SCIENCE

VOL. 83 FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1936 No. 2149

SCIENCE: A Weekly Journal devoted to the Advancement of Science, edited by J. MCKEEN CATTELL and published every Friday by

THE SCIENCE PRESS

New York City: Grand Central Terminal
Lancaster, Pa. Garrison, N. Y.

Annual Subscription, $6.00 Single Copies, 15 Cts.

SCIENCE is the official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Information regarding membership in the Association may be secured from the office of the permanent secretary, in the Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D. C.

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGISTS[1]

By Dr. MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE anthropologist, in following the dictum that the proper study of mankind is man, must inevitably answer the questions that arise from the related fact that, in the last analysis, mankind's greatest curiosity is also man. And to-day, when this natural curiosity is reinforced by the pragmatic philosophy of our time, it has become increasingly difficult for students of humankind to maintain the detachment of the scientist who works with non-human materials.

Faced with the brilliant examples of the successful application of results of research in the fields of the physical, natural and medical sciences, there are those who emphasize the desirability and the urgency of producing like results in the study of man. What, in the final analysis, they ask, validates the ends of science, and the support given the scientist by society, if it is not to point the way to immediate gains accruing from the work thus supported? How justify his withdrawal to the ivory tower, where, occupied with his researches, the worker seemingly ignores all those facets of his work that impinge on the practical problems of contemporary life? The issues raised by these questions are not lacking in importance. For in considering them, not only are we concerned with the problem of the aims of pure science and the obligation of the scientist to society, but also with the never-ending problems of the relationship between the scientist and the engineer, the thinker and the doer, the planner and the executive. And it is some of the implications of

[1] Address of the vice-president and chairman of the Section of Anthropology, American Association for the Advancement of Science, St. Louis, January 3, 1936.

these questions, as they bear upon the field of anthropology and the work of American anthropologists, that it is proposed to examine at this time.

Recent use of the term "applied anthropology" has defined the studies of cultural life of primitive folk rather than those branches of the discipline having to do with physical type or with prehistory or linguistics. The practical applications of physical anthropology were illuminatingly and carefully set forth last year in the address of my predecessor in this office,[2] when the importance of recent techniques and discoveries in the fields of growth and development of children was demonstrated for those concerned with the practical problems of child care. In the field of race differences or the classification of racial types, however, there are few who would not hesitate to set down positive programs of action on the basis of present-day knowledge. Indeed, such contributions as they make to practical affairs of race are in the nature of the case principally negative. Theirs is the word of caution in drawing conclusions about race, and the refutation of "principles" of race advanced by those not sufficiently versed in the subject. In the main, then, it can be said that the shield of the traditions of the natural sciences makes it possible for the physical anthropologist to work in the seclusion of the laboratory and emerge only to administer a rebuke to those who would go too fast in drawing conclusions not as yet justified by the progress of the work.

Any analysis of what has come to be known as "applied anthropology," therefore, primarily involves applications of our ethnological knowledge, though the phrase "applied anthropology" itself has a twofold meaning. Chiefly, it describes those applications of anthropology that can be made and are made to the problems of administration and education confronting government officials, and others, who must deal with the primitive folk under their charge. A recent discussion of the relationship between anthropology and the administration of native peoples in New Guinea provides a useful definition of this type of applied anthropology:

> Anthropology, it is now agreed, must concern itself with the broad problem of the reconciliation of natives to the changes which must inevitably take place as a result of European contact. It must plan to help the people bridge the gulf between their primitive culture and the requirements of modern days; to ensure their social stability, economic welfare, and future progress. This is the task *par excellence* of anthropology as an applied science.[3]

The other meaning of the term involves those applications of anthropological knowledge that can be made, and are made but too infrequently, to problems of our own culture—a usage more in accord with the underlying intellectual assumptions implicit in the subject held by many anthropologists, and preponderantly by those in this country. A brief statement of the aims of this kind of application of anthropological knowledge is to be had in the following:

> . . . Some of the most firmly rooted opinions of our times appear from a wider point of view as prejudices, [but] a knowledge of anthropology enables us to look with greater freedom at the problems confronting our civilization. . . . A clear understanding of the principles of anthropology illuminates the social processes of our own times and may show us, if we are ready to listen to its teachings, what to do and what to avoid.[4]

It might well be argued that ideally there need be no cleavage between the two approaches. Yet the stress of the application of anthropology to the practical problems of the administration of primitive peoples that has such currency at the present time is a pragmatic problem in the extreme, and the anthropologist must be realist enough to see it as such. This pragmatic emphasis comes, logically enough, from those European countries which have great colonial empires, comprising populations of primitive folk the disregard of whose traditions brings on irritation, unrest and, if carried too far, demoralization. In this country, also, the new policies of the Indian Bureau give point and urgency to the question of the relationship that should obtain between a governmental agency attempting to put into effect a policy toward the Indians based on an understanding of Indian cultures, and the obligations of the anthropologists and potential rôle to be played by them in the situation.[5]

Yet even in this latter sense, more than one meaning is given the phrase "applied anthropology." On the one hand, there is the type of applied anthropology in which anthropological training is required for admission to the Colonial service. In this type, which may be spoken of as *indirect* application of anthropological knowledge, the anthropologist teaches those concerned with primitive folk the principles and facts of his subject, with perhaps some special reference to their particular problems. In the other, which may be called *direct* application of anthropology, the anthropologist himself goes into the field to study those aspects of primitive life which he is requested to study by an

[2] T. Wingate Todd, SCIENCE, 81: 2098, pp. 259–263, March 15, 1935.

[3] William C. Groves, *Oceania*, 6: 94, 1935.

[4] F. Boas, "Anthropology and Modern Life" (revised edition, pp. 3 and 11).

[5] Applied anthropology has afforded the subject-matter for the addresses of the president of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Professor J. L. Myres, in 1929 and 1931, and of the chairman of the Section of Anthropology of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Professor A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, at the Brisbane meetings of 1930. A section of Professor Brown's address as chairman of Section H of the British Association in 1931 was likewise devoted to the same topic.

administrator, answering specific problems put before him by a colonial official who may or may not use the data in formulating his policy toward native life. And just as the application of anthropology to the government of primitive peoples has been much more prominently discussed in recent years than its application to the understanding of our own problems, so, within the former category, the employment of anthropologists as aides and advisers to administrators has been much more to the fore than has been the question of the teaching of anthropology to officials. Because of this emphasis, we shall here principally touch upon this type of applied anthropology in making the assessment that is necessary if we are to see the problems that confront the American anthropologists.

Though the academic tradition holds that a devotion to knowledge is a valid enough end in itself, yet the drive to solve the pressing problems of humanity concerns the anthropologist as a citizen no less than it does his fellows. What form shall this concern take? Shall he hold to the long-term view or shall he accede to the demand that his work show immediate results? The case for the latter view has been clearly and succinctly put by Professor Malinowski:

> The slogan of complete academic independence is all very well, especially if it were the case of submitting science and teaching to political influences, but that the whole vast branch of study which ambitiously calls itself the Science of Man ought to remain completely aloof from the real troubles and difficulties which beset the management of one race by another, and their contacts and cooperations, this is surely an anomalous and unhealthy state of affairs.[6]

In this quotation, another important point is implied, for the obligation of the anthropologist is a dual one, arising out of the manner in which he must gather his data. Though as any other scientist, he must repay his debt to his own society, he also can not forget what he owes to the primitive peoples who give him the information without which his discipline could not exist. And in this, his situation is unique. The subject-matter of the ethnologist is the human being; to obtain his data he must make friends of the primitives he studies, and only to the extent that he does gain their confidence will his research be of value. Yet often he belongs to a political entity which has taken away the right of self-direction from the very people he is studying. He is a member of a group, whether he be European or American, whose superior technological achievements have enabled it to impose upon the primitive peoples under its control duties and obligations foreign to them; to insist that they take over moral, social and legal systems strange to their traditions; and to put upon them economic burdens under which they not only become restive, but to carry which their institutions must often be so drastically reorganized that a destruction of the patterns of living essential for an adjusted life is entailed. We must ask, therefore, to what extent an exact knowledge of the patterns of native life will actually permit the administrator to ease, in any fundamental sense, the burden on the natives he rules? May it not also aid him in fastening this burden more tightly upon them, if policy dictates such a course?

It would be unjust to claim that anthropologists who are concerned with the application of anthropology to the administration of primitive folk are actuated by any but the greatest sympathy with the natives. Nor is it to be denied that, faced with a situation in which the contact of native and European cultures is operating not only to demoralize the primitive folk, but in some cases to obliterate them, there is much reason for approaching the problem with the greatest political realism; for undertaking, whatever the cost, to cushion the clash of cultures to any degree possible, even though this may seem in some measure to further the interests of those who are responsible for the harm. This attitude has been well expressed in Professor Radcliffe-Brown's presidential address before the Australian and New Zealand Association:

> What one would like to see in such a region as the Mandated Territory would be a body of research workers engaged in the systematic study of the native social organization handing on their knowledge to an administration that would be able to decide on policies to be adopted. The effects of any policy could then be scientifically observed under control, and something approaching the laboratory methods of other sciences could be reached. A real experimental anthropology would be the result. If it is to be objected that we ought not to experiment in this way with human beings, the reply is that we are already experimenting, but the experiments are not scientifically conducted but are blind, made without any real knowledge of what the results are likely to be. While our present efforts often bring, instead of benefit, disaster to the people whom we govern, in the form of social disintegration or depopulation, a more scientifically controlled experimental policy would stand a much better chance of avoiding harm and giving them at least some benefits. One can feel quite certain that more knowledge of the nature of Indian culture and a proper grasp of the laws of social integration would have prevented our long experiment with India from reaching its present unsatisfactory position.[7]

Therefore, in analyzing the recent developments in the field of applied anthropology, it must be carefully remembered that the point at issue is an evaluation of wisdom of procedure, and of the amount of help that can be given the native by the anthropologist in apply-

[6] *Africa*, 3: 428, 1930.

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 12–13 (of reprint).

ing his knowledge to the problems in the ruling of primitive folk, rather than any assessment of underlying motivation.

The widest use of applied anthropology among colonizing powers has been in England and the Netherlands. In the case of the latter, and in much of the application of anthropological knowledge found in the former, this takes the indirect form of teaching those who are contemplating entering the colonial service;[8] or, from the point of view of the administration, of making anthropological training requisite to appointment. It is not necessary here to trace the development of a sentiment, both among anthropologists and colonial officials, in favor of such training, for the addresses of Professor Myres, especially that of 1929, have done this in great detail,[9] as has the discussion of Professor Seligman in the most recent edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.[10] Both these, however, emphasize the indirect application of anthropology to the problems of governing native folk. Indeed, even where the direct approach is mentioned, it goes no further than recommendations for the appointment of government anthropologists; as where Professor Seligman, commenting on the fact that

> All governments have their experts in geology, botany, agriculture and zoology in its many branches; it is a strange paradox that so often man alone should be unstudied. . .

recommends

> In order to save the backward races from extinction and enable them to adapt to new circumstances two courses seem advisable: (*a*) that all government servants, and others—especially missionaries—coming into direct contact with natives should take as a part of their preparatory studies a course in anthropology; (*b*) that every government should appoint trained anthropologists, in order to make detailed investigations and to act, when needed, as advisers to the administration.[11]

Professor Myres' 1931 presidential address was delivered at a time when, as will be shortly seen, the direct application of anthropological knowledge to colonial problems had already been strongly and specifically urged. Yet in it, he comments approvingly on the decision of the Government of the Gold Coast—"one of the first to appoint an official anthropologist"—not to name a successor to its retiring anthropological officer, but to appoint selected political officers to carry on the work on the basis of further training in anthropology, these men being expected to regard their anthropological work "more in the nature of a pleasurable pursuit than of a duty." Professor Myres says:

> Here we have already, in principle the substance of all that our Institute has been recommending for so many years; and it is to be hoped that the wise decision of the Government of the Gold Coast may before long be generally adopted elsewhere.

His only other observation on this decision concerns the manner in which these data are to be utilized—and here the interests of the scholar, rather than of the man of practical affairs, are put to the fore:

> . . . With any considerable number of district officers regarding anthropological study "more in the nature of a pleasurable pursuit than of a duty," there will soon be need for someone, in the Colonial Secretariate or the Department of Native Affairs, to give his whole time to the valuable material that will be concentrated there. . . . Every Colony, too, will assuredly feel the need, in time, of some such bulletin of the more generally important items, as the *Native Affairs Department Annual* ("NADA") in Southern Rhodesia.[12]

Similarly, in the case of New Guinea, recent publications stress the importance of indirect application of anthropology to colonial problems rather than that of the professional anthropologist acting as an aide to the administrator, though government anthropologists are also employed in this region.[13]

In indirect applied anthropology, the anthropologist functions merely as a teacher. As such, he is, in any event, bound to teach all who come to him for instruction who can qualify intellectually; and there are few who teach anthropology, either in this country or in Europe, who have not had in their classes students who were to go to the far corners of the earth. As a teacher, the anthropologist gives his students the facts of primitive civilization, inculcating in them at the same time an understanding of the processes of human culture and, concomitantly, a respect for all human civilizations. Once these students leave his classes, he can not, of course, exercise control over the use they make of that knowledge. And it may well be that one factor in the development of the movement toward a more direct application of anthropology was the recognition by those who have taught prospective colonial officials, missionaries and teachers, of their inability to exert continued influence over their students once they had assumed their posts in the field.

The feeling that a direct application of anthropological knowledge, by anthropologists, offers the most

[8] This is also the case with such "applied anthropology" as is found in France.

[9] J. L. Myres, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 59: 19–52, 1929; *ibid.*, 61: xxv–xli, 1931.

[10] C. G. Seligman, s. v. "Anthropology, Applied," 14th ed.

[11] *Loc. cit.*

[12] *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii.

[13] E. P. W. Chinnery, "Anthropology and administration in the Mandated Territory of New Guinea" (abstract). Proceedings, 1st International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, London, 1934, pp. 286–287.

advantageous manner of attacking the problem of cushioning the contacts of primitive folk with European culture was crystallized in a paper from the pen of Professor Malinowski, published in 1929, and which set forth the position as follows:

> It is the thesis of this memorandum that there exists an anthropological No-man's-land; that in this are contained studies of primitive economics, primitive jurisprudence, questions of land tenure, of indigenous financial systems and taxation, a correct understanding of the principles of . . . indigenous education, as well as wider problems of population, hygiene and changing outlook. Scientific knowledge on all these problems is more and more needed by all practical men in the colonies. This knowledge could be supplied by men trained in anthropological methods and possessing the anthropological outlook, provided that they also acquire a keen interest in the practical applications of their work, and a keener sense of present-day realities.[14]

That the problems indicated have suffered neglect no one would deny, and in this summons to anthropologists to attack them Professor Malinowski has performed an undoubted service to anthropology. Moreover, academic anthropologists would agree with the statement that such knowledge may be pointed toward greater usefulness to administrators, especially were the studies of the well-rounded type whose advocacy is so intimately associated with the name of the author of the above quotation. Yet, from this point onward, the realistic view of the situation—pointed particularly toward Africa, since the memorandum and much of the work resulting from it have reference to the peoples of that continent—sharply differentiates his approach from all others.

After a discussion of direct and indirect rule,[15] in which it is stated that ". . . if we define dependent rule as the control of Natives through the medium of their own organisation, it is clear that only dependent rule can succeed," the end of the government of natives is set forth: "The government of any race consists . . . in implanting in them ideas of right, of law and order, and making them obey such ideas." Therefore,

> Indirect cultural control is the only way of developing economic life, the administration of justice by Native to Natives, the raising of morals and education on indigenous lines, and the development of truly African art, culture, and religion.

[14] B. Malinowski, *Africa*, 2: 23, 1929.

[15] It is impossible in the time and space available here to consider the tremendous influence that the principle of "indirect rule" of native peoples, as enunciated by Lord Lugard and extended in practice by Sir Donald Cameron, have had on the crystallization of sentiment in favor of the direct application of anthropology to administration, particularly in Great Britain. For one of the most recent discussions of the subject, see M. Perham, *Africa*, 7: 321–334, 1934.

The major portion of the discussion which follows considers the manner in which the study of the neglected problems mentioned above can be of service to the administrator. Native political organization, obviously, is of importance, and the consequences of leaving this field almost untouched are shown to have been serious in the light of administrative needs. Thus, even for the more complex African states, while these

> can be allowed to run on their own lines . . . they have to be first expurgated and then controlled. Now it is essential to touch as little as possible of the established order, and yet to eliminate all elements which might offend European sensibilities or be a menace to good relations.[15a]

And it is the rôle of the scientific student of primitive politics to show the administrator what can be retained to advantage and what is to be eradicated.

Again, land tenure is basic. After sketching the correct procedure to be followed in making definite studies and stating that "it is only the anthropologist, who specializes in the study of primitive legal ideas and economic conditions who is competent to deal with this question," the advantages to the administrator of obtaining such exact knowledge are given:

> Such an inquiry would not easily alarm the Native. He would often be not even aware that you are trying to take a survey of land tenure. In the second place such a survey would not only reveal the real legal rights of the individuals, it would also answer the often more important question of how the lands are used and what is the "indispensable minimum" which must be reserved for them.[16]

A similarly realistic approach is maintained toward the study of native canons of work, where the necessity of knowing the drives that motivate native labor are set forth. Mentioning the harm done by the Canadian policy of suppressing the pot-latch (numberless and even more harmful examples from American policy could also be cited), Professor Malinowski says:

> Forced labour, conscription or voluntary labour contracts, and the difficulties of obtaining sufficient numbers —all these form another type of practical difficulties in the colonies. The chief trouble is to entice the Native or persuade him to keep him satisfied while he works for the white man; and last but not least to prevent the period of work having bad consequences on his health and morale as well as on the temporarily depleted village and home.

And while there are those who might not accept the statement that "the simplest experience teaches that work . . . is prima facie unpleasant," it is doubtlessly

[15a] Malinowski's footnote at this point reads: "An enlightened anthropologist or statesman has to take count of European stupidity and prejudice quite as fully as those of the African." *Op. cit.*, pp. 24–25.

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 31–32.

accurate that "a study of primitive conditions shows that very efficient work can be obtained, and the Natives can be made to work with some degree of real satisfaction if propitious conditions are created for them." The rôle of the anthropologist is thus suggested:

> In every community I maintain there are such indigenous means of achieving more intensive labour and greater output, and it is only necessary to study the facts in order to apply efficient incentives.[17]

With the phrase "A new branch of anthropology must sooner or later be started: the anthropology of the changing native. . . ." Malinowski comes to his conclusions concerning the need for practical applications of anthropological knowledge to colonial administration.[18]

The repercussions of this memorandum were far-reaching. It was not long before a reply from a "practical man"[19] drew the author's fire in defense of his position,[20] and so effective was the defense that this same "practical man" instituted the first experiment in direct applied anthropology that has been fully reported on to date.[21]

In this experiment, which was carried on in Tanganyika Territory, an anthropologist and an administrator joined forces under the terms of an agreement laid down by Mr. P. E. Mitchell, the chief secretary of the Colony. The nature of the experiment is outlined in his introduction to the book. Assuming that the work is based on the policy of indirect rule, the administrator, in order to implement his task of carrying on an administrative system, "deriving from and resting on local organisations, loyalties, and traditions, but compelled by the supervision of a trained British staff to assure to the people proper standards of security, honesty, justice, and efficiency,"[22] asks the anthropologist questions, and the anthropologist answers them on the basis of field research.

> It must clearly remain the responsibility of the administrator to decide whether to act or intervene in consequence of information so obtained, but he would be careful not to dispute, or be drawn into argument about, its correctness, for that is the responsibility of the anthropologist. The anthropologist for his part would abstain from expressing agreement or disagreement with the actions of the administrator, but not from describing their effects; he would not advocate or condemn particular courses, though he would describe their advantages or faults; his principal concern would be to answer to the best of his ability the questions put to him.[23]

With their mandate clear, then, the anthropologist and the political officer worked for a period of one year. The results, as might be expected from so short a trial, were anything but conclusive, as the authors of the report themselves are careful to state. Yet certain points do emerge from their experimentation. That every particular culture presents special problems which make it difficult to envisage the development of an applied anthropology on other than an *ad hoc* basis is suggested, and in like manner, that there are various possible kinds of applications of anthropology:

> Missionaries, employers of native labour, teachers, and all others who have to deal with primitive peoples in any comprehensive manner, will have their own specific problems and will require relevant information for their solution.[24]

Still other comments concern procedures to be adopted in the field; one methodological point, however, has special significance:

> It has been suggested that an anthropologist, beginning work in collaboration with the administration in a new tribal area, should be given a status which would rank him as an official in the eyes of the native. We do not believe that this would be desirable. In East Africa there might be a small initial advantage in possessing a status easily recognizable by the natives, but it would result in many lost opportunities in the end. African natives recognize as well as any one else that District Officers have duties which they can not disregard, and that they must take action on receipt of certain information; therefore many facts would be, and as a matter of fact are, concealed from them. The anthropologist suffers from no such handicap. He learns many things that natives are afraid to tell the District Officer; and the accumulation of such facts is a necessary part of the information required for a true understanding of any culture. We suggest, therefore, that the anthropologist should forego the possible initial advantage of pseudo-official rank, for the sake of the much greater advantages to come.[25]

The assumption in this frank discussion—if one may be permitted a crude illustration—is that the rôle of the anthropologist, in helping assuage a difficult social situation, is like that of the lawyer who seeks the confidence of his client, with the implicit understanding

[17] *Op. cit.*, pp. 35–36.
[18] *Op. cit.*, pp. 36–38.
[19] P. E. Mitchell, *Africa*, 3: 217–223, 1930.
[20] Malinowski, *Africa*, 3: 405–429, 1930. It is not possible in the space at hand to analyze either of these papers, or even mention the other numerous discussions provoked by them, since they have added little to Malinowski's original contentions. They are to be found, in the main, in such journals as *Africa* and the *Journal of the African Society*.
[21] G. Gordon Brown and A. McD. Bruce Hutt, "Anthropology in Action," London, 1935.
[22] *Op. cit.*, p. xi.
[23] *Op. cit.*, pp. xvii–xviii. On page 4, however, the authors state that "the administrator must accept the information as given, even if it necessitates an unexpected change in his plans."
[24] *Op. cit.*, p. 239.
[25] *Op. cit.*, pp. 235–236.

that he is to defend him, yet at the same time must furnish all privileged information to prosecution and presiding judge. The answer, of course, to those who do not admit that this is a proper rôle for an anthropologist to play, may always be that of Professor Radcliffe-Brown already quoted—that since primitive peoples under European rule have no control over their own affairs, a benevolent intervention is better than no intervention at all.

When an attempt is made to evaluate this new "direct" type of applied anthropology in terms of charting a course in this country, two questions present themselves. What can it do for the native? What effect will it have on the science of anthropology and on anthropologists?

That applied anthropology can, in certain minor aspects of cultural contact, soften the impact of conquest and its results on native peoples would certainly seem to be the case. The example of the manner in which Dr. Gordon Brown's investigation of the Hehe afforded the basis for a recommendation that a plural wives' tax be revoked and an older system of a uniform single tax be reinstated indicates how a source of irritation might be corrected.[26] Yet when we come to a possible solution of anything other than these minor problems, in situations such as are found in Africa, in the Far East, and in the islands of the Pacific, we must admit the powerlessness of the anthropologist. The administrator is there to preserve law and order among the native peoples under his control; he is there to see that the proper supply of native labor is maintained, that produce flows to the controlling country, that the colonial market for goods produced at home is preserved. In the same fashion, given all the good will in the world toward native cultures, the missionary is there to preach the truth as he sees it, and the educator to inculcate new patterns of behavior. Behind all these, moreover, is the pressure of opinion at home; nor can the attitudes which those who administer or teach have themselves absorbed from their own early training be overlooked.[27]

Perhaps it is the counsel of despair that bids the anthropologist hold off from any overt action in what are often the tragic situations which his work in the field has caused him to understand only too well. Perhaps it is the counsel of perfection that bids him hesitate because he can be so little effective in the face of the great social and economic forces that move toward the disintegration of the patterns of primitive life. Yet there is more than this. Certain assumptions which underlie the call for direct applications of anthropology to native administration may themselves be questioned. Is it not possible that native cultures have more vitality than they are credited with, and resist direction to a greater degree than is assumed? And, if so, may they not of themselves withstand the onslaught of European contact far better than is commonly held? May not the activities of the anthropologist hold only minor significance in the light of the reluctance of peoples to change their habits of life even where the attempt is made to bring about such changes under the most expert direction?

The effects of a too fervent practice of applied anthropology on anthropology as a discipline and on anthropologists must also be examined. On this point the words of a great economist may be quoted with profit:

> . . . Though we are bound, before entering on any study, to consider carefully what are its uses, we should not plan out our work with direct reference to them. For by so doing we are tempted to break off each line of thought as soon as it ceases to have an immediate bearing on that particular aim which we have in view at the time: the direct pursuit of practical aims leads us to group together bits of all sorts of knowledge, which have no connection with one another except for the immediate purposes of the moment; and which throw but little light on one another. Our mental energy is spent in going from one to another; nothing is thoroughly thought out; no real progress is made.[28]

No better illustration of this could be had than that embodied in the study of the Hehe by Dr. Gordon Brown, which though containing valuable information on certain aspects of their life, shows such gaps in several important fields, that for those who hold that to know a culture at all one must know it in the interrelationship of all its parts the work takes on a quality of expediency that materially lessens its scientific usefulness.

If we turn to the possible applications of anthropology which can be made in the United States, we must examine both the immediate and the long-term results in the light of the total situation. Our situation is unique, for we are "unembarrassed by imperial responsibilities"—to quote Professor Myres' apt phrase—that lie in the path of anthropologists in other lands. To-day in this country, as nowhere else in the world, we find government unequivocably on the side of the native. That this is true is undoubtedly due in large measure to the fact that the Indian is no longer a social or political force to be reckoned with. There are not enough Indians to allow large-scale economic exploitation, nor do they afford enough potential man-power for industry or the army to allow these factors to enter. This combination of circumstances makes it possible for the American anthropologist to work

[26] Brown and Hutt, *op. cit.*, pp. 201–204.

[27] The implications of this latter point of view have been developed in a paper by F. Clarke in *Africa*, 5: 158–168, 1932.

[28] Alfred Marshall, "Principles of Economics" (8th ed.), p. 39.

whole-heartedly with the Indian Office. Thus he is prepared to cooperate in advising on problems of land-tenure, knowing that the end in view is to obtain more land and better land for the Indians, and not to ascertain that "irreducible minimum" which can be left to the native, as is the problem of the administrative advisers in Africa. But we must have a care, nevertheless, that aid given the Indian Office does not in some future administration stimulate an urge for retrenchment that might bring about the absorption of that distinctive governmental organization of a purely scientific anthropological character, the Bureau of American Ethnology, by that other governmental agency whose concern is the practical one of administering to the needs of the Indians.

Nor must we be forgetful of that other type of applied anthropology, whose application is to our own problems. From a purely sporting point of view, so to speak, it is here that we have the best right to make ourselves heard, inasmuch as the experimental results of our advice can react only upon ourselves, and not on some primitive folk. And if our contribution at present still remains less positive than some would have it, we can make it with the knowledge that eventually it will be more positive, and surer, and when given, will carry power. One such "application" is particularly pertinent. In our university classes, the anthropological point of view is being daily presented to students who come to the subject with open minds. Whether these students be future administrators of colonies, or citizens who stay at home, the broadening influence of the realization that all human culture has its special dignity, and that the invasion of one culture by another, and the imposition of the patterns of one people upon another, is an affront to this dignity, must, in time, have its effect. Is it not here that the really important use of our knowledge can be made, rather than in the *ad hoc* advice we may, as experts, give administrators of native folk?

The answer, for the American anthropologist, must be unequivocal. The opportunity to aid those on whose side we should be ranged in the conflicts arising from the clash of cultures of unequal strength happens to make it advisable at the moment for us to grasp the opportunity to give direction to those who have the power as well as the will to better the conditions of Indian life. Let it be recognized, however, that we do this with the understanding in our own minds and in the minds of those whom we are advising that for us as scientists the search for truth must come before all else. The debt we owe the society that supports us must be made in terms of long-time payments, in our fundamental contributions toward an understanding of the nature and processes of culture and, through this, to the solution of some of our own basic problems.

OBITUARY

ALBERT SPEAR HITCHCOCK

ALBERT SPEAR HITCHCOCK, the eminent agrostologist, died on December 16, 1935, on board the S.S. *City of Norfolk,* homeward bound from Europe with his wife. He had attended the International Botanical Congress at Amsterdam as a delegate and remained in Europe studying the grass collections in several large herbaria. After a heart attack on the 14th the end came quietly, his wife beside him, on the morning of December 16.

He was born on September 4, 1865, at Owasso, Michigan, grew up in Nebraska and Kansas, attended Iowa State Agricultural College, where he was a student of Professor Charles E. Bessey and of Professor Herbert Osborn, graduating in 1884, the youngest of his class. He was appointed assistant in chemistry for 1885 and took post-graduate courses in chemistry and other sciences and continued work in botany under Professor B. D. Halstead, Professor Bessey's successor. In the fall of 1886, just 21 years old, he was appointed instructor of chemistry at the State University, Iowa City. In 1889 he gave up this position to go to the Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, under Dr. W. Trelease, as instructor in botany in Washington University and curator of the herbarium.

In 1890 began his career as botanical explorer and productive taxonomist. The first trip was one of three months' duration to the West Indies, with Dr. J. T. Rothrock, of the University of Pennsylvania, and two young assistants.

In January, 1892, he was appointed professor of botany and botanist to the experiment station at the Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas, remaining there nine years. Several vacations during these years Professor Hitchcock spent botanizing in Florida.

In March, 1901, he went to Washington as assistant chief of the Division of Agrostology, of which Professor F. Lamson-Scribner was chief. The work was mostly economic, and in the course of his work he traveled through the southeastern states, and from Colorado and Wyoming to the Pacific Coast.

Professor Hitchcock was assigned work on control of sand dunes, and in October was sent to Europe to investigate methods in use. He visited the dune regions of Europe and published the results in the Bureau of Plant Industry Bulletin 57.