

LETTERS

Women in Anthropology

Eliot Marshall, in his article on the Freeman-Mead controversy about Samoan morals (News and Comment, 4 Mar., p. 1042), asserts that Mead "was a figure in the women's movement as well, an especially impressive one because she had risen in a discipline that was almost exclusively male." Mead's feminist stance is unquestioned, but I take issue with the statement about her position in anthropology.

Robert H. Lowie, a student of Boas and contemporary of Mead, noted that "Women have made important contributions independently of Boas, but probably nowhere have they achieved so much work as under the stimulation of the Columbia [University] atmosphere—witness the publications of Drs. Elsie Clews Parsons, Ruth Benedict, Ruth Bunzel, Gladys Reichard, Erna Gunther, Margaret Mead, Gene Weltfish, Ruth Underhill" (1). Of this list, Ruth Benedict was chosen by Abram Kardiner with nine men (including Darwin, Malinowski, and Freud) in his survey of students of man, society, and culture (2). And Columbia was not the only locus of women in anthropology. Two women at the University of California, Berkeley, earned Ph.D.'s in the subject within a few years of Mead's (1929): A. H. Gayton (1928), among the first half-dozen from that department, and Cora DuBois in 1932. In the same period, Erna Gunther became chairman of anthropology at the University of Washington and director of the Washington State Museum, posts held for a third of a century. She went on to chair the department at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

I agree that women in anthropology do not, and did not, account for half the professional force, but they are likely no more underrepresented than in the physical and biological sciences, mathematics, and the other behavioral sciences.

ROBERT F. G. SPIER

Department of Anthropology,
University of Missouri, Columbia 65211

References

1. R. H. Lowie, *The History of Ethnological Theory* (Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1937), p. 134.
2. A. Kardiner and E. Preble, *They Studied Man* (World, New York, 1961).

A recent characterization (Book Reviews, 25 Feb., p. 957) of Elsie Clews Parsons as an "amateur" anthropologist could mislead those unaware she was president of the American Anthropological Association at her death in 1941, a

former president of the American Ethnological Society and the American Folklore Society, a former vice president of the New York Academy of Sciences, author of two dozen volumes of anthropological studies, and according to her obituary (1) "an unusually productive and painstaking scholar." To be sure, her own resources rather than an academic salary or grants funded her research, which included at least two dozen field trips among the Pueblo Indians in the Southwest, Zapotec Indians in Mexico, Peguchi in Ecuador, Micmacs in Nova Scotia, Kiowa and Caddo Indians in Oklahoma, and blacks in the Sea Islands, Bahamas, and West Indies. But defining her as an "amateur" as one might an unpaid athlete or dilettante does an injustice to her memory and her discipline.

H. MCILVAINE PARSONS

Human Resources Research
Organization, 300 North Washington
Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

References

1. F. Boas, *Science* 95, 89 (1942).

Alcoholism Studies

Now that the Dickens Independent Review Committee in Toronto has affirmed the personal and professional integrity of Mark and Linda Sobell, with regard to their early data on controlled drinking in alcoholics (News and Comment, 19 Nov., p. 771), we sincerely hope that further research on this and other treatment approaches will be forthcoming from clinical research centers in attempts to improve treatment for this difficult problem. We also hope that research into all possible methods holding some promise as effective and humane treatments will be explored and that the freedom of inquiry will not be inhibited by this unfortunate controversy. In addition, we firmly believe, in accordance with the ethical codes of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychiatric Association, that controversies such as this are most productively argued in our scientific journals rather than the lay press.

In view of the sensitivity of this issue, the implicit attack on the investigators' integrity, and the resulting storm of controversy following publication of the report by Mary L. Pendery *et al.* (9 July, p. 169), we express concern about *Science's* editorial decision to publish a reinterpretation of an original data set, or even some new data that contradict the original data set, *without simultaneous*

comment from the investigators concerned. We realize that this situation was an unusual one that was complicated by possible legal actions. However, as editors of clinical-research-oriented journals*, we believe that the course of action followed, particularly when there are strong disagreements for whatever reasons, can give a very biased, one-sided picture of this issue which makes objective evaluation difficult. By following this course of action, science has not been advanced.

DAVID H. BARLOW

Department of Psychology, State
University of New York, Albany 12222

ALAN S. BELLACK

Department of Psychiatry,
Medical College of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia 19129

ALEXANDER M. BUCHWALD

Department of Psychology, Indiana
University, Bloomington 47405

SOL L. GARFIELD

Department of Psychology,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

DONALD P. HARTMANN

Department of Psychology, University
of Utah, Salt Lake City 84112

C. PETER HERMAN

Department of Psychology,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1, Canada

MICHEL HERSEN

Western Psychiatric Institute and
Clinic, University of Pittsburgh
School of Medicine, Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania 15261

PETER M. MILLER

Sea Pines Behavioral Institute,
Sea Pines Plantation, Hilton Head
Island, South Carolina 29928

S. RACHMAN

Department of Psychology,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver V6T 1W5, Canada

JOSEPH WOLPE

Department of Psychiatry,
Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19129

*The authors are editors, respectively, of the following journals: *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis and Behavior Therapy*; *Clinical Psychology Review* (co-editor); *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*; *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*; *Behavioral Assessment*; *Journal of Personality*; *Clinical Psychology Review* (co-editor); *Addictive Behaviors*; *Behaviour Research and Therapy*; and *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*.

In the absence of criticism of experiments and replication of results, the integrity of science would be destroyed. The overwhelming majority of scientists understand this, and most cooperate with those who challenge the validity of their work. The behavior of the Sobells with respect to the research report by