CLYDE KLUCKHOHN AND THE NEW ANTHROPOLOGY: FROM CULTURE AND PERSONALITY TO THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF VALUES

John S. Gilkeson
Arizona State University

This essay examines Clyde Kluckhohn's relations with Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and Gregory Bateson in two contexts: the school of culture and personality, and the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life convened during the Second World War. Kluckhohn strongly identified with the Boasian tradition. Enlisting in the Boasian campaign to make Americans more "culture-conscious," Kluckhohn joined Benedict and Mead as a public intellectual. In this capacity, Kluckhohn sought to clarify the concept of culture and to widen its currency, emphasized the affinity between anthropology and psychiatry, and, after 1945, searched for the integrating principles of cultures.

Introduction

In 1949, Clyde Kluckhohn published *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life*. His book, which won a $10,000 prize offered by McGraw-Hill for the best popular book on science, was a "manifesto" of "the New Anthropology." Popularized by Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, the New Anthropology was, in the words of the critic Robert Endleman, "anthropology with a message"—the message that anthropologists now commanded "the knowledge needed to reform the world." The New Anthropology had been popularized, between the world wars, by Margaret Mead, who instructed the educated public on such problems as adolescence, child rearing, and gender roles. Ruth Benedict "forged" the

Pacific Studies, Vol. 32, Nos. 2/3—June/Sept. 2009

"link" between studying "the exotic primitive" and solving "the problems of modern society." Whereas Benedict marshaled anthropological knowledge to shatter Americans' "ethnocentric ethical conceptions," Kluckhohn hoped to derive the "ultimate values" with which social scientists could promote a peaceful postwar world. (Endleman 1949: 285–6, 290).

In *Mirror for Man*, Kluckhohn declared that anthropology was "no longer just the science of the long-ago and far-away," it was "an aid to useful action." Thanks to the "all-embracing" or holistic character of their discipline, anthropologists occupied "a strategic position" to determine which "factors" would "create a world community of distinct cultures and hold it together against disruption." Only those experts who, like anthropologists, were "singularly emancipated from the sway of the locally accepted" could surmount the apparently "unbridgeable gap" between "competing ways of life" by laying bare "the principles that undergird each culture" ([1949a] 1985: 286–7). On the heels of the publication of *Mirror for Man*, Kluckhohn appeared on the cover of the January 29, 1949, issue of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, proclaiming that anthropologists now had "the beginnings of a science whose principles are applicable to any human situation."

Described by a reviewer as a "prophet" of the New Anthropology (Mishkin 1949, 15), Kluckhohn captured anthropologists' exuberance and heady optimism, born of their wartime service and access to policymakers, that they would play prominent roles in postwar reconstruction. No longer practitioners of what Clifford Geertz (2002, 3) has described as "an obscure, isolate, even reclusive, lone-wolf sort of discipline," they would increasingly participate in "multi- (or inter-, or cross-) disciplinary work" and "team projects," lavishly funded by philanthropic foundations and, in some cases, by federal agencies, dedicated to solving "the immediate problems of the contemporary world." This enthusiasm proved infectious. For a brief moment, anthropology loomed as "the reigning social science" in the eyes of many political scientists, family therapists, historians, and American studies scholars (Pye 1973, 65; see also Berkhofer 1973 and Weinstein 2004).

In what follows, I examine Kluckhohn's relations with Benedict, Mead, and Gregory Bateson in two contexts: the school of culture and personality and the wartime Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life. Although technically not a Boasian—having studied anthropology with Father Wilhelm Schmidt in Vienna, Robert Marett in Oxford, and Alfred Tozzer at Harvard—Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn (1905–1960) nonetheless strongly identified with "the Boasian tradition" (Handler 1995: 80–1). He worshipped Boas as his

"anthropological god" (Kluckhohn to Robert H. Lowie, letter dated October 20, 1945 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3]), and "derived a major part of [his] theoretical orientation from" Benedict (Kluckhohn 1949c, 18). Kluckhohn joined Benedict and Mead in communicating anthropologists' findings to the educated public, and agreed with Mead and Bateson on the fundamental importance of biology to anthropology (Kluckhohn, *Comments on Persons Nominated for Consideration at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences as of February 23, 1954* [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.6]; Kluckhohn 1951a: 121–2). In addition, he developed a "close full friendship" with Alfred Kroeber, with whom he attempted to fix the meaning of the culture concept (Theodora Kroeber 1970, 201; Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952). Kluckhohn's closest intellectual affinity among the Boasians, however, was with Edward Sapir, and it is this affinity that helps to explain Kluckhohn's eventual turn away from psychoanalytically informed culture and personality to the linguistically informed study of values (Stocking 1996, 8).

Like Benedict, Kluckhohn came to anthropology through affection for the American Southwest. In 1922–1923, while recuperating on a ranch near Ramah, New Mexico, from the rheumatic fever that interrupted his freshman year at Princeton, he became "fascinated" by a nearby band of Navajo. Kluckhohn's academic interests then lay in the classics: he had studied Latin in preparatory school. Learning to speak "passable" Navajo, he explored Navajo Country on horseback. After resuming his studies at the University of Wisconsin in 1924, Kluckhohn majored in Greek and, as a Rhodes Scholar, read classical archaeology in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He then briefly studied at Harvard Law School, before traveling extensively in Europe, learning French and German, and studying anthropology in Vienna with Father Wilhelm Schmidt, a member of the *Kulturkreis* (culture circle) school of diffusionism. Returning to Oxford, Kluckhohn worked with Robert Marett, a specialist in comparative religion. From 1932 until 1934, Kluckhohn taught physical anthropology at the University of New Mexico and, as an associate of the School for American Research, directed archaeological excavations in Chaco Canyon. In 1934, he went to Harvard on a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to study physical anthropology and archaeology. Shifting his interests to social and cultural anthropology, Kluckhohn cut such a brilliant figure that Harvard kept him on after he earned his degree in 1936. Appointed assistant professor in 1937, he became associate professor in 1940 and professor in 1946—the same year in which the Department of Social Relations was established (transcript of Ann Roe's interview with Clyde Kluckhohn, 1950 [American

Philosophical Society, Anne Roe papers, B/R261]; Kluckhohn, *Autobiographical Sketch*, ca. 1946 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn papers, HUG 4490.7]).

Culture and Personality

Although he had been analyzed in 1931 by Eduard Hitschmann—one of Freud's earliest disciples in Vienna—Kluckhohn did not overcome his "ambivalence" toward psychoanalysis until 1939 (Parsons 1973: 30–1). He first made his name as an outspoken critic of "the almost morbid avoidance of theory" in anthropology and archaeology. Until anthropologists and archaeologists made their "postulates" and "canons of procedure" explicit, and hence subject to "systematic criticism," their findings, Kluckhohn (1939, 1940) insisted, would not have any scientific standing.

Although his dissertation had been library-based, Kluckhohn soon earned his spurs as an ethnographer. In 1936, he began fieldwork among the Ramah Navajo that would continue until his death. Inspired by the social psychologist, John Dollard, whom he had known from his freshman year at Wisconsin, and by Edward Sapir, with whom he studied the Navajo language in New Haven in 1936–1937, Kluckhohn decided to follow a representative sample of Navajo children "through time" as they "acquired" their culture in "a needed experiment" to correct "the flat, one-dimensional quality" of most ethnographies at that time (Kluckhohn 1949b, v). In doing so, he became one of the pioneers of "long-term field research" in American anthropology (Foster et al., 1979, 7).

While kinship and social organization bored Kluckhohn, he paid close attention to the details of Navajo religion, ceremonialism, and beliefs. Concerned with individual variation, he documented the frequency of the behaviors he observed, sought to determine the extent of individual participation in ceremonies, and indicated whether his sources were informants' statements or his own observations. From the outset, Kluckhohn was strongly oriented toward the life-history method, which John Dollard defined as "a deliberate attempt to define the growth of a person in a cultural milieu and to make theoretical sense of it" (Dollard [1935] 1949, iii). Quick, however, to acknowledge the usefulness of statistical analysis, Kluckhohn put his generalizations, whenever possible, on a quantitative basis (Lamphere and Vogt 1973). His concern with documenting variation, combined with his life-history orientation, may explain Benedict's disparaging allusion to "Kluckhohn's counting noses" (Benedict to Margaret Mead, letter dated January 30, 1939, cited in Young 2005, 74).

Believing that "multiple observations" and "approaches" would eliminate any "distortions" stemming from personal bias or from the "stereotyped fashions" prevalent in the fieldworker's discipline, Kluckhohn engaged in a number of cross-disciplinary collaborations (Kluckhohn 1949b, vi). With the physiologist Leland Wyman, he compiled a taxonomy of Navajo rituals; with the psychiatrist Dorothea Leighton, he produced two books on the Navajo for the Indian Education Research Project; and with the biological anthropologist James N. Spuhler, he studied Navajo genetics (Kluckhohn and Wyman 1940; Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946; Leighton and Kluckhohn 1947; Spuhler and Kluckhohn 1953). It is small wonder, then, that the 1940s and 1950s were known as "the Kluckhohn era" in Navajo studies (Witherspoon 1975, ix).

As an undergraduate at Wisconsin, Kluckhohn had taken his first course in psychology from Norman A. Cameron—at that time a "brass instrument" behaviorist who had little use for Freud. Kluckhohn, however, "stopped ranting about Freud's anthropological errors" when he discovered the "unconscious" during his analysis in Vienna (transcript of Anne Roe's interview with Clyde Kluckhohn, 1950 [American Philosophical Society, Anne Roe Papers, B/R261]). In 1939, Kluckhohn accepted a fellowship from the Carnegie Corporation. This allowed him to study psychology and psychiatry with Ralph Linton at Columbia, to present material on the Navajo in the seminar on culture and personality run jointly by Linton and the psychiatrist Abram Kardiner, and to participate in Sandor Rado's seminar on psychoanalytic theory at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute (Charles Dollard to Kluckhohn, letter dated March 3, 1939; Ralph Linton to Kluckhohn, letters dated 9 and February 13, 1939, and March 26, 1939 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3]; see also Kluckhohn 1944a 1989, 237*n*). While in New York, Kluckhohn became one of Mead's numerous protégés (Lagemann [1989] 1992, 166; Sahlins 1984, 1).

In 1941, Kluckhohn collaborated with O. Hobart Mowrer and Henry A. Murray in offering a cooperative seminar on "socialization" modeled on the Linton–Kardiner seminar. Mowrer, an experimental psychologist, had come to Harvard in 1940, after six years at the Yale Institute of Human Relations, where he worked with John Dollard and others on integrating learning theory and psychoanalysis. In 1944, Kluckhohn and Mowrer outlined a "conceptual scheme" for culture and personality that fused "concepts" and "postulates" drawn from anthropology, learning theory, and psychoanalytic theory (Kluckhohn and Mowrer 1944; Mowrer and Kluckhohn 1944). Kluckhohn, like Mead, had more use for Kurt Lewin's field theory than did Mowrer (Kluckhohn to Norman A. Cameron, letter dated October 24, 1944

[Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3]; Margaret Mead to Kluckhohn, letter dated December 10, 1943 [Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers, Box C10]; Kluckhohn to Mead, letter dated December 28, 1943 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.3]).

Kluckhohn found the clinician Henry Murray, Director of the Harvard Psychological Clinic and developer of the Thematic Apperception Test, more congenial than Mowrer. Murray's press–need formulation (in which "press" designated the "temporal gestalt of stimuli" ascertainable by a fieldworker, and "need" designated the informant's motivation) provided Benedict with the "psychological ground-work" to go "beyond relativity," to search for the "fundamental social and cultural arrangements" that "minimize[d] hostility and conflict (aggression)" (Benedict to Murray, letter dated July 30, 1944, cited in Caffrey 1989, 305; Benedict, reply to *Questionnaire from the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion, 1943*, cited in Young 2005, 100). To Kluckhohn, Murray was "the great humanist" whom he himself aspired to be. Kluckhohn thus followed Murray in "defining humanistic social science as the systematic study of 'the whole man'" (Kluckhohn to Murray, letter dated July 18, 1944, cited in Robinson 1992: 294–5). In 1948, Kluckhohn and Murray published *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, the first collection of readings from the periodical literature in culture and personality, designed in part to teach "social science to psychiatrists" (Kluckhohn to Roger Shugg, letter dated May 8, 1948 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.7]). As Kluckhohn and Murray explained in their Introduction, "all research in [the] field [of culture and personality] is in the last analysis directly or indirectly oriented to one central type of question: What makes an Englishman an Englishman? an American an American? a Russian a Russian?" (Kluckhohn and Murray 1948, xiv).

When the American Psychiatric Association invited Kluckhohn in 1944 to assess psychiatry's impact on anthropology, he credited Benedict, Mead, and Sapir with having promoted a "rapprochement" between the two disciplines. Kluckhohn perceived in Benedict's work an "attitude" that could "only be described as 'psychiatric.'" He attributed Mead's standing as "possibly the best-known anthropologist in psychiatric circles" to her "field data," tests of psychiatric problems in the field, and "idiom," which psychiatrists "found intelligible." However, it was Sapir, according to Kluckhohn, who had done the most to make "possible some real fusion between the two disciplines." The "tough insights" Sapir drew from psychiatry had "forced" anthropologists to reconstruct their "postulates." Thanks to Sapir's "conceptual refinements," anthropologists were no longer able to regard

individuals as the "more or less passive carrier[s] of tradition," or culture as "a superorganic, impersonal whole" (Kluckhohn 1944b: 597, 600–603).

In 1945, Kluckhohn evaluated the use of personal documents in anthropology for the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Appraisal of Research. He drew on his collaboration with Dorothea Leighton to discuss the "interpersonal" aspects of fieldwork. Urging anthropologists "to take more account of the 'human' side of their materials," Kluckhohn suggested that they act as "a blank screen" on which informants could project their own lives. Kluckhohn was convinced that until anthropologists learned how to "deal rigorously with the 'subjective factors' in the lives of 'primitives,'" their work would remain "flat and insubstantial" (Kluckhohn 1945e: 86, 122, 162–3; Bashkow 1991: 189–90).

Kluckhohn was also convinced of the existence of "certain affinities" between the anthropologist and the psychiatrist. Both were interested in "total personality" and "the whole man." Both were practitioners of disciplines that were "innocent of statistics," "observational" as opposed to "experimental," and "holistic." Finally, fieldwork was, to Kluckhohn's mind, as "fundamentally revealing" of the relationship between the anthropologist and informant as analysis was of the relationship between the psychiatrist and analysand. Thanks to the influence of psychiatry, Kluckhohn (1948: 440–1, 1956a, 906) thought, anthropologists were gaining "a better understanding of and control over their principal instruments—themselves."

What Kluckhohn most wanted from psychoanalysis was "a theory of raw human nature." Like Benedict and Mead, he had earlier considered Freudian theory "strongly culture-bound," and had found the work of "culturalists," such as Erich Fromm and Karen Horney, more congenial than that of the orthodox Freudian, Géza Róheim. By the late 1940s, however, Kluckhohn's own views were converging with Róheim's. The culturalists, Kluckhohn had come to believe, went too far in discounting the influence of biology and in paying more attention to cultural differences than to cultural "universals." Besides, Kluckhohn's fieldwork among the Navajo had convinced him of the "astonishing correctness" with which Freud had depicted a number of universal "themes in motivational life." While the "expression" and "manifest content" of these themes varied from culture to culture, "the underlying psychologic drama," Kluckhohn believed, "transcend[ed] cultural difference." It was now time for anthropologists to turn their attention from the differences among cultures to the similarities (Kluckhohn and Morgan [1951] 1962: 350–1; Wolf [1964] 1974, 36, 39).

Like Benedict and Mead, Kluckhohn had studied "Culture at a Distance" during the Second World War. While working alongside Benedict in the Foreign Morale Analysis Division of the Office of War Information during

1944–1945, Kluckhohn came to appreciate her uncanny ability to "saturate" herself in library materials and to grasp "the essential dynamics of Japanese personality and culture" without having engaged in fieldwork (see also Tannenbaum 2009 and Schachter 2009). Then, while serving as a consultant to the American occupation forces in Japan in 1946–1947, Kluckhohn was "astonished to discover" how well "he knew what was coming in unformalized situations," thanks to his conversations with Benedict and his reading of her book, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, published in 1946 (Kluckhohn 1949c: 18–9; Benedict 1946).

Like Benedict and Mead in the Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures, Kluckhohn attempted, after 1945, to refine methods that had been hurriedly improvised during the war. As Director of the Harvard Russian Research Center from its inception in 1948 until 1954, Kluckhohn sponsored research intended to be at once interdisciplinary, experimental, coherent, and "cumulative," and to incorporate the methods and insights of the behavioral sciences. Together with Alex Inkeles and Raymond Bauer, he analyzed more than 400 life-history interviews with "displaced" Soviet citizens and some 2,000 questionnaires in the Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System. However, when, Kluckhohn stepped down from the directorship of the Russian Research Center in 1954, the methods and insights of history, economics, and political science had largely eclipsed those of the behavioral sciences (Kluckhohn 1949d; Bauer, Inkeles, and Kluckhohn [1956] 1960; Inkeles 1973; Lagemann [1989] 1992: 174–75; Mead and Métraux 1953).

By 1954, Kluckhohn could point to the "considerable improvement in communication" that had occurred "between psychoanalysts and anthropologists" since the late 1920s. Yet, as he admitted, work in culture and personality "suffered" from being too "fashionable," with too many publications in the field "hasty, overly schematic, and indeed naive." Still, the "underlying notions" of culture and personality seemed to Kluckhohn "basically sound." By then, however, Kluckhohn's "central interests" lay elsewhere (Kluckhohn 1954a, 961; 1954b, 693). Although he continued to review work in the field for professional journals, and for the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune*, Kluckhohn turned his attention to the linguistically informed study of values.

The Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion

Kluckhohn's move toward Freudian orthodoxy, interest in the scientific study of values, and turn to linguistics become more understandable when placed against the backdrop of his participation—along with Mead,

Benedict, and Bateson—in the wartime symposia of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life. Founded in 1940 by Louis Finkelstein, provost of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the Conference mobilized American intellectuals in a democratic crusade against fascism by sponsoring annual interdisciplinary and ecumenical symposia. The Conference was a product of what Philip Gleason (1992) has called the "democratic revival" of the late 1930s and early 1940s, an "ideological reawakening" in which American intellectuals responded to the rise of totalitarianism abroad by affirming the American way of life as a normative democratic culture. For the more religiously inclined participants like Finkelstein, the point of the annual symposia was to ground democratic ethics in moral absolutes. For Mead and Benedict, the point was to develop "a wartime theory of democratic culture." For Kluckhohn, the annual symposia provided a stage on which he could rehearse themes that, after 1945, he presented to the educated public in publications like *Mirror for Man* (Gleason 1992, 165; Yans-McLaughlin 1986, 208).

Kluckhohn first participated in the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion at the second annual symposium in 1941 when he commented on Mead's paper, "The Comparative Study of Culture and the Purposive Cultivation of Democratic Values." Kluckhohn did not dissent from Mead's disavowal of any "finished blue print of the future of the absolutely desirable way of life." He also endorsed Mead's recommendation that social scientists devote themselves "to a direction, not a fixed goal," and "to a process, not a static system" (Mead 1942: 67–8; Yans-McLaughlin 1986, 209).

Where Kluckhohn did differ from Mead was in urging social scientists to search for "ultimate" values based on the scientific study of mankind's "universal needs" and of the "varied ways" devised to meet those needs. Were there, he asked, "certain cultural features which remain constant in those cultures which give high value to the individual?" If these features could be discovered, they could be "incorporated" into American culture to enhance the democratic way of life. Kluckhohn (1942, 76) was thus "slightly more optimistic" than Mead that social scientists could chart "aims" as well as "general direction."

Replying to a questionnaire from the Conference in 1942, Kluckhohn identified the principal "evil of our world" as the lack of a secular "faith" that could "give clear meaning and purpose to living," yet be compatible "with what we have learned of our world by 'scientific methods.'" Anthropologists were agreed on the necessity of religion conceived as a symbolically enacted "system of common purposes," but no such system,

Kluckhohn insisted, should be based on "supernatural sanctions" (Kluckhohn, reply to *Questionnaire from the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion*, dated December 7, 1942 [Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers, box E59]). As a lapsed Protestant who had once "flirted" with becoming an Episcopalian priest and who had even considered converting to Roman Catholicism, Kluckhohn now stood resolutely opposed to revealed religion. He had come to believe that "scientific humanism" was "the only hope for American culture" (Kluckhohn 1941a: 174–5; transcript of Anne Roe's interview with Clyde Kluckhohn, 1950 [American Philosophical Society, Anne Roe Papers, B/R261]). Kluckhohn was one of a number of anthropologists who played prominent roles in the Kulturkampf waged in the first half of the twentieth century by what David Hollinger (1996) has called the "American liberal intelligentsia" to "de-Christianize" America's public culture. By the early 1940s, this Kulturkampf had taken on an anti-Catholic animus, owing to the Concordats the Vatican had reached with fascist regimes in Italy and Germany, and to Catholic support for Franco's insurgency in Spain (McGreevy 2003: 166–88).

During the winter of 1942–1943, Kluckhohn circulated among his friends a "manifesto" entitled, *A Declaration of Interdependence: A Creed for Americans as World Citizens*. In this manifesto describing his vision of a world made "safe for differences," Kluckhohn dismissed "the American Century" proclaimed by Henry Luce in *Life* magazine in 1941 (Luce 1941) as nothing more than a prescription for "imperialistic American domination of the world." Kluckhohn's new world order, in contrast, would guarantee the world's peoples the right to "live according to their own values and traditions." Kluckhohn then threw down the gauntlet: Americans must choose. They could either "waste" the "potentialities" of millions of men and women by beating "a frightened retreat to some single standard," or they could reorient American culture around the principle of "orchestrated heterogeneity" (Kluckhohn, A Declaration of Interdependence: A Creed for Americans as World Citizens. Version 1b, dated January 17, 1943 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4990.3]). Among the sources from which Kluckhohn borrowed some of his ideas was Mead's 1939 Introduction to *From the South Seas*. "We are at a crossroads," Mead (1939: xxx–xxxi) wrote, "and must decide whether to go forward towards a more ordered heterogeneity, or make a frightened retreat to some single standard which will waste nine-tenths of the potentialities of the human race."

In "Anthropological Research and World Peace," a paper given at the Conference's fourth annual symposium in 1943, Kluckhohn characterized anthropologists as "tough-minded" social scientists who insisted on the

"stupidity" of "unlinear attack[s]" on the problems of the contemporary world, yet criticized attempts to view those problems "too exclusively in the light of reason." The distinctive contribution anthropologists could make to world peace was, in conjunction with sociologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists, to emphasize such nonrational elements in human life as "sentiments" and "unconscious assumptions." Indeed, for Kluckhohn, "the central problem of world peace" was to "minimize and control aggressive impulses" (Kluckhohn 1944c: 143–5, 149).

In "Group Tensions: Analysis of a Case History," a paper given at the Conference's fifth annual symposium in 1944, Kluckhohn drew on *Navajo Witchcraft*, his newly published inquiry into the sources of aggression among the Navajo, to locate "the conditions for universal sociopsychological processes" in "the uniformities of human neurological equipment" and "the universality of the great dramas of human life (birth, renewed dependency, death)" (Kluckhohn [1944a] 1989, 1945a).

During this symposium, Kluckhohn dissented from the call issued by his Harvard colleague, the sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, for an international order based on "universal adherence" to "values long since discovered by great religious leaders and thinkers." Kluckhohn took issue with the implication that the "integration" of mankind would be achieved only by subordinating "*all* men to values which are *all* the same" (Kluckhohn 1945b: 216–7, italics in original). In addition, he denounced the claim advanced by "official Christianity" that it was "the *only* perfect faith to which all humanity must be converted" as "one of the most dangerous threats to world order" (Kluckhohn 1945c: 297–8, italics in original).

Finally, Kluckhohn agreed with the Harvard political scientist Carl Friedrich that the culture concept could not "form the firm cornerstone of a unified social science." There was simply too much disagreement among "specialists" over the concept's "philosophical and methodological implications." Here Kluckhohn revealed perhaps his primary reason for collaborating with Alfred Kroeber on their 1952 compendium of culture: to fix, as best they could, the concept's meaning. Kluckhohn also objected to "cultural determinism," which, to his mind, was just "as false as every other unilateral 'ism.'" While agreeing with Friedrich that "the pooling of 'psychological' and 'anthropological' knowledge" in culture and personality had "only barely opened up," Kluckhohn extolled the promise of analyzing "culture structure." If anthropologists could "dissect out" patterns in explicit (or overt) culture, they could arrive at the "integrating principles" of the "implicit culture" without having to rely on vague "intuition" (Kluckhohn 1945d: 628–9; Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952).

Here Kluckhohn touched on what he considered his most important contribution to anthropological theory—the concept of implicit culture. Implicit culture designated the integrating principles of a culture. Because informants were largely unconscious of them, these integrating principles had to be "inferred" by the anthropologist. Kluckhohn borrowed the concept of implicit culture from Ralph Linton's unpublished lectures and then refined it by drawing on Benedict's notion of "unconscious canons of choice" (Kluckhohn 1964, 145; Herskovits 1961, 130). Indeed, Kluckhohn thought that when Benedict spoke of "patterns" in her celebrated book, *Patterns of Culture* (1934), she meant the "configurations" or unconscious patterns of implicit culture, rather than the behavioral patterns of explicit culture. For Kluckhohn, as for Benedict, patterning suggested the "regularity," as opposed to the "randomness," of culture (Kluckhohn 1941b: 117, 126–8; Benedict 1934). From Edward Sapir, Kluckhohn learned how anthropologists could "infer" patterns. Like Sapir, he believed in the existence of "linguistic universals" (Sapir 1927).

The Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures

Kluckhohn designed the Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures Project to discover the integrating principles of implicit culture. Supported by $200,000 in grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, some forty researchers from Harvard and nine other institutions, as well as practitioners of seven different disciplines, conducted a series of researches between 1949 and 1954 among the Navajo, Zuñi, Mexican Americans, Mormons, and Texans in the Ramah area.

The project was one of the great undertakings sponsored by the Harvard Department of Social Relations, which had been founded in 1946 by Kluckhohn, Parsons, Mowrer, Murray, and the social psychologist, Gordon Allport. Before the Second World War, all had been members of the "Levellers," an interdisciplinary group interested in promoting "basic social science" at Harvard (Parsons 1949, 1973: 32–3) In 1943, Kluckhohn sent Mead and Bateson a copy of a proposed curriculum for "a unified teaching of the social sciences" at Harvard. Bateson recommended that students be exposed to scientists' "ways of thinking," but that they be trained in "qualitative" rather than "quantitative" techniques (Bateson to Kluckhohn, letter dated January 18, 1944 [Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers, Box O3]). In 1944, Kluckhohn and Parsons attempted to bring Mead and Bateson to Harvard, but James B. Conant, then President of Harvard, balked. Conant, as Kluckhohn phrased it, "didn't want to commit himself

to women professors on the Harvard faculty" (Kluckhohn to Mead, letter dated October 31, 1944 [Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers, box C16]).

The Five Cultures Project sought to explain why the values of these adjacent cultures differed, even though each culture had adapted to the same environment, had been exposed to the same streams of diffusion from "generalized" American culture, and—with the exception of the Texans who migrated to the region in the 1930s—had interacted with each other for two generations (Kluckhohn [1951c] 1962, 395). The project's ultimate objective, however, was to develop a "unified theory" and a common "set of methods" for the scientific study of values. Although more than sixty books and articles eventually issued from the project, it produced neither a unified theory nor a common set of methods. Instead, the whole effort was soon forgotten after Kluckhohn's death (Dumont 1980: 212–3; Powers 1997; Vogt and Albert [1966] 1970: 1–5]).

For help in comparing cultures and identifying cultural universals, Kluckhohn turned to linguistics, the social science discipline that, in his eyes, most resembled the natural sciences "in rigor and elegance." As Franz Boas and Edward Sapir had contended, language approached "pure culture" in illustrating "regular and patterned selection among a limited number of biological possibilities." Language was also that aspect of culture in which "order and predictability" had been "most successfully demonstrated." Inspired by Claude Lévi-Strauss, "the most brilliant and innovating anthropologist alive today," and by the linguist Roman Jakobson's analysis of the "distinctive features" of languages, Kluckhohn searched for cultural equivalents of the phoneme—basic units of culture comparable across cultures (Kluckhohn 1955, 347; Kluckhohn to Kenneth Setton, letter dated October 27, 1959 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.6]; Fischer 1973). Kluckhohn's untimely death of a heart attack in July 1960 cut short this attempt to develop a cultural "grammar" that would allow anthropologists to describe and compare cultures as "parsimoniously" as linguists did languages. His turn to linguistics illustrates the way in which the discipline provided models not only for the school of culture and personality, as David Aberle has noted, but also for the scientific study of values. Kluckhohn derived from linguistics the characteristics of selectivity, patterning, and the largely unconscious nature of implicit culture that he emphasized in his later work (Kluckhohn 1951b, 1956b; Aberle 1960).

The Second World War spurred Kluckhohn's embrace of an international order founded upon cultural diversity and, as its concomitant, American culture reorganized around orchestrated heterogeneity. The

Cold War, which pitted the United States in ideological warfare with the Soviet Union, heightened the urgency that Kluckhohn felt for formulating "a good five-cent ideology" that Americans could both articulate to themselves and communicate to foreigners. Such "a positive, clearly defined national faith" seemed essential, not only to offset Communism's appeal as a secular religion but also to supersede the "competitive individualism" and outmoded "Horatio Alger economic and achievement values" that Kluckhohn ([1950] 1962: 328–31) deplored. By 1957, Kluckhohn thought that he had detected the emergence of "a 'new' set" of American values, the "most pervasive" of which was "the weakening of the Puritan ethic with its demands for exhibitionistic achievement, unbridled 'individualism,' and competition" (Kluckhohn 1958, 204). "Heterogeneity," he believed, was fast becoming "one of the organizing principles of American culture" (Kluckhohn 1958: 196–7; Morison 1958, 407).

Conclusion

At the time of his death, Kluckhohn had just begun a well-earned respite from teaching, thanks to a multiyear grant he received from the Ford Foundation in 1957. Kluckhohn looked forward to synthesizing his many years of fieldwork among the Navajo, shaping the summary volumes of the Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures Project, and preparing a new edition of *Navaho Witchcraft*. He also hoped to make some progress on two books—one on "anthropological theory," the other on "anthropological studies of modern civilizations" (Kluckhohn to Bernard Berelson, letter dated June 1, 1957 [Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn Papers, HUG 4490.6]; Parsons 1973, 36). By then, Kluckhohn had earned a well-deserved reputation as fieldworker, theorist, promoter of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary projects, and prophet of the New Anthropology.

Kluckhohn's wide-ranging interests well equipped him to represent anthropology, not only to professional colleagues in other disciplines but also to educated Americans. As a public intellectual, Kluckhohn exemplified a long and rich tradition in American anthropology stretching from his anthropological god, Franz Boas, to his student, Clifford Geertz (Stocking [1979] 1992: 92–113; Ortner 1997). Influenced more by Benedict the theorist, than by Mead the popularizer, Kluckhohn endeavored to make Americans culture-conscious. Like Benedict, he wanted to go "beyond relativity." For Benedict, going beyond relativity meant finding the social and cultural arrangements that fostered social cohesion; for Kluckhohn, it meant searching for the organizing principles of cultures. Hence his turn, after 1945, to linguistics. As a practitioner of culture and personality,

Kluckhohn was interested in discovering the personality characteristics that distinguished Americans from other peoples; as a student of values, in discovering the organizing principles that distinguished American culture from other cultures. Although Kluckhohn died before he could produce the authoritative account of the Navajo that would have constituted his legacy, he should be recalled, nonetheless, as an eloquent spokesman for anthropology's unique position in the American academy as "the most scientific of the humanities, the most humanist of the sciences" (Wolf [1964] 1974, 88).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article began as a paper presented at the symposium, "Gang of Four: Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Reo Fortune, and Margaret Mead in Multiple Contexts," at the annual meetings of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, in Kaua'i, Hawai'i, in February 2005. Quotations from the Kluckhohn Papers are reproduced courtesy of the Harvard University Archives. I am grateful to the American Philosophical Society for permission to quote from Anne Roe's interview with Clyde Kluckhohn in the Anne Roe Papers. I am also grateful to Mary Catherine Bateson and the Institute for Intercultural Studies in New York for permission to quote from Kluckhohn's correspondence with Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson in the Margaret Mead Papers at the Library of Congress. I would like to thank Gerald Sullivan, Sharon W. Tiffany, and Susan E. Gray for their comments on earlier drafts of this article.

REFERENCES

Aberle, David F.

1960 Influence of linguistics on early culture and personality theory. In *Essays in the science of culture in honor of Leslie A. White*, ed. Gertrude F. Dole and Robert L. Carneiro, 1–29. New York: Crowell.

American Philosophical Society, Anne Roe Papers

var. American Philosophical Society, Anne Roe Papers. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society Library.

Bashkow, Ira

1991 Dynamics of rapport in a colonial situation: David Schneider's fieldwork on the Islands of Yap. In *Colonial situations: Essays on the contextualization of ethnographic knowledge*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 170–242. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bauer, Raymond A., Alex Inkeles, and Clyde Kluckhohn

1956 *How the Soviet system works: Cultural, psychological, and social themes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint edition, 1960. New York: Vintage.

Benedict, Ruth Fulton
1934 *Patterns of culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
1946 *The chrysanthemum and the sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr.
1973 Clio and the culture concept: Some impressions of a changing relationship in American historiography. In *The idea of culture in the social sciences*, ed. Louis Schneider and Charles Bonjean, 77–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caffrey, Margaret M.
1989 *Ruth Benedict: Stranger in this land*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dollard, John
1935 *Criteria for the life history: With analyses of six notable documents*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Reprint edition, 1949. New York: Peter Smith.

Dumont, Louis
1980 On value. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 66:207–41.

Endleman, Robert
1949 The new anthropology and its ambitions: The science of man in messianic dress. *Commentary* 8 (October): 284–91.

Fischer, John L.
1973 Linguistic models and the study of culture: Clyde Kluckhohn's approach. In *Culture and life: Essays in memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fischer, and Evon Z. Vogt, 136–56. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Foster, George M., Thayer Scudder, Elizabeth Colson, and Robert V. Kemper, eds.
1979 *Long-term field research in social anthropology.* New York: Academic Press.

Geertz, Clifford
2002 An inconstant profession: The anthropological life in interesting times. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (October): 1–19.

Gleason, Philip
1992 *Speaking of diversity: Language and ethnicity in twentieth-century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Handler, Richard, ed.
1995 *Schneider on Schneider: The conversion of the Jews and other anthropological stories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kluckhohn papers

var. Harvard University Archives, Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn Papers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Archives.

Herskovits, Melville J.

1961 Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, January 11, 1905–July 28, 1960. *Biographical Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences* 37:129–53.

Hollinger, David A.

1996 *Science, Jews, and culture: Studies in mid-twentieth-century American intellectual history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inkeles, Alex

1973 Clyde Kluckhohn's contributions to studies of Russia and the Soviet Union. In *Culture and life: Essays in memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fischer, and Evon Z. Vogt, 58–70. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kluckhohn, Clyde

1939 The place of theory in anthropological studies. *Philosophy of Science* 6 (July): 328–44.

1940 The conceptual structure in middle American studies. In *The Maya and their neighbors*, ed. C. L. Hay, R. Linton, S. K. Lothrop, H. L. Shapiro, and G. C. Vaillant, 41–51. New York: Appleton-Century.

1941a The way of life. *Kenyon Review* 3 (Spring): 160–79.

1941b Patterning as exemplified in Navajo culture. In *Language, culture, and personality*, ed. Leslie Spier, A. Irving Hallowell, and Stanley S. Newman, 109–30. Menasha, WI: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund.

1942 Comment on *The comparative study of culture and the purposive cultivation of democratic values*, by Margaret Mead. In *Science, philosophy, and religion: Second symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson and Louis Finkelstein, 72–6. New York: Harper.

1944a Navajo witchcraft. In *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 22, no. 2. Reprint edition, 1989. Boston: Beacon Press.

1944b The influence of psychiatry on anthropology in America during the past one hundred years. In *One hundred years of American psychiatry*, ed. James K. Hall, Gregory Zilboorg, and Henry A. Bunker, 597–605. New York: Columbia University Press.

1944c Anthropological research and world peace. In *Approaches to world peace: Fourth symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, 143–52. New York: Harper.

1945a Group tensions: Analysis of a case history. In *Approaches to national unity: Fifth symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, 222–31. New York: Harper.

1945b Comment on *Theses on group tensions*, by Pitirim Sorokin. In *Approaches to national unity: Fifth symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, 215–17. New York: Harper.

1945c Comment on *Some requisites for better understanding between the East and West*, by Taraknath Das. In *Approaches to national unity: Fifth symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, 297–300. New York: Harper.

1945d Comment on *The problem of communication between cultures seen as integrated wholes*, by Carl J. Friedrich. In *Approaches to national unity: Fifth symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, 628–34. New York: Harper.

1945e The personal document in anthropological science. In *The personal document in history, anthropology, and sociology*, 79–173, ed. Louis Gottschalk, Clyde Kluckhohn, and Robert Angell. New York: Social Science Research Council.

1948 An anthropologist looks at psychology. *American Psychologist* 3 (October): 439–42.

1949a *Mirror for man: The relation of anthropology to modern life*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Reprint edition, 1985. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

1949b The Ramah Project. In *Gregorio, the hand trembler*, ed. Alexander H. Leighton and Dorothea Leighton, v–x. In *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 40, no. 1.

1949c Remarks. In *Ruth Fulton Benedict: A* Memorial, 18–9. New York: Viking Fund.

1949d Russian research at Harvard. *World Politics* 1 (January): 267–71.

1950 Mid-century manners and morals. In *Twentieth century unlimited*, ed. Bruce Bliven, 303–15. New York: Lippincott. Reprinted in *Culture and behavior: Collected essays of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Richard Kluckhohn, 323–35. New York: Free Press, 1962.

1951a Review of *The nature of natural history*, by Marston Bates. *American Anthropologist* 53 (January): 121–2.

1951b An anthropological approach to the study of values. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 4 (March): 2–3.

1951c Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In *Toward a general theory of action: Theoretical foundations for the social sciences*, ed. Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, 388–433. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint edition, 1962. New York: Harper.

1954a Culture and behavior. In *Handbook of social psychology*, ed. Gardner Lindzey, 921–76. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

1954b Southwestern studies of culture and personality. *American Anthropologist* 56 (August): 685–97.

1955 Anthropology. In *What is science?* ed. James R. Newman, 319–57. New York: Simon and Schuster.

1956a The impact of Freud on anthropology. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 32 (December): 903–7.

1956b Toward a comparison of value-emphases in different cultures. In *The state of the social sciences*, ed. Leonard D. White, 116–32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1958 Have there been discernible shifts in American values during the past generation? In *The American style: Essays in value and performance*, ed. Elting E. Morison, 145–217. New York: Harper.

1964 Covert or Implicit Culture. In *A dictionary of the social sciences*, ed. Julius Gould and William L. Kolb, 145–6. New York: Free Press.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Dorothea Leighton
1946 *The Navajo*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and William Morgan
1951 Some notes on Navajo dreams. In *Psychoanalysis and culture: Essays in honor of Géza Róheim*, eds. G. B. Wilbur and Warner Muensterberger, 120–31. New York: International Universities Press. Reprinted in *Culture and behavior: Collected essays of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Richard Kluckhohn, 350–63. New York: Free Press.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and O. Hobart Mowrer
1944 "Culture and personality": A conceptual scheme. *American Anthropologist* 46 (January): 1–29.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Henry A. Murray, eds.
1948 *Personality in nature, society, and culture*. New York: Knopf.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Leland Wyman
1940 *An introduction to Navajo chant practice with an account of the behaviors observed in four chants*. Menasha, WI: American Anthropological Association.

Kroeber, Theodora
1970 *Alfred Kroeber: A personal configuration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kroeber, Alfred, and Clyde Kluckhohn
1952 Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions. In *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 47, no. 1.

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe
1989 *Politics of knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, philanthropy, and public policy*. Boston: University Press of New England. Reprint edition, 1992. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamphere, Louise, and Evon Z. Vogt
1973 Clyde Kluckhohn as ethnographer and student of Navajo ceremonialism. In *Culture and life: Essays in memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fischer, and Evon Z. Vogt, 94–135. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Leighton, Dorothea, and Clyde Kluckhohn
1947 *Children of the people*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Library of Congress, Margaret Mead Papers
var. The Margaret Mead papers and South Pacific ethnographic archives. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division.

Luce, Henry
1941 The American century. *Life Magazine* (February 17).

McGreevy, John T.
2003 *Catholicism and American freedom.* New York: Norton.

Mead, Margaret
1939 *From the South Seas: Studies of adolescence and sex in primitive societies*. New York: William Morrow.
1942 Comparative study of culture and the purposive cultivation of democratic values. In *Science, philosophy, and religion: Second symposium*, ed. Lyman Bryson and Louis Finkelstein, 56–69. New York: Harper.

Mead, Margaret, and Rhoda Métraux, eds.
1953 *The study of culture at a distance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mishkin, Bernard
1949 Science on the March. *New York Times Book Review* January 30:15.

Morison, Elting E., ed.
1958 *The American style: Essays in value and performance*. New York: Harper.

Mowrer, O. Hobart, and Clyde Kluckhohn
1944 Dynamic Theory of Personality. In *Personality and the behavioral disorders*, ed. Joseph McV. Hunt, 69–135. New York: Ronald Press.

Ortner, Sherry B., ed.
1997 The fate of "culture": Geertz and beyond. *Representations* 59 (Summer): 1–162.

Parsons, Talcott
1949 Toward a common language for the area of applied science. In *Essays in sociological theory, pure and applied*, 42–51. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
1973 Clyde Kluckhohn and the integration of social science. In *Culture and life: Essays in memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, ed. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fischer, and Evon Z. Vogt, 30–57. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Powers, Willow Roberts
1997 *The Harvard five cultures values study and post war anthropology*. Ph.D. diss., University of New Mexico.

Pye, Lucian W.
1973 Culture and political science: Problems in the evaluation of the concept of political culture. In *The idea of culture in the social sciences*, ed. Louis Schneider and Charles Bonjean, 65–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Forrest G.
1992 *Love's story told: A life of Henry A. Murray*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sahlins, Marshall
1984 Views of a culture heroine. *New York Times Book Review* August 26:1, 20–1.

Sapir, Edward
1927 The unconscious patterning of behavior in society. In *The unconscious: A symposium*, ed. Ethel S. Dummer, 114–42. New York: Knopf.

Schachter, Judith
2009 Writing lives: Ruth Benedict's journey from biographical studies to anthropology. In *Gang of four: Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Reo Fortune, and Margaret Mead in multiple contexts*, ed. Gerald Sullivan and Sharon Tiffany, special issue, *Pacific Studies* 32 (2–3): 348–66.

Spuhler, James N., and Clyde Kluckhohn
1953 Inbreeding coefficients of the Ramah Navajo population. *Human Biology* 25 (December): 295–317.

Stocking, George W., Jr.
1979 Anthropology as *Kulturkampf*: Science and politics in the career of Franz Boas. In *The ethnographer's magic and other essays in the history of anthropology*, 92–113. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

Stocking, George W., Jr., ed.
1996 Schneider on Kluckhohn, 1964: Myth and memory, the oral and the written, historical retrospect and self-representation in the historiography of modern American and British anthropology. *History of Anthropology Newsletter* 23 (2): 7–14.

Tannenbaum, Nicola B.
2009 Ruth Benedict and the study of Thai culture. In *Gang of four: Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Reo Fortune, and Margaret Mead in multiple contexts*, ed. Gerald Sullivan and Sharon Tiffany, special issue, *Pacific Studies* 32 (2–3): 367–91.

Vogt, Evon Z., and Ethel M. Albert
1966 *People of Rimrock: A study of values in five cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint edition, 1970. New York: Atheneum.

Weinstein, Deborah F.
2004 Culture at work: Family therapy and the culture concept in post-World War II America. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 40 (Winter): 23–46.

Witherspoon, Gary
1975 *Navajo kinship and marriage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf, Eric R.
1964 *Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Reprint edition, 1974. New York: Norton.

Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia
1986 Science, democracy, and ethics: Mobilizing culture and personality for World War II. In *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others: Essays on culture and personality*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 184–217. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Young, Virginia Heyer
2005 *Ruth Benedict: Beyond relativity, beyond pattern*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.