

SAMUEL ALFRED BARRETT

1879 - 1965

David W. Peri and Robert W. Wharton
University of California, Berkeley

During the midafternoon of Tuesday, March 9, 1965 at Santa Rosa, California, after making a brilliant recovery from a fractured hip some two months earlier, Samuel A. Barrett suffered a series of cerebral hemorrhages. He died at 9:55 that same evening at the age of eighty-six.

Samuel Alfred Barrett was born on November 12, 1879 in Conway, Arkansas. His parents were Lillian Mary Stryker and Samuel Eliphlet Barrett, both from New York. In 1888 the family moved from Waterville, Kansas to Los Berros, California. Here Mr. Barrett formed the company of Barrett and Lewis General Merchandise. Dr. Barrett's brother, and the only other child of Samuel and Lillian, Theodore Roy, was born at Los Berros on January 10, 1890. Following four years' residence in Los Berros the family moved to the Indian Territory of Oklahoma. They settled at Ocarche where his father again opened a general store. At thirteen young Samuel had his first contact with American Indians, the Cheyenne and the Arapaho. Later he witnessed an Arapaho Sun Dance.

In 1893 Barrett accompanied his father to the World Columbian Exposition in Chicago. While at the Exposition, Barrett, at 14, was introduced to Frederic Ward Putnam and Franz Boas. Later he was associated with both Putnam and Boas. Putnam was the Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley, where Barrett received his Ph.D., and Boas was one of his professors at Columbia University.

The family moved from Ocarche to Calpella, California. It was here that Samuel Barrett began in earnest his anthropological career with the Pomo. After a year's stay they moved a few miles south to Ukiah and again his father opened a general store. Most merchants discouraged the patronage of the Indians as they felt it would antagonize their white clientele. The Barretts, however, encouraged Indian patronage, and went so far as to build an arbor with tables for the Pomo to eat their lunch while in town shopping. Barrett remarked that his father's store had periodic runs on canned salmon when the Indians were in town.

Barrett often reminisced about his youthful experiences with the Indians while in Ukiah. The wages he received from working in his father's store he used to collect baskets and other ethnographic material. He often went into debt with his father when his buying activities far exceeded his allowance. He bought, traded, and sold baskets utilizing every opportunity to improve his collection. On his days off he hitched up his team and visited local rancherias, expanding his collection and gathering ethnographic data. Since the local railroad stopped in Ukiah, Barrett capitalized on the tourist trade, selling baskets. He also became a buyer for an Eastern store which had added baskets to its line of merchandise. With the profits he realized from the tourist trade he payed off his father and increased his wholesale activities.

While his early interest in native materials led him to daily contact with the Pomo through their patronage of his father's general store, he was simultaneously developing interests and skills which would benefit him in his later career.

His other fields of interest ranged from collecting and classifying bird's eggs, to taxidermy, animal keeping, and photography. One of Barrett's trademarks was the camera. On his collecting trips as a boy, and all through his professional career his camera was standard equipment. Barrett progressed from the early box camera to the very latest in 16 mm. motion picture cameras; from taking still pictures to producing motion pictures. He was later to direct American Indian Films. The majority of his ethnographic publications always included a series of photographic plates.

Barrett graduated from the Ukiah Grammar School in 1895 and from the Ukiah High School in 1899. His entrance into the University of California at Berkeley in 1900 heralded the beginning of his formal training. Barrett entered the University desiring to pursue his study of aboriginal peoples; however, the Department of Anthropology was yet to be created. His first academic major was mining engineering and later chemistry. With the formation of the Department of Anthropology in 1902, Barrett transferred and studied under Pliny Earle Goddard, John Campbell Merriam, and Alfred Louis Kroeber. His courses in anthropology as an undergraduate included: General Introduction to Anthropology, North American Ethnology, Athapascans of the Pacific Coast, North American Archaeology, North American Languages, Geological History of Man, and Experimental Phonetics. As a graduate student: Advanced Work in Primitive Languages and Advanced Work in Ethnology.

As an undergraduate he was appointed Levi Strauss Scholar for 1903-1904 and again for 1904-1905. In 1905 he received the degree Bachelor of Science. As a graduate student he was appointed Le Conte Memorial Fellow and Goeway Scholar for 1905-1906, and museum assistant in the Department of Anthropology for 1906-1907. Barrett was the first academically trained museum associate in the department's newly organized museum. He received the Master of Science degree in 1906, his thesis being the Ethno-Geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians.

In 1907-1908 Barrett attended Columbia University where he studied under Franz Boas, Adolph Bandelier, Berthold Laufer, and Livingston Farrand. Under Boas his courses included American Languages, Advanced American Languages, The Negro Question, and Ethnography of America and Siberia. Other courses included Early Spanish Sources of American Ethnography, Bandelier; Archaeology of Peru, Bandelier; Ethnology: Primitive Culture, Farrand; General Anthropology, Farrand; and Archaeology and Ethnology of China with special reference to Farther India and Central Asia, Laufer. The courses taught by Boas and attended by Barrett were small enough that they were often held in Boas's office. Of his courses at California, Barrett often found himself the only student and more often than not the course was conducted by the professor over lunch or dinner at an oyster house on Eddy Street in San Francisco--Kroeber was that professor.

Barrett returned to Berkeley where he was awarded the degree Doctor of Philosophy in May, 1908 with his dissertation Pomo Indian Basketry. He

was the first graduate student in anthropology at Berkeley to receive his doctorate, the first awarded in anthropology west of the Atlantic seaboard.

Shortly after receiving his doctorate, Barrett, in June of 1908, signed a contract with Marshall H. Saville. He served as ethnologist of the George G. Heye Expedition for the year 1908-1909 engaging in ethnological and linguistic research among the Cayapa Indians of Ecuador. It was during his work with the Cayapa that Barrett contracted Blackwater fever and subsequently acquired his second trademark--his white hair.

While in Ecuador, at the suggestion of A. L. Kroeber, Barrett was offered the position of Curator of Anthropology by Henry L. Ward, Director of the Milwaukee Public Museum. Barrett's duties were to include the organization of the department, display of specimens, and the expansion of the museum's ethnological collection. His salary was \$2000 per year. Ward wrote of the position: "It affords a great and glorious opportunity for the dissemination of anthropological knowledge among the masses and for some little time will also afford a considerable amount of good hard work but ultimately I hope and expect that it would also offer a fair amount of time for investigation and field work, although of this latter it can never hope to offer the facilities that some of the larger museums have."¹

Of the position Kroeber wrote to Barrett in Ecuador: "I think the chance an excellent one. Milwaukee is hardly the place that one should pick out as an anthropological center of promise, and yet they have plenty of money, which after all is the main thing. One could do more there with ample funds than at Harvard without any."² In a later communication to Barrett, Kroeber wrote: "As I may have told you, I look upon this opening as so good that I seriously considered recommending myself for it,³ and if it had not been for my many connections here, might have done so."³

Barrett was Curator of Anthropology from 1909 to 1920. He subsequently became the director and held the position until 1940.

Barrett found his new responsibility difficult--there was much to do and little to do it with. As McKern (1965:115) aptly pointed out; "The situation at Milwaukee was one that offered a minimum of opportunity and a maximum of challenge. The Museum at that time was, at best, a third-rate institution of its kind. . . ." This was not to remain the situation for long. In thirty years Barrett transformed the museum from a "third-rate" institution to one of the nation's leading museums, a "museum from the lowlands of the past to the present aspiring hillside" (McKern 1965:114). The history of the Milwaukee Public Museum under the leadership of Samuel A. Barrett is a history of expansion and innovation. While director, Barrett organized and led the famous Cudahy-Massee-Milwaukee Museum African Expedition of 1928-1929. The expedition had as its primary objective the collection of African wildlife for building museum groups. Enough materials were gathered for the construction of forty-four mammal, thirty-seven bird, and ten ethnological groups. Barrett had as his slogan, "Bring 'em back and make 'em look alive."

On August 15, 1912 Barrett married Eileen Cecilia Bray of Milwaukee. No children were born to the Barretts; however, Samuel Barrett adopted Carl Fellons, his wife's son by a former marriage. His name was subsequently

changed to Charles Theodore Barrett. Samuel Barrett was devoted to his wife and son all during their lifetimes. In 1917 they suffered a great loss when their only son was struck down by a taxicab in Milwaukee and died at the age of eleven. The Barretts never fully recovered from the shock.

The association with the Milwaukee Public Museum expanded Barrett's horizons to include not only the activities of the museum and other North American Indian groups but an interest in the direction of civic affairs.

On June 17, 1936 Marquette University awarded Barrett a certificate for "distinctive civic service, far reaching and beneficent in its effect on the community and helpful in building up a constructive community program." Barrett was one of the founders and president for several years of the Milwaukee Government Service League. On December 7, 1939 the League paid tribute to Samuel A. Barrett for a "Quarter Century of Service." They wrote of him:

He has become more than a public personality--he has become an institution in Milwaukee. . . . By virtue of his knowledge, his personality and his leadership, he has transformed what is ordinarily a mausoleum of specimens into a living, teaching instrument of the great sciences in which he is learned.⁴

The honor which pleased Barrett the most was the resolution passed by the League. It read:

. . .the trustees and officers of the League be authorized and directed to establish the "Samuel Alfred Barrett Award" to be granted each year to a senior student from each of the Milwaukee High Schools, and resolved further, that in addition to an individual personal award a suitable plaque be erected in a public place listing the recipients of the annual award for excellence in student leadership, knowledge of local civic affairs and participation in community undertaking, . . .

In 1939, on the recommendation of the Executive Faculty of the Medical School at Marquette University, Barrett was appointed Professorial Lecturer in Medical Anthropology.

Due to his wife's ill health Barrett resigned as Director of the Milwaukee Public Museum on January 1, 1940 after twenty years of service. On December 21, 1939 he was appointed to the honorary post of Director Emeritus, the first director to be awarded this honor.

The Barretts traveled to Florida where they built a small house at New Port Richey. It was here in May of 1940, at the suggestion of A. L. Kroeber, that George Creel, United States Commissioner of the Golden Gate International Exposition offered Barrett the directorship of the Indian Exhibit on Treasure Island, San Francisco, California. Barrett accepted and by all standards the exhibit far exceeded everyone's anticipations for its success.

A. L. Kroeber was director of the Far Eastern Section of the Army Specialized Training Program, located on the Berkeley campus. In September of 1943 he suffered a heart attack which necessitated several months of rest. At Kroeber's request, Barrett became the associate director, and remained with the program until December of 1944.

With the end of the Army Specialized Training Program, the Barretts spent their time in traveling to and from Florida, Wisconsin, and California. Barrett utilized his time in writing and editing much of the ethnographic material that he had collected earlier. During this period his wife's health became increasingly worse and they abandoned their vagabond activities and settled in Sonoma, California. Mrs. Barrett's illness was diagnosed as cancer and it was here that Barrett suffered his worst tragedy. Eileen Barrett died on June 11, 1953 after forty-one years of marriage.

In 1953 A. L. Kroeber asked Barrett to participate in research which Kroeber had begun some years earlier. It was Kroeber's thought to collate all the anthropological and other data as well into a series of monographs on the Indians of northwestern California. On August 26, 1953 Barrett was appointed Research Associate of the Museum of Anthropology, a position which he occupied until his death.

Barrett decided that his wife's death might have been prevented or at least forestalled if more was known about the early symptoms and characteristics of cancer. To this end he brought to bear all his energy on the problems of breast cancer. From July 1953 to June of 1957 in collaboration with John M. Kenney, M.D., he researched and developed tactile models used for teaching the diagnosis of breast cancer. In these efforts Barrett and Kenney were supported by the American Cancer Society.

As the cancer project drew to a successful close, Barrett felt that he could now resume his research with Kroeber on the Indians of northwestern California. Their research included the use of Kroeber's unpublished material, a survey and synthesis of the relevant anthropological literature, field work by Barrett, and to a large extent the collections of the R. H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology. Their first joint monograph, Fishing Among the Indians of Northwestern California, was issued in 1960 as volume 21, number 1, in the University of California's series, Anthropological Records.

In July of 1954 Barrett was called upon to testify as an "expert" witness on behalf of the California Indians. Before the Indian Claims Commission, Barrett testified as to land use and occupancy by certain California Indian tribes. Eleven different publications by Barrett were admitted as evidence in support of his arguments.

Of the many activities that involved Barrett at the Berkeley campus, the one that pleased him the most was the illustrated lectures he gave on the Cayapa Indians of Ecuador to Professor John Howland Rowe's Anthropology 105b (South American Indians) class.

The period between 1953 and 1957 found Barrett doing independent field work among the Hupa, Yurok, and Karok in connection with Kroeber and his research. He later extended his field activities to include many of the central California tribes. As a result, he and Kroeber were led to the realization that there remained sufficient traditional culture to warrant its documentation. From Barrett's point of view there was only one way that this could be documented effectively. Barrett and Kroeber discussed the idea of motion pictures and mutually agreed that it was worth a try. Barrett returned to the field with his camera, and succeeded in recording those activities he

found extant. This first venture led to the establishment of American Indian Films. This was to be the final major research undertaken by both Kroeber and Barrett.

Throughout Barrett's career he remained active in professional organizations. He held membership in the following: American Anthropological Association, American Ethnological Society, American Folk Lore Society, American Association of Museums, Mid-West Museums Conference, Wisconsin Academy of Science, Wisconsin Historical Society, President of the Wisconsin Archaeological Society, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, and a Fellow of the Society for American Archeology.

Among the many honors and distinctions conferred upon Barrett was the honorary degree Doctor of Science by Lawrence College in 1929 for his "researches in anthropology and skilled management of a great museum," and honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa. On March 15, 1926 Barrett was awarded the Lapham Medal by the Wisconsin Archeological Society for "distinguished service in anthropological research." The Society further honored him in 1953 by awarding him the Pioneer Certificate "in appreciation of sustained interest and efforts in promoting the study and preservation of Indian antiquities in Wisconsin." He was also a member of Sigma Xi and Pi-Gamma Mu.

Samuel Alfred Barrett's death terminated a career of seventy-one years which began at the age of fifteen. His death was more than the loss of a distinguished anthropologist, it was the loss of a dear friend and colleague to all of those who knew him. Although ethnography and museology were the core of Barrett's interest, he ranged over a variety of other fields. There was no area, no interest and no activity that was not grist for the Barrett mill.

Throughout Barrett's career he was driven by a compulsion to preserve the rapidly vanishing culture of the American Indians. In his later years he became frustrated by his advancing age and the many new problems he perceived. It was this compulsion, this frustration and his commitment of long standing to the ideals and philosophies of his science that renewed his strength and gave him the desire to endure, sometimes against overwhelming obstacles. Barrett's compulsion toward the preservation of aboriginal life was not preservation for its own sake, but for a larger and more meaningful objective. It was to provide the empirical data necessary for the development of theory and the general advancement of knowledge. It was further, to provide the important and necessary orientation for future students of culture and the subsequent advancement of his discipline. To these ends Barrett's career was devoted.

It is difficult to estimate the impact made upon Barrett by A. L. Kroeber and Franz Boas. The results, however, were profound and were to remain with Barrett throughout his professional career. Barrett received his training when American anthropology was essentially under the domination, or at least profoundly influenced by Boas. As Barrett's professor, Kroeber, who also received his training under Boas, followed many of the precepts that Boas advocated, though he differed in several respects. As a graduate student, Barrett came under the direct influence of Boas when he attended

Columbia University. Boas stressed the primacy of direct firsthand information and the importance of observed fact over theory. "As a matter of principle, Boas came to insist more and more on the thoroughgoing description of all cultural data as the sole warrantable scientific attitude. House types, basketry, social structure, beliefs and tales must all be registered faithfully and with the fullest detail possible" (Lowie 1937:131). One has only to glance over the table of contents of Barrett's monographs and his list of publications and later, ethnographic films, to readily see the impact of Boas on Barrett. Like Boas, Barrett must be understood first of all as a field worker. Nowhere did Barrett attempt to summarize his views on culture or the cultures with which he worked. "On the one hand, our duty is to gather the raw facts before they disappear; on the other hand, when can one be sure of having all the data that would warrant definitive interpretation?" (Lowie 1937:152). It was to this philosophy that Barrett committed himself.

Boas was also characterized as, "a practical administrator, a theorist on the functions of museums, an organizer of expeditions and of publication series" (Lowie 1937:130). One has only to review Barrett's association with the Milwaukee Public Museum to find parallels, though of a lesser magnitude. Barrett was not only a practical and efficient administrator as Curator of Anthropology, but also as Director of the Museum. He brought new ideas regarding the scope and purpose of museums, innovated changes in its techniques and theories of exhibition; and organized and led numerous expeditions. He was, further, influential in initiating the Museum's Bulletin series as its primary source of publication and instigated the Year Book series of the museum.

While the study of material culture and museology are areas which held particular interest for Barrett, they in no way represent either the range or depth of his interest. Barrett was a field anthropologist who, in the tradition of his discipline, utilized direct firsthand information which formed the basis of his contributions to knowledge. It might be said that Samuel A. Barrett and others like him provided the foundations upon which modern anthropology is built.

Contributions to the Ethnography of North America

Barrett's contributions are by no means solely reflected in his published writings and motion pictures. He also contributed significantly by his extensive field collections for research and exhibition.

Samuel Barrett was most noted for his contributions to the ethnography of California and primarily the Pomo. From 1903 to 1907 he engaged in systematic field work and collecting among the Pomo, Miwok, Maidu, Yokuts, Yuki, and Wintun for the Department of Anthropology under the sponsorship of Mrs. Phoebe Apperson Hearst. From 1894 to 1949, Barrett consulted some 703 Pomo informants each for varying lengths of time and on various aspects of Pomo culture. His first major published work was his masters thesis The Ethno-Geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians. He set as his problem the discovery of boundaries, both territorial and linguistic of the Pomo and their neighbors. His secondary problem was an exploration of the linguistic relationships between the seven Pomo groups, and those geographically related to them.

His doctoral dissertation in 1908 and second major publication was Pomo Indian Basketry. Although Barrett had collected information earlier regarding Pomo basketry it was not until 1904 that he began to systematically record data for his dissertation. Barrett concentrated his field work among the Northern, Central and Eastern Pomo. He set as his problem the materials, techniques, forms, and ornamentations. The various designs, their patterns and arrangement and the terms used to describe these were of special interest to him. In order to accomplish this he took into the field eight hundred and forty patterns depicted on photographs of three hundred and twenty-one baskets. He also utilized the baskets he found in the possession of his informants. Barrett's monograph on Pomo basketry is still the most definitive study yet undertaken.

A third major work was Pomo Myths published in 1933. Field work was conducted primarily between 1903 and 1906 while at the University of California and again in 1914 and 1915 for the Milwaukee Public Museum. Barrett collected an extensive series of myths--some 108--from the Central, Northern, and Eastern Pomo. The myths were taken as free translations where his informants had command of English, or through an interpreter. Others were recorded in text with inter-linear and free translations. Only the free translations were subsequently published, however, Barrett strived to maintain the integrity of each myth. Barrett's monograph, however, was more than a mere compilation of myths. He characterized and classified myths, in addition to discussing the Pomo mythological system and religious concepts. He also discussed the use of numbers, provided a catchword guide, Pomo-English, English-Pomo glossary, and an all inclusive index. These additions facilitated the further use of the study. Pomo Myths, in addition to providing primary data and comparisons with other Central California groups, also served to corroborate Kroeber's regional division of California mythology into a north central and south central group. Barrett also concluded that the master creator, Madumda, and Coyote were one and the same being. Pomo Myths remains today the most definitive study yet undertaken in its field among the Pomo. It is also the most extensive work of its kind among any California Indian group.

Barrett's last published contribution to the ethnography of the Pomo was his two volume work Material Aspects of Pomo Culture published in 1952. Field work for these two volumes was carried on sporadically between 1894 to 1900, 1903 to 1907, 1914, 1915, and 1948 and 1949. Barrett's objective was a descriptive inventory of Pomo material culture. He also incorporated data on various ceremonies, and life cycle material as well as an account of the Bloody Island Massacre. He utilized the knowledge of more than 98 informants from all of the Pomo divisions. He concentrated on the Pomo residing in the southern part of the Clear Lake region since there existed various specialized cultural features based upon the lake environment.

While still on the Berkeley campus, Barrett collected material and conducted research among the Sierra Miwok. It was here that he collected the majority of his data for his and E. W. Gifford's joint monograph: Miwok Material Culture, published in 1933. Their monograph is essentially an inventory of the material culture of the Sierra Miwok. They also attempted to define, though briefly, the cultural position of this group in relation to other Central Californian groups.

Barrett's appointment as Curator of Anthropology at the Milwaukee Public Museum in 1909 took him from California and he became involved with other concerns and other American Indians. One of Barrett's responsibilities was to build the museum's ethnological collection and he was subsequently sent into the field on numerous occasions. He utilized this opportunity not only to collect but to observe and record as much data as time and circumstances allowed. Barrett was never satisfied with simply collecting but tried to combine this with actual observational recording of cultural data when the opportunity afforded itself. One of Barrett's first assignments was with the Chippewa and Menominee Indians of Northern Wisconsin.

The object particularly in view upon this occasion was the collecting of ethnological material for the museum, together with all possible data concerning the life and culture of the peoples visited. Fortunately, during this time the opportunity came to witness the so-called dream dance among both the Chippewa and the Menominee.

Also much information was obtained concerning other phases of the ceremonial life of these people, embracing the medicine lodge, the ceremonial games, the ceremonial feasts, and the smoking customs (Barrett 1911: 253).

This assignment was Barrett's second experience outside of California and resulted in his first publication (The Dream Dance of the Chippewa and Menominee Indians of Northern Wisconsin) dealing with other than the California Indians.

In 1911 Barrett spent six months for the Milwaukee Public Museum with the Hopi primarily at Mishongnovi though visiting the other villages at intervals. Barrett's material and information were utilized in the preparation of museum groups. Barrett used this opportunity to collect botanical, geological, and zoological material as well. He was taken into the Snake and Antelope Kivas where he witnessed and recorded various rituals. He also observed and photographed the Snake Dance. Barrett was affectionately known to the Hopi as "goat whiskers" because of his white goatee. The majority of his Hopi material he never found time to publish and still remains in manuscript form. Only one short article, An Observation On Hopi Child Burial, was published in the American Anthropologist.

Barrett spent the winter and spring of 1914-1915 among the Kwakiutl of Alert Bay, Port Hardy, Fort Rupert, and among adjacent tribes. It was here that Barrett assembled the Milwaukee Museum's extensive Northwest Coast collection. The collection of masks assembled by Barrett was one of the most representative of its kind. While in Victoria, B.C., he met Dr. Newcombe, from whom he purchased the Haida totem pole which later stood in front of the Milwaukee Public Museum.

After forty-seven years, Barrett again returned to the Kwakiutl, this time as director of American Indian Films. He made extensive film recordings of Kwakiutl ceremonies and technologies. As part of the results of the field work two films were produced: THE WOODEN BOX MADE BY STEAMING AND BENDING and THE TOTEM POLE.

It was in the summer of 1915 that he worked among the Paiute and Washo of California and Nevada again collecting specimens and data for the construction of the museum's ethnological group-building program. The Paiute and the Washo were selected as representative of the Great Basin Culture Area. It was Barrett's practice to first of all observe, wherever possible, the manufacture and use of various items before collecting them. Therefore, he remained in the field until he had secured enough data and collected enough specimens and in so doing familiarizing himself with the culture. It was then that Barrett sent for the museum's artist and together they made a small scale model of the later life-size group. Barrett then brought in his informants who commented upon the accuracy of the model. Changes were made until the model met with the approval of all his informants. One of the results of this field work was Barrett's paper, The Washo Indians, published in 1917. Dr. Warren L. d'Azevedo has remarked (1963:6) that Barrett's monograph on the Washo "was the first major study of this culture by a professional anthropologist." Forty-five years later Barrett recorded, on film, material for the motion picture PINE NUTS: A FOOD OF THE PAIUTE AND WASHO INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA.

In the summer of 1921 Barrett and the museum's artist, George Peter, worked with the Blackfoot at Browning, Montana. On this occasion Barrett was particularly interested in gathering data for a reconstruction in the museum of the buffalo drive, or "piskun." Barrett also collected medicine bundles and related ceremonial paraphernalia. While among the Blackfoot he made a special study of their sweat lodge, the "iniskim" or buffalo bundle, and ceremonial lodges. Brief accounts on his research were subsequently published in three articles in the museum's year book of 1921. Forty-one years later, in the summer of 1962, Barrett returned to the Blackfoot where he made extensive film recordings of their ceremonies and general daily activities.

Barrett's last major work and consequently his final published contribution to the ethnography of California was his and A. L. Kroeber's Fishing Among the Indians of Northwestern California. The monograph undertakes a definitive description of the various practices related to the taking of fish, shell fish and sea mammals. Harold E. Driver, in review of the work (1960: 1079) remarked:

This reviewer will venture a prediction that Kroeber's and Barrett's descriptive study of fishing will be regarded as a more valuable item of anthropological bibliography a century or half century hence than most contemporary theoretically orientated works of comparable size. Theory can become outdated, but the primary evidence on which valid generalizations must be based will always be timeless. The authors are to be congratulated for producing an outstanding comparative work that will be a model for some time to come.

Archaeology

Though Barrett is most noted for his ethnographic research, he however contributed significantly to the archaeology of Wisconsin. He also undertook, to a limited extent, archaeological investigations in California and the southwestern United States. His first archaeological experience while a student at the University of California was the excavation of a

burial site on Putah Creek near Winters, California in 1905. Barrett's second experience was excavating as well as supervising the excavating at the Emeryville shell mound from May to June 1906.

In addition to Barrett's curatorial responsibilities and ethnographic researches, he figured prominently in the archaeology of Wisconsin. As McKern has pointed out (1965:115):

. . . his major efforts in the field were directed towards starting a new chapter of archaeological research in Wisconsin. The technical methods which he introduced in this work were superior to any employed at that time west of Ohio and north of the Southwest's pueblo area. It was primarily due to Barrett's archaeological efforts in Wisconsin that professional interest in neighboring areas was stimulated, resulting in initial or intensified archaeological programs evolving in Michigan, Illinois, Iowa and Minnesota.

Barrett's first published monograph on Wisconsin archaeology, with E. W. Hawkes, was The Kratz Creek Mound Group, published in 1919. In the summer of 1917 Barrett made a preliminary survey of sites located on the shores of Buffalo Lake, Marquette County, Wisconsin. Two sites were selected for work; however, only one, the Kratz Creek site, was excavated. Barrett, E. W. Hawkes, and two others undertook the excavation. From their data, Barrett and Hawkes concluded that at least two cultures were indicated and three types of mounds were present: conical, linear, and effigy. They also noted several methods of construction. Conicals, though consistent in form, varied according to their construction and use. Linear mounds were relatively few, and unimportant. The effigy was found to be most important and occurred in several types. Certain mounds were found to be used as special repository and crematory altars. Excavation indicated the presence of several types of sacrifice, including the possibility of human sacrifice.

Barrett is most noted for his monumental study of Astalan located in Jefferson County, Wisconsin. Astalan has been described as one of the largest and most famous archaeological site in Wisconsin and the northernmost extension of middle Mississippian culture. The most striking features of the site are its large earthen pyramids and the construction of sizable stockaded villages. The builders of Astalan, who have been characterized as intruders, established permanent villages, were sedentary agriculturists, and practiced cannibalism. The site was first reported in 1836 by Judge N. F. Hyer, who described it briefly, in addition to mapping it. His data was made available a year later in the form of a newspaper article. Hyer mistakenly attributed the building of Astalan to the Aztecs of Mexico, hence its name. It wasn't until 1850 that Increase A. Lapham with some degree of accuracy surveyed and described the site. His findings were made available in 1855 in his Antiquities of Wisconsin, published in volume seven of the Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. The first scientific and the most comprehensive excavation of the site was undertaken by Samuel A. Barrett. The first survey and excavating began on July 10, 1919 and continued through September 30 of that year. Further excavations were conducted from June until September of 1920. Barrett conducted a short and final session from June to July, 1932.

It wasn't until late in the first field session that one of the most striking features of the site was excavated: the stockaded nature of the

enclosure. One of the many conclusions at which Barrett arrived was the evidence of nonceremonial cannibalism based on the recovery of skulls, indicating they had been fractured for the brains; long bones cracked for the marrow and dismembered arms and legs. The human bones recovered were associated with animal and fish bones in refuse pits. On the basis of the inventory of material culture, Barrett concluded Astalans' relationship with the middle Mississippian culture.

Barrett's findings were painstakingly described in his monumental study of some 500 pages, Ancient Astalan, published in 1933. The study was locally known and referred to as "Barrett's Bible."

South American Ethnography

One of Barrett's most important field experiences as a professional anthropologist took place in 1908-1909. Hired as an ethnologist by Marshall H. Saville for George G. Heye, Barrett undertook field research among the Cayapa Indians of Ecuador. The focus of his study was linguistic and ethnological reporting. It was on this expedition that he made full use of photographic recording to augment his other field techniques.

While the purpose of Barrett's expedition was to determine the source of gold and platinum objects unearthed by Saville, he quickly learned that any inquiry into this subject would lead to his immediate and forcible expulsion from the Rio Cayapa region. He, however, proceeded with the task of an ethnological and linguistic investigation, the results of which were published in 1925 as a two volume work in the Museum of the American Indian series, Indian Notes and Monographs, No. 40, The Cayapa Indians of Ecuador. Though of lesser importance, Barrett published, in 1909, a short article on the Cayapa numeral system for the Frederic Ward Putnam anniversary volume. Barrett's research among the Cayapa is the first ethnological account by an American trained anthropologist of any South American Indian group.

The Museum Years

Barrett's position as museum assistant in the Department of Anthropology for 1906-1907 can be perceived as the preface for his years as the Director of the Milwaukee Public Museum. To attempt to isolate one or several factors which would explain Barrett's rise from Curator of Anthropology in what was then a third rate municipal museum, to the Directorship and establishment of one of the foremost municipal museums, would be impossible if not facetious. Examination of the Barrett, Milwaukee Public Museum years reveals much about the individual and the mechanisms he employed.

Barrett's personality is a factor which cannot be held in abeyance without lending severe distortion to these years. Successful mastery and meaningful contribution to any endeavor cannot be attained by passive examination or interest. The dynamics that this man possessed were both his weakness and his strength. His convictions and the strength to carry out his ideas are the features which separated him from so many other men.

We have suggested that Barrett should be considered a field anthropologist. There is ample evidence for this in his pre-professional interests

and activities and later, his professional training. It was while he was in Ecuador that he learned of the position at the Milwaukee Public Museum. In keeping with his training and experience, his first task upon accepting the position was to put the department under his charge on a professional and business-like basis. Unwilling to delegate too much authority or responsibility, changes which were introduced in the Department of Anthropology were revolutionary rather than transitional.

Without documentary evidence of the first causes championed by Barrett, it would be possible to predict with accuracy what they would be. Of prime importance would be a systematic program of field research and ethnological collecting. Such a program would be a logical outgrowth of previous experience and his current situation.

There are certain themes which are recurring throughout Barrett's career. Three of these are particularly noticeable: the first is the emphasis on field research; the second, the use of photography as a tool for research and as a method for presenting information; and a third, interest in and emphasis on publication.

The implication of volume one of the Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee appearing one year after the beginning of Barrett's association with the museum cannot be appraised. If coincidental, it is interesting, if not, it is very important. This series provided a convenient resource for publication of materials of local interest, and findings of a much larger scope.

The need to reach the scientific community with a publication series was fulfilled by the bulletins. Information of a mechanical nature dealing with the administration was disseminated in its annual reports. A third publication series was implemented in 1921, the "Yearbook." This series provided a logical mechanism to convey, to the ever increasingly important public, what activities were being undertaken by their museum. In this series appear progress reports of various kinds. Independent research conducted by staff members was presented in a popular form. In addition, nontechnical information concerning projects for the improvement of the museum were also made available. Such articles had implication far beyond the subjects they sought to explain. The general public, through such articles, were permitted a "back stage" view of the operation of the museum and the preparation of its exhibits. The collections and new accessions were also made known to the public through such articles. Perhaps of greatest importance, the reader was given special knowledge of what "his" museum was doing, which was previously unavailable. The yearbooks, like the museum itself, was a mechanism of visual education. The reader not only saw photographs of the preparation areas of the museum, but was exposed, vicariously, to the various field situations that the staff worked in.

Barrett contributed to the field of museology as Curator of Anthropology and also as director of the museum. His interest in developments in this field and his contributions illustrate his notions of the educative function of a public museum. Henry L. Ward, director of the Milwaukee Museum at the beginning of Barrett's association, stressed the need for a curator of anthropology who would subordinate his personal research to the goal of

popular visual education. Considerable emphasis was placed on several personality characteristics that this department head should have. Included among these was the ability to organize much diverse material that had accumulated over the years and was to become part of the collection. During the first two years as Curator of Anthropology, Barrett did not have exhibit space, or even adequate work space. In fact, the building which was to house the museum had not been completed. In a letter concerning the position, Ward informed Kroeber that the new curator would probably have to find work space in a closet for a year or more. This possibility was substantiated by Barrett.

Barrett's contributions to museology were only partially original. This is not to indicate that his role was merely the passive application of principles discovered and tried by others. The genius of his contribution lay in his ability to select ideas and innovations, modify them, and translate them into reality. With popular education as his major task, it was imperative that any program have popular interest and support.

The Barrett era was characterized by the implementation of numerous projects. While those that are most commonly known pertain to traditional forms and subjects of anthropological research, of equal value and importance were projects undertaken to improve the visual educational function of the museum. Throughout his professional career, Barrett attempted to portray reality as accurately through visual media as was possible. Among the Cayapa and earlier in California research, Barrett carried and used the camera to supplement verbal description. Viewing this activity from the contemporary scene, his action was neither unique or of particular importance. If, however, he is considered on an equal basis with his contemporaries, the use of a camera was an important innovation and preceded its common use in ethnographic field research by considerable years. The camera became an essential tool of the museum, and its value and importance increased proportionately with each year. By 1929, the audio-visual services had expanded to the extent that it was necessary to house this service outside the museum. In appraising the crowded situation in the old museum building, McKern (1956:111) stated; "The extensive, growing Museum loan service is now housed on the first floor of the old Line Material building where 100,000 visual aids, including 9,000 motion picture films, are kept, . . . and without room for normal expansion." While Barrett's early interest in the use of the camera was as a research tool, the new circumstances in the museum provided an easy adaptation to record the activities of the museum for public information services. The importance of the use of the camera during Barrett's museum years is attested to by his policy, that all museum sponsored field studies were to employ the use of cameras in research, and for the recording of the study itself.

Illustrated lectures became an important addition to the popular education program of the museum. The comprehensive program of lectures to school children is claimed as a first by the Milwaukee Public Museum. While many of these lectures were conducted on a formal basis and supplemented with slides and motion pictures, numerous other situations existed within the exhibit area of the museum where lectures of a less formal nature were held.

One of the easiest and most direct methods of conveying information in this situation was by the recreated environmental settings. As Coleman (1927:232) has commented:

A group is an installation of related objects or models with realistic setting. In most highly developed form, it is a sort of stage-effect enclosed in a specially lighted case and viewed through a window. . . . The group represented an effort to make museums interesting to lay-visitors by resort to dramatization, and doubtless it offers the most successful way of conveying information about the manner of life of man or beast. As an object of interest and beauty a group is attractive, and as a vivid portrayal it is profoundly impressive.

It is unfortunate that we cannot credit Barrett with the origin of this unique and extremely sound notion on public education. We can, however, give him credit for elaboration and innovation in the group building idea. Barrett's contribution to the development of this method for the visual presentation of information will probably stand as his monument in the field of museology. The origin of the idea of group building was attributed to Carl Akeley, by S. A. Barrett.

Just down the avenue stood the taxidermy shop of Carl E. Akeley who did mounting of birds and mammals for the museum. Up to that time every bird was mounted on a polished wood perch, every mammal on a slab of polished wood. This was true not only here but everywhere else in the world as well.

Carl Akeley conceived the revolutionary idea that birds and mammals could be mounted in environmental settings. This "visionary" notion met with set opposition, but Carl persisted. The result was our muskrat group which is as perfect today as it was when first built in 1889. That is the origin of the idea of habitat groups, a museum display technique which has spread far and wide over the world and which is not at all confined to the display of birds and mammals. It is now used to the greatest possible advantage in all scientific fields, in history, in industrial exhibits, in fact in every branch of museum work (Barrett 1962:30-31).

While Akeley provided the group idea, Barrett elaborated on it and applied the principle to nearly every department of the museum. Not content with the success in portraying birds, mammals, and other forms, he constructed groups of historical incidents, and of somewhat greater importance the placement of anthropological subjects in similar settings. From his early field research among the Hopi, Blackfoot, Kwakutl, and Pomo, Barrett constructed groups from the daily lives of these people. The visiting public was allowed glimpses into the lives of these people which had previously been confined to the few anthropologists fortunate enough to work with them. If the cliché about one picture being equal to a thousand words is true, the value of these groups is inestimable.

Barrett estimated the value of the groups, both life-size and miniature, at \$1,000,000. While it would be impossible to obtain an unbiased appraisal equal to this figure, the number of people who have viewed and benefited from these exhibits, the service they have rendered and continue to render, may make this a conservative estimate. Whatever their value, their importance to the field of museology is one that is lasting.

The museum-wide program of group building reached one of its peaks with the attempt to portray extremely large geological features.

The changes which are constantly occurring on the surface of the earth and the processes by which these are brought about, have always been difficult to illustrate in a museum exhibit. For this reason they have been often neglected, although of the greatest scientific importance. It is so obviously impossible to inclose any part of a glacier, a geyser, or a volcano within the glass of an exhibition case, that the constructors of such exhibits have tried to show these natural objects by specimens of the materials that are produced or acted upon, accompanied by photographs and relief maps of the country in which they are found. These suit the purpose very well and explain to those familiar with geology the various processes which are going on in different parts of the world. It was felt, however, that those of the general public who were only mildly interested in the earth sciences, would find such exhibits difficult of comprehension.

In order to overcome such deficiencies in the exhibits of the Museum, the Director, together with the Chief Artist and the writer, projected a series of life-sized environmental groups--seven in number, each designed to show some particular geological process actually in operation. These were to combine with a geological lesson, a representation of some of the most famous scenic places in the United States (Edwards 1926:122-123).

This monumental task, its conception, planning, and successful execution are indicative of Barrett and the kinds of projects he undertook and completed. His skill and polish as an administrator is attested to by the successful completion of these and later projects.

Survey of the Yearbooks, and Barrett's personal chronology reveal the importance of field work. As we have shown, Barrett's early life was punctuated with moves back and forth across the United States. His professional career is similarly punctuated. His occupations were consistent, however; he took every opportunity to broaden his horizons both geographically as well as professionally. In many senses, the peak of his field research experience came while he was the director of the Milwaukee Public Museum. We have shown that field work expeditions were instigated for the benefit of various museum departments. As there developed more demand on Barrett's time, there were fewer opportunities for field work. He, however, stimulated his staff to conduct the anthropological field work that he would have conducted, had time permitted. The anthropological aspects of the Grand Canyon research appear almost parenthetically in the Yearbooks. Barrett never lost his interest in the department that had provided his first position. He rarely allowed work in areas that did not hold particular interest for him. The point is rather subtle.

Barrett has been described as a field anthropologist, and there are subtle indications that support this contention although they are not often evident. Field work as a recurring theme has been indicated by the building of various groups based on original research.

No better example of the skills and techniques possessed by Barrett can be found than the Cudahy-Massees-Milwaukee Museum African Expedition, 1928-

1929. Metaphorically speaking, no greater "field" existed than that of Africa. While other areas might have profited by a similar expedition, no other area enjoyed the same public appeal as did the "Dark Continent." The benefits of patrons and the importance of public appeal were facts which Barrett had come to value. The experience of directing a rapidly growing institution in what Kroeber had indicated as something less than a hotbed of anthropological interests led to an awareness of these facts. The organization of the African Expedition illustrates the final honing of a precision set of skills which is rarely encountered. The employment of these skills need not, and in fact does not indicate that the expedition was organized under false pretences or that the goals of the expedition were sacrificed to some ulterior motive. The implication is that these skills afforded the patrons and the public a greater return on their investment than they might have otherwise received. Not to be discounted, however, is the fact that almost parenthetically the possibility of collecting ethnological material from one or two native tribes was included in an expedition whose focus was a faunal collection stressing "big-game animals."

Various scales can be employed to weigh the success of the expedition. In many respects, the caution employed in preparation, selection, and procedure forecast the results. As Barrett stated, "the final results far exceeded the picture we painted." This is applicable to not only the collection of fauna, but also to the collection of ethnological material as well as written descriptions, and sizable amounts of motion picture footage and lantern slides.

It was Barrett's practice, during most of his professional career, to keep personal diaries during his major field experiences. The daily events that lend flesh and blood to official reports and published articles from his years in the museum took the form of letters and personal diaries. The personal journals provide rare glimpses of Barrett the man, which is so often missing from other accounts. Consequently, the fullest picture we have comes from periods in which he was in the field. Certainly the information gained from these journals does not provide sufficient information for the sort of sketch that would be most useful or appropriate. What we do have from these are flashes of personality, examples of his humor, and general statements of the mode of operation that lended distinctiveness to the Barrett years. Much of the material about the expedition has been derived from these letters and journals.

The scope of the African Expedition was sufficiently broad to make difficult a detailed analysis of the function of the director. It is, however, possible to provide some insights of a general nature. The responsibility of the director is stated in the expedition's slogan: "Bring 'em back and make 'em look alive." This was accomplished by using members of the museum staff, the artists, taxidermists, and other specialists. The Director took as his task the general organization of the field work, and the supervision of his staff. Of extreme importance was his photographic recording of the expedition itself and its objectives. While the note and measurement taking of the taxidermist could restore the animals to their former stature, and the artist's sketches could reconstruct the environmental settings in which they made their home, still something lacked--animals in their living environment. This gap Barrett filled through the use of his photographic skills.

The same held true for the various African groups with which the expedition came in contact. The educative aspects of the project both as recreations in the museum and as a visual record were the prime task of the director.

As Barrett was in ultimate charge of the expedition, the responsibility for its success or failure was on his shoulders. He was acutely aware that cooperation in the field, as in the museum, largely determined the success of the expedition. In examination of the functioning of a safari and the role of the native porters, Barrett made the following observation:

Much of course depends upon the head man. He has full charge of all the boys, except cooks, personal boys, gun bearers and trackers. If he is a good firm leader, no trouble will occur. If he is not, then there is no end of trouble. We had two head men. One was always shouting at his men and taking them to task for any little thing. He was a tempest in a teapot, literally. As long as he was our head man we had one difficulty after another, acts of insubordination were frequent and there was trouble all around. And this is a most serious thing when you are off out in the veldt many miles from anywhere and are so situated that the success of your whole expedition depends upon the team work of the whole safari personnel.

Our second head man was of a very different type. He was quiet and firm. He said little but when he spoke the boys knew that his orders were to be obeyed and that quickly. He was not in the least unkind to them. He was merely efficient and business-like, and the boys respected him immensely (Barrett 1928a:577-578).

This moralistic story has more than an incidental meaning to the success of the African Expedition. The qualities praised by Barrett in the second head man were, in fact, those that made the entire project a success. Barrett often said that there could be only one captain for a ship, or one director for an expedition. The qualities of the head man, and the culmination of leadership, both responsibility and authority in one individual are the qualities that made Barrett's field projects successful.

Consideration of the African Expedition began with an appraisal of the success of the project. It was suggested that the administrative skills of the director were indicative of the success of the venture. In terms of more conventional standards, Barrett's statement of the results should serve.

The modest hopes we had expressed in respect to the amount of material we might secure were far exceeded by the final results. We succeeded in securing full group material for forty-four species of mammals and thirty-seven species of birds. In addition to this we were able to make more or less complete collections from ten of the native tribes. Further, and entirely incidentally, we secured certain botanical specimens and considerable numbers of insects. There were secured also some thousands of still pictures and over forty thousand feet of motion picture negative. Also color notes and background sketches, plaster casts, and a most valuable series of notes (Barrett 1928b:227).

From the standpoint of research, the African Expedition was the last major contribution that Barrett made during his years at Milwaukee. The Depression and the years that followed were not conducive to field work. The funds to all public institutions were severely reduced and research of any nature became a memory and a hope of the future. The Federal Government came to the aid of the nation through various public supported projects. One of these was the Work Projects Administration.

For years, thoughts had been turned to the many projects within the museum which should be undertaken. Barrett and his staff submitted a proposal to the Federal Government for a revolutionary program. Essentially the plan was to capitalize on the unemployed craftsmen and artisans by organizing them into a useful, well directed group, working toward the solution of the problems that had plagued the museum for a number of years. With funds channeled through the WPA various projects were begun. The number of people who had been unemployed and the various projects on which their services were applied made necessary expansion to space outside the Milwaukee Public Museum. Under this program extensive construction of group and exhibits was initiated. Preparation of materials long needed for exhibits and the designing and painting of various murals were also begun. As the initial project which had been attempted by Barrett as an experiment caught hold and grew, it became necessary to enlarge the program to serve more institutions than the Public Museum. To find sufficient work to keep this new staff occupied, it was necessary to solicit requests from other educational institutions and museums. Barrett served as the director of this new organization which had as its budget \$1,000,000.

On January 1, 1940 after thirty years of service, Barrett tendered his resignation. The size and meaning of his contribution to the museum through the concept that he referred to as the Modern Museum Idea cannot be fairly appraised by only considering the Milwaukee Public Museum. Notions that he fostered and those that he elaborated served to revolutionize the museum field. One of Barrett's greatest wishes was that he not be retired into what he referred to as the "rocking chair fleet." On the surface the appearance might have been given that official retirement would lead, as it does in many cases, to the completion of various research, several publications, and then oblivion. Those who knew Barrett realized this would hardly be the case. We have referred to the Cudahy-Massee-Milwaukee Museum African Expedition as the final honing of a set of precision tools. In the case of many, following retirement, the tools lose their edge, but not so in the case of Barrett. Perhaps it was due to the time involved in reaching this level that allowed the skills to remain as useful for as long as they did. Perhaps it was merely the nature of the man.

Golden Gate International Exposition

Following a period of less than five months' "retirement," Barrett was called on to direct the Exhibit of Aboriginal Cultures of the Western Hemisphere at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1940. This exposition had been preceded by a similar one held in 1939. The change for 1940 was the addition of cultural materials from Middle and South America. Barrett's task as director was to organize an exhibit depicting the cultures of the Western Hemisphere. Such a task could easily involve research for a

year and an additional year for gathering the specimens. Under the conditions set for the exhibit this had to be accomplished in a little over a month. The notions of public education through visual material remained the over-all organizing principle for this exhibit.

With the cooperation of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, The Museum of Anthropology at the University of California, and the Middle American Research Institute of Tulane University, the specimens were gathered and the exhibit opened on schedule. It is acknowledged that much of the administrative framework from the preceding year was still intact, however, Barrett's acceptance of the directorship, the opening and operation of a successful exhibit further served to demonstrate his ability as a museum administrator. He brought to bear all his skills plus a genuine and deep interest in presenting the American Indian to the public. In every sense Barrett attempted to convey knowledge of an anthropological nature to the public through visual media. In the room housing material from the Northwest Coast, Barrett utilized the house poles exhibited a year earlier and simulated a dwelling typical of this culture area to house the exhibit. Similarly, a special room was constructed in the form of a hogan for the Navajo exhibit. Not content with sterile displays of material culture and crafts, he attempted to bring more of the daily and religious lives of various people to cognizance through a fuller use of the visual media. To fill out the picture of Navajo life, a chanter was brought to the exhibit and demonstrated the techniques of sand painting. An attempt was also made to explain some of the esoteric aspects of the ceremonies of which sand painting is an integral part.

In a sense the exhibit's success is aptly summarized by its director for 1940. "By whatever yard stick the exhibit of Aboriginal Cultures of the Western Hemisphere is measured; size, scope, or public service rendered, we feel that it was eminently worth while and that it contributed in no small measure to the total success of the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1940."

Army Specialized Training Program

The war years saw the establishment of an Army Specialized Training Program on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. Kroeber, the director, was stricken with a heart attack, and was forced to delegate his authority. Barrett was invited to join this program in the capacity of Administrative Assistant. When Kroeber was no longer able to meet the demands of the project he appointed Barrett as Associate Director. Barrett was familiar with administrative procedures; however, he lacked the years of classroom experience that the rest of the staff brought to the project. Barrett often remarked that this training program was as close as he ever came to formal classroom teaching.

Briefly, the Army Specialized Training Program was designed to impart vast amounts of knowledge to the "students" in a minimum length of time. Divisions were established within the program to provide instruction in specialized areas. Kroeber and later Barrett's division was Far Eastern Languages. Both men were ably assisted by a staff of specialists representing several fields of endeavor. The program attempted to use the "Area Concept," and as a consequence specialists from various Social Sciences and the Humanities

were brought together. In terms of the goals that the Army set for this program on the Berkeley campus, it fell short of its expected success.

Barrett's specific contribution to the Army Specialized Training Program, beyond his administrative work, was the formulation and implementation of a course in methods of field research. He was forced to approach this subject in an extremely narrow fashion. In fact, he was only permitted to teach a course dealing with information techniques. In this regard, he employed his knowledge of interviewing, as he had learned it as a student and from practical experience. One part of the course, and perhaps the most important innovation for the teaching of field technique, was the use of a bilingual informant in the classroom. Each in turn, the students would interview the informant in his native language. Following this the informant would rate the researcher as to his ability to derive factual knowledge through interviews.

After only eighteen months, the Army felt it was advisable to eliminate the program. In Barrett's seventy-one year anthropological career, only those eighteen months were spent in formal instruction, and only part of that time was spent in the classroom.

Cancer Research

Following the war years, the Barretts moved back and forth across the continent, visiting. Meanwhile Barrett was completing various research that had not been possible due to time and other commitments. His wife's increasingly ill health made it necessary that they establish a permanent home. It was in Sonoma, California that they settled. On June 11, 1953, after suffering many years of illness, Eileen Barrett died. The cause of death was cancer.

Shortly after her death Barrett, at the suggestion of Dr. M. Fernan-Nunez, was persuaded to apply his skills and experience to research in cancer. While Barrett had no formal training in medicine, his experience in model and group building from the museum years provided the best background to work in one phase of cancer research. It was Barrett's opinion that, had it been possible to detect cancer at an earlier date, some additional years of life might have been given his wife. Previously, in Milwaukee, Barrett had been involved in a project for the American Cancer Society. Dr. M. Fernan-Nunez was Professor of Pathology at Marquette Medical School in Milwaukee; he became Chairman of the American Cancer Society, Wisconsin Division, Committee on Cancer Education. At that time the facilities of the museum's Modeling Division were made available for the construction of an extensive series of visual cancer models.

The medical details of that work were directed by Dr. Nunez. The remainder of the work was under the supervision of Barrett who became familiar with the processes, materials and techniques involved.

In 1953, Dr. Nunez suggested to the American Cancer Society that Barrett might be interested in re-engaging in model making similar to that done in Milwaukee, a quarter of a century earlier.

Following discussions with Dr. John M. Kenney of Santa Rosa, California, then Chairman of the California Division's Committee on Cancer Education, and at his suggestion, a proposal was submitted to develop and produce tactile models of various organs commonly effected by cancer. It was the goal of this project to make available to greater numbers of medical students and nurses the opportunity to detect possible malignant growths through the use of tactile models.

Barrett stated the proposed uses of the models.

The opportunity for students to examine patients with cancer is relatively limited. These models, which will demonstrate both the normal and cancerous organ, will make possible unlimited opportunities for such examination.

Also the opportunity for instruction of lay groups under proper supervision is unlimited. These models in the hands of a physician or a nurse in a large industrial plant, for instance, could be most helpful in the spread of cancer education.

For Barrett, the cancer work differed from his museum experience only in subject matter. The media were the same, and the purpose was again to educate by providing a simulated experience.

Using a specially constructed building on his property in Sonoma, Barrett established a laboratory. His first task was to experiment with various materials and processes that he might duplicate as closely as possible the subject. Considerable time and expense were involved in these phases, however, the results were encouraging. With a small grant from the Cancer Society, with the counsel of Dr. Kenney, and generous contributions of materials from business firms, Barrett began his operation. He approached the manufacturers of industrial supplies, and persuaded an engineer to design and build a special furnace to be used in his process.

An administrator of the California Division of the American Cancer Society made the following comment about Barrett's project:

For the past two years the American Cancer Society, California Division, has been supporting a project of Doctor S. A. Barrett, of Sonoma. Doctor Barrett has developed a tactile model of the human breast in which he has been able to incorporate several pathological conditions. As far as we know, this is the first time that such models have been perfected to the state that Doctor Barrett has been able to attain. We feel also that they are as near lifelike as possible, and far superior to any others that we have seen.

Perhaps the greatest tribute that was paid to Barrett for his work in cancer research came from Dr. Nunez, his first medical colleague.

I have always regretted that your life work was not in the field of medicine. You certainly would have made signal contributions to our science. But I am somewhat compensated by your present interest and devotion to a field of medicine in which you are making a very definite contribution.

Barrett continued his work with the tactile models until 1957 when the Society felt it was no longer financially possible to continue its support. Once again Barrett had succeeded in contributing to education through the design and construction of visual material. In this project a new dimension was added, that of the tactile.

American Indian Films

Barrett found partial satisfaction for his compulsion to record the rapidly vanishing culture of the American Indian. His frustration of age and the perception of new problems was met by a method of recording which was more efficient and exacting than any he had previously encountered.

From Barrett's earliest beginnings in anthropology the camera was one of his trademarks. In the 1920's his photographic interests took a new turn. The development of the motion picture camera opened new horizons for recording. These early interests in photography were to culminate in American Indian Films.

While conducting the field work for the proposed series on the material culture of Indians of Northwestern California, Barrett discovered that there was sufficient traditional culture extant to warrant its recording on film. He, however, insisted that the recording be made with "complete fidelity to ethnological detail."

In January, 1957 he conducted a survey among the Clear Lake Pomo and Northeastern Maidu as a preliminary step to later film recording. It was his idea that a project yielding research materials was suitable justification for its undertaking. Barrett, with the support of A. L. Kroeber, applied for funds from the University of California's Institute of Social Sciences and the Department of Anthropology's research fund. With these, they produced THE TULE BALSAs, the pilot film for the later American Indian Films project.

At a later date, Barrett approached E. W. Gifford, and together they prepared a proposal for making documentary films. This project, however, failed to materialize. Barrett refused to abandon his interest in the application of documentary film technique to ethnographic subjects.

One of the weaknesses of the Barrett and Gifford proposal was failure to utilize the skills of professional film makers. Barrett modified and expanded his aims and objectives to include the production of educational films and to this end he incorporated professional film makers. With Kroeber, Barrett submitted a proposal to the National Science Foundation incorporating these new aims. While the principle goal of the project was the production of educational films, its secondary objective was the documentation of the remaining forms of traditional American Indian life. One very important aspect of the project was the awarding of two fellowships to students trained in anthropology who were to receive specialized instruction in the application of film to ethnographic subjects. Kroeber was to be the principle investigator and supervising director and Barrett the assistant investigator and director of production. Kroeber was responsible for the overall direction of the project while Barrett undertook the field work and supervised the production of the films. To these ends they were aided by the research assistants of the project.

In August of 1960, the Course Content Improvement Section of the National Science Foundation awarded to Alfred Louis Kroeber and Samuel Alfred Barrett as co-directors a grant for the establishment of the project American Indian Films (see Barrett 1961).

As co-directors, they proposed that the films could be utilized to fill a gap in the experience of many students. There were fewer and fewer situations whereby students could have direct firsthand field experience with native peoples on the undergraduate and graduate levels. They proposed that the films could be made in such a way that they would record rapidly vanishing cultures, make possible the visual presentation of these materials to large numbers of students, and bring the "living laboratory" of the anthropologist to the classroom.

Kroeber's untimely death on October 5, 1960, left Barrett with full responsibility and he was subsequently appointed director and principal investigator. Barrett held this position until his death when William R. Bascom was appointed director.

In February of 1965, the National Science Foundation found that they could no longer support the project in the light of its original goals. As a consequence, they awarded a grant for the orderly termination of American Indian Films. This final phase of the project's work is to make available its total results to research by scholar and the production of additional films.

The first field research of American Indian Films was in Northwestern California where Barrett recorded on film the manufacture and use of the Sinew Backed Bow. Barrett moved from this specific area to subjects having greater meaning for the understanding of the culture of Californian Indian groups generally. He produced films on the preparation of various native foods which provided the cornerstone of the culture of this area.

The acceptance of a second proposal for a continuation of the project stimulated Barrett to broaden the scope of the project. The emphasis changed from a conscious attempt at a systematic treatment of California Indian culture, to an attempt to record any traditional cultural behavior among any group in the Western United States. Much of the field research constituted the restudy of groups that Barrett had encountered while at the Milwaukee Public Museum. Extensive work was conducted on the Northwest Coast. The results of this were the films THE TOTEM POLE, and THE WOODEN BOX. During later years of this project field work was conducted and films produced on subjects pertinent to the Plains area, emphasizing the Blackfoot and the Sioux.

The third year of the project saw the beginning of field research among Southwestern groups. It was during this year that Barrett diverged from the pattern he had established in earlier years. While in the Southwest, he found that there were numerous phases of traditional Navajo life extant. The work among the Navajo probably represents the greatest contribution that the film project made. Barrett had never attempted working with this group, and at the age of 85 began a program of research which placed less emphasis on subsistence or technology and stressed the recording of various ceremonies. Some measure of the project's success in this task is indicated by the fact

that between June and December, 1963 four major ceremonies were recorded: The Red Antway, Girls Puberty Ceremony, Mountain Chant, and Yeibichai. Three of these ceremonies were recorded in their complete nine day form. While none of the Navajo material has been released in the form of educational films, the total footage, 46,000 feet, represents the most complete record of these ceremonies.

The released films produced by the project were awarded many distinctions. Three films, THE SINEW BACKED BOW, BUCKEYES, and THE BEAUTIFUL TREE, were accepted in the Italian Festival dei Popoli, an international review of ethnographic and sociological documentary films. These films were awarded the Diploma of Participation indicating they were among the few selected for showing. THE BEAUTIFUL TREE was selected for the festival from an international entry of more than 200 films. THE SINEW BACKED BOW, and BUCKEYES were the only American documentary entrees selected for showing in 1962. THE BEAUTIFUL TREE was also the recipient of the Chris Award at the 1965 Columbus Film Festival. THE TOTEM POLE was selected for showing in 1964 at the American Film Festival in New York City. The CALUMET: THE PIPE OF PEACE received the Certificate of Meritorious Participation in 1965 at the San Francisco International Film Festival.

The fifteen films released by American Indian Films are in no way representative of the total results of the project. There are approximately 362,569 feet of original and work print film, exclusive of released films, and 139,200 feet of original sound tapes. This body of film represents field work among twenty tribal groups.

American Indian Films represents Barrett's final contribution to his discipline and probably his most significant contribution to the ethnography of North America.

NOTES

Letters and reports cited are in the possession of the authors

¹Letter from Henry L. Ward to S. A. Barrett, March 20, 1909.

²Letter from A. L. Kroeber to S. A. Barrett, February 1, 1909.

³Letter from A. L. Kroeber to S. A. Barrett, March 15, 1909.

⁴Government Service, Vol. 4, No. 6. December. Publication of the Milwaukee Government Service League, p. 1. (n.d.)

⁵Report of the Director S. A. Barrett to George Creel, Commissioner Golden Gate International Exposition, October 31, 1940.

⁶From the proposal for a grant from the American Cancer Society, 1953.

⁷Letter from Dr. W. E. Batchelder to Chairman Medical Faculty, Stanford University, 1956.

⁸Letter from Dr. M. Fernan-Nunez to S. A. Barrett, 1955.

REFERENCES

- BARRETT, S. A.
 1911 The dream dances of the Chippewa and Menominee Indians of northern Wisconsin. Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, Vol. 1, Article IV, pp. 251-406. Milwaukee.
 1928a Jotted notes. Yearbook of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee 1928, The Cudahy-Massee-Milwaukee Museum African Expedition, 1928-1929, Vol. VIII, part II, pp. 575-578. Milwaukee.
 1928b Introduction. Yearbook of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee 1928, The Cudahy-Massee-Milwaukee Museum African Expedition, 1928-1929, Vol. VIII, part II, pp. 223-230. Milwaukee.
 1961 American Indian films. Berkeley, Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, No. 25, pp. 155-162.
 1962 The Milwaukee Public Museum timetable. Lore, pp. 128-137. Milwaukee.
- COLEMAN, L. V.
 1927 Manual for small museums. New York, Putnam's.
- d'AZEVEDO, WARREN L.
 1963 Introduction. The Washo Indians of California and Nevada. Anthropological Paper No. 67, pp. 1-7. Salt Lake City, University of Utah.
- DRIEVER, HAROLD E.
 1960 Review. Fishing among the Indians of Northwestern California, A. L. Kroeber and S. A. Barrett. Berkeley, University of California Anthropological Records, Vol. 21, No. 1.
- EDWARDS, IRA
 1926 The new geological groups. Yearbook of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee 1924, Vol. IV, pp. 122-129. Milwaukee.
- LOWIE, R. H.
 1937 The history of ethnological theory. New York.
- McKERN, W. C.
 1956 What is wrong with the present building. Lore, pp. 110-113. Milwaukee.
 1965 The Barrett era. Lore, pp. 114-119. Milwaukee.