

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology. By Robert E. Bieder.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/72d8t4dx>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

DeMallie, Raymond J.

Publication Date

1987

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Pimans on the other hand had worked out a better balance in gender roles, males hunting more, being shamans, being more involved in agriculture and the like (they were irrigation not flood farmers). Warriors were not given as much prestige as in Yuman culture. Nevertheless, they were sucked into the cycle primarily in terms of defense against their neighbors.

The authors cite a variety of "cross-cultural survey" type studies and mythology to support their claim of the link between agriculture, war, and male roles.

As intriguing as the thesis is, there seem to be a number of counter examples. One comes directly from the Southwest. The Mescalero Apaches, unlike their Navajo and Western Apache neighbors engaged in no agriculture yet had an extensive warfare complex. Perhaps even more damaging are the Alaskan Eskimo data. Eskimos (a totally hunting/fishing society) in Alaska regularly engaged in warfare before Europeans stopped it in the 19th century. When they did so their primary tactical objective was "to annihilate the enemy (Ernest S. Burch, Jr., *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* No. 16, 1974: 8). This is not to say that the thesis is totally untenable, but its application to a variety of other cases about which we have ample data seems to be problematic. It is certainly something scholars will debate for some time to come.

Philip J. Greenfeld
San Diego State University

Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology. By Robert E. Bieder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986. xii + 290 pp. \$19.95 Cloth.

This volume is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the history of anthropology. It was written to reconstruct the intellectual context for anthropological theory in America during the nineteenth century, and it succeeds admirably in explicating the major themes that shaped the development of the field. At the opening of the century, European philosophers held a variety of positions in relation to the American Indians. Some explained them as products of the American environment, primitive and inferior like the New World itself. Others embraced the idea of the Great Chain of Being, from primitive to complex,

reflecting progressive development through time, and suggested that American Indians represented an earlier period in human history. Still others believed American Indians to be the inferior products of a separate creation. These theories formed the backdrop for the growth of anthropology in America during the nineteenth century, as ethnologists contemplated the Indian in the light of the developing theory of biological evolution.

The substance of the book presents biographical sketches of five early scholars, each representing a distinctive emphasis in the field of anthropology, their active careers spanning the century. While not intended as biography, the book nonetheless presents cogent studies of each individual.

Albert Gallatin (1761–1849) was an Enlightenment thinker; he took a comparative perspective on the American Indian, viewing humankind as a single species whose cultural forms were basically progressive in nature. As early as 1805 he stressed to Jefferson the need for a map of North American Indians, and selected language as the best means for reconstructing historical relationships among Indian peoples. His preliminary findings were published in 1826 and enlarged on a decade later, and the map with accompanying comparative linguistic charts that he produced laid the basis for all future work. Concluding that environment, not race, was the determining factor in cultural advancement, Gallatin argued that the government must create a new environment for American Indians that would lead them to a settled, agricultural way of life, the necessary first step to civilization.

Samuel G. Morton (1799–1851) became the leading student of American Indian physical anthropology in his day. An anatomist interested in phrenology, he focused his studies on the skull, correlating size with intelligence, moral character, and cultural development. On the basis of comparative study he concluded that American Indians were of one race; however, he argued that the striking similarity of skull form throughout the Americas disproved the theory that American Indians had been shaped by environment. He came to accept the polygenist point of view, believing that American Indians were the products of a separate creation. He argued that they were racially inferior, thereby providing a type of scientific justification for Indian removal, the logical prologue to Indian extinction.

Ephraim George Squier (1821–88) shared more in common

with Gallatin than with Morton. A believer in individual and social progress, which he derived from the French historian Guizot, Squier felt that American Indians were capable of achieving civilization. His most influential studies were archeological surveys of the mounds, which he argued were products of a higher civilization, one based on agriculture and influenced by connections with Central and South American civilizations. He hypothesized that the study of religious symbols and myths could allow for a reconstruction of the course of human development. Although Squier accepted the polygenetic theory, he argued that mankind possessed a common intellect, making environment far more critical than race in determining the course of progress toward civilization.

Henry Rowe Schoolcraft (1793–1864) was the first of the ethnologists discussed in this volume to have had extensive contact with American Indian people. From 1821–44 he served as Indian agent at Sault Saint Marie and married a mixed-blood Chippewa woman; this provided him entree into local Indian society. Beginning with a study of language, Schoolcraft moved into ethnology. Believing that science ought to serve practical needs, he argued that ethnology could inform Indian policy. He recorded folklore in order to understand the Indian mind, which he felt to be an essential foundation for Christian missionization. After leaving the Indian service he moved to the East where he became the leading ethnologist of the day, entrusted by Congress with the compilation of data about American Indians. Schoolcraft edited the six-volume *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1851–57), still a valuable resource for study of the American Indian past. Schoolcraft was a monogenist who traced the origins of the American Indians to the old world. However, he felt that Indians had degenerated since contact with Europeans. He came to believe that the Indian mind was incapable of change, and therefore American Indians were doomed to extinction.

Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–81) may be seen as the scholar who transformed the diverse threads of ethnology in the United States into a modern anthropology. Coming from the practice of law, he began ethnological study of the Iroquois as an avocation. Intrigued with the Iroquois system of matrilineal descent, he discovered that the principles for classifying relations were basically

the same among North American Indians of diverse linguistic groups, and differed fundamentally from the system of Western Europe. Convinced that the comparative study of kinship terms could reach further into the human past than the study of language itself, he embraced it as the potential key for proving the origin of the American Indians in the Old World. He was a monogenist who believed that all human minds contained the germs of civilization, allowing for progress. Biological potential, rather than cultural level, determined the possibility of progress, and Morgan thought that the intermarriage of Indians with whites would provide the means for bringing Indians to civilization. His work thoroughly embodied the Enlightenment faith in progress, and he was convinced that ethnology could provide the sound foundation for Indian policy. Shifting from the philological method of his kinship studies, in later work he developed a theory of three stages of human progress from savagery to civilization, based on a geological model of process. Articulated in his *Ancient Society* (1877), Morgan's view of anthropology became the classic American expression of nineteenth century evolutionism and held sway until replaced during the first decades of the twentieth century by Boasian anthropology and the emphasis on the study of individual cultures and smaller-scale, regional comparisons in place of the postulation of universal stages of development.

Science Encounters the Indian presents an opportunity to contemplate the origins of American anthropology in ways of thinking that are rejected today as racist and unscientific. Yet these were the leading theorists of their time, and dispassionate study of their work may place our own in clearer historical perspective. Perhaps the theories of today will receive no kinder treatment from our intellectual descendants. Bieder makes no attempt to generalize from his study, to assess the extent to which the modern field has been shaped by these progenitors, or to moralize. This may be all to the good if his work is read as it should be, as background and foundation for understanding the development of the academic field that throughout its existence has been intimately related to the American Indians, a fruitful if not always comfortable marriage.

Raymond J. DeMallie
Indiana University