



*Margaret Mead.*

# CHANGING STYLES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL WORK

❖ 9516

*Margaret Mead*

The American Museum of Natural History, New York City, NY

The last 20 years have seen an enormous growth of institutions devoted to anthropological enterprises, membership within the discipline, and students, textbooks, and paraphernalia. From a tiny scholarly group that could easily be fitted into a couple of buses, and most of whom knew each other, we have grown into a group of tremendous, anonymous milling crowds, meeting at large hotels where there are so many sessions that people do well to find those of their colleagues who are interested in the same specialty. Today we look something like the other social science disciplines, suffering some of the same malaise, and becoming cynical about slave markets and worried when grants and jobs seem to be declining.

It has been a period of excessive growth; it is astonishing, looking back, to recount how many large enterprises have been undertaken. The year 1953 marked the end of the Korean war and the final exodus from Washington of almost all the remaining anthropologists who had lingered on to make the kind of contribution to national affairs that had developed in wartime. Most of the ventures that had been specifically influenced by the immediate post-World War II world drew to a close: Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures, Studies in Soviet Culture, American Museum of Natural History Research in Contemporary Cultures A and B, (189, 213), the Coordinated Investigations of Micronesian Anthropology, the period of affluence in the Foreign Service Institute, the intensive exploitation of the Human Relations Area Files, and the preparation of manuals and directives for participation in technical assistance and foreign aid (13, 191, 269). A few anthropologists stayed on for several more years, but activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee had disillusioned anthropologists with government, and as their participation in government shrank, so did the receptiveness of government agencies to anthropological contributions because there was no one to inaugurate them, receive them, or interpret them.

Anthropologists came out of the war years with several important new orientations. They had learned that their skills could be applied fruitfully to problems affecting modern societies and the deliberations of national governments and nation

states. They had learned to apply themselves to problems they had not themselves chosen, and to work with members of other disciplines. While this was most conspicuously true in the United States, the English style of operational research involved anthropologists in many unfamiliar fields, and some of the theoretical approaches of the French underground also meant a novel use of anthropology. A rationale for the kind of contribution that anthropologists could make to problems of national and worldwide scope was developed (171). But, at the same time, the experience of anthropologists during the war was summed up in the dictum, "you can't advise an adviser." If anthropologists were to participate in public activities, it meant some of them had to accept positions within various parts of the establishment, and this they became increasingly unwilling to do. The contradiction between a willingness during World War II to become involved and a disinclination to become involved later has not yet been resolved. This, in addition to the rejection of the Vietnam war, may account for the rather meager participation of anthropologists in the last 20 years in problems involving technical assistance, modernization, arms control, the prevention of nuclear warfare, peaceful uses of atomic energy, population control, and the environmental crisis (122).

In the earlier years, anthropology was so slightly established that the usual academic punishment for unorthodoxy was confined to excluding from it those who expressed very large heresies, such as the racist approach or an overemphasis on the dependence of American Indian culture on importations from Asia. After the war, although such major unorthodoxies persisted to a certain extent, the scene shifted to rewarding those who took part in currently popular minor theoretical discussions. Students were advised to concentrate on very recent polemics, and small, specific discussions of kinship, or variations in response to Lévi-Strauss (144, 160), became the road to academic advancement.

This exodus from any situation connected with national policy coincided with a tremendous growth in research opportunities and academic appointments. The National Institutes of Mental Health and National Science Foundation programs, and in the 1960s the development of programs vaguely conceived as foreign aid that would be relevant to political purposes abroad, such as the Ford Foundation Area Studies programs, all provided funding for academically phrased research. There were not enough funds for the tasks that needed doing, but there were more than enough for the strength and capabilities of those who were mature enough to lead and direct these programs.

An enormous number of new possibilities opened up in the United States through the establishment of new departments in old universities, transformation by upgrading old institutions, and a proliferation of new institutions. The establishment of new universities in the United Kingdom, new forms of cooperation in Paris (through coordination provided by the *Sixieme Section de L'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* and the *Maison de la Science de l'Homme*), and the new universities in Australia, India, and the new countries of Africa and Oceania also widened the field.

Movement from academic post to project to a different academic post was very rapid, and in the scramble for projects and posts there was little time for writing up the large amount of field work that was being funded. A great many young men

and women wrote their dissertations, their three short papers, did a few reviews, presented a paper or so, and went on to a tenured appointment with very little opportunity to show their mettle. As the period of educational expansion slows down, it may well be that one legacy from those years will be a layer of middle management, the members of which reached their positions by a kind of gamesmanship that is no longer as relevant to a world where stringency, frugality, and specific capacities critically appraised are again in vogue.

Internationally, there have been a series of large enterprises: the Wenner-Gren Conference of 1952, which held us together for another decade (150, 280); *Current Anthropology*, with its network of associates and commentators; the big University of Chicago symposium on evolution (279); the Wenner-Gren Conferences at Burg Wartenstein and in the United States, the International Congresses of Anthropology and Ethnology, and a strong anthropological presence at the Pacific Science Congresses; the development of the Center for the Study of Man at the Smithsonian; the Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale in Paris; the New Guinea Research Unit of the Australian National University; and the present (culminating) effort for the Ninth Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences to be held in Chicago in September 1973. These clusters of impressive activities owe a great deal to the imagination and energy of three people: Sol Tax, Editor of *Current Anthropology*; Lita Osmundsen, Director of the Wenner-Gren Foundation; and Clemens Heller of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, in Paris. As available openings for research, personnel, and funds have been identified and deployed around the world, these people have enlisted the cooperation of many institutions and seized opportunities for amplifying organizational efforts.

This has also been a period of large research programs, varying from the Caribbean program of the Institute for the Study of Man, the continuing area-based projects, like the Chiapas project (296), Watson's New Guinea project (297), Goldschmidt's African project (114), the associated sets of fellowships and activities of the East-West Center in Hawaii, the New Guinea Research Unit of the Australian National University, the Arctic Institute of North America, Vayda's ecology project on the New Guinea Rainforest, the widespread studies emanating from the University of Manchester, the cluster of studies in French West Africa and French Oceania, integration of studies on political and social organization in the Netherlands at the Hague, and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. And there are many, many more programs in which there has been an attempt to bring together groups interested in an area with various related anthropological specialties. The large scale long term projects have had, I think, no higher rate of failure—failure to complete work, write it up, or integrate results—than other social science projects which had less complicated logistical problems (177).

The catholicity of anthropology, with its ideological insistence on the psychic unity of man, and its traditional disregard of race, ethnicity, age, and sex as criteria for academic posts or research capabilities, combined with the political instabilities of the post-World War II world, has resulted in another form of international cooperation and interpenetration of different nationally based anthropological traditions. When I was a graduate student, Jochelson, a refugee from the new Russia,

was writing the last of his volumes on the Koryak (148) in the tower of the American Museum of Natural History, and an Ansa African student from the Gold Coast (187) was giving us lessons on how Africans viewed their own kinship systems. During these early years, a Nez Perce American Indian left Columbia to be welcomed in the Soviet Union as a member of a persecuted minority, and Boas and Manuel Gamio were planning joint studies in the United States and Mexico. In the early 1930s Radcliffe-Brown was teaching at the University of Chicago and—to the great disapproval of his American colleagues—was being considered for the directorship of a large international effort. Since World War II, the mix of students, students as informants, and faculty members drawn from all over the world, partly due to political upheavals, partly due to the great number of foreign fellowships available, has increased enormously. Americans teach in Japan, Frenchmen in India, Indians in the United States, Ceylonese in Australia, and the number of anthropologists from the new African, Asian, and Oceanic countries has increased. The vociferous group making political demands for more representation of Third World points of view has almost completely ignored this movement of scholars between countries, which has also included Third World political leaders who have studied anthropology in some Euro-American country. It is true that anthropology was born among the Euro-American metropolitan powers and flourished most vigorously among countries with colonial interests or identifiable minorities within their gates. But it is also true that this very anthropological emphasis has brought with it an insistence upon the comparable capacities for political and social development of all the members of *Homo sapiens*, and so has made a substantial intellectual contribution to the process of political democratization in different parts of the world. The current emphasis upon the symbolic processes found in primitive man (166), while it stems (at least within the French tradition) from Lévy-Bruhl, nevertheless reflects just as much interest in the existence of primary process thinking in modern man and the importance of symbolism and ritual in modern life as it does an emphasis on the more vivid and bizarre elements of the culture of preliterate peoples (28, 49–51, 73, 74, 101, 236, 288, 289). One of the belated effects of criticism of Freud's *Totem and Taboo* (88, 195) has been to establish that primitive man could think in ways as rational as modern man, as Boas maintained, and that primitive children might be more rational than primitive adults, and that civilized adults might display the kind of egocentric thinking of civilized children (190, 278). With this it has been established that it is necessary to rethink our whole overevaluation of rational linear thinking, with its dependence upon script and script-like processes (24, 28, 47, 178, 260). There has also been a new interest in cross-cultural studies of cognition and perception (61, 261, 290) and a return to a study of multimedia contexts.

At the same time, there are ways in which anthropologists have remained almost incredibly ethnocentric. Forty years ago Radcliffe-Brown suggested a system of kinship nomenclature that was not only cross-cultural but also a way in which kinship relationships could be read back as reciprocals (242). (I put this system on my typewriter in 1931.) Yet in 1972 Conrad Arensberg (12) can call for real “scientific models” and still express beautifully generated kinship relations as ab-

breviations of English terms *fā si da* or *mo br da*. We do little better in archeology, or physical anthropology, and only slightly better in linguistics. It is true that we need an agreed-upon terminology, but it is equally true that we need terminology that is not ethnocentric, favoring members of one linguistic group or world religion over another.

The last 25 years has also been a period of massive individual enterprises. These have included: Murdock's progressive exploitation of the Human Relations Area Files, first in *Social Organization* (218) and later in his *Ethnographic Atlas* (219); Lévi-Strauss' enormous and detailed study of the myths of the world (166); Yehudi Cohen's intensive use of cross-cultural comparisons and systematic attempts to grapple with the complexities of large areas (58–60), combining field work and integration of the literature; the Whittings' continued cross-cultural studies (304); Mandelbaum on India (182); Goldman's *Ancient Polynesian Society* (112); Leach's *Social Systems of Highland Burma* (159); and the Geertz's work on Indonesia and Morocco (97, 99, 102). These activities are comparable to the syntheses of an earlier day in which art, folklore, and material culture were organized within theoretical frameworks for the benefit of other students. They are notable for the way in which the individual integrating intelligence, handling vast amounts of material collected by hand, is still the prevalent style, only slightly helped by IBM cards or computers.

Traditionally, the sciences have advanced with the help of complementary interrelations between theory, instrumentation, and the stimulating or diverting effects of the climate of opinion within which their practitioners were working. There has been an increasing amount of critical and historical work on anthropological theory, such as Stocking's very distinguished work on Boas (273) combined with a series of trivial father-killing attacks (251, 302), reassessments of Malinowski to the point of boredom of all those participating, Marvin Harris's portentous evaluation of everyone else (130), and the interesting experiment of using biography as a method of assessment of periods and national schools of anthropology in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (201). Encyclopedias have become one of the ways that the anthropological ideas which originated in the West have been incorporated into the thinking of other parts of the world, e.g. the *Educational Encyclopedia* published in Hebrew (77) and the Japanese version of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. But the Wenner-Gren conference on The Nature and Function of Anthropological Tradition, held in 1968, which attempted to delineate the various national streams in anthropology failed both to draw together a sufficiently representative group and to integrate the results (162).

Biography, in a more personal sense than the theoretical evaluations, has also flourished: *Alfred Kroeber* by Theodora Kroeber (151), *Franz Boas* by Herskovits (135), the new series edited by Charles Wagley on Columbia anthropologists (173, 222), *An Anthropologist at Work*, *Writings of Ruth Benedict* (192) are examples. Autobiographies of various sorts include (166, 185, 271), *High Valley* (244), *Return to Laughter* (42), *Women in the Field* (111), and *Blackberry Winter* (206). There have also been passionate ethnologies like Jules Henry's *Culture Against Man* (132), and Colin Turnbull's *The Mountain People* (287). The furor over the publication of Malinowski's *Diary* (181) represents a low point in the discipline's degree of

sophistication. In the inflamed political atmosphere of the 1960s, Malinowski was attacked because of his private diary, which records his tribulations and miseries as he did his magnificent field work. A Polish word, which he used for the Trobrianders when he was most emphatically fed up with them, was translated as "nigger." The increase in self-evaluation and puzzled, troubled exposure of difficulties in the field has not been accompanied, as it might have been, with greater charity or detachment. Anthropologists have continued to be highly personal, unskilled in separating their own affects from their material, polemic, given to *ad hominen* arguments and, as if they were all members of one giant extended family, personal rather than relevant nit-picking.

The question of whether anthropology should be regarded as a self-sufficient science, and as such be required to generate its own propositions and hypotheses without the use either of concepts or the findings of other human or social sciences, remains a subject of controversy (220). At the Wenner-Gren Conference in 1952, David Mandelbaum demanded that the field of culture and personality should make its own contributions and validate its own premises (280), and this same demand has been made by psychoanalysts, because they objected to the importation of physiological data into the validation of their discoveries, as in the famous study of Benedek & Rubenstein (35) in which the findings of the analysts are juxtaposed and validated by records of endocrinological occurrences. Importations from other sciences, whether social and human or biological, are treated by Arensberg (12) as analogies, and yet what he wished to identify as anthropology is "interaction theory," with a heavy dependence on physiological theory and measurement (55).

The argument has several facets. Should there be more than one science concerned with the behavior of human beings, as individuals, in groups, as carriers of culture? Are we not enormously hindered when sociologists, social psychologists, clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, or ethologists attack the same problems as anthropologists, and develop their own set of terminologies, methods, and literature? Shouldn't we all be branches of one human science, which would include human biology, evolution, history and prehistory, distinguished by our methods rather than by the areas or fields that we study? How can we compensate for the damage done by attempts to synthesize a science of human behavior that relies on secondary sources, as Freud did in *Totem and Taboo* (188, 195), as George Land is doing in *Transformation* (157), or on a smaller scale as Barkun (18) is doing in his study of millenarian movements? As long as each subdiscipline of the human sciences persists in its myopic, academically bounded contemplation of its own navel, we will have over-reliance on secondary sources, because access to all the small self-contained subdisciplines will be impossible for the synthesizer.

In addition to the objections that can be raised equally to any of the discussions within the human sciences, there are special conditions in anthropology which complicate the matter even further. One of these is the circumstance that we are dealing with vanishing materials; primitive cultures are swallowed up, remote, isolated human populations interbreed, rare languages vanish when the last two old women who speak them die, archeological remains are destroyed by road-building and dam construction. The data can never be re-collected in the light of later

paradigms. Thomas Kuhn's illuminating discussion of the way paradigms are finally replaced in the natural sciences (153) simply does not apply to any branch of anthropology, and only to a limited degree to some of the other human sciences. True, a Bavelas experiment may be repeated on a later group of MIT students (30) or Bell Telephone employees, but won't the difference in period contaminate the experiment, as the later subjects have been reared in a different social milieu, eaten different food, breathed different air? The explicit demand of the natural sciences that an experiment be replicable is simply impossible in anthropology. The nearest approach we can make to it is to preserve observations in as complete a form as possible. Sound-synch film today is the closest we can come to the preservation of a complex event which will be subject to later analysis in the light of new hypotheses. With a 360° sound-synch camera we will come even closer. But replicability we cannot produce. The anthropologist must take earlier data into account; he cannot simply wipe the slate clean and begin all over again as the physical scientist can, and he must therefore continue to use the kind of tools and understandings that will enable him to work with data collected under very different conditions in the past (16).

Furthermore, anthropology shares with other field sciences, with ethology and geology, an extraordinary degree of interpenetration between particular sets of data and theory. Anthropology continues to have such special and peculiar characteristics which on the one hand provide the cement that holds us together as a discipline and on the other hand limit and define our work by the conditions under which it is done. In the laboratory sciences, one laboratory is very like another, better or worse equipped and endowed, but nevertheless laboratory scientists in Japan, Africa, Germany, and the Americas are linked by common methodologies, and scientists can move easily from one country to another. But in the field sciences, the actual conditions of work, bound in as they are with the geography, cultural areal style, politics, logistics, and state of equipment, are so intimately related to the discipline that while the processes of dealing with them provides a basic bond of sympathy between ethnologists a world apart in theory and national origin, they also preserve the extraordinarily idiosyncratic, apprentice style of the discipline.

But this close relationship between the nature of a particular area and the temperament, capabilities, and theoretical orientation of individual field workers has certain other consequences. As anthropology has expanded, the literature has proliferated to such an extent that it is almost impossible to keep up with publications in one's own area, so that an area of specialization shrinks accordingly from the Pacific, to Melanesia, to the Solomon Islands, for example; from New Guinea, to the Highlands, to a part of the Highlands; from Mesoamerica to Mexico; from South America to jungle dwellers only. We do not, on the whole, relinquish our close relationship to our own field materials, and most theoretical work that matters is tightly bound, although sometimes rather remotely, as in the case of Lévi-Strauss, or Radcliffe-Brown in his later years, to the individual's own field work. But the sense of scope which it was possible for Boas, or Kroeber, or Lowie, or Haddon to have is becoming lost under the torrent of publications, many of them unpredictably trivial or unidentifiably magnificent. It is not, I believe, the kind of loss that we



anticipated a generation ago, when the 1952 Wenner-Gren conference (150) was designed to hold together the diverging classical fields of archeology, linguistics, ethnology, and physical anthropology. Instead of a split into these larger fields, as we feared, there has been a kind of fragmentation, by areas, by schools, by instruments used, by approaches preferred, by style of work, into subfields which are as complex as whole cultures seen in their complete ecological settings. This fragmentation may perhaps reflect the greater sense of holistic imperatives just as much as it does the sort of narrowing of approaches that one finds in biology—the development of embryology, the merging effect found in biochemistry, or the development of experimental ethology.

There has been an increased but still rather limited response to general systems theory, as variously reflected in the work of Bateson (24), Vayda (293), Rappaport (243), Adams (3), and an interest in the use of computers, programming, matrices, etc (105). But the interaction between general systems theory [as represented, for example, by the theoretical work of Von Bertalanffy (33, 39)] has been compromised, partly by the state of field data, extraordinarily incomparable as it inevitably is, as well as historical anthropological methods of dealing with wholes. General systems theory has taken its impetus from the excitement of discovering larger and larger contexts (163), on the one hand, and a kind of microprobing into fine detail within a system, on the other (41, 258). Both of these activities are intrinsic to anthropology to the extent that field work in living societies has been the basic disciplinary method. It is no revelation to any field-experienced anthropologist that everything is related to everything else, or that whether the entire sociocultural setting can be studied in detail or not, it has to be known in general outline. General systems theory, in a sense, is no news at all, as Von Foerster found out when he attempted to organize a conference of general systems people and anthropologists (162). In a sense, the situation is comparable to that found by the Committee for the Study of Mankind, in which a committee that included Robert Redfield tried to get each discipline to consider its relationship to the concept of Mankind. Anthropologists replied, “we are related already,” and so they were. Something similar may be said of attempts to date in mathematical anthropology (107, 149). The kind of information that a computer program can finally provide, on a level of a particular culture, is simply a reflection of how detailed field work has been done, and to the careful field worker, on kinship, for example, it provides no illumination. This is, however, in strong contrast to the uses to which computer programming can be put, as in the work of Alan Lomax (174, 175), where it has been possible to map world styles in song and dance, combining Murdock’s technologically defined areas (219) with analysis of films, records, and tapes made by many field workers in many parts of the world.

Without the kind of unification that might be provided by a recourse to some sort of agreed-upon complex mathematical analysis, which would include information retrieval, prediction, and genuine standardization of data collection, the discipline fragments in the way in which Bali, for example, has been studied. Anthropologists have taken samples of one village in detail and studied trance in selected spots. Orchestral music has been recorded and defined for the whole island. Temple

ceremonial has been studied at different levels of complexity, and there have been restudies of specific spots. The construction of one ceremonial object found in many ceremonies has been detailed, photographic records of various aspects of the culture have been made, along with cinematographic studies of artistic behavior, etc. Such methods of unsystematically interrelated probes, some taxonomic, some following older categories of analysis, some searching for large chunks of unanalyzed materials, relate each field worker to a different network of interdisciplinary fellow scholars and scientists. One has only to mention the names of Bateson & Mead (25, 26), Kunst (154), Jane Belo (33, 34), Colin McPhee (179), H. J. Franken (86), C. Holt (142), C. and H. Geertz (96, 100, 103), to illustrate this.

So we have had such incomparable, cross-cutting developments as the Society for the Study of Oceania and the Society for Visual Anthropology, Urban Anthropology, and Structural Anthropology. There are those who have developed *festschriften* for Boas, Herskovits, Radin, Bateson, and the group in applied anthropology who worked on interaction theory (12). And there are those archeologists who combine archeology and ethnology; those who combine primatology and the study of hunters and gatherers; anthropologists who are using video tape; those who are interested in the study of child development, or millenary movements, or ethnohistory, or blood types, ethnoscience, latent structures, and somatotyping. Any given anthropologist of any experience today will be found to have his interests anchored and flourishing in half a dozen fields. So, for example, the late Oscar Lewis was interested in: Mexico (163, 169, 170), Puerto Rico (171), and Cuba; restudies (168), poverty (172), urbanism; the use of tape, multiple familial interviewing, collection, transcription, translation, and integration by one field worker (169), integration of interviews collected and transcribed by many field workers (171); relationship of recorded ethnographic materials and those whose lives are recorded; photography, projective tests, child-rearing, and effects of social revolution. Journals read and articles written span such a variety of fields that it is not surprising that when I asked 80 colleagues, variously selected from many areas and lines of association, to name the five most important books of the last 5 years, only four books were mentioned more than twice. Each respondent revealed his deep involvement in one or more sets of overlapping fields. The interpretation that one informant placed on it, that nothing of very much importance has really happened in the last 5 years, is simply inaccurate. A great deal has happened, but no consensus can be reached, because of the extraordinary diversity within the subject.

This diversity is somewhat paralleled by the increasingly rapid oscillation between the search for universals and the emphasis on diversity. Kluckhohn signaled the search for universals, and the whole series of value studies, eagerly grasped at by other disciplines, represents attempts to find cross-cultural units of analysis which lose the depth of the cultures from which they come. The earlier period of *etic* research, in which etic or cross-culturally viable units that disregarded the specific cultural unities of the cultures within which they were found, has given place to a much more sophisticated use of comparisons. We contrast, for example, the earlier correlation studies from the Human Relations Area Files, their criticism by Norbeck (228), and Mead & Newton (215), and Cohen (58), the substitution of very

detailed studies of clusters of cultures, Vizedom (295), and Textor's type of "more" or "less" associations (281). This trend is beautifully summed up in Levi-Strauss' Gildersleeve Lecture (167) in 1972, in which he says:

Should we insist on sticking to the "etic"/"emic" distinction, this can only be done by reversing the acceptances currently given to those terms. It is the "etic" level, too long taken for granted by mechanistic materialism and sensualist philosophy, which we should consider as an artefact. On the contrary, the "emic" level is the one where the material operation of the senses and the more intellectual activities of the mind can meet, and altogether match with the inner nature of reality itself. Structural arrangements are not a mere product of mental operations; the sense organs also function structurally, and outside us, there are structures in atoms, molecules, cells, and organisms. . . . When the mind processes the empirical data which it receives previously processed by the sense organs, it goes on working out structurally what at the outset was already structural. And it can only do so inasmuch as the mind, the body to which the mind belongs, and the things which body and mind perceive, are part and parcel of one and the same reality.

At the same time, anthropological interest in diversity has been given a boost by the worldwide responses to such homogenizing trends as the green revolution, which sums up both tendencies. At the same time that there is a drawing together of a huge genetic pool of human experiments in the domestication of a particular grain and the development of synthetic types appropriate for the assumed average growing conditions, there is the rediscovery of the dangers of monocrops and a return to the previous uses of diversity in the horticulture of such areas of poor soil as East Africa (46) and the ecologically varied slopes of the mountainsides of Peru or Guatemala. This renewed enthusiasm for diversity—which is after all our particular concern and heritage—was demonstrated by the symposium held at Brown in the spring of 1971 (240).

Today there is a growing movement towards ecological synthesis and systematization of world materials (8, 284). This is evidenced by the considerations of the planetary environment, the simulations of the Club of Rome (217), the search for an Index for the Quality of Life, the development of a Law of the Seas, the search for appropriate regulation and provision of cross-culturally usable soft-ware in the satellite program, the design of new towns and regions, the development of new energy sources, the invention of new life styles, the revision of education to fit a world of rapid cultural change, and the extreme divergence that exists at present between the experience of the generation in power and the young people under 30 (204).

The more that anthropologists respond to these movements, the more they are almost inevitably forced into narrower specializations, as they try to keep up with the specialized vocabulary of the area of worldwide problems with which they are dealing, the places within anthropological literature where the particular area is being tackled, and those anthropologists—who may be at the moment anywhere in the world—who are concentrating on one aspect of the whole. Who would have expected one of the most brilliant pieces of research relevant to planetary political organization to be developed by a field worker in the Congo (307) and published initially in an African newsletter, or that we would be able to tie it in easily with

Morton Fried's paper at the NYAS on tribalism (89) and Adams' discussion (3) of Central American national political structures? Would we have expected that in the field of urbanization it would be difficult for a student of social integration in the city, who follows work at the Athens Ekistikal Institute with graduate work in Sydney, to be at once conversant with legislative proposals for utility corridors and attempts to think about the present status of unemployed youth; or that in the field of child development, it is equally difficult to integrate Lawrence Malcolm's studies of protein deficiencies in New Guinea (180) to the Society for Social Anthropology's gingerly approach to problems of childhood by way of studies of socialization (186)?

There is another set of these clusters which centers about the use of specific instruments, either psychological or technical, and still another of those who are interested in particular theoretical approaches. One of the great advances of recent decades has come in the whole field of semiotics, ushered in by the conference at Indiana University (260). We now have the well-developed fields of Kinesics (41), Proxemics (126–128), Choreometrics and Cantometrics (174), and Paralinguistics (260), all dependent upon a fine scale analysis based on film and tape, and more recently on video tape. These specialties overlap with the interaction studies of Arensberg (12), Bateson (23, 26), Oliver (231), and the interaction chronograph of Eliot Chapple (55), which in turn overlap with cybernetically oriented field studies like Rappaport's (243), studies in Psychiatry (24) and Primatology (71), and studies of conference techniques and reporting (203, 208).

Other groups are formed around the use of psychological instruments, a sophisticated use of Human Relations Area Files (172, 219, 224, 281), the Whittings' continued studies of judgments of selected anecdotes (156, 304), use of questionnaires on mother-child behavior (5), Rorschachs, Raven Matrices, Mosaics, etc. Each user has to have at least a working knowledge of what is being done by others using the same instruments, and these uses are likely to cross every other subdivision, geographical or subdisciplinary.

Another consequence of the proliferation of data is that each theorist became so tied in with the particular field experience within which his theoretical stance became clarified for him—but not for others—that there has developed a complementary tendency to ignore other people's work and start from scratch. It is perhaps not accidental that in *The Nature of Cultural Things* (129), Marvin Harris only uses the work of a social psychologist, Roger Barker (17), who himself insisted on starting from scratch, ignoring all previous work that had been done in the same field. So we have insights, some of them developed decades ago, which prove periodically illuminating to a new generation, such as Bateson's *Naven* (23) or Chapple's *Interaction* chronograph (12). And finally we have books about books about books, like Murphy's *The Dialectics of Social Life* (221), and those by Barnes (19) and Jarvie (147). However, one distinctive feature of the present day set of attack and counterattack is the willingness to discuss, analyze, dissect, propound, and expound the findings of Lévi-Strauss during the course of his work, where in previous periods, except for book reviews, very little of this was done until a master was dead (160).

It is not surprising that there has been such a proliferation of field manuals and

field work reports, and quasi-autobiographical discussion of field problems, such as *In the Company of Man* (48), *Crossing Cultural Boundaries* (298), Hilger's story of an Araucanian (138), Golde's *Women in the Field* (111), Williams' *Field Methods in the Study of Culture* (305), Freilich's *Marginal Natives* (87), and including the mammoth and outrageously delayed handbook by Naroll & Cohen (225). But the writers of most of these manuals have to rely on methods that are not very much of an improvement over those of the 1920s and 1930s. They expose a student to intimate and detailed accounts of the troubles and struggles that other anthropologists have had, just as we expose a student to exercises in a variety of languages and accounts of a variety of kinship systems, with the hope that somehow they will be able to incorporate a sense of how to do their field work with different equipment and under quite different conditions. The traditional tendency to avoid teaching concrete methods of field research has been exacerbated by the extremely rapid changes in technology of taping, filming, photographing, preserving, developing, viewing, retrieving, and preparing materials for suitable forms of publication and exposition. When to this is added the complexity of preparing for a field trip, in terms of selecting and testing equipment, and the length of time it takes to process grant applications, it is perhaps not surprising that efforts to do any systematic teaching in the use of both kinds of instruments break down. But when we add to this a lack of training, and the requirement that predoctoral students elect a narrow problem that often precludes their making the absolutely essential study of the culture first, it is not surprising that a great deal of incomplete work has come out of the areas which have been popular for predoctoral study. It is even possible that the present financial stringency may keep a certain number of graduate students at home, doing book theses and learning how to organize materials before they plunge prematurely into an area which they may only learn to dislike.

There have been curious discrepancies in the application of anthropology also. Ecology became fashionable over a decade ago, and a whole school has grown around the meticulous reporting of terrain, crop, land ownership, ethnobotanical knowledge, soil fertility, and relative shares of food allotted to families of men of different rank. One might have expected that as the environmental crisis deepened there would be contributions from the field of anthropological ecology. Equally, it might have been expected that a field so deeply concerned with the study of kinship and related problems might have contributed to the whole question of population control. In fact, there are only a handful of workers in either field.

It also might have been expected that those who had clamored most loudly for a scientific and objective approach would have eagerly availed themselves of the new exactness of recording provided by film and tape (1, 2, 14, 16, 26, 94, 189). Actually, it was not until video tape appeared that this kind of instrumentation received much approval, and this, I believe, is because video tape will permit the anthropologist to join the sociologist and social psychologist in distancing himself from his data. Someone else, several someone elses, can code the hours and hours of video tape, and the traditional close tie between observation and recording is broken. Those who demand that anthropology be objective and scientific for the most part have been uninterested in improving upon the pencil as a recorder of anecdotes, subsequently

given a rank order by three trained observers. So, in spite of the very greatly increased number of anthropologists, both the funds and the personnel needed to make records of existing primitive peoples are missing, and those who emphasize the use of film are likely to be told they aren't doing real anthropology.

The post-World War II period has been characterized by two kinds of turning towards high cultures: intensive work in countries like India and Japan; and attention to subgroups within our own society, such as transvestites, drug addicts, those living in communes, and ethnic minorities. However, work on the white majority is still somewhat suspect; the demand that anthropology should be comparative seems often to be translated into the demand that there must be something strange and other worldly about the people whom the anthropologist studies. This provision was originally not only a way of fulfilling our responsibility to record vanishing cultures, but was also believed by Boas to be a way of attaining a limited degree of objectivity. Boas did not believe that objectivity was possible or even desirable within one's own culture, where the responsible anthropologist, like any responsible citizen, had to take sides on matters of social justice. He believed it was possible to learn that a member of another culture, far away physically and in technological level, might smack his lips aloud as a sign that he had eaten well, and that this was good manners, and still be critical of the manners of ill-bred persons in our midst. But we would, he used to tell his students, be a little more tolerant as we came to understand that manners were learned cultural behavior and not matters of absolute right and wrong.

However, this achievement of a scientific objectivity, and even the achievement of the ethically desirable stance of tolerance, looks very different today from the way it did 50 years ago. Those who are studied, whether they be members of other races, other ethnic groups, the poor, the oppressed, the imprisoned, feel that to use their lives to obtain a kind of objectivity is to treat them as objects, not as subjects (65, 292). And all over the world the previously dispossessed and ignored are actively demanding an identity which the rest of mankind must respect. For many anthropologists, the recognition of these new demands has coincided with new situations which they welcomed, such as the greater ability of previously nonliterate people to participate in research, to write about their own cultures (20), to become ethnologists themselves, and to engage in a mutual interchange, instead of an exchange in which one side was at least partially ignorant of the motivations of the other (234). But such recognition has not by any means been universal; in many divisions of the human sciences, human beings are spoken of as digits, as middle-aged white ethnic males, or black unemployed females; nameless, faceless, they appear as statistics, or as individuals described in terms that the reporter has taken no pains to make bearable. The protests of English-speaking "objects of study" became merged with various forms of political protest and partisanship for the oppressed (291). The possessive "my people" or "my village" appears arrogant where once it appeared affectionate and personal. In fact, the application of anthropological methods to our own society, especially when they are applied to groups other than our own, contaminates the study of other peoples, who become, not the primitive peoples whom we fully respected as representatives of whole

cultures, but instead members of disadvantaged groups contending for a place in the sun (291, 292). And the anthropologist, who has developed the idea of culture, in the name of which they are pleading their case, is simultaneously attacked for having somehow been responsible for their primitive state, which they now wish to redefine or repudiate (64). When this is combined with the identification of applied anthropology in fields like technical assistance or community development, as colonial, neocolonial, or imperialistic maneuvers, the whole ethic of research and applied research becomes ambiguous (123, 124).

Another of the current ambiguities in anthropology is the question of the new feminism. Anthropology has traditionally been very receptive to the participation of women. In England, in France, in the United States, and more recently in Japan, women students have been given opportunities to do research, in spite of the objections of introducing women into parts of the world where there are many physical dangers. Yet today there is a lively movement among young women anthropologists against their own departments, against the paucity of data on the primitive societies that have been studied on matters of interest to women: pregnancy, childbirth, women's health, the menopause, etc. There is also a movement against theories of the early division of labor between men and women, which they assert neglect the contributions that prehistoric women made to the development of culture. Too often none of these claims and accusations are analyzed with the degree of cultural sophistication which anthropology should provide. Scarcity of data on women in primitive cultures is due primarily to the fact that most women anthropologists were more interested in doing the same kind of work that men did, rather than studying women and children. Early theories of the consequences of the division of labor, which assigned disproportionate roles to man the hunter, had to wait for correction until studies made on hunters and gatherers provided data on the relative contributions of each sex to subsistence, now estimated at something like 80 percent produced by women. (There is, it is true, one major discovery which had to have been made by women, and that is the discovery of the role of paternity; only women were in a position to make it.) But the revival of discredited speculations about previous matriarchies does no credit to historical perspective and threatens to cloud discussions which should proceed on a different level. University establishments do discriminate against women in all departments. We have been short of data on the female contribution to food supply, and we know far less than we would like to about many aspects of women's lives in primitive societies. "Male" speculations about matriarchies may make attractive daydreams, just as the widely spread myth of the island of women—a male nightmare fear that women could get along without them—is at present being turned into a feminine daydream by some feminist extremists. But as in the question of race, it is a great mistake to let contemporary partisan politics distort a disciplined look at the facts as we now know them.

I wish to return again to the subject of applied anthropology. Applied anthropology involves working with interdisciplinary teams and administrators and politicians. This field, so highly and promisingly developed during and immediately after World War II, has languished during the last two decades (214). A number of conditions have contributed to this decline: loss of interest in psychoanalysis—

which mediated between the field of mental health and anthropology (66, 68, 193, 267, 268); disillusionment with government where many such projects originated; easily found, well-paying jobs in academia and the realization that anthropology is becoming an academic-based discipline with rather rigid hierarchical relationships, from the prestigious universities, through a series of lower echelons, all academic, and the awareness that the ambitious young anthropologist is likely to be penalized for working outside these frozen hierarchies. Anthropology was a vocation until World War II; when it became a field that men and women entered instead with high sensitivity to their career hopes and problems and posts which would fulfill their professional ambitions, something was lost. It may be that the contrast between the relations of pre-World War II field workers and the people they studied or attempted to help in a variety of ways, and the postwar inflation of the field by those who thought of it as just one way of making a living, may also be somewhat responsible for some of the extravagant political accusations of the last decade.

Anthropology, like all the social sciences, has been subjected to intentional politicizing, by the demands of minorities, including students and women, by a questioning about the relationship of scientific work to the state of the world, the inequities of the establishment, the hope of revolution, the mysticism about the people themselves. For anthropology, the intense polarization about these issues has been intensified by a number of special problems: (*a*) almost all of our field work has been done on the cultures of those who are now subsumed under the term Third World; (*b*) almost all of our field work involves complicated relationships with some form of officialdom—foreign offices, district officers, Indian agents, or customs officers—and we are also likely to encounter movements and activities which are illegal, from methods of burying the dead, the illegal cultivation of opium, and militant nativistic cults, to politicized rebellions and conspiracies. Furthermore, we have been the discipline concerned with race, with the comparable abilities of all members of the human species, with records of past glory or past primitiveness, with problems of language—dialects, developments of national languages, new orthographies. In a world that is teeming with the rising expectations of minorities, with new nations, and revolutionized or modernized old nations, almost every anthropologist stands somewhere in a crossfire position, knowing too much about the renaissance of old customs, or providing information that may be used by some agency of modernization, suppression, or militarization, etc.

The original response to anthropologists participating in national activities during World War II culminated in the code of ethics developed by the Society for Applied Anthropology in 1953 (209), with its insistence on anthropologists taking responsibility for all foreseeable effects. Since then, there have been a succession of crises. There were objections to participation in secret research which was to be guarded against by open publication as represented in the Beals report (31). This was followed by the seemingly contradictory demand that information be hidden from government agencies that might misuse it, which resulted in the Thailand investigation in 1971 (10a, 10b, 11a, 11b) and the recognition that anthropologists not only had to protect their informants and the cultures they studied, but also identifiable communities which might become targets. They are also called upon to become



more active protectors of threatened minority primitive peoples around the world, such as the aboriginal peoples in the Amazon valley who are being threatened at present.

The question of the participation by a people in studies of their culture has been raised in many ways: in demands that the Indians receive a percentage of research grants, on the grounds that someone, anthropologist or society, was exploiting them for gain; the assertion that only an ethnic group was equipped to study itself; and proposals, notably by Alan Lomax, that the material collected by anthropologists—especially on music and dance and folklore—be fed back to the people themselves as an element in their cultural renewal. These demands parallel the discussions in medicine which ranged through a suggestion of giving experimental subjects the status of coinvestigator in a relationship of collegiality (123), to a recognition that the aims of the investigator and experimental subject might be so different that only organization on the part of the proposed subjects would meet the situation. The classical position of trust and cooperation between an anthropologist and his informants, no matter how disparate their education, in which both were devoted to recording a vanishing culture and assuring the safety of its artifacts, has now been replaced by a relationship in which the anthropologist must sometimes either espouse the cause of some ethnic group within a revolutionary formula, or be forced to acknowledge that there are no longer such shared values.

It has been a period of minimal detachment and capacity for cultural self-consciousness and loyalty. We could pride ourselves that no anthropologist denounced a fellow anthropologist in the various anticommunist witch hunts of the late 1930s and early 1950s. But the 1960s have involved us in a mass of denunciations and counter-denunciations, in the failure of seniors to recognize the implications of the generation gap, or in a refusal to consider any discussions whatsoever of racial differences, some of which, like the campaign against Carleton Coon's book (62) and the extreme views expressed in the symposium on Science and Race (210), do us little credit.

Intellectual ferment has taken as many and as diverse forms as the formation of clusters of co-workers and recognition of subgoals. Evolution, formerly a battle cry which assumed lines drawn up on both sides, has become a respectable central object of discussion (6, 196, 230, 264, 303), illuminated by studies of the behavior of primates in the wild (115) and attempts at teaching chimpanzees to communicate (238), studies of the brain (43, 239, 241, 300), and by the claims of the various types of structuralists for a basic brain-based grammar (56, 164) and dialectics of opposites (166). While the study of evolution has been enriched by the new kinds of archeology—which united thousands of years of selective adjustment to the same terrain, or by the combinations of studies of living hunters and gatherers and associated primates and ungulates—it has also been given extra urgency by considerations of the present technological crisis. A serious consideration of man-made crises and the need for a middle technology has revived interest in material culture, for example, and the role of museums, and attempts to understand earlier artifacts by making them. It also brings into focus the role of conscious purpose in our increasingly man-made, interdependent world (28).

Ethology has seriously entered into the theoretical considerations of anthropologists only during the last two decades (255), and comparative studies of man and other creatures, the arguments over aggression and war (91, 119, 176, 203, 264) and a reconsideration of the degree of patterning of instinctive behavior have proceeded in parallel with discussions of the structure of the brain and its products (248). Here again, political ideology has clouded the issue and the clarity of the arguments; new findings (235) call for drastic revisions in over-elaborate schemata of human development. The specter of behavior modification, of the loss of autonomy and freedom, not only haunts any discussion of biological engineering, but also hinders investigation into the functioning of the brain, the effects of psychedelic drugs, and the interpretation of insights provided by natural and laboratory experiments with animals (165). There seems little doubt that cross-disciplinary research in the wild, taking in wider and wider considerations of the total environment (78, 238), is a more promising field for anthropological cooperation with other sciences than patching together results of isolated laboratory procedures. The very circumstance that recent studies of the brain involve the whole brain (300) reinforces the traditional anthropological preference for the study of whole cultures and whole societies, with the integrative capacity of our major scientific resource, single human minds (197).

The peculiar history of anthropological field work has introduced a new dimension into the discipline, as field workers have been able to make restudies of earlier work, especially their own. The limitations of purely synchronic records of a people at a given moment in time, and subjects who had the same speed of movement and life-span as the investigator, has been mitigated by the rapidity of culture change. When people studied at 20 or 30-year intervals are changing within a world scene where everything else is changing as well, new opportunities for research have been automatically introduced, as new tools, new concepts, and new conditions enable the field worker to study quite new problems. Boas inaugurated this kind of thing when he took recording and film equipment to the Kwakiutl when he was in his sixties (192), and since then we have had a long series of restudies: by Oscar Lewis (170), Redfield (246, 247), Firth (81), Mead (199), to mention only a few. The possibility of studying fully identified groups over a long period has enormously increased the capacity of anthropology to include individual differences and continuities of personality within statements of cultural regularities. This in turn has made it possible to distinguish levels of analysis more sharply. Taking Lévi-Strauss' categories into the field may illuminate field research, but importing far more detailed studies of myth-making or myth-telling into Lévi-Strauss' work would only be disruptive.

Anthropology is entering a new era, the flesh pots are emptier, the difficulties of doing field work increase geometrically as the equipment grows more elaborate and the political situation in many parts of the world becomes more unsettled. In such meager times as these, anthropology can take several directions: an increased interest in professional careers that involve professional competence in related fields, like town planning, health, nutrition, and political organization; an intensive reexamination of existing materials (where Lévi-Strauss has erected such a challenging theoret-

ical structure); concentration on audio-visual recordings in an attempt to obtain the new kind of records of still living cultures with film and tape (14, 16, 94, 95); a renewed dedication to the preservation of cultural diversity; and a greater involvement in an increasingly endangered planet. The problem remains of how to keep so many extraordinarily diverse and discrepant foci of interest and competence in active interrelationship. The very peculiarity of the task may be what will make it possible.

#### Literature Cited<sup>1</sup>

1. Adair, J., Worth, S. 1967. The Navajo as filmmaker: A brief report of research in the cross-cultural aspects of film communication. *Am. Anthropol.* 69: 76-78
2. Adair, P., Boyd, B. 1967. *Holy Ghost People*. 16 mm black & white film, sound (60 min). New York: McGraw-Hill
3. Adams, R. N. 1970. *Crucifixion by Power: Essays on Guatemalan National Social Structure, 1944-1966*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
4. Adams, R. N., Preiss, J. J., Eds. 1960. *Human Organization Research*. Homewood: Dorsey
5. Ainsworth, M. D. 1967. *Infancy in Uganda*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
6. Alland, A. 1967. *Evolution and Human Behavior*. New York: Natural History Press
7. Alland, A. 1971. *Human Diversity*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- 8.\* Albertson, P., Barnett, M., Eds. 1971. *Environment and Society in Transition*. NY Acad. Sci.
- 9.\* Albisetti, C., Venturelli, A. J. 1968-1969. *Enciclopedia Bororo*. Compo Grande, Mato Grasso, Brasil: Museu Regional Dom Bosco (first volume publ. 1962)
- 10a. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., M. Mead, chairman, 1971. Charge to the ad hoc committee to evaluate the controversy concerning anthropological activities in relation to Thailand. *Newsletter Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 12, No. 3
- 10b. Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 1971. Report of the ad hoc committee to evaluate the controversy concerning anthropological activities in relation to Thailand, Sept. 27, 1971. Part I: Anthropological Activities in Thailand; Part II: Guidelines on Future Policy
- 11a. Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 1972. Council rejects Thai controversy committee's report. *Newsletter Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 13, No. 1:1,9
- 11b. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., M. Mead, 1972. Thailand controversy response to the board's response to the discussion. *Newsletter Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 13, No. 2:1,6
12. Arensberg, C. M. 1972. Culture as behavior: Structure and emergence. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 1:1-26
13. Arensberg, C. M., Niehoff, A. H. 1964. *Introducing Social Change: A Manual for Americans Overseas*. Chicago: Aldine
14. Asch, T., Chagnon, N., Neel, J. V. 1971. *Yanomama*. 16 mm color film, sound (43 min). Center for Documentary Anthropology, Brandeis Univ.
- 15.\* Balandier, G. 1971. *Political Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon
16. Balikci, A. 1969. *Netsilik Eskimos of the Pelly Bay Region of Canada*. 9 films, 16 mm color, sound (approx. 30 min each). New York: Universal Education and Visual Arts
17. Barker, R. G., Wright, H. F. 1971. *Midwest and Its Children*. Hamden: Shoe String Press (first publ. 1954)
18. Barkun, M. *Disaster and the Millennium*. To be published
- 19.\* Barnes, J. A. 1971. *Three Styles—The Study of Kinship*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press
- 20.\* Barnett, D. L., Mjama, K. 1966. *Mau Mau from Within*. New York: Monthly Review Press
- 21.\* Barth, F., Ed. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown

<sup>1</sup>The following kinds of references are included: (a) literature cited in text; (b) publications which were suggested by one or more of the author's colleagues (starred); (c) books the author considers especially interesting; (d) references to the author's own work, particularly articles which have extensive bibliographies.

22. Bateson, G. 1956. The message "this is play." In *Group Processes*, ed. B. Schaffner, 2:145-242. New York: Macy Found.
23. Bateson, G. 1958. *Naven*. Stanford Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
24. Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco: Chandler
25. Bateson, G., Mead, M. 1962. *Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis*. N.Y. Acad. Sci. (first publ. 1942)
26. Bateson, B., Mead, M. 1952. *Character Formation in Different Cultures* series. 6 films, 16 mm, black & white, sound. New York Univ. Film Library
  - a. *A Balinese Family* (17 min)
  - b. *Bathing Babies in Three Cultures* (9 min)
  - c. *Childhood Rivalry in Bali and New Guinea* (20 min)
  - d. *First Days in the Life of a New Guinea Baby* (19 min)
  - e. *Karba's First Years* (20 min)
  - f. *Trance and Dance in Bali* (20 min)
27. Bateson, M. C. 1970. *Structural continuity in poetry*. PhD thesis. Harvard Univ., Cambridge
28. Bateson, M. C. 1972. *Our Own Metaphor*. New York: Knopf
29. Bateson, M. C. 1973. Ritualization: A study in texture and texture change. In *Pragmatic Religions*, ed. I. Zaretsky, M. Leone. Princeton Univ. Press
30. Bavelas, A. 1951. Communication patterns in task-oriented groups. In *The Policy Sciences*, ed. H. D. Laswell, D. Lerner, 193-202. Stanford Univ. Press
31. Beals, R. L. 1969. *Politics of Social Research: An Inquiry into the Ethics and Responsibilities of Social Scientists*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton
32. *Behavioral Science* 1956 to date. Mental Health Res. Inst. Univ. Michigan, Ann Arbor
33. Belo, J. 1960. *Trance in Bali*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
34. Belo, J. 1970. *Traditional Balinese Culture*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
35. Benedek, T., Rubenstein, B. 1939. Correlations between ovarian activity and psychodynamic processes: I. The ovulatory phase; II. The menstrual phase. *Psychosom. Med.* 1:245 ff., 461 ff.
- 36.\* Bennett, J. W. 1969. *The Northern Plainsmen*. Chicago: Aldine
- 37.\* Berger, P., Luckmann, T. 1966. *Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City: Doubleday
- 38.\* Berlin, B. 1970. A universalist-evolutionary approach in ethnographic semiotics. In *Current Directions in Anthropology*, ed. A. Fischer. *Bull. Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 3:3-18
39. Bertalanffy, L. von 1969. *General System Theory: Essays on Its Foundation and Development*. New York: Braziller
- 40.\* Binford, L. R., Binford, S. R., Eds. 1968. *New Perspectives in Archeology*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton
41. Birdwhistell, R. L. 1970. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press
42. Bowen, E. S. 1964. *Return to Laughter*. Natural History Library 36. Garden City: Doubleday (first publ. 1954)
43. Braud, L. W., Braud, W. G. 1972. Biochemical transfer of relational responding (transposition). *Science* 176:942-44
44. Brown, D. 1971. *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- 45.\* Butzer, K. 1971. *Environment and Archeology*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton
46. Campbell, J. 1971. *Agricultural development in East Africa: A problem in cultural ecology*. PhD thesis. Columbia Univ., New York
47. Carpenter, E. 1970. *They Became What They Beheld*. New York: Outerbridge & Dienstfrey
48. Casagrande, J. B., Ed. 1960. *In the Company of Man*. New York: Harper
49. Castaneda, C. 1968. *Teaching of Don Juan: Yaki Way of Knowledge*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press
50. Castaneda, C. 1971. *Separate Reality*. New York: Simon & Schuster
51. Castaneda, C. 1972. *Journey to Ixtlan: The Lessons of Don Juan*. New York: Simon & Schuster
52. Caudill, W., Lin, Tsung-Yi, Eds. 1969. *Mental Health Research in Asia and the Pacific*. Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii Press
53. Caudill, W., Weinstein, H. 1969. Maternal care and infant behavior in Japan and America. *Psychiatry* 32:12-43
54. Chagnon, N. A. 1968. *Yanomamo: The Fierce People*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
55. Chapple, E. D. 1970. *Cultural and Biological Man: Explorations in Behavioral Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
56. Chomsky, N. 1972. *Language and Mind*, enl. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich
- 57.\* Clastres, P. 1972. *Chronique des Indiens Guayaki*. Paris: Plon
58. Cohen, Y. A. 1964. *The Transition from Childhood to Adolescence: Cross-*

- Cultural Studies of Initiation Ceremonies, Legal Systems, and Incest Taboos.* Chicago: Aldine
59. Cohen, Y. A. 1968. *Man in Adaptation: The Cultural Present.* Chicago: Aldine
  60. Cohen, Y. A. 1971. *Man in Adaptation: The Institutional Framework.* Chicago: Aldine
  61. Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J. A., Sharp, D. W. 1971. *The Cultural Contexts of Learning and Thinking: An Exploration of Experimental Anthropology.* New York: Basic Books
  62. Coon, C. S. 1962. *The Origin of Races.* New York: Knopf
  - 63.\* De Laguna, F. 1960. *The Story of a Tlingit Community: A Problem in the Relationship Between Archeological, Ethnological, and Historical Methods.* Washington, D.C.: GPO
  64. Deloria, V. Jr. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins.* New York: Macmillan
  65. Deloria, V. Jr. 1970. *We Talk, You Listen.* New York: Macmillan
  66. De Reuck, A. V. S., Porter, R., Eds. 1965. *Transcultural Psychiatry: A Ciba Foundation Symposium.* London: Churchill
  67. Deutsch, K. W. 1966. *Nationalism and Social Communication.* Cambridge: MIT. 2nd ed.
  68. Devereux, G. 1967. *From Anxiety to Method in the Behavioral Sciences.* The Hague: Mouton
  69. Devereux, G. 1968. *Reality and Dream.* New York: Doubleday (first publ. 1951.) 2nd ed.
  70. Devereux, G. *Dreams in Greek Tragedy.* Oxford: Blackwell. In press
  71. De Vere, I., Ed. 1965. *Primate Behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
  72. Dillon, W. S. 1968. *Gifts and Nations: The Obligation to Give, Receive and Repay.* New York: Humanities Press
  73. Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger.* New York: Praeger
  74. Douglas, M. 1970. *Natural Symbols.* New York: Pantheon
  - 75.\* Duchet, M. 1971. *Anthropologie et Histoire au Siècle des Lumières: Buffon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, Diderot.* Paris: Maspero
  - 76.\* Dumont, L. 1970. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications.* Univ. Chicago Press
  77. Educational Encyclopedia (Hebrew) 1959-61. Thesaurus of Jewish and general education, ed. M. M. Buber, Vol. 1, 2. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, and the Bialik Institute
  78. Eisenberg, J. F., Dillon, W. S., Eds. 1971. *Man and Beast: Comparative Social Behavior.* Washington: Smithsonian Inst. Press
  - 79.\* Epstein, T. S. 1962. *Economic Development and Social Change in South India.* New York: Humanities Press
  80. Erikson, E. H. 1969. *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence.* New York: Norton
  81. Firth, R. 1967. *Tikopia: Ritual and Belief.* London: Allen & Unwin
  82. Firth, R., Ed. 1967. *Themes in Economic Anthropology.* New York: Barnes & Noble
  83. Foerster, H. von, Ed. 1950-1956. *Cybernetics.* New York: Macy Found. 5 vols.
  84. Fortes, M. 1969. *Kinship and the Social Order.* Chicago: Aldine
  - 85.\* Fox, R. 1968. *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective.* New York: Penguin
  86. Franken, H. J. et al 1960. *Bali: Studies in Life, Thought and Ritual.* The Hague: van Hoeve
  87. Freilich, M., Ed. 1970. *Marginal Natives: Anthropologists at Work.* New York: Harper & Row
  88. Freud, S. 1960. *Totem and Taboo.* Transl. A. A. Brill. New York: Random House (first publ. 1918)
  89. Fried, M. H. 1966. On the concepts of 'Tribe' and 'Tribal Society.' *Trans. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 28:527-40
  90. Fried, M. H. 1972. *The Study of Anthropology.* New York: Crowell
  91. Fried, M., Harris, M., Murphy, R., Eds. 1968. *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression.* Garden City: Natural History Press
  92. Fromm, E., Maccoby, M. 1970. *Social Character in a Mexican Village.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall
  93. Gans, H. J. 1962. *Urban Villagers.* New York: Free Press
  94. Gardner, R. 1964. *Dead Birds.* 16 mm color film, sound (83 min). Cambridge: Peabody Museum, Harvard Univ. Distributed by Contemporary Films, New York
  95. Gardner, R., Heider, K. G. 1968. *Gardens of War.* New York: Random House
  96. Geertz, C. 1959. Form and variation in Balinese village structure. *Am. Anthropol.* 61:991-1012
  97. Geertz, C. 1963. *Agricultural Involution: the Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia.* Berkeley: Univ. California Press

98. Geertz, C. 1964. *The Religion of Java*. Glencoe: Free Press (first publ. 1960)
99. Geertz, C. 1968. *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
100. Geertz, C. 1972. Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese cockfight. *Daedalus* Winter: 1-37
101. Geertz, C., Ed. 1972. *Myth, Symbol and Culture*. New York: Norton
102. Geertz, H. 1961. *Javanese Family*. Glencoe: Free Press
103. Geertz, H., Geertz, C. 1964. Teknonymy in Bali: Parenthood, age grading and genealogical amnesia. *J. Roy. Anthropol. Inst. Gt. Brit. Ireland* 94: 94-108
- 104.\* Gellner, E. A. 1969. *Saints of the Atlas*. Univ. Chicago Press
105. General Systems Yearbook of the Society for General Systems Research 1956 to date, ed. L. von Bertalanffy, A. Rapoport. Washington: Soc. Gen. Syst. Res.
106. Gilbert, C. 1968. *Margaret Mead's New Guinea Journal*. 16 mm color film, sound (90 min). New York: Nat. Educ. Telev.
- 107.\* Gillespie, J. V., Nesvold, B. Eds. 1970. *Macro-Quantitative Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publ.
108. Gluckman, M. 1964. *Custom and Conflict in Africa*. New York: Barnes & Noble (first publ. 1955)
109. Gluckman, M., Ed. 1964. *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naivety in Social Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine
110. Gluckman, M. 1965. *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society*. Chicago: Aldine
111. Golde, P., Ed. 1970. *Women in the Field*. Chicago: Aldine
112. Goldman, I. 1970. *Ancient Polynesian Society*. Univ. Chicago Press
113. Goldschmidt, W. 1971. *Exploring the Ways of Mankind*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston
114. Goldschmidt, W., et al 1965. Variation and adaptability of culture. *Am. Anthropol.* 67:400-47
115. Goodall, J. V. L. 1971. *In the Shadow of Man*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- 116.\* Goodenough, W. H. 1970. *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine
117. Gorer, G. 1965. *Death, Grief and Mourning*. Garden City: Doubleday
118. Gorer, G. 1966. *The Danger of Equality*. London: Cressett
119. Gorer, G. 1966. Man has no killer instinct. *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 27:47ff.
120. Gorer, G. 1971. *Sex and Marriage in England Today*. London: Nelson
121. Gould, R. A. 1969. *The Yiware: Foragers of the Australian Desert*. New York: Scribner
122. Graubard, S. R., Ed. 1965. Science and culture. *Daedalus* Winter issue
123. Graubard, S. R., Ed. 1969. Ethical aspects of experimentation with human subjects. *Daedalus* Spring issue
124. Gwaltney, J. L. 1970. *Thrice Shy: Cultural Accommodations to Blindness and Other Disasters in a Mexican Community*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
125. Hagen, E. E. 1962. *On the Theory of Social Change*. Homewood: Dorsey
126. Hall, E. T. 1961. *The Silent Language*. New York: Fawcett (first publ. 1959)
127. Hall, E. T. 1963. A system for the notation of proxemic behavior. *Am. Anthropol.* 65:1003-26
128. Hall, E. T. 1966. *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City: Doubleday
129. Harris, M. 1964. *The Nature of Cultural Things*. New York: Random House
- 130.\* Harris, M. 1968. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Crowell
131. Heider, K. G. 1970. *Dugun Dani*. Chicago: Aldine
132. Henry, J. 1963. *Culture Against Man*. New York: Random House
133. Henry, J. 1972. *Pathways to Madness*. New York: Random House
134. Henry, N. B., Ed. 1959. *Community Education*. Nat. Soc. Study Educ. 58th Yearb., part 1. Univ. Chicago Press
135. Herskovits, M. J. 1953. *Franz Boas*. New York: Scribner
- 136.\* Heusch, L. de 1972. *Le Roi Ivre ou L'Origine de L'Etat* (Les Essais CLXXIII). Paris: Gallimard
137. Hilger, M. I. 1954. An ethnographic field method. In *Method and Perspective in Anthropology*, ed. F. Spencer. Minneapolis: Univ. Minnesota Press
138. Hilger, M. I. 1966. *Huenun Namku: an Araucanian Indian of the Andes Remembers the Past*. Norman: Univ. Oklahoma Press
139. Hill, R. B. 1972. *The Strengths of Black Families*. New York: Emerson Hall
- 140.\* Hodgson, M. T. 1964. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press

141. Hogbin, I. 1970. *The Island of Menstruating Men*. Scranton: Chandler
142. Holt, C. 1967. *Art in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press
143. Holt, C. 1972. *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. Cornell Univ. Press
144. Homans, G. C., Schneider, D. M., 1955. *Marriage, Authority, and Final Causes*. Glencoe: Free Press
- 145.\* Horton, R. 1960. A definition of religion and its uses. *J. Roy. Anthropol. Inst. Gt. Brit. Ireland* 90:201-26
146. Ianni, F. A. 1972. *A Family Business: Kinship and Social Control in Organized Crime*. New York: Sage Found.
- 147.\* Jarvie, I. C. 1964. *The Revolution in Anthropology*. New York: Humanities Press
148. Jochelson, W. 1908. *Material Culture and Social Organization of the Koryak*. Mem. Am. Mus. Natur. Hist. 10, part 2. Leiden: Brill
- 149.\* Kay, P., Ed. 1971. *Explorations in Mathematical Anthropology*. Cambridge: MIT Press
150. Kroeber, A. L., Ed. 1953. *Anthropology Today*. Univ. Chicago Press
151. Kroeber, T. 1970. *Alfred Kroeber*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press
- 152.\* Kronenberg, A. 1972. *Logik und Leben*. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag
153. Kuhn, T. S. 1968. *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*. Univ. Chicago Press
154. Kunst, J. 1949. *The Cultural Background of Indonesian Music*. Amsterdam: Indish Inst.
155. Kunz, R. M., Fehr, H., Eds. 1972. *The Challenge of Life*. Basel, Stuttgart: Birkhäuser Verlag
156. Lambert, W. M., Minturn, L. 1964. *Mothers of Six Cultures: Antecedence of Child Rearing*. New York, London: Wiley
157. Land, G. *Transformation*. New York: Random House. In press
158. Lawrence, P. 1964. *Road Belong Cargo*. New York: Humanities Press
159. Leach, E. R. 1965. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. New York: Beacon (first publ. 1954)
160. Leach, E. R. 1970. *Claude Lévi-Strauss*. New York: Viking
161. Lee, R. B., De Vore, I., Eds. 1968. *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine
162. Leeds, A., von Foerster, H., Eds. 1965. *The Potentiality of Systems Theory for Anthropological Inquiry*. New York: Wenner-Gren Found. Anthropol. Res.
163. Lehman, F. K. 1959. *Some anthropological parameters of a civilization: The ecology and evolution of India's high culture*. PhD thesis. Columbia Univ., New York. 2 vols.
- 164.\* Lenneberg, E. H. 1967. *The Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley
165. Lévi-Strauss, C. 1961. *Tristes Tropiques: An Anthropological Study of Primitive Societies In Brazil*. New York: Atheneum (first publ. 1961 as *A World on the Wane*)
166. Lévi-Strauss, C. 1964-1971. *Mythologiques*. 4 vols. Paris: Plon.  
Vol.1: *Le Cru et le Cuit*  
Vol.2: *Du Miel aux Cendres*  
Vol.3: *L'Origine des Manières de Table*  
Vol.4: *L'Homme Nu*
167. Lévi-Strauss, C. 1972. Structuralism and ecology. *Barnard Alumnae Spring* issue: 6-14
168. Lewis, O. 1960. *Tepoztlan: Village in Mexico*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
169. Lewis, O. 1961. *The Children of Sanchez*. New York: Random House
170. Lewis, O. 1963. *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlan Restudied*. Urbana: Univ. Illinois Press (first publ. 1951)
171. Lewis, O. 1966. *La Vida*. New York: Random House
172. Lewis, O. 1966. The culture of poverty. *Sci. Am.* 215:19-25
173. Linton, A., Wagley, C. 1971. *Ralph Linton*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
174. Lomax, A., Ed. 1968. *Folksong Style and Culture* (Symp. Vol. 88). Washington: Am. Assoc. Advan. Sci.
175. Lomax, A. 1972. The evolutionary taxonomy of culture. *Science* 177:228-39
176. Lorenz, K. 1971. *Studies in Animal and Human Behavior*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
177. Luszki, M. B. 1958. *Interdisciplinary Team Research: Methods and Problems*. New York: University Press
178. McLuhan, M. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Univ. Toronto Press
179. McPhee, C. 1966. *Music in Bali*. New Haven, London: Yale Univ. Press
180. Malcolm, L. A. 1969. Growth and development of the New Guinea child. *Papua and New Guinea J.* 6:23-32
181. Malinowski, B. 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. New York: Harcourt, Brace
182. Mandelbaum, D. G. 1970. *Society in India*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press. 2 vols.
- 183.\* Marshack, A. 1972. *The Roots of Civilization*. New York: McGraw-Hill

184. Marshall, J., Gardner, R. 1958. *The Hunters*. 16 mm color film, sound (72 min). Cambridge: Film Study Center Peabody Mus., Harvard Univ.
185. Maybury-Lewis, D. 1968. *The Savage and the Innocent*. Boston: Beacon Press (first publ. 1965)
186. Mayer, P., Ed. 1970. *Socialization*. Scranton: Barnes & Noble
187. Mead, M. 1937. A Twi relationship system. *J. Roy. Anthropol. Inst. Gt. Brit. Ireland* 67:297-304
188. Mead, M. 1950. The comparative study of cultures and the purposive cultivation of democratic values, 1941-1949. In *Perspectives on a Troubled Decade: Science, Philosophy, and Religion, 1939-1949*, ed. L. Bryson, L. Finkelstein, R. M. McIver, 87-108. New York: Harper & Row
189. Mead, M. 1951. *Soviet Attitudes Toward Authority*. New York: McGraw-Hill
190. Mead, M. 1954. Research on primitive children. In *Manual of Child Psychology*, ed. L. Carmichael, 735-80. New York: Wiley. 2nd ed.
191. Mead, M., Ed. 1955. *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*. Mentor Books. New York: New Am. Libr. (first publ. 1953)
192. Mead, M. 1959. *An Anthropologist at Work: Writings of Ruth Benedict*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
193. Mead, M. 1961. Psychiatry and ethnology. In *Psychiatrie der Gegenwart: Forschung und Praxis, III: Soziale und Angewandte Psychiatrie*, ed. H. W. Gröhle et al, 452-70. Berlin: Springer
194. Mead, M. 1963. Anthropology and the camera. In *The Encyclopedia of Photography*, ed. W. D. Morgan, 166-84. New York: Greystone
195. Mead, M. 1963. Totem and Taboo reconsidered with respect. *Bull. Menninger Clin.* 27:185-99
196. Mead, M. 1964. *Continuities in Cultural Evolution*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
197. Mead, M. 1964. Vicissitudes of the study of the total communication process. In *Approaches to Semiotics*, ed. T. A. Sebeok, A. S. Hayes, M. C. Bateson, 277-87. The Hague: Mouton
198. Mead, M. 1966. *The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe*. Cap Giant 266, New York: Putnam (first publ. 1932)
199. Mead, M. 1966. *New Lives for Old: Cultural Transformation—Manus 1928-1953*, with new preface. Apollo Editions. New York: Morrow (first publ. 1956)
200. Mead, M. 1968. Cybernetics of cybernetics. In *Purposive Systems: Processes of the First Annual Symposium of the American Society for Cybernetics*, ed. H. von Foerster et al, 1-11. New York, Washington: Spartan Books
201. Mead, M. 1968. Incest. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. D. L. Sills, 7: 115-22. New York: Macmillan. 17 vols.
202. Mead, M. 1969. Crossing boundaries in social science communication. *Soc. Sci. Inform.* 8:7-15
203. Mead, M. 1969. From intuition to analysis in communication research. *Semiotica* 1:13-25
204. Mead, M. 1970. *Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap*. Garden City: Natural History Press & Doubleday
205. Mead, M. 1970. *Ethnicity and Anthropology in America*. Wenner-Gren Conf. Ethnic-Identity, Burg Wartenstein Symp. 51. To be published
206. Mead, M. 1972. *Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years*. New York: Morrow
207. Mead, M. Systems analysis and meta-communication. In *The World System*, ed. E. Laszlo. New York: Braziller. In press
208. Mead, M., Byers, P. 1968. *The Small Conference: An Innovation in Communication*. Paris, The Hague: Mouton
209. Mead, M., Chapple, E. D., Brown, G. G. 1949. Report of the committee on ethics. *Hum. Org.* 8:20-21
210. Mead, M., Dobzhansky, T., Tobach, E., Light, R. E., Eds. 1968. *Science and the Concept of Race*. New York, London: Columbia Univ. Press
211. Mead, M., Heyman, K. 1965. *Family*. New York: Macmillan
212. Mead, M., Macgregor, F. C. 1951. *Growth and Culture: A Photographic Study of Balinese Childhood*. New York: Putnam
213. Mead, M., Metraux, R., Eds. 1953. *The Study of Culture at a Distance*. Univ. Chicago Press
214. Mead, M., Metraux, R. 1965. The anthropology of human conflict. In *The Nature of Human Conflict*, ed. E. B. McNeil, 116-38. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall
215. Mead, M., Newton, N. 1967. Cultural patterning of perinatal behavior. In *Childbearing—Its Social and Psychological Aspects*, ed. S. A. Richardson, A. F. Guttmacher, 142-244. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins
216. Mead, M., Schwartz, T. 1960. The cult as a condensed social process. In *Group*



- Processes: Transactions of the Fifth Conference, October 12–15, 1958*, ed. Bertram Schaffner, 85–187. New York: Macy Found.
217. Meadows, D. et al 1972. *The Limits to Growth*. Washington: Potomac Assoc.
  218. Murdock, G. P. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan
  219. Murdock, G. P. 1967. *Ethnographic Atlas*. Univ. Pittsburgh Press
  220. Murdock, G. P. 1972. Anthropology's mythology. *Proc. Roy. Anthropol. Inst. Grt. Brit. Ireland for 1971*, 17–24
  221. Murphy, R. F. 1971. *The Dialectics of Social Life: Alarms and Excursions in Anthropological Theory*. New York: Basic Books
  222. Murphy, R. F. 1972. *Robert Lowie*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
  - 223.\* Nader, L., Ed. 1969. *Law in Culture and Society*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
  224. Naroll, R. 1970. What we have learned from cross-cultural surveys. *Am. Anthropol.* 72:1227–88
  225. Naroll, R., Cohen, R., Eds. 1970. *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*. Garden City: Natural History Press
  226. Norbeck, E. 1970. *Religion and Society in Modern Japan: Continuity and Change*. Houston: Rice Univ.
  227. Norbeck, E. 1971. Man at play. *Natur. Hist. Mag.* 80:48–53
  228. Norbeck, E., Walker, D. G., Cohen, M. 1962. The interpretation of Data: Puberty rites. *Am. Anthropol.* 64:463–85
  229. Norbeck, E. et al, Eds. 1968. *The Study of Personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
  - 230.\* Nurge, E., Ed. 1970. *Modern Sioux*. Lincoln: Univ. Nebraska Press
  231. Oliver, D. L. 1955. *A Solomon Island Society*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
  - 232.\* Ortiz, A. 1969. *The Tewa World*. Univ. Chicago Press
  - 233.\* Otterbein, K. F. 1970. *The Evolution of War: A Cross-Cultural Study*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Press
  - 234.\* Owusu, M. 1970. *Uses and Abuses of Political Power*. Univ. Chicago Press
  235. Payne, M. M. 1973. The Leakey tradition lives on. *Nat. Geogr. Mag.* 143: 143–44
  - 236.\* Peacock, J. L. 1968. *Rites of Modernization*. Univ. Chicago Press
  - 237.\* Pelto, P. J. 1970. *Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry*. New York: Harper & Row
  238. Pfeiffer, J. E. 1972. *The Emergence of Man*. New York: Harper & Row (first publ. 1969)
  239. Pietsch, P., Schneider, C. W. 1969. Brain transplantation in salamanders: An approach to memory transfer. *Brain Res.* 14:707–15
  240. Poggie, J., Lynch, R., Eds. *Modernization: Anthropological Approaches to Contemporary Socio-Cultural Change*. Westport: Greenwood. In press
  241. Pribram, K. H. 1969. The neurophysiology of remembering. *Sci. Am.* 220: 73–86
  242. Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1930. A system of notation for relationships. *Man* 30: 121–22
  243. Rappaport, R. A. 1968. *Pigs for the Ancestors*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
  244. Read, K. E. 1965. *The High Valley*. New York: Scribner
  245. Redfield, R. 1930. *Tepoztlan: A Mexican Village*. Univ. Chicago Press
  246. Redfield, R. 1962. *A Village that Chose Progress: Chan Kom Revisited*. Univ. Chicago Press (first publ. 1950)
  247. Redfield, R., Villa Rojas, A. 1962. *Chan Kom: A Maya Village*, abr. ed. Univ. Chicago Press
  248. Richardson, F. L. W., Ed. *Allegiance and Hostility: Man's Mammalian Heritage*. To be published
  - 249.\* Rigby, P. J. 1969. *Cattle and Kinship Among the Gogo*. Cornell Univ. Press
  - 250.\* Rivière, P. 1969. *Marriage Among the Trio*. London: Clarendon
  251. Rohner, R. P., Ed. 1969. *The Ethnography of Franz Boas*. Univ. Chicago Press
  252. Romanucci, L. *Violence, Morality and Conflict*. Palo Alto: National Press Books. In press
  - 253.\* Rosman, A., Rubel, P. G. 1971. *Feasting With Mine Enemy*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
  - 254.\* Sahlins, M. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton
  255. Schaffner, B., Ed. 1955–1960. *Group Processes*. New York: Macy Found. 5 vols.
  - 256.\* Schlegel, A. 1972. *Male Dominance and Female Autonomy*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Press
  257. Schneider, D. M. 1968. *The American Kinship*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall
  258. Schwartz, T. 1962. *The Paliau Movement in the Admiralty Islands, 1946–1954*. *Anthropol. Papers Am. Mus. Natur. Hist.* 49, Part 2
  259. Schwartz, T. 1963. Systems of aerial integration: Some considerations based

- on the Admiralty Islands of Northern Melanesia. *Anthropol. Forum* 1:26-97
260. Sebeok, T. A., Hayes, A. S., Bateson, M. C., Eds. 1964. *Approaches to Semiotics*. The Hague: Mouton
  261. Segall, M. H., Campbell, D. T., Herskovits, M. J. 1966. *The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception*. Indianapolis, New York: Bobbs-Merrill
  - 262.\* Selby, H. A. 1970. Continuities and prospects in anthropological studies. In *Current Directions in Anthropology*, ed. A. Fischer. *Bull. Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* 3:35-53
  - 263.\* Silverman, M. G. 1971. *Disconcerting Issue*. Univ. Chicago Press
  - 264.\* Simons, E. L. 1972. *Primate Evolution: An Introduction to Man's Place in Nature*. New York: Macmillan
  - 265.\* Singer, M. B. 1972. *When a Great Tradition Modernizes: An Anthropological Approach to Indian Civilization*. New York: Praeger
  - 266.\* Sinha, S. 1970. *Science, Technology, and Culture: A Study of the Cultural Traditions and Institutions of India and Ceylon in Relation to Science and Technology*. New Delhi: Res. Council. Cult. Stud., Munshiram Manoharlal
  267. Soddy, K., Ed. 1961. *Identity, Mental Health and Value Systems*. London: Tavistock
  268. Soddy, K., Ahrenfeldt, R. H. 1965. *Mental Health in a Changing World*. London: Tavistock
  269. Spicer, E. H. 1952. *Human Problems in Technological Change: A Casebook*. New York: Sage Found.
  270. Spindler, G. D., Ed. 1955. *Education and Anthropology*. Stanford Univ. Press
  271. Spindler, G. D. 1970. *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
  272. Steiner, S. 1968. *The New Indians*. New York: Harper & Row
  273. Stocking, G. W. Jr. 1968. *Race, Culture and Evolution*. New York: Free Press
  - 274.\* Strathern, M. 1972. *Women in Between: Female Roles in a Male World, Mount Hagen, New Guinea*. New York: Seminar Press (Academic)
  - 275.\* Sturtevant, W. C. 1964. Studies in ethno-science. *Am. Anthropol.* 66:99-131
  - 276.\* Sudnow, D., Ed. 1972. *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press
  277. Swidler, W. W. 1972. Some demographic factors regulating the formation of flocks and camps among the Brahui of Baluchistan. In *Perspectives on Nomadism*, ed. W. Irons, N. Dyson-Hudson. Leiden: Brill
  278. Tanner, J. M., Inhelder, B., Eds. 1956-1960. *Discussions on Child Development*. London: Tavistock. 4 vols.
  279. Tax, S., Ed. 1960. *Evolution After Darwin*. Univ. Chicago Press. 3 vols.
  280. Tax, S. et al, Eds. 1953. *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*. Univ. Chicago Press
  281. Texter, R. B., Ed. 1967. *Cross-Cultural Summary*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Press
  - 282.\* Thomas, K. 1971. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Scribner
  - 283.\* Tiger, L., Fox, R. 1971. *The Imperial Animal*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
  284. Tiselius, A., Nilsson, S., Eds. 1970. *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*. Nobel Symp. 14. New York: Wiley
  - 285.\* Tuden, A., Plotnicov, L. 1970. *Social Stratification in Africa*. New York: Free Press
  286. Turnbull, C. M. 1961. *The Forest People*. New York: Simon & Schuster
  287. Turnbull, C. M. 1972. *The Mountain People*. New York: Simon & Schuster
  288. Turner, V. W. 1967. *Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Cornell Univ. Press
  289. Turner, V. W. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine
  - 290.\* Tyler, S. A. 1969. *Cognitive Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
  291. Valentine, C. A. 1968. *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals*. Univ. Chicago Press
  292. Valentine, C. A. 1972. *Black Studies and Anthropology: Scholarly and Political Interests in Afro-American Culture*. Reading, Mass.: Modular Publ.
  293. Vayda, A. P. 1969. An ecologist in cultural anthropology. *Bucknell Rev.* March issue
  294. Vincent, J. 1971. *African Elite*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
  295. Vizedom, M. B. 1963. *The concept of rites of passage in the light of data from fifteen cultures*. PhD thesis. Columbia Univ., New York
  296. Vogt, E. 1961. *A model for the study of ceremonial organization in highland Chiapas*. Presented at 60th Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., Philadelphia
  297. Watson, J. B. 1963. A micro-evolution study in New Guinea. *J. Polynesian Soc.* 72:188-92

298. Watson, J. B., Kimball, S. T., Eds. 1971. *Crossing Cultural Boundaries*. San Francisco: Chandler
299. Wax, M. L., Diamond, S., Gearing, F., Eds. 1971. *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*. New York, London: Basic Books
300. Westlake, P. R. 1970. The possibilities of neural holographic processes within the brain. *Kybernetik* 7:129-53
301. White, L. A. 1959. *Evolution of Culture*. New York: McGraw Hill
302. White, L. A. 1963. *The Ethnography and Ethnology of Franz Boas*. Austin: Memorial Mus. Univ. Texas
303. White, L. A. 1966. *The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization*. New York: Grove Press (first publ. 1949)
304. Whiting, B. B., Ed. 1963. *Six Cultures: Studies of Child Rearing*. New York, London: Wiley
305. Williams, R. R. 1967. *Field Methods in the Study of Culture*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
306. Williams, T. R. 1972. *Introduction to Socialization: Human Culture Transmitted*. St. Louis: Mosby
307. Wolfe, A. W. 1963. The African mineral industry: Evolution of a supranational level of integration. *Soc. Probl.* 11:153-64
- 308.\* Young, M. W. 1972. *Fighting with Food*. Cambridge Univ. Press