibly the first to combine personal experiences with impersonal description of culture was Kroeber who in 1908 published narratives of the war experiences of three Gros Ventre Indians. These were obtained "for the picture they give of the war-life of the Plains Indians" (50, p. 197). This was followed in 1913 by Radin's "Personal reminiscences of a Winnebago Indian" (51) and in 1920 by "The autobiography of a Winnebago Indian" (52). Here again the purpose was "not to obtain autobiographical details about some definite personage, but to have some representative middle-aged individual of moderate ability describe his life in relation to the social group in which he had grown up" (52, p. 384).

In "The life of a Nootka Indian" published in 1921 (53), Sapir uses the biographical form as a means of personalizing and presenting more vividly to the reader the characteristics of a strange culture. *American Indian life*, which appeared in 1922, was conceived by Parsons for a similar purpose: to present the general public with a truthful and interesting picture of "the psychological aspects of Indian culture" (54, Preface, p. 2). In the years from 1925 to 1933 biographies of Fox (55), Winnebago (57), Lenape (58), Cheyenne (59) and Arapaho (60) men and women appeared.

About this time the purpose for collecting these stories changed. The interest in a way of life, and in the individual only secondarily as he illustrates it, gave way to an interest in the individual, and in the way of life secondarily and as it affects him. Thus we have articles on the importance of using information on primitive peoples in forming an adequate concept of personality (e.g., 61, 62), descriptions of personality in primitive cultures (e.g., 65, 69, 72, 73), and discussions of the relationship between personality and culture (67, 74, 76, etc.), as well as biographies (68, 70, 71, etc.).

The remaining articles on general psychology may be divided into studies of the abnormal and of the normal. Of the two, interest in abnormal behavior, including psychiatry and psychoanalysis, is most recent. Two of the earliest articles appeared in 1933: "The Cree Witiko psychosis" by Cooper (146), and "Mental disorders among the James Bay Cree" by Saindon (147). In 1934 Benedict (148) pointed out that abnormality is not an absolute state but is relative to the standards of each society, and that whole culture patterns might be considered abnormal from our point of view. In the same year Cooper (149), Dollard (150), Hallowell (151) and Winston (153) discussed the relationship between culture and mental disorder, and Herskovits (152) described

"Freudian mechanisms in primitive Negro psychology." The status of abnormal individuals in primitive culture was described by Hill in 1935 (154), Devereux in 1937 (161), and Landes in 1940 (174). The way in which mental disorders are treated by primitive peoples has been reported by Hill (157), Opler (159), Darlington (163), and Devereux (172, 177). Interest in the relationship between psychic stress and culture patterns is revealed by the work of Hallowell (156), Warner (162), Aginsky (166), Devereux (167, 168), Kardiner (169), and Kroeber (173).

The study of normal behavior has been directed toward the solution of similar problems. The distinction between the innately biological and the cultural has occupied Mead (97, 99, 100), Flannery (109), Hallowell (121), and Linton (123). The variations in the behavior of individuals affected by the same culture have been discussed by Lowie (96), Linton (115), Ford (120), and Eggan (144). Attempts to explain or describe whole cultures or some of their aspects by principles of psychology have been made by Benedict (98, 102, 104), Gillin (106), and Mead (124). Dollard (119), Hallowell (128), Bateson (130), Miller (134), and Powdermaker (145) have reported on frustration and aggression. Interest in the phenomena of interaction has been manifested primarily by Chapple (e.g., 118, 126).

In summary, it may be said that from the time of its introduction into anthropology around 1900 psychology has come to occupy an increasingly larger part of the field. Until about 1930 psychology was looked upon as a tool that would help to explain culture. About this time, however, abnormal psychology and psychoanalysis came into prominence and attention was diverted from cultural to psychological problems. The belief became current that culture is an abstraction and that explanations would be possible only if attempts to arrive at them on this level were abandoned for studies of man, their creator. The extent to which psychologists and anthropologists feel their subject matter and aims to be alike is indicated by the recent cooperative enterprises in which they have engaged (91, 169), as well as by the censure with which anthropologists who study culture meet. That this trend will continue for some time to dominate anthropology cannot be doubted. In the meantime, however, the province of culture is being neglected. Anthropologists of the present would do well to recall Lowie's warning that "psychology will not solve all our sociological problems."

ACCULTURATION

A more recent development in anthropology is the increasing emphasis on the importance of studying acculturation. The word itself is nearly as old as the science of anthropology. In the 1880's some writers used it in its present sense, as did Powell when he wrote:

The force of acculturation under the overwhelming presence of millions of civilized

people has wrought great changes. Primitive Indian society has either been modified or supplanted, primitive religions have been changed, primitive arts lost, and in like manner, primitive languages have not remained unmodified.[4]

Others, like Holmes, used it as a synonym for diffusion:

The arts migrate in ways of their own. They pass from place to place and from people to people by a process of acculturation, so that peoples of unlike origin practice like arts, while those of like origin are found practicing unlike arts.[5]

Examples of acculturation were most obvious in folklore. Between 1913 and 1918 Speck (180), Skinner (181), and Parsons (182) reported on European folktales that had been adopted by American Indian tribes. Radin, in 1913, wrote on "The influence of the Whites on Winnebago culture" (179). It was not until a decade later that studies like these were labeled "acculturation." One of the first was "Euro-American acculturation in Tonga" by Gifford which appeared in 1924 (183). This was followed in 1927 by Herskovits' "Acculturation and the American Negro" (184). Until 1929 acculturation was not sufficiently important to appear in the subject index of the American Anthropologist, but immediately after this it became a prominent category in anthropology.

The change in orientation that was noted in psychological studies is visible here. The early acculturationists were interested in the changes on the level of culture: which aspects changed easily and quickly and which persisted, how the innovations were integrated into the old culture-pattern. In more recent years attention has been directed toward people: how cultural disorganization affects the individual and what part he plays in determining the reception of a new trait (195, 203, 217, 218, 228).

Until 1936 no formal attempt was made to provide a precise definition of the word "acculturation." In that year Redfield, Linton and Herskovits worked out "A memorandum for the study of acculturation" in which it was proposed: "Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups" (197, p. 149). Later it became apparent that this description did not include all the phenomena called "acculturation," and in 1941 Herskovits suggested that "the definition be rephrased so as to emphasize the continuous nature of the cultural impulses from the donor to the receiving groups, whether these be at first hand or through literary channels" (210, p. 7).

How is this differentiated from the process of diffusion? According to Herskovits

---

[4] Powell, J. W., "Introduction to the study of Indian languages." Washington, 1880, p. 46.

[5] Holmes, W. H., "Pottery of the ancient Pueblos." AR-BAE, 4: 257–360, 1886, p. 266.

. . . acculturation is but a specialized form of the diffusion process . . . . Cultural borrowing is thus a single phenomenon, whether it occurs on a wide or a restricted scale, whether it is casually achieved or sustained over a long period of time, whether its carriers operate at first-hand or more remotely, and whether it takes place on the literate or nonliterate level. Yet to recognize the absence of differences of kind does not lessen the importance for scientific analysis of differences of degree . . . the recognition of historic control as an added resource in the anthropologist's repertory does not imply that contact on the nonliterate nonhistoric level is to be held in complete contrast to it except for the factor of historicity. Acculturation studies and diffusion studies, therefore, are a part of the same general search for an understanding of cultural dynamics (210, pp. 8–9).

To illustrate the difference Herskovits uses Spier's articles "The Ghost Dance of 1870 among the Klamath of Oregon" (185) and "The Sun Dance of the Plains Indians: its development and diffusion."[6] The former is an acculturation and the latter a diffusion study. As Herskovits sees it,"The difference is only one of the degree to which historicity can be established; in the first case . . . the history of the movement does not have to be reconstructed, while in the latter it must be conjectural" (200, p. 16–17). In an earlier article he said: "In studies of acculturation, however, recourse to history—actual recorded history, that is, not "historical" reconstructions—is mandatory" (199, p. 262).

Several objections can be raised against this distinction. Perversions through bias or ignorance on the part of the recorder often make historical records no more reliable than reconstructions made by other means. Therefore, the historical reconstructions made by the acculturation student cannot be distinguished from those of the diffusionist on the basis of "fact versus conjecture." Acculturation studies cannot even be differentiated from non-acculturation ethnography by the use of recorded history since, as Herskovits says, "all actual historical documents . . . are of the greatest value in the study of any civilization, *acculturated or not*" (200, pp. 25–26, emphasis ours). Further, studies called "acculturation" are made in archeology in which little or no "actual recorded history" is available (211, 227). They are none the less correctly labeled "acculturation." The importance of recorded history is that it is a means of reconstructing the pre-contact culture so that it can be compared with the post-contact one. Acculturation can be studied only where this can be done. Archeology, however, may be substituted for written records in making the reconstruction. Although it limits the comparison to material objects and deductions made from them, it has the advantage of freedom from the errors and distortions found in historical accounts.

The difference between diffusion and acculturation studies seems rather to be the point of view: When we are concerned with the *movement* of a trait or complex over the area represented by its present distribution we call the

[6] AP-AMNH, 16: 451–527, 1921.

process *diffusion;* when we are concerned with the *reception* of this trait or complex in a particular culture in this area we call it *acculturation.* Thus Spier in "The Sun Dance of the Plains Indians" is concerned with the origin and spread of the Sun Dance over the Plains and the variations in which it appears in the acculturated groups. In "The Ghost Dance of 1870 among the Klamath of Oregon" he is viewing a similar phenomenon from the position of a society to which the trait has been diffused. Here the interest is on the particular form which the trait assumes in that particular society. Spier says: "In this paper I have set myself the problem of defining the character of the acquired dance, the conditions of its reception, and the modifications wrought by preexisting habits" (185, p. 43). These are complementary points of view and both contribute to a complete understanding of culture change.

Herskovits outlines the procedure in making an acculturation study as follows:

> On his guard against thus taking the familiar for granted, the competent field-worker otherwise prosecutes his study of acculturation along lines of generally recognized methods of field procedure, and attempts to obtain as rounded a picture as possible of the culture he is studying in its present manifestations (200, p. 20).

Following this, a reconstruction is made of the society as it existed before the acculturation process began. The next step is an analysis of the data:

> The nature of the contact and the individuals concerned in it; the role these persons played, and, if possible, the reasons why they exerted their influence as they did; whether the contact was friendly or hostile, and whether or not the two groups were similar or dissimilar in numbers or in the forcefulness of their cultures: all these should be pointed toward an understanding of both field data and the relevant historical literature. Which cultural elements were accepted or, of equal importance, those which were rejected, together with any available information as to why they were accepted or rejected, should also be exhaustively analyzed. Finally, viewing the culture under investigation as a going concern, an inquiry into the provenience of the elements of this culture, and the manner in which they are integrated into the totality of the resulting culture will round out the presentation . . . (200, pp. 27–28).

To recapitulate: the steps are (1) a description of the present culture, (2) a reconstruction of the pre-contact culture, (3) an account of the history of the contact, (4) a functional view of the hybrid. An acculturation study as specified here seems to require a synthesis of the methods of history and functionalism. This is a very large order and we know of no acculturation study that has filled it. It is possible that to do so would inject so many different approaches and variables into the situation and supply so much irrelevant data that the fundamentals of culture change would be more effectively obscured than revealed.

A variety of aims and purposes have been given for acculturation studies. They may be combined under four headings:

(1) To determine the function and interrelationship of cultural elements and to show why some traits are more or less readily accepted, others rejected, etc. (Herskovits, Siegel).
(2) To test assumptions, such as "material aspects of culture are the most stable," "women are more conservative than men," "things diffuse more easily than ideas" (Herskovits).
(3) To understand the relationship between the individual and culture, and the effect of cultural disorganization on personality (Herskovits, Mead).
(4) To understand the dynamics of culture and to make generalizations about the results of culture contact and about culture change (Redfield, Mead, Parsons, Herskovits, Eggan).

We already have information on most of these points from stable, "untouched" cultures, but it is believed that the social process is more easily observable in cultures where rapid adjustments are being made between new traits and old ones, and that such a situation brings the relationship between personality and culture into relief. This sounds well in theory but the increased confusion and the disorganization encountered in such cultures render the task so much more difficult for the ethnologist as to offset the advantage gained. Most of the acculturation studies published are descriptions of the society in its present stage of adjustment (e.g., 189, 194, 196) with some effort to separate the items introduced from those that were indigenous. The ultimate aim—to make generalizations about culture change—is shared by the largest number of individuals, but there have been no positive and concentrated efforts to achieve it. Possibly we are on the wrong track and the answer is not to be found in acculturation studies. In any case, they enjoy great popularity at the present time and will probably continue to do so in the near future. Whether this is a fad that will have a burst of glory and then fade away, or whether acculturation studies can make a real contribution to our understanding of culture remains to be seen.

COMMUNITY STUDIES

In recent years some anthropologists have turned from research on primitive peoples as a basis for understanding our culture to studies of modern communities. The leader of this movement is W. L. Warner, and many of the participants did field work under his direction at Newburyport, Massachusetts between 1930 and 1934. Only Warner and Powdermaker have had previous experience with primitive groups.

The aim of this work is best expressed by Warner:

The research in Yankee City has been a practical attempt to use the techniques and ideas which have been developed by social anthropologists in primitive society in order to obtain a more accurate understanding of an American community. Heretofore,

social anthropology has confined itself largely to studies of more simple societies and has left the investigations of our own society to representatives of other disciplines. This, on the whole, has had deleterious effects on understanding our own and the other "high" cultures. It seems likely that once we place the study of civilization in the framework of an inductive, systematic, comparative sociology, we can increase our knowledge of our own social behavior with the same rapidity that the biologists did when they placed knowledge of our physical structure in the framework of comparative biological science (242, pp. 14–15).

To this end fieldwork was done in Ireland in 1932 by Arensberg and Kimball, in Mississippi from 1933–35 by Powdermaker, Davis and the Gardners, and later by Dollard, and in midwestern and western communities by Junker, Loeb and Arensberg.

The first reports on this work were two short articles by Warner which appeared in 1936, one on "American caste and class" (229) and the other on "Formal education and the social structure" (230). These comprised a preliminary discussion of the caste and class system in the United States and its effect on personality and on education.

Caste and class in a southern town by Dollard appeared in 1937. It represents "the attempt to see the social situation as a means of patterning the affections of white and Negro people, as a mold for love, hatred, jealousy, deference, submissiveness, and fear" (232, p. 2), and "to grasp and describe the emotional structure which runs parallel to the formal social structure in the community" (232, p. 17). Subjects discussed include economic, sexual and prestige gains of the white middle class; gains of the lower-class Negroes; caste patterning of education, politics and religion; accomodation attitudes of Negroes: aggression within the Negro group; Negro aggression against whites and white-caste aggression against Negroes; defensive beliefs of the white caste.

A description by Powdermaker of the same community in Mississippi appeared in 1939. Her purpose was "to study the living forces of a culture: their present functioning and their impact on the individuals who comprise the community" (236, pp. xii–xiii). Among the topics included are social contours, social mechanisms expressing white attitudes, economic considerations, cohesion and conflicts in the Negro family, religion and superstition among the Negroes, education as a faith, and the Negro's response to the social situation.

A third report, by Davis and the Gardners (240), published in 1941, describes the caste and class system and the economic system in the South and the interrelations between the two.

The first volume of the Yankee City Series containing the results of the Newburyport study appeared in 1941. The amount of time, labor and money expended on this project and the fact that many of the participants in this trend had their introduction to field work here justify a description in some detail of the techniques employed. Observations, interviews and questionnaires

were utilized in gathering the data. Some appreciation of the detailed nature of the analysis may be gained from the following paragraphs taken from *The social life of a modern community:*

Observations . . . conducted by the Yankee City group of researchers included the study of certain factories, retail stores, and banks, of the mass activities of a strike, of the meetings associated with loss of income and unemployment, of sacred and secular rituals such as those on Memorial Day, and of the ceremonies of the churches and associations. The *rites de passage* surrounding marriage, birth, and death were observed. The police desk, with its flow of arrests, convictions, and discharges, was kept under long-term observation and the behavior of such officials as the truant officer and the policeman on the beat was studied. The mayor's office, the poor-relief, the health office, the office of the superintendent of schools, with their several systems of behavior were each observed by one or more fieldworkers. In the schoolhouses and the schoolyards the relations of teachers, of pupils, and of each to the other and to the principal were recorded over periods of time by field workers (p. 53).

Of the various methods employed in assembling our field data, the most important was that which involved the use of what we called the social personality card. Each individual in the community (except infants) was represented by a card. On these cards, which ultimately totaled nearly 17,000, were entered data abstracted from the original interview sheets and references to the location of pertinent material in the files. . . . The full name, residence, age, sex, social status, and occupation were entered on the cards of all individuals (pp. 70–71).

Also noted were his membership in cliques and associations, church affiliation' residence and type of house, physician and undertaker, income and items of expense (p. 71).

This material was treated by statistical analysis and the individuals were divided into six social classes. These classes were then described in terms of the facts that had been collected.

In Volume 2 of the series, *The status system of a modern community*, associations, families, cliques and other institutions were sorted and grouped according to the range of their extension through the six classes.

The relations of the family, the clique, and the association, each of which was distributed through one or more classes in the separate class types, were now converted into relations which had no references to the several structures but were seen as general relations or general class types. This was done by breaking down the class types of each of the structures into one class type. Thus, whenever two or more of the structural types coincided, they were treated as one general class type; whenever only one structure occurred, this also was treated as one general class type. Thirty-four of these general class types were found, and these were converted into 89 positions (p. 12). The eighty-nine positions constituting the Yankee City status system contain 71,149 memberships or 'members' (p. 53).

The interconnections between the 89 positions were computed and set forth on an 87–page table.

This is not the place to discuss the shortcomings of this method in detail.[7] We are interested primarily in discovering how this differs from traditional sociology and how it advances our understanding of the mechanics of society. Warner says that he has attempted to apply the techniques of social anthropology to a modern community. He observed and interviewed his informants in the manner of a social anthropologist and a sociologist. He then arranged his statistics and computed percentages for practically every item collected, and put many of the results on graphs and tables in the most approved sociological manner. Any present-day ethnographer who described a primitive culture with as little reference to "living, breathing human beings" would be criticized for dealing with an abstraction, and told that it is the people after all who produce the culture and if anything is to be learned they are the ones to be studied. Here, however, the culture and the people are both sifted out and all that remains is the 89 positions, which correspond to no definite entities in culture and which are occupied by many people who have little in common. This is the most extreme form of abstraction. No social anthropologist practises it on primitive peoples.

It is interesting to compare the books on Yankee City with the earlier studies of Middletown.[8] Here two sociologists made "a pioneer attempt to deal with a sample American community after the manner of social anthropology."[9] They did just that. Although the town they picked was twice as large as Yankee City (35,000:17,000 pop.) they succeeded in giving us a far superior picture of the life of the people. Their field methods were essentially the same as those used by the Newburyport analysts, but they were able to carry their social anthropological approach over into their writing, and to organize and present their material in accord with it. No social anthropologist has produced anything that can be ranked with *Middletown* as a report on a whole modern community. The anthropologists who have entered the sociologist's realm have concentrated on caste and class to the exclusion of most other aspects of the community, or have produced predominantly psychological studies.

A third focus of community studies has been Ireland. Field work was done there by Warner, Arensberg and Kimball beginning in 1931. In 1937 *The Irish countryman* by Arensberg (231) appeared, and in 1940 a more comprehensive study *Family and community in Ireland* by Arensberg and Kimball was published. The latter report is more comparable to standard social anthropological studies than any of the volumes by anthropologists so far described. It includes

[7] For critical reviews of *The social life of a modern community* see *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 48: 431 (Nels Anderson) and *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 7: 263 (C. W. Mills); of *The status system of a modern community* see *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 7: 719 (M. E. Opler).

[8] Lynd, R. S. and H. M., *Middletown: a study in contemporary American culture.* New York, 1929; Lynd, R. S. and H. M., *Middletown in transition: a study in cultural conflicts.* New York, 1937.

[9] Wissler, C., Foreword to *Middletown*, p. vi.

discussions of the small farmers, family labor, the relations of kindred, demography and familism, dispersal and emigration, the problem of the aged, occupation and status, markets and the community. However, "The purpose of the study is not so much to characterize the communities described as to examine the behaviors of the persons living in them" (238, p. xxv).

In summary it may be said that interest in caste and class is the dominant one in these community studies. The reports by Powdermaker, Dollard, Davis and the Gardners on southern towns are much less abstract, mathematical and diagrammatic than the Yankee City Series and deal principally with the psychological effects of the caste and class structure. While they are interesting it is a question whether they add anything to what we already know and it is certain that they do not give as good a description of a modern community as the Lynds were able to do in *Middletown*.

None of the anthropologists who have made these studies have attempted to make any generalizations that would be applicable to the general area in which their community is located, to say nothing of putting "civilization in the framework of an inductive, systematic, comparative sociology." Indeed, it would be impossible to compare the results of the Yankee City study with our information on any other community, primitive or civilized. It is even difficult to visualize the American town familiar to all of us when it is presented in the form of pages of statistics. Warner and Lunt say that "the purpose of the social scientists must be to formulate . . . generalizations" (242, p. 11). They feel that anthropologists "have tended to neglect the scientific problems of explanation of the facts by classification and their interpretation by the formulation of laws and principles" (242, p. 12). They are sure, however, that laws are not possible at present and that "to understand the general forms of human conduct, it is necessary to examine the individual societies in all their variations" (242, p. 22).

MINOR TRENDS

There are several lesser developments that should be mentioned in a survey of the recent history of anthropology. These may be divided into three classes: culture, special phases of culture, and influences of the recent world crisis.

Work in culture is being carried on at two centers, the Institute of Human Relations at Yale and the University of California. At Yale, the Cross-Cultural Survey under the direction of G. P. Murdock is classifying and putting in readily accessible form ethnographic data from cultures all over the world (265). The studies in culture-element distributions made by various ethnographers under the auspices of the University of California perform a similar service for cultures in the western part of the United States.

In the last decade three particular areas of primitive culture have received special attention: law, education and economics. In law, crime and punishment (Gillen, 281; Oberg, 282), motivation of crime (Montagu, 289; Devereux, 290;

Devereux and Loeb, 293), and primitive jurisprudence (Province, 284; Llewellyn and Hoebel, 288; Hoebel, 291, 292) have come in for consideration. Research in learning has produced such discussions as "Our educational emphases in primitive perspective" (Mead, 307), "Education and cultural dynamics" (Herskovits, 306), "Social learning and imitation" (Miller and Dollard, 299), "The acquisition of culture by individuals" (Kluckhohn, 297), and "Formal education and the social structure" (Warner, 230). In economics we have Herskovits' general survey *The economic life of primitive peoples* (316), "Economic control in primitive society" by Mead (314), and accounts of economics in Ifugao (311), Teton Dakota (312), Hopi (313), Guatemalan (317), Mexican (318), and Pueblo (319) communities.

Until recently applied anthropology has had little emphasis in America as compared with its role in British and Dutch colonial administration. The Society for Applied Anthropology was formed in 1941 for "the promotion of scientific investigation of the principles controlling the relations of human beings to one another, and the encouragement of the wide application of these principles to practical problems" (from the Journal). Since its inception the Society has published a quarterly called "Applied Anthropology" devoted to articles on "the solution of practical problems of human relations in the fields of business and political administration, psychiatry and social work". The value of the kind of information possessed by anthropologists was recognized by the government during the recent war, and many anthropologists left their libraries, laboratories and class rooms for government service.

The war has produced another kind of applied anthropology. Many questions about the issues involved have come to anthropologists for clarification and settlement. The most prominent of these is the race question: "Is there a physical basis for race superiority?" (Krogman, 331), what are the "Intellectual and cultural achievements of human races"? (Lowie, 337). Other anthropologists have written semi-popular articles on war: "Are wars inevitable?" (Swanton, 362), "Warfare is only an invention—not a biological necessity" (Mead, 346), and on post-war planning: "How a world equilibrium can be organized and administered" (Chapple, 353), "Anthropological research and world peace" (Kluckhohn, 363). Bateson and Mead have analyzed the problem of national morale (347, 348, 351).

CONCLUSION

It is a good thing for a science to survey its works critically from time to time. When we look back over the path by which anthropology has come to 1945 we can see that it is not straight, but crooked and branching. In its first fifty years, and even under the Boas school to a large extent, the subject of anthropology was culture—its evolution, its history, its function. In the last twenty-five years the view that culture is a self-contained class of events that

can be studied objectively as though human beings did not exist has been almost entirely superseded by the view that culture is an "abstraction" or a sort of accessory to man that can be explained only in terms of his nervous system. This view is repeatedly expressed by the contributors to *The science of man in the world crisis* (e.g., Murdock, p. 137; Herskovits, p. 163; Hallowell p. 174). With this change in philosophical outlook has come a change in field work. Detailed ethnographic description has given way to psychological, personality, acculturation and modern community studies, as well as to studies of primitive law, education and economics. Anthropology has grown to be a very different science from the one that Morgan and McGee might have predicted.

While we are looking over the record of the recent years, we might ask what anthropology is really contributing to our knowledge. Are the people who call themselves anthropologists doing anything that psychologists and sociologists do not do? What justification is there for calling those who are making psychological studies of primitive peoples "anthropologists" instead of "psychologists"? Psychology is the study of behavior, and whether the subject is a New York schoolchild or a Balinese aborigine, the study of his behavior is still psychology. Sociology is the "science of society." Whether an anthropologist goes to an American town or to an Indian village, if he describes the interaction that occurs he is still doing social psychology or sociology. We do not wish to assert or even to imply that this work is valueless, but only to ask why it should be done by anthropologists. Psychology is a science of long standing and has a much larger body of trained technicians than has anthropology. It would seem reasonable to suppose that it would be capable of carrying on its own research. Sociology, while less affluent, boasts many more followers than anthropology. Although it might be true that an ethnographic background is of value in interpreting our own society, few of those who have made community studies have such a background, and the ones who do have stopped short of interpretation. As a consequence of psychological and sociological interests on the part of anthropologists, culture is almost completely ignored at present. We have almost no conception of the magnitude of the contribution that a systematic study of culture *as such* could make to our lives. The glimpses that we have had give indications of great promise.

It is commonly believed that anthropology has made progress in the last few decades. Whether we call these recent trends progressive or regressive depends on the goal against which we measure them. If the goal is the merging of anthropology with psychology and sociology, we have made progress. If the goal is to make of anthropology an independent science, we have retrogressed far from the position achieved in the first half-century. Its subject matter is more heterogeneous and its outlook less scientific now than then. We are trying to solve our equation in terms of three variables at the same time—culture,

society and man. This cannot be done in anthropology any more than it can in mathematics. Psychology has already claimed man, and sociology has cast its lot for society. If anthropology is to become an independent and self-consistent science it must concede these fields and devote itself to the one as yet relatively untended—culture.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

The following abbreviations have been used in the bibliography:

AP-AMNH	Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History
AR-BAE	Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology
ICA	International Congress of Americanists
JAFL	Journal of American Folklore
JRAI	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute
SI-MC	Smithsonian Institution, Miscellaneous Collections
UCPAAE	University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology

CLASSIFIED REFERENCES TO LITERATURE*

PSYCHOLOGY

PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE

1910

1. Boas, F., Psychological problems in anthropology. *Amer. J. Psychol.* 21: 371–384.

1915

2. Hocart, A. M., Ethnology and psychology. *Folklore* 75: 115–138.
3. Lowie, R. H., Psychology and sociology. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 21: 217–229.

1916

4. Rivers, W. H. R., Sociology and psychology. *The Sociol. Rev.* 9: 1–13.
5. Wissler, C., Psychological and historical interpretations for culture. *Science* 43: 193–201.

1918

6. Goldenweiser, A., History, psychology and culture; a set of categories for an introduction to social science. *J. Phil., Psych. & Sci. Methods* 15: 561–570.

1924

7. Jones, E., Psychoanalysis and anthropology. *JRAI* 54: 47–66.
8. Malinowski, B., Psychoanalysis and anthropology. *Psyche* 4: 293–332.

* Although some of the titles might have been placed under more than one heading, this has been done in only two instances: Mead, 30, and Hallowell, 46, have been repeated under Normal Psychology (97) and Acculturation (218) respectively.

1927

9. Willey, M. M., and M. J. Herskovits, Psychology and culture. *Psychol. Bul.* 24: 252–283.

1928

10. Seligman, C. G., The unconscious in relation to anthropology. *Brit. J. Psychol.* 18: 373–387.

1932

11. Glover, E., Common problems in psychoanalysis and anthropology. *Brit. J. Med. Psychol.* 12: 109–131.
12. Sapir, E., Cultural anthropology and psychiatry. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 27: 229–242.

1933

13. Mead, M., More comprehensive field methods. *Amer. Anthrop.* 35: 1–15.
14. Seligman, C. G., Anthropological perspective and psychological theory. *JRAI* 62: 193–228.

1935

15. Opler, M. E., The psychoanalytic treatment of culture. *Psychoanal. Rev.* 22: 138–157.

1937

16. Bartlett, F. C., Psychological methods and anthropological problems. *Africa* 10: 401–420.
17. DuBois, C., Some anthropological perspectives on psychoanalysis. *Psychoanal. Rev.* 24: 246–263.
18. DuBois, C., Some psychological objectives and techniques in ethnography. *J. soc. Psychol.* 8: 285–300.
19. Köhler, W., Psychological remarks on some questions of anthropology. *Amer. J. Psychol.* 50: 271–288.
20. Mekeel, H. S., A psychoanalytic approach to culture. *J. soc. Phil.* 2: 232–236.
21. Sapir, E., The contribution of psychiatry to an understanding of behavior in society. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 42: 862–870.

1938

22. Sapir, E., Why cultural anthropology needs the psychiatrist. *Psychiatry* 1: 7–12.

1940

23. Goldenweiser, A., Some contributions of psychoanalysis to the interpretation of social facts. (*Contemporary Social Theory:* H. E. Barnes, H. Becker and F. B. Becker, Eds.) New York. Pp. 391–430.
24. Linton, R., Psychology and anthropology. *J. soc. Phil.* 5: 115–126.

1942

25. Hallowell, A. I., Psychology and anthropology. *Proc. 8th Amer. Sci. Cong.* Part 2, 291–297.
26. Klineberg, O., Psychology and anthropology. *Proc. 8th Amer. Sci. Cong.* Part 2, 299–307.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS

1901

27. Rivers, W. H. R., The color vision of the natives of Upper Egypt. *JRAI* 31: 229–247.

1901–1903

28. *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits.* Vol. 2, Physiology and psychology. Cambridge.

1910

29. Woodworth, R. S., Racial differences in mental traits. *Science* 31: 171–186.

1928

30. Mead, M., *Coming of age in Samoa*. New York.

1929

31. Davenport, C. B., and M. Steggerda, *Race crossing in Jamaica*. Washington (Carnegie Inst. Pub. 395).

1932

32. Mead, M., An investigation of the thought of primitive children, with special reference to animism. *JRAI* 62: 173–190.

1934

33. Steggerda, M., Racial psychometry. *Eugenical News* 19: 132–133.

1935

34. Bleuler, M. and R., Rorschach's ink-blot test and racial psychology: mental peculiarities of Moroccans. *Character & Pers.* 4: 97–114.
35. Curti, M. W., F. B. Marshall, M. Steggerda, and E. M. Henderson, The Gesell schedules applied to one-, two-, and three-year-old Negro children of Jamaica, B.W.I. *J. comp. Psychol.* 20: 125–156.

1936

36. Goodenough, F. L., The measurement of mental functions in primitive groups. *Amer. Anthrop.* 38: 1–11.
37. Steggerda, M., The McAdory art test applied to Navaho Indian children. *J. Comp. Psycho'.* 22: 283–285.

1937

38. Steggerda, M., Testing races for the threshold of taste, with PTC. *J. Hered.* 28: 309–310.

1939

39. Curti, M. W., and M. Steggerda, A preliminary report on the testing of young Maya children in Yucatan. *J. comp. Psychol.* 28: 207–224.

1941

40. Hallowell, A. I., The Rorschach method as an aid in the study of personalities in primitive societies. *Character & Pers.* 9: 235–245.
41. Hallowell, A. 1., The Rorschach test as a tool for investigating cultural variables and individual differences in the study of personality in primitive societies. *Rorschach Res. Exch.* 5: 31–34.
42. Henry, J., Rorschach technique in primitive cultures. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry* 11: 230–234.
43. Steggerda, M., Form discrimination test as given to Navajo, Negro and white school children. *Human Biology* 13: 239–246.
44. Steggerda, M., *Maya Indians of Yucatan*. Washington (Carnegie Inst. Pub. 531).

1942

45. DuBois, C., and E. Oberholzer, Rorschach tests and native personality in Alor, Dutch East Indies. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 4: 168–170.

46. Hallowell, A. I., Acculturation processes and personality changes as indicated by the Rorschach technique. *Rorschach Res. Exch.* 6: 42–50.
47. Schachtel, A. H., J. Henry, and Z. Henry, Rorschach analysis of Pilagá Indian children. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry* 12: 679–712.

1944

48. Thompson, L., and A. Joseph, *The Hopi way*. Chicago.

1945

49. Hallowell, A. I., The Rorschach technique in the study of personality and culture. *Amer. Anthrop.* 47: 195–210.

PERSONALITY

1908

50. Kroeber, A. L., Ethnology of the Gros Ventre. *AP-AMNH* 1: 141–281. (War experiences of individuals, pp. 196–220.)

1913

51. Radin, P., Personal reminiscences of a Winnebago Indian. *JAFL* 26: 293–318.

1920

52. Radin, P., The autobiography of a Winnebago Indian. *UCPAAE* 16: 381–473.

1921

53. Sapir, E., The life of a Nootka Indian. *Queens Quarterly* 28: 232–243, 351–367.

1922

54. Parsons, E. C. (Ed.), *American Indian life*. New York.

1925

55. Michelson, T., The autobiography of a Fox Indian woman. *AR-BAE* 40: 291–337.
56. White, L. A., Personality and culture. *The Open Court* 39: 145–149.

1926

57. Radin, P., *Crashing Thunder: the autobiography of a Winnebago Indian*. New York.

1932

58. Harrington, M. R., The life of a Lenape boy. *Penn. Archeologist* 3, No. 4.
59. Michelson, T., The narrative of a southern Cheyenne woman. *SI-MC* 87, No. 5.

1933

60. Michelson, T., Narrative of an Arapaho woman. *Amer. Anthrop.* 35: 595–610.

1934

61. Mead, M., The use of primitive material in the study of personality. *Character & Pers.* 3: 1–16.
62. Sapir, E., The emergence of the concept of personality in a study of cultures. *J. soc. Psychol.* 5: 408–415.
63. Steward, J. H., Two Paiute autobiographies. *UCPAAE* 33: 423–438.

1935

64. Mead, M., *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies*. New York.

1936

65. Henry, J., The personality of the Kaingang Indians. *Character & Pers.* 5: 113–123.
66. Mead, M., On the institutionalized role of women and character formation. *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5: 69–75.
67. Mead, M., R. Cavan, J. Dollard, and E. Wembridge, Culture and personality. *Amer. J. Social.* 42: 84–87.
68. Underhill, R., The autobiography of a Papago woman. *Amer. Anthrop. Assn. Mem.* 46.

1937

69. Landes, R., The personality of the Ojibwa. *Character & Pers.* 6: 51–60.

1938

70. Barton, R. F., *Philippine pagans: the autobiography of three Ifugaos.* London.
71. Dyk. W., *Son of Old Man Hat: a Navaho autobiography.* New York.
72. Hallowell, A. I., Shabwán: a dissocial Indian girl. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry* 8: 329–340.
73. Landes, R., *The Ojibwa woman.* New York.
74. Opler, M. E., Personality and culture: a methodological suggestion for the study of their interrelations. *Psychiatry* 1: 217–220.
75. Steward, J. H., Panatübiji', an Owens Valley Paiute. *BAE Bul.* 119: 185–195.

1939

76. Devereux, G., Mohave culture and personality. *Character & Pers.* 8: 91–109.
77. Gillin, J., Personality in preliterate societies. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 4: 681–702.
78. Reichard, G., *Dezba: woman of the desert.* New York.

1940

79. Chapple, E. D., "Personality" differences as described by invariant properties of individuals in interaction. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, Washington, 26: 10–16.
80. Davis, A., and J. Dollard, *Children of bondage: the personality development of Negro youth in the urban South.* Washington (Amer. Council on Educ.).
81. Mead, M., Character formation in two South Sea societies. *Trans. Amer. Neurol. Assn.* 66: 99–103.
82. Mead, M., Material conditions affect our character structure. *J. adult Educ.* 12: 271–272

1941

83. Ford, C. S., *Smoke from their fires; the life of a Kwakiutl chief.* New Haven.
84. Linton, R., and others, *Culture and personality; three lectures to educators.* Washington (Amer. Council on Educ.).
85. Warner, W. L., B. H. Junker, and W. A. Adams, *Color and human nature; Negro personality development in a northern city.* Washington (Amer. Council on Educ.).

1942

86. Bateson, G., Some systematic approaches to the study of culture and personality. *Character & Pers.* 11: 76–82.
87. Bateson, G., and M. Mead, *Balinese character; a photographic analysis.* New York.
88. Simmons, L. (Ed.), *Sun Chief; the autobiography of a Hopi Indian.* New Haven.

1943

89. Davis, A., Racial status and personality development. *Sci. Mo.* 57: 354–362.

1944

90. Bateson, G., Cultural determinants of personality. (*Personality and the Behavior Disorders;* J. Hunt, Ed.) New York. Pp. 714–735.
91. DuBois, C., *The people of Alor.* Minnesota.
92. Kluckhohn, C., and O. H. Mowrer, "Culture and personality": a conceptual scheme. *Amer. Anthrop.* 46: 1–29.
93. Mowrer, O. H., and C. Kluckhohn, Dynamic theory of personality. (*Personality and the Behavior Disorders;* J. Hunt, Ed.) New York. Pp. 69–135.

1945

94. Linton, R., *The cultural background of personality.* New York.

NORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

1915

95. Wallis, W. D., Individual initiative and social compulsion. *Amer. Anthrop.* 17: 647–665.

1928

96. Lowie, R. H., Individual differences and primitive culture. (*Schmidt-Festschrift;* W. Koppers, Ed.) Vienna. Pp. 495–500.
97. Mead, M., *Coming of age in Samoa.* New York.

1930

98. Benedict, R., Psychological types in the cultures of the Southwest. *Proc. ICA* 23: 572–581.
99. Mead, M., Adolescence in primitive and modern society. (*The New Generation;* V. F. Calverton and S. D. Schmalhausen, Eds.) New York. Pp. 169–188.
100. Mead, M., *Growing up in New Guinea.* New York.

1931

101. Mead, M., Jealousy: primitive and civilized. (*Woman's Coming of Age;* S. D. Schmalhausen and V. F. Calverton, Eds.) New York. Pp. 35–48.

1932

102. Benedict, R., Configurations of culture in North America. *Amer. Anthrop.* 34: 1–27.
103. Morgan, W., Navaho dreams. *Amer. Anthrop.* 34: 390–405.

1934

104. Benedict, R., *Patterns of culture.* New York.

1935

105. Dollard, J., *Criteria for the life history, with analyses of six notable documents.* New Haven

1936

106. Gillin, J., The configuration problem in culture. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 1: 373–386.
107. Goldenweiser, A., Loose ends of theory on the individual, pattern, and involution in primitive society. (*Essays in anthropology presented to A. L. Kroeber;* R. H. Lowie, Ed.) Berkeley. Pp. 99–104.
108. Radin, P., Ojibwa and Ottawa puberty dreams. (*Essays in anthropology presented to A. L. Kroeber;* R. H. Lowie, Ed.) Berkeley. Pp. 233–264.

1937

109. Flannery, R., Child behavior from the standpoint of the cultural anthropologist. *J. educ. Sociol.* 10: 470–478.
110. Kennard, E. A., Hopi reactions to death. *Amer. Anthrop.* 39: 491–496.
111. Mead, M. (Ed.), *Cooperation and competition among primitive peoples.* New York.

1938

112. Benedict, R., Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning. *Psychiatry* 1: 161–167.
113. Dollard, J., Hostility and fear in social life. *Social Forces* 17: 15–26.
114. Hallowell, A. I., Fear and anxiety as cultural and individual variables in a primitive society. *J. soc. Psychol.* 9: 25–47.
115. Linton, R., Culture, society, and the individual. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 33: 425–436.
116. Opler, M. E., Further comparative anthropological data bearing on the solution of a psychological problem. *J. soc. Psychol.* 9: 477–483.

1939

117. Benedict, R., Sex in primitive society. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry* 9: 570–573.
118. Chapple, E. D., Quantitative analysis of the interaction of individuals. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, Washington, 25: 58–67.
119. Dollard, J., and others, *Frustration and aggression.* New Haven.
120. Ford, C. S., Society, culture, and the human organism. *J. gen. Psychol.* 20: 135–179.
121. Hallowell, A. I., The child, the savage, and human experience. *Proc. 6th Inst. except. Child, Child Res. Clin.*, pp. 8–34.
122. Hallowell, A. I., Sin, sex and sickness in Saulteaux belief. *Brit. J. med. Psychol.*, 18: 191–197.
123. Linton, R., The effects of culture on mental and emotional processes. *Res. Publ. Assn. nerv. ment. Dis.* 19: 293–304.
124. Mead, M., Researches in Bali, 1936–1939. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 2: 24–31.

1940

125. Aginsky, B. W., The socio-psychological significance of death among the Pomo Indians *Amer. Imago* 1, No. 3, pp. 1–11.
126. Chapple, E. D., and C. M. Arensberg, Measuring human relations: an introduction to the study of the interaction of individuals. *Genet. Psychol. Mon.* 22: 3–147.
127. Chapple, E. D., and C. F. Harding, Simultaneous measures of human relations and emotional activity. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, Washington, 26: 319–326.
128. Hallowell, A. I., Aggression in Saulteaux society. *Psychiatry* 3: 395–407.
129. Henry, J., Some cultural determinants of hosility in Pilagá Indian children. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry* 10: 111–119.

1941

130. Bateson, G., The frustration-aggression hypothesis and culture. *Psychol. Rev.* 48: 350–355.
131. Fortune, R. F., Social forms and their biological basis. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 6: 571–572.
132. Hallowell, A. I., The social function of anxiety in a primitive society. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 6: 869–881.
133. Mead, M., Back of adolescence lies early childhood. *Childh. Educ.* 18: 58–61.
134. Miller, N. E., The frustration-aggression hypothesis. *Psychol. Rev.* 48: 337–342.

1942

135. Chapple, E. D., The measurement of interpersonal behavior. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.*, 4: 222–233.

136. Chapple, E. D., and C. S. Coon, *Principles of anthropology*. New York.
137. Chapple, E. D., and E. Lindemann, Clinical implications of measurements of interaction rates in psychiatric interviews. *Appl. Anthrop.* 1, No. 2, pp. 1–11.
138. Dollard, J., *Victory over fear*. New York.
139. Dollard, J., and N. E. Miller, The problem of fear. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 5: 17–18.
140. Hallowell, A. I., Some psychological aspects of measurement among the Saulteaux. *Amer. Anthrop.* 44: 62–77.
141. Linton, R., Age and sex categories. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 7: 589–603.
142. Mead, M., Anthropological data on the problem of instinct. *Psychosom. Med.* 4: 396–397.
143. Montagu, M. F. A., On the physiology and psychology of swearing. *Psychiatry* 5: 189–201.

1943

144. Eggan, D., The general problem of Hopi adjustment. *Amer. Anthrop.* 45: 357–373.
145. Powdermaker, H., The channeling of Negro aggression by the cultural process. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 750–758.

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

(Including Psychiatry and Psychoanalysis)

1933

146. Cooper, J. M., The Cree Witiko psychosis. *Primitive Man* 6: 20–24.
147. Saindon, E., Mental disorders among the James Bay Cree. *Primitive Man* 6: 1–12.

1934

148. Benedict, R., Anthropology and the abnormal. *J. gen. Psychol.* 10: 59–82.
149. Cooper, J. M., Mental disease situations in certain cultures—a new field for research. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 29: 10–17.
150. Dollard, J., The psychotic person seen culturally. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 39: 637–648.
151. Hallowell, A. I., Culture and mental disorder. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 29: 1–9.
152. Herskovits, M. J., Freudian mechanisms in primitive Negro psychology. (*Essays presented to C. G. Seligman.*) London.
153. Winston, W., The alleged lack of mental diseases among primitive groups. *Amer. Anthrop.* 36: 234–238.

1935

154. Hill, W. W., The status of the hermaphrodite and transvestite in Navaho culture. *Ame. Anthrop.* 37: 273–279.
155. Mekeel, H. S., Clinic and culture. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 30: 292–300.

1936

156. Hallowell, A. I., Psychic stresses and culture patterns. *Amer. J. Psychiat.* 92: 1291–1310.
157. Hill, W. W., Navaho rites for dispelling insanity and delirium. *El Palacio* 41: 71–74.
158. Opler, M. E., An interpretation of ambivalence of two American Indian tribes. *J. soc. Psychol.* 7: 82–116.
159. Opler, M. E., Some points of comparison and contrast between the treatment of functional disorders by Apache shamans and modern psychiatric practice. *Amer. J. Psychiat.* 92: 1371–1387.

1937

160. Darlington, H. S., The primitive manufacture of clay pots; an exposition of the psychology of pot-making. *Psychoanal. Rev.* 24: 392–402.

161. Devereux, G., Institutionalized homosexuality of the Mohave Indians. *Human Biology* 9: 498–527.
162. Warner, W. L., The society, the individual, and his mental disorders. *Amer. J. Psychiat.* 94: 275–284.

1938

163. Darlington, H. S., An instance of primitive psychotherapy. *Psychoanal. Rev.* 25: 205–208.
164. Hallowell, A. I., Freudian symbolism in the dream of a Saulteaux Indian. *Man* 38: 47–48.
165. Landes, R., The abnormal among the Ojibwa Indians. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 33: 14–33.

1939

166. Aginsky, B. W., Psychopathic trends in culture. *Character & Pers.* 7: 331–343.
167. Devereux, G., Maladjustment and social neurosis. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 4: 844–851.
168. Devereux, G., A sociological theory of schizophrenia. *Psychoanal. Rev.* 26: 315–342.
169. Kardiner, A., *The individual and his society; the psychodynamics of primitive social organization.* New York.
170 Kroeber, A. L., Totem and taboo in retrospect. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 45: 446–451.

1940

171. Devereux, G., Social negativism and criminal psychopathology. *J. Crim. Psychopathol.* 1: 323–338.
172. Devereux, G., Primitive psychiatry I. *Bul of the Hist. of Med.* 8: 1194–1213.
173. Kroeber, A. L., Psychosis or social sanction. *Character & Pers.* 8: 204–215.
174. Landes, R., A cult matriarchate and male homosexuality. *J. abn. & soc. Psychol.* 35: 386–397.

1941

175. Leighton, A. H. and D. C. Elements of psychotherapy in Navaho religion. *Pyschiatry* 4: 515–523.
176. Montagu, M. F. A., Nescience, science, and psycho-analysis. *Psychiatry* 4: 45–60.

1942

177. Devereux, G., Primitive psychiatry II: funeral suicide and the Mohave social structure. *Bul. of the Hist. of Med.* 11: 522–542.
178. Opler, M. K., Psychoanalytic techniques in social analysis. *J. soc. Psychol.* 15: 91–127.

ACCULTURATION

1913

179. Radin, P., The influence of the Whites on Winnebago culture. *Proc. State Hist. Soc. of Wis.* 61: 137–145.
180. Speck, F. G., European folk-tales among the Penobscot. *JAFL* 26: 81–84.

1916

181. Skinner, A., European tales from the Plains Ojibwa. *JAFL* 29: 330–340.

1918

182. Parsons, E. C., Pueblo Indian folk-tales, probably of Spanish provenience. *JAFL* 31: 216–255.

1924

183. Gifford, E. W., Euro-American acculturation in Tonga. *J. Polynesian Soc.* 33: 281–292.

1927

184. Herskovits, M. J., Acculturation and the American Negro. *SW pol. & soc. Sci. Quarterly* 8: 211–224.
185. Spier, L., The Ghost Dance of 1870 among the Klamath of Oregon. *Univ. Wash. Publ. in Anthrop.* 2: 39–56.

1928

186. Hallowell, A. I., Recent changes in the kinship terminology of the St. Francis Abenaki. *Proc. ICA* 22, Part 2, pp. 97–145. Rome.
187. Parsons, E. C., Spanish elements in the Kachina cult of the Pueblos. *Proc. ICA* 23: 582–603. New York.

1929

188. Mead, M., Americanization in Samoa. *Amer. Mercury* 16: 264–270.

1930

189. Redfield, R., *Tepoztlan, a Mexican village.* Chicago.

1931

190. Johnson, G. B., The Negro spiritual: a problem in anthropology. *Amer. Anthrop.* 33: 157–171.

1932

191. Mead, M., *The changing culture of an Indian tribe.* New York.

1933

192. Lesser, A., The Pawnee Ghost Dance hand game, a study of cultural change. *Columbia Univ. Contr. to Anthrop.* 16.

1934

193. Redfield, R., Culture changes in Yucatan. *Amer. Anthrop.* 36: 57–69.
194. Redfield, R., and A. Villa, *Chan Kom, a Maya village.* (Carnegie Inst. Pub. 448.)

1935

195. Bateson, G., Culture contact and schismogenesis. *Man* 35: 178–183.

1936

196. Parsons, E. C., *Milla, town of the souls.* Chicago.
197. Redfield, R., R. Linton, and M. J. Herskovits, A memorandum for the study of acculturation. *Amer. Anthrop.* 38: 149–152.

1937

198. Herskovits, M. J., *Life in a Haitian valley.* New York.
199. Herskovits, M. J., The significance of the study of acculturation for anthropology. *Amer. Anthrop.* 39: 259–264.

1938

200. Herskovits, M. J., *Acculturation ; the study of culture contact.* New York.

1939

201. Bloom, L., The Cherokee clan: a study in acculturation. *Amer. Anthrop.* 41: 266–268.
202. Redfield, R., Culture contact without conflict. *Amer. Anthrop.* 41: 514–517.

1940

203. Gillin, J., and V. Raimy, Acculturation and personality. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 5: 371–380.
201. Linton, R. (Ed.), *Acculturation in seven American Indian tribes.* New York.

1941

205. Bascom, W. R., Acculturation among the Gullah Negroes. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 43–50.
206. Densmore, F., Native songs of two hybrid ceremonies among the American Indians. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 77–82.
207. Eggan, F., Some aspects of culture change in the northern Philippines. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 11–18.
208. Embree, J. F., Acculturation among the Japanese of Kona, Hawaii. *Amer. Anthrop. Assn. Mem.* 59.
209. Greenberg, J. H., Some aspects of Negro-Mohammedan culture-contact among the Hausa. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 51–61.
210. Herskovits, M. J., Some comments on the study of culture contact. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 1–10.
211. Keur, D. L., Big Bead Mesa; an archeological study of Navaho acculturation, 1745–1812. *Soc. for Amer. Archeol. Mem.* 1.
212. Mandelbaum, D. G., Culture change among the Nilgiri tribes. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 19–26.
213. Redfield, R., *The folk culture of Yucatan.* Chicago.
214. Siegel, M., Religion in western Guatemala: a product of acculturation. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 62–76.
215. Tax, S., World view and social relations in Guatemala. *Amer. Anthrop.* 43: 27–42.

1942

216. Aginsky, B. W., Acculturation. *Proc. 8th Amer. Sci. Cong.*, Part 2, pp. 211–216.
217. Gillin, J., Acquired drives in culture contact. *Amer. Anthrop.* 44: 545–554.
218. Hallowell, A. I., Acculturation processes and personality changes as indicated by the Rorschach technique. *Rorschach Res. Exch.* 6: 42–50.
219. Lewis, O., The effects of white contact upon Blackfoot culture, with special reference to the role of the fur trade. *Amer. Ethnol. Soc. Mon.* 6.
220. Locke, A., and B. J. Stern (Eds.), *When peoples meet; a study in race and culture contacts.* New York.

1943

221. Benedict, R., Two patterns of Indian acculturation. *Amer. Anthrop.* 45: 207–212.
222. Devereux, G., and E. M. Loeb, Antagonistic acculturation. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 8: 133–147.
223. Kennedy, R., Acculturation and administration in Indonesia. *Amer. Anthrop.* 45: 185–190.
224. Reed, S. W., The making of modern New Guinea, with special reference to culture contact in the mandated territory. *Amer. Phil. Soc. Mem.* 18.
225. Steward, J. H., Acculturation studies in Latin America: some needs and problems. *Amer. Anthrop.* 45: 198–204.

1944

226. Hawthorn, H. B., The Maori: a study in acculturation. *Amer. Anthrop. Assn. Mem.* 64.
227. Kraus, B. S., Acculturation, a new approach to the Iroquoian problem. *Amer. Antiq.* 9: 302–318.

1945

228. Hallowell, A. I., Sociopsychological aspects of acculturation. (*The Science of Man in the World Crisis;* R. Linton, Ed.) New York. Pp. 171–200.

COMMUNITY STUDIES

1936

229. Warner, W. L., American caste and class. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 42: 234–237.
230. Warner, W. L., Formal education and the social structure. *J. educ. Sociol.* 9: 524–531.

1937

231. Arensberg, C. M., *The Irish countryman; an anthropological study.* New York.
232. Dollard, J., *Caste and class in a southern town.* New Haven.

1938

233. Dollard, J., The life history in community studies. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 3: 724–737.

1939

234. Embree, J. F., Suye Mura; a Japanese village. (*Univ. Chicago Pubs. in Anthrop.*)
235. Miner, H., *St. Denis: a French-Canadian parish.* Chicago.
236. Powdermaker, H., *After freedom, a cultural study in the deep South.* New York.
237. Warner, W. L., and A. Davis. A comparative study of American caste. (*Race relations and the race problem;* E. T. Thompson, Ed.). Durham, N. C. Pp. 219–245.

1940

238. Arensberg, C. M., and S. T. Kimball, *Family and community in Ireland.* Cambridge, Mass.

1941

239. Davis, A., American status systems and the socialization of the child. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 6: 345–354.
240. Davis, A., B. B. Gardner, and M. R. Gardner, *Deep south; a social anthropological study of caste and class;* directed by W. L. Warner. Chicago.
241. Warner, W. L., Social anthropology and the modern community. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 46: 785–796.
242. Warner, W. L., and P. S. Lunt, *The social life of a modern community.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 1.) New Haven.

1942

243. Arensberg, C. M., Industry and the community. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 1–12.
244. Arensberg, C. M., Irish rural social organization. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 4: 202–207.
245. Gardner, B. B., M. R. Gardner, and M. B. Loeb, Social status and education in a southern community. *School Rev.* 50: 179–191.
246. Junker, B. H., and M. B. Loeb, School and social structure in a midwestern community. *School Rev.* 50: 686–695.
247. Warner, W. L., and P. S. Lunt, *The status system of a modern community.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 2.) New Haven.

1945

248. Warner, W. L., and L. Srole, *The social systems of American ethnic groups.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 3.) New Haven.

Unpublished

249. Warner, W. L., and J. O. Low, *The social system of the modern factory.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 4.)
250. Warner, W. L., *American symbol systems.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 5.)
251. Warner, W. L., *Data book for the Yankee City Series.* (Yankee City Series, Vol. 6.)

MINOR TRENDS

CULTURE ELEMENT DISTRIBUTION

1935

252. Klimek, S., The structure of California Indian culture. *UCPAAE* 37: 1–70.

1936

253. Gifford, E. W., and S. Klimek, Yana. *UCPAAE* 37: 71–100.
254. Kroeber, A. L., Area and climax. *UCPAAE* 37: 101–116.

1937

255. Barnett, H. G., Oregon coast. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 155–204.
256. Driver, H. E., Southern Sierra Nevada. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 53–154.
257. Drucker, P., Southern California. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 1–52.
258. Gifford, E. W., and A. L. Kroeber, Pomo. *UCPAAE* 37: 117–254.

1938

259. Driver, H. E., The reliability of culture element data. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 205–220.
260. Murdock, G. P., C. S. Ford, A. E. Hudson, R. Kennedy, L. W. Simmons, and J. W. Whiting, *Outline of cultural materials*. New Haven.

1939

261. Barnett, H. G., Gulf of Georgia Salish. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 221–296.
262. Driver, H. E., Northwest California. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 297–434.
263. Kroeber, A. L., Tribes surveyed. *Anthrop. Recs.* 1: 435–440.

1940

264. Gifford, E. W., Apache-Pueblo. *Anthrop. Recs.* 4: 1–208.
265. Murdock, G. P., The Cross-Cultural Survey. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 5: 361–370.

1941

266. Driver, H. E., Girls' puberty rites in western North America. *Anthrop. Recs.* 6: 21–90.
267. Drucker, P., Yuman-Piman. *Anthrop. Recs.* 6: 91–230.
268. Kroeber, A. L., Salt, dogs, tobacco. *Anthrop. Recs.* 6: 1–20.
269. Steward, J. H., Nevada Shoshone. *Anthrop. Recs.* 4: 209–360.
270. Stewart, O. C., Northern Paiute. *Anthrop. Recs.* 4: 361–446.

1942

271. Essene, F., Round Valley. *Anthrop. Recs.* 8: 1–98.
272. Harrington, J. P., Central California coast. *Anthrop. Recs.* 7: 1–46.
273. Ray, V. F., Plateau. *Anthrop. Recs.* 8: 99–262.
274. Stewart, O. C., Ute-Southern Paiute. *Anthrop. Recs.* 6: 231–360.
275. Voegelin, E., Northeast California. *Anthrop. Recs.* 7: 47–252.

1943

276. Aginsky, B. W., Central Sierra. *Anthrop. Recs.* 8: 393–468.
277. Steward, J. H., Northern and Gosiute Shoshoni. *Anthrop. Recs.* 8: 263–391.

1945

278. Chretien, C. D., Reliability of statistical procedures and results. *Anthrop. Recs.* 8: 469–490.

LAW

1919

279. Barton, R. E., Ifugao law. *UCPAAE* 15: 1–186.

1920

280. Moss, C. R., Nabaloi law and ritual. *UCPAAE* 15: 207–342.

1934

281. Gillin, J., Crime and punishment among the Barama River Carib of British Guiana. *Amer. Anthrop.* 36: 331–344.
282. Oberg, K., Crime and punishment in Tlingit society. *Amer. Anthrop.* 36: 145–156.

1936

283. Van Valkenburgh, R., Navajo common law. *Mus. Notes, Mus. of N. Ariz.* 9: 17–22.

1937

284. Provinse, J. H., The underlying sanctions of Plains Indian culture. (*Social Anthropology of North American Tribes;* F. Eggan, Ed.) Chicago. Pp. 341–376.

1940

285. Hoebel, E. A., The political organization and law-ways of the Comanche Indians. *Amer. Anthrop. Assn. Mem.* 54.
286. Richardson, J., Law and status among the Kiowa Indians. *Amer. Ethnol. Soc. Mon.* 1.

1941

287. Hoebel, E. A., Law-ways of the primitive Eskimos. *J. crim. Law & Criminol.* 31: 663–683.
288. Llewellyn, K. N., and E. A. Hoebel, *The Cheyenne way; conflict and case law in primitive jurisprudence.* Norman, Okla.
289. Montagu, M. F. A., The biologist looks at crime. *Ann. Amer. Acad. polit. soc. Sci.* 217: 46–57.

1942

290. Devereux, G., Motivation and control of crime. *J. crim. Psychopathol.* 3: 553–584.
291. Hoebel, E. A., Fundamental legal concepts as applied to the study of primitive law. *Yale Law J.* 51: 951–966.
292. Hoebel, E. A., Primitive law and modern. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 5: 30–41.

1943

293. Devereux, G., and E. M. Loeb, Some notes on Apache criminality. *J. crim. Psychopathol.* 4: 424–430.

LEARNING

1931

294. Mead, M., Two South Sea educational experiments and their American implications. *Schoolmen's Week Proc.* 18: 493–497. Philadelphia.

1936

295. Mekeel, H. S., An anthropologist's observations on Indian education. *Progr. Educ.* 13: 151–159.

1939

296. Dollard, J., Culture, society, impulse and socialization. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 45: 50–63.
297. Kluckhohn, C., Theoretical bases for an empirical method of studying the acquisition of culture by individuals. *Man* 39: 98–103.

1940

298. Mead, M., Social change and cultural surrogates. *J. educ. Sociol.* 14: 92–109.

1941

299. Miller, N. E., and J. Dollard, *Social learning and imitation.* New Haven.
300. Whiting, J., *Becoming a Kwoma; teaching and learning in a New Guinea tribe.* New Haven.

1942

301. Burgess, E. W., W. L. Warner, F. Alexander, and M. Mead, Environment and education. *Suppl. Educ. Mon.* 54.
302. Ford, C. S., Culture and human behavior. *Sci. Mon.* 55: 546–557.
303. Mead, M., An anthropologist looks at the teacher's role. *Educ. Method* 21: 219–223.

1943

304. Benedict, R., Transmitting our democratic heritage in the schools. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 722–727.
305. Embree, E. R., The educational process as applied in America. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 759–764.
306. Herskovits, M. J., Education and cultural dynamics. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 737–749.
307. Mead, M., Our educational emphases in primitive perspective. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 633–639.
308. Mekeel, H. S., Education, child-training, and culture. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 676–681.
309. Redfield, R., Culture and education in the midwestern highlands of Guatemala. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 48: 640–648.

ECONOMICS

1901

310. Jenks, A. E., *The wild rice gatherers of the upper lakes; a study in American primitive economics.* Washington.

1922

311. Barton, R. F., Ifugao economics. *UCPAAE* 15: 385–446.

1936

312. Mekeel, H. S., The economy of a modern Teton Dakota community. *Yale Univ. Publ. in Anthrop.* 6.

1937

313. Beaglehole, E., Notes on Hopi economic life. *Yale Univ. Publ. in Anthrop.* 15.
314. Mead, M., Economic control in primitive society. (*Planned Society;* F. MacKenzie, Ed.) New York. Pp. 3–25.

1938

315. Bunzel, R., The economic organization of primitive peoples. (*General Anthropology;* F. Boas, Ed.) New York. Pp. 327–408.

1940

316. Herskovits, M. J., *The economic life of primitive peoples.* New York.

1941

317. Wagley, C., Economics of a Guatemalan village. *Amer. Anthrop. Assn. Mem.* 58.

1942

318. Foster, G. M., A primitive Mexican economy. *Amer. Ethnol. Soc. Mem. 5.*

1943

319. Hawley, F., M. Pijoan, and C. A. Elkin, An inquiry into food economy and body economy in Zia Pueblo. *Amer. Anthrop.* 45: 547–556.

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

1936

320. Herskovits, M. J., Applied anthropology and the American anthropologists. *Science* 83: 215–222.

1941

321. *Applied Anthropology*, published quarterly by the Society for Applied Anthropology.

1943

322. Kluckhohn, C., Covert culture and administrative problems. *Amer. Anthrop.*, 45: 213–227.
323. Provinse, J. H., Anthropology in program planning. *Appl. Anthrop.* 3, No. 1, pp. 1–5.

1944

324. Embree, J. F., Community analysis—an example of anthropology in government. *Amer. Anthrop.* 46: 277–291.
325. Thompson, L., Some perspectives in applied anthropology. *Appl. Anthrop.* 3, No. 3, pp. 12–16.

1945

326. Keesing, F. M., Applied anthropology in colonial administration. (*The Science of Man in the World Crisis;* R. Linton, Ed.) New York. Pp. 373–398.

RACE

1933

327. Herskovits, M. J., Race relations. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 38: 913–921.

1934

328. Radin, P., *The racial myth.* New York.

1940

329. Benedict, R., *Race: science and politics.* New York.
330. Cole, F.-C., An anthropologist's view of race. *Amer. Teacher* 24, No. 5, pp. 8–11.
331. Krogman, W. M., Is there a physical basis for race superiority? *Sci. Mon.* 51: 428–434.
332. Mead, M., The student of race problems can say . . . *Frontiers of Democracy* 6: 200–202.
333. Montagu, M. F. A., Problems and methods relating to the study of race. *Psychiatry* 3: 493–506.
334. Montagu, M. F. A., *Race and other kindred delusions.* New York.
335. Montagu, M. F. A., The socio-biology of man. *Sci. Mon.* 50: 483–490.

1941

336. Benedict, R., Race problems in America. *Ann. Amer. Acad. polit. soc. Sci.* 216: 73–78.

337. Lowie, R. H., Intellectual and cultural achievements of human races. (*Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem.*) New York. Pp. 191–249.
338. Montagu, M. F. A., Race, caste and scientific method. *Psychiatry* 4: 337–338.

1942

339. Benedict, R., and M. Ellis, Race and cultural relations: America's answer to the myth of a master race. *Probl. Amer. Life*, No. 5.
340. Montagu, M. F. A., The creative power of ethnic mixture. *Psychiatry* 5: 523–536.
341. Montagu, M. F. A., *Man's most dangerous myth: the fallacy of race.* New York.

1943

342. Benedict, R., and G. Weltfish, The races of mankind. *Public affairs pamphlets* No. 85. New York.
343. Hrdlicka, A., The German "race." *Sci. Mon.* 56: 238–249.
344. Montagu, M. F. A., The myth of blood. *Psychiatry* 6: 15–19.
345. Redfield, R., What we do know about race. *Sci. Mon.* 57: 193–201.

WAR AND PEACE

1940

346. Mead, M., Warfare is only an invention—not a biological necessity. *Asia Mag.* 40: 402–405.

1941

347. Bateson, G., and M. Mead. Principles of morale building. *J. Educ. Sociol.* 15: 206–220.
348. Mead, M., On methods of implementing a national morale program. *Appl. Anthrop.* 1: 20–24.

1942

349. Arensberg, C. M., The nature of world equilibrium. *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts & Sci.* 75: 29–32.
350. Arensberg, C. M., and D. Macgregor, Determination of morale in an industrial company. *Appl. Anthrop.* 1, No. 2, pp. 12–34.
351. Bateson, G., Morale and national character. (*Civilian Morale;* G. Watson, Ed.) Boston. Pp. 71–91.
352. Chapple, E. D., The analysis of industrial morale. *J. industr. Hyg.* 24: 163–172.
353. Chapple, E. D., How a world equilibrium can be organized and administered. *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts & Sci.* 75: 33–37.
354. Mead, M., *And keep your powder dry.* New York.
355. Mead, M., The comparative study of culture and the purposive cultivation of democratic values. Comments by Benedict, Kluckhohn, Lee, Gorer and Bateson. (*Science, Philosophy and Religion; Second Symposium.*) New York. Pp. 56–69.
356. Mead, M., Customs and mores. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 47: 971–980.
357. Mead, M., Has the "middle class" a future? *Survey Graphic* 31: 64–67 and 95.
358. Mead, M., War need not mar our children. *NY Times Mag.*, Feb. 15, pp. 13 and 34.
359. Montagu, M. F. A., The nature of war and the myth of nature. *Sci. Mon.* 54: 342–353.

1943

360. Benedict, R., Recognition of cultural diversities in the postwar world. *Ann. Amer. Acad. polit. soc. Sci.* 228: 101–107.
361. Mead, M., Anthropological techniques in war psychology. *Bul. Menninger Clinic* 7: 137–140.
362. Swanton, J. R., Are wars inevitable? *SI: War Background Studies* 12.

1944

363. Kluckhohn, C., Anthropological research and world peace. (*Approaches to World Peace, 4th Symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion.*) New York. Pp. 143–152.

"RECENT TRENDS" IN THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST*

The role of the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST in the above study is naturally of considerable interest. The following tabulation reveals the surprising fact that, although practically all of the authors of the above 363 articles are professional anthropologists, they have generally chosen other outlets for their contributions. Only 41, or 11%, appeared in the ANTHROPOLOGIST, and only in the field of Acculturation (40%) is the proportion appreciable.

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF ARTICLES		DATE RANGE OF ARTICLES	
	Total	In Am. Anth.	Total	In Am. Anth.
PSYCHOLOGY				
Psychology and Culture	26	1	1910–1942	1933
Psychological Tests	23	2	1901–1945	1936, 1945
Personality	45	3	1908–1945	1933–1944
Normal Psychology	51	6	1915–1943	1915–1943
Abnormal Psychology	33	2	1933–1942	1934, 1935
ACCULTURATION	50	20	1913–1945	1931–1944
COMMUNITY STUDIES	23	0	1936–1945	
MINOR TRENDS				
Culture Element Distribution	27	0	1935–1945	
Law	15	3	1919–1943	1934–1940
Learning	16	0	1931–1943	
Economics	10	2	1901–1945	1941, 1943
Applied Anthropology	7	2	1936–1945	1943, 1944
Race	19	0	1933–1943	
War and Peace	18	0	1940–1944	
TOTAL	363	41		

THE EDITOR

* See also "The Range of the American Anthropologist" by A. L. Kroeber in the *Brief Communications* section herewith.