The History and Philosophy of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY

by Sol Tax

In recording in 1964 the origin and development of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY, I draw extensively and verbatim from the “Pre-issue” and the 24 “Letters to Associates” which have been inserted into and distributed to Associates in CA (Table 1) and No. 25 which was separately sent in July, 1964. Since they are not part of the journal itself, hence neither indexed nor found in libraries, this is a means to bring them into the formal record.

Plates I and II are reproduced from the Pre-issue; the first is my original version of the History of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY until the summer of 1959; the second is the 1st “Letter to Associates,” outlining the projected character of the enterprise and raising issues for discussion by Associates.

To describe the history and philosophy of CA in terms of its issues and policies, as they have developed, is also to provide an agenda for continuing discussion. CA began with a question posed to scholars over the world: How could the Wenner-Gren Foundation help to maintain communication among all students of mankind? The answer came after discussion among many hundreds on five continents. The scholars of the world through a new kind of journal would exchange knowledge and information useful to one another. To serve these ends the scholars themselves would set policies by free communication through an editor. There would be no committees, no boards, no bureaucracy; the voice of each Associate would be equal.

Has the subsequent development lived up to the stated philosophy? After 5 years, where is CA? These questions are answered by reproducing the more pertinent excerpts from Letters to Associates in which as Editor I reported the issues as they developed, under 3 main headings:

1. Associates, the Editor, and a Community of Scholars . . . . . . . . 242-250
2. Evolution of CA Features
   Beginnings (from the pre-issue) Plate III . . 251-252
   Review Articles and CA* Treatment . . . 252-255
   Book Reviews . . . . 255-256
   Reprinted Articles (including Plate IV) . . 256
   Departments and Novelties . . . . 256-257
3. Special Projects and Problems
   The CA Dictionaries 259
   Ph.D. Dissertations . . 259-260
   Directory of Anthropological Institutions . 260-261
   Selection of Viking Medalist . . . . . . . . . 261-263
   International Directory of Anthropologists . 263-264
   Anthropology and World Affairs . . . . 264-265
   Problems of Language 265-268
   Abstracts . . . . . . . . 269
   Advice from Associates 269

The reader is invited to examine the original documents and to form his own conclusions. But since every word that follows has been filtered through me, there is another set of “facts” that in retrospect I should add as relevant to any objective history:

I recall that as Editor of the American Anthropologist from 1953-1956 I thought seriously enough of a world journal to bring to the IVth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (Philad.-
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delphia, U.S.A. 1956) a plan for a journal to be called *Humana*. Possibly the idea of the community of individual scholars was independently in mind; I recall (in 1957?) asking a UN official for precedents, and being told that all international non-Governmental associations joined national groups in some way, rather than individuals; he could not then think of an exception from which I might learn.

The history of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY as given in the Pre-issue of September 1959, and reproduced here, is given from the point of view of the Wenner-Gren Foundation. When I was asked to carry on the Yearbook tradition in some form, I did not consciously see it as an opportunity to develop either a world journal or a community of scholars. When Paul Fojas persuaded me to assume the editorship of the “Yearbooks” and I talked about developing over several years an encyclopaedia, he might well have known better than I what was to be the eventual result.

My first idea was to publish 5 biennial yearbooks which would complete the “inventory of anthropological knowledge” begun in the book *Anthropology Today*, and update it. In effect we would in 10 years produce a new encyclopedia of review articles and reference materials. But it would be the profession—the whole world community of scholars—which would decide the content of the encyclopedia. Thus I undertook the series of conferences which eventuated in the Conference at Burg Wartenstein where the idea of an open ended journal rather than a closed encyclopedia crystallized. The conception until then had required that somebody make decisions as to the nature and boundaries of the discipline; otherwise how fit it between covers? I rejected my own right as Editor to make such decisions; was I not rather asking this to be a project of all relevant scholars? It was perhaps inevitable therefore that the dilemma should be resolved with an institution like CA today—a changing journal through which individual scholars speak to one another and thus develop a community of scholars which in turn determines the policy of the journal. But did not this resolution stem from my own personality; from my strong and optimistic belief in humanity, community, and democracy; from my rejection of the role of authoritarian decision-maker?

Thus, although CA did develop out of the conferences, as described in the documents, had somebody else piloted the projects, the outcome doubtless would have been different.

This does not however matter in considering the issues and alternatives which face us in this on-going experiment in scholarship. Every decision that has been made, consciously or without discussion, is open always to review.

The present document is designed for such review and discussion.

1. ASSOCIATES, THE EDITOR, AND A COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

January 1960

Who Are Associates? The original idea of an Associate in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY is that he is a contributing scholar, one of a co-operating group. To be an Associate clearly is an “honor,” so that Associates should be chosen with careful criteria in mind. However, the criteria to be applied have practical or functional significance. Associates are supposed to help one another. If a scholar who could be helpful is not included, a resource is lost; so we must be “open.” Likewise, an Associate who is not a responsible scholar can hurt rather than help the development of science; so we must be “restrictive.”

There are two axes along which judgment must be exercised. First, there is the scholarly quality of the person nominated to be an Associate. We have never been able to define criteria here. In conferences over the world the tendency arose to be ad hoc in the matter. Those invited to the conference were usually persons who should clearly be Associates, and they tended to suggest criteria for their country that would add similar people. Since the situation differs from place to place, it became more and more difficult to establish criteria for acceptance as an Associate.

At one time we used the word “professional” as a qualification, and in some places our colleagues, troubled by “amateurs,” indeed want to conceive of Associates as professional in status, whatever that means. A relevant letter from Ethel John Lindgren meanwhile warns us that use of the term “professional anthropologist” as a criterion might seriously limit all of us “if in theory and/or in practice, it became the sole guide to contributions and the solicitation of comments.” Lindgren refers us to the Royal Anthropological Institute Presidential Address of J. P. Mills, “Anthropology as a Hobby,” which points out the enormous scholarly contributions made by persons in government or church service, and by others who devote years to serious scholarship without having academic degrees in disciplines or earning their living from them. Mills’s paper is very worth reading, as are the comments by E. E. Evans-Pritchard and E. J. Lindgren that are published together with it (Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 83, Pt. I [1952]: 1-8).

The word “amateur” has two meanings. Sometimes it is a derogatory term for somebody who cannot perform well, and sometimes it means that the person does not earn money from the activity. An amateur tennis player can at any time “turn professional” and earn money from, rather than spend money on, his ability.

An Associate clearly must be one whose scholarship and reliability are unquestioned, and who has knowledge that we value. Nothing else should matter. The problem is to apply such a criterion. The Editor does not want, and could not properly exercise, the power to choose among our colleagues in all fields of knowledge over the world. We must depend upon the advice of others; and since opinions about people differ, we shall always be in trouble. When an Associate suggests the name of another for similar status, should we accept his judgment, or ask others in the same country and discipline? If they disagree, what should we do? Similarly, if a committee of colleagues has prepared a list of persons to be invited, and later we are informed that some were omitted from this list because of “politics” or factionalism, we cannot ignore the appeal, but also we cannot possibly investigate and make sound judgments. If there is an answer, we do not yet know it, and beg at once counsel and patience.

March 1960

Correspondence with Associates: Our editorial and office staff has grown to ten people, who keep records in
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Dr. Paul Fejos, Director of Research of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, from the beginning thought of the Foundation as international and interdisciplinary. The sciences of man could be separated neither by political boundaries nor by walls between different special sciences. On September 18, 1951, he proposed a Symposium at which scholars from nearby all major regions of the world would assess the accomplishments of anthropological science. Dr. Alfred L. Kroeber agreed to act as president of the symposium, and a committee of leading anthropologists was formed to plan the symposium. Eventually 50 scholars agreed to write papers reviewing knowledge in their special fields, and to do so in advance so that they could be studied by the participants. All of these papers were published as Anthropology Today (University of Chicago Press, 1953). On June 9, 1952, 81 scholars met at the Foundation to discuss these 50 “inventory papers.” They came from 21 different countries, and represented the widest range of branches of the study of man. They lived and talked together for two weeks. The discussions are reported in An Appraisal of Anthropology Today (University of Chicago Press, 1953). These books together describe the state of the anthropological sciences in 1952, and the directions in which studies were going.

At the same time appeared the International Directory of Anthropological Institutions, a reference work which describes the institutions and their scholars engaged in research and teaching.

The results of this 1952 International Symposium, on both the intellectual side, and the reference side, were so useful to scholars in the sciences of man that the demand was immediate that it be continued in some way. The Foundation therefore experimented with a Yearbook of Anthropology, which would contain both scholarly and reference materials which would keep us all informed of the worldwide progress of knowledge in all the fields of anthropology.

The Yearbook of Anthropology appeared in 1955 in a limited edition. Part of it was reprinted for wider distribution under the title CURRENT Anthropology (University of Chicago Press, 1955). Edited by William Thomas, who was then Assistant Director of Research at the Foundation, the Yearbook was received with enthusiasm as a worthy continuation of the 1952 Symposium publications.

However, this publication of books by the staff of the Foundation itself proved to be too great a drain on its facilities and its human resources. At about the same time, Dr. Thomas left the Foundation for a post at the University of California. Dr. Fejos therefore approached Professor Sol Tax, who had recently edited the American Anthropologist, and who had played an active role in the 1952 International Symposium and was one of the editors of the discussion volume. Dr. Fejos felt that he himself was not sure what the profession of anthropology would find most useful, and asked Dr. Tax to develop a plan that would continually keep scholars abreast of new knowledge.

In April of 1957, at the meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Tax agreed, and soon submitted the following plan which was accepted by the Foundation:

1. To publish a series of books to be called CURRENT Anthropology which would appear every second year and contain articles like those in Anthropology Today, filling the gaps in its review of our knowledge; by 1965 to publish these new articles, together with revisions of the original ones in Anthropology Today, as an encyclopaedia of anthropology, and finish the task.

2. But he would not put into effect this plan, or any other, before discovering from the scholars of the world what they thought most useful. In order to accomplish this he would undertake a series of conferences with groups of anthropologists in different places.

After conferences in the United States, the Editor of CURRENT Anthropology in July-August, 1958, traveled through Europe to meet with colleagues in England, France, Spain, Italy, Germany and Austria. Then in August a group of 14 scholars who had been at the regional conferences met in Burg Wartenstein to discuss the results to date.

This group consisted of Firth of England; Métraux of UNESCO in Paris; Lindblom of Sweden; Alcobé and Pericot of Spain; Blanc of Italy; Schult of Switzerland; Heydrich and Hisinsk of Germany; and Haeckel (and for part of the time Pitiioni and Koppers) of Austria; and Fejos and Tax of the U.S.A. In the quiet beauty of Burg Wartenstein all of the suggestions for CURRENT Anthropology were examined and the following plan developed:

First, that CURRENT Anthropology should be as broad and open as the problems of the changing sciences of man require, bringing together the widest variety of relevant ideas and data, and extending and facilitating intercommunication among students of man wherever in the world they are working.

Second, that CURRENT Anthropology should be unitary, a single set of cross-cutting materials available to all. All students of the sciences of man should be speaking to one another on the same page in the same language. Though no scholar can be equally interested in all things, CURRENT Anthropology should not prejudge where the individual's interests will carry him.

Third, that CURRENT Anthropology should provide communication that is both fast and convenient. A scientist engaged in research cannot wait years to learn what relevant work others are doing. CURRENT Anthropology should provide a single, common center where scholars can with minimum duplication of effort share knowledge of their current activities.

To achieve these objectives, the conference developed and reached unanimous agreement on the following plans: I. CURRENT Anthropology should be published as a journal,* in English,** probably quarterly (later changed to

---

* A journal was preferred rather than a yearbook so that (a) scholars could publish and read more promptly, and (b) the whole range of material would appear in units small enough to be easily handled.
** English was chosen because it happens to be the language currently read by more scholars than any other language. The choice of a multilingual journal was regretfully rejected in favor of translations of all material into one language.
bimonthly), addressed to the world audience of those who professionally pursue the anthropological sciences including physical anthropology, ethnology, prehistory, folklore, linguistics, social anthropology, and all of their subsidiary and related sciences by whatever names.

II. CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY should publish two classes of materials:

A. Major reviews of subjects of considerable scope that are (1) of interest to a broad segment of anthropologists usually comprising several of the sub-disciplines, and for those of different scholarly traditions; and which are (2) either new considerations of traditional subjects or preferably subjects of new, current, and growing interest.

The emphasis, then, is at the growing points of our science, although re-evaluations of traditional subjects will have their place. The original notion of the Editor was that over the course of time the review would cover the field of anthropology and eventually might be published as an encyclopedia; therefore the articles talked about were mainly the traditional. In all the conferences, however, there developed the tendency to favor and place high value on new material at the growing points of anthropology and new evaluations rather than syntheses of what has become well known.

The criteria to govern selection of major articles were discussed in terms of particular problems that might be deemed important for review. Over the course of three or four sessions, in which topics were measured against tentative criteria, some 38 were selected as examples suitable for articles in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. At the same time, the criteria were crystallized. The topics are not listed here because of the space required to explain each; in any case these were simply examples from the particular experience of the participants used as a means to derive the criteria, rather than to achieve a list of topics for articles.

Review articles might require conferences, or prior written material, that will bring together people and data in areas where ideas and data are still too scattered to be controlled by an individual author.

Attached to all review articles should be substantial bibliography, and possibly in some cases abstracts of important articles and conceivably even reprints of hard-to-obtain articles of special significance for the subject.

The articles should be written in general terms for the professional audience in the variety of disciplines.

B. Current news and reference materials that would include:
1. News of research activities and discoveries, organized by countries and regions, and including all fields of anthropology as reported from that country—or alternatively by problem area or subdiscipline, or convenient geographical areas. Included in the news may be Ph.D. dissertations completed, acquisition of important new research materials, establishment of new laboratories, etc.

2. Systematic surveys of guides to materials, including written materials (i.e., a bibliography of bibliographies) and research collections in museums and elsewhere. New guides to old materials would be published; if published elsewhere, reported as news. In effect, we should develop a catalogue of sources of information in all fields and for all types of research materials, but not publish the inventory of materials themselves; and keep up this catalogue by reporting new sources of information as news.

3. Requests for information, and suggestions for problems for research in a "Want Ad" section, where intercommunication on all our areas of research would be encouraged on a world-wide scale. Anyone embarking on a research project might report his topic and request information on sources unknown to him. Contributors might also record research ideas which had occurred to them but which lie beyond their interest, time, or competence.

III. With the aid of colleagues in each country and field of study, professional anthropologists all over the world (numbering perhaps 3,000) should be mailed a report of this meeting, and a card asking their co-operation and some necessary information thus inviting them to become the first Associates in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. They would then be called on by local representatives and the Editor for news, articles, comments on articles, etc. New Associates should be added as new ones develop or are located. Associates of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY could be considered a list of professional anthropologists for many purposes, such as preferential treatment in receiving subsidized publications.

IV. The fee for Associates of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY would be the equivalent of the purchasing power of $2.00 in North America, e.g., Austria—30 sch.; Belgium—60 B. fr.; England—10 sh.; Finland—400 F.M.; France—600 fr.; Germany—6 D.M.; Italy—600 lire; Netherlands—9 ½ guilders; Scandinavia—6 S.kr., 7.50 D. or N. kr.; Spain—75 ptas.; Switzerland—6 Sfr.; payable in local currencies. Libraries and institutions would pay five times the Associates' fee. Rates should of course be adjusted with changing conditions.

The plan now at hand was quite different from the notions with which the Editor had begun. When he presented this new plan to a group of Belgian scholars in Brussels, it was received with enthusiasm. Thus encouraged, he undertook a series of new conferences in Asia and from the end of December traveled in a month to Moscow, Delhi, Calcutta, Bangkok, Manila, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Honolulu and Palo Alto (U.S.A.) with a conference in each place. Again in April and May he held conferences in Mexico, Guatemala, Bogota, Lima, Santiago, Buenos Aires, Sao Paulo and Caracas. General plans were discussed, and changes suggested. Particularly the role of the co-operating Associates assumed greater importance as the conferences developed.

In June and July the Editor took a fourth journey, holding conferences in Stockholm, Warsaw, Prague, Ankara, Cairo, Addis Ababa, Kampala, Khartoum, Baghdad, Acre, Dakar, and London. By the time the first issue appears, he will have had advice from all major regions of the world except Australia and the Pacific islands. CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY is the result of the suggestions and planning from all of these conferences. It is the product of a unique historical development.
Letter to Associates

As we go to press, I have just returned from a fourth long journey seeking advice about CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. Still breathless from six weeks of airplanes and visits with colleagues in ten cities in Eastern Europe, the Near East and Africa, I am happy to report that the first issue of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY will be in the mail about November 15. The format will be like this PRE-ISSUE. It is printed by the Baird-Ward Company; we hope they will be our regular printers. They print the journals of the American Medical Association and many other publications. They promise us fast service to keep CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY current.

We plan to publish six times a year, in January, March, May, July, September and November. We hope to arrange to send CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY by air to Associates in Asia, Africa, Oceania and South America, so that all of us will receive it within the same ten days. Please tell us what you think of our format, our cover design, and the way this PRE-ISSUE came to you in the mail. If there is something that should be changed, there is still time to change before the first issue. That is why we are sending this to you now.

Also, please tell us whether our English style is as "universal" as we wish it to be. In the years to come, our English should at least be clear to everybody who reads English. We want constant criticism so that we can correct any tendencies to use localisms.

As you know, CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY has been shaped not by us or any other small group, but by our colleagues in all of our subdisciplines all over the world. In addition to private conversations and correspondence with hundreds of colleagues, I have met formally with over 44 groups including over 650 individuals, all over the world. The map shows where conferences were held. Unfortunately, time and air schedules made it impossible to make more stops and visit with more colleagues. As the conferences developed, the idea of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY tended to shift in emphasis. It is a journal, yes; but the journal has become for most of us simply the means by which the individual scholars (Associates) are able to communicate with one another all over the world. Our primary object is to exchange and "pool" ideas, information, research materials and new knowledge. We shall review for one another the major results of past research, as a basis for more fruitful intercommunication and cultural generalizing. But in every one of our national traditions the organization of the sciences differs, and so do the words we use. The choices made in our symbol are arbitrary; we shall enjoy changing the words as soon as we know better ones. Please make your suggestions on the enclosed form letter.

As an Associate you will pay your annual fee and receive CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. But if this is to be a truly co-operative venture, with every Associate contributing News and Reference Materials and writing and commenting on manuscripts, all of us will be giving much more than the Associates' fee.

As an Associate you will be expected:
1. To help keep up-to-date our list of Associates, nominating eligible persons to be Associates, and telling us the names of students eligible to pay the special rate.
2. To pay your fee in the manner indicated on the back cover for the country where you live; we do not want to take the time or money to send bills or reminders.
3. To look through CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY as soon as it is delivered, and to respond to requests of the Editors (and other Associates) when meant for you.
4. To write to the Editor your suggestions for articles and other material that might be included in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY, particularly proposals of material you yourself might provide.
5. To respond promptly (even if negatively) to requests of the Editors for articles, comments on articles, and news and other materials.

The decision to publish CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY in a single language, English, was reached by the European Conference leaders only after long discussion of the alternatives. We reluctantly concluded that publication in one language was essential and that English was the most widely known. Therefore, material should if possible be
submitted in English. This first translation need not be perfect but only sufficiently smooth so that we can then decide whether to use it, and suggest changes in content. After acceptance and revision (and for publication) the English will be made as readable as possible, with the cooperation of the author. On request, CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY can supply limited funds where necessary to help in translations and similar editorial expense after material has been accepted for publication.

With some 3,000 Associates in all fields of anthropology living and working in all parts of the world, a major problem will be to select material of general enough interest to justify the distribution. We shall have two rule-of-thumb measures: material addressed to an audience that is covered by a specialized journal should go in the specialized journal; where this is not the case, material estimated to be of interest to at least one-third of our Associates will get priority in space, so that every Associate is likely to find interesting at least a third of each issue.

Assuming that CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY is the most appropriate medium to reach the audience, we shall accept items intended to reach relatively few scattered Associates, but the space used will be proportional to the potential audience. Thus items intended for less than 1,000 potential readers will be limited to—say—1 column inch of space for 10 readers; ½ page for 100 readers; 2 pages for 500.

You are now invited to submit material for the first issues of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY; to supply and to see that your institution supplies us with News and Reference Materials; to fill out the form to be returned to us and to add to it whatever data you think useful for us. We look forward to hearing from you!
The "Special Rate" vs. Associate's Fee:
The Associate's fee is 20%, and the Special Rate is 40%, of the subscription price. We have had several letters arguing that students should pay no more than their professors. The original CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY conference at Burg Wartenstein in 1958 took this same view.

We argued there that since all Associates must read the journal if each of us is to benefit from the knowledge of all the others, there should be no financial obstacles to becoming an Associate. Therefore, the fee in each country was set very low, and in the local currency. The fee is important as a symbol and as a commitment; it should never be a financial hardship, and in countries where there are foreign exchange difficulties, methods are worked out by which Associates pay their fees to a local institution and to be used within the country on behalf of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. On the other side, we agreed that students also should be able to subscribe to the journal cheaply, not because they are yet contributing to knowledge but because they need to live and they are poor. Ideally students were to be able to subscribe to CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY at a rate equal to the Associate's fee. Indeed, since students had none of the obligations of Associates (which may also be financial), in effect they would be getting the journal for even less.

Later rates are a difficulty. The question arose of defining a "student." In many countries hundreds of students who never become anthropologists enter upon graduate studies; at what level should they be admitted to the special rate? This was discussed in conferences with several hundred U.S.A. graduate students. In the end they concluded that no formal level or "stages" could be defined that could be applied usefully even in the U.S.A. not to mention the whole world. In despair they asked me, "Why not include any student, without having to establish criteria?" The answer was that since the special rate is below the marginal cost of production and distribution of the journal, with every student added the subsidy, completely open door could not be justified. The more students subscribed, the more money would be taken from other purposes. At this point the students suggested that the subscription price be raised just enough to cover costs. Then it would not matter how many students subscribed and no restrictions would be necessary. This eventually seemed the best alternative. The actual cost of an addition to the mailing list is about $4.00. Therefore, this price was set in the U.S.A. This is 40% of the regular subscription price ($10.00 in the U.S.A.), and the same proportion was adopted for the rest of the world. In most places the special rate is below our dollar cost, so that some students are being subsidized; but, since the total will be small, Associates need not hesitate to recommend any student for the special rate.

The "special rate" is not only for students, but also for younger colleagues and persons in related fields who are interested in reading CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY but who should not be Associates. Only Associates receive the inserted "Letter to Associates," and only Associates have the obligations (and privileges) of participation in the co-operative enterprise of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. Rather than thinking that Associates have a "low rate of subscription," they may be thought to receive CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY "free" as the necessary means through which they intercommunicate. The fee that: Associates pay is not "for the journal"; Associates have other obligations even more important than payment of the fee. What students pay cannot, therefore, be compared with the Associate's fee. The students get 60% off the subscription price; they get the journal at no more than the cost of keeping them on the list. If a student cannot afford this, he can, of course, use the copy or that of one of the Associates. If there is a better solution, we hope that Associates will offer it in the Reply Letter, Item 9.

Private Correspondence among Associates:
In this issue is the first supplementary list of Associates following what was published in March. One reason for publishing these lists is to get corrections, which will be taken into account when we republish the entire list at the beginning of next year. Another reason is to inform all of us which Associates in the world share our various interests. A third reason is to supply accurate mailing addresses of all, so Associates may write directly to one another. One Associate in Asia recently wrote in his Reply Letter that he wished some information from an Associate in Austria; all Associates are reminded that CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY uses its pages (1) for public communication, and (2) to help establish private communication which can then be carried on without an intermediary.

Travel Plans: A U.S.A. Associate makes an interesting suggestion. He points out that many of us know long in advance our plans to travel through different countries (or to distant places within one country), and, if these plans were published in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY, colleagues along the travel route could write to the traveler to make arrangements to meet and discuss mutual interests. Or, of course, lectures and other meetings might be arranged.

We would be happy to try this out. If you have plans to travel some distance any time after November, 1960, tell us on the Reply Letter (Item 10) specifically when, where, and by what route you are going, and we shall publish the information in a section on "Individual Travel Plans."
To what degree are Associates a "community" of scholars, rather than simply the readers of a journal? A person invited to become an Associate makes an initial commitment when he supplies information (on his roster card) to the other Associates, and expresses his willingness to write and to comment on articles. Many Associates then enter into direct communication with others. A request for a book, for example, was printed in the March issue; within a few weeks it brought 11 offers from the farthest corners of the world. Almost 1,000 Associates have also been in correspondence with me, and thus indirectly with others. Despite the newness of this enterprise, and the linguistic and other obstacles, we are indeed in active interrelation. At the international congresses in Europe this summer, it became evident that CA has become important to many of us, particularly to the more isolated scholars. I was besieged with colleagues who thought that CA might be useful in solving their problems. Indeed, all thoughtful readers of CA have always seemed to be some way that CA could be of help. This is not surprising, since CA is a means of drawing upon the varied resources of our professional colleagues wherever they are.

If we are a functioning community of scholars, then we must consider means to preserve and to strengthen the community. Since the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, which supports CA financially, does not in any way interfere with our operation, the responsibility and authority rest in the Editor. In turn, as Editor I have made every effort to turn CA into a medium of free cooperation among all scientists and scholars concerned with the study of man. The logic is this: Science requires the sharing of knowledge; each scholar is helpless without information which others supply, usually through the printed page. Help is therefore needed. Most of our colleagues doubt that substantial help can be provided by formal organizations with bylaws, officers, and committees. CA has therefore been permitted to evolve after the fashion of a community, like the family or a hunting party, with which anthropologists are so familiar, rather than a "formal institution." As it has grown, CA is now most analogous to a market place (for ideas and information), with only a single functionary: the Editor, who maintains order and keeps open the channels of communication to encourage those who have something to offer others.

As CA has developed, the Editor is successful to the degree that he keeps out his personal preferences and discovers what others find most useful. Some Associates think I am trying to be "democratic," when in fact I am simply being empirical: I try to learn what our needs are and to satisfy them, while continuing to ask whether I have correctly interpreted and effectively acted upon the data. Whether this is "democracy" or quixotic idealism is not only directly to other individual Associates, but indirectly to all—through the Editor.

So far, CA has been a means of interchange alone; but it could also be the machinery for new research that could not be done except cooperatively—analogous to the recent International Geophysical Year. There are many problems concerning man, culture, and society, which because of their complexity and the rapid speed of change cannot be studied effectively without the simultaneous co-operation of scholars throughout the world. CA could become a device through which creative Associates can undertake research we have not yet even thought possible. This prospect gives us added incentive to strengthen the CA community, even if some of us become impatient with the smaller obligations that this entails, such as returning the Reply Letter or an equivalent.
I know at least that you are receiving the journal and looking at it. It is also a useful medium for keeping track of changes of address, and giving us some idea of how long it takes for issues to reach some of our more distant colleagues.

---

**June 1961**

"Associate" Trouble Again: Two interrelated problems concerning Associates seem important enough to discuss here.

1. Several Associates have resigned because they feel they are unable to fulfill their obligations to CA. Thus, one of these writes:

   Please accept my resignation as an Associate and contributor to CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. I much regret this, as I consider your publication extremely valuable, but I am unable to contribute towards your work in any useful way. My writings are more suited to publication in archaeological papers or journals than in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY, and I have not the time to make duplicates, etc.

   With regard to reviews, here again I cannot be relied upon, and in any case much of your material is right out of my line. In view of the above, I consider that I have no right to continue as an Associate.

   But at the same time, other Associates remain on the rolls with no more apparent opportunity to contribute.

2. Several Associates have resigned because they cannot afford to pay the fee; some are retired professors with very limited income. At the same time, other Associates do not pay their fees, because arrangements to do so are not completed. A few others have not paid, apparently out of carelessness or neglect.

Should we accept the resignations of scholars who should be Associates? Of course, if people may freely accept the invitation to become Associates, they surely must be free to resign if they no longer wish to be Associates. But what should we do if they resign not because they wish to, but because they cannot perform all of the obligations they feel? The following seems to be the best solution:

1. An Associate does have obligations to our community which he cannot perform unless we continue to send him CA. If his work and his knowledge are important to other Associates, all are hurt if he is cut off.

2. The most important obligation is to maintain scholarly communication—to exchange information. Every Associate who is seriously working might at any time become important to others. Some years may go by when he works only in relative isolation, his knowledge not widely relevant; but if he "keeps up," he is serving because his potential usefulness is being maintained. If he is willing to give and take—if he will only look at CA when it comes, to see if there is something of relevance to him—he should not resign.

3. The obligation to pay the Associates' fee is important symbolically as well as materially. Yet, if an Associate is dropped because he cannot (or will not) pay his fee, we all lose his help without getting his money. We should continue to try to make it possible and convenient for Associates to pay each year (without reminders, I hope), but we should not drop one from the list because he has not sent his fee.

---

**December 1961**

Associates' Fees: As we close the second year of CA we appear to have "settled down" in many ways. In Letter to Associates No. 9 (June 1961) I asked for guidance on the matter of Associates who could not (or did not) pay their fees.

Later I might report the many interesting individual responses which reflect a feeling that we have indeed become a community of scholars. The bare statistics to date: of the Associates who expressed a clear opinion, 87% agreed that we should not cut off Associates who are unable for some reason to pay their fees. The implication is clear, however, that all who can pay their fees should do so. Consequently, I am writing to Associates who are delinquent, to determine in each case what the facts are, preparatory to dropping from our list any of them who are able but do not wish to pay their fees.

The responses also suggest that it is time to reconsider the structure of fees and subscriptions. If CA is a community of scholars, the Associate's fee in any country should not be a serious obstacle to being an Associate. Since the economic situation of scholars differs from country to country, it has been necessary to set the fee in each country individually. Many Associates feel that the fees are generally too low. Since mistakes may have been made, or conditions or currencies changed in one or another nation, it is time to ask both what revisions are necessary in our fees, and how much the Associates' fee can be increased without its becoming an obstacle to participation.

---

**April 1962**

In Letter to Associates No. 9, I reported that some Associates were unable to fulfill their obligations—either because they could not pay the fee, or because at present they have no general knowledge to contribute to colleagues. A few Associates were resigning not because they wished to, but because they could not perform the obligations they felt were required of them.

I have already reported (Letter to Associates No. 11, December 1961) overwhelming agreement on the 3rd point. Responses to the 2nd are even more overwhelmingly in agreement. One Associate (U.S.A.) expressed the general view by quoting John Milton's famous line, "They also serve who only stand and wait." One Associate writes from France that "Scientific interchange and creativity is sometimes a very slow process; immediate contributions to CA should not be considered as a prerequisite to Association. It is, on the contrary, for most of us, a constant stimulus which will sooner or later bear its fruits." Another writes from Japan that "every Associate who works is important and should not be dropped. Actually, your comment calmed somewhat my own objections because of my lack of opportunity to do more for CA."

Nevertheless, a handful of Associates suggest that those with qualms resign; and one writes "You waste far too much time in discussing your reaction to other people's remarks about your publication." I can only remind this Associate that CA was never intended to be "my" publication. On the whole, we seem to be building the community of scholars that most of us have wanted.

---

**June 1962**

In the roster published in April 1961 there were 2,461 Associates. In the present list there are 2,471. These figures do not reflect the number of new Associates who have joined CA because over 250 names of individuals from whom nothing has been heard in the past 2 years have been dropped from the list. It is not known if they have received the journal or are interested in participating in the community of scholars which it represents. Only those who have failed to respond in any way have been canceled; no Associate has been dropped simply for non-payment of fees. Those whose silence we have misinterpreted can, of course, apply for reinstatement.

---

**February 1962**

Cooperation among Associates: In assessing two years of experience with CA, I must recall the expectation still unfulfilled that Associates together might do research—perhaps simultaneously—on a problem that could not otherwise be resolved, or not so well. This awaits two things: first the devel-
Racist Propaganda: An Associate in Copenhagen writes us:

I have recently been receiving racist propaganda from the United States. The senders of these pamphlets can only have obtained my address from the CA list of associates. I enclose a part of the first envelope. Please note that the address is printed with an addressograph plate. This seems to indicate that more pamphlets can be expected.

If the pamphlets have been sent to all the CA Associates, they may create a very unpleasant impression in wide parts of the world of the state of racism in the U.S.A. Maybe you ought to give some comments about the second I cannot as Editor propose now that we abandon the category. High in the hierarchy of every institution which should be involved in CA there is bound to be an Associate in CA who will continue to read the Journal and the letters and who can do what needs to be done on behalf of the institution. The new International Directory of Anthropological Institutions will eventually help us to know them better than our poor lists of Institutional Associates.

I am surprised at the response to my suggestion (Letter to Associates No. 11, December 1961) that the category of "Institutional Associates" be dropped. A large majority (69 percent) of Associates expressed approval of this policy without comment. But most of the 31 percent minority gave compelling reasons why—in their situations—the category is important. In some countries cooperation through CA is heavily dependent upon the institutions, which should, therefore, be directly associated in order to help individual scholars. Since maintaining the category of Institutional Associates hurts nobody (at worst it is a minor administrative nuisance) and substantially helps many, Associates recommended patience while the response from Institutions gradually develops.

Institutional Associates are, therefore, still with us, under the same terms: a journal, a society, or an institute or department of anthropology (or prehistory or linguistics, etc.), in a university or museum, may become a cooperating Associate in CA with all of the appropriate obligations and privileges. If the director or secretary of the society, institute or department—or the editor of the publication series—is an individual Associate in CA, and only one copy of the journal is needed, only one fee need be paid.
CA Review Articles in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY will, in general, overlap the interests of several of the subdisciplines; they may consider an area which is at the crossroads of its development or be forward-looking reviews of recent advances in a field.

We see forward-looking reviews as articles in which the literature of a problem-area is reviewed in such a way that a new (but educated) student of the field could really know what and why anthropologists think about that area. That new student might, of course, be a new student of anthropology, or someone from another field interested in learning how anthropologists handle that particular problem. Actually, such a review is but the background for the present status of the problem area and the emerging developments within it.

The first task is to present the topic in terms of the people, problems and bibliography that constitute the field today; then to look at the historical antecedents of the problems and ideas, and perhaps trace the connections between past and present; and, finally, to look to present trends and future developments.

Because manuscripts will vary so in approach, compass and complexity, the Editors may handle them in a variety of ways.

1. Some manuscripts may be read by a few referees, and accepted and published.
2. A paper may be an important nucleus for intercommunication among specialists in the area covered by that paper. This should serve as a technique for combining the advantages of symposia (without having to travel) with the advantages of the kind of discussion found in Letters to the Editors (without having to wait); for bringing specialists together, for pooling capabilities in areas which are increasingly difficult for one person to cover single-handed, and for drawing in people at the borderlines of our science. In the case of such manuscripts, after a paper has been read and provisionally accepted here, it will be duplicated and sent to a list of readers. This list will include names suggested by the author, and will have two general categories of people:
   a) Readers who are also experts in the area under consideration. They may add material, argue the interpretation, or say nothing. In every case, the author will see the readers' comments and advise us on the best way to handle each reply; by incorporation in the original (with acknowledgement); by inclusion (with appropriate rejoinder); or however seems best. Thus in one issue we shall have the core statement, the additional relevant information, the principal arguments, and the rebuttal.
   b) Readers whose interests are at the edges of the material covered by the paper but to whom it is not so central. For example, people who approach the material either as part of a larger whole, or as the whole of which they are primarily concerned with the parts. Thus we shall have an inclusive and expanding framework and an opportunity to learn from other sciences and to share our findings with them.

This plan seems to be a promising way to facilitate intercommunication. By sending each paper to a variety of people we shall have a different level of accuracy and comprehensiveness, and a greater opportunity to answer the questions which arise at the borders of our field.

CA Review Articles may be submitted voluntarily or they may be invited. It is understood that articles submitted have not been accepted for publication elsewhere. Manuscripts will vary in length but are thought of as being between 5,000 and 25,000 words.

News Notes and Queries

ONE OF THE MAJOR functions of the News and Reference sections of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY will be to serve as a clearing house for information—a means of world-wide intercommunication in all areas of anthropological research. It is hoped that they will include requests for information, suggestions for research, the recording of research ideas so that others may pursue them and other similar information of interest to professionals everywhere.

News may be defined as any item of information which would be of interest to anthropologists in general or to any group of specialists within the field. Items might announce the establishment of a new research center, the acquisition of a new collection by a museum, the inauguration of new research facilities or a new research program, new archaeological discoveries, the plans for an expedition, project progress reports, Ph.D. dissertations completed, publication foci, notices of interdisciplinary collaboration, announcements of meetings, and so on.

Whenever possible it is hoped that items in this section, rather than merely announcing or noting, will point to the significance or special importance of the item.

It should be stressed that the Editors are dependent upon Associates for contributions to the News Notes and Queries section. This portion of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY can provide a much needed facility for scholarly intercommunication and the exchange and dissemination of information. The extent to which it does so successfully will depend entirely on the participation of Associates.

Reference Materials

The Reference Materials section of the journal is designed to cover a broad range of topics. In addition to bibliographic aids of various kinds it will also include other guides to source materials, inventories of or notes on research collections or libraries, check lists, summaries of research needs, rosters of dissertations completed or in progress, descriptions of available research facilities, indexes of periodicals, abstracts of scarce or unobtainable materials, statements of the results of research programs, descriptions of various archives, and in
general any and all varieties of materials which have reference value to anthropologists.

The editors not only welcome the contributions of Associates to this section, but are dependent upon them. In addition to contributing materials for publication, Associates can provide an extremely helpful service if they will suggest needed reference materials and possibly even the names of persons qualified to supply or prepare them.

For example, at the suggestion of Associate Woodbury, we are seeking someone who is willing to undertake a survey of the major unstudied archaeological collections in Museums and private hands. Other Associates are needed to survey the anthropological resources of libraries; others to offer specialized bibliographies relating to specific research foci or to particular geographic regions. A survey of the various foundations throughout the world which support anthropological research would be a most useful reference item. At the same time Associates are encouraged to consider the compilation of a series of histories of the development of anthropology in as many countries as possible—ultimately resulting in a world survey of the history of anthropology. Another most worthwhile effort would be the compiling of an international index of anthropological periodicals.

Clearly, there are far too many potential projects of importance to reference materials to list here, and many more, it is hoped, will be suggested by Associates.

2. EVOLUTION OF CA FEATURES

March 1960

Review Articles and CA* Treatment: A troublesome problem is the CA* treatment of Review Articles. During the pre-publication stage of CA, colleagues everywhere advised that we build into these articles additions, corrections, and criticisms. Therefore we solicited comments according to the principles set forth on the inside front cover, but without rigid instructions on form or content. Interested commentators respond generously and promptly, in spite of not knowing exactly to what purpose their contributions will be put. Authors are extraordinarily kind, patient, and cooperative about coping with comments. But there are practical difficulties.

One difficulty eliminated itself. When we send a review article to specialists in the subject, they respond at once. When we send it to colleagues in related fields, they often do not reply, or decline to comment. The reason: while it is easy to identify and interest the specialists on a subject, not so colleagues in related fields who might wish to comment. Therefore, we now send manuscripts only to those close to the subject matter, and hope that other Associates will themselves send us comments on the published version.

It is difficult to be just to both authors and commentators. Two main principles have guided us: (1) that commentators are credited and responsible for their contributions; (2) that the author of an article is better able than the Editor to incorporate comments into it, and is entitled to "reply" to comments if he wishes. The results have been: an inhuman burden on authors, a danger of (unwitting) injustice to commentators, and transformation of the Editor into an umpire. The reason is the wide variety of comments. Some are confined to issues raised by the author; others add essays. Some consist of a series of informal miscellaneous; others are expositions on a theme. Some are in letters mixed with other content; others are polished manuscripts. And so on.

The remedy: hereafter, we shall ask from each reader two kinds of comments—suggestions for particular changes in, or additions to, the text, and comments intended for publication. The former will be credited to the commentator or not, depending on significance in terms of substance. The latter will be treated by us like any other manuscript, except that they will be sent to the author of the article for a rejoinder, if he wishes to make one. Thus an author will not be forced to accept or reject comments, and commentators will be assured that their published comments will be fully their own. We are still printing articles acceded to original CA* treatment, but the transition toward greater justice has already begun. In the January issue, we printed Dyn's extended comment on Hymes's article on lexical statistics without rejoinder by Hymes, leaving the reader to imagine—as it happens, mistakenly—that Hymes accepts everything in it. In this present issue we preclude speculation by stating in the editorial note at the beginning of Giddings' article what his view is toward Collins' long comment.

We still have unresolved problems. A commentator supposes he is the first voice on an issue for which another commentator, or the author, shows priority in his publications. Or we are enmeshed in semantic misunderstandings between author and commentator. In such cases publication is delayed endlessly by false issues unless the Editor cuts the knot.

How should we handle comments that consist only or largely of praise? In the January issue, we omitted the commendatory portions of comments on Hymes's and La Barre's papers, on the theory that praise takes space without adding substance. Now we have reversed this policy, on the ground that praise reflects one's stand on issues. Printing a simple "Amen!" at least eliminates speculation that a commentator's response was only minimally acknowledged because he disagreed with everything in the article. The danger now is that everybody will feel he must include some praise as a matter of etiquette!

Sept.-Nov. 1960

This issue is the last in which the review articles were handled by Anna Pikilis, who provides the following summary of our experience to date.

During 1960, thirteen major articles, comprising 70% of the volume, were published in CA. Yet the three questions confronting us at the beginning of the year are still with us today: (1) Should CA publish major articles that are not properly "review articles"? (2) Is CA* treatment worth the difficulties involved? (3) How is the journal to become as international as the community of Associates in CA? These questions are closely linked, since in an important sense all subsume, as means to end, under a single question that is harder to answer in practice than in the abstract: Given the limited resources available to CA, what, out of the totality of knowledge available for communication, should be selected for publication, and what rejected?

During the year we have considered several manuscripts that have not seen print. The rejected manuscripts were either anthropologically unsophisticated or so pointlessly problem-oriented that they were more appropriate for other journals. More often, review articles that were incomplete reviews were returned to their authors with suggestions for revision. But over time this clean-cut picture has been blurred by receipt of manuscripts that were not, and
Letters, correspondence, and comments have continued to flow in. It is true that most major articles published in CA have been authored by persons in the U.S.A., and predicted that this imbalance would gradually give way to something nearer proportional representation. Another point that escapes general notice. It is true that of the 13 major articles published in CA to date (excluding Gibson's major bibliography for the Americas), 10, or 77%, have been authored by Americans. But, of the 69 scholars from 18 countries who responded with substantive comments to the CA* treatment of 10 of the 13 articles, only 35% came from outside the U.S.A. These figures are promising: Whatever considerations have so far discouraged Associates outside the U.S.A. from submitting major articles to CA on their own initiative, it is increasingly high among these in the international community of interacting professionals. But the interaction would be greatly enhanced by more and more major articles from outside the U.S.A. An Editor selects items for publication, and the self-selection manifest in what appears in his mailbox. The answer to the question, "How is the journal to become as international as the community of Associates in CA?" seems at this time to depend primarily on Associates outside the U.S.A., and these, especially, should be urged to submit communications in any amount. Manuscripts from Americans would continue, of course, to be more than welcome.

In closing this discussion of one year of review articles, it is appropriate to point out two of these: (1) whether CA should publish major articles that are not properly "review articles"; and (2) whether CA* treatment is worth the trouble involved and should be given all articles.

Opinion on publishing articles that are not review articles was deeply divided, and so many Associates qualified their support for a complete breakdown was not possible. On the whole, the policy indicated by the replies was fairly flexible: Articles that are not properly review articles may be published in CA at the Editor's discretion, provided that they are important, and that they constitute new contributions; that their subject is of fundamental interest to a large section of Associates in several fields; and that their appearance is occasional, rather than regular.

While most Associates endorse CA* treatment as worthwhile, many of them suggested simplifying it by reducing the number of commentators or the number of rounds of comments. Another frequently-voiced suggestion was to place more reliance on communications from outside the U.S.A. than language are the complex implications of inter-cultural and inter-disciplinary communication pointed out by Carpenter in his present issue, it being obvious that what he has said is by no means peculiar to communication with Japanese scholars or within Japan. Sensitivity about language could now be completely cast aside. Associates would accept the quicker get down to these other, more important, issues. What has a practical interest in this viewpoint: that is, while it may be abundantly clear to some authors that we normally edit thoroughly, it may not have always so clear that we mean it when we say in cover letters that the author is free to reject editorial changes as he sees fit. The point is that language, if clear, is relatively unimportant compared to desiderata of content and style in introducing or communicating, and we might even say we hope for early support of this opinion in the form of more and more contributions in poor English! Perhaps all of the major questions raised above are awaiting precisely that for their resolution.
form of galley sheets, with the following letter:

The attached review article will be published in an early issue of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. In accordance with our practice, we are sending an advance copy to a number of Associates for comment. You are invited to provide one of these comments. If you accept this invitation and we receive your comment before —, it will be printed with the article. If it comes after that date, we can still print it in a later issue.

If you do comment, your text will be edited for publication, then sent to the author for reply if he wishes.

Thus, unless the article, for some reason peculiar to itself, calls for a second round of comments from a different group of commentators, CA* treatment is limited to a single round; and errors or omissions in the original manuscripts are rectified in the author's Reply to the comments.

October 1961

In a letter accompanying a sample abstract of "Neolithic Diffusion Rates" (2:71-102) by Munro S. Edmonson, Richard B. Woodbury questions our present method of CA* treatment. He writes:

The several close readings that I gave Edmonson's article and the comments on it had reinforced my previous feeling that there is a serious defect in the system of printing comments instead of having them used by the author as the basis for improvements in the article... A revised article, and one or two comments presenting additional points of view (whether pro or con would not matter), ought to save space and make for more meaningful reading.

Since other Associates voice similar opinions from time to time, it might be useful to review the evolution of our policy in this respect and explain the shifts it has undergone.

Originally, we solicited comments that provided additions, corrections, and criticism to be used by authors in revising their articles. However, this system was not satisfactory, because the comments varied from polished texts to miscellaneous informal notes intended only for the author's use. As we reported in Letter to Associates No. 3 (March 1960), it resulted in "an inhuman burden on authors, a danger of (un)writing injustice to commentators, and transformation of the Editor into an umpire." Consequently, we adopted a new policy whereby each commentator was asked for (a) suggestions directed to changes in or additions to the text of the article; and/or (b) comments intended for publication. We also instituted the practice of following the published comments by a formal reply from the author.

Yet this procedure involved a new set of problems, as Anna Pikelski reported in Letter to Associates No. 6 (Sept.-Nov. 1960). Although it relieved authors of the burden imposed by the previous system, it was sometimes unfair to commentators and it entailed heavier work for the editorial staff. The chief difficulty was that authors sometimes changed their texts to satisfy criticism offered in comments that were written for publication; which in turn required commentators to revise their statements. Moreover, each such change necessitated careful rereading of all comments to make sure that other statements would not be affected. Consequently, the process of CA* treatment has again been revised (see inside front cover in this issue). Once a manuscript has been edited and the author's approval obtained, it is set in type and circulated among commentators. All comments are intended for publication, and errors or omissions are to be rectified in the comments and the author's reply, rather than in the text of the article.

However, this system is presenting problems. It is fair to the author, to commentators, and to our staff, but not to the reader, who sometimes must read minor errors and then corrections, both now committed to sacred type. Two other difficulties have arisen:

1. Sometimes misspelled proper names or incorrect bibliographical listings affected our staff, partly because CA* treatment takes so much time. Fortunately, commentators often catch these errors in the proofs. Embarrassed, we make the editorial corrections we should have caught in manuscript, and commentators are justifiably irritated at having to do our chores.

2. Most serious is the kind of problem exemplified by Herta Haselberger's article in this issue. Here, the volume of comment was so large that commentators' factual points—a corrected date, an additional reference, another example of a particular phenomenon—would have been obscured enough to be overlooked by the reader if (as suggested by Dr. Haselberger) we had not tied them to the article itself with footnotes. Thus, only theoretical issues raised by the commentators are treated in Dr. Haselberger's reply. We would welcome any advice that might help us achieve a wholly satisfactory method of handling the variety of comments (see Item 4 of the attached Reply Letter).

Most Associates who have expressed opinions about CA* treatment agree that it is useful and valuable, and advise its continuation, even when they criticize certain aspects of the particular method we use. This response has been gratifying, but it leaves serious problems unresolved.

An extreme example of the difficulties that may arise is illustrated by "Scientific Racism Again?", Juan Comas' article in this issue. This article was originally written in Spanish for simultaneous publication in America Indigena, and—with CA* treatment—commissioned a translation, which was set in print and, in the form of galleys, circulated among the commentators. After the comments had been received, we and Comas discovered that the translator had rendered many passages incorrectly and had omitted sentences, paragraphs, and occasionally entire pages. Unfortunately, several commentators had taken exception to exactly those parts of the article affected by these faults, and objected to statements that were in fact gross distortions of the author's words, or criticized the article for omitting items that had actually been cited in the Spanish text. We hastily put together a new translation and sent a second set of galleys (or relevant sections) to those persons whose comments required revision. In our haste, we overlooked some of the omissions or errors in parts of the original translation which were incorporated in the second mailing; and again, some of the criticism centered on these. Consequently, still a third round of correspondence and revision became necessary.

It is true that had I taken the time to check the translation at the very start, the difficulties would have been avoided. But this is beside the point, since in the case of most languages, nobody on the editorial staff would have been able to review a translation.

Although the author and the commentators showed infinite patience in spite of this trying sequence of events, its cost in time to them must have been great. In our case, too, considerable time was lost. It was necessary to postpone publication of the article from June until October; and our schedule for editing other manuscripts has not yet caught up.

October 1962

Some may perhaps be surprised at how much material is packed into a page of CA. The articles themselves range from about 7,000 words (a long article in many journals) to nearly 40,000 words, a veritable monograph. The average is 14,100, the median 11,500. Those that have received CA* treatment range from 10,000 words to 51,000, with the average 15,100 and the median 12,200. The journal as a whole is much larger than it looks. A still unresolved question is whether we should discourage such long articles. It is evident that as it becomes better established, CA* treatment is more and more "successful" in that the response and discussion become more
lively. Although this is generally considered an important and very distinctive feature of CA that few want to drop, we should ask if we are overdoing it.

We have tried until now to keep this principle: an article should be as long as it needs to be for what it says, and not one word longer. There has thus been no absolute standard, no word limit. Regardless of how well the principle is kept in practice, should we perhaps change the principle and begin to set arbitrary limits on articles—say 10,000 words—thus permitting a larger number of them, and a greater variety?

An analysis of the journal's content from January 1960 through June 1962 reveals great variation in the lengths of both the review articles themselves and the comments which accompanied them. But the treatment for comments to outrun the original article has become marked, as shown in the table. If CA^ treatment has gone too far, the choices are to reduce either the number of comments or the length of each comment, or both.

On the number of comments: We generally send an article for comment to (1) persons suggested by the author, and sometimes by other commentators; (2) living colleagues whose work is referred to in the article; (3) persons who have volunteered to comment in response to our printed invitation; and (4) any appropriate additional individuals who will give better geographical distribution to the total list of commentators. We send out as many as 50 invitations to comment on a particular article.

On the length: In a recent discussion consensus seemed to be (1) that there is in fact too much to read in CA^ treatment; (2) that it would be better to limit the length of comments than to restrict the number of comments, since a limitation on the number might sacrifice the range and distribution of commentators. It was suggested that 500 words might be enough, pointed to the article itself; that the commentator who wished to “take off” from the article to some other general ideas could write a separate article. Therefore, we have for the time being inserted a word limit into the invitation which is sent to commentators. I suggest that Associates:

1. look at particular articles in their own specialties and see whether (a) the numbers of commentators should have been reduced, and (b) the length of the comments could have been reduced; 2. consider whether they would have preferred less commentary or more on articles outside their own specialties; 3. decide whether limits on either the numbers of commentators or the length of comments should be firmly set; and then,

4. offer whatever general advice they wish to give on the entire process.

April 1964

From the beginning of CA, readers have suggested needed subjects review, and we have published the suggestions in “Our Readers Write.” It has been our policy not to press individuals to write articles; we have maintained an open market and clearing house, expecting that the appropriate people will write what needs to be written, as the whole community appears to see the needs.

We are now developing a more active method of discovering community needs, however, and some Associates have already received (and returned) a questionnaire like the following:

This is a new, experimental procedure. As you know, Associates frequently suggest that we need certain articles. We publish their suggestions in the section of CA called “Our Readers Write.” I have avoided selecting particular Associates to write articles because I have no way of determining who would be the most qualified in the whole world. Instead I have hoped for interested volunteers from among whom a selection could be made. This has not worked well because few Associates volunteer.

The present experiment is a compromise. In addition to publishing the suggestions in “Our Readers Write,” we send this questionnaire to several Associates in different parts of the world whose interests are in the general area of the suggested article, as indicated in the List of Associates.

Please return this questionnaire by …………; if it does not arrive by that date, we will assume that you either are away, or are too busy, or are not interested. If you do not like the questionnaire, please feel free to write a letter instead or in addition.

Suggestion:

1. I would be good to have such an article (Yes ☐ No ☐).
2. I would be interested in developing such an article and would take the following approach:

3. I cannot work on this myself; I suggest you ask another to do it.
4. It would be better to have instead an article on ……………

The results are gratifying. Many of the free suggestions of Associates have become disciplined and reoriented, and thus made more achievable by those who must develop them.

Sept.–Nov. 1960

Book Reviews: It is often suggested that we publish book reviews. The problem has been that in a field as broad as ours, and taking in the whole world, there is no practical way of getting coverage in small space, or of organizing a systematic operation. It is time to try out a possible solution.

We shall not send books out for review, or ask anyone to review a particular book. But we might encourage any Associate who wishes to review a book to do so and send the review to us. We would treat it as a contribution, subject to the same editorial rules (including rejection) as other manuscripts submitted. We would not print as a review simply a description—that belongs in a section on abstracts, or even in Publications Received. Instead, we would want a discussion of factual or theoretical issues raised by the book, a critique of or addition to some significant contribution of the book, so that the review is a step in the advance of knowledge.

June 1961

Describing a proposed policy for printing book reviews (Letter to Associates No. 6), the Editor asked Associates to comment on the plan. While the majority of those who responded endorsed the procedure suggested, a substantial minority objected to it, or proposed restrictions. Thirty-two Associates entirely opposed the inclusion of book reviews in CA, primarily because they think these are covered so adequately in specialized anthropological journals that such a department in CA would be unnecessary and a wasteful duplication. Sixty-two Associates, while accepting the desirability of some form of book reviews, set forth objections to the plan outlined. The most frequent objections (besides duplication of material in other journals) were: (1) the sampling entailed by the plan would be too erratic; (2) volunteered reviews might tend to be biased; (3) Associates might hesitate to volunteer reviews through fear of being thought “pushy.”

The majority of the revisions suggested to correct these imperfections fell into the following four classes:

1) CA should solicit reviews of outstanding books, not accept those volunteered. 2) CA reviews should be restricted to books of such general importance that even normal coverage in specialized journals would not make them known to all of the potential market; or to books of interdisciplinary orientation.

3) Rather than publishing reviews of single books, CA should have “review articles of the literature,” commenting upon several related books.

4) Rather than reviews, CA should list publications, giving a one or two sentence abstract.

The replies are so disparate that a
definite policy is not clearly indicated, and although the majority of Associates voiced approval of book reviews, none of them has submitted any. We conclude, therefore, that in spite of the approval noted, there is little enthusiasm for the plan; and therefore, shall not publish book reviews—although "review articles of the literature" will be welcome.

April 1964

The usefulness of CA treatment of articles has suggested an experiment which is perhaps best described by quoting in full a form letter which has now gone out with respect to 2 different books.

DEAR,

This is an innovation for CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY.

You are one of 50 Associates invited to participate in a CA book review of .......

If you would like to review it, please reply at once. I shall ask the publisher to send copies of the book to the first 20 Associates who reply in the affirmative.

Most book reviews consist of 2 parts: (1) a description of the book, and (2) an evaluation of the book and comments about it. To avoid repetition, CA reviewers will write only the second part. The first part, the description, will be written by the author and sent to you together with the book. Your discussion should be limited to 500 to 1,000 words, and will be due here six weeks after you receive the book.

When we have received all 20 of the individual reviews (or as many as shall have been received by the due date), we shall send them to the author, who will write his reply. The whole will then be published: the author’s précis, the reviews, and the author’s reply.

Let me know by return airmail if you wish to participate.

With best regards,

Yours sincerely,

SOL TAX

Editor

PLATE IV

Should CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY Reprint Articles?

Although most material in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY will be new, it is frequently suggested that we might usefully reprint especially important articles that have appeared in obscure places or in languages that few can read. Nominations for such, in all specialities, are invited. Use the enclosed letter form to express your opinion.

Reprinted Articles:

July 1960

On page 306 we report the views of Associates about reprinting in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY articles published elsewhere. Our tentative conclusion is that we should devote our space primarily to original articles, but should occasionally print translations of important articles that, because of language barriers, are not available to most of the world’s scholars. Eventually this program of reprinting might be expanded, if Associates find it worthwhile.

We shall be happy to permit republication, in national and special journals, of any CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY material, in translation or in English, assuming that the author is also agreeable. Please ask permission of the author first, and then write to us.

April 1961

This issue of CA includes D. H. Olendorf’s “Problems in the Study of Kinship Systems,” a translation of an article published in Sovetskaiia Etnografiia, which we are printing here as a first experiment in publishing reprints of articles that originally appeared in other journals. The July 1960 issue of CA included a report (1:306) of earlier opinions about reprinting articles from obscure journals or translations of articles published in languages other than English. The responses have made it clear that most Associates in CA are willing to accept translations of articles originally in languages such as Russian and Japanese, which most of the world’s anthropologists are unable to read, but object to CA’s reprinting articles that were originally published in English, French, German, or Spanish. Besides falling into a class of reprints acceptable to most of us, Professor Olendorf’s article meets the requirements of a review article, and we might well have given it CA treatment. However, we should then have been tempted to ask the author if he wished to revise or bring the article up to date, and it would no longer have been a reprint!

Departments and Novelties

July 1960

“Our Readers Write” and “Departments”: In our March issue, we ran ten pages of comments and suggestions from Associates. This list served the useful function of giving Associates a feeling for the boundaries of the community in which they are working. Thus one Associate (U.S.A.) wrote, “I find CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY establishing a sort of charged atmosphere for my own work—an increasing awareness of my colleagues all over the world and of their ongoing studies.” On the other hand, there were several criticisms that we printed too many trivial comments and suggestions, not worth the space.

We shall publish in “Our Readers Write” only substantial comments clearly intended for publication, including compliments that say something other Associates would be interested in hearing, but mainly items that supply information or express opinions. Whenever it is possible, we shall start a new “department” in the news,
needs, and opportunities part of the journal with the comments received, as in the case of the three reported below. Readers should take the existence of a “department” as an invitation to contribute to it.

“Terminology.” Many Associates feel that a function of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY ought to be the standardization ofanthropological scientific terminology. One suggestion is that we help develop a multilingual dictionary of terms, and some progress on this may be made in Europe this summer. Such a dictionary would at least inform us what the equivalent terms for things and concepts are in languages other than our own; at most, it would also indicate preferred terms in languages where several might be used for the same concept. Whether these latter decisions can be arrived at is a large question.

Meantime, in this issue we introduce a section on “Terminology.” The fact that we print these suggestions does not, of course, indicate editorial approval of the terms. The question is rather whether a system can be developed by which the profession can begin to choose among suggested terms in order to bring order out of terminological anarchy. The editor of CA can never avoid the issue because he is faced always with choices in translating and editing. Perhaps this section of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY can become the place for discussion of terms, on the basis of which editorial decisions can—individually or collectively—be made.

“For Sale” (1:337). We have not yet established policy with regard to what news we can carry of books offered for sale. Our section “Publications Received” gives notice of any new book an example of which comes to our office. We have also the sections “Serial Publications” and “Free Catalogs.” We certainly will always carry notices of interesting books offered free to Associates; but on those offered for sale we propose to print only notices (see 1:337) from Associates and non-profit institutions which offer to our readers books of broad or special interest at no more than the cost of production.

“Research and Plans” (1:333) and “Research Reports” (1:332) are two new departments which set patterns in terms of which all Associates should consider sending us news.

May 1960

Calendar: Associates are urged to send appropriate items for the Calendar (inside back cover) as early as possible, even years before the event, to make planning possible for those who might be traveling in the next few years. Our criteria for including events in the Calendar are three. (1) The event should be of relatively wide interest rather than local or specialized; if a local journal or news bulletin might reach all the interested people, the event need not be reported here. (2) The meeting should be “open.” If only by invitation, it need not be advertised. (3) The notice should be early enough to be useful. There is no use, for example, in listing in this May issue a meeting to be held on May 5th.

Publications Received: Starting with this issue, we are publishing, as a regular feature, a list of publications received to date. The present list includes material sent to the Editor—chiefly by Associates—over the course of the past year, and is our acknowledgment, with thanks. If the practice continues and grows, “Publications Received” may become a sample guide to current publication, as well as an index to the work of individual Associates. Associates are invited to continue to send us their publications. As time goes on, the material may also be found useful by Associates who may wish to review parts of the sample.

Publications of Associates: In this issue we continue our listing (begun in May, 1960) of publications received from Associates. We have had several valid criticisms of this procedure. What is sent to us is an accidental sample which is not very useful, while, if all Associates sent us all of their publications, there would be far too many to list. Yet CA will soon be a community of some 3,000 scholars interested mainly in each others’ work. To keep us abreast of current literature, CA’s most important reference material would be items on the current publications of its Associates, assembled in some usable form.

At one CA conference (in Paris), it was argued that CA should be mainly a clearinghouse, distributing abstracts in looseleaf form. The department “Publications Received” is inadequate from this point of view, but we propose to develop in the following directions:

(1) We continue to ask that Associates send us their publications that do not fall into the classes described in (2) and (3) below; and we shall be more selective in listing them.

(2) We list all Associates’ books that are included in the accessions lists of such libraries as the Peabody Museum (Harvard University, U.S.A.), the Musée de l’Homme (Paris), the Royal Anthropological Institute (London), or certain classifications of the Library of Congress (Washington, D.C.). We need help and advice to be able to do this economically, and the cooperation of these or other libraries.

(3) We print the entire table of contents of each of the “central” periodicals of our field as long in advance as Editors will supply them. A “central journal” is simply defined as one in which almost all the contributors are Associates in CA. There may be a hundred or more. We probably would have to establish an additional criterion of importance or generality, e.g., we could exclude a small local journal written completely by only one or two Associates. We need to choose the “central journals” now, and arrange with their Editors (probably all Associates) to get tables of contents, with English translations and possibly some description, for publication.

Contributions to Knowledge: In this issue, as an experiment, we are publishing two short pieces, “Aboriginal Languages of Latin America” and “Social Dialect and Language History.” Unlike the Research Reports, communications of this type are primarily designed to stimulate further work by persons other than the authors.

April 1961

Forthcoming Review Articles: On page 70 of “Our Readers Write” appears a letter from Dr. Karl J. Narr, who suggests that we publish lists of review articles that are planned for future issues of CA, and that Associates who wish to be included in our CA* treatment should write us in advance. This proposal, as Dr. Narr points out, would help avoid one-sided treatment of issues. It would also prevent our overlooking experts of whose interests we might be unaware, in favor of persons much less interested in the subject of the paper. There are also difficulties. We try to provide commentators from as wide a geographic range as possible; in an area where their specialty flourishes we must therefore select only two or three from among many competent scholars to avoid duplication of effort. If many interested scholars of the same place and point of view spontaneously commented, we might not wish to print them all.

April 1962

CA “Departments”: As Associates have informed us of new ways in which CA can be useful to them in their work, the number and variety
Fieldwork Reports: In this issue a new department is introduced to CA readers. Our first “Fieldwork Report” is presented on page 429 in Martin Silverman’s account of his work with the Banaban people from Ocean Island resettled on Rambi Island in Fiji. Additional reports of fieldwork will be welcome, as will comments on them from readers. Does this first example have too much detail, or too little? Is there something else you would like such reports to include?

Two New Departments: CA readers are introduced to two new departments in this issue. The first of these, “Identifications Wanted,” represents a department instituted at the suggestion of Gordon Gibson, who has pointed out an area in which our wide, varied and miscellaneous knowledge can perhaps help to identify the numerous specimens whose identifications may be lacking, incomplete, or questionable. If you have some suggestions for making this department more useful, and especially if you have some items you would like identified, please write in the Reply Letter in item no. 4. The other new department is “Exhibits.” Exhibits are often transient phenomena, but, nonetheless, they are of wide interest and importance. When you hear of an exhibit to be undertaken or when you arrange one yourself, please inform us fully about it and we shall publish the information.

And a New Idea: On page 93 a new series of articles is initiated in honor of Melville J. Herskovits, probably new in Festschriften. After considerable discussion between the editors of the Festschrift and the editor of CA that the best way to honor a respected scholar is to make the articles of a Festschrift as rapidly available to as wide an audience of scholars as possible. CA suggests itself as a particularly apt medium for the honoring of Herskovits who is known over the world for his work in anthropolgy. On the other hand, this puts a limitation on Festschriften which could be published in our journal because CA should not publish articles except of a certain kind. They should be of the quality and kind we call “review articles,” that is, a major survey of knowledge on any topic relevant to the sciences of man. This may include a review of literature, or the presentation of data, a report on research, or an outline or critique of method. The topics should be ambitious and the coverage should be comprehensive, well illustrated by concrete cases, interpretive, and oriented toward future research. Festschrift articles cannot be given CA treatment, however, since the authors usually desire that their articles be a surprise to the persons honored.

We shall happily receive suggestions for similar series of articles. The organizer of the Festschrift, however, commits himself to full preparation and editorial supervision of the work involved. We do not promise to publish the articles unless they are fully suitable for CA—articles that could otherwise also have been published. Furthermore, there is the usual language limitation. The articles will have to be in English. If you want to honor someone, therefore, and you wish to do it in another language, CA unfortunately cannot be of service to you.

Research Grants: This department (4:378, 5:127) proves useful but troublesome. The criticisms of B. K. Thapar, G. Lasker, and G. L. Trager (5:77-78) suggest some needed changes. First, we ought to classify the grants primarily by the subject of the research, topically and geographically. The purpose of publishing the material is to apprise Associates of research being undertaken, so that they can communicate about it. Second, we should if possible have better descriptions. And third, clearly we should get information from more granting agencies in different parts of the world. The Directory of Institutions includes only 8 such agencies (5:274) because, presumably, in many countries research is subsidized in other ways. It would be helpful now if Associates would advise how we can get better lists of specific researches about to be undertaken. Item 5 includes not only this general request, but the beginning of a possible means of collecting information for a department, “New Research,” into which “Research Grants” ought eventually to be absorbed.
3. SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PROBLEMS

April 1961

The CA Dictionaries: Plans for two new anthropological dictionaries, the Dictionary of Anthropology and the Multilingual Glossary of Anthropological Terms, are announced on pp. 121-135. At present, the Glossary is being assembled in four languages, English, French, German, and Spanish. Since the size of CA pages permits six languages, Associates should decide which two additional languages would be most useful, and indicate their choices in Item 5 of the Reply Letter. The choice of languages depends in part on persons who can and will develop the dictionary in those languages in cooperation with Dr. Mostny. Please communicate directly with Dr. Greta Mostny, Museo Nacional de Historia Natural, Casilla 787, Santiago, Chile, on the multilingual glossary, and with Dr. Wolfgang H. Lindig, Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, Freie Universität Berlin, Habelschwerder Allee 19, Berlin-Dahlem, Germany, (F.R.), if you wish to write articles for the Dictionary of Anthropology.

June 1962

Ph.D. Dissertations: In Letter to Associates No. 5 (July 1960) a proposal was made to complete and expand the list of titles of "Dissertations in Anthropology Submitted to Educational Institutions of the World in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Ph.D. or Equivalent." The list last appeared in the 1955 Yearbook of Anthropology published by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Associates were asked to indicate, first, whether such a listing of Ph.D. dissertations was worth continuing. The names of the 61 institutions included in the earlier listing were given, and Associates were also asked to 
advise CA of other educational institutions which should be added to the list, as well as to tell us the name of the individual at each institution to whom a questionnaire should be addressed. A third task assigned to Associates was to recommend the most useful categories of information to be sought and the most functional order in which it should be presented.

Replies to these queries were received from Associates in 23 countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, British West Indies, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Japan, Jugoslavia, Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, and United States of America. There were 80 additional institutions submitted by Associates for inclusion in the new list, and 108 suggestions dealing with the form of the questionnaire, the categories of information which should be supplied, and the sequence of data which would be most useful.

 Provision of a thorough cross-index for major classifications met with the most overwhelming approval of those responding. Specific mention of the desirability of this system was made by 20 Associates, and the majority implied endorsement of this plan by the content of their other suggestions. The largest single group (54) urged that the list be classified primarily by subject; several insisted that the project would not be worthwhile unless this were done. The next largest vote (31) was for classifying by author. While 22 favored listing by title, many Associates seemed to feel that titles are often misleading or uninformative and would not be very useful. Other categories recommended were: by institution (19), geographically (12), and by field of specialty (7). These tallies are not necessarily mutually exclusive; many Associates mentioned several of them as equally desirable.

The inclusion of a résumé, abstract, or summary was strongly urged by 20 Associates. Knowing about availability (how and where and in what form they could be obtained) was important to 18 of those responding; there were 6 Associates who specifically wanted to know if the dissertations were on microfilm.

Among other facts thought to be useful were: date and place of publication (17 Associates), date of degree was granted (14), length of the paper in pages or volumes (5), methodology used (5), and author’s address (2). There were several miscellaneous suggestions: one Associate preferred using Family Relations Area Files, topically, for classifying; another would like to know if the paper is illustrated; one is interested in an evaluation by the thesis committee; and another thinks that points of special interest should be highlighted.

The order for the data presented in the 1953 volume still seems best to the 20 Associates who specifically mentioned it. Judging from the comments, however, the order, as such, seemed to be of secondary importance to most, as long as the cross-indexing provides the desired information. The final form of the questionnaire will attempt to take into account those categories of information in which most interest has been expressed by Associates, and the type of organization of the data which has been most often recommended. At the same time, every effort will be made to keep both the questionnaire and the published list as simple and functional as possible.

From the tabulation of responses noted above, the most practicable arrangement for the published list seems to be the following:

1. Main list by author, giving the title of the dissertation, the subject matter, field of specialty broadly considered, geographical area covered, institution granting degree and date, and availability (including publication information, if any). Obtaining a summary of the paper from its author presents so many difficulties that it seems unfeasible for this listing. Inasmuch as many of the dissertation writers are likely to be Associates in CA, it will be simpler for the person desiring further information to write directly to the author, using the Associates’ roster published in CA.

This basic list will then be cross-indexed under several other headings: 2. alphabetical list of the institutions granting the degrees; 3. subject matter of the dissertation; 4. geographical areas treated; and 5. field of specialty of the author.

June 1961

Directory of Anthropological Institutions: As an initial step toward developing a new edition of the 1953 Directory of Anthropological Institutions, we are printing on pages 286-298 a slightly revised list of the institutions included in the Directory, as well as copies of the questionnaires with which the 1953 information was gathered. On the attached Reply Letter (Item 4), please inform us about any new or defunct institution, or any other changes that should be noted. In this way, we shall obtain a new list to which questionnaires may be sent. Please also indicate any changes that might be called for in the questionnaire.

June 1962

The project of preparing a new edition of the International Directory of Anthropological Institutions has been under consideration for some time, and much thought has been given to the most useful and feasible form in which it should be published. It now seems most practical to present the new Directory as a special supplement (or a special section) of an issue of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY.

The need for a new edition of the International Directory of Anthropological Institutions (1953) was discussed in the June 1961 issue of CA (2:286). Associates were asked to help in (1) obtaining a complete and up-to-date list of institutions to be included in the new edition; and (2) preparing questionnaires to be sent to these.

A list of the institutions and organizations included in the 1953 Directory and a copy of the original questionnaire used in gathering the information were reproduced, and associates asked to respond in Reply Letter No. 9 with (1) additions, deletions, or changes in the list; and (2) suggestions for revising the form of the questionnaire to be used in compiling material for the new edition of the Directory.

Many useful ideas were received, both for developing the list of institutions itself, and for improving the process of collecting the information about them. Among the important questions raised were:

1. The variable criteria used in different countries for defining institutions and organizations related to the anthropological fields. It was pointed out that the 1953 coverage of various countries was highly unequal because of this lack of uniformity in designating appropriate institutions. Several Associates from Germany, for example, write that since there is in German no single term for what in English is called “anthropology,” only those institutions having chairs in certain subdisciplines, particularly physical anthropology and ethnology, tended to be mentioned, while such subfields as prehistory, archaeology, and folklore were greatly underrepresented.

2. The difficulty in adapting the questionnaire to forms of organization characteristic of some countries. It was not clear to many, for instance, whether a university as a whole, or only the particular institute or department were meant to be considered. An Associate in India points out that many of the Indian universities are simply affiliating bodies for several dozen colleges, some of which may have Anthropology Departments, and asks whether these should be classified separately in the Directory.

An Associate in Japan suggests that the criteria for listing should be
broadened to include all agencies concerned with the "Sciences of Man," but that the scope of this subject should be very clear defined to help determine appropriate inclusions. He points out that in the case of Japan a listing of the various university "faculties" would be more meaningful, since various schools or divisions are often located in different cities and departments have "very little contact with each other."

In order to help solve some of these problems of criteria and national organization patterns, several Associates recommended that committees be set up nationally or regionally to "coordinate the compilers," in the words of one Associate.

3. Some Associates were particularly concerned with series publications, and a few recommended making a separate list, rather than merely incorporating them as entries under those institutions which publish them. A Canadian Associate urged that anthropological periodicals not be attached to institutions be included also, since although they are "private" publications, they do serve as a "public" forum for the field.

4. To avoid what was described as "chaos" in the earlier lists, one Associate advised that the International section be followed by a geographical arrangement of the list alphabetically by continent (Africa, Asia, etc.), under which there would be an alphabetical listing of countries within each continent.

5. Many specific suggestions were aimed at getting more detailed information from the questionnaire, while, on the other hand, there were those who, like a Czechoslovak Associate, urged leaving out "a lot of unnecessary questions because it is too complicated."

Taking into account all these problems and the needs of those who would find the list useful, our inclination has been to work in the direction of simplifying the categories of information to be included in a given entry, but elaborating the system of cross-indexing. The Directory as now conceived would be similar to the List of Associates in one obvious way: it would be published periodically in CA. It will be designed primarily to offer a complete listing of institutions which are Associates in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. Any institution not presently an Associate will be invited to become one at the time the questionnaire is returned. (In most cases individual scholars who are themselves Associates are connected with these institutions, and if they wish to share their copies of the journal with their institutions as "mixed" Associates, no new financial arrangements will be needed.) I am confident that we can expect the cooperation of our individual Associates also in having the questionnaires properly filled out for their own institutions.

In the new list the basic information will be entered in a single alphabetical listing by the name of the institution. Entries in the proposed Directory would have a form similar to these:

**NAME OF UNIVERSITY.** Address. Degrees granted in anthropology; research facilities; major field of interest; geographic area covered; symbol for type of institution (in this case, "educational").

**NAME OF MUSEUM.** Address. Research facilities; exhibits; major field of interest; geographic area covered; symbol for type of institution ("museum").

**NAME OF JOURNAL.** Address. Field of interest; geographic area covered; symbol for "periodical."

**NAME OF SOCIETY.** Address. Field of interest; geographic area covered; membership requirements; symbol for "society."

In addition to this entry, additional sections would provide cross references to this list under various headings: geographic, type of institution, major field of interest, etc. Thus, under U.S.A., Midwest, would be found "Chicago Natural History Museum"; "Chicago University of"; "Current Anthropology"; and "Northwestern University." Thus also under Museums would be found in its alphabetical place "Chicago Natural History Museum"; under Educational Institutions "Chicago, University of"; and "Northwestern University"; and under Periodicals "Current Anthropology." Reference can then be made to the basic list for the various categories of information which will be included in the entries, as shown above.

With this kind of presentation it is felt that the Directory can serve more useful purposes as a ready reference. For example, an Associate planning to travel in Africa could check the geographic listing and make his choice of institutions on his itinerary which he might want to stop and visit.

It is true that such a Directory will not contain as much detailed information as may be needed in a given case. As many Associates have pointed out, however, such details become rapidly obsolete, so that in most situations it is in any case preferable to write directly to the institution for current information. The new abbreviated Directory will be conceived as a compact reference tool, coordinated with the interests of CA Associates, rather than as an attempt to provide statistics or full descriptions.
over to the University of Chicago with the provision that they be entirely at the disposal of this Editor. The Foundation, committed to support but not to influence this establishment of world-wide intercommunication among us, leans far backward to avoid any suggestion of interference with the Editor. In turn, I too do not make decisions for others, but am committed to maintaining CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY by (1) discovering how it can be useful to the community of scholars, (2) doing what seems to be wanted and necessary, (3) being always responsive to criticisms and suggestions.

If Associates in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY are asked to select one from among us to receive an award for outstanding contributions, how should it be done? A committee? Who would appoint it, and on what criteria or basis? How could all be represented, geographically and by interest, and how could the committee meet? Rather than try to resolve such problems, it seems wiser to follow the CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY pattern and intercommunicate directly as individual scholars. If so, how would the following work out?

(1) In the Reply Letter with the January, 1961, issue, we all make nominations.

(2) In the May, 1961, issue, the names of all nominees are printed, and we state our preferences in the accompanying Reply Letter.

(3) In the September, 1961, issue, the names of the top ten are published, with biographical sketches, and a ballot provided.

(4) In the January, 1962, issue, the result is announced.

Presumably, under such a scheme, at least the final ballots should be addressed not to the Editor’s office but to some wholly impartial and preferably international agency where they could be kept and counted.

There are two questions. First, would this be a fair and feasible scheme whereby to choose a Medalist on a world-wide scale? Second, could the scheme guarantee that the Award would continue to be made for scholarly and scientific achievements? The danger is that it might become a mark only of renown or popularity.

February 1961

Dr. Paul Fejos, President of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, informed me last year that after 1960 the Foundation would not continue to award the medals unless a means could be found to make the selection internationally. The question became whether this might be done through CA. Would Associates accept this responsibility? I asked your opinions (in Reply Letter No. 4) with the following results:

☐ We should agree to exercise the responsibility ............ 232
☐ with Associates voting directly, by mail .... 207
☐ according to some other method ............ 25
☐ We should ask to be excused from the responsibility ............ 70

No preference expressed ............ 43

Total replies received by September 30 ............ 345

Among the choices offered, Associates thus clearly preferred to accept rather than to reject the privilege. This conclusion I reported to Dr. Fejos. Subsequently, the Foundation formally invited Associates in CA to choose the 1961 Viking Fund Medalist. Because almost 77% of the Associates who had expressed views had been favorable, I accepted on behalf of all of us this privilege and responsibility.

However, the 22% of negative responses would not be ignored, particularly since some of them were accompanied by thoughtful arguments. Some of the small group of Associates who wished to award the Medal through CA, but not by direct vote, used similar arguments. The major concern expressed is that Associates cannot know and compare the work of scientists all over the world and in all the disciplines of our sciences. Therefore, since no Associate can make a qualified judgment among all, the medalist might be selected for the wrong reasons. Therefore, some suggested that a committee be established to nominate candidates, or to select the winner from a list nominated by Associates, or both.

In my conversations in Europe this summer, we discussed at length both the problem and the proposed alternatives. Eventually it became apparent that (1) it would be safer (as well as simpler) to follow the direct method of choice without intercession of committees, and (2) the danger of making a bad selection is not in fact great. The reasoning follows:

Each Associate knows and uses the work of a limited number of scientists, and he will nominate from among those he knows the one who (in his view) has made the most important recent contributions. The ten scientists nominated by the largest number of Associates would then be included in a final list, from which each Associate would then have to choose a single one. While no single Associate will know well the work of all ten among whom he must choose, everyone on the list is there because he has won the respect of a substantial number of scholars who do know his work. Therefore, an unworthy person could never be chosen, and the chances are excellent that the final list would include the 10 scientists who have impressed the greatest number of their knowledgeable colleagues with the importance and usefulness of their contributions. It is true that the method favors the scientist whose work affects and influences others over an equally brilliant scientist whose research is in so narrow a field that very few others know it; whether good or bad, this would be the same by any method of choice, and the Viking medalists chosen by American committees in the past we also all persons of broad interest and influence.

Granted that the ten nominees on the list would all be worthy of the Viking Fund Medal, would the single one chosen by Associates from among these ten be the most worthy? Whether a committee does the choosing, or whether the choice is made directly by all Associates, there could never be agreement on such a matter. How does one compare the scientific contributions of very different persons—for example, Darwin, Marx, Freud, Einstein? But this difficulty also is likely to resolve itself. Suppose that the ten persons nominated in 1961 are the imaginary list that follows:

A—a geneticist who has reclassified populations in a way that suits most of the known evidence.

B—an Africanist who has put new order into the data of the whole continent.

C—the discoverer of a new hominid fossil that finally shows the relationship between sapiens and neanderthalensis.

D—an ethnologist who has conclusively demonstrated paths of worldwide cultural diffusion.

E—a linguist who shows the cultural interrelation of symbols.

F—the developer of a successful statistical method of relating and interpreting ethnographic data.

G—a brilliant fieldworker who in one instance has shown fully how religion operates.

H—a great teacher, writer, synthesizer who has moved to a new level our understanding of the relations of culture and biology.

J—the person who has broken the Maya hieroglyphic system of writing.

K—the “father” of a new and all-embracing theory of technological change.

Associates voting would anticipate these contributions differently, according to their own fields and interests. What, then, of relative numbers? Suppose our Associates break down something like this:
Would the first group always monopolize the choice because of sheer numbers? No; in fact, they would divide their votes among at least B, D, F, G, and K; while the fourth group (for example) would give most of its votes to E and J, who each might get as many votes as anybody. Furthermore, the group "getting in" an excellent candidate one year would have to give way next year to an excellent candidate of another field. Suppose, for example, that the distribution of votes in 1961 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of distribution thus shows relatively small breaks between the first six names, with a large break separating these from the others named.

The concern expressed by some Associates over this method of selecting a Viking Medalist (see Letter to Associates No. 6) seems to have been unfounded. By March 10, a total of 271 reply letters had been received. These are listed below so that each Associate can see whether his reply came in time. Four, which were from Institutional Associates, were not counted. Twenty-six reported no preference for a Medalist—five of these objected to the method of selection; the others either doubted their qualifications for making a choice, or said nothing. Thirteen Associates named persons who have already received Viking Medals and are therefore ineligible. The remainder (228) were counted, and the results are reported in this issue (219-200).

Although a few of the anthropologists named are known only locally, the overwhelming majority are persons whose names would have appeared no matter what means of selection were used. The list of 6 Candidates is one that (I am told) might well have emerged for high consideration by any world-wide committee.

It is particularly satisfying that none of the candidates (or the near-candidates whose names were mentioned several times) was selected by a parochial group from one nation. The following tabulation may be of interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Nominations from own country</th>
<th>Nominations from other countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A year ago the opportunity to select the Viking Medalist was gratefully accepted partly because it would add a function that might strengthen the "machinery" of CA.

The brief announcement on Page 1 is amplified for Associates in the following letter received from Dr. Paul Fejos, President of the Wenner-Gren Foundation:

The Wenner-Gren Foundation is grateful to the 591 Associates who sent ballots to the Foundation in New York. Since the ballot was part of "Associates Reply Letter No. 9," the following procedure was carefully followed by the Foundation in New York, where Reply Letter No. 9 was addressed:

1. Ballots attached to CA Reply Letter No. 9 were stamped with the date on which they were received at the Foundation.
2. A day by day list of Associates from whom ballots were received was kept.
3. Ballots were detached from the Reply Letters. Reply Letters were sent on to Editor of CA.
4. Ballots were placed under lock and key after Steps 1 through 3 were completed.
5. The list of Associates from whom ballots were received was also kept under lock and key.

Since each ballot was dated, it is possible to certify the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>572</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Directory of Anthropologists: The story on page 426 is intended to help a committee in the U.S.A. develop the long-awaited fourth edition of the Directory. CA may be in a position to help in distributing the questionnaire, but we might be even more useful in helping to develop a questionnaire that will result in the
It has been suggested that CA help coordinate worldwide research in matters of war and peace (3:56A, 78; 4: 234). But what in anthropological knowledge is relevant to such problems? What research might anthropologists do that we are not already doing? Do our disciplines have any compelling special functions or anything at all—to help the world to keep peace while we improve our understanding of man and culture?

In order to find out, and cognizant of my promise in Letter to Associates No. 12 (February 1962) I proposed to the Wenner-Gren Foundation a series of conferences on "Anthropology and World Affairs" designed as a research on anthropology itself. Eventually the plan was explained in an introduction to a series of papers which were reprinted and sent to Associates in the U.S.A. and Canada:

This is the beginning of an enterprise designed to undertake empirically what in anthropological knowledge is relevant to problems which face the world and with which we have not generally been concerned. The problems are large, varied, complex and presumably interconnected; differences in wealth of nations and peoples; the "population explosion;" major differences in economic-political systems; the danger of nuclear world war; and so on.

Anthropologists tend to agree on questions of race, colonialism, ethnic minorities, etc., and can point to knowledge relevant to our "positions" on these matters. The large questions asked, therefore, is: if we who have anthropological training take on some of the other questions, will we discover that with respect to them also we tend to have a common position? If so, is it because of some general anthropological understanding that comes from being anthropologists? If not, are the differences among us based on differences in our anthropological understandings that can then be cleared up by discussion, or are they put out to agree generally or not? What, if anything, can the alternative preferences be explained? In the case of any or all of these, is there agreement of positions around the table? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them? What other issues of world affairs impinge upon the special issue and with which each of them, what agreement is there, and what issues of world affairs (if any) are independent of the special one posed? In the case of any or all of these, is there agreement of positions around the table? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them?

Anthropologists have been selected in each local conference a copy of the papers for the preference may be added if they are independent of the special one posed? Whether we turn to the position(s) taken? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them? What other issues of world affairs impinge upon the special issue and with which each of them, what agreement is there, and what issues of world affairs (if any) are independent of the special one posed? In the case of any or all of these, is there agreement of positions around the table? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them?

5. A report of each conference, answering these questions, will be sent to New York for comparison and analysis; the indicated problems for research in anthropology (if any) will be set up. Each participant will receive a copy of the general report, and the chairman of each local conference a copy of the papers by the people who will attend that conference.

4. At each local conference (limited to 20 persons maximum) discussion around the table will in general follow this pattern: a. Deterrent Strategy: Is there a preferred decision, and if so, why? If not, can the alternative preferences be explained? b. What, if anything, of anthropological knowledge appears relevant in explaining the position(s) taken? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them? c. What other issues of world affairs impinge upon the special issue and with which each of them, what agreement is there, and what issues of world affairs (if any) are independent of the special one posed? In the case of any or all of these, is there agreement of positions around the table? What are the issues underlying preferences in position and the anthropological knowledge relevant to them?

3. The papers will be studied the weekend of February 2-3 and a general report prepared on the "positions" taken. At the same time, the local conferences will be set up. Each participant will be notified of the location of the nearest conference and the name of the conference chairman with whom to arrange his attendance. Each participant will receive a copy of the general report, and the chairman of each local conference a copy of the papers by the people who will attend that conference.

2. All professional anthropologists are invited to participate, beginning for convenience with U.S.A. and Canadian Associates in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. Those of you who wish to accept the invitation might send the three things indicated:

a. Study the papers which are included in this book; if you study other materials also you should indicate so.

b. Write a paper—as brief as possible—indicating at least which of the alternative policies you prefer. A suggested format is first to state the alternatives as you understood them, and then your preference. Reasons for the preference may be added if they can be stated briefly.

c. Send the paper (two copies) to the Wenner-Gren Foundation, 14 East 71st Street, New York 21, N.Y. Of course, state your name, address and major field of anthropology; whether you wish to attend a local conference (at your own expense) February 22-24 and how far you are willing to travel.

The first paper is a recent calculation of the major problems of the postwar world to which we have given little professional attention.

In order to discover then the answer to the empirical question, this is the research design:

1. We choose one specific "modern" problem that has hitherto been quite foreign to us, but on which considerable theory has developed in other fields: so called "Deterrent Strategy." A series of papers on this subject forms the main body of this booklet.

The first paper is a recent calculation of the basic "military balance" of the Western vs. Soviet blocs; the following five selections, by Brower, Halperin, Kahn, Waskow, and Brill, concern policies related to deterrent strategy. The last paper deals with the general problem of social scientists and action. All of these papers discuss the problem from the Western alliance viewpoint; present, by a set of similar papers could be written from the Soviet viewpoint, for example.

I would have sent the book to Associates all over the world, but to perform the same function the papers would have had to be selected in each country from its own point of view. All these papers, therefore, are written from the point of view of Japan, India, France or the U.S.S.R., for examples.
Therefore, I sent copies to a single person in each of 4 countries to seek advice. Two of them replied that it would be better not to undertake conferences elsewhere until the North American Conferences were reported. Meanwhile, Associates in the U.S.A. warned against distributing such papers lest others think their North American colleagues are obsessed with war and convinced only of military strategy. Nevertheless any Associate may now receive a copy simply by checking Item 5 of the Reply Letter. The reason for these particular papers was chosen is precisely that anthropologists have not generally been concerned with these matters. They would thus be posed with a common problem—the evident acceptance by governments of a strategy of increasing nuclear armaments as a means of averting nuclear war.

Many U.S.A. anthropologists evidently declined entirely to take up the challenge because they were outraged by the content of the papers which seemed to describe alternative ways to commit suicide. However, 75 Associates did respond. Their replies were analyzed by Robert P. Wolff (who had also helped to select the papers), who reported that:

With only a handful of exceptions, the entire group of papers displays neither belief in nor preference for any one of the alternative policies which the past three [U.S.A.] Administrations have espoused. Confronted with a choice among counterfactual alternatives, first-strike and second-strike, the respondents displayed reactions ranging from scepticism to disgust. Forced to choose, many who rejected all the alternatives would probably have opted for some form of minimal deterrence; relieved of the obligation of choice, many who made a selection would probably have been happy to say "a pox on both your houses." In any case, the poll was a failure. But in fact it succeeded in eliciting a quite consistent attitude toward problems of international peace.... Here we find papers rejecting the language and concepts of the deterrence strategists as unreal, unnatural, impossible to take seriously, or useless. Several persons refused to discuss the question in the terms set by the readings; others argued in considerable detail that the entire deterrence strategy was a failure for economic, political, or ideological struggles. As anthropologists, as citizens, and as intellectuals, this group insisted that it could not fruitfully think about world peace in terms of alternative military strategies. In some cases, it was evident that the authors had thought deeply about questions of deterrence and had arrived at a process of reasoning at their rejection of the debate; in other cases, this rejection seemed immediate and instinctive. "First strike," controlled retaliation, and "Doomsday machine" simply couldn't be the appropriate language for discussing the planning of a peaceful world!

The consistency of response throughout the entire body of papers continues when we turn to the positive alternatives offered by the authors. Here the language and frame of reference of the "dissenters" was indistinguishable from that of the more orthodox respondents. The keywords were: a rejection of ethnocentricity (or exclusive concern with a purely American point of view); a holistic approach to the cultures of the major powers; an insistence that war and international conflict were to be viewed as culture traits, or as institutions of a society, not as the consequences of this or that policy; that the long run, rather than the short run, is the appropriate frame of reference; that nuclear war is not science or anything else can be used to make communication easier, not to substitute for genuine discussion among Associates everywhere. Suffice it to say now that the results of the discussions so far indicate that CA Associates in the U.S.A. take (as might be expected) the super-national "humanitarian" view that is likely to be found among scholars everywhere who habitually think in the broadest historical terms about politics and culture. When we can point to and develop the theory and knowledge that lie behind this view we shall be on the road to whatever major contribution anthropology is to make to the affairs of a problematic world.

Problems of Language

October 1963

"Nonpartisan" Language: John Donoghue's report on his research among the Rhade of South Vietnam in this (October) issue, pp. 382-384, presented a most difficult challenge. Whether or not science or anything else can be truly non-political or non-national, CA tries hard at least fairly to represent all of us. The easiest way would have seemed to discuss all subjects. Donoghue's is very difficult. He studied a people involved in a serious and complicated military action; he is in fact not the man from Mars but a citizen of one of the nations engaged in the action; he had to show in the writing that his study was as objective as any scientist could hope to make it. To do so is important to our profession; we cannot respect ourselves without mutual confidence. The way to confidence is full and immediate publication, our only protection against actual bias or the accusation that one's data were gathered for partisan purposes.

But the special difficulty of language remains. The conflict in the world is reflected in the words we use. Americans casually use words like Democratic and Communist, or "the Free World" or "Iron Curtain Countries" as simply descriptive labels without realizing that because they color the speech of popular and biased journalist and national statesmen, they are symbols of quite different meaning for many of our colleagues abroad.

It became necessary, therefore, for Donoghue to become more conscious of the language of his article, and to substitute truly descriptive terms for clichés. Probably he has not fully succeeded; we would all gain greatly if Associates would write us (Item 6) of offensive phrases which still appear in the article. Precisely because CA is published in the language of part of the world, its English must transcend the biases of the nations to which it is native.

February 1962

Arguments ad hominem: I have been trying to establish an appropriate role for the editor of CA. It was agreed from the beginning that the Editor must open and keep open channels of communication among Associates. "Editorial judgment" was to be used to make communication easier, not to stop it. We are committed also to being as fair as possible to all views, disciplines, and national traditions. This is not always easy; in the current treatment of Bielicki's article there is an example of a difficult choice in which many Associates will not concurred. When Dr. Michalski's comment came to me, I returned to him an
Ad hominem: 3 letters in this issue (5:77) express shock and distaste for personal references in a recent exchange in CA, and 2 suggest that the Editor should exercise more discretion. On page 78 begins a report on the previous discussion of the problem. The discussion gives me no clear directive. I propose that when a manuscript contains personal references, we refer the author to this discussion and ask him to consider carefully if they can be justified by the scientific and scholarly purpose to be served. If the author persists, we shall publish, and also publish any criticism his personal references evoke. Your opinions of this solution would now be useful (Item 5).

As this goes to press, Santiago Genovés makes the following plea which adds greatly to the moral weight favoring courtesy and care in scholarly interchanges:

A recent paper by C. Loring Brace, "The Fate of the 'Classic' Neanderthals: A Consideration of Hominid Catastrophism" (CA 3:1), was commented upon by 17 scholars, 9 of whom, myself included, felt unhappy about its tone and strong phraseology.

Some of us—and I want flatly to state—mea culpa—used a phraseology in our comments that was certainly not less humble or malevolent than that of Brace. Of course, this prompted a Reply, published in the same issue of CA, that was still less appropriate in style than the original article.

Recent controversial discussions of Race and Racism, Oto-Africanus Coon's latest book, etc., have also degenerated into language which certainly has not been quite appropriate.

Now, CA is a "world journal of the sciences of man," and I believe it was Sophocles who, when asked what he admired most in man, answered that it was his spirit of cooperation, his ability to consult and live in harmony with his fellow men (or words to that purpose).

I am herewith urging the Editor of this journal of anthropologists to urge us—and I admit my own error in more than one instance—to a more humble, charitable, scientific manner of expression, which need not detract from subtlety, irony, or any other of the manifold charms of literature. A spade can be called a spade and not an agricultural implement. It can also be described as something else. It is this else that we should avoid.

American Authorship: We have had several cautions from Associates in the U.S.A. that too many of our articles are written by Americans. Indeed, of the nine review articles so far published, only two (Pericot and Ripoll in March, and Clark in this issue) are by Associates who live outside the U.S.A. We have, and to our great regret, no correspondence from all over the world, including comments on articles; and Kurath's "Panorama of Dance Ethnology" is a worldwide composite from beginning to end. Nevertheless, the Associates who have put together our major articles have so far been disproportionately American.

The philosophy of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY as it has developed specifies that we are individual scholars associated together without respect to national lines. This suggests (1) that we ought to have articles from Associates everywhere, but (2) that the nationality of our authors should not concern us. The reason why our first articles have been mostly by Americans will be obvious to all: CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY is edited in the U.S.A., so that geography as well as language and culture make communications quicker and easier, and scholars in the U.S.A. got an earlier start on CA than scholars anywhere else. But, while a year ago more than half of our Associates were Americans, this disproportion has steadily been lessening, until now the proportion of Americans is less than 40%. As the disproportion continues to lessen, their written contributions will also be relatively fewer.

Meantime, we continue to invite contributions from all over the world, regardless of the country or discipline, and to print good material as it comes, trusting that soon scholars everywhere will contribute their knowledge to the common worldwide store.

December 1961

Each new issue of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY is received in our office with mixed apprehension (fear of discovering mistakes now forever set in print!) and satisfaction. When the October issue arrived, there was a surprise in store for us: we looked at the table of contents and for the first time noticed that not a single U.S.A. Associate was listed among the authors! Comas lives in Mexico; Haselberger in Austria; Singer in South Africa; Pericot in Spain; Jungraithmayr in Germany; and Diakonoff in the Soviet Union. What pleased us even more than this diversity was the fact that, through all the stages of editing and production, none of us in the CA office had so much as noticed the phenomenon.

A World Language? Once scholars in Europe all read Latin, which was perhaps a "neutral" language. Today there is no "neutral" scholarly language; and CA must be published in English, which our Associates agree is read (in 1962) by more anthropologists than is any other one language. Aside from sentiment and politics, it perhaps makes no difference whether our major languages is used for worldwide communication. But it appears that no one of the present "world languages" is, in fact, gaining ground; and the coming years may see anthropologists translating more than ever, from and into Russian, Chinese, English, Spanish, French, German, Japanese, etc., when any translation will help; but inevitably we give up the dream of a common language.

The problem goes beyond science and scholarship. The medieval Euro-
pean separation between scholar and citizen is not possible with modern technology. But if a common language is necessary "vertically" in our future society, it must also necessarily bind all parts of a world tied by social and economic bonds. No group is more qualified to study this problem than the Associates in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY, and this note is to suggest that our linguists and others take some initiative, perhaps during the 9th International Congress of Linguists, which will meet in Cambridge, Massachusetts (U.S.A.), August 27-31, 1962.

Somebody might also prepare for CA an article on the history of attempts to establish a world language (Esperanto, Interlingua, Basic English, etc.). According to linguists with whom I have discussed this over the past years, one thing that might succeed is selected "natural" language which happens to be (1) unusually easy to learn for speakers of most other languages and (2) proven capable of easily incorporating concepts of science. Malay and Turkish have been suggested as fulfilling these criteria; but there might be dozens of other languages equally suited. A natural language has the advantage (as Margaret Mead wrote on November 5, 1961) of having been "shaped and tested by time and speakers of many degrees of intelligence and types of imagery, both sexes, all ages, etc." If it also has the two characteristics mentioned, and has no great "political" disadvantages, it might succeed where artificial languages have failed.

Recently I wrote to a high official of the United Nations Secretariat:

"Suppose that a fairy waved a magic wand so that 'everybody in the world' spoke X as a second language? Schools all over the world were teaching it at all levels; people were listening to identical radio and TV programs simultaneously broadcast, and reading the same newspapers, magazines, and books, printed in X; and we were half-way through a project to translate all of the United Nations Secretariat: into X-it might not save the world, but it seems to make too much of something. So we regretfully follow American tradition (Webster's dictionary). The temptation is to make some reasonable compromises. One is that we shall spell archaeology with the "a"—what is more appropriate than an "older" form? At the same time, might we not try to simplify and "rationalize," as well as bring the two together? In 1877 a lexicographer named Worcester (Dictionary of the English Language, Philadelphia, p. xxv) wrote that, "Some ingenious men have attempted to introduce a uniformity... but these attempts have been attended with little success.'"

January 1960

Language: Language is a real problem. By general agreement, we publish in English, which is read by more scholars than any other language. It is convenient because it is the Editor's language—perhaps too convenient to be a coincidence? Since we want this to be a world journal, not American or even European or "Western," such a suggestion is embarrassing. We want to "make up" in any possible ways for the fact that we publish in English. For one thing we can adopt a suggestion made to me by Mlle. Yvonne Oddon that at least we do not change place names to their English version. At least in our price list (back cover), we follow this rule. How far to go with this is another matter. Surely nobody would want us to write "Bharat" when "India" is mentioned in an article?

For another thing, we need not translate into English technical terms introduced in another language. But do we backtrack on this, and—say—change "hand ax" to coup de poing? It will be too easy to become foolish in these matters.

Another problem concerns the spelling of English itself. Which spelling should be used—English, or American? Note the following examples of preferences in English versus American:

- anemia—anemia
- oesophagus—esophagus
- enpanel—impanel
- emic—emic
- defense—defense

wherever we are in development of machine translation, this would be speeded up because all would be aimed at translating only into X and the urgency of all other translations would be ended; our graduate students would all be learning X, just like our 5th graders. X would be a new language equally to children, scholars, and diplomats in Ghana, Tokyo, Moscow, Delhi, Chicago, and in villages and towns everywhere. We would all be learning it together. I would try to be the first to turn a scientific journal (CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY) from English into X. We might have a great language market, and get there before we reach the moon!"

My correspondent agreed that it would be a good idea to bring the critical questions to Associates in CA:

"Among all the world's problems, how high a priority does a world language have? Do we know of any technical obstacles to achieving this end? Should we not start the technical work which would have to be done in any case and which might convince statesmen that this is not a far-fetched dream? I mean the question of the level of the problem, and report on any action you may take. (Reply Letter No. 13, Item 5)."

So far we have concluded that the best thing is to publish articles in the English of their authors or translators. Why should we turn American into English, or vice versa, when both are equally understood by our readers? Why should an author have to read such changes in his article, only to serve some end of uniformity? We shall ask for consistency and correctness within any article, but we shall accept any legitimate style of English that is clear.

But what of our own written material—the news and editorial matters and anything else we write? At first we thought to "lean over backward" and use English English, but this seems to make too much of something. So we regrettfully follow American style (Webster's dictionary). The temptation is to make some reasonable compromises. One is that we shall spell archaeology with the "a"—what is more appropriate than an "older" form? At the same time, might we not try to simplify and "rationalize," as well as bring the two together? In 1877 a lexicographer named Worcester (Dictionary of the English Language, Philadelphia, p. xxv), wrote that, "Some ingenious men have attempted to introduce a uniformity... but these attempts have been attended with little success."

July 1960

On page 346 there is a report on Associates' reactions to our policy on language and style. A small minority suggest that we publish in more than one language, which raises the possibility that we might not (as UNESCO does) all of our material in both French and English. Under present circumstances, this could be done only by printing half as much material as we now do. To make certain that the wishes of Associates are understood, all are asked to make this difficult choice on the accompanying Reply Letter, Item 4.

The suggestion that we print abstracts of our articles in languages other than English has always been very attractive. The difficulties are (1) to choose the languages, and (2) to get the abstracts ready for publication. Regarding (1), the case for French and German (at one extreme) is that many people over the world know these; the case for Japanese and Chinese (at the other extreme) is that scholars everywhere should not have to depend forever on European lan-
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centre—center
tonne—meter

plough—plow
defence—defense
guages; and that for Russian and Spanish (in the middle) is that these together would meet both the above arguments. Regarding (2), the practical difficulties of providing abstracts in various languages are considerable. Our review articles are already complex because we usually send them out for CA treatment, and it might well be impossible for the editorial staff to add to their problems of arranging for abstracts in several languages.

Our proposed solution is that we should publish good short abstracts of our articles in any or all languages, providing that each comes to us already approved by the author and by Associates familiar with the language of the abstract. If we receive the abstract in time to print it with the article itself, we shall do so; otherwise, publication can be in a later issue. Thus we leave the initiative to interested Associates, not to our editorial staff, and we do not have to decide which languages are appropriate. Comments on this policy should be made on the accompanying Reply Letter, Item 5.

Meanwhile, we have adopted a related suggestion. We plan to publish our inside-cover material in a different language in each issue, starting with the French version in this present issue. So far, we have asked Associates for translations into Japanese, Russian, German, and Spanish. Associates are invited to take the initiative in sending us a translation (preferably approved by several others) in other languages.

April 1961

Noting that in response to an earlier question a small minority had wanted CA to be printed in more than one language, I raised the possibility of printing the journal in both French and English, as UNESCO does. This could be done only by printing half as much material, and the choice was put to Associates. The result: about 82% prefer the present policy, while 9.5% had no opinion. Dissatisfaction with publication in English was expressed by 35 persons, of whom 21 favored publication of all material in both French and English, while 14 suggested other alternatives.

No significant division along national lines was discernable. In fact, the most vehement protests against changing the present policy were made by Europeans, several of whom denied the existence of any problem of understanding English. Thus (Austria) "Everybody who reads CA knows how to read English," (the recent "We Americans" Americanist) "I don't know I can read the French colleague who cannot read English."

Although originally sentiment for publishing in French as well as in English was strongest among French anthropologists, particularly those living in Africa, this pattern became much less pronounced when it was pointed out that such a policy would entail printing less material. Undeniably, some of the French Associates are unhappy about the situation, but only three are willing to sacrifice material. None of those who voted for publication in both languages are residents of the U.S.A., some of whom consider the present policy unjust and ethnocentric; three are from Italy; and one each from Spain, England, Germany, Chile, Belgium, and Puerto Rico.

The 14 who rejected both alternatives suggested publication in both English and French, but without decreasing the material; publication in English entirely in French (this was an Associate from the U.S.A.); publication in any major language of Western Europe (although one Associate advocated Russian, Japanese, and Chinese as well); and publication of a separate edition in French.

February 1964

The Language Problem Again: Recently one of our Associates in Switzerland sent us a comment in English which had a strong Germanic flavor. When it was edited and returned for his approval, he wrote,

I am unhappy to be forced to give a comment in English. If you have to use a language other than your own, you are forced into simplicity which really gets too simple.

He suggested that we reconsider our earlier solutions to the language problem (Pre-issue, pages 3, 4, 15; Letters to Associates No. 2, 5, 6, and 8; 1346) and publish in the authors' own languages (if European) with summaries in other languages. When I wrote to him, he proposed a specific plan, but he suggested that first we undertake as study of what languages our Associates control, with a questionnaire somewhat as follows:

1. Language in childhood up to age 15.
2. Language used today in the family.
3. Language used mainly in profession.
4. Fluency of reading ability of other languages.

I think this would be most worthwhile, and we shall undertake it not in the Letter to Associates (which would bias the study in favor of those who are fluent in English) but with a separate mailing. In the questionnaire it was voted by Associates who thought that if nobody would be able to read the entire journal, there could not be a single community; if CA were printed in one language (the argument ran) at least all who could read that language would form a community. The language most spoken by anthropologists was thought to be English. So English became the language of CA. Is a world community of English-readers better than a larger community who read only summaries of what others write?

It is important for us to know opinions on the question; but it will be easier to form wise opinions after we have facts of what languages Associates use with ease. (This will of course not be a fair test of languages used by all anthropologists, since CA must already be selective of those more proficient in English.) The possibilities of a world language (Letter to Associates No. 13) will soon be discussed fully in CA by N. A. McQuown, who is analyzing the material supplied by Associates over the months.

July 1964

Enclosed is a multilingual questionnaire, our latest attack on the language problem (see Letter to Associates No. 22, February 1964). With this questionnaire we hope to get information on which languages Associates control. This should give us a better understanding of the exact nature of the language problem. Because it is crucial to the problem we are concerned with minimizing the influence of English on the responses. Thus we have decided on 6 languages. Because Japanese type was not available at the time of printing, Japanese Associates are receiving, in addition to the printed questionnaire, a copy duplicated in Japanese. Obviously these few languages do not include the mother tongues of all Associates. It was impractical to include Arabic, Chinese, Czech or Slovak, Finnish, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Swedish, etc., etc. I apologize to those Associates who are inconvenienced by the choice of languages on the questionnaire.

Please fill out the language questionnaire in whichever language you wish, and return it to this office. If you prefer, the language questionnaire may
Abstracts: When the Editor asked for comments on the suggestion "that we print abstracts of our articles in languages other than English," many Associates apparently interpreted our request as referring to articles by CA Associates, rather than articles in CA. Further confusion was caused by a tendency, on the part of some, to consider this a proposal to appease those who object to English as CA's language of publication. Although most Associates said that they approved the policy suggested, their comments indicate that their interpretations of the suggestion were so disparate that it is impossible to tell what is being approved. Thus, the figures are not really meaningful, and they have not been totalled.

As far as can be determined, the suggestion that was actually made met with considerable approval. On the other hand, a minority set forth strong arguments against this policy. The most frequent objection was that the language barrier, which abstracts were designed to help circumvent, was greatly exaggerated. Some Associates opposed abstracts on principle; and others pointed out that CA review articles are by their nature unsuited to abstracts. To sharpen these issues, and to define them more clearly, several of the objections and some alternative proposals, were printed in the February issue of CA, page 26.

A summary report of the discussion on the advisability of printing abstracts in CA appears in the columns of Our Readers Write (3:370).

Authors of review articles are henceforth asked to submit their own abstracts of not more than 500 words for publication with their original articles. Only the article itself will be abstracted; comments will not be. Abstracts of articles appearing first in other publications will not be solicited, but will be accepted on a voluntary basis. Advance approval of the original author should be secured before the abstract is submitted for publication in CA. English will continue to be the language used for the following reasons:

1) the majority of Associates seem to prefer it;
2) there would be difficult problems in deciding which language would be chosen in a given case;
3) abstracts in other languages will probably be more useful in journals published in those languages.

Reply Letter No. 15 provides space for you to indicate your willingness to abstract articles for publication in CA (Item 7), and the first contributions should be sent as soon as possible.

The question of printing abstracts of the articles published in CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY has been discussed in earlier issues (e.g. Letter to Associates Vol. 4, No. 4, July 1960; Our Readers Write, February 1961; Letter to Associates No. 8, April 1961). As an experiment assessing the practicability of abstracting review articles, Richard B. Woodbury has prepared an abstract of Munro Edmonson's article "Neolithic Diffusion Rates" (April 1961). This is published on page 352 C as a model for similar contributions and a basis for further discussion.

In his covering letter, Dr. Woodbury wrote:

The article itself was not too difficult to abstract, but it was harder to handle the comments briefly and fairly. The article contains roughly 18,000 words, and the comments run to about 19,000. Although the abstract of the article is about 400 words in length (and would occupy about as much space as the editorial note and the footnote on the first page of the article) it takes nearly as much space to abstract the comments. I would suggest that CA carry abstracts of articles, but not of the comments included in them. I shall be interested in your reaction, and I hope you will feel that abstracts are worth the very modest space they need.

Now that the issues involved in our printing abstracts have been sharpened and an example is available, it seems worthwhile to open the discussion again. We would welcome comments by Associates on Dr. Woodbury's abstract and on his suggestions; please note these on Item 3 of the attached Reply Letter. We also invite brief abstracts, in English or another language, of other articles we have published.

Advice from Associates

Footnotes: In response to a plea from an Associate in Yugoslavia, we now print notes at the foot of the page. Our correspondent argued: "Valuable additions and explanations can be given in footnotes without interrupting the main arguments. This value is, however, minimized, if the reader is obliged to turn the pages every now and again. But modern printing seems to be done for the benefit of printers, not for that of readers or authors." It turns out that he is right: the amount of extra trouble and money is small compared to the value of footnotes. This may not be the case in all journals—depending on the printer, the method of printing and editing, and the base on which the printer makes up his bills.

Panel of Reviewers: A recent letter from an Associate contained a critical "review" of the entire April issue, article by article. This communication, which we found extremely worthwhile, suggests the usefulness of a "panel of friendly but critical reviewers, who will write utterly frank impressions of the contents of each issue. Such a panel should include persons from several disciplines, since the reactions of each individual will probably be colored by his or her own interests. Their statements, of course, would be intended for our use only, and would not be published.

Several Associates with whom I discussed this plan agreed that it presents definite advantages. As one of them pointed out, "in view of the great number of Associates, it certainly offers a workable compromise between "democracy" and "practice." Should such a panel be a formally organized group of "reviewers," or would it be better to solicit such reviews (regularly or occasionally) from individuals? Or perhaps we should simply invite all Associates who wish to help us in this way to do so, just as Associates were invited to review the first volume of CA and tell us what material they found particularly useful.
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