TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY AT BERKELEY

Theodore D. McCown
University of California, Berkeley

The history of an academic department such as the one at Berkeley is complex and in the present context this essay presumes no more than to set out a few sign posts. It was not created to be a teaching organ of the University, although it soon became such, but was intended to serve as museum and research institute.

Let me first say something about the way the department relates to the history of anthropology and particularly anthropology as an academic discipline in the United States. The Peabody Museum was founded by a gift of $150,000 to Harvard University and accompanying this the University agreed to establish the Peabody Chair of American Archeology and Ethnology. Whoever held that chair usually taught students at Harvard; and about the same time there was some teaching going on at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. This effort was modest and scattered. Anthropology as an academic discipline did not come into any real focus until the 1890's. One of the events that helped very materially was the decision to include in the Columbian Exposition a large set of exhibits of an anthropological nature. This was a new venture for international expositions in this country although similar things had been done in France considerably earlier. There was a very substantial Division of Anthropology set up in connection with the Exposition. Frederick Ward Putnam, then curator of the Peabody Museum and Peabody Professor at Harvard, was asked to head up the Division and he, in turn, drew in people like Franz Boas, Alexander Chamberlain, and a whole host of others not only to collect materials for the exhibition but also to collect information. Many individuals were sent out with questionnaires and they did what today we would call field work, both of an ethnological and a

physical anthropological nature. Resources were insufficient to undertake much in the nature of archeology. There was a considerable coming together of anthropological interests through the numerous people who were associated with the establishment of the anthropological exhibits at the Columbia Exposition. This covered a total period from 1891 to 1894 with the actual exhibition opening in the latter part of 1892; it closed in 1894. It was during this period of time that Franz Boas began the teaching of anthropology; first at Clark University, then at Columbia. It is interesting to recall that his first title was Lecturer in Physical Anthropology in Columbia University.

He retained that title for several years and then, five years after his initial appointment in 1894, was made Professor of Anthropology. One of his bright young men, Alfred Kroeber, was recommended by Boas to Putnam, to come to California and take charge of the archeological and anthropological collections that Mrs. Hearst had been securing since about 1895.

Phoebe Apperson Hearst was the wife of Senator George Hearst, the mother of William Randolph Hearst and the grandmother of William Randolph Hearst, Jr. George Hearst was one of the movers and shakers of the mines, railroads and various other enterprises in the west. The Hearst family also was early involved in the newspaper business and their first venture in newspapers was the San Francisco Examiner which the Hearst family still controls. History is not altogether clear on what interested Mrs. Hearst in doing something about anthropology; her idea was to present to the University of California the materials to establish a Museum of Man. Who aroused her interest in this is not altogether clear. She was a friend of a woman who was interested in anthropological materials, Zelia Nuttall, the daughter of the famous botanist Nuttall. Mrs. Nuttall for many years was associated with the Peabody Museum. Mrs. Hearst and Mrs. Nuttall were friends from their girlhood in Massachusetts. Indirect evidence suggests that it was through Mrs. Nuttall that Mrs.

Hearst came to rely on Professor Putnam as her senior advisor. He was extremely influential in advising her what and whom to support. Beginning in 1895 and for a decade thereafter she financed expeditions directed by George Reisner, one of America's foremost Egyptologists, and Max Uhle, a German archeologist who had been working in Peru and who was subsequently supported by Mrs. Hearst in this work. She also employed several people who, acting as her collectors, roamed the Mediterranean and Europe buying up collections of archeological and anthropological interest.

By 1901 there had begun a steady stream of the crated materials from Egypt, Peru, and Europe, arriving in San Francisco and Berkeley for the new Museum of Man. Mrs. Hearst was appointed a Regent of the University and in this way came to be closely associated with Benjamin Ide Wheeler who became President of the University of California in 1898. Wheeler said in 1900 that one of the most pressing needs of the University was a museum and department of Anthropology. At the Regents' meeting of September 20, 1901, they formally established a Department and Museum of Anthropology. The department was for a few years the museum. The main activity was the museum and this revolved around the collections, but right at the beginning it also involved the concept of research.

Kroeber has recorded that Wheeler was rather loathe to agree that a course in anthropology be offered on the campus. One can speak in the singular because Berkeley was the University of California in those years. A two hour course was authorized for the Spring term in 1902, but it is not listed in any catalogue; Kroeber had three students in it. It must have been authorized after the printing of the catalogue since the first formal listing for Anthropology was in 1903 and that year there were four courses offered. These were offered only in the Spring semester. It was clearly understood from the start that Kroeber and his anthropological assistant, P. E. Goddard, who later went on to become an important figure in anthropology in the American Museum of Natural History, taught only in the Spring semester and in the other semester were free to engage

in research. This research right from the very beginning involved the ethnology of California.

It is instructive to know what the courses were. Kroeber obviously had as a model of what you taught in anthropology the subject matter and concepts which had been taught at Columbia by Boas. Boas taught several different kinds of things. From the beginning he offered one course every year in Physical Anthropology. He offered one or more courses in various aspects of American Indian languages, and he also offered courses in ethnology. With the resources Kroeber had available, namely, himself as a part-time teacher and Goddard as a part-time teacher, in the first year in which there was any real set of course offerings, they offered North American Ethnology as Anthropology 1 and Tribes of Northwest California as Anthropology 2. This last was offered by Mr. Goddard who had already spent a number of years in Northwest California as a missionary, and had accumulated a very large amount of ethnological and linguistic information. North American Languages was given by Dr. Kroeber--"Prospective students should consult the instructor before electing the course." This was a warning he gave in this and similar courses because he did not want simply to give training in elementary linguistics! He wanted students who had some linguistic or philological training before he would take them in this particular kind of course. Anthropology 5 was The Indians of California. This constituted the entire offering of Anthropology.

In terms of what is offered in American Anthropology departments today this is a highly curious sort of offering. Every one of these courses would today be regarded as highly specialized, not offered earlier than the upper division, for junior or senior undergraduates. The North American Languages would probably be a graduate course. I have not been able to find any records of the enrollment in these courses but my guess is that neither Kroeber nor Goddard were overwhelmed with students.

The collections that were being sent to the University on behalf of Mrs. Hearst were stored first in a wooden building, the Meyers Cottage, a cottage built on land that had become property of the University. Mrs. Hearst was persuaded to put up several thousand dollars and the University constructed a building with a stout wooden frame, the roof and walls being made of corrugated iron sheets. This was designed initially as a warehouse where the cases were brought and kept until there was a suitable place for the unpacking and storage of their contents; it was internally transformed and served as the physical headquarters of the Department of Anthropology and its teaching staff until we were finally moved out of it in 1952, into another temporary building, T-2, and then finally in 1959 into Kroeber Hall.

The Museum collections were moved to San Francisco in 1903 and housed in a building originally intended as the Law School of the University. This was located south of Golden Gate Park in what is today the San Francisco campus. The lawyer-professors refused to move away from downtown San Francisco because the horse-cars were too slow for them to teach out by the Park and get back to appear in court on Kearney Street. The building was of three stories, with basement, processed offices and lecture rooms. It was an interesting wooden building that always posed a problem as far as fire was concerned but it was in a part of San Francisco that was well away from the conflagration that took place in 1906 and the collections were not much damaged by the earthquake. The Museum had a largely independent life from that of the gradually developing teaching department until 1931 when changes with regard to the Medical School and the Affiliated Colleges led to a demand for the space on which that building was placed. The collections were brought to Berkeley and were housed in a building that had been vacated a year or so before by the Department of Civil Engineering. This was one of the older buildings on the Berkeley campus, with a wooden interior, no elevator, and again constituted a continual source of concern because of the danger of fire. We must leave the Museum because it has related but yet separate history.

The teaching program of the department stayed very much the way it has been described, for a number of years. The first time a general and comprehensive anthropology course was offered, extending over two semesters, was in the year 1909-1910. Anthropology 1A and 1B, General Anthropology, with Professor Kroeber teaching it, was offered to undergraduate students. He had been largely responsible for teaching a one-semester version for several years by himself. It now became a course in which people who had joined the staff in 1910 and 1911 participated. One was N. C. Nelson, who later left Berkeley to spend the rest of his professional life as an archeologist in the Department of Anthropology in the American Museum. The other was T. T. Waterman who taught here for a number of years, then finally left anthropology for journalism. Kroeber, Nelson and Waterman combined in 1910 to teach 1A, 1B as a course, the first semester being physical anthropology and the second, cultural. It was a sort of combination course. This continued for a number of years until the twenties when, because of the demands that were represented by the additional courses that had been added to the curriculum of the department, it became the responsibility of either Professor Kroeber or Professor Lowie, after the latter had joined the staff of the department in 1921.

This year-long course demanded suitable reading material and this led Kroeber to the compilation of a syllabus. He and Waterman did this initially. It was published by the University of California Press. Later known as the Source Book of Anthropology, it was the first of the readers which are now so numerous. It was in this course that Kroeber worked out the ideas that you will find represented in the edition of his textbook Anthropology published in 1923. As far as I know this was the first formal presentation of a textbook in general anthropology in the United States. If you are familiar with the writings of Professor Boas you will find that he never brought himself to write a textbook. He participated with some of his students and others in a book called General

Anthropology, of which he wrote some sections. Kroeber's "Anthropology" was interesting because it represented one man's view of anthropology as he saw it and as he had been developing it himself here at Berkeley over the period from 1909 to 1923.

Advance work with graduate students in ethnology and in primitive languages was added to the curriculum in 1904 and 1905. One of the things that is interesting is that Goddard was a linguist in the manner in which this discipline was practiced in these early years, the first decade of the twentieth century, and he offered every year a course on experimental phonetics. Comparative Mythology and two courses, one on the Philippines and one on Malaysia by David Prescott Barrows, were given in 1906 and 1907. Professor Barrows, after whom Barrows Hall was named, was a member of the Political Science Department. He was a man of considerable interest and talent.

Another name who was to become an important figure in anthropology was Edward Sapir. He was here as a research assistant working on various aspects of California Indian linguistics in 1907 and 1908, but did no teaching. In 1909 Goddard left to go to the American Museum and it was the following year that Nelson and Waterman were added as instructors. The year 1908 is additionally interesting because in that year Samuel Barrett, who was later to become the Curator of Anthropology at the Milwaukee Public Museum and still later to become its Director, received the first Ph.D. in Anthropology that was awarded by the University of California. Two years later, a man who was to spend most of his life as one of the curators of the Museum at the University of Pennsylvania, James Alden Mason, received his Ph.D. degree. Then there was a considerable lapse of time, partly a consequence of the hiatus created by World War I, before further higher degrees were awarded. This lasted until 1926 when the third Ph.D. was awarded to William Duncan Strong, who was to become Lubot Professor of Archaeology at Columbia University. From 1926 on, there are few years in which there was not at least one higher

degree and the department is now approaching the point where we anticipate ten or more degrees in the course of each academic year. There has been a steady build-up of graduate and undergraduate work. As early as 1918-1919 the introductory anthropology courses had enrollments of over 300 students.

Professor Robert Lowie joined the department in 1919, coming first as a visitor, returning to the American Museum for a year and then joining the department as an Associate Professor in 1921. Continuity of instructional program was long given by Professor Kroeber and Professor Lowie. Edward Gifford, who had become a member of the Museum staff in 1912, was appointed lecturer in 1920. Gifford would come across from San Francisco three times a week in the afternoon and offer an upper division lecture course. This constituted the staff of the department until 1931 when Ronald Olson was appointed Associate Professor. There were visitors during the summer and others who came as substitutes when Lowie or Kroeber had a sabbatical leave, but from then until 1938 the program of the department varied but little.

When I joined the staff in 1938 regular courses in physical anthropology, with laboratory, were added, as were upper division courses on prehistory and fossil man. Nearly a decade was to follow, much of it occupied by World War II, before significant new changes took place. Within the space of three years Professors Mandelbaum, Heizer and Rowe joined the department. Culture and personality on the one hand, archeology in several aspects on the other, came to be vigorously represented. Some of these changes were a consequence of Professor Kroeber's retirement in 1946 with Professor Lowie becoming the Chairman of the department.

It is interesting to contrast the offerings I have mentioned previously with the ones that were being offered to both graduate and undergraduate students in 1937 and 1938. At this time you had a 1A-1B that had been presented for many years by Professor Olson. He usually gave both parts of the course, with from two to four teaching assistants,

depending on the size of the enrollment. My recollection of the course when I took it in 1927-28 was that there were several hundred students; in the late thirties the numbers were frequently 300-400. Olson was an extraordinarily gifted teacher. One meets people who now have grandchildren in the University and when they learn that I am an anthropologist, they will say, "Oh, yes, I had a course with Ronald Olson and it is one of the things I really remember as an undergratuate."

The upper division courses were Ethnography of the World, Chapters in Cultural History, both of these by Professor Lowie; Professor Kroeber's Culture Growth and a course in The American Indian--these were the standard ones. The latter was required as part of the undergraduate major, the idea being that no student should graduate with an A.B. degree unless he had been exposed to some modicum of knowledge with regard to the aboriginal peoples of the New World. Professor Kroeber also offered a course on the Nature of Culture. Mr. Gifford presented Indians of the Southwest and Primitive Inventions, and Mr. Olson gave Primitive Society. Primitive Art was one of Professor Kroeber's new courses. Gifford alternately gave Indians of California, or Africa, or Oceania. At one time or another courses in Primitive Religion and a variety of other subjects were offered. Professor Kroeber attempted for several years to offer a course on the Anthropology of the Bible. I asked him why he abandoned this and he replied that "I couldn't get the students to do the reading," and when I asked "What was the reading?" he said "The Bible." Reflecting the concerns of the University and society during and just after World War I, there was a course offered by Professor Kroeber on "War" and there were lectures in connection with the museum on the "Status of Women." I mention this because the offerings of the department reflected not only the academic and professional considerations of the anthropologists but have always mirrored in part some sense of the kind of interests that the larger public has in anthropology.

Let me now say something about what was expected of graduate students in the period of the twenties and the thirties. One offered a

variety of subjects for the qualifying examination for the Ph.D. degree, since then as now there was emphasis on the Ph.D. as the desirable focus for professional training for anthropologists. M.A. degrees have always been offered by the department but they have never been integrated in any clear and close way with the graduate program. You were expected to offer at least three fields but these were special fields and they correspond to what most students offer today. There were two additional fields, that were not regarded as special fields, which everyone offered. These were World Ethnography and History and Theory of Anthropology. World Ethnography was something you learned as an undergraduate in Lowie's course, and you read it as a graduate student. There were no seminars on this; it was simply something that you were expected to acquire. This involved basic information with regard to languages, culture history and ethnology of the peoples of the world. History and theory was something that everyone was expected to know. For a while there was a 30 page reading list, mostly comprising articles that you were expected to read because they were regarded as important. Systematic reading in history and theory was later on somewhat simplified after Professor Lowie wrote his book on the History of Ethnological Theory. It is an interesting book but obviously not the history of anthropology. It is the history of limited segments of anthropology as Lowie conceived it and as he saw it. At the end of your second or the beginning of your third year of graduate work you finally went and saw Kroeber or Lowie and said you thought you were ready to take your "prelims." Next you settled down and wrote for five days, morning and afternoon. One day was devoted to World Ethnography, one day to History and Theory. Then a day was spent on each of your special fields. These were read by Kroeber, Lowie and Olson.

If your written examinations were regarded as satisfactory, arrangements were then made for you to have an oral qualifying examination, conducted by at least five people. Looking back over some of the former committees, I discovered that some students had as many as seven

people on their qualifying committee, three or four from the Department and two or three from outside the Department. This picture changed radically after World War II when the written examinations were cut down to a mere three days. Now they have been eliminated altogether.

For several years the department followed a program in which at the end of the first year students had a couple of days of written examinations to test what they had learned in the first year. This proved unsatisfactory because the first year graduate students spent all their time preparing for the examination and not learning much that was really very useful, so this was abandoned.

The kind of anthropology that developed and flourished between the Wars no longer exists. There has been a tremendous amount of change and the discipline today is quite different from the kind of anthropology that was taught here in the 1950's. Further it should be kept in mind that the very nature of anthropology, as the study of man demands new approaches and viewpoints.