

Process and Pattern in Culture

Essays in Honor of
Julian H. Steward



edited by
Robert A. Manners

Process and Pattern in Culture



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Process and Pattern in Culture

Essays in Honor of
Julian H. Steward

edited by
Robert A. Manners

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2007 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2007 by Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 2007024258

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Process and pattern in culture : essays in honor of Julian H. Steward / [edited by] Robert A. Manners.

p. cm.

Originally published: Chicago : Aldine Pub. Co., 1964.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-202-36134-5 (alk. paper)

1. Culture. 2. Social change. I. Steward, Julian Haynes, 1902-1972. II. Manners, Robert A. (Robert Alan), 1913-

HM621.P76 2007

301.092--dc22

2007024258

ISBN 13: 978-0-202-36134-5 (pbk)

*Editor's
Preface*

THIS FESTSCHRIFT commemorates the sixtieth birthday of Julian H. Steward. The essays were contributed by former students, by colleagues, and by other anthropologists whose research or thinking have been influenced by Professor Steward. As we have indicated in the *post hoc* articulation that follows, there was no preconceived attempt to give the volume any unity or to impose upon the contributors any restrictions as to subject matter. On the contrary, each author was urged to write on an anthropological topic of greatest current interest to himself. Nevertheless, when the papers were collected we found it possible to group them under six headings, each of which represents a facet of Steward's broad theoretical interests. Inevitably, there is some overlap. Many of the essays could be placed just as handily within a division other than the one to which we have arbitrarily assigned them. This kind of interchangeability may reflect in some measure the interrelatedness of Steward's contributions to anthropological theory.

The unanticipated relevance of all the selections to Steward's work could reflect also the extent to which his interests continue to be those of anthropologists influenced by him. It may, on the other hand, reflect a parallelism of theoretical concerns within the profession which stems from the cultural ambience which produced Steward himself. I think this latter interpretation would be most appealing to him, not only because he has always reacted with embarrassment and more than a shade of disbelief to assertions about his charisma or his disciplogenetic qualities, but because it fits the theoretical stance most congenial to him. Parallelisms and convergence are aspects of the kind of cultural determinism which has claimed Steward's attention during the many years that he fought a fairly lonely battle to reestablish the respectability of evolutionism

in anthropology. Now that that respectability has been achieved — with an almost bandwagon fervor — it is clear that Steward, as much as anyone else in anthropology, was “responsible” for the change.

The essays in this collection are at once a vindication of his patience, an evidence of the high status he enjoys among anthropologists, and a testimony to the impact of his unusual creativity on his colleagues.

I should like to thank the members of the editorial advisory board: Richard Adams, Morton Fried, Kathleen Gough, Elman Service, Demitri Shimkin and Eric Wolf for their invaluable assistance in the editing of the individual essays. I am especially grateful to Professor Shimkin, not alone for his astute editorial help but for writing the introduction to the collection, and to Jane Steward who prepared Professor Steward’s bibliography which appears at the end of the volume and helped in a number of ways to see the book through the press. Brandeis University subsidized the preparation of an index. A grant to cover a substantial part of the costs of publication was given by the Research Institute for the Study of Man. My sincere thanks for this assistance goes to the Foundation and to its Director, Dr. Vera Rubin.

Robert A. Manners

Contents

DEMITRI B. SHIMKIN	Julian H. Steward: A Contributor to Fact and Theory in Cultural Anthropology	1
THE AUTHORS	Julian Steward's Writings and Essays: A <i>post hoc</i> Articulation	18

The Individual as a Factor in Culture Change I

STANLEY DIAMOND	What History Is	29
MORTON H. FRIED	Ideology, Social Organization and Economic Development in China: A Living Test of Theories	47
OSCAR LEWIS	Seventh Day Adventism in a Mexican Village: A Study in Motivation and Culture Change	63
CHARLES J. ERASMUS	A Raindance in Northwest Mexico: The Causal Analysis of an Event	84

Cultural Patterning in Ceremonialism and Art II

EDWARD H. WINTER	The Slaughter of a Bull: A Study of Cosmology and Ritual	101
IRVING GOLDMAN	The Structure of Ritual in the Northwest Amazon	111
LOUIS C. FARON	Shamanism and Sorcery Among the Mapuche (Araucanians) of Chile	123
ERIC R. WOLF	Santa Claus: Notes on a Collective Representation	147
GORDON R. WILLEY	Diagram of a Pottery Tradition	156

*Sociocultural Integration:
The Structure of
Sedentary Communities* **III**

FRED EGGAN	Alliance and Descent in Western Pueblo Society	175
PEDRO CARRASCO	Family Structure of Sixteenth-Century Tepoztlan	185
HENRY ROSENFELD	From Peasantry to Wage Labor and Residual Peasantry: The Transformation of an Arab Village	211

*Sociocultural Integration:
The Impact of National
and Worldwide Influences* **IV**

DEMITRI B. SHIMKIN	National Forces and Ecological Adaptations in the Development of Russian Peasant Societies	237
SIDNEY W. MINTZ	Currency Problems in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica and Gresham's Law	248
ROBERT A. MANNERS	Colonialism and Native Land Tenure: A Case Study in Ordained Accommodation	266
JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE, STEPHEN I. THOMPSON AND PHILIP D. YOUNG	Colonization as a Research Frontier: The Ecuadorian Case	281
RALPH L. BEALS	Some Value Changes in Modern Mexico	326
HARRY L. SHAPIRO	Anthropology and the Age of Discovery	337

*Types of Cultural
Complexes and
Sociocultural
Systems* **V**

H. G. BARNETT	Diffusion Rates	351
ELMAN R. SERVICE	Archaeological Theory and Eth- nological Fact	364
F. K. LEHMAN	Typology and the Classification of Sociocultural Systems	376

*Cross-Cultural
Regularities* **VI**

GEORGE PETER MURDOCK	Cultural Correlates of the Reg- ulation of Premarital Sex Be- havior	399
ROBERT J. BRAIDWOOD	More Complex Regularities?	411
	Bibliography of Julian H. Stew- ard	418
	Contributors	425
	Index	427



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

*Process
and Pattern
in Culture*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

*Julian H. Steward:
A Contributor to
Fact and Theory
in Cultural
Anthropology*

DEMITRI B.
SHIMKIN

TO SKETCH, with friendly objectivity, the biography, characteristics and contributions of a scholar of wide accomplishments and with years of creative potential still to come is an exacting task. It is particularly difficult in a field such as cultural anthropology, which is undergoing disjunctive changes and which today is uncertain of its very identity. Yet even an imperfect attempt at portraying Julian Steward is both pleasurable and rewarding. He is not merely an active field worker, a fruitful writer, and a successful teacher. He is an uncommon man, with a keen sense of intellectual purpose and order, coupled with high energy, organizational ability and capacity for growth. He has known defeat, illness and self-doubt; he has faced moral issues with strength and determination. Somewhat reserved, perhaps reluctant to expose himself to others' demands, he exemplifies generous friendship toward those he has come to esteem.

1. Biographical Highlights

Julian Steward was born January 31, 1902, in Washington, D.C., the second of two children. He came of intellectual stock — his father, Thomas Gifford Steward, rose, self-trained, to be Chief of the Board of Examiners of the U.S. Patent Office, while his maternal uncle, Edward Garriott, advanced to Chief Forecaster of the U.S. Weather Bureau. Steward's childhood reflected the sylvan environment, leisurely life and quickening excitements of a community just flowering into a world political and scientific capital. He determined early to seek a college education and a professional career, but the outdoors and sports rather than studies preoccupied him until his sixteenth year.

At that time he was selected to attend Deep Springs Preparatory School, on a ranch in the remote mountains near Death Valley, California. This school, founded by L. L. Nunn, a pioneer in the electric-power industry, sought to

develop young men into moral and intellectual leaders. It inculcated hard thinking, careful writing, austere living habits, physical capacity and self-reliance as preparations for careers of public service. Limited resources, a student body of some 20 young men and extreme isolation restricted the variety of learning available, but promoted contemplation, observation and direct experience as roads to knowledge.

In 1921-22, Julian Steward took his freshman year at the University of California. He received a special stimulus from a course in introductory anthropology then taught jointly by A. L. Kroeber, Robert H. Lowie and Edward W. Gifford. However, in common with most other Deep Springs graduates, Steward went on to Cornell University, where he gained an A.B. in 1925. By this time, he was convinced that anthropology was his chosen career; it would yield satisfactions in scientific achievement, social betterment through understanding, and travel. The president of Cornell, Livingston Farrand, himself an anthropologist, advised Steward to return to California to achieve this goal.

Berkeley was then a scene of remarkable creativity. Only two years earlier, A. L. Kroeber had published his incisive *Anthropology*. This work distilled vast scholarship into a compact review of the basic elements, sequences and regions of human culture. Its central concept was the significance of persisting cultural centers whence content flowed to less vital peripheries. Such centers rose under conditions favorable to population growth, but then developed and spread with little direct dependence upon environment. A considerable portion of Kroeber's treatise rested upon his original data on the Indians of California. His monumental monograph on them appeared, much delayed, in 1925. Robert Lowie was already renowned for his studies of the Crow Indians and, especially, for his *Primitive Society*, which had shattered unilinear evolutionism under a barrage of facts. Gifford, less known, was undertaking methodical studies of California Indian social structures.

Steward's fellow students included many of high talent: William Duncan Strong, Lloyd Warner, Ralph Beals, and others. Moreover, cross-fertilization with geography had begun soon after Carl Sauer's arrival in Berkeley in 1923. An understanding of the role of the physical environment in culture and of geographical techniques was communicated to anthropologists not only by formal instruction, but through contact with able graduate students such as F. Kniffen and C. W. Thornthwaite.

Julian Steward rapidly acquired the large bodies of anthropological fact demanded by his teachers. Soon he began to produce original descriptive and theoretical studies based upon field and library re-

searches. In 1926, he participated in excavations along the Columbia River, near the Dalles, and gained therefrom two modest articles and junior authorship in the overall report. The summers of 1927 and 1928 he spent in ethnographic work in Owens Valley, California, an area already familiar to him from his school days. This fieldwork proved highly fruitful. Out of it came Steward's important discovery of the Eastern Mono practice of systematically irrigating wild seed plants and tubers, but without planting or cultivating (Steward, 1930*b*).¹ Another product included his competent ethnography of the Owens Valley Paiute, noteworthy for its meticulous treatment of subsistence and its thorough mapping of settlements, trails, fishing sites, and other elements of land use (Steward, 1933*d*).

During this period, Steward undertook a laborious compilation, description and trait analysis of petroglyphs in California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and Lower California (Steward, 1929*b*). He was able to define regional patterns, and to suggest some indications of chronology and function in these remains. However, it is likely that such a time-consuming and essentially unrewarding study discouraged his further interest in the culture-element approach. He was able to display more significant insights in his mathematical formulation of joint criteria of the probability of diffusion versus independent invention (Steward, 1929*a*) and especially in his doctoral dissertation on the aboriginal North American buffoon (Steward, 1931*b*). Here, underlying great variability in detail, he found "psychic unity" in the tensions and releases of Indian humor . . . "sickness, misfortune, poverty and the like, and physiological necessities affect all groups of men alike. They are equally charged with emotional interest and pleasurable or comic relief from them is everywhere sought" (*ibid.*, 204). This study foreshadowed Steward's increasing concern with parallelism in cultural development, and his willingness to accept psycho-physiological influences in the formation of expressive and, later, adaptive traits.

The shadow of the Great Depression and personal problems burdened Julian Steward's early postdoctoral years at the Universities of Michigan, Utah and California. His investigations centered on Great Basin archaeology, especially cave sites on ancient terraces of the Great Salt Lake Region (Steward, 1937*a*). His analysis of the nature and interrelationships of the archaeological cultures of the northern periphery of the American Southwest, prepared in honor of Robert H. Lowie's fiftieth birthday in 1933, remains noteworthy.

In 1934, newly married to Jane Cannon of Salt Lake City, Steward began a fresh phase of intense fieldwork and creative writing. Almost two years of arduous ethnography in company with his wife produced an enormous mass of observations of Shoshonean cultures which later

culminated in a fundamental monograph on the social structure of a sparse population dependent on seedgathering — *Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups* (Steward, 1938a); in two large inventories of localized cultural detail, carefully collected and precisely recorded — *Culture Element Distributions: XIII. Nevada Shoshoni* (Steward, 1941d) and *XXIII. Northern and Gosiute Shoshoni* (Steward, 1943d); and in a number of papers. Two basic theoretical analyses consolidated Julian Steward's reputation, at least among younger anthropologists. The first, originally rejected by the *American Anthropologist*, apparently because of the descriptive and historical emphasis of that period, was his now-famous "Ecological Aspects of Southwestern Society" (Steward, 1937b). This paper, the first archaeological study of settlement patterns in the New World, postulated the developments of clan organization in Southern California and the Pueblo area as reflections of dense populations concentrated in large villages through threats of war and reinforced by secondary, partly diffused, features, such as group names and ceremonies. In particular, it demonstrated that Basket Maker-Pueblo settlement patterns comprised a unified evolution, characterized by the progressive increase of the ratio of dwelling-rooms to kivas. That trend indicated the grouping of villages into ever fewer and larger groups, most likely changing from demonstrably related lineages to true clans. The second well-known paper, *The Economic and Social Basis of Primitive Bands* (Steward, 1936a) undertook a comparison of the ecology, population density, band size, and marriage rules of hunting and gathering societies resident in highly adverse environments as the foundation for a theory of primary social organization. Its originality lay in its interpretation of the operational consequences of given resources and technologies upon social development — probably the first systematic attempt by an anthropologist to apply the concept of cultural ecology comparatively; its limitation was a paucity of firm evidence.

Overall, Steward's researches were greatly enhanced by his appointment as Associate Anthropologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1935. Through this means he gained the opportunity to widen his sphere of work by participating in applied anthropology under John Collier, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; by fieldwork in highland Ecuador and Peru, as well as among the Carrier Indians of British Columbia; and by collaboration with his colleagues at the Bureau. Personal security also contributed to his development. His elder son, Gary Cannon, was born in 1936 and his younger, Michael, in 1939.

The year 1940 marked both a terminus and a beginning in his affairs. In his essay "Native Cultures of the Intermontane (Great Basin) Area" (1940b) Steward synthesized more than a decade of geographic,

post-glacial geological, archaeological and ethnographic study of the Great Basin. His goals were both descriptive and interpretative; in particular, he sought to define the types, sequences and sources of Great Basin cultures. The results were valuable, but distinctly limited by non-use of Uto-Aztecan comparative linguistic and ethnographic materials, particularly for North Mexico; also by lack, at that time, of attention to direct historical materials on the intermontane northward diffusions of the horse, and on Comanche culture.² Later, in the 1950's, when he was involved as an expert witness in Indian claims cases, Steward returned to this problem and prepared detailed ethnohistorical reports which now constitute a part of the record of litigation in that area.

His other step was to begin work on a comprehensive survey of South American Indian cultures, a hemispheric project sponsored by the U.S. Department of State. Preliminary planning had been done, over the preceding decade, by a committee of the National Research Council, but much effort by Steward was needed to organize the investigation, recruit some ninety collaborators from a dozen countries, and develop a common pattern of work. The undertaking required not merely the compilation of existing knowledge but also of much unpublished field and archival material. Its by-products included a sizeable cadre of trained anthropologists; the formation of an Inter-American Society of Anthropology and Geography, with a journal, *Acta Americana*, edited by Ralph Beals; and Steward's increasing involvement in problems of contemporary acculturation (1943*a*, 1943*b*, 1945). In 1943, Steward set up and was the first Director of the Institute of Social Anthropology established within the Smithsonian Institution to teach in Mexico, Peru, Brazil and Columbia and to conduct field research on practically significant aspects, such as economics and land use, of contemporary Latin American cultures. By 1945, research on the Handbook of South American Indians had been completed, and in 1946 the new Institute had been turned over to his successor (1944*b*, 1946*b*, 1947*c*.)

By this time, Julian Steward had become a key figure in American anthropology. He was appointed chairman of a committee to plan the reorganization of the American Anthropological Association from a loose scientific forum into a cohesive professional body. Hopefully, this body would undertake internal research planning and also co-ordinate its efforts with Government Departments, the United Nations, and an anticipated "Federation of Social Sciences."³ Steward's other organizational activities included planning and representation on behalf of the National Science Foundation, then being debated; he helped to initiate the River Valley program of salvage archaeology; and, with

the late Wendell Bennett, planned and helped to launch the Viru Valley project in Northern Peru.

His acceptance, in the fall of 1946, of a professorship at Columbia University denoted a sudden cut-off in administrative efforts. Editing of the Handbook had already been completed, and the publication of all six volumes was accomplished by 1950. His teaching and guidance load was substantial, since Columbia had some 120 graduate students in anthropology. Above all, research on Puerto Rico preoccupied him.

Beginning early in 1947, Steward and his collaborators surveyed historical sources and the social-science literature on Puerto Rico. Exterior economic and political forces, cultural history, demography, race relations and ideologies were reported on by seminar members. The field research was conducted between February 1948 and August 1949 by ten workers under the over-all direction of Steward. The entire project involved three phases — a general reconnaissance and selection of type communities, community studies, and analysis of the relation of the communities to one another and to the insular whole. The investigation was completed and largely written up by 1951, but the final report appeared only in 1956(1956c). As a whole it represents a remarkable institutional analysis in both historical and geographical perspectives. It culminates in a series of explicit hypotheses which seek to identify the dynamic factors generating today's island-wide and local subcultures. Far more attention is devoted to the qualitative aspects of research design than to quantitative measures to test the reliability and significance of the results.

Partly as a by-product of the Puerto Rico study, Julian Steward attempted to provide a general review and appraisal of *Area Research: Theory and Practice* (1950a). Although suggestive in many ways, its orientation was too institutional and its point of view too restricted to be very useful to those interested in the study of nations or of international relations. Since Steward was not directly concerned here with these matters, he paid little attention to resource bases, manpower, spatial organization, political power, industrialization and allied questions. Like some of the British anthropologists of this period and later — but within a somewhat different framework — Steward was concerned about the tendency to view, to study, and to analyze social entities in isolation. While his British colleagues were calling for a recognition of the "social field" in the study of tribal societies, Steward was exhorting American anthropologists to enquire into the "larger context" in their studies of modern communities.

Substantial scientific contributions were achieved by two other papers. "Cultural Causality and Law" (1949b) was an effective concordance of developmental stages in Old and New World cultures which

posed far-reaching questions on the magnitude and mechanisms of parallel evolution. "Levels of Sociocultural Integration" (1951) introduced a basic new concept for the construction of analytical social models.

In six years at Columbia, Steward achieved much teaching and research. As in the period 1940-46, he developed new levels of capacity and insight. He was no longer largely a specialist on the Great Basin, or even an expert on Latin America, but had become a vigorous worker on the frontiers of anthropological theory.

His desire to push forward new research on contemporary cultures, and the heavy demands made upon his time by teaching and student counselling at Columbia led to his acceptance, in 1952, of a research professorship at the University of Illinois. Receipt of the Viking Fund Medal in General Anthropology signified his entry into the senior ranks of his profession. He gained this distinction for the *Handbook of South American Indians*, the Puerto Rico study, and his theoretical work, particularly on sociocultural evolution.⁴ Two years later, these contributions led to his election as a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

Between 1952 and 1959, Julian Steward's activities centered on writing up and editing a large backlog of work, and on launching a new cycle of group research, even more ambitiously conceived than the Puerto Rico project. In 1955, he systematized a good part of his theoretical approach in a collection of reworked papers, *Theory of Culture Change* (1955g). A year later, *The People of Puerto Rico* (1956c) came out. This was followed, in 1959, by *Native Peoples of South America* (1959c), in which he and Louis Faron used the rich materials of the *Handbook* as the basis for a typological, as distinct from a culture areal, analysis of the continent. Thus the summary not only achieved lucid descriptions of native cultures, but placed them in an interesting and suggestive theoretical framework. A number of useful papers and the editorship of symposia on *Irrigation Civilizations* (1955b) and *Perspectives on Plantations* (1957a) were other products of this period.

Most important has been the new research program on cross-cultural regularities, which has had as its goal the description and analysis of the culturally leveling and differentiating consequences of industrialization and urbanization upon a variety of societies. It began under a Ford grant in 1956, with studies on Northwestern Mexico, the Central Andes, West Africa, East Africa, Indonesia and Japan (1956a). An added impetus for the research came from a half-year's work as Director of the Kyoto American Studies Seminar in Japan. This permitted Steward to share ideas with the faculties at Kyoto and Doshisha Universities, and to initiate studies on two communities near Nara.

In 1957, a Ford Foundation grant permitted the start of extensive fieldwork, after an initial period of group planning, by a team of anthropologists. This team included Stanley Diamond in Nigeria, Edward Winter and Thomas Beidelman in Tanganyika, Robert Manners in Kenya, Frederic K. Lehman in Burma, Richard Downs in Malaya, Toshinao Yoneyama in Japan, Charles Erasmus in Mexico, and Sol Miller and Louis Faron in Peru. Julian and Jane Steward spent almost a year in 1957-58 visiting the team's operations in Tanganyika, Kenya, Malaya and Japan. Infections picked up in the field contributed greatly to Julian Steward's prolonged, severe illnesses in 1959-1961.

The year 1959, however, was also a start on new tasks. Steward, recently appointed to the University of Illinois Center for Advanced Studies, Oscar Lewis, and John McGregor, jointly achieved an independent Department of Anthropology. A year later, Joseph B. Casagrande, its newly appointed Head, launched a vigorous program of undergraduate and graduate instruction. Julian Steward has been a major contributor to the formulation and conduct of the basic graduate course, in addition to his own seminar and doctoral guidance.

Among his research papers have been valuable reviews and biographical memoirs. In 1960-61, he drafted, with the aid of D. B. Shimkin, the core elements of a broad study of cultural development; a summary of this investigation has been published (1961f). It also served as an important component in the design of an integrated course on Human Ecology, conducted jointly by specialists in physiology, physiological psychology, zoology, anthropology, geography, agronomy, epidemiology and nutrition after eighteen months of preparation. Work on the overall results of the cross-cultural investigation and the editing of the specialized monographs are also well under way. A new phase of disjunctive growth in Julian Steward's intellectual contribution may be emerging.

2. Scientific Characterization

Julian Steward's contributions to anthropology have been many. He has added greatly to knowledge of American cultures, both Indian and Latin, in the past and today. This he has achieved through personal fieldwork and as an organizer and director of group research. As a theorist he, in common with Malinowski, Lowie, Lévi-Strauss, Murdock and others of similar persuasion, has sought to reawaken in anthropology concern for the formulation and testing of broad principles of cultural organization, dynamics, and evolution. He has also stressed the interdependence of cultural phenomena with the biological and psychological characteristics of man, and with the operational require-

ments of wresting livelihoods from particular environments. He has minimized particularism, holistic approaches, national character, and cultural egalitarianism as doubtfully valid and unproductive concepts.

Steward has raised many fruitful research questions, notably the role of national institutions in the patterning of local behavior. He has attempted to synthesize currently available evidence on cross-cultural regularities and on broad courses of cultural development. His studies of primitive bands, of the growth of Puebloan society, of Old and New World evolutionary concordances, and of pre- and post-Columbian stages of social integration in South America have combined bold hypothesizing with skillful interpretations of heterogeneous evidence. As a critic, he has sympathetically yet insightfully appraised the work of Swanton, Kroeber, Benedict and Redfield, among others, and thus provided keys to the effective use of much past research.

Overall, Steward's lasting impact upon anthropology's fund of fact and theory has been largely the product of five major studies. One is his monograph on Shoshonean ecology, *Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups* (1938a). The second is the monumental, six-volume, *Handbook of South American Indians* (1946-50), a study which he organized, directed, contributed to, and edited. This investigation represents the greatest coordinated, productive effort realized to date by American anthropologists of the entire hemisphere. It constitutes a permanent foundation for ethnographic and archaeological work in South America. The third is his collection of conceptual and methodological papers, *Theory of Culture Change* (1955g), which defines a unified and deeply thoughtful approach to the nature and processes of culture. Fourth among his notable works is *The People of Puerto Rico* (1956c), in which he, with his students, developed a powerful, sophisticated methodology that combined cultural-pattern identifications, social-strata differentiations, ecological interpretations, and national historical perspectives into a many-faceted, dynamic model of a complex society. And fifth has been *Native Peoples of South America* (1959c), written jointly with Louis Faron. This is a theoretically rich, well-written interpretation of the rise, acculturation and present-day characteristics of that continent's folk cultures.

Shorter papers of continuing interest and substantive or methodological significance include his early discovery of "Irrigation Without Agriculture" (1930b); his doctoral work on North American Indian clowns (1931b); his *Ethnography of the Owens Valley Paiute* (1933d); his basic albeit somewhat incomplete and dated "Native Cultures of the Intermontane (Great Basin) Area" (1940b); and his penetrating, farsighted delineation of social stresses and potential developments, "The Changing American Indian" (1945). His biographical

memoirs on Swanton (1960*b*) and Kroeber (1962*a*) are noteworthy. Joint papers coping with problems of theoretical merit include "Function and Configuration in Archaeology" (with F. M. Setzler, 1938*b*), "Tappers and Trappers: Parallel Process in Acculturation" (with R. F. Murphy, 1955*e*) and "Some Mechanisms of Sociocultural Evolution" (with D. B. Shimkin, 1961*f*).

Julian Steward has been an effective teacher and informal mentor of younger colleagues. He has concentrated almost totally on graduate instruction, via seminars, colloquia, informal conferences and correspondence. He has tried to keep his students keenly aware of educational goals, while giving them great leeway in the manner they might choose to meet these goals. Careful guidance in the design and conduct of field research, and the painstaking review of manuscripts and theses have been his characteristic supports for emerging professionals.

Prior to the growth, since 1960, of graduate education in anthropology at the University of Illinois, Julian Steward's most active teaching was at Columbia University. There, over a period of six years, he participated in the doctoral work of some fifty students, and was primarily responsible for guiding more than twenty. The participants in the Puerto Rico project worked extensively with him prior to, during, and after the fieldwork. They included Robert Manners, Sidney Mintz, Elena Padilla, Raymond Scheele and Eric Wolf. Others trained in good part by Steward at Columbia include Inez Adams, Pedro Carrasco, Stanley Diamond, Clifford Evans, Louis C. Faron, Morton Fried, Ernestine Friedl, Helen Halley, Frederic K. Lehman, Betty Meggers, Eugenio Fernández Méndez, Robert Murphy, Robert Rands, Henry Rosenfeld, Vera Rubin and Elman Service. Among his current students at Illinois, Shuichi Nagata and William H. Alkire are close to doctoral completion.

The limitations of Steward's work are, in part, those of American anthropology generally, and of the Berkeley school specifically; in part, they are inherent concomitants of an introspective, creative and independent mind. Julian Steward has long been concerned with methodology, and his work on concepts and research strategies has been very productive. But he has not been a vigorous innovator in field or analytical techniques, and has been slow to exploit either quantitative methods or historical linguistics on a number of relevant problems. He has implied or assumed but not measured such factors as environmental productivity and cyclicity, labor inputs, movement capacities, and consumption requirements. In his comparative studies, the coverage achieved has been illustrative rather than comprehensive.

Unlike Kroeber, whose position with regard to participation in prac-

tical "causes" had been clearly spelled out, Julian Steward was not averse to the involvement of anthropologists in matters of direct practical value. He was opposed, however, to the point of view which encouraged "scientific pronouncements" by his colleagues on subjects which lay outside the area of their scientific competence. He has sought, in this manner, to encourage a distinction between the role of the anthropologist *as* anthropologist, and his role as citizen. Kroeber's position had been unequivocal:

"...all through my career I have consistently not participated in practical movements or considerations...my role had best be that of a person who is completely uninvolved in active issues or causes, no matter how worthy..."⁵

The conflict between this Olympian viewpoint and the moral code inculcated at Deep Springs was animated by Steward's association with New Deal efforts to improve conditions on Indian reservations and then reinforced by World War II. For several years Julian Steward was a prime mover in fostering hemispheric cooperation among anthropologists, in identifying key problems of Indian welfare, and of creating instruments — notably the Institute for Social Anthropology — for their scientific study. His activities in furthering the reorganization of the American Anthropological Association were also aimed at strengthening the profession's capacity for public service.

In 1946, his shift to Columbia University brought him teaching and new research opportunities but diminished his direct participation in public affairs. The "Statement on Human Rights" provoked his opposition (1948*d*), for he felt that the Association had dangerously confused the protection of static, often reactionary, institutions with the safeguarding of universal personal dignities. Despite continuing conflicts with vociferous exponents of cultural egalitarianism, despite the early postwar death of the Institute for Social Anthropology, and despite some painful experiences as an expert witness in Indian claims cases, Steward continued to explore the links between theoretical and applied anthropology. His project on cross-cultural regularities in adaptation to contemporary changes centered on problems of practical as well as theoretical significance. And, in 1961, he began again to express himself publicly and powerfully on moral questions within the purview of anthropology, especially race relations (1961*f*, 1962*b*, 1963*e*).

In sum, Julian Steward is a large figure, as a scholar and as a man. His contributions have been numerous and appear, in good part, to be of lasting value. But much of his work, in common with other works of any living science, will serve as the raw stuff of further investigations and not as the revelations of a culture hero. Certainly the tone

and flavor of Steward's formulations are cautious and heuristic, never dogmatic or oracular. In his investigations, in teaching, and in the development of roles for cultural anthropology beyond the acquisition of knowledge for its own sake, Steward has given us a great deal and has much unfinished business for the years ahead.

3. Past, Present and Potential Scientific Influence

To understand Julian's Steward's position within American anthropology, a fairly careful review of doctrinal development therein is needed beforehand. For a half a century, American anthropology has been both the beneficiary and the victim of domination of two able, positive minds, Franz Boas and Alfred L. Kroeber. This domination has not been a product of the quality, abundance, variety, and continuity of Boas' and Kroeber's efforts alone. Rather, it has also been reinforced by the systematic, concerted actions of disciples seeking to define and guard the traditions their leaders had espoused. Notably, the frank adulation of Robert H. Lowie and the two uncritical compendia published by the American Anthropological Association in 1943 and 1959 have created an orthodox mythology about Boas which Leslie White alone has savagely, and in part justly, attacked.⁶

A. L. Kroeber's influence was substantially magnified by the support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, particularly in the organization and conduct of an International Symposium on Anthropology under Kroeber's direction, in 1952. This conference and its products were designed to "assess the accomplishments of anthropological science to date and to solicit answers on what direction future research would be likely to take . . .".⁷ Much useful work was accomplished by this effort, in summarizing technical developments and in synthesizing current states of knowledge in large areas of the field. But, except for reports on culture and personality studies, and on limited aspects of applied anthropology, the frame of reference was essentially defined by Kroeber's interests, especially the topics of *Anthropology's* second edition in 1948. Attendance at the meetings was by invitation only; of the 87 participants, perhaps two-thirds were prominent American anthropologists. Among those absent were C. M. Arensberg, H. G. Barnett, Cora Du Bois, M. J. Herskovits, E. A. Hoebel, Francis Hsu, Felix Keesing, Alexander Leighton, Morris Opler, Cornelius Osgood, Leslie Spier, and W. Lloyd Warner. Omitted topics in this purportedly comprehensive review included political organization, economics, industrialization, comparative education and race relations. Areally, the Islamic world and the Communist-bloc countries received

casual coverage at most; temporally, post-World War II developments and imminent changes, such as widespread African independence, were rarely within purview. Only a few reports, such as Alex Krieger's and Margaret Mead's, recommended concrete new research, and that of Lévi-Strauss alone advocated a radical advance — treating kinship, economics and language as interaction systems of a common type. Overall, the conference seemed to represent more of an intellectual solidification than a bold survey of new frontiers.

In 1960-61, a new synthesis began, under the direction of David G. Mandelbaum, and with a participation dominated by Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Columbia, Harvard and the British universities. The published report, *The Teaching of Anthropology*,⁸ represents a moderate diversity of views. Central concepts, espoused by Mandelbaum, Cora Du Bois, C. Leslie, Margaret Mead, Verne Ray, and others, blend selected aspects of Kroeber's, Kluckhohn's and Mead's teachings. Essentially, these views maintain that cultural variations, developed historically, and acting as unified configurations on personal values, are the primary determinants of variable human behavior. Basic institutions are those governing roles and statuses, while basic processes include diffusional mechanisms and ecological adaptations. The methodology of cultural anthropology is founded on empathic fieldwork, intuitively adapted, with little reliance upon quantitative measures or precise models. The main purpose of anthropological teaching is the development of a relativistic viewpoint of human behavior.

Variations from this position include M. Fortes' Malinowskian fundamentalism, and some progressive approaches. In culture history, E. Z. Vogt advocates use of "genetic" models, based on coordination of linguistic, archaeological and geographical materials in the study of language families such as Uto-Aztecan.⁹ J. W. Bennett has employed Steward's contrasts of national and local traditions, and the problem of parallelisms in Old World and Middle American culture growth as foci for teaching comparative civilizations. Solon Kimball has a strongly analytical approach, which utilizes models of institutions, events and processes to attack problems in both simple and complex societies. In applied anthropology, H. G. Barnett and Benjamin Paul have evolved combinations of model-building and case-study techniques; important facets of Paul's innovations are his attention to public opinion, to communication and to estimates of program effectiveness. Finally, D. H. Hymes, K. Little and J. B. Casagrande have stressed the interrelationships of cultural anthropology with other disciplines, notably linguistics, psychology, sociology, statistics and economics.

From this review of American anthropology as a doctrinal system, it

is clear that intellectual acceptance in that field is not merely a scientific accident reflecting activity on research frontiers but also a sociological phenomenon measuring orthodoxy in relation to dominant values, professional role, academic power and personal popularity. Julian Steward has fared quite well in these terms, if the relative frequency of citations to him in the *American Anthropologist*, in *Anthropology Today* and in *The Teaching of Anthropology* be taken as guides (Table 1).¹⁰ The first source defines him, over the period 1937-62, as a respectable secondary figure, overshadowed by Kroeber, Boas, Lowie, Kluckhohn, Herskovits, White, Malinowski and Mead, but distinctly more influential than Benedict, Childe, Cora Du Bois, Eggan, Evans-Pritchard, Firth, Leach, Redfield, Speck, Spier, Tax and Wissler. Those of coordinate status with Steward have been Hallowell, Linton, Murdock, Morris Opler, Elsie Parsons, Radcliffe-Brown, Sapir and Swanton. On the basis of data for all ten years of the past decade alone, 1953-1962, Steward's influence in the pages of the *American Anthropologist* is much more significant. Kroeber, Kluckhohn and Murdock alone have been more frequently cited.

In *Anthropology Today*, the most frequent references are to Kroeber, Kluckhohn, Margaret Mead, Lowie and Childe. In the second rank come Steward, as well as Evans-Pritchard, Hallowell, Herskovits, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown; other names are much less in evidence. And in *The Teaching of Anthropology*, Kroeber and Kluckhohn dominate, while Richard Adams, Beals, Harry Hoiijer, Felix Keesing, Lévi-Strauss and Margaret Mead form the second rank. Citations of Steward are fewer, but compare favorably with those of many prominent anthropologists, e.g., Barnett, Childe, Leighton, Lowie and Redfield. No mention is made in this source of Spier, White and Wissler, among those once noted.

Steward's influence within the anthropological profession rests upon *Theory of Culture Change* and the articles reprinted therein, which comprise a third of all references to him. The *Handbook of South American Indians* and *Area Research* each account for another sixth of the citations. Eight per cent are to *Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups*, while the remaining twenty-five per cent are scattered. One reference was found to *Native Peoples of South America* and none to the *People of Puerto Rico*. Examination of many of the citations to Steward indicates that they are blanket references to ideas and fields marginal to configurational, tribe-centered approaches; his identification with "culture ecology" and "multilinear evolution" are recurrent themes. Serious appraisals and developments of his work have been rare, especially so for the less obvious and recent studies.

TABLE I: THE FREQUENCY OF CITATION OF LEADING ANTHROPOLOGISTS
(Including Books Reviewed, Excluding Self-Citations)

KEY: a, 21 or more citations; b, 11-20 citations; c, 6-10 citations;
d, 3-5 citations; e, 1-2 citations; —, no citations.

<i>Anthropologist</i>	American Anthropologist						Anthro- pology Today	The Teaching of Anthro- pology
	'37	'42	'47	'52	'57	'62		
Kroeber, A. L.*	b	b	b	c	a	b	a	b
Benedict, R.*	d	—	c	e	d	d	c	d
Boas, F.*	c	—	d	d	a	c	b	d
Childe, V. G.*	d	—	d	e	e	d	a	d
Coon, C. S.	—	e	d	e	e	d	d	d
DuBois, C.	e	—	d	—	e	e	d	-
Eggan, F.	d	e	e	—	d	e	d	e
Evans-Pritchard, E.	—	e	e	e	c	d	b	d
Firth, R.	d	e	—	e	e	c	c	d
Hallowell, A. I.	e	e	e	c	d	c	b	d
Herskovits, M. J.*	d	e	d	d	b	b	b	d
Kluckhohn, C. K.*	e	e	c	c	b	b	a	c
Leach, E. R.	—	—	—	—	d	c	e	-
Linton, R.*	e	d	b	e	d	d	b	d
Lowie, R. H.*	c	c	b	e	d	d	a	d
Malinowski, B.*	c	e	d	e	c	c	b	d
Mead, M.	c	—	b	e	c	d	a	c
Murdock, G. P.	e	e	e	d	c	c	b	d
Opler, M.	e	e	c	e	c	d	d	e
Parsons, E. C.*	b	e	e	—	d	e	c	-
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R.*	c	e	d	e	e	d	b	e
Redfield, R.*	e	e	e	—	b	e	c	d
Sapir, E.*	d	d	c	e	e	e	b	d
Speck, F. J.*	d	c	c	—	e	—	e	-
Spier, L.*	d	c	e	e	e	—	d	-
STEWART, J. H.	d	d	—	d	d	c	b	d
Swanton, J. R.*	c	e	c	e	d	e	e	-
Tax, S.	—	—	e	e	c	c	e	d
White, L.	d	—	b	c	d	c	c	-
Wissler, C.*	e	d	d	e	d	e	c	-

*Deceased

In sum, American anthropological orthodoxy has accepted Steward, over the past generation, as an approved figure quotable in limited

contexts of a theoretical and substantive nature. But, in common with uncritical approaches to fact and theory generally, the conventional view has missed both high achievements — notably, the concepts and methodology of the *People of Puerto Rico* and some limitations in much-quoted papers. The present volume thus constitutes an overdue clarification of Julian Steward's *scientific* rather than *sociological* influence to date.

For the future, it is clear that Julian Steward's total influence will depend not only on his past and forthcoming work, as well as that of his friends, but on the very nature of American anthropology. Steward's fundamental views certainly do not accord with a position of anthropology as "... a discipline of the whole, the whole of man's history, the whole of man's culture, the whole of man's being ... [which] ... can only be communicated by someone who is himself, or herself, wholly involved, immersed, in it."¹¹

It is only in a context of thoroughly analytical work, with attention to sharp model-building, and careful testing, that the questions inherent in Steward's work assume operational worth. Such use would ultimately wear away many of his syntheses and conclusions, to replace them with more perfect answers wrested from growing bodies of knowledge. But Steward's questions — the role of the individual in culture change, the nature of cultural patterns and sociocultural integrations, the significant types of culture, and the cross-culturally uniform rather than particularistic features of cultural growth — will long remain as guides.

NOTES

1 All references to Julian Steward's publications in this essay are keyed to the terminal bibliography, pp. 418-24.

2 For a bibliography, and some added results see D. B. Shimkin: "Shoshone-Comanche Origins and Migrations," *Proceedings of the Sixth Pacific Science Congress IV*: 17-25. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1940; and "The Uto-Aztec System of Kinship Terminology," *American Anthropologist* 43: 223-45 1941. Also F. Haines: "Where Did the Plains Indians Get their Horses?" *American Anthropologist* 40: 112-7, 1938; and "The Northward Spread of Horses Among the Plains Indians," *ibid.*, 429-37, 1938.

3 "Proceedings of the American Anthropological Association for the Year Ending December 1946," *American Anthropologist* 49: 346-71, 1947.

- 4 "1952 Viking Fund Medalist," *American Anthropologist* 55:328, 1953.
- 5 A. L. Kroeber: "Concluding Review", 357-76 of S. Tax *et al*: *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953; see p. 357. Also, A. L. Kroeber: "The History of the Personality of Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 61: 398-404, 1959.
- 6 R. H. Lowie: *Biographical Memoir of Franz Boas*, 1858-1942. National Academy of Sciences *Biographical Memoirs* XXIV: 303-22, 1947; A. L. Kroeber *et al*: *Franz Boas 1858-1942*, American Anthropological Association *Memoir* No. 61, 1943; W. Goldschmidt, (ed.): *The Anthropology of Franz Boas*, American Anthropological Association *Memoir* No. 89, 1959; L. A. White: *The Ethnography and Ethnology of Franz Boas*, Texas Memorial Museum, *Bulletin* No. 6, 1963.
- 7 A. L. Kroeber *et al*: *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- 8 American Anthropological Association, *Memoir* No. 94, 1963.
- 9 This technique derives ultimately from Kroeber's stimulus which animated my work on the Uto-Aztec kinship system in 1941 (note 2) and later, exploitation of the extensive resources of Uralic studies. I taught the technique in my Harvard seminar on Uto-Aztec culture history in 1952-53 to H. R. Harvey, David Kelley, H. B. Nicholson and A. K. Romney. Romney has been Vogt's source; Harvey's doctoral thesis also embraces this approach.
- 10 I wish to thank Mr. Stephen I. Thompson for help in this statistical analysis.
- 11 Margaret Mead: "Anthropology and an Education for the Future," in D. G. Mandelbaum *et al*: *The Teaching of Anthropology*, *op. cit.*, 595-607.

*Julian Steward's
Writings and
the Essays:
A post hoc
Articulation*

THE AUTHORS

THE BROAD relevance of Julian Steward's work to current research and theory in cultural anthropology is readily demonstratable through the medium of this collection of essays. Their authors reflect a variety of educational backgrounds, while their current concerns in research and teaching range from life histories to technology, from the Near East to China and Paraguay. Their institutional affiliations are diverse, and include twelve out of the thirty-seven departments offering Ph.D.'s in Anthropology in the United States in 1963. The essayists conceived and wrote their papers independently, attempting in some but not all cases to relate their efforts to Julian Steward's past contributions.

Under these circumstances, the degree of cohesiveness evident in this volume is striking. Of the several explanations offered for the cohesiveness we are most partial to the view that the common concern with cultural patterns and processes revealed in the essays reflects parallel outgrowths of a shared intellectual tradition, an important part of which has been Julian Steward's work. Specifically, the essays can be regarded as contributions to six themes strongly represented in his writings.

1. The Individual as a Factor in Culture Change

Basic to Julian Steward's commitment to a search for meaningful regularities in cultural patterns and dynamics has been a belief in a unity and creative capacity of the human mind far outweighing the relativistic effects of social conditioning and racial differentiation. This belief was first expressed in his doctoral dissertation on North American Indian clowns (1931b)¹ and most fully stated in his "Problems of Cultural Evolution" (1958) and in the joint paper with D. B. Shimkin, "Some Mechanisms of Sociocultural Evolution" (1961f). The recogni-

tion of psychological and, in significant degree, physiological foundations for human behavior in no sense negates the role of culture which, in common with other objective phenomena, sets preconditions for the possibility of given behavior, its acceptance and its persistence. These constraints are severest under conditions of simple technology and harsh environment when but few possibilities can be exercised, especially in social organization (1936a, 1941c). Conversely, the achievement of key successes, such as agriculture or the integration of multi-nucleated communities through ceremonial centers, generates effects (population growth, trade, specialization) which are preconditions for still other innovations (1949b).

In his essay, Stanley Diamond undertakes a critique of volitional and deterministic approaches to history. His thesis is that history is a thread of contingencies, woven by human decisions into cultural forms.

Morton Fried seeks to identify, first in Steward's writings and then in the current ideological turmoil and physical difficulties of China, clues to the deterministic sequence in cultural growth. Steward has been loath to commit himself on the subject, calling it one for empirical research. Chinese thought has vacillated from orthodox Marxism to a faith in charisma capable of overwhelming physical obstacles and social contradictions.

Oscar Lewis' paper has a substantive aim, to exemplify the social milieu, the personality correlates and the effects of Protestant conversion in Mexico through the intense study of an individual case. Many of the factors disclosed appear to be recurrent phenomena; these include social marginality and high personal aspiration combined with strong family cohesion.

C. J. Erasmus elucidates the causes of a particular event and an anomalous revival of a raindance among the Mayo of Northwest Mexico after a lapse of 20 years. He shows how the motivations of one individual interacting with those of other villagers in their search for social approbation produces an event resulting from individual, village and cross cultural patterns of behavior.

2. *Cultural Patterning in Ceremonialism and Art*

Concern with the ways in which different cultures structure varying assemblies of traits pragmatically, cognitively and emotionally has long been evident in Western anthropology. Malinowski, Boas, and especially Kroeber, have devoted much attention to patterning or style in art, feeling that esthetic canons and preferred techniques provide major keys to the distinctive and persisting features of societies. Steward's contributions, as well as the essays on patterning by Winter,

Goldman, Faron, Wolf and Willey, have been built upon these foundations. In particular, it must be stressed that patterns rather than traits or whole cultures have been the central features of Steward's comparative and theoretical studies. Concretely, he dealt with patterning in ceremonialism and the functioning of ceremonialism as a psychological release in his doctoral dissertation on the Ceremonial Buffoon of the American Indian (1931*b*). In his theories of culture growth, he has ascribed to religious belief and practices crucial roles, especially in the transition from individual communities to multi-nucleated sociopolitical systems (1949*b*, 1949*e*, 1961*f*). For Steward, art styles constitute patterns of special types, relatively independent of major technological and sociopolitical trends, readily diffused and sometimes subject to sharp discontinuities (1961*f*).

In his paper, E. H. Winter examines the system of beliefs and the immediate circumstances surrounding a ritual of atonement among an East African people. As a whole, this analysis indicates elaborate cosmological and ethical symbolization, incomplete catharsis, and limited support to the afflicted through social solidarity.

Irving Goldman's study of a commemorative ceremony practised by the Cubeo Indians of the Northwest Amazon presents ritual as a philosophical system. Disavowing psychological and functionalist interpretations he points to the parallels between ritual structure and social structure and ritual themes and fundamental cultural values.

L. C. Faron deals with a related problem, the channeling of frustrations and anxieties by the tenacious social system of the Mapuche or Araucanians of Chile. The fear of witches as sources of general and personal calamity is the fundamental rationale for maintaining protective shamanism on a corporate basis, for minimizing contact with Chileans of European ancestry, for exchange marriages between patrilineages, and for extended relations through food and gift exchanges. At the same time, deviant behavior such as wealth accumulation or eccentricity is suppressed since it is symptomatic of witchcraft.

In the United States, Santa Claus is a ceremonial figure self-consciously developed a century or more ago. E. R. Wolf finds this figure's present-day social and psychological roles to be complex and contradictory. The figure promotes both adult materialism and regressive unreality in children. It is a paragon of morality based on a flimsy secular mythology. It is expressive of a larger anxiety about values and behavior from which American society seeks to shield children.

G. R. Willey surveys the history of North Peruvian Plastic pottery over a period of 2500 years in the light of its internal development and in its relations to technological and sociopolitical phenomena. He indicates that a stable, slowly expanding population permitted long artistic

continuity, while craft specialization underlay its technical excellency and capacity for elaboration. Invasion and ideological pressures induced stylistic interruptions in Tiahuanaco times, followed by a reascendence of the submerged tradition, which persisted until the Spanish conquest. Peruvian Plastic pottery, unlike Western European art of the past century, appears thus to be deeply integrated with other cultural features, rather than being a fairly free variable.

3. *Sociocultural Integration: The Structure of Sedentary Communities*

Since his early studies on primitive bands (1936a), Julian Steward has stressed community size as a basic index of level of integration. In consequence, he has long been concerned with demography, in the Southwest (1937b), Great Basin (1938a) and Latin America (1945, 1949c). Another area of his interest has been in the principles of organization, which he believes to be sex, age and kin group in the simplest societies, with inherited status differences reinforced by religious sanctions comprising an additional formant in those of intermediate complexity. With larger groups, especially multi-nucleated societies, militarism, cooperation in irrigation works, and other factors enter (1960a, 1961f).

Fred Eggan's essay weighs the significance of matrilineal descent as opposed to the control of property (and of marital alliances to consolidate that control) among the Hopi. He concludes that here, in contrast to the Sinhalese village studied by Leach, matriliney is basic. It determines ritual seniority, ceremonial rights and the control of agricultural land. Marriage alliances have important consequences in economic cooperation and in extended ritual functions for men after the birth of a son. But when marriages conflict with clan loyalties, divorce is common.

Pedro Carrasco's paper digests much hitherto unavailable information on the population of sixteenth-century Tepoztlan. The study discloses that half of the households were nuclear families; and most of the rest, joint families. Patrilocal residence characterized five-sixths of the latter, with other types being varied. Non-related free clients and slaves were found in wealthier households. Overall, the households of the *cacique* or chief and his direct subjects differed markedly from those of the ward dwellers. Among the former, joint families predominated over nuclear ones, 121 to 74; among the latter, the reverse was true, with 114 joint and 222 nuclear families being enumerated.

Henry Rosenfeld discusses the origins of peasantry in feudal Palestine during the Ottoman Empire. Despite recent radical changes and the emergence of a rural proletariat, a residual peasantry exists today

in the village studied by the author. The persistence is attributed to the state's failure to institute changes in the productive-social order of the village.

4. Sociocultural Integration: The Impact of National and World-wide Influences

In 1893, at the International Congress of Anthropology in Chicago, Daniel G. Brinton, a leading American anthropologist of the day, presented a thoughtful analysis of the changes in values and behavior coincident with social transformation from a tribal community to a nation (Wake, 1894:19-34).² Little more was done with this problem for half a century thereafter; studies of individual tribes, communities or cities tended to ignore almost completely the national — or colonial — contexts in which they lay. However, World War II brought to the fore as acute practical problems both major national differences in behavior and the effects of nationalism and colonialism on particular societies. In their work on the Indians of Latin America, Julian Steward and his colleagues had to consider with increasing care the interactions between a variety of national and local institutions, currently and in the past (1943*a*, *b*, *c*; 1945). Postwar research in Puerto Rico further developed understanding, leading to the identification there of an island-wide high status subculture, and of distinctive local subcultures reflecting particular economic institutions (sugar plantations and coffee haciendas, etc.). These were dependent, in turn, upon national and international phenomena (1950*a*; 1951; 1953*b*, *c*; 1956*a*, *c*). Since 1952, Steward's project on crosscultural regularities in change has devoted much added effort to empirical and theoretical researches on nation-community interrelations. Lehman's recent publication (1963)³ is illustrative.

D. B. Shimkin's paper interprets the development of Russian peasant society since the first millennium B.C. as an interplay between internal functional arrangements and external pressures. Some pressures, such as the cleavage between the State church and popular religion which arose in the seventeenth century, induced internal adjustments enhancing village solidarity. Others, such as the rise of serfdom, inhibited internal stratification and diversification even though they sapped economic strength. The net result has been a tenacious cultural system.

S. W. Mintz considers an obverse case. How did local conditions in eighteenth-century Jamaica affect the operation of a national phenomenon, namely the financial system? He shows that the slave and the planter sub-societies on the island maintained somewhat independent

economies. This resulted in an equilibrium between full-value and de-based currencies, each of which had an optimum economic role.

The focus of R. A. Manners' paper is the influence of British colonialism upon land tenure among the Kipsigis of East Africa. This has gone from full communalism thirty-five years ago to complete partition and individual ownership today. Concurrently, many attitudes, such as those toward cattle, have changed. The precipitating factors have been many: increased importation of consumer goods and the proliferation of shops and markets for their sale, colonial legal controls, white plantation markets for food, alternative sources of plantation labor other than the Kipsigis, etc.

J. B. Casagrande, S. I. Thompson and P. D. Young compare two areas of new settlement (colonization) in Ecuador, one in the Oriente and the other on the western coastal plain. They view the area of colonization as characterized by a distinctive over-all settlement pattern, and describe the process of colonization as one combining increasing integration with national level institutions and creative adaptation to new ecological conditions. Demographic characteristics of the colonists are also considered and attention is given to problems of psychological accommodation to the economic and social uncertainties of the frontier.

R. L. Beals abstracts the behavioral code traditionally held by the upper and middle classes in Mexico. This code, like its counterpart in Puerto Rico, is highly authoritarian, paternalistic and nonintellectual. It is now undergoing change selectively, both in terms of form and of content. At present, the emergent values are less coherent than the traditional system.

H. L. Shapiro illuminates the problem of the relations between "macro-changes" and "micro-changes" by data from the history of anthropology itself. The contributors to the earliest journals were largely travelers and administrators who reported on exotic peoples. Humanitarian concerns, especially the welfare of aborigines, were more evident than philosophical purposes as motivations for ethnological organization. Yet the observations recorded on human physical and cultural variability forced changes in concepts and classifications influential in the formation of profoundly important theories of biological and cultural evolution.

5. *Types of Cultural Complexes and Sociocultural Systems*

Thirty years ago, Steward (1933a) drew attention to the distinctiveness in content and, especially, in developmental sequences evident between the geographical core and the northern periphery of the

Southwest because of differential rates of diffusion for various culture elements, trait regroupings and amalgamations, and local inventions. Thus, he saw areal differences to be the end-results of given processes in a receiving zone operating selectively upon content available from a donor region. Three years later, his noted paper on primitive bands (1936a) postulated a cross-cultural social system in terms of the interactions between particular kinds of food resources and the selective advantages of appropriate kin groups, given simple technologies and harsh environments. In 1949, "Cultural Causality and Law" proposed other cross-cultural social types as comparable stages in the rise of Old and New World high cultures (1949b). In this formulation, the comparable features, although numerous, comprised functional nexuses rather than holistic cultural classifications. Steward's classification of South American cultures used combined criteria for areal definition. Subsistence bases, social organization and religion were all considered; average community sizes reflected all these forces and provided an overall index of category (1949e). In 1951, Steward further developed his thoughts in regard to complex modern societies. These simultaneously involve several levels of integration, from family to nation, and are structured in subcultures involving all levels to varying extents. Change in complex societies operates disjunctively by level and by subculture. In 1953, Steward clarified his distinction between *type*, a term of cross-cultural significance, and *area*, a unique configuration (1953e). In all, Steward's many contributions to cultural taxonomy have constantly, and with increasing depth and discrimination, used processual formulations. Cultural contents, community sizes and other factual elements have underlain these generalizations.

H. G. Barnett examines the internal heterogeneities of cultures in order to ascertain whether present knowledge permits a reliable assignment of different components to more or less diffusible classes. On the basis of historical evidence, and on analytic grounds, both the nature of the complex diffused (material culture, religion, etc.) and that of the receiving culture must be considered. Specifically, phenomena promoting social individualism appear also to facilitate technological change.

E. R. Service approaches the problem of estimating differential probabilities of diffusion within the context of archaeological remains, and from the standpoint of the variety of operational alternatives open in the manufacture of an artifact. By using such criteria, archaeologists can differentiate resemblances into those of greater or lesser historical significance, thereby improving the reliability of reconstructions.

F. K. Lehman surveys the general problem of cultural taxonomy. Stressing the limited utility of trait-inventory and distributional approaches, he concurs with Steward in ascribing central classificatory

importance to social-structural criteria related to adaptive ends. Drawing from linguistic experience, he indicates the value of describing cultures as sets of rules of given domain.

6. *Cross-Cultural Regularities*

The identification and interpretation of cross-cultural regularities of pattern and process are the crucial elements in the development of any potential science of culture. Such analyses are not easy, since what must be shown is the operational equivalence of both underlying conditions and consequences, rather than nominal similarity. Thus, Dakota and Turkmen clans have little functional resemblance, although both are patrilineal and regulate marriage. Conversely, as Steward has shown, Shoshoni seed-gathering and Alacalouf shellfish collection are similar configurations in so far as population grouping, division of labor and social effects are concerned (1960a). For these reasons, the accumulation of valid regularities is laborious and slow.

G. P. Murdock has assembled data which show strong associations, in a sample of 180 societies, between increasingly strict standards of premarital sex behavior and growing cultural complexity. At the same time, patrilocal residence alone is linked with restrictive norms. Thus, while the general cultural pressure in the United States – to apply these findings – is restrictive, the advent of social mobility and neolocal residence appear to be sharply offsetting forces.

In the final essay, R. J. Braidwood reviews new comparative data on the associations of incipient agriculture in the Old and New Worlds. These materials do not invalidate Steward's basic comparisons (1949b) but do show the presence of many more variables and sequential non-conformities which will require much restudy and reformulation to achieve comprehensive and valid cross-cultural comparisons.

NOTES

1 This and other references to Steward's works in this essay are keyed to the terminal bibliography, pp. 418-24.

2 D. G. Brinton: "The Nation as an Element in Anthropology," in C. S. Wake (ed): *Memoirs of the International Congress of Anthropology*, 19-34. Chicago: Schulte Publishing Co., 1894.

3 F. K. Lehman: *The Structure of Chin Society*, Illinois Studies in Anthropology No. 3, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

I

*The Individual
as a Factor in
Culture Change*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

What History Is

STANLEY DIAMOND

JULIAN STEWARD is one of the few American anthropologists of his generation who has a tough-minded concern with the developing issues of the modern world. He has earned his impatience with antiquarianism (Steward 1929, 1937), and has asked the question that remains unanswered for all reflective men; how does the past *specifically* become the present? Moreover, Steward has always been aware of the multiplicity of cultural forms through which parallel functions are expressed; and he respects the contingent nature of human events. Therefore, I shall address this essay to the problem of contingency, which is the very sense and meaning of history, thus sustaining a debate which has engaged many of us who have been associated with Julian over the years.

I

Everything that happens in nature or society, happens as history.¹ More specifically, all human events are fundamentally historical. But I must acknowledge at once that these events are not of equal importance; perhaps most things that men do turn out, in the end, to be publicly inconsequential, although they may be critical to the persons concerned. This is another way of saying that human affairs are often trivial, or apparently chaotic; that is, the patterns are there but they are so intricate and private that it demands a divine eye to sort them out; they crisscross through our daily lives; they happen as history but they have no historical gender. No socially critical turn of events hinges upon them; but this is not, as we shall see, because the behavior of "mere" individuals is involved.

A convenient point of departure is the following individual analogy. Should citizen X be killed crossing the street, the event would be called an "accident," a "chance" occurrence

and it would be historically irrelevant, although a sad business for all concerned. But in what sense was the fate of citizen X an accident, And why was it historically irrelevant? I shall consider these, in a sense related, questions separately.

First, the event may be viewed as an accident descriptively, in the sense of being a casualty. The fact that it was "unexpected" or "unpredictable" does not, on that account alone, lead us to classify it in any particular way. Many events are equally unforeseen, but we do not call them "accidents." If we did, then most of the future would have to be regarded an accident of the present. In such a view the life of the individual, or of the group, would be almost wholly determined, and equally unpredictable, an attitude that is untenable, and a point to which I shall return. Moreover, the manner of citizen X's dying was not without precedent; it was less unpredictable than a good many other events. Traffic fatalities are relatively common, rather intricate rules and regulations operate in order to prevent them, and so on. Nor was the death of citizen X an accident in the sense that it was isolated, intrusive, or merely random, without immediate "cause." On the contrary a superhuman eye could detect its position in a marvously involved, if apparently meaningless pattern. Citizen X and the automobile may be said to have collided at a particular time and place, at the intersection of a practically infinite sequence of events, to which the accident provides a "nonsensical" climax.

All this is simple enough. Why then, supposing that citizen X did not commit suicide, that he and the driver were obeying regulations, and that both were exercising reasonable judgment — for to suppose anything less would be to introduce the element of responsibility, and thus, volition — why then do we persist in defining the death of citizen X as an "accident?" The answer has already been implied. It was an accident, first and foremost, because it was *beyond human control* not because it seemed random, or may have been more or less unpredictable or unexpected. Citizen X's accident falls into that class of events which seems always and everywhere to have been designated "acts of God." This does not mean literally that no human decisions preceded the death of citizen X; on the contrary, an infinite number of decisions was implicated. But the climax of these decisions was involitional, although, in this case, well within the category of what was known to be possible. Citizen X knew that he conceivably *could* be killed crossing the street, and the driver of the automobile was aware of the possibility of striking a pedestrian. In retrospect, then, the accident became part of a patterned series of historical occurrences. Indeed, one is tempted to state that the accident *created* the pattern, that is, the last event made everything immediately preceding it and connected with it significant and visible within a small social radius.

But the aspect of citizen X's accident that interests us most is that it was inevitable. This may sound a paradox, but all true accidents are inevitable, that is, literally unavoidable, and thus, to the human consciousness, nonsensical or absurd, the conclusion of a sequence of hidden events beyond human control. Accidents can be most broadly defined, then, as unintended, inevitable events which effect or determine the existence of individuals and/or the fate of groups. Of course, it does not logically follow that because all accidents are inevitable, everything that is inevitable is an accident. But I am not arguing in terms of a perfectly abstract logic; the human perception is decisive and there is a fundamental sense in which we perceive the accidental and inevitable as coterminous. That is, we apprehend both accidents and inevitabilities as fated, and either metaphorically or literally, "acts of God," thus echoing the ancient attribution of intent to caused but incomprehensible occurrences.

This brings me to a brief consideration of natural history. All natural events are, of course, historical events. Natural history overlaps with, interpenetrates, and is often experienced in the same way as, but cannot be equated with, human history. Natural history, to the extent that it is not mastered or negated by human history, is perceived as inevitable. Birth, death, hunger, the rotation of the earth, fatigue, the weather — all those natural or physical conditions which remain beyond human control are normally accepted as aspects of our fate. From the standpoint of the human will, the world of nature may be enjoyed, accepted, adapted to, but it remains a vast accident, unintended, except by God for those who believe in God, and it is inevitable. For us, the imperatives of nature have the drastic inevitability of accidents. This, of course, is precisely the opposite of saying that natural history is in itself a question of chance. For chance conventionally denotes the property of being undetermined; and in the more radical Peircian sense, chance being a cause itself, is itself uncaused, while accident is absence of intention linked to the impossibility of control, and is, thus, wholly determined. Even Cournot's conservative conception of chance (following Aristotle) as a coincidence of two causally determined series of events, permits us to distinguish it from accident, since in accident, the "coincidence" must itself be seen as completely determined, or caused. In short, chance is the antithesis of accident, although the two words are commonly used synonymously.

Because we have proposed that the death of the pedestrian was a perfect accident (perhaps the driver suffered a minor stroke, perhaps sunlight reflected on metal blinded both), it assumes the aspect of an event in natural history although it occurred in human history. That is, citizen X's mishap is experienced as an inevitable event, as, say a sudden change in the weather would be, in the face of which all con-

cerned are helpless. For, to extend the analogy, the manner of citizen X's dying was as absolutely uncontrollable as the rising or the setting of the sun. There is, of course, this objective difference between certain inevitable events happening in nature and perfect human accidents: many, (by no means all), natural events are, in the particular case, repetitive and, within a small margin of error, predictable. They occur in cycles that occur as history but which may fluctuate only slightly over a given period of humanly scaled time; and once we admit that the universe has a history, we must recognize that none of its laws can be absolute. However, similarities and distinctions of this character could be pressed indefinitely; for example, general classes of accidents are predictable; specific accidents are not. On the other hand, even the cyclic movements of the stars are not exactly predictable and so on. The major point has already been made; on the critical score of inevitability, more precisely lack of human intention plus lack of control, accidents can be assimilated to natural history. They are, so to speak, "given."

This perception is expressed in ordinary idioms. Soldiers during the First World War were supposed to have said that if a bullet had your name on it you were done for — otherwise, not, so why worry? Thus they merged the accidental and the inevitable; and in trying to convert a human event, which is always in some degree contingent, into a purely natural event, which is inevitable, perhaps succeeded in reducing anxiety. That is, from the soldiers' point of view, the event might just as well have been a natural one and the diminution of anxiety was a normal accompaniment of an authentically felt denial of responsibility.

Similarly, romantic lovers characteristically say that it was "fated" or inevitable that they should have met; the greater the insistence on inevitability, the more "accidental" the meeting is likely to have been, until we reach the point of the absolute inevitability of the perfectly romantic "chance" encounter, experienced as an imperative of natural history. In the same vein, the recourse to astrology literally recognizes the identity of accident and inevitable event, both for individuals and groups and then invokes, aptly enough, a pseudo-natural historical argument, the conjunctions of the planets, in order to advise men or explain what they do.

II

"To know in the scientific sense means, ultimately, to-have-power-over. To the degree that human beings are authentic persons, unique and self-creating, they cannot be scientifically known." — W. H. Auden.