Local Knowledge, Global Stage

EDITED BY REGNA DARNELL

& FREDERIC W. GLEACH

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015960670

Set in Arno Pro by Rachel Gould.

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

PRISCILA FAULHABER

4

A View from the West

The Institute of Social Science and the Amazon

In this chapter I focus on the significance of frontier in the history of social anthropology, especially fieldwork in the Amazon supported by the Institute of Social Science (ISS) of the University of California at Berkeley (UCB). I understand that subventions for scholarly research in the western part of the United States resonate in the scientific field of moving-frontier theories. ISS supported projects on "economic and cultural boundaries," relocating to the social domain the former biological metaphor of botanical germination. This institute supported projects that went beyond domestic U.S. issues, embracing social problems in other countries such as Mexico and the Brazilian Amazon.

During the interwar years, the social sciences emerged as a legitimate field of knowledge in the United States because entrepreneurs employed social engineering and applied social sciences as a way of seeking economic alternatives and gaining greater social control. Thus, new scientific hierarchies were established and new demarcations of competence were made as a means of fulfilling this goal. Curt Uckel (1882–1945), a German-born travel explorer who arrived in Brazil in 1903, specialized in Brazilian indigenous knowledge, collecting their artifacts for European museums and collaborating with representatives of Brazilian Indigenous state policy. He naturalized himself in 1921 as a Brazilian with the name Curt Nimuendajú, the name the Apopokuva-Guarani Indians gave him when they adopted him in 1906 during his sojourn among them. However, his ethnography, improved by the dialogue with his Berkeley mentor, Robert Lowie, produced boundary objects that later led to the revision of concepts such as acculturation, social change, and cultural areas. He received ISS grants that helped defray his travel expenses. In reports

he was classified as Lowie's assistant without actually being affiliated with the ICB.

BOUNDARY OBJECTS

Boundary objects are objects having "different meanings in different social worlds," but their structure is "common enough to more than one world to make them recognizable means of translation" (Star and Griesemer 1989:393). Their creation and management develop and maintain coherence across intersecting social worlds. Thus, boundary objects appear together with the delimitation of different unities of observation, implying contrast or condensation between different worldviews.

This formulation led to demarcating boundaries between scientific fields, established in disputes for monopolizing professional authority and control over resources by a group of scientists who also used this control to exclude others. However, historical constraints imply that these delimitations vary according to specific contexts, thus making such boundaries ambiguous and flexible (Gieryn 1983). The scientific field demarcates what it denominates as properly scientific, separating this from the unstructured spheres that escape understanding and academic control; these spheres are thus thrown into the margins of a structured production of knowledge.

The social division of labor between armchair inquiry and fieldwork is in the core of the production of anthropological knowledge. Recognized as a field science, this discipline was eventually embedded by colonialist routes (Kuklick and Kohler 1996; Kuklick 2008). Even though interacting with their subjects of research during ethnographic encounter, traveling explorers perhaps inadvertently prepared the terrain for social control even after colonial times. I deal here with the relationship between the ISS and Nimuendajú's field research in the Amazon. While sociocultural anthropology configured itself as a field of knowledge, Lowie advised Nimuendajú's ethnographic research, helping him revise his travel writings into the academically recognized structure of publishable monographs.

Boundary objects involve antinomies between theoretical and empirical science, objective and subjective, limited and unbound (Gieryn 1983). Moreover, boundary objects of knowledge such as Amazonian

peoples and their artifacts have supported the break of the idea of cultural authenticity (Clifford 1988). In their border character, they showed themselves as a strong means of discussing and reformulating concepts. Even though these objects and concepts had appeared as strange particularities produced in unstructured political and scientific fields, the goal was clearly the organization of domains of knowledge articulated within power systems.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE INTERWAR YEARS AND THE ISSN

After moving to the United States, Franz Boas became entangled with the museum field's constraints (Jacknis 1996). Boas had constructed his historic-cultural approach as an alternative to evolutionary schemes, and he sought autonomy in the field of scholarly research and academic training (Stocking 1976). Although he had trained as a geographer, his intellectual trajectory in German thought led him to avoid biological determinism. Looking for particular anthropological evidences, Boas emphasized historical individuality in cultural contexts using an approach that favored the historical reconstruction of human variability. He believed that methodological unity between particular disciplines could provide documentation for such reconstruction. Boas and his students, including his Berkeley disciples, sought information about indigenous cultures in an as yet incompletely analyzed cultural area. Conquest and colonization of indigenous territories had changed American indigenous cultures. This led Boas and his disciples to consider the "acculturation" problem.

George W. Stocking Jr. (1976) analyzes the transformations in U.S. anthropology that occurred after philanthropic agencies began to support academic programs. In 1923 Rockefeller Foundation Social Sciences Programs began to finance the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). In 1924 the SSRC defined interracial relationships and scientific aspects of human migration among its main fields of knowledge. Philanthropic financing acquired an "interested" character, incorporating, together with the intervention of social scientists (and anthropologists), inquiries into sociocultural differences as part of a definition of human sciences research (Stocking 1985), despite primarily supporting physical anthropology and saving archaeological sites from

devastation. Formerly, U.S. cultural anthropology had focused mainly on national territories without comparing indigenous groups in other American countries.

In their formative years, the social sciences were informed by British social anthropology, together with British colonial administration. Academic institutions adapted their research methodology in such a way as to serve British imperial purposes. This doesn't mean that ethical dilemmas didn't arise, but they did not disrupt domination practices, and scholarly programs accepted the colonial system as a historical given (Asad 1973). Stocking (1985:133) reiterates the relevance of discussing how Rockefeller ideology—as capitalist entrepreneurs representative of Western colonialism—determined anthropologists' research agendas. Political agency eventually intervened in this relationship, for instance, when New York State governor Franklin Delano Roosevelt integrated the SSRC Advisory Committee on Business Research in 1928.

The University of California at Berkeley became, in the first half of the twentieth century, a recognized center of scientific research in the United States. Philanthropic agencies supported scholarly research in the western United States as a response to the moving theoretical frontier, commonly used at the time. Frederick Jackson Turner ([1921] 1963) conceived his thesis about the democratic meaning of frontier in American society by analyzing colonizing movements, implying that the conquest and appropriation of land were factors in the U.S. nation-state's "westward expansion." Turner employed the idea of the frontier as a metaphor for national expansion. He characterized it as the "place where the spirit of the American Nation germinated" (Machado 1992). Machado saw in Turner's conception a biological metaphor for the social mechanism of national expansion, even though his work emphasizes that social problems created "moving frontiers," which could then be incorporated and controlled by governmental policies.

The ISS/UCB was founded in 1932 in an attempt to transform crises into opportunities during the Great Depression. In an August 30, 1932, meeting, the UCB formalized the ISS council program after Alfred Kroeber attended the 1931 meetings of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). His participation at the SSRR and his relationship with repre-

sentatives of the Rockefeller Foundation were strategic in obtaining the foundation's support for the type of fieldwork that was vital for promoting anthropological training at the UCB. However, the ISS had to obtain better local and institutional funding. The executive committee, composed of C. B. Lipman, H. E. Bolton, I. B. Cross, A. L. Kroeber, and P. O. Ray, established the program. The main purposes of the institute were summarized in appendix 2 of the 1930 meeting minutes.

> The Institute undertakes, therefore, not to plan research, but to make it more readily possible for the individual to carry on by establishing certain functions of association and cooperation:
>
> 1—to provide a clearing-house to which every student of the social sciences is invited to bring his results and his plans for consideration.
>
> 2—its own initiative to inquire at intervals into the character and status of research activities on the campus, as bearing on the field of the social sciences (p. 1).
>
> 3—to further the development of scientific methodology in the social studies in general, by constructive criticism.
>
> 4—to initiate studies in neglected and important fields, and especially to support the appointment of scholars therein.
>
> 5—to foster division of labor, or collaboration, with the purpose of avoiding duplication of work or misdirection of energy.
>
> 6—to aid the university as an organization to achieve a more symmetric development of scholarship and instruction (consideration of teaching load, administrative duties, research assistants, library facilities, and working quarters).
>
> 7—to scrutinize, select and budget specific projects as in need of immediate support, and to solicit funds, through and for the Board of research.[1]

The planning for the next six years determined that "the duty of the Council of the Institute is to determine the rules, procedures, and policies of the Institute, and to define in general terms the activities of the Institute, subject to the approval of the President and the Regents. The Executive Committee has the duty of administering the Institute in accordance with the policies determined by the Council."[2]

The ISS included several UCB social science departments, mainly in

the fields of anthropology, geography, and history. The institute supported interdepartmental projects, notably a cooperative research project involving the anthropology, geography, and history departments on cultural frontiers and the "culture hearts [*sic*]" of the U.S. Southwest and Mexico.[3] During the meeting of the Council of the ISS held at the Faculty Club on Tuesday, August 30, 1932, its counselors considered the proposal for the Research Program to be conducted by the ISS. According to the minutes of this meeting, these research projects included a "cooperative research project involving the Departments of Anthropology, Geography, and History on culture frontiers and culture hearts of our southwestern states and Mexico." It would "require extensive travel and much assistance" and involve "subjects most timely owing to the fact that every year makes it more difficult to get authentic and original records." The program was designed to take place in Latin America and the United States in order to integrate socioeconomic trends and contemporary problems, creating "an obligation of present to future social scientists by documenting rural social change in a period of great flux."[4] Carl Sauer and John Leightly, both from the Department of Geography, were in charge of creating the program's "Memorandum on Marginal Lands of the Post-frontier and the Cultural Atlas of California."

Sauer (1889–1975) founded the field of cultural and historical geography, which was based on the historic-cultural paradigm promoted by Kroeber and Lowie in the Department of Anthropology. All of them had learned systemic social theory from their German American background, which was based on Romantic and historicist theories (Kenzer 1985; Anderson 2011). Sauer conceived of human geography as in close relationship to cultural anthropology; his regional analysis of area studies was based on comparative study, empirical fieldwork, and archival inventory. Sauer (1941) discussed the idea of cultural area centers, although he was more interested in understanding margins (borders), frontiers (national expansion), and boundary (limits) dynamics. His economic and cultural frontiers projects were inspired by moving frontier theories, even while criticizing them. Following Vaughan Cornish, Sauer believed that the active frontier, independently from continued territorial expansion, was based on the increasing massive energy of

people breaking barriers and acting as social frontiers. However, he criticized the Turnerian conception of advancement of the development of productive forces in a series of stages. Distrusting unfounded generalizations, Sauer (1941) preferred to undertake a historical examination of singular situations and processes of acquisition and loss.

Working at museums, Kroeber based his references on natural science classification practices and aesthetic thinking applied to organizing exhibitions. He envisaged the possibility opened by social sciences of integrating different disciplinary fields into scholarly association within the university. These three fields of employment of anthropological work were related to its threefold affiliation with research councils existing in the United States: the National Research Council (physical anthropology and archaeology), the Social Science Research Council (ethnography and ethnology), and the American Council of Learned Societies (linguistics, art, and history) (Steward 1961).

Lowie's work, also interdisciplinary, shows his awareness of the comingling of anthropology and other fields. He was interested in biology, human geography, and history, understanding an economy in terms of property or ecology, and political sciences mainly for social control purposes, seeking "specific linkages between institutions and between fields of inquiry" (Dubois 1960:187). He undertook "one of the first syntheses attempted by the Boasians" (Stocking 1976:19), since Boas's resistance to systematic conceptualization made it difficult for his students to extract a theoretical basis from his work.

This integration of different departments working in the field of social sciences had been articulated with area-studies programs within the United States but extrapolating its internal scope to areas of Latin America, described in the ISS foundation document as "terra incognita": "As to both nature and man, California is the terra incognita from which many problems of the Southwest, of Latin America, of the Pacific Margin as a whole are best approached. Also, it is only in California that academic institutions exist where one may recruit and consult a sufficient body of experts for comprehensive studies relating to the Pacific Hemisphere."[5]

The ISS redefined its frame of action during World War II, whereas U.S. scientific institutions had been involved in organizing the anthropo-

logical field together with governmental and military agencies directly involved in the war effort. The ISS council meetings were held until 1946, when the social sciences went into decline and Latin American funds were retracted. During the meeting of the ISS council in October 1932, the counselors considered the Department of Anthropology project conducted by Kroeber and Lowie, advocating "intensification of ethnological research under way; extension to border-line problems involving psychology, statistics, geography, etc."[6] In this same year, the ISS incorporated economics, political sciences, psychology, and social institutions departments.

The ISS supported academically structured projects for selected scholars among its faculty members. Its goal was to provide for the fullest possible participation, irrespective of departmental lines, by scholars of Berkeley's faculty associated with the ISS. Approximately fifty professors in the diverse areas of the social sciences were involved in the institute. The ISS provided support for their research activities, including "clerical" and "expert assistance" research support, travel expenses, and so on. The council especially recommended that "younger males be privileged." Other criteria included favoring methodologies geared toward "gathering data by field observation and archival study," depending on the nature of the project proposed.[7] Among the graduate students supported by ISS was Julien Steward, who received one of these grants to do research in 1938 under Lowie's direction. This research resulted in his 1939 PhD dissertation. The ISS also supported Nimuendajú's travels, even though his research had no formal academic ties. Robert Lowie was interested in comparing North American and South American indigenous cultures, the latter considered as being less affected by contact with "civilization." Lowie collaborated with Nimuendajú, who conducted field research in the Amazon from 1935 to 1941 that was financed by ISS. In the ISS reports, Nimuendajú acted as Robert Lowie's assistant.[8]

MOVING TRAJECTORIES AND SHIFTING PARADIGMS

Usually, the image of indigenous groups sparks curiosity and images of exoticism, instigating anthropologists to learn more about them. Baron Erland Nordeskiöld, who had taught a course at the UCB in late 1926,

introduced Nimuendajú to Lowie. Nimuendajú also maintained correspondence with Boas about his knowledge of indigenous groups, and in a letter dated December 15, 1932, he offered to sell to Boas his collection of Apinayé material culture for $900. Boas replied that he wouldn't be able to offer financial support for Nimuendajú's work despite its significance.[9] Boas sent Nimuendajú a telegram on March 3, 1933, asking if he could "take along future party without interference of scientific work cable collect [*sic*]."[10] Boas expressed in this telegram his disagreement with Nimuendajú guaranteeing his subsistence during his sojourns to the Amazon by collecting artifacts and then selling them to European ethnographic museums, entrenched as they were in the international market for material culture. This market was based on international networks of diplomatic connections, which involved entangled relationships of material and symbolic exchange (Penny 2002:54). As a foreign collector (he was born in Germany but was a naturalized Brazilian), Nimuendajú was subjected to Brazilian patrimonial policy,[11] which imposed severe restrictions on his collecting during World War II. He was constantly suspected of being involved in exploitive practices.

During World War II, nationalist representatives of the Brazilian state had dealt with Nimuendajú as merely a "foreign explorer" who collaborated with those museums of natural history and ethnography seen as great collector entrepreneurs. The idea of defending Brazilian national heritage meant evoking values associated with the ideology of the nation-state in Brazil (1930–45) and the consecration of national integrity, thus leading to consequent suspicion of foreigners. Using legal means (Decreto-Lei 22.698), the Brazilian state established the right of national scientific institutions to incorporate foreign collections with the goal of protecting indigenous heritage, including their images. But Nimuendajú had become a Brazilian citizen, and his contributions to anthropological knowledge about social organization and the cultures of specific indigenous groups in the Amazon were recognized by other local anthropologists who admired his devotion to fieldwork.[12]

K. G. Izikowitz strongly recommended Nimuendajú's work to Boas in a letter dated September 1934 so that he could produce the Handbook of South American Indians (HSAI).[13] In 1932 Lowie wanted to edit the HSAI, since he was the chair at the Division of Anthropology and

Psychology for the National Research Council. However, the project failed (Faulhaber 2012), and in 1934 Lowie abandoned the project and enrolled Nimuendajú in his ISS project, following Izikowitz's suggestion. In 1935 Nimuendajú received $700 for fieldwork expenses. From 1936 to 1941 he received $1,200 a year. In 1942, however, the institute gave him just $300.

ISS funds were evaluated according to a productivity system based on whether or not the applicants held a doctorate. Since this was not Nimuendajú's project, Lowie filled out the forms in his own name, adding a justification explaining that the fieldwork in the Brazilian Amazon would be conducted by Curt Nimuendajú. Lowie then annexed bibliographic references attesting the academic recognition of Nimuendajú's works by landmark anthropologists such as Alfred Métraux and Lowie himself.[14] Lowie's 1939 report underlines the anthropological accuracy of Nimuendajú's writings, recognized by authors such as E. Nordeskiöld and A. Métraux.

The ethnographic richness of Nimuendajú's publications enabled Lowie and his Berkeley companions to consider a comparative approach with Amazonian and U.S. Native peoples. Lowie had never visited the Amazon, obtaining information for his comparisons through Nimuendajú (Lowie 1959), who worked under Lowie's instructions (Freed 1960:371). Lowie publicly recognized Nimuendajú's skills in producing extensive monographs about several of the less well known indigenous peoples; Lowie also helped Nimuendajú publish as sole author at the University of California (Nimuendajú 1946, 1952). Afterward Nimuendajú's status was upgraded from a specialized gatherer in the symbolic goods market selling indigenous artifacts to museums to a consecrated author in the ethnological field, therefore achieving entry into the scientific productivity system. In his preface to *Primitive Society*, Lowie states: "Nimuendajú in the interior of Brazil has revealed unsuspected institutions among the simpler New World natives" (1947:viii).

Born in Jena, Thuringia (Germany), Curt Nimuendajú was a naturalized Brazilian citizen and lived in the Amazon (Grupioni 1998; Welper 2002; Oliveira 2006). His conception of anthropology was closer to Lowie's than Sauer's, eventually building on the same German cultural provenance of Julian Steward, who after 1940 worked with the DEA and

thus became involved in the U.S. expansionist project and the fight for cultural hegemony in the field of Americanist studies. When Steward began to work for the Smithsonian in 1940, he envisaged the possibility of using the resources of the U.S. Congress for creating cooperation with South American republics as part of the "good neighbor" policy. This possibility was the basis for his proposal for the SI in collaborative projects such as the Handbook of South American Indians (Faulhaber 2012) and the Institute of Social Anthropology (Faulhaber 2011), whose ethos I see as stemming from the ISS/UCB.

Besides gathering detailed information about South American Indians, a remarkable region from a strategic point of view, Steward's scientific enterprise had theoretical implications. Articulated with the empirical evidence of "cultural contact," his cultural change paradigm, dealing with the results of other researchers' intensive fieldwork in Mexico and Brazil, built bases for Steward's later theories on "cultural ecology," which contemplated an ecological interpretation of sociopolitical development (Stocking 1976:27; Steward 1955; Kerns 2003). Steward proposed a new evolutionary paradigm. However, he based his analysis on his hypothesis of the inevitable "integration of cultures as subcultures" (Steward 1955) in "developmental programs" adequate to market integration embedded in a network of local relationships.

HOW ETHNOGRAPHIC FIELDWORK PUZZLED ANTHROPOLOGY

Institutions such as the ISS/UCB, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution didn't envisage receiving the indigenous artifacts gathered by Nimuendajú; instead, they were sent to national and regional museums. However, the objects participated in the cultural appropriation of locally produced knowledge with recourse to ethnography promoting its international circulation. In his "Report on Snr Curt Nimuendajú's Investigation for the Institute of Social Sciences" (labeled "Pranch 6, 1939"), Lowie stated:

> One of the general results of Nimuendaju's work is that of exploding the traditional scheme of Brazilian ethnography, which turns out to be far too simple. There are not merely two strata, a primi-

tive Gê and a more advanced Tupi' culture, with the latter passing on fragments of its inventory to the ruder stock. This is definitely refuted by Nimuendaju's observations on the pottery of the simpler groups, which is consistently different from the Tupi' type. The indications are that Eastern Brazil had a distinctive culture heart, largely associated with the cariri family, and representing an intermediate level of sophistication: its bearers planted cotton and sweet potatoes, made plain earthenware, and practiced the above-mentioned cult. It is from this focus rather than from a Tupi' or Arawak center that those Gê who have taken up agriculture and ceramics seem to have received influence. . . .

In the Handbook of Latin American Studies (Ed. Lewis Hanke), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938, Métraux writes: "Only two brief résumés on N.'s extensive reports were published last year, but they mark a turning point in our conception of primitive cultures in South America." (1938)

The Handbook concisely summarizes these articles on page 44.

Lowie recognized as well the accuracy of Nimuendajú's criticism on Tukuna linguistic affiliation to the Aruak language, as previously stated by Paul Rivet. In a letter from Nimuendajú to Lowie from August 9, 1942, Nimuendajú explained that he had stated this in his monograph on the Tukuna Indians (Nimuendajú 1952). The fact that the ISS changed part of its research approach to focus on Latin America explains why Nimuendajú recovered in the 1940s his Tukuna ethnography, which he had begun in 1929 while traveling in collaboration with the SPI (Brazilian State Service for Indigenous Protection) to work among this indigenous group, which lived on the triple border between the Brazilian, Colombian, and Peruvian Amazon. His work, produced from direct interaction with indigenous groups, showed their ethnic singularity and also described how they maintained their cultural uniqueness, despite having contact with nonnative groups. His ethnography had not entirely corresponded with the way those Indians were seen by European and U.S. Americanists.[15] Although Nimuendajú lamented that such Indians had changed their previous customs, he believed that knowledge about so-called deculturated Indians had great significance for ethnology.[16]

Nimuendajú's letters show that besides trying to better understand indigenous mythology and cosmology, he had also been seeking to ethically document their thought; he claimed that his translation work depended on his empathetic relationship with the peoples whom he researched. He wrote to Carlos Estevão, his friend and director of the Goeldi (Amazonian) Museum, that his desire to work with "decently dressed" Indians like the Ticuna "came from the need to save what could yet be saved" (Nimuendajú 2000:291). Although Nimuendajú lamented that they had changed their previous customs, he believed that knowledge about deculturated Indians was also important for ethnology.[17]

Nimuendajú aimed to reconstitute the mythology and cosmology of specific peoples such as the Tukuna, even though the individuals he met affirmed that they had ceased to practice the old rituals in the ways prescribed by their elders, even though they still remembered their old myths. Nimuendajú complained that he could only find fragments of a mixed cosmology without "original characteristics." Although without producing theoretical concepts refuting acculturation theories, he showed in his writings that even though indigenous cultures and mythologies had been modified by their subordination, accommodation, or adaptation to the relationships imposed by the encompassing societies (Oliveira 2006), their cultures had not entirely disappeared, as previewed in the memorandum (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits 1936).

The limits of the adequacy of the analysis of the Amazonian Indians to the cultural area notion conceived in the interwar years may be attributed to its baseless general approach. Direct-observation inquiries into specific indigenous peoples came to invalidate generic categories such as "marginal peoples" (Lévi-Strauss 1964). Eduardo Galvão, who knew Nimuendajú in the last days of his life, used his monographs to redefine the concept of cultural areas according to regional criteria, considering the contact between different indigenous peoples and between them and national societies (Galvão 1967; Oliveira 2001). Following Nimuendajú, the question went beyond great theories or discussing the consequences of cultural change. Ulterior approaches were founded on the definition of ethnographic areas (Melatti 2001:7) and based

on temporal, linguistic, and environmental criteria. The researcher's interference in delimiting the object became crucial for its definition.

CONCLUSION

I dealt in this chapter with the significance of frontier in projects supported by the ISS/UCB. The ISS/ICB itself was a boundary object for the Social Science Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation. During the Great Depression, support for social sciences was a way of incorporating and controlling disciplines that claimed autonomy. Founded at a university in the west of the country, this institute dealt with the social "frontiers of knowledge" in areas on the border of the nation-state.

Indirectly supported by the ISS as Lowie's assistant, Curt Nimuendajú's status was upgraded from a specialized supplier of indigenous artifacts for European museums to a researcher having academic legitimacy. Without appropriating indigenous artifacts, the ISS appropriated writings about Amazonian Indians in the context of an academically controlled research project. In this case, the ethnographic knowledge itself was a boundary object. Meanwhile, this kind of knowledge remained outside of the territory established, yet science expected to incorporate it. Moreover, it contributed to modify ways of thought on acculturation, area studies, and social change. Nimuendajú showed that records on Indians in situations of contact and on their living culture were more relevant for anthropological analysis as transforming subjects than essentializing the "lost culture."

Nimuendajú had access to anthropological publications that his colleagues from Europe and the United States sent him. He managed with skill, accuracy, and aplomb social organization analysis, which he had learned through his correspondence with Lowie. The fact that actual indigenous cultures had persisted despite the virulence of colonizers—in the terms of his observations—shows the inaccuracy of the idea that indigenous social relations were inserted in evolutionary chains and that their cultures could be absorbed as "subcultures" into national societies. Amazonian records contributed to the breakdown of the essentialist foundation of the cultural area concept. The social actors themselves were seen as able to reappropriate their destinies

from the regional museums, putting into question the idea that the explanation of museum exhibitions might uncritically follow theories conceived overseas. General categories, such as the Ge tribe's characterization based on "marginal tribes," lost sense. Analyses founded on historic and geographic records seemed more convincing. The anthropological commitment, together with the dialogue with native agency, became seriously considered as boundary objects.

NOTES

A preliminary version of this chapter was presented in the panel "Histories and Legacies of Berkeley Anthropology," organized by Sergei Kan and Ira Jacknis (American Anthropological Association Meeting, 2012). I would like to thank Ira Jacknis as well for the invitation to do research at UCB in November 2010.

1. December 5, 1930, meeting document, Records of the Department of Anthropology, CU 23, University Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
2. Program established with the foundation of the ISS after the nomination of its executive board, "Appendix to the General Statement of the ISS Research Program," as formulated in October 1932. It described the ISS goals and presented a "series of representative projects in progress" (unpaginated document, CU 23, p. 1).
3. On December 5, 1930, the ISS committee approved a collaborative project titled "Culture Frontiers and 'Culture Hearts' in the Southwest of Mexico." The committee later suggested that the project's name be changed to "Culture Frontiers and Culture Hearths of the Southwest and Latin America" (ISS/ICB folder, CU 23, unnumbered typed sheet, p. 1).
4. Program established with the foundation of the ISS, with the nomination of its executive board, appendix 1, p. 2.
5. Appendix 2, "Preferential Research Program of the Institute of Social Sciences University of California," ISS foundation document, ISS folder, CU 23, p. 4. Metraux evoked this same characterization of the region as "terra incognita," lacking really intensive anthropological inquiry involving cultural translation, when he wrote to Boas about his intent to move from Polynesia back to South America (Metraux to Boas, December 9, 1936, Boas Professional Papers, Getty Museum Archive, Los Angeles, hereafter cited as BPP).

6. Appendix 2, "Preferential Research Program."
7. ISS folder, CU 23, unnumbered typed sheet.
8. Objectives: intensification of ethnological research under way; extension to border-line problems involving psychology, statistics, geography, etc.

   Since 1901, the Department of Anthropology has carried on systematic field investigations, especially in ethnology, also in archaeology and linguistics. This work has centered in California and for many years has been largely restricted to this area on account of economy of prosecution. . . .

   The program hear outlined bases on this accomplished work but proposes its extension and deepening as follows:

   Areal extension, especially to adjacent regions, to allow the attack of problems insoluble by locally restricted area.

   Fuller application of points of view other than the standard descriptive-ethnographic one. For instance, "functional" analyses of selected tribal culture, where still possible; studies of attitudes of craftsmen toward their craft; processes of growth in organized and of adaptation in unorganized native religions, etc.

   Problems in border-line fields such as, on the side of psychology, normal personality differentiation in native cultures; messianic cult waves; speech learning by Indian children. Methodological: controlled test studies on the value of statistics in ethnographic definition; cyclical developments; relation of types of kinship systems to types of society. Also certain studies verging into geography, demography, and ethnobotany.

   The group of investigations is conceived not as a series of adventures into new terrain but as the additional sowing of new crops in the well-tilled field of native Californian anthropology (ISS folder, CU 23).
9. "I am sorry to hear that you do not see any way of continuing your valuable ethnological work. I wish you would be good enough to let me know as soon as you can how much money will enable you to continue. I have nothing to offer at the present moment but there are certain negotiations under way that might perhaps, in the not too distant future, lead to support of work, particularly in South America" (Boas to Nimuendajú, January 8, 1933, BPP).
10. Telegram, March 3, 1933, BPP. I believe that here Boas is trying to say to Nimuendajú that he is seeking scholarly research autonomy from the colonial field of indigenous material-culture appropriation.
11. As stated by a large collection of manuscripts deposited at the archive of the Conselho de Fiscalização das Expedições Artísticas e Científicas no Brasil (Brazilian Council for Inspection of Artistic and Scientific Expeditions in Brazil, deposited at the Mast/MCT/Brazil). Nimuendajú took many photographs of indigenous peoples (Soares 2010); they were sold together with his personal archive by his widow to the Brazilian Museu Nacional of Rio de Janeiro, where they are still stored.
12. In a letter to Boas (March 27, 1933), Nimuendajú explained that he was not merely a collector, thus exposing his unhappiness with the interference of filmmakers who documented indigenous Indian culture: he felt they were more preoccupied with the public presentation of these peoples than with actual information about their real lives and culture. Moreover, Nimuendajú saw these groups as being endangered by attacks of "neobrazilians." In another letter (December 15, 1933), Nimuendajú noted that he had been accused of being a Nazi spy. Even though his original nationality was the apparent cause of these persecutions, agents in charge of indigenous policies in Brazil felt threatened by the results of his work on Indian self-esteem. Nimuendajú sketched out his main ethnographic concerns regarding the Kamkomekra in order to obtain funding necessary to support his work. He gave detailed information about the "decay" of a number of indigenous groups, noting, for instance, that the Apinayés were reduced from 273 to just 80 members and had been suffering from diseases introduced by Europeans. The Kraó were also disappearing through their union with Afro-Brazilian groups (BPP). I would like to thank Willi Bolle for translating and commenting on the German letters.
13. Izikowitz lost his position, persecuted by Nazi forces in 1934, and wrote to Lowie that he felt that Nimuendajú would be the most qualified person to edit the Brazilian part of the HSAI. Lowie consigned a number of Nimuendajú manuscripts to archaeologist John Rowe, who kept them as private archives. His widow, Patricia Lyon, kindly allowed me to copy those documents.
14. Application for research grant from funds of the Institute of Social Sciences, University of California, sent by Robert Lowie, March 6, 1941, JRA.
15. In a letter to the director of the Museu Nacional, Heloisa Alberto Torres, Boas evaluated Nimuendajú, stating that he was "evidently an excellent student of ethnology, even though he also (compared to Charles Wagley) lacked linguistic training" (January 20, 1941, BPP).
16. In a June 1933 letter to Jules Blumensohn, introduced to Nimuendajú by Franz Boas, the German Brazilian ethnographer stated, "I myself take rather more results from my studies among the deculturated Apapokúva-Guarany, who were thought to be completely known, than

from the contacts such as being the first civilized man to deal with the Kawahiwa-Parintintin, as when I had a hand in their pacification in 1922" (BPP).

17. Nimuendajú was baffled by indigenous groups whose customs differed from what he considered to be their "original" customs. He wrote to Carlos Estevão that the Ticuna Indians were very "deculturated" (Nimuendajú 2000:143). He also stated that in 1929 he could only find "remnants" of the Mura Indians, which were of no ethnographic value (Nimuendajú 2000:94). His bafflement, I suppose, was conditioned by his being primarily a collector. However, as a representative of the Brazilian indigenous policy apparatus, Nimuendajú translated indigenous claims into national policies in favor of indigenous citizenship. This professional compromise often created conflicts with local merchants who subjugated Amazon peoples by way of indentured servitude, as happened during work among the Ticuna. His presence there incited the Ticuna to stand up to the merchants who exploited them. These merchants, afraid of losing control over "their" Indians, felt threatened by Nimuendajú's presence (for further information, see page 81 of the Portuguese manuscript sent to the Handbook of South American Indians, 82 pages, 1943, Museu Nacional Arquive, Belém).

REFERENCES

Anderson, Ryan. 2011. Franz Boas: Geographer/Anthropologist. Anthropologies: A Collaborative Online Project.

Asad, T., ed. 1973. Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Clifford, James. 1988. The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Du Bois, Cora, ed. 1960. Lowie's Selected Papers in Anthropology. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Faria, Luís de Castro. 1981. Curt Nimuendajú. *In* Mapa etno-histórico de Curt Nimuendajú. Pp. 17–22. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE.

———. 2000. Introdução. *In* Inventário Sumário-Conselho de Fiscalização das Expedições Artísticas e Científicas no Brasil. Pp. 7–13. Rio de Janeiro: MAST.

Faulhaber, Priscila. 2001. O Instituto de Antropologia Social (EUA, Brasil e México): Um artefato da resposta antropológica ao "esforço de guerra." Revista Mana 17(May):9–39.

Freed, R. S. 1960. Robert H. Lowie, Ethnologist: A Personal Record. Social Forces 38(4):371.

Galvão, Eduardo. 1967. Indigenous Culture Areas of Brazil (1900–1959). *In* Indians of Brazil in the Twentieth Century. Janice H. Hopper, ed. and trans. Pp. 167–205. Washington DC: Institute for Cross Cultural Research.

Gieryn, T. F. 1983. Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists. American Sociological Review 48(6):781–795.

Grupioni, Luís Donisete. 1998. Coleções e expedições vigiadas: Os etnólogos no Conselho de Fiscalização das Expedições Artísticas e Científicas no Brasil. São Paulo: ANPOCS/HUCITEC.

Jacknis, Ira. 1996. The Ethnographic Object and the Object of Ethnology in the Early Career of Franz Boas. *In* Volksgeist as Method and Ethics: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition. George W. Stocking Jr., ed. Pp. 185–214. HOA 8. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kenzer, Martin S. 1985. The Making of Carl O. Sauer and the Berkeley School of Historical Geography. Open Access dissertation and theses. Paper 1083. http://DigitalCommons@master.Ca/opensdissertation/1083.

Kerns, Virginia. 2003. Scenes from the High Desert: Julian Steward's Life and Theory. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kuklick, Henrika. 2008. Introduction. *In* A New History of Anthropology. Pp. 1–18. London: Blackwell.

Kuklick, Henrika, and Robert E. Kohler, eds. 1996. Introduction. OSIRIS: Science in the Field, 2nd ser., 11:1–14.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1964. Le cru et le cuit: Mythologiques. Paris: Plon.

Lowie, Robert. 1939 Report on Snr Curt Nimuendaju's investigation for the Institute of Social Sciences Berkeley. Manuscript.

———. 1947. Primitive Society. New York: Liveright.

———. 1959. Field Work in Absentia. *In* Ethnologist: A Personal Record. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Machado, Lia Osório. 1992. A fronteira agrícola na Amazônia brasileira. Revista Brasileira de Geografia 54(2):27–55.

Melatti, Júlio Cezar. 2011. Por que áreas etnográficas? *In* Áreas etnográficas da América Indígena. Júlio Cezar Melatti, ed. Pp. 1–10.

Nimuendajú, Curt. 1946. The Eastern Timbira. University of California

Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 41. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 1952. The Tukuna. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 45. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Oliveira, João Pacheco. 2001. Galvão e os estudos de aculturação no Brasil: Ou "santo de casa também pode fazer milagres." *In* Conhecimento e fronteira: História da ciência na Amazônia. Priscila Faulhaber and Peter Man de Toledo, eds. Belém: Museu Goeldi / Paralelo 15.
———. 2006. Curt Nimuendajú et la configuration de l'ethnologie au Bresil. *In* ESSE: Actes du colloque rapports ambivalents entre sciences sociales européenes et américaines. Pp. 165–197. Milan: Arcipelago Edizioni.
Penny, H. Glenn. 2002. Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton, and Melville J. Herskowitz. 1936. Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. American Anthropologist 38:149–152.
Sauer, Carl. 1941. Foreword to Historical Geography. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 31(1):1–24.
Soares, Marilia Faco. 2010. Indios do Brasil e o olhar de Curt Nimuendajú. DVD. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional.
Star, Susan L., and James R. Griesemer. 1989. Institutional Ecology, "Translations" and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology. Social Studies of Science 19:387–420.
Steward, Julian H. 1955. Theory of Culture Change. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
———. 1961. Alfred Louis Kroeber 1876–1960. Obituary. American Anthropologist, n.s. 63:1038–1087.
Stocking, G. W., Jr. 1976. Introduction: Thoughts toward a History of the Interwar Years. *In* American Anthropology, 1921–1945. G. W. Stocking Jr., ed. Pp. 1–74. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
———. 1985. Philantropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology. *In* Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. G. W. Stocking Jr., ed. Pp. 112–145. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
———. 2001. Delimiting Anthropology: Occasional Inquiries and Reflections. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Turner, F. J. 1963. The Frontier in American History. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Weinstein, Barbara. 2007. Modernidade tropical: Visões norte-americanas da Amazônia nas vésperas da Guerra Fria. Revista do IEB 45:153–176.
Welper, Elena Monteiro. 2002. Curt Unkel Nimuendajú: Um capítulo alemão na tradição etnográfica brasileira. PhD dissertation, Mestrado—Museu Nacional / PPGAS / UFRJ.