Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

A. Peter Castro

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, ahcastro@maxwell.syr.edu

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

A. Peter Castro
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
ahcastro@syr.edu

Abstract

International research collaboration is increasingly popular, providing many scholarly and practical benefits. These collaborative endeavors also encounter obstacles and costs, including ones involving issues of power and professional ethics. My study seeks to widen our understanding of international collaborative social science research by examining the complex origins, diverse activities, and clouded legacy of the Smithsonian Institution's Institute of Social Anthropology (ISA). The ISA was an innovative collaborative teaching and research program founded by Julian Steward during World War II to meet many goals, including increasing social science capacity in Latin America, expanding knowledge about contemporary cultural change, strengthening area expertise among U.S. scholars, and promoting closer relations among the peoples of the Americas. The ISA provided career-enhancing opportunities for U.S. and Latin American scholars, while helping to pioneer applied medical anthropology. I take issue with recent analysts who portray the ISA as promoting, including through covert research, U.S. hegemonic interests seeking to control rural Latin America.

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

57

International research collaboration is increasingly popular, forging new links across nations, institutions, disciplines, and other boundaries. A recent study examining co-authored refereed articles in the sciences between 1990 and 2005, for example, found an exponential growth in the number of international addresses (Leydesdorff & Wagner, 2008). Collaborative activities also occur with greater frequency between researchers, indigenous peoples, and other groups who traditionally served as the object of study. The drive towards collaborative activities reflects, in part, wider trends of globalization and increased inter-connectedness brought about by technological and other changes. Recognition of professional and practical benefits arising from collaboration also provides strong motivation, including greater effectiveness in addressing scholarly and applied problems that require a wide range of skills and knowledge, a desire to strengthen research capacity and action networks worldwide, and a concern with promoting equity and efficiency in research and training through widening the scope for participation (Katz & Martin, 1997; Fluehr-Lobban, 2008). Increased public and private funding for such endeavors have been an important element as well, with both public and private entities pursuing agendas varying from broad cosmopolitanism to more narrowly defined national, commercial, or other strategic interests. Attempts at collaboration have also demonstrated that significant barriers can exist in trying to work together on common projects. These obstacles include difficulties in overcoming structural inequalities and mistrust among participants, project management and logistical problems (especially when multiple layers of bureaucracy are involved), and the added time and costs required in coordinating a far-flung network. At its worst, such activities may end up essentially colonial operations, marked by deep asymmetries in power and benefit-sharing (Kishk Anaquot Health Research, 2008).

Although the frequency of international collaboration is increasing, the working together of researchers across national and disciplinary boundaries is by no means a recent phenomenon. Area studies programs in the United States, for example, are based on collaborative endeavors engaged in by anthropologists, geographers, and others in Latin America and elsewhere during the first half of the twentieth century (Steward, 1950). In this paper, I analyze a pioneering effort at promoting international collaboration, focusing on the Smithsonian Institution's Institute of Social Anthropology (ISA), an innovative program founded by iconic scholar Julian Steward that operated from 1943 to 1952. At the request of several Latin American governments, the ISA placed U.S. social scientists in local institutions to engage in teaching and research with host country colleagues and students. The ISA offered an alternative to the usual *modus operandi* of foreign anthropologists, who carried out "most research through the continent [...] [but] recognized little, if any, obligation towards the profession in the host countries" (Murra, 1985, p.160). The ISA provided career-building opportunities for many participants, particularly the Smithsonian's social scientists, while fostering U.S. scholarly interest in Latin America (Foster, 1967, 1979). In its later phase, the ISA pioneered applied medical and evaluation anthropology. Yet the ISA's reputation is clouded by recent charges that Steward and the Institute promoted U.S. hegemonic interests and engaged in unethical activities such as covert research (Patterson & Lauria-Perricelli, 1999; Price, 2008; Ross, 2008). My paper examines the ISA's origins, goals, personnel, and activities, exploring its relevance and clarifying its legacy.

My interest in the Institute of Social Anthropology and my investigation of it arose from research I am doing on the career of Charles Erasmus, professor emeritus at

the University of California, Santa Barbara (and my former teacher), who was the last regular staff member hired by the ISA, witnessing its transition from a collaborative technical assistance agency to one specializing in applied anthropology. In exploring the limited literature on the ISA, I learned that the ethical issues raised about its activities during World War II and the Cold War mirror current ethical concerns with respect to the ISA regarding its engagement in America's current – and seemingly endless – War on Terror (Fluehr-Lobban, 2003; Gonzalez, 2009). As an applied and academic anthropologist, I have been involved in collaborative programs and projects sponsored by the United Nations, the U.S. government, and non-governmental organizations. In these endeavors, I witnessed issues and challenges similar to those experienced by the ISA arising from structural inequalities among the participants, the need to navigate different management cultures, and the intrusion of external and internal politics on programmatic activities. Thus, I believe that understanding the ISA's historical experience is relevant to understanding not only the dynamics of present-day international collaborative social research but also the ethical concerns raised about Julian Steward and the Smithsonian Institution's activities.

Cold Warriors or Collaborators?

Recently, the ISA has received attention from scholars reassessing Julian Steward's work (he was its founder), the role of anthropologists in World War II (wartime geo-political concerns gave impetus to the ISA's creation in 1943), and the Cold War's impact on anthropology (it operated until 1952). Steward is an iconic figure in anthropology, whose work on ecology and evolution still influences research. Yet analysts also now criticize his record as an ethnographer of the Great Basin, a theorist, a proponent of value-free science, an applied researcher for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a leader of largely male-based collaborative projects, an opponent of some American Indian land claims, and a supporter of U.S. hegemonic interests (Clemmer et al., 1999; Kerns ,2003; Pinkoski, 2008a; Price, 2008). Much of this critique is insightful, contributing to a self-correcting process in anthropological knowledge. At times, however, some of it is over-wrought, such as a claim that his work had the effect of "dehumanizing entire populations" (Pinkoski, 2008b, p. 81), or it is misleading, as it is in the case of the ISA.

Three decades ago, the ISA was said to be "a tribute" to Steward's "perspicacious sense of the new demands that would be made on anthropology following World War II" (Foster, 1979, p. 205). In contrast, Thomas Patterson and Antonio Lauria-Perricelli (1999, p. 228) now portray the ISA as a venture of Steward the "technocrat," whose research priorities in Latin America fell in line with U.S. policy seeking "to eliminate all possible interimperial competitors for access to or control over hemispheric production, markets, and sociopolitical forces." Similarly, Eric Ross (2008, p. 114) asserts that "[the ISA] had, as one of its principal aims, 'to keep Latin America within the U.S. political orbit'" (Adams, 1964, p. 2). In making this claim, Ross quoted an ISA insider, Richard N. Adams, its representative to Guatemala. David Price (2008, pp. 112-113) states that ISA staff members "collected and tracked information on regional ethnologists," assembling "dossiers […] to vet the political allegiances of foreign scholars with whom they might enter into partnerships." Both Ross and Price portray U.S. policymakers' concern with controlling rural Latin Americans as the driving force behind the ISA's concern for peasants. Price (2008, p. 112) contends that it is "remarkable" that the "ISA

anthropologists were not more suspicious of their own government's interest in the peasants they were being paid to study." Furthermore, Price (2008, p. 113) argues that the ISA served American interests until its termination, saying: "The ISA continued to carry on research after the war, focusing on concerns of the Cold War, until it was disbanded in late 1952" (see Foster, 1979, p. 205). Citing George, Foster suggests that the ISA's compliance was incontrovertible, since Foster not only worked for the agency during its entire existence but served as its director from 1946 to 1952, the formative Cold War years. Although Price (2008, p. 113) acknowledges that the ISA "had no significant impact on war planning or policies," he believes it helped further U.S. strategic interests while encouraging anthropologists to accept a paradigm of Cold War-directed research. Such accounts convey the image of the ISA as Cold Warriors in service to U.S. power interests, rather than social scientists seeking genuine collaboration with colleagues. Is this critical view of the ISA's activities and legacy accurate?

In their zeal to expose past errors and ethical lapses, however, analysts sometimes distort the historical record (see Lewis, 2005). For example, Ross fails to mention that Adams (1964, p. 2) also stated in the same article: "The ISA had a beneficial effect and stands as a monument to anthropological efforts of its kind." In fact, Ross misquoted Adams about the ISA seeking "to keep" Latin America within the U.S.'s political orbit – which truly would have been a monumental task for anthropologists. Instead, Adams (1964, p. 2) wrote: "[The ISA] was born of a concern to keep Latin America within the U.S. political orbit, and it died when politicians mistakenly thought that Latin America was secure in that orbit." Thus, the motivation and interests attributed by Ross to the ISA belonged to American policymakers who funded it. Contrary to Price's citation, Foster's article provides no confirmation of the ISA's concern with the Cold War. Foster (1967, 1979) wrote about the ISA's activities after World War II, but working *during* the Cold War is not the same thing as doing work *for* Cold War interests. In addition, Price neglects to bring up Foster's (1979, pp. 214-215, n. 2) statement included in an endnote regarding the ISA, anthropology, and covert activities:

> In an age when government employment is looked upon
> with suspicion by some anthropologists, readers may
> wonder about the close administrative relationship between
> the Institute and the governments, both of the United States
> and of the participating Latin American countries. For the
> record, I wish to state categorically that, to the best of my
> knowledge, there was absolutely no attempt on the part of
> the United States or Latin American government to use ISA
> personnel for intelligence or other related activities. I saw
> no evidence that the State Department, in funding the
> Institute, hoped for more than some small contribution to
> basic understanding between the United States and Latin
> America. During my nine and one-half years with the
> Institute, I was not once approached about information that
> might be useful to the United States government, and I
> know of no other Institute staff members who had any type
> of clandestine ties with intelligence services. I have always

> believed that, and continue to believe, that the Institute was
> exactly what it represented itself to be, and nothing more.

His endnote left no doubts about his views regarding the ISA's political and ethical integrity. Other writings by Foster (1969, 1973) also demonstrate his considerable concern about the issue of professional ethics.

The inclusion of this endnote in Foster's 1979 article contrasts with its absence in a similar paper he published 12 years earlier. By 1979, he had become acutely aware of how anthropologists in the intervening period had become more sensitive about relationships of power and ethics. His presidency of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in 1969-1970 coincided with a public controversy about the involvement of anthropologists in U.S. military counterinsurgency (Jorgensen & Wolf 1970). Foster (2000, p. 207) later admitted, "The whole association nearly blew up over the matter." One of his antagonists was Eric Wolf, who criticized the AAA leadership for its seemingly conservative stance. Ironically, Wolf was a former doctoral student and research associate of Steward's, having worked on his collaborative projects on Puerto Rico in the late 1940s and on cross-cultural regularities in the mid-1950s. Reflecting 30 years after his AAA presidency, Foster (2000, p. 216) stated that the ethics battle demonstrated clearly how times had changed; in World War II, one's obligation was clear, he explained: "It was the duty of the anthropologist to aid the government." However, in a post-Vietnam war context, any association with the government was no longer favorable to an anthropologist. Admitted Foster, recognizing that "the Vietnam War was a very different type of thing" took quite a while.

Unknown to Foster was the fact that two ISA colleagues had previously worked for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the World War II predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency, *before* joining the ISA: geographer Robert West, who shared teaching duties with Foster in Mexico; and anthropologist John Gillin, who served in Peru (Robinson, 1980, p. 74; Price, 2008, p. 222). In addition, ISA member Harry Tschopik Jr. performed intelligence work in Peru during 1942 for the U.S. government, years before his service in the ISA (Rowe, 1958). As yet, no evidence exists that any of these men or others used their ISA posts for military intelligence or related covert activities. However, in a review of the Smithsonian Institution's overall wartime contributions, its secretary publicly admitted that its auspices had been used by an anthropologist for such a purpose. He stated the following intention of anthropology: "[to seek] information on the current political situation in Peru with special reference to Axis espionage – for a war agency" (Smithsonian Institution, 1945, p. 462). The Smithsonian had several affiliated anthropologists, including archaeologists, in Peru during this time, so it is unclear to whom this statement refers.

Foster's claim about the absence of Cold War concerns in the ISA's agenda and activities is shared by Charles Erasmus, the ISA representative to Colombia from 1950 to 1952. When informed about Price's assertions, Erasmus noted that he joined the ISA long after World War II, so he could not comment directly on that era. He thought that if the claims regarding covert research for that period had been true, however, "There would have been some aftertaste that I would have felt when I joined the place." As far as his own experience in the ISA, Erasmus was clear and direct: "There was certainly nothing like that going on when I was in there. That is totally ridiculous." He added: "We weren't concerned with current events. We were all going to do these community studies." Erasmus pointed out that when Foster led the ISA into applied research, "It was simply

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

61

what it was, an investigation into the health aid program" (Erasmus, personal communication). As will be seen, my analysis of the ISA's past supports Foster's and Erasmus' views, though critics of the ISA are correct in identifying the need to understand the wider context of power and conflict in the agency's origins, operations, and termination.

The Origins of the ISA: Julian Steward, Government Scientist

World War II furnished the immediate setting for the creation of the ISA, but many ideas behind its planning had been of concern to Julian Steward, its initiator, for years. He earned a Ph.D. at the University of California at Berkeley in 1929, trained by Alfred L. Kroeber in the Boasian tradition of cultural relativism and historical reconstruction. For the next six years, Steward held a series of temporary academic and research jobs. During this period, he increasingly explored cross-cultural regularities in how societies interacted with their environment – "a fundamental departure from the Boasian frame of reference" (Hatch, 1973, p. 118). Hired by the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE) in October 1935, Steward then had a fruitful setting in which to pursue his interests.

Since its founding in 1846, the Smithsonian has served as a leading center of American anthropology, sponsoring research and providing employment (Roberts, 1946, p. Darnell, 1997). Created under the leadership of John Wesley Powell in 1879, the BAE was supposed to carry out scientific and policy-related studies on American Indians. The reform-minded Powell hoped that the BAE would contribute to the more humane treatment of Indians. Yet officials rarely sought the agency's advice, and the few BAE reports dealing with policy matters, such as James Mooney's Ghost Dance investigation, generated controversy, threatening the agency's funding (Hinsley 1981). By the 1930s, the BAE resembled "an old fashioned government bureau doing research [on] […] traditional theoretical problems" (Foster, 2000, p.122). William Fenton (1982, p.650), a long-time BAE anthropologist, recalled that "the Smithsonian ambience suggested an Oxford college […] scholars, each with his own fieldwork and the expectation of publishing." Instead of providing an idyllic retreat, however, Steward's duties at the BAE became very challenging.

President Franklin Roosevelt appointed reformer John Collier to run the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in 1933. The BIA long relied on paternalism and assimilation, but Collier sought Indian empowerment and cultural renewal. He requested BAE helped to recruit anthropologists for applied work related to the newly-passed Indian Reorganization Act, which allowed greater tribal self-governance under certain conditions (McNickle, 1979). Steward, who had studied Great Basin cultures, was seconded to the BIA. This proved a bitter experience. He clashed with BIA officials over their plans promoting Shoshone empowerment, arguing that the legacies of conquest and assimilation would thwart romantic and unrealistic initiatives. Collier and others attacked his professional competency, and they suppressed his report (Clemmer et al., 1999).

Steward (1950, 1969) drew several lessons from this experience. The BIA's use of anthropologists and other specialists suggested the potential value of coordinating research teams around questions dealing with contemporary cultures. Yet he felt the partnership also revealed the danger of value-laden applied research, as officials could set agendas deluded by romantic ideas and misguided, even if well-intended, goals. In fact,

Steward developed a lifetime "unshakable disdain for applied anthropology" (Kerns, 2003, p. 208). Nonetheless, he recognized that effective and humane public policy required accurate information about the current situation of communities. From his perspective, Boasian anthropology, concerned with reconstructing aboriginal cultures, lacked the theories and methods necessary to contribute such knowledge. To be useful, he believed, anthropologist should examine "acculturation" – processes and trends of contemporary cultural change (Steward, 1943).

Steward's Shift to Latin America: Opportunities and Collaborations

In the late 1930s, Steward developed plans to work in Latin America. Starting with a research trip to South America in 1938, he soon wielded considerable influence in the interaction of American social scientists with the region. As Steward (1943, p. 199) later wrote, the United States held only limited possibilities for "studying functioning native cultures," whereas prospects abounded in Latin America. The region also offered "vast" opportunities and yet "heavy" responsibilities for analyzing culture change. He developed an ambitious, multifaceted research agenda involving basic data collection on indigenous groups and other social "types," analysis of culture change, and the strengthening of regional social science institutions. Collaboration between U.S. and Latin American scholars was seen as a crucial aspect of this initiative.

His regional shift to Latin America was not unusual, as other BAE staff already had research projects there, and Smithsonian leaders encouraged this widening geographical spread (Abbot, 1942). Steward's involvement also happened at a time when strategic concern about the region increased due to rising world tensions and Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy. More than a half a century later, Foster (2000, p.120) described Steward at the Smithsonian as "an operator, in the good sense of the word." To pursue his BAE duties, Steward recognized and took advantage of a new trend in the social sciences: the rise of public and private institutions in shaping and funding research (Patterson, 2001; Kerns, 2003). Such support was modest in the 1930s, reflecting the nation's hard times and the novelty of interventionist government. Three decades later, with the military-industrial complex and the welfare state, millions of public and private dollars flowed into the social sciences (Beals, 1969).

The State Department set up the Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation with the American Republics (which underwent several subsequent name changes starting in the mid-1940s, and which will be called here the "Interdepartmental Committee") in 1938 to furnish technical assistance to the region. The Smithsonian was represented in these efforts since the committee's inception. The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, created in 1940 to secure U.S. economic and political interests in the region, also made available research funding. It set up the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in 1942, the first major U.S. technical aid program, which later proved decisive in the ISA's history (Foster, 1969). These initiatives were influenced by scientific internationalism, the notion that cooperation in science and technology could foster peace and prosperity among nations (Miller, 2006). Yet, by nature, federal support was inseparable from geo-political rivalries; research funds were distributed as part of the American effort to counter German influence, while promoting national strategic interests (Price, 2008).

Using funds from the Interdepartmental Committee, Steward launched programmatic initiatives in the early 1940s that challenged the BAE's model of

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

63

independent, uncoordinated scholarship. He led preparations for the *Handbook of South American Indians*, a path-breaking, multi-volume set dealing with past and present aboriginal populations. Approximately half of its nearly 100 authors came from Latin American scholars (Smithsonian Institution, 1942, p. 52). He also received funds for the new Inter-American Society of Anthropology and Geography, along with its journal, *Acta Americana*. More than 700 members enrolled in its first year (Smithsonian Institution, 1943). Steward (1943) envisioned this kind of organization as a countervailing force against pressures to make social science a servant of state interests. Such professional bodies, he hoped, would provide institutional settings for defining and defending scientific standards. The society also aimed to strengthen ties between U.S. and Latin American scholars. Sustaining the society in the post-war years proved difficult due to financial and other problems (Brand, 1950). In 1942, Steward (1950, p. 33) directed the development of a proposal for a new Smithsonian program "to carry out basic research on the cultures of foreign areas." Submitted to the Interdepartmental Committee, it met a favorable reaction. A Smithsonian Institution (1945, p. 467) later commented: "With the outbreak of war came the realization that Western Hemisphere solidarity was not only desirable but essential to the safety of the countries of both continents." The ISA fit well in this setting, joining cooperative efforts in Latin America by the BAE and the National Museum.

The Institute of Social Anthropology: Goals and Inspirations

Established in September 1943, the ISA operated as an autonomous unit of the BAE. Steward headed the new entity, reporting directly to the Smithsonian's secretary. The ISA sought to increase social science capacity in Latin America by establishing cooperative training and research activities involving U.S. scholars, who would directly participate in local institutions. Their teaching and mentoring aimed to shape the next generation of scholars in the participating countries. In essence, it was a 'training-of-trainers' approach. New institutions devoted to social analysis were emerging in many Latin American countries, including the Escola de Sociología e Politíca of Sao Paulo in the 1930s, Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia in 1939, and Colombia's Instituto Etnológico Nacional in 1941. These entities sought to deal with the scholarly and practical issues related to their multicultural societies. Thus, the ISA would be furnishing assistance at a very formative time for these institutions. To ensure expansion of the knowledge about these countries, the ISA established scientifically-oriented field research as an integral part of its agenda. A publication series would disseminate research findings to both a specialist and popular audience. American scholars would benefit through the work opportunities offered in Latin America – a major consideration in the days before the proliferation of area studies and overseas research support. These activities were intended to foster hemispheric cultural and institutional ties (Smithsonian Institution, 1944; Steward, 1950).

The ISA combined Steward's research interests with a practical concern for capacity building. Past and present programs in Latin America shaped his ideas, including Franz Boas' short-lived Mexican anthropology school that started in 1910, the Carnegie Institution's long-standing Maya Project, the Institute of Andean Research's archeological projects, and the Tarascan Project involving American and Mexican scholars (Steward, 1950; Foster, 1967). His plans about the practice of cooperative

teaching were influenced by sociologist Donald Pierson's participation in the Escola Livre de Sociología e Politíca in Brazil. Pierson helped organize its sociology and anthropology program, and he later served as dean of the Graduate Division. His approach emphasized the need for participatory research as a training component, arguing that people from the society being studied needed to be involved to understand "subtle meanings of cultural forms which may escape the outsider" (Pierson, 1951, p. vii). Sol Tax and others with experience teaching abroad also influenced Steward's thinking (Foster, 1967).

Despite its name, the ISA aimed to bolster Latin American capacity in a range of disciplines, including geography, sociology, and linguistics. Anthropology's predominance reflected not only Steward's background and BAE affiliation, but the contemporary realities of U.S. expertise on Latin America. An official report in 1943 identified American social scientists with at least a year's experience in Latin America and a working knowledge of Spanish or Portuguese: 70 anthropologists were listed, compared to two economists (Beals, 1969, p. 55). In fact, the report showed that anthropologists led for all world regions except Europe.

The ISA's practical goals heightened its funding appeal. The ISA's name supposedly indicated "social value or utility," underscoring the agency's relevancy and tangible benefits (Foster, 1979, p. 205). ISA collaborator Luis Valcárcel (1947, p. vii), who became Peru's Minister of Public Education, hoped that ethnologists and sociologists might someday be entrusted to help cure "social ills." Yet, Steward clearly stated in his original proposal that the ISA would not be dominated by applied concerns. It would be "unconnected with action and welfare programs," engaging only in "pure science rather than applied science" (quoted in NAA/ISA/Point Four, Willey, "Anthropology and the Point Four Program," September 22, 1949). He believed that the ISA's research on Latin American communities would have policy relevance (Foster, 1979). Steward (1944, p. ix) promised that the ISA reports would provide "specific and accurate data on which any successful action programs affecting the peoples concerned must be based." Planners and officials, however, were on their own in using such information.

The ISA's activities initially focused on Latin America, but ambitions for it ranged more widely. Steward and Smithsonian officials hoped its operations might be extended eventually to the Middle East, China, and the Soviet Union (Roberts 1946). As late as 1949, the ISA sought funds to place two anthropologists at American University in Beirut, Lebanon (NAA/ISA/Rowe, Foster to Rowe, December 29, 1949). A lack of financial support halted these plans.

ISA Administration

Steward directed the ISA from Washington, D.C. His role focused on agency management, planning, and related tasks. Alfred Métraux, an anthropologist who worked on the *Handbook of South American Indians*, served as assistant director. No one replaced Métraux when he was transferred to the War Department in April 1945 (Smithsonian Institution, 1945). A secretary – Ethelwyn Carter (1943-47) and Lois Northcott (1947-52) – managed the flow of administrative tasks and information. George Foster, the first field staff member hired by the ISA, took over as director in September 1946, when Steward left for a professorship at Columbia University. Steward held an advisory role until March 1947, when differences with Foster caused him to resign.

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

65

Gordon Willey, a BAE senior anthropologist who specialized in archaeology, became acting director in 1949-1950, when Foster went on extended research leave to Spain.

The ISA directorship seemed an ideal setting for Steward to coordinate the field stations to work towards "integrated results," but he never did so. Steward's years of ISA leadership coincided with his *Handbook* editorship and participation in numerous professional bodies, which consumed much time and effort (Kerns, 2003). Although he influenced ISA activities to some extent, its collaborative nature imposed a degree of decentralization, given the different interests of participating governments, institutions, and individuals. When Foster took over, his experience as an ISA representative gave him a field-level understanding of operations. He gave his colleagues considerable leeway in seeking new research opportunities. Foster initially lacked Steward's nominal interest in using the ISA to achieve a broad theoretical synthesis.

An inter-governmental agreement, called a *convenio*, set up the cooperative arrangement between a Latin American country and the U.S. A prospective Latin American government issued a formal request for assistance, which served as the basis for negotiating the ISA's involvement. Thus, the ISA always had the advantage of portraying itself as a response to a locally-identified need. State Department officials formally signed the *convenio* with their counterparts at the participating country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The governmental status afforded to the ISA set it apart from usual academic exchange programs. The *convenios* furnished an innovative way for host countries to manage American researchers. At this time, scholars generally took for granted their freedom to operate abroad without specifying obligations to authorities, the local scholarly community, or the people being studied (Beals, 1969).

Formats for the *convenio* were essentially the same for all countries (Foster, 1967). The ISA's Washington office identified and hired experts, and it furnished financial and logistical support for their training and research activities. The experts were "Smithsonian professors" (Foster, 1973, p. 226). They were usually employed for multi-year stays, allowing them to become well acquainted with the host country, ensuring continuity in training programs, and permitting sufficient time for completing research projects. Short-term contracts were used when necessary, such as when Raymond E. Crist spent a sabbatical in 1949 as temporary replacement for John Rowe in Colombia. The ISA staff members were federal employees, with all obligations and privileges thereof, setting them apart from independent scholars operating abroad.

Before going abroad, prospective ISA representatives had to be vetted by the host country and the U.S. government. Clearances by the latter became burdensome in the late 1940s with the rise of McCarthyism (Foster, 1967; also see Price, 2004). FBI reviews often took two to four months. Failure to obtain FBI clearance due to alleged communist affiliation or other supposed forms of deviancy resulted in the denial of employment, as occurred in the case of Preston Holder, who was slated to go to Colombia in 1948 (NAA/ISA/Rowe, Foster to Rowe, October 19, 1948). Some ISA candidates encountered troubles obtaining passports in a timely manner, resulting in their not taking the ISA job (Price, 2008). In contrast, Latin American governments never rejected candidates recommended by the ISA (Foster, 1967).

Participating countries were expected to support their own institutions, staff, students, facilities (classroom and offices), project activities, and publications. Foster (2000) learned early on in Mexico that host institutions often had to deal with cumbersome national bureaucracies and limited funds, constraining full participation.

ISA field staff and their local counterparts worked out specific arrangements for teaching and research. Although collaboratively organized, ISA activities did not involve equal partners who faced similar circumstances. Engaged in a technical assistance program, the ISA field staff clearly had more resources at their disposal than the host nation staff (Foster, 1967). The ISA posts supposedly involved an equal division between research and teaching duties to make them more attractive to potential candidates. In contrast, host country faculty often had significant teaching, advising, and service obligations.

Cooperative agreements started with Mexico (1943), followed by Peru (1944), Brazil (1945), and Colombia (1946). The addition of Guatemala in 1950 happened at the request of its ambassador (Foster, 1967). Table 1, which is based on Foster's (1967) overview of the ISA, presents for each country a summary of its personnel, main institutional affiliations, selected collaborating colleagues and students, and publications. Most ISA staff members later had successful academic careers, including Steward (Columbia, Illinois), Foster (Berkeley), Willey (Harvard), Gillin (Pittsburgh), Rowe (Berkeley), George Kubler (Yale), Allan Holmberg (Cornell), Erasmus (Santa Barbara), Adams (Texas at Austin), Crist (Florida), and Donald Brand (Texas at Austin). Anthropology's central role is indicated by the staffing, with geography well represented, and other disciplines involved to a lesser extent. Foster (1979, p. 211) reported that Steward felt disappointed by the participation of geographers, whose work proved less complementary to anthropology than he had hoped. Table 1 also reveals the pattern for which Steward is notorious: his reluctance to include women in collaborative research projects. Isabel Kelly, another Berkeley alumnus, was the only woman social scientist employed as an ISA representative. The list of collaborating Latin American colleagues and students only lightly scratches at the surface of the actual number of Latin American participants involved. Foster's (1967) review of the ISA in *Anuario Indigenista* gives a fuller listing of collaborating personnel.

Training and Professional Development

Foster (1969, p. 204) described how the ISA staff viewed their jobs: "the personnel conceived their function to be academic rather than applied. Although all were government employees, they taught and did research much as if they had been professors in American universities." In Colombia, for example, Rowe and Erasmus engaged in standard academic duties: planning curriculum, offering classes on general anthropology, advising, supervising fieldwork, evaluating students, and seeking support for them to carry out more research or to gain advanced training in the United States (NAA/ISA/Rowe; NAA/ISA/Erasmus). Rowe taught with Gregorio Hernández de Alba at the Universidad del Cauca in Popayán, developing a two-year anthropology certificate program. Of a large cohort that started in 1946, only three students obtained certificates by 1948. One of them, Rogerio Velásquez, later became a professional anthropologist. Rowe noted that the initial group had been "purposely weeded out for quality" (ISA/Rowe, "Report," August 20, 1948, p. 3). Hernández de Alba and Rowe used contacts in national institutions and civic groups to find anthropology-related jobs for graduates. Erasmus worked with Luis Duque Gómez and others at the Instituto Nacional Etnológico in Bogotá, to offer classes and supervise fieldwork.

Significant differences existed in the way the training unfolded in each country, largely reflecting local institutional conditions. Foster (1967, 1979) felt that training

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

67

operated most effectively in Mexico and Brazil, where well organized educational programs already existed. For example, between June 1944 and June 1946, the ISA's collaboration with Mexico's Escuela Nacional de Antropología resulted in "15 university courses in anthropology, geography, and linguistics […] attended by 100 individual students. Total enrollment in all courses has exceeded 150" (Smithsonian Institution, 1946, p. 71). These students not only included Mexicans, but ones from Central America, Colombia, and Europe. In Brazil, the ISA "took over and expanded" Pierson's program with the Escola Livre de Sociología e Politíca (Smithsonian Institution, 1947, p. 62). Its support, for example, allowed the Escola Livre to arrange books to be translated from English into Portuguese. In contrast, Peru possessed less capacity for social science training when the ISA entered in 1944. Its Ministry of Education soon established the Instituto de Estudios Etnológicos, which served as a focal point for ISA activities. F. Webster McBryde also worked with the University of San Marcos on geography curriculum. Nevertheless, ISA staff turnovers in the host country hindered the creation of a consistent training program (Foster, 1967). A similar situation occurred in Colombia, where the ISA program temporarily lapsed due to staff turnover.

Fieldwork often comprised a major component in graduate and undergraduate training, furnishing hands-on experience in using social science methods, building rapport with suspicious or uninterested people, analyzing data, and writing-up results. Many of the ISA staff wanted to expose students to different ways of life, providing trainees with a sense of their own cultural biases. To invoke this experience, the usually urban-based, non-Indian students conducted research in rural and, if available, indigenous communities. Rowe claimed that Indian societies offered "magnificent training laboratories" for this purpose (NAA/ISA/Rowe, "Report," August 20, 1948). Field research absorbed considerable time. Between 1944 and 1946, for example, seven students had put "55 man-months" into Tarascan community studies, while the ISA staff had invested 24 person-months into this fieldwork (Smithsonian Institution, 1946, p. 71). Lowry Nelson (1952, p. 111) commented regarding the ISA's published study of a Brazilian community: "There can be no doubt the participating students got an invaluable experience."

The ISA staff generally produced highly descriptive community studies. In a book review, Gillin (1950, p. 531) observed how Foster effectively deployed trainees in a Mexican case study: "The value of this sort of team research in the field is shown in the unusual wealth of statistical data, the gathering of which is usually beyond the time and resources available to a single ethnologist." Comprehensive data collection did not always result in compelling reading or convincing analyses in ISA publications. Marvin Bernstein's (1951, p. 666) review of *Quiroga: A Mexican Municipio* praised the research team's "painstaking" thoroughness but questioned its general value: "In many instances, Dr. Brand's staff members' careful census – which included trees, cactus clumps, dogs, cats, caged birds, and door knockers – is significant only to initiates in cultural geography." Ironically, it is these details about local life in the 1940s that often give the ISA monographs enduring value as socio-cultural baselines.

ISA Collaborative Research

In planning the ISA research component, Steward and others wanted to overcome perceived limitations in community studies of the era. They sought "to place the

Institute's research in a larger frame of reference and to develop work that would lead to comparable results" (Steward 1950, p. 33). Despite these ambitions, individual ISA stations had to take into account country-specific conditions, priorities of collaborating host institutions, quality-control issues associated with fieldwork conducted by students, and delays due to logistical or scheduling concerns. For whatever reasons, Steward also did not impose a unified and synchronized agenda or method. His vision of coordinated cross-cultural analysis never materialized, though projects later in his career on Puerto Rico and on global cross-cultural regularities fulfilled some aspects of this goal (Kern, 2003). Instead, each ISA's station's activities uniquely unfolded, and its publications ended up "factual rather more than theoretical" (Foster, 1967, p.188).

The Mexican program is illustrative. Faculty at the Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia asked the ISA to revive the Tarascan Project, started in 1940 but moribund due to funding constraints. Beginning in 1944, Foster, Brand, and Robert West of the ISA pursued community studies in the Tarascan area with Mexican colleagues and students. In an appraisal written after leaving the ISA, Steward (1950, pp. 57-66) commended the program but identified many conceptual and methodological shortcomings in both the original project and the ISA studies: analysts treated communities as isolated, cohesive units, missing their linkages to the wider region and nation; significant gaps in knowledge still existed about the Tarascan area; and interdisciplinary activities were poorly conceived and coordinated. He observed that at times the project was not a matter of collaboration, but persuasion: trying to convince experts or students to carry out needed studies. In providing this critique, Steward (1950, p. 61) did not sidestep his own role, stating: "None of us could have been wholly aware of the scientific needs ten years ago, and practical considerations would have prevented our meeting many of the needs in any event." He used these insights in a 1950 report on area research for the Social Science Research Council, an early 'state of the art' account.

The early ISA research plans in Peru probably most closely reflected Steward's original plan for a coordinated effort based around the concept of acculturation. He and his collaborators attempted to implement studies based on a sample of communities seen as characteristic of particular regions, cultural types, and acculturation stages (Steward, 1950, pp. 34-37). From 1944 to 1946, ISA staff and Peruvian researchers visited 30 communities. The coastal village of Moche, for example, was portrayed as a place "in the last stages of losing its identity as an Indian group and […] being absorbed into Peruvian national life" (Steward, 1947a, p. vii). The country's officials reportedly hoped that the information might illuminate "practical problems [such] as obtaining laborers for the high Andean mines and […] colonizing sparsely populated areas of eastern Peru, a matter of prime importance to the agricultural experimental stations" (Smithsonian Institution, 1946, p. 72). Instead of examining these policy issues, the ISA focused on the Virú Valley's history (Steward, 1950). Years later, sociologist Ozzie Simmons contributed to local concerns such as urban migration by highland Indians, but the ISA was already nearing its last days.

The Brazilian and Colombian research programs reflected more the priorities of the ISA representatives and host-country collaborators. Pierson's fieldwork centered on a single rural community near Sao Paolo; when published, it was hailed as a work of "great significance," since studies of its type were "almost non-existent in Brazil" at the time (Price, 1952, p.119). Kalvero Oberg and colleagues conducted research among indigenous groups in the Mato Grosso. Steward had departed by the time the Colombian agreement was finalized, and Foster deferred to Hernández de Alba and Rowe in

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

69

arranging a research program among the Guambiano Indians (Perry, 2006). When the ISA station shifted to Bogotá, Erasmus and colleagues at the Instituto Etnológico Nacional started a community study at Tota in Boyacá, but abandoned it when the ISA shifted to applied research in the early 1950s.

Besides collaborative training duties, ISA representatives were expected to pursue their own research and publication agendas. Once again, their jobs closely resembled university professors. The ISA publication series furnished only a limited outlet, so staff members often sought other outlets as well. For instance, Erasmus in 1952 published two items in the *American Anthropologist*: an article based on prior Mexican research, and a review of Geraldo Reichel-Dolmatoff's book on the Kogi of Colombia. That same year, he had a pioneering article on medical anthropology in the *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* based on ISA research in Ecuador. He also finished a Spanish-language book on the history of American ethnology, published locally the following year.

ISA Publication Series

The ISA's publication series constitutes one of its major legacies. Most of the 16 monographs derived from training and fieldwork carried out as part of the ISA cooperative agreements in Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. Two books originated with the Tarascan Project. The rest were based on other research done by ISA representatives or outside scholars, such as Sol Tax's (1953) *Penny Capitalism*, which presented research from the late 1930s and early 1940s. None of the ISA publications derived from teaching materials used by the ISA representatives.

ISA publications were supposed to be available in Spanish and Portuguese, but this never happened. Foster (1979) felt that the failure to provide funding for translations was the biggest error made in ISA planning and budgeting. He also believed that greater effort should have been placed on having Latin Americans as main or joint authors. Only a few of the studies list Latin American co-authors. Thus, aspects of intellectual collaboration were unrealized or unfulfilled. The ISA was by no means unique in this respect. One still encounters barriers to co-authorship in collaborative endeavors, especially when significant differences in skills or experience exist between potential authors. In addition, underlying competitiveness, worries about free-riding, ambiguities about rights to jointly held data, and other concerns can undermine collaborative writing.

The ISA monographs consisted of descriptive community studies. Foster called them, "Word pictures of the way of life, the people, all aspects, as many aspects as we could deal with" (Foster, 2000, p. 135). The monographs occasionally offered very general discussions about the possibilities for social betterment, but usually without dispensing specific advice. Overall, the ISA publication series reflected Steward's initial concern with providing "scientific" descriptions of peoples, rather than "applied" studies. Steward was not alone in his skepticism about applied anthropology. Rowe wrote to Foster regarding his study *Empire's Children*: "your report is the best piece of evidence I have seen yet that the hope of applying anthropological results to the solution of social problems is largely a mirage." He contended that Foster's study revealed that "any change in the present setup […] would create as many problems as it solves" (NAA/ISA/Rowe, Rowe to Foster, April 16 1948, p. 2).

Although Steward drew inspiration from the concept of acculturation in launching the ISA, its publication seldom furnished extensive theoretical analyses. If anything, the

publications were non-theoretical in approach. Gillin (1950, p. 531) explained this in a review of Foster's (1948) *Empire's Children*:

> Some readers may wish for more theoretical interpretation
> […]. This, however, is in keeping with the policy of the
> Institute of Social Anthropology, namely, to provide as
> thorough documentation as possible of cultures studied in
> Latin America, so that the data may be discussed from a
> variety of theoretical points of view, or may serve as a basis
> for further intensive work in some particular field of
> scientific interest.

Reviews in social science and history journals indicated that their peers responded well to such an approach. The studies became renowned for their ethnographic detail. For example, Charles Gibson (1953, p. 339) praised Isabel Kelly and Ángel Palerm's (1952) monograph for maintaining "the high standards characteristic of the series." Reviewers were occasionally puzzled why some facets of culture received attention, while others were lightly treated. The intellectual danger in taking the cataloging approach too far was captured in Bernstein (1951, p. 667) review of *Quiroga*: "The 'scientific objectivity' that is the guidepost of the study has reduced it to a reference work which at times verges on a mere list." The study population sometimes disappeared under a mass of ethnographic inventory.

The publication series perhaps best exemplified the ISA's caution about applied research. The ISA's "value-free science" approach was exemplified by Ralph Beals and colleagues (1944) in its first monograph. The role of policymakers was to enable researchers by providing funds for their scientific endeavors. In return, the researchers, guided by the dictates of science rather than the values of the officials, would bear in mind the need to collect categories of information that might inform the general policy-making process. What policymakers did with such data was their own affair. Even in the 1940s, some anthropologists expressed discomfort with this idea, saying that it involved 'abandoning' their data to others who held uncertain motives (Bennett 1949). Years later, Beals (1969) acknowledged that the ethical dimensions of social research were more complicated than he earlier imagined. For the most part, however, the utility of the ISA monographs for officials was never demonstrated. Doing desk studies of community natural resource management practices for international agencies in the 1980s, I often found the ISA reports useful sources of information, but the reports now, and undoubtedly then, furnished little guidance on what to do regarding pressing issues of the day.

Budgets and Crisis

The ISA relied on the Department of State and Congress for funding. During its early years, the budget was "satisfactory" (Foster, 1967, p. 184). Steward's new agency received $60,000 for its first fiscal year (Smithsonian Institution, 144, p. 55), about $744,000 in present purchasing power (calculated from "CPI Inflation Calculator"). As Foster (1979, p. 208) observed, "Money went a long ways in those days." In its second year of operation, the ISA returned some unspent funds to the Treasury, a situation that never occurred in later years. When Foster took over in fiscal year 1946-47, the budget

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

71

had grown to $113,150 (more than $1.1 million in present value), its highest point (Smithsonian Institution 1947, p. 62). Three subsequent years of cutbacks reduced its allocation to $82,510 (nearly $750,000 at current prices) (Smithsonian Institution, 1950, p. 67). Foster responded by eliminating the ISA's cultural geography positions in Peru and Mexico, and the possibility of further cutbacks hindered long-term planning. The ISA budgetary struggles revealed that its mission and contributions no longer seemed to policymakers as worthwhile as they had in the past (Foster, 1967, 1979).

The need to justify funding eventually moved the ISA from an agency devoted to scholarly training and basic research to one engaged in applied anthropology. In 1947, Foster contemplated involving ISA staff in applied activities, which contributed to Steward's departure from his advisory role[1] (NAA/ISA/Point IV, Willey, "Anthropology and the Point Four Program," September 22, 1949). By mid-1949, moving into applied activities no longer seemed an option but rather a necessity. President Harry Truman's new foreign aid initiative, the Point IV Program, took over management of the Interdepartmental Committee's projects. The implications of this shift for the ISA staff were not immediately clear, but Foster viewed the future with trepidation:

> All indications are that after next year we will have to
> embark pretty heavily into the realm of applied
> anthropology if we are to have anything of what we are
> now doing. I am not too sure this is wise, but we will wait
> and see how things shape up. President Truman's Point IV
> Plan for saving the world with American know-how
> apparently is going to eliminate all former cultural and
> scientific programs. Perhaps it would be better to say
> 'eliminate or absorb' (NAA/ISA, Rowe, Foster to Rowe,
> June 3, 1949).

When Foster went on leave, acting director Willey continued exploring the agency's possible applied role, but officials from the ISA and Smithsonian decided to retain its focus on basic research and training (NAA/ISA/Point IV). Nonetheless, Willey positioned it to serve "in an informal consultative capacity" with Point IV, including "recommendations for anthropological aid and personnel for Point IV work, conferences with […] governmental agencies considering technical assistance programs, and informal memoranda from our field representatives on feature of local native life that provide a background for economic development background" (Smithsonian Institution, 1950, p. 67). The ISA inched closer to direct policy engagement.

Returning from Spain, Foster found that the State Department was ready to terminate the ISA's funding. With the Interdepartmental Committee ended, the State Department's support now came from the Division of International Exchange of Persons. According to Foster, the move had increased the ISA's vulnerability, since it "did not form an organic part of [the division's] program" (Smithsonian Institution, 1952, p. 79).

---

[1]Steward retained his interest, however, in collaborative social science research, carrying out a project on Puerto Rico in the late 1940s with Columbia graduate students, including Eric Wolf. During the 1950s, Steward directed a project on culture change involving coordinated ethnographic research in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Charles Erasmus served as a team member, replacing Wolf, restudying the Mayo Indians in Sonora, Mexico.

Once reluctant to engage in applied work, he now felt it would be necessary to save the agency. He later reflected: "There's nothing like the threat of financial disaster to make a person re-examine his fundamental premises" (Foster, 2000, p. 157). Consulting with the ISA staff, he gained their approval to approach the Institute of Inter-American Affairs (IIAA) about reviewing cultural aspects of its health care programs. The IIAA had been created early in the 1940s as one of the first foreign aid agencies. Foster worked for it prior to joining the ISA. The IIAA officials agreed to a month-long study in Peru, Mexico, Brazil, and Colombia. Training halted as the staff focused on applied work. Ironically, Foster achieved what Steward never accomplished: using ISA personnel for a controlled comparison of a central research question. Further ironically, it was an applied task that provided this opportunity. All involved realized that the IIAA study offered a test of anthropology's possible usefulness to "American-sponsored technical-aid programs" (Smithsonian Institution, 1951, p. 88).

The ISA's report, compiled and edited by Foster (1951), caused a sensation with its practical insights (Foster, 1979). The IIAA decided to provide funding for the ISA through the Smithsonian for operations through 1952. It did so "with the understanding that the Smithsonian anthropologists would be available for program analysis of technical aid projects" (Smithsonian Institution, 1953, p. 88). The ISA staff members became involved in an evaluation of the IIAA's health care service (Public Health Service, 1953; Foster, 1953). They also individually carried out applied studies for local IIAA missions, such as Erasmus' evaluation of community and agrarian development projects in Haiti (Erasmus, 1952). Their work not only influenced ongoing and future policy and programs, it contributed to the emergence of applied medical anthropology (Foster & Anderson, 1978). Applied work, however, supplanted the original ISA objectives of training and basic research. Even this reorientation could not save the ISA; it ceased to exist on December 31, 1952. Staff members were integrated as individuals directly into the IIAA, which soon merged into what today is known as the Agency for International Development.

Conclusion

The Smithsonian's ISA was an innovative collaborative research and training program created in the midst of World War II to meet many goals: fostering stronger relations among the peoples of the Americas, promoting U.S. cultural ties among Latin American scholars, strengthening social science capacity in host-country educational institutions, and fostering area expertise among U.S. scholars. Julian Steward, an ambitious Smithsonian anthropologist, founded and initially directed the ISA. Many of the ISA's approaches and activities reflected the priorities, concerns, and, as can be seen today, limitations of its founders. Although set up in wartime and lasting well into the Cold War, the ISA was not a kind of Trojan Horse, a 'gift' that served as a vehicle for stealth conquerors. In assessing the ISA's legacy, we need to be careful not to engage in an over-zealous revisionism that unfairly or inaccurately tarnishes reputations, particularly when many of the individuals are no longer available to defend themselves.

The legacy of the ISA is substantial. It provided invaluable educational and research experience to North Americans and Latin Americans, contributing substantially to career advancement for many individuals. The ISA's institutional impact in the U.S. includes helping to foster Latin American area studies. The long-term institutional impacts for the participating Latin American countries were never evaluated (Foster,

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the
Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

73

1967, 1979). The impression gained is that the benefits were of a lesser magnitude for the host countries. The ISA's international activities were not a collaboration of equal partners: North American scholars and institutional interests cast a strong influence over the activities, and North Americans were better poised to gain from the experience. Structural inequalities among participants are difficult to overcome. It would be misleading, however, to interpret the gains from the ISA simply in a zero-sum manner.

The ISA's usefulness for policy purposes was largely unrealized until it moved directly into the realm of applied anthropology. The rapid ethnographic research carried out by the ISA staff provided impressive cross-cultural insights, demonstrating in an unambiguous manner the practical value of applied research. Steward's successors ultimately came to reject the ISA founder's belief that social scientists should engage solely in value-free research. Foster (1979, p. 212) learned through the ISA's health studies that anthropologists needed to "translate their findings into a language that can be understood by planners and administrators." The ISA's entry into applied research, however, came at the direct expense of its collaborative training and research program. Overall, the ISA represents an innovative program whose positive legacy continues to be felt.

Acknowledgements

References

Abbot, C. (1942). Smithsonian enterprises. Science, *96*, 417-419.

Adams, R. (1964). Politics and social anthropology in Spanish America. Human Organization, *23*, 1-4.

Beals, R. (1969). The politics of social research. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Beals, R., Carrasco, P. & McCorkle, Y. (1944) Houses and house use of the Sierra Tarascans (Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication No.1). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bennett, J. (1949). Science and human rights: Reason and action. American Anthropologist *51*, 329-336.

Bernstein, M. (1951). Review of the book Quiroga: A Mexican Municipio. The Hispanic American Historical Review *31*, 665-667.

Brand, D. (1950). Report of the Inter-American Society of Anthropology and Geography. The Professional Geographer *2*, 38.

Clemmer, R., Myers, R., & Rudden, M. (Eds.). (1999). Julian Steward and the Great Basin: The making of an anthropologist. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.

Darnell, R. (1997). And along came Boas: Continuity and revolution in Americanist Anthropology. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Erasmus, C. (1952). Agricultural changes in Haiti: Patterns of resistance and acceptance. Human Organization, *11*, 20-26.

Erasmus, C. (1953). Las dimensiones de la cultura: Historia de la etnologia en los Estados Unidos entre 1900 y 1950. Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial Iqueima.

Fenton W. (1982). Review of the book Savages and scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the development of American anthropology 1846-1910. American Anthropologist, *84*, 650-653.

Fluehr-Lobban, C (ed.). (2003) Ethics and the profession of anthropology (2nd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.

Fluehr-Lobban, C. (2008). Collaborative anthropology as twenty-first-century ethical anthropology. Collaborative Anthropologies, *1*: 175-182.

Foster, G. (1948). Empire's children: The people of Tzintzuntzan (Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication No. 6.). Mexico City: Imprenta Nuevo Mundo.

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

75

Foster, G. (1953). Use of anthropological methods and data in planning and operation, 10-year evaluation of the Bilateral Health Programs, Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Public Health Reports, *68*, 841-857.

Foster, G. (1967). The Institute of Social Anthropology of the Smithsonian Institution 1943-1952. Anuario Indigenista, *27*, 173-192.

Foster, G. (1969). Applied anthropology. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company.

Foster, G. (1973). Traditional societies and technological change. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Foster, G. (1979). The Institute of Social Anthropology. In W. Goldschmidt (Ed.), The uses of anthropology (pp. 205-216). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Foster, G. (2000). An anthropologist's life in the twentieth century: Theory and practice at UC Berkeley, the Smithsonian, in Mexico, and with the World Health Organization. An oral history conducted in 1998 and 1999 by Suzanne B. Riess. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Bancroft Library, Regional Oral History Office. Retrieved from: http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt7s2005ng&brand=calisphere.

Foster, G. (Ed.) (1951) A cross cultural anthropological analysis of a technical aid program: Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Foster, G. and Anderson, B. (1978). Medical anthropology. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Gillin, J. (1945). Moche: A Peruvian coastal community (Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication No 3). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gillin, J. (1950). Review of the book Empire's children: The people of Tzintzuntzan. American Anthropologist, *52*, 530-531.

Gibson, C. (1953). Review of the book The Tajin Totonac: Part I, history, subsistence, shelter, and technology. The Hispanic American Historical Review, *33*, 393-395.

Godoy, R. (1977). Franz Boas and his plans for the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico. Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences, *13*, 228-242.

Goldschmidt, W. (Ed.). (1979). The uses of anthropology. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

González, R. (2009). American counterinsurgency: Human science and the human terrain. Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Hatch, E. (1973). Theories of man and culture. New York, NY: Colombia University Press.

Helm, J. (Ed.). (1985). Social contexts of American ethnology: 1984 proceedings of the American Ethnological Society. Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society.

Hinsley, C. (1981). Savages and scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the development of American anthropology 1846-1910. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Katz, J. & Martin, B. (1997). What is research collaboration? Research Policy, *26*, 1-18.

Kelly, I., & Palerm, A. (1952). The Tajin Totonac: Part 1, history, subsistence, shelter, and technology (Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication No. 13). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kerns, V. (2003). Scenes from the high desert: Julian Steward's life and theory. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kishk Anaquot Health Research (2008). Collaborative research: An "indigenous lens" perspective. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research.

Lewis, H. (2005). Anthropology, the Cold War, and intellectual history. Histories of Anthropology Annual, *1*, 99-113.

Leydesdorff, L., & Wagner, C. (2008). International collaboration in science and the formation of a core group. Journal of Informetrics, *2*, 317-325.

McNickle, D. (1979). Anthropology and the Indian Reorganization Act. In W. Goldschmidt Ed.), The uses of anthropology (pp. 51-60). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Miller, C. (2006). "An effective instrument of peace": Scientific cooperation as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, 1938-1950. Osiris, *21*, 138-160.

Murra, J. (1985). Ethnological research in Spanish America: The roles of foreigners and the emergence of national cadres of scholars. In J. Helm (Ed.). Social Contexts of American Ethnology: 1984 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society (pp. 122-138). Washington DC: American Ethnological Society.

NAA/ISA/Erasmus (n.d.). Correspondence: Erasmus, Charles J., 1949-1953. Washington, DC: National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology Records, Box 5.

NAA/ISA/Point Four (n.d.). Point Four, 1949-1952. Washington, DC: National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology Records, Box 1.

NAA/ISA/Rowe (n.d.). Correspondence: John M. Rowe, 1948-1953. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology Records, Box 10.

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the
Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

77

Nelson, L. (1952). Review of the book Cruz das Almas: A Brazilian Village. American Journal
of Sociology *58*, 110-111.

Patterson, T. (2001). A social history of anthropology in the United States. Oxford: Berg.

Patterson, T. and Lauria-Perricelli, A. (1999). Julian Steward and the construction of area-studies
research in the United States. In . R. O. Clemmer, L. D. Myers, & M. E. Rudden (Eds.),
Julian Steward and the Great Basin: The making of an anthropologist (pp. 219-240). Salt
Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.

Perry, J. (2006). Caminos de la antropología en Colombia: Gregorio Hernández de Alba. Bogotá,
Colombia: Universidad de los Andes, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Departamento de
Antropología, Centro de Estudios Socioculturales e Internacionales, Ediciones Uniandes.

Pierson, D. (1951). Cruz das Almas: A Brazilian village (Institute of Social Anthropology,
Publication No. 10). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pinkoski, M. (2008a). Julian Steward, American anthropology, and colonialism. Histories of
Anthropology Annual, *4*, 172-204.

Pinkoski, M. (2008b). American colonialism at the dawn of the Cold War. In D. Wax (Ed.).
Anthropology at the dawn of the Cold War: The influence of foundations, McCarthyism,
and the CIA (pp. 62-88). London, UK: Pluto.

Price, D. (2004). Threatening anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's surveillance of activist
anthropologists. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Price, D. (2008). Anthropological intelligence: The deployment and neglect of American
Anthropology in the Second World War. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Price, P. (1952). Review of the book Cruz das Almas: A Brazilian village. American
Sociological Review, *17*, 118-119.

Public Health Service (1953). 10 years of cooperative health programs in Latin America: An
evaluation. Washington, DC: Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Department of Health,
Education, & Welfare, Public Health Service.

Roberts, F. (1946).One hundred years of Smithsonian Anthropology. Science, *104*, 119-125.

Robinson, D. (1980). On Preston E. James and Latin America: A biographical sketch. In D. J.
Robinson (Ed.). Studying Latin America: Essays in honor of Preston E. James (pp. 1-
101). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Press.

Ross, E. (2008). Peasants on the minds: Anthropology, the Cold War, and the myth of peasant
conservatism. In D. Wax (Ed.), Anthropology at the dawn of the Cold War: The influence
of foundations, McCarthyism, and the CIA (pp. 88-107). London, UK: Pluto.

Rylko-Bauer, B., Singer, M., & Van Willigen, J. (2006) Reclaiming applied anthropology: Its past, present, and future. American Anthropologist, *108*, 178-190.

Smithsonian Institution (1942). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1943). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1944). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1945). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1946). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1947). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1948). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1949). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1950). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1951). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1952). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Smithsonian Institution (1953). Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Steward, J. (1943). Acculturation studies in Latin America: Some needs and problems. American Anthropologist, *45*, 198-206.

Steward, J. (1944). Preface. In R. L. Beals, P. Carrasco, & T. McCorkle, Houses and House Use of the Sierra Tarascans (pp. ix-x). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Steward, J. (1947). Foreword. In J. Gillin, Moche: A Peruvian coastal community (pp. vii). Washington DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the
Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

79

Steward, J. (1950).Area research: Theory and practice. Social Science Research Council
Bulletin, *63*, l-164.

Steward, J. (1969). Limitations of applied anthropology: The case of the American Indian New
Deal. Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society, *1*, 1-17.

Tax, S. (1952). Penny Capitalism: A Guatemalan Indian economy (Institute of Social
Anthropology Publication No. 16).Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Valcárcel, L. (1947). Preface. In H. Tschopik, Jr., Highland Communities of Central Peru: A
Regional Survey (pp. vi-vii). Washington DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wax, D. (Ed.). (2008). Anthropology at the dawn of the Cold War: The influence of foundations,
McCarthyism, and the CIA. London, UK: Pluto.

Table 1: Institute of Social Anthropology: Stations, Personnel & Publications

---

Washington, DC, USA: 1943-1952

ISA Personnel: Julian Steward (anthropologist), director, 1943-46; Alfred Métraux (anthropologist) 1943-45, assistant director; George Foster (anthropologist), director, 1946-52, Gordon Willey (anthropologist) 1949-1950, acting director

Visiting International Scholars (facilitated by the ISA): Luis Duque Gómez (1948-49), José Cruxent (1949), Julio Caro Baroja (1951-1952)

Mexico: 1943-1952

ISA Personnel: George Foster (anthropologist) 1943-46; Donald Brand (geographer) 1944-45; Stanley Newman (linguist) 1945-49; Isabel Kelly (anthropologist) 1946-52; Robert West (geographer) 1946-47; William Wonderly (linguistics) 1951

Main Collaborating Institution: Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia

Collaborating Scholars and Students included: Rubín de la Borbolla, Don Pablo Martínez del Río, Ángel Palerm, Gabriel Ospina, José Corona Núñez, Angélica Castro, and Roberto Weitlaner

ISA Research: The Tarasca, the Totonaca, and the Huasteca; linguistic studies of modern Nahuatl and Otomian.

ISA Publications: seven monographs from the ISA researchers and affiliated scholars

Collaborative Researchers or Cold Warriors? The Origins, Activities, and Legacy of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology

81

Peru: 1944-1952

ISA Personnel: John Gillin (anthropologist) 1944-45; Harry Tschopik Jr. (anthropologist) 1945-46; F. Webster McBryde (geographer) 1945-1947; Allan Holmberg (anthropologist) 1946-48; George Kubler (historian) 1948-49; Ozzie Simmons (sociologist) 1949-52

Main Collaborating Institution: Ministry of Education and the Instituto de Estudios Etnológicos

Collaborating Scholars and Students included: Luis Valcárcel, Óscar Núñez del Prado, Jorge Muelle, and Alfonso Trujillo Ferrari

ISA Research: Towns/areas of Moche (north coast), Virú (north coast), and central highland communities

ISA Publications: Three monographs by ISA researchers (plus Holmberg's Bolivian study)

Brazil: 1945-1952

ISA Personnel: Donald Pierson (sociologist) 1945-52; Kalvero Oberg (anthropologist) 1946-52

Main Collaborating Institution: Escola Livre de Sociología e Politíca

Collaborating Scholars and Students included: Cyro Berlink, Octávio de Costa Eduardo, Oracy Nogueira, Mauro Lopes, Carlos Borges Teixeira, Levi Cruz, and Juarez Lopes

ISA Research: rural São Paulo State; indigenous groups in the Mato Grosso

ISA Publications: Three monographs by ISA researchers

Colombia: 1946-1952

ISA Personnel: John Rowe (anthropologist) 1946-48; Raymond Crist (geographer) 1949;

Charles Erasmus (anthropologist) 1950-52

Main Collaborating Institution: Universidad del Cauca; Instituto Nacional Etnológico

Collaborating Scholars and Students: Gregorio Hernández de Alba, Luis Duque

Gómez, Francisco Velez Arango, and Rogerio Velásquez

ISA Research: Guambianos in Cauca

ISA Publications: None

Guatemala: 1950-51

ISA Personnel: Richard Adams (anthropologist) 1950-51

Main Collaborating Institution: Instituto de Antropología e Historia and the Instituto

Indigenista

Collaborating Scholars: Hugo Cerezo D. and Juan de Dios Rosales

ISA Publications: Two books by affiliated scholars

Source: Foster 1967; Smithsonian Institution (various dates)