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Putting this topic into a necessary context, the acts and practices of mentoring are not only interpersonally meaningful in everyday life, but an organizational mission in and of the modern world. Look no further past today’s objective culture (Simmel: 1971: 234) of books, books-on-tape, training classes, private academies, conferences, websites, and even professional associations (e.g. International Mentoring Association) for ample evidence of its weight and cultural resonance. The Medieval and European guilds of long past, when craftsmen were destined and trained as apprentices, shifted over time to the protégés and now mentee/mentor relationships of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Mentoring as a contemporary variety of perspectives and strategies is part and parcel to the broader academic and increasingly professional interest in social networking, practices of reciprocity, and social connections or capital (Putnam 2000). With that said, such concepts remain abstract and lacking the necessary examples, such as these provided in this thoughtfully compiled volume. These contributions address the importance of how mentoring is not only relational, but also involves evolutionary processes and products of these relations – all embodied in a transitional journey by individuals into different social roles, identities, and organizations (Turner 1975).

Marjorie Snipes’ and Frank Salamone’s *Passing the Torch: Mentoring the Next Generation* is a laudable and valuable collection of articles exploring the people, practices, and processes of mentoring in the humanities and social sciences. As both a case in point and for full disclosure, this topic resonates closely to me personally as Frank Salamone was an influential mentor to my professional development as a junior faculty member before and after his retirement. His continued acts of support bring Marcel Mauss’ *The Gift* to mind. Foundational to the mentoring relationship and process is the reciprocation of gifts that well exceed the gifts alone. The gifts of mentoring manifest generations later as mentees become another link in a long diachronic chain.

Although oversimplified, Mauss in this canonical anthropological piece argued that societies and social relations are built on gift-giving, but not the type in which parties keep score in a zero-sum exchange. Rather, giving, receiving, and reciprocating are an ongoing set of affairs, big and
Mauss made this assertion even though he and others (e.g., Mestrovic 2015) assert these social practices have changed or waned. Mentoring, in its best intentions, is predicated on giving without calculating the profits and future rewards. Let’s hope this book reaffirms and catalyzes the value in this tradition that all junior faculty and mentees, no matter their social position, identity, or community, receive these future gifts and learn also the essentialness of carrying that same torch. In the meantime, an overview of the book’s contents will illuminate its noteworthy contributions.

This edited volume packs a punch of topical breadth and depth. Although these ten articles approach mentoring from different perspectives and employ different methodologies, they can be separated into three general thematic areas. The first encompasses authors’ reflections of closely meaningful and influential mentors pivotal in their own and others’ intellectual and professional development. Frank Salamone explores how profoundly Franz Boas influenced Margaret Mead in this richly important relationship that laid the foundations for not only ethnography and the worldwide study of culture, but the entire field of Western anthropology. Myrdene Anderson discusses how Harold Conklin’s ongoing tutelage at Yale and afterwards on the meanings and methods of ethnography greatly impacted her career as an anthropologist. Miroslava Chávez-García and Ernesto Chávez reflect on how their mentor, Norris Hundley, Jr., catalyzed their intellectual growth at UCLA with an invigorating style, helping many aspiring graduate students and historians embrace the study of historically-marginalized ethnic groups. Moshe Shokeid’s article examines the influence of his mentor, Max Gluckman.

The second theme has an organizational and professional focus. It includes a chapter by Joy Williams-Black on the challenges aspiring academics face in their professional development when they lack familial and social support. Many times they are not provided adequate and continued peer and formal mentoring options in the workplace. Tom Greaves discusses the practices, effectiveness, and areas of improvement for a formal program provided to members of the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology. Among other elements, it establishes a one-on-one matching for young faculty with older faculty. Marjorie Snipes outlines her observations from two different peer mentoring courses: one in ethnographic methods and another in the anthropology of religion. Her experimental, “provoked participant observational” method often leads to students experiencing...
a creative liminality and communitas beneficial to their intellectual and professional growth.

A third way of cataloguing this collection of articles is a more scientific and empirical means of understanding best mentoring practices. Dannielle Joy Davis, Patricia Boyer, and Isela Russell’s qualitative study of a nontraditional mentoring program of junior faculty concludes with interesting findings and suggestions for increasing the efficacy of future programs. They place these findings in context with three general and traditional means of mentoring faculty: matching mentors and protégées, intradepartmental matching, or cultural mentoring. With a different population than the previous study, Kayla Sherman, Gloria Gonzales, and Erin Kostina-Ritchey discuss a model and strategies in a university outreach program pairing undergraduate and graduate students with elementary and middle schoolers. The program specifically focuses on how to elevate and inculcate best mentoring practices in young adults. A final article by Jacki Fitzpatrick, Erin Kostina-Ritchey, and Shima Hassan Zadeh explores different theoretical perspectives on mentorship. This review of literature focuses on the perspective that views mentoring as an interactional craft involving the three educational principles of scaffolding, debriefment and empowerment critical to improving mentoring practices.

This valuable collection elevates the discourse on mentoring in academia. It does so through a variety of articles, some of which illuminate the personal relationships that greatly enhance the advancement and integration of students and lifelong teachers and scholars. Individuals reside in relationships organized by institutions and other forms of association, such as professional groups, academic fields, and university positions or appointments. Building new bridges and solidifying existing ones help further integrate people in need of greater social involvement and stable, modeling relationships. Passing the Torch: Mentoring the Next Generation is a worthwhile and well-needed collection which updates the topic of mentoring in academic settings.

Marcus Aldredge, PhD
Associate Professor of Sociology
Iona College
December 27, 2015
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PART ONE:

MENTORS
CHAPTER ONE

THE INFLUENCE OF FRANZ BOAS
ON HIS STUDENTS:
THE EXAMPLE OF MARGARET MEAD

FRANK A. SALAMONE

Abstract: Perhaps the most famous mentor in American anthropology was Franz Boas. Among the many people whom he mentored, his most famous mentee was Margaret Mead. The relationship between them is highlighted in her work in Samoa. The existence of letters between them shows how Boas mentored people mainly through suggestion and how Mead built on those suggestions in her own way. This case study refutes any suggestion of Boas dictating what Mead wrote as Derek Freeman and others have suggested.

Anthropology’s basic boundary marker from other social sciences has been fieldwork and the culture concept developed through it. Fieldwork has a romantic aura, one that has clung to it despite almost innumerable books and articles detailing its inner workings from almost every conceivable angle. Certainly, movies, television programs, and novels have wielded more influence over the imagination of the public than all the dry, technical tomes academics have produced. Moreover, let us be honest, we have reveled in Susan Sontag’s (1963) characterization of the heroic anthropologist. Assuredly, there have been those like James Boon (1975) who have briddled at the characterization, at least as Sontag applied it to Lévi-Strauss, but in our secret hearts do we not really at times allow ourselves the hidden pleasure of seeing ourselves as the heroes of our own fantasies “in the field”? Who among us has not enchanted and bored our students with tales of our work in the field, typically featuring ourselves in some heroic role?

Sulika and Robben (2007) indicate the continuing centrality of fieldwork in the anthropological paradigm. Indeed, they, along with Keesing and
Strathern (1998: 8-9), view the cultural anthropologist as a humanist torn between basic dualities inherent in the juncture where scientific and humanistic interests intersect. Out of the struggle between allegiance to each of these dualities and the marginal position in which fieldwork inevitably puts the ethnographer emerges our sense of identity both professional and individual.

Arthur P. Cohen (2007) notes that the very process of fieldwork forces us to ask ourselves, echoing the very question we hear repeatedly in fieldwork, who we are. Cohen asserts that a major part of ethnography and thus anthropology itself is revealed in the way we answer that question. Moreover, as I heard from my earliest days in anthropology many years ago, ethnography is autobiography. In what now seems ages ago, one of my colleagues pointed out to me that my description of the Gungawa was a dead-on self-portrait of myself. I was stunned to hear it and even resisted it. However, that comment not only stopped me in my tracks, for I had not viewed myself in that light, but it stayed with me to the present. Although it was not entirely true, there was enough truth to give me pause about how much one reveals through ethnography. Of course, this should not be surprising. Cohen (110) notes that we use the self to discover others and vice versa. We define ourselves in fieldwork against those whom we study. After all, there is probably no other experience in our lives so intense, so conducive to reflexive musing, and so all-encompassing to the young selves we were upon first encountering it, than fieldwork.

When we add the element of long-term return to the same location, we have only deepened that sense of reflexivity. At different stages of our lives, as we become different people and assume different identities, we test our sense of self in a similar setting. We have grown older, alas, and so have our friends in the field. They see us as the same but different, and we do likewise. This social-psychological aspect of fieldwork cries out for additional investigation.

There are many influences on the anthropologist in conducting fieldwork. One important influence is that of our mentors. Perhaps the most famous mentor in cultural anthropology was Franz Boas. Through examining his influence on Margaret Mead, arguably his most famous student, we can measure, more or less, how much influence even a dominating figure such as Boas may have in influencing his most famous student and extrapolate our findings to others mentors and students.

In looking at Boas’ influence on Mead we are fortunate to have two people who were diligent correspondents and whose work has been preserved. Moreover, Mead specifically addressed her relationship with Boas and his influence on her own work. I focus on their correspondence
during Mead’s fieldwork in Samoa and on her later reflections of his influence in shaping and influencing her work.

**Apprenticeship under Boas**

Mead’s opening paragraph in her article *Apprenticeship under Boas* (1959:29) provides the appropriate tone and setting for understanding this significant interaction:

The myths that obscure the personality of an intellectual leader gather thickest in the years immediately following his death, when there are many people alive who speak with varyingly authoritative voices, and the next younger generation listens. As one of Boas’ students, and a student of his later, mellower years, I feel that it will be useful to include in this memoir something of the effects, as I see them, of the way he taught and the way he appeared to those who were learning from him in day-to-day contact.

Melville Herskovits (1953) has written of Boas, using extensive documentation from his published work and fusing his account with his own long-time association with Boas, as a student and a research worker. I shall not attempt to duplicate this, but shall confine myself to some aspects of Boas’ relationships to his students and to his role in anthropology as it appeared to me as a student - a subject to which Herskovits devoted only a couple of pages.

These aspects included four major areas: “man's oneness with the rest of the living world, or the problems that arose when man became the first domesticated animal”; giving “attention again and again to the small, vivid detail and its possible relevance within the larger framework”; “was criticism of the methods that lay back of the fragments with which he, and we, had to work”; the creation of research methods and his criticism of them; and, most importantly, Boas’ sense of being “morally responsible for the uses made of anthropology,” noting it should be used for promoting and advancing the cause of human freedom (Mead 1959: 30-31).

Mead notes that field conditions in the early days of anthropology sharpened the sense of obligation to Boas’ principles, especially that of moral responsibility. Although these conditions left fieldworkers free to conduct their research in various ways, using whatever methodologies worked for them, there was a great obligation not to let Boas down and to do the best work possible to do him honor. However, Mead draws attention to the fact that Boas taught implicitly, not explicitly. He did not promote any type of “Boasian” methodology nor did he put forth a master plan. This type of teaching led to what we would consider today a phenomenological approach, learning in the process of doing ethnographic
work. It promotes a type of serendipity and a delight in finding answers to problems we might not have known existed.

However, Mead also acknowledges some drawbacks. “This inarticulateness about method has perhaps been a disadvantage. Students trained in other universities have learned only to recognize a method if it is labelled as such, and a good many of the innovations we made went unrecognized and had to be reinvented” (Mead 1959:32).

This lack of self-consciousness about method could even lead to the making of a kind of somnambulistic choice:

In 1953, we realized that one of the crucial changes which had taken place in Manus culture since the first study in 1928 was in the attitude toward boundaries in time and space. This showed up clearly in the way children filled a piece of drawing paper, and I complained, ‘If only I’d tested them on paper of different shapes in 1928!’ But later, when I again went over the sets of drawings collected in 1928, I found that I had done this, and so could demonstrate the change that had taken place by 1953. Automatic methodological behavior of this kind is only transmissible from person to person. So, for example, it is striking that even with the degree of explicitness that has been introduced into the use of still photography as a research tool in anthropology, our method has been used only by those who have had research contact with Gregory Bateson or myself, and discussions of the method turn into attacks on the approach (Mead 1959:32-33).

Mead discusses Boas’ influence on a number of other people, including Melville Herskovits, Ruth Benedict, and Ruth Bunzel. Important aspects of his teaching include his trust in his students and his urging them to follow their interests. The important concept was that of urgency to get information before it was lost forever. Following one’s interests would insure commitment. Methods would follow if one were interested and committed. Of course, moral purpose was required. This freedom within an overall project helped ensure that his goals would be kept firmly in the minds of his students.

Mead in Samoa

The Navy have really done noble in preserving the native tone; … Only the arial <radio> stations and one arial [radio] stations and one smokestack really damage the scene. The presence of the fleet today skews the whole picture badly. There are numerous battleships in the harbor and on all sides of the island, mostly not in the harbor because they make the water oily and spoil the governor's bathing. Aeroplanes scream over head; the
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band of some ship is constantly playing ragtime (Samoa Field Bulletin, no. 4, p. 1, August 31, 1925 [Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers, box N1], spelling in original; reprinted with editorial modifications in Mead 1977: 23).

Margaret Mead’s entrance story is unlike those of Bronislaw Malinowski, Napoleon Chagnon, or numerous others - not a tale of the lone, heroic anthropologist making his or her triumphant and intrepid entrance upon an undiscovered people; rather, it is that of a clear-eyed young woman taking in the full picture of the imposition of colonialism changing an indigenous people in many ways, many of them, but not all, bad. Indeed, her central topic may have been a test of just what impact colonialism and Westernization might have on indigenous people.

Boas wrote and often repeated that "much of what we ascribe to human nature is no more than a reaction to the restraints put upon us by our civilization" (Boas 1928). It is not news that Mead followed Boas in this belief. The primacy of culture in shaping human behavior was a matter of prime importance to Boasians. Once humans had evolved as culture-bearing animals it was their “nature” to use culture to shape their lives. This tenet was not anti-biological and did not lead to its neglect; indeed, it helped lead to an investigation in anthropology upon the very nature of biological nature. However, cultural anthropologists, with notable exceptions, have been interested in just how the culture-bearer uses culture to determine the cultural development of our species - in simple terms, how nature and nurture interact.

Mead put it this way:

The native culture is so very much alive that it does not threaten one with any signs of early disappearance. Of course a good many of the religious ceremonies have been gone for half a century; the women wear a few ungainly clothes; a few packing boxes are used in the construction of the houses; some of the villages have showers and incidentals of material culture seem to make little show in the villages where only native houses are seen and the call to Kava is heard every evening. Yesterday the news was brought over the mountains of the sudden death from convulsions of seven children in one village. The people believe they were made sick from eating a large sea turtle but an autopsy on one of the bodies reveals unmistakable signs of strychnine poisoning. This is laid, conversationally, at the doors of the “witch doctors,” of whom there are a good many left (Mead to Boas September 17, 1925).

However, in further looking into matters Mead notes:
I have now visited almost every village on this island. They are divided into two types; those which are along the bus line, and those which are practically inaccessible except by difficult mountain trails or by water. The villages along the bus line have been very much influenced by American goods and American visitors and do not present a typical picture of the original culture. The villages of the bus line present two disadvantages; they are very difficult to reach and very small. No one of them boasts more than four or five adolescents, and so the difficulty of getting from one to the other makes them impossible places to work. To find enough adolescents, I would have to spend all my time climbing mountains or tossing about in the surf in an open boat, both extremely arduous and time consuming activities. There are only two villages which are really large enough for my purposes: Pago Pang and Leone, and both of these are over-run with missionaries, stores, and various intrusive influences (Mead to Boas October 11, 1925).

Thus, Mead understood the importance of the influence of Westernization on the indigenous culture. She also knew that times had changed drastically. Thus, she shows her awareness of culture change and the “plasticity” of human nature and its biological foundation. She sought a reasonable facsimile of traditional Samoan culture but knows that no true “aboriginal” culture still existed. Boas had advised her to pursue her study of adolescent girls, noting that it would not be easy to do so:

One question that interests me very much is how the young girls react to the restraints of custom. We find very often among ourselves during the period of adolescence a strong rebellious spirit that may be expressed in sullenness or in sudden outbursts. In other individuals there is a weak submission which, however, is accompanied by repressed rebellion that may make itself felt in peculiar ways, perhaps in a desire for solitude which is really an expression of desire for freedom, or otherwise in forced participation in social affairs in order to drown the mental troubles. I am not at all clear in my mind in how far the desire for independence may be simply due to our modern conditions to more strongly developed individualism (Boas to Mead July 17, 1925).

Finally, after advice to Mead about where to locate Boas writes:

I am fully aware that the subject you have selected is a very truly difficult one and is, I believe, the first serious attempt to enter into the mental attitude of a group in a primitive society. Great, of course, will be the satisfaction if you succeed in getting even part of what you would like to find and I believe that your success would mark a beginning of a new era of methodological investigation of native tribes. At the same time, I trust you will not feel discouraged if the results are coming slowly and not the
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extent you would like to get. Conditions are such that even if you do not get all you want in your principal subject, there are plenty of other aspects in regard to which material will be accumulated all the time that will be of value and many of which will have a bearing on a matter that you really want to investigate (Boas to Mead November 7, 1925).

Mead kept Boas’ suggestions and concerns in mind but also used her own judgment to put them into practice. On October 11, 1925, she wrote him:

Most of the observances which I am recording are still going on; my informants are of the chiefly class and well informed. How much checking would you consider it necessary and legitimate for me to do? . . . I hope to divide my time between a Samoan girls boarding school where no English is spoken and a half caste family in Leone where I can hear Samoan most of the time.

It is important to note that Mead did spend time with adolescents of the chiefly class and of a lower class, sampling as widely as possible, contrary to the assertions of some of her detractors.

Her description of the area in which she worked also demonstrates a keen eye and presents a clear view of the location. This letter of November 29, 1925, from which I quote extensively, demonstrates a prodigious grasp of traditional Samoan culture and changes in the system. Almost alone it is sufficient to refute many of the attacks made on her Samoan work, a point I will return to in the Conclusion. Mead opens with a note regarding her being in Samoa for three weeks and her desire to mention some of the possibilities inherent in it. She spent one of the three weeks in bed. Mead was of a delicate constitution at the time and Boas worried about her health. Although her survey was far from complete, she wanted to send some material to Boas since mail was so slow. She demonstrates a keen awareness of her surroundings and of changes that have come to the area:

This island has four villages on it. One of them is eight miles away and I do not expect to do much work there except perhaps of a strictly ethnological nature. The other three villages are immediately accessible. The Dispensary where I make my headquarters is situated in Luma, which runs into Siufaga without a perceptible break. Luma and Siufaga, between them have 580 inhabitants. About a mile away is the village of Faleasau, with a population of 259. There is a small copra vessel which runs back and forth to Tutuila every few weeks and the Navy ship also carries passengers, so that many of the Manu'a people have been to Tutuila and a good many of them to Western Samoa. Tattooing was forbidden a good many years ago by the king of Manu'a, and about half of the younger men
on the island are tattooed. These all had to go away from the island to receive their tattooing. A much smaller number of the women were sent away for the same purpose. There is one family of half castes on the island, and a few scattered half caste children. There has been a Naval Dispensary here for about 13 years, and a wireless station for 8 years. This had meant the presence of at least three white men on the island. They never learn the language and apparently have very little influence aside from the medical aid which they render to the people. There is a small store, formerly run by a white man, but at present that is also in the hands of a Samoan. The governor of Manu’a lives in Siufaga, and he speaks English and finished High School in Honolulu. There are no white missionaries on the island, and neither Mormons nor Catholics have ever been able to establish themselves here. So the religious scene is perfectly homogeneous, what the natives call “Lot Tahiti” the London Missionary Society’s sponsoring. The conduct of religious matters is in the hands of native pastors who were trained in the Missionary training school in Western Samoa. Economically the islands are practically self sufficient. There is no bakery, and such articles as soap and matches are great luxuries. They buy clothes a few dishes and kerosene and paper from the store. The island was swept by a hurricane which completely demolished houses and fruit trees in 1915, so that all the houses have been built since that time, and the plantations replanted.

Mead then turns to institutions that exert a disturbing influence on the population, demonstrating further her awareness of culture change and her lack of a pristine untouched population to study. Interestingly, she does not see the Church as being a particularly disturbing factor. Rather, it is the Government School that is causing more problems:

The two principal disturbing factors in the native milieu are the Church and the Government School. The Church, its teaching in the matters of sex morality and modesty of wearing apparel excepted, is not a particularly disturbing factor. The oldest people on the island have almost all always been Christian. The phraseology of the Samoan Bible is thoroughly ingrained into the mind set of their ceremonial speeches. The native pastors hold schools in which they teach the children to read and write in Samoan and to read the Bible. Church services consume a great deal of time, as does choir practice, but there is no attempt at revivals or of any sort of emotional appeal. The church provides goals however for the young people of both sexes, in the form of boarding schools; one for the girls on Tutuila and one for the boys who are to be pastors in Upolu. Attendance at these schools is dependent upon diligence and physical chastity. Manu’a is so far away that very few of the students come home for vacations and very few return afterwards, as the boys go elsewhere as pastors and the girls usually go into training as nurses at the Naval Hospital in Tutuila. So the
The influence of these schools is mainly as they serve as incentive to special sorts of conduct.

The government school presents a more disturbing influence. The teachers are supposed to teach in English; the chief effect of the ruling is that the teaching is hopelessly ineffective. The teachers cannot speak intelligible English and the children spend year after year in purposeless drill. The teachers also attempt to instill rudimentary notions of hygiene in the children’s heads. The teachers are young men who have possibly completed the sixth grade in the government school in Pago Pago. That school maintains a boarding school for boys and affords another goal for boys who wish more education but do not wish to be pastors. But it is not by what it teaches that the government school is disturbing but the time spent in school. This last year a compulsory school law was enacted, coupled with quite rigorous truancy regulations which are strictly enforced by the native judicial authorities. The children are in school from 9 to 12 and from 12 to 3. As the pastor refused to yield his title to hold school daily, he has school from 7:30 to 9 and 3 to 4:30. This seriously deranges the original regime under which the children have always lived. The Samoan meals are two, one at 10 A. M. and one about 8 in the evening. The school children have to forage for themselves early in the morning, are entirely robbed of their afternoon naps, and presented with a meaningless hour at noon. Furthermore, they are kept in retraining from early morning until late afternoon. This is bound to produce factors of insubordinacy and rebellion which were quite absent under the old regime.

Mead now turns to the main subject of her research, the adolescent girl. In contrast to those who have stated that she overlooked the Taupou couples, she immediately addresses it and notes its limitations on the population and the fact that it is dying out in the area. Far from ignoring it, she hits it head on and places it into context. She then turns to the impact of the Church on the life of adolescent girls, particularly of those who live on Church grounds and hope to continue their education, the “Good Christian girls”:

To now come to the problem of the adolescent girl. Here conduct is subject to the influence of two sets of ideals, one of the Taupou concept and the other under the missionary one of the Good Christian girl. Contrary to other parts of Polynesia there’s no prejudice against women as a contaminating influence, no sex taboo, and it is the taupou, the daughter or niece of the highest chief, who enjoys the greatest honor in the village. To her taboo fish are brought, her marriage is the great event of village life, she accompanies the chiefs on important journeys, and her funeral is attended by all the meticulous ceremony and taboo accorded to a high chief. This high prestige of being an ex-taupou is always greater than that...
of being the present wife of a high chief. The taupous are as carefully ranked as the chiefs, a definite ceremony attends their installation, and the wife of the chief’s principal councilor (talking chief) becomes the taupous chaperon and mentor in all things. On the other hand the chief’s son is not so honored. Until the death of his father he remains a virtual servant, he cannot speak in the council of the men who hold titles as heads of families, he must eat after his sister and wait upon her. Formerly all the unmarried girls and the widows slept in the same house as the taupou, and constituted a sort of court. However, the taupou has begun to pass away in Ta’u. There is only one acting taupou at the present time and she lives in Fitiuta. The younger girls have probably never come into direct contact with the taupou activities. But the concept is still vividly alive. And the central requirement for the taupou was that she should be a virgin. She was chaperoned everywhere she went (sic) are severely watched. The notion was that she was the village virgin, providing vicarious virtue for the rest of the village. And it is also important to notice that the rest of the girls of the village stood little or no chance of becoming taupou. Only her younger sister of first cousin might be influenced by the chance of succeeding her at her marriage. So that none of the requirements of modest, dignity, chastity were made on the other girls of the village.

The Missionary notion of a Good Christian Girl has the following effects. Girls who decide they wish to lead the good life. This means that they would like to go to boarding school someday, or like to live now in a houseful of girls, or that their parents to appear virtuous and has nothing to do with a change of heart or any sort of evangelical conversion as nearly as I have been able to ascertain so they go to live in the household of the pastor. He virtually adopts them; they may or may not go home for meals; they must always sleep there, as must the boarding school girls on vacation, and are very strictly supervised. 11 girls live in the house of the pastor of the village; 4 in the pastor in Faleasau. The group shifts somewhat. 2 girls were recently taken away because their mothers were angry that they did not win prizes in the examinations set by the missionaries each year. Inasmuch as this group does not represent girls of a different emotional makeup, but a fairly typical selection, I think I can use them as a control group. The teachers report that they are by far the most insubordinate in school, and surface contact shows them to be unusually self-conscious and salacious minded when compared with a group as a whole. The pastor is regarded as a sort of policeman and no girl was ever known to voluntarily confess any sort of wrong doing.

The phenomenon of insubordination accompanying adolescence seems entirely absent….

The aspects of these girls lives which are in most striking contrast to the lives of our adolescents and should therefore present the most fruitful
points of approach seem to be: complete absence of privacy and of private property; the merging of the biological family in the gross family often necessitating obedience to a father and a matai, the large percentage of children brought up by relatives rather than parents; the communal living making ignorance in sex matters nonexistent; the strong brother and sister taboo; the precedence which blood relationship takes over every other sort of grouping.

Mead is clear in the direction she is to take, namely, to contrast Samoan adolescent girls with their American counterparts. She states clearly the greater sexual knowledge of Samoan girls when compared with American girls and the looser restrictions they face compared with other South Sea women and, by implication, with American women as well.
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CHAPTER TWO

HAROLD C. CONKLIN:
THE JOY OF ETHNOGRAPHY –
FROM EYE TO EAR TO MOUTH TO NOSE
TO HAND, AND BEYOND TO WITHIN
AND WITHOUT

MYRDENE ANDERSON

**Abstract:** I chose to attend graduate school in anthropology at Yale University primarily because of reading Conklin's work—particularly the ideas that could be divorced from geography. In general, students found his intellectual breadth and depth intimidating, and even more intimidating his command of the concrete. The concrete included the toolkit of the era, field notes, and documentation in every imaginable medium, scale-models included. Someone had told me of a departmental social event in which students took on the roasting of faculty; the person taking on Conklin came out on stage with an unmanageable mobile constructed of wire coat hangers and proceeded to point to all the palpable and imaginable connections.

**A Prehistorical Note**

By the time I arrived at Yale for graduate school in 1968, I had already wandered around the northern hemisphere. These global peregrinations were by dint of compulsively saving anything from pennies upwards, earned from fortuitous jobs as an actuarial assistant when the hourly rate in 1953 started at one dollar per hour. An earlier stab at a chemistry pre-med major at the University of Washington in 1952-1953 quickly atrophied, as I reinvented anthropology-cum-ethnography on the hoof.
I was comfortable in assuming that the most important aspects of "ethnogging" could not be taught per-se, but, nonetheless, everyone proceeded as though that were possible, if not necessary, in centers of higher learning. For years I had been attending any and all free public lectures anywhere by anyone from any background. Reapplying the discipline involved in budgeting, traveling, haunting libraries, and finding the way to all those public lectures without ever owning a car, I was primed to settle down and study. Eventually I enrolled in some courses at Pasadena City College in the early 1960s, took advantage of a job transfer to Honolulu, and finally accumulated enough credits to graduate from the University of Hawaii with a B.A. in anthropology in 1968.

Fortunately, I then landed in a graduate department at Yale graced with seasoned fieldworkers representing the breadth of anthropology—six of them Fellows in the National Academy of Sciences, and all willing to share their abundant experiences beyond any prescriptive expertises. Just to list the extracurricular intellectual resources would take a lot of ink. Social gatherings, sharing the density of intellectual capital, were frosting on the cake. As happened previously at the University of Hawaii, visitors from around the world routinely paused through campus to share their ideas and report on their research. Returning fieldworkers—both students and faculty—studded the colloquium calendar as well. Students from other programs visited to confer and be “mentored” (although that term was never used) by Yale faculty, and external colleagues of the faculty regularly came to New Haven to offer courses, or at least deliver lectures. Students flocked to take courses from visiting faculty, including Georges Condominas, Ward Goodenough, and Joseph Greenberg, because there already was ample daily access to the regular Yale faculty.

**The Mentor-Mentee Relationship Self-Organizes**

That I chose the Yale graduate program in 1968 mainly traces to two factors. The lesser important was that so many of my undergrad mentors at Hawaii had been trained at Yale: for starters, Edwin A. Cook, Thomas Maretsky, and Richard J. Pearson. Though an archaeologist, Pearson was assigned to me as an advisor, and he and Takie Lebra supervised my ethnography of a local Honolulu congregation of Tensho Kotai Jingu Kyo, a religious movement emerging in Japan during World War Two, this research becoming my B.A. thesis (Anderson 1968).

More importantly, I had become fascinated by a number of the minds, many anthropological, whom I had read as an undergraduate or while away from the academy. Some thinkers had passed on, such as Charles
Sanders Peirce, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Lee Whorf; other eminences I had at least already met in Hawaii, including Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson. Then there was the constellation in their primes at Yale, including Floyd G. Lounsbury, Cornelius Osgood, Leopold J. Pospisil, Harold W. Sheffler, and especially, considering my untamed interests, Harold C. Conklin. I must also mention my exploration of literatures beyond anthropology at Yale, but sympathetically close by, including G. Evelyn Hutchinson in biology and Rulon Wells in linguistics.

Thanks to the library and especially the interlibrary loan at the Manoa campus, I had explored unending troves while pro-forma finishing the undergraduate degree in anthropology. During that time, I devoured a number of articles of Conklin’s: “Hanunóo Color Categories” (1955); “Lexicographic Treatment of Folk Taxonomies” (1962); and “Ethnogenealogical Methods” (1964); and I thoroughly enjoyed without being intimidated by his “Linguistic Play in its Cultural Context” (1959); and “Maling, a Hanunóo Girl in the Philippines: A Day in Parina” (1960). Conklin’s range of styles and topics encouraged me to imagine that a scholarly and scientific life might not require blinders and hobbles.

The anthropology classes at the Manoa campus were never disappointing in themselves, either, with the substantial resident faculty augmented by visitors, even Gregory Bateson. Still, courses in other fields almost diverted me from anthropology; I considered other majors, even genetics and structural geology. The humanities I found more daunting, as I think they must be for young minds in general.

Although I was much older than the usual B.A. applying to graduate school, I was much less savvy, coming from a family without university exposure. My Honolulu ethnographic research with Tensho Kotai Jingu Kyo, my twice studying Japanese (and forgetting it many times over), and my travel in Asia, could have pointed me toward area programs such as Harvard’s. Indeed, Harvard (and the three other schools to which I applied) did accept me. But with few exceptions, their contemporary faculties hadn’t beckoned me so strongly through their literatures. It was also the case that “Yale” was the shortest name of all those institutions, an important consideration taken over the longer haul. Already I had developed a practice of only renewing my passport in countries with very short capitol names, such as Oslo and Kabul, and decades later, in a casual conversation with my father, I learned that when he enrolled in the first grade (perhaps in 1913, in or near Tacoma, Washington), he had given the teacher his middle name rather than his first, because the middle name, LeRoy, had one letter fewer than his first name, Andrew. That shorter name became the record he carried with him through his life, Social
Security, and death, and that fact was something his daughter, the ethnographer, almost never discovered.

**Conklin, Hal Conklin**

Finally, I introduce Harold C. Conklin, destined to serve as my indulgent major professor. However, Hal was away on sabbatical, in the field in Ifugao with his wife and two sons my entire first year 1968-1969, during which interlude I almost succumbed to primatology or straight linguistics instead of focusing on some fusion of "languaging" with natural history. I had been attracted to Hal’s work, particularly the ideas that could be divorced from geography. Southeast Asia was surely interesting; between 1956 and 1961 I had myself traveled through much of Asia, but general issues of ecology were even more compelling.

Hal’s approach to anthropology and ethnography—and to anthropological linguistics-cum-linguistic anthropology, and to ecology—proved to be well worth the wait. Even though my geographic interests would not be contained by insular Southeast Asia or shifting agriculture—arctic tundra reindeer pastoralism would become more like it—I had traveled through those tropical regions and could easily imagine returning someday.

First soaking up impressions of my future major professor from students in other cohorts, I gathered that Conklin could be at the same time sternly demanding and downright hilarious. He was bound to be aware of this Janus impression, but kept that awareness to himself. In general, students found his intellectual breadth and depth intimidating, and even more intimidating was his command of the concrete. The concrete included the toolkit of the era, fieldnotes, and documentation in every imaginable medium, scale-models included.

Fortunately, the Yale cohorts were then small, I believe a half-dozen in my class, and consequently the courses were also intimate, even though all four subfields were represented amongst us. Seminar rooms were near the faculty offices, some offices large enough to host the seminars.

The typical Conklin seminar would be launched by the professor entering from his expansive offices (that is plural) across the hall, laden down with archival volumes and complicated structures made not of toothpicks, but of strange yet supposedly authentic materials. Having just had a close call with an infatuation with primatology, I could smile, thinking of a chimp leaving a provisioning station with more bananas than hands and feet and chin together. But then the seminar conversation might veer toward language, the structures and functions of folk classifications, wherein the theme would be “context, context, context” and "relations on