

## The Advent of Sociocultural and Applied Anthropology at Arizona: A Brief Genealogy

*Thomas R. McGuire*

*Research Anthropologist Emeritus*

*Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, School of Anthropology  
University of Arizona*

John H. Provinse was on Dean Byron Cummings' staff in the Department of Archaeology when he heard that Eshreh Shevky was recruiting a team of anthropologists to conduct surveys for the Soil Conservation Service on the Navajo reservation. Provinse had received his Ph.D at the University of Chicago under the direction of A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Robert Redfield. Upon getting the SCS job, he wrote to Redfield in the fall of 1936: "I am sure that my Chicago training was largely responsible for securing me the appointment... I am trying to fit my conceptual scheme into the concepts employed by Shevky and his associates in the Planning Division. I find it very stimulating after the antiquarian sterility of Tucson" (Kelly 1985:142).

During his abbreviated stay in Tucson, Provinse established friendships with two young colleagues, Harry T. Getty and Edward H. (Ned) Spicer. Getty received a master's in 1932 for a thesis on the archaeology of the

Upper Gila. Spicer took his undergraduate training at the University of Arizona in economics in 1932, then received an MA under Dean Cummings in archaeology the following year. Getty worked as a field technician, gathering and analyzing tree ring data for Andrew Ellicott Douglass before being hired by Cummings as an assistant in the Arizona State Museum. Cummings then moved Getty to the department to take over the instructional load after Provinse's departure. Getty also worked with Spicer and a fellow student, Louis Caywood, on the excavation of the large pueblo site of Tuzigoot in the Verde Valley in 1933 and 1934. Spicer would be credited with defining the prehistoric Prescott wares. Trained as archaeologists, Spicer and Getty would reconfigure themselves as sociocultural anthropologists, and begin to fulfill the vision of Cummings and his successor, Emil Haury, of a "program in anthropology" (Thompson 2005:338). Provinse would, in government

service and policy formulation, lay a model for an applied anthropology which saw its fruition in the establishment in 1952 of the department's Bureau of Ethnic Research (BER, now the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology) under the leadership of William H. Kelly.

Watson Smith, the inveterate Southwestern archaeologist and rough contemporary of Provinse, Getty, Spicer and Kelly, briefly reflects on Ned Spicer's conversion from archaeologist to sociocultural anthropologist:

After such a seminal beginning, with the resultant creation of two "new" cultures and the recovery of thousands of pots and other artifacts it might be supposed that Ned was off and running for additional archaeological laurels. But, instead, he was persuaded by his friend and professor John Provinse to enter the University of Chicago for graduate study in anthropology in the fall of 1934. He was awarded a fellowship at Chicago, and under the influence of Professors A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Robert Redfield, his interests focused on cultural anthropology (Smith 1983:77).

And Spicer, in his obituary of Provinse, recounts his friend's path into applied work, which Spicer would follow as well:

John Provinse's abiding interest became apparent, now that his basic training in theory had been completed. At Arizona, in his first teaching job, it was evident that he was not completely at home in the classroom or even in the academic atmosphere generally. He was impatient with the piling up of knowledge for its own sake, and turned steadily toward activities in which social knowledge was being sought by administrators for the solution of urgent human problems. In the classroom he radiated a deep conviction that the social sciences ought to be used practically, and at the same time fostered skepticism and caution about facile claims for them (Spicer 1966:991).

This essay offers a brief genealogy of the early development of sociocultural and applied anthropology at the University of Arizona, from the "antiquarian sterility of Tucson," through the heady and taxing matriculation of Spicer and Getty in Chicago, to the institutionalization of an applied program in the Bureau of Ethnic Research at the university. It will intertwine the efforts and interests of Provinse (1897-1965), Spicer (1906-1983), Getty (1904-1995), and Kelly (1902-1980). Provinse and Kelly will serve to bracket my focus on Getty and Spicer –

their “coming of age,” as it were, through graduate school, through their devotion to, and trepidation about, advisors, and to their early careers. Getty and Spicer (and their respective wives) were close friends, and their rich correspondence<sup>1</sup> reveals a picture of mutual support and respect at crucial developmental stages in their careers as anthropologists and educators.

Kelly, Getty, and Spicer were senior members of the departmental faculty when I entered the graduate program in 1971. I had audited Kelly’s applied anthropology class when I arrived. When I worked on the “Douglas Project” for the Bureau of Ethnic Research in 1973, Thomas Weaver had succeeded Kelly as the Bureau’s director. Getty was graduate student advisor when he awarded me an MA degree, without additional work, after I had gone through the comprehensive exams. At the time, the “comps” were two-day, closed book, written exams on four fields, and they determined if you would be accepted into the Ph.D program. I failed archaeology the first time around, but perhaps Getty had sympathy from his experiences, recounted below, with his own experience with the comps at Chicago. His study of

1 The Spicer-Getty correspondence is in the Spicer Papers, Arizona State Museum Archives.

the San Carlos Apache cattle industry was influential when I worked on the history of the Fort Apache cattle industry for the Arizona State Museum’s Cultural Resource Management Section (Getty 1963; McGuire 1980). My own field research and dissertation, completed in 1979 and published as *Politics and Ethnicity on the Rio Yaqui: Potam Revisited* (McGuire 1986), attempted to place Spicer’s structural/historical study of Potam (Spicer 1954) in a more processual and interactionist perspective. Spicer, a member of my committee, was, I think, bemused at best.

### Provinse and the SCS

Historian Lawrence Kelly traces the work of the handful of anthropologists brought to the Navajo Reservation in 1936 to assist soil scientists in addressing problems of overgrazing. The reformist Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, built on previous efforts by the New Deal soil conservation agencies and hired Eshreh Shevky, a Ph.D in experimental medicine but well-read in anthropology, ecology, economics, and colonial administration, to build a team of anthropologists. Through “human dependency surveys,” the team was to gather social and

economic information on the Navajo to inform the efforts of soil scientists in implementing range management measures. Shevsky recruited two recent Ph.Ds from Harvard, Burleigh Gardner and Solon T. Kimball. Interestingly, Kimball and a fellow Harvard graduate student (and fellow Kansan), Emil Haury, worked together on the Canyon Creek site on the Mogollon Rim during the summer of 1932 (Haury 1995). A third anthropologist, John Provinse, sought Shevsky out directly and got a job. At Harvard, Gardner and Kimball were students of W. Lloyd Warner, who had received his own training directly from A.R. Radcliffe-Brown during fieldwork in Australia. Radcliffe-Brown's appointment to the faculty of the University of Chicago coincided with Provinse's decision to leave a law practice and study anthropology, obtaining a Ph.D in 1934 for a dissertation on social control among the Plains Indians. Thus, all three of Shevsky's team were trained as functionalists, as distinct from the Boasian-inspired traditions of culture history, trait diffusion, and evolution, dominant theories in the United States.

Kelly provides a succinct summary of functionalism and its utility:

Functionalists were interested in those aspects of a society which were also of most interest to governmental planners: land and property concepts, social and political organization, kinship patterns, native law, status systems. Functionalists were also insistent upon "explaining" culture in terms of the relationships between various parts of culture. They were, above all, insistent upon the point that cultures survived and withered according to their ability to maintain an "equilibrium" among the various parts of the system, and this insistence made them especially sensitive to the effects which a change in any part of the system would have upon every other part (Kelly 1985:141).

Burleigh Gardner resigned from the team to join his mentor, W. Lloyd Warner, who had taken up a position at Chicago. Provinse was put in charge of the Navajo human dependency survey, and Kimball joined him shortly from an assignment with the Rio Grande Pueblos. Together, the two published a brief but seminal paper in applied anthropology, "Navajo Social Organization and Land Use Planning" (Kimball and Provinse 1942). It defined the "land use community" of the Navajo, a group of matrilineally-related families working a traditional territory

in cooperative groups. Stressing that land management programs must acknowledge and utilize local leadership, they elaborate on the significance of their finding: "Through the recognition of community areas, it is now possible to indicate specific land use areas for administration and planning. The same mechanisms of cohesion and direction operating within the community group will continue to operate where administration recognizes and manages land on a community basis" (1942:23).

Provinse had attempted to recruit Ned Spicer to the work on the Navajo reservation as Spicer was finishing up his dissertation at Chicago. But Spicer made a difficult decision to accept a short-term teaching job in the UA anthropology department, filling in for Harry Getty, who was embarking for his dissertation training. It was perhaps the right decision for Spicer, as the Interior Department canceled the use of anthropologists in soil conservation, citing Congressional "impatience with the multiplicity of surveys and the absence of results therefrom" (quoted in Kelly 1985:146; see also Kelly 1980). With the approaching war, Provinse and Spicer would find themselves working together, Provinse as Chief of the Community Services Division of the

War Relocation Authority (WRA), and Spicer first as social science analyst for WRA's Japanese relocation camp in Poston, AZ, then in the WRA office in Washington (Gallaher 1984; Spicer 1966). Solon Kimball also worked for the WRA, then went on to a teaching career, retiring from the University of Florida in 1980. All three were active in the formation of the Society for Applied Anthropology in 1941.

### **Malinowski's Tucson Sojourn**

Bronislaw Malinowski of the London School of Economics made several overtures to Dean Cummings and his successor, Emil Haury, about spending a sabbatical in 1939 in the Department of Anthropology. Haury was quite receptive to the idea of bringing one of Great Britain's foremost social anthropologists to campus and expressed his appreciation after Malinowski had left: "...Your willingness to conduct a group of seminars without remuneration gave all of us an opportunity which rarely comes to an institution. To be able to discuss intimately with you the problems of social anthropology stands out as the one incomparable experience of the year and I am confident that you have stimulated us to carry on our work more intelligently

than we could have done otherwise" (Haury to Malinowski, June 1, 1939, quoted in Troy 1998:161).

Haury later confirmed to the accountant at the London School that Malinowski had expended \$357.03 for research assistants, two of whom were Harry T. Getty and Carleton S. Wilder (Troy 1998:162). Wilder was doing graduate work at Chicago which would result in a monograph on the Yaqui deer dance (Wilder 1963). He and Getty were assigned to Malinowski as "readers," sitting with the professor, reading to him from various works, discussing the contents of those readings, and recording notes of those discussions. Wilder, in a letter to Malinowski's daughter, remembers the experience: "I imagine we functioned adequately as reader and recorder - but had doubts even then that we met his severe and demanding standards as discussants...your father, as I recall, was just as uncompromising in criticizing us as he was the authors we were discussing" (Troy 1998:146).

One of Malinowski's main tasks while in Tucson was to revise a paper he had prepared for the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. The ultimate revision would appear in the *American Journal of Sociology* as "The Group and the Individual in Functional Analysis." This would

stand as his major statement on his brand of functionalism which, in a footnote, he claimed as "pure" functionalism and contrasts this to the "hyphenated" functionalism of his intellectual rival, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown (Malinowski 1939:939). As a reader, Getty was involved in this revision activity, and he reports on it in a letter to Spicer in early January, 1939: "The editors of the Encl butchered up the article as he sent it to them, so he is re-writing it to be published elsewhere. I have had one session on it with him, and tonight Carleton joins the discussion. As I told him, I don't know anything about socl anthrop but I'm out to learn everything I can. What a golden opportunity, to have Malinowski plopped down in my yard (not literally of course). So, Carleton and I are going to get saturated in functionalism a la Malinowski by the old maestro himself" (Getty to Spicer, January 12, 1939).

Another of Malinowski's interests while in Tucson was to observe the Yaqui Easter ceremonies, and in his brief report, "Functional Interpretation of the Yaqui *Fiesta de Gloria* (in Troy 1998:178-180), he would mildly chide Spicer for not fully placing the Yaqui community of Pascua in its historical context of being an uprooted group, dependent on

wage labor, without any political or municipal organization. Thus, Malinowski observed, the religious societies bear the burden of carrying out whatever functions these other pursuits once served in the indigenous pueblos of the Rio Yaqui. Malinowski is rightly regarded as the originator of extended anthropological fieldwork with the publication of his Trobriand work. Getty took him out to Pascua and commented briefly on this experience in a letter to Spicer: "I went out to the Yaqui village with Malinowski last Friday. He is an aggressive old devil. He would take us rushing right up to one of the groups in action, peer in to see what he wanted (he is a bit nearsighted) and then have me make notes literally under their nose. I expected that we would be run out of the country, but the Yaquis didn't seem to object. It's a great life if I can manage to live through it - keeping up with my regular classwork, trying to work on German and French, and getting a very small part of all that he wants me to do..." (Getty to Spicer, March 13, 1939).

Timothy Troy aptly summarizes Malinowski's impact on the anthropological community in Tucson, suggesting that Haury's vision of a broad program in anthropology was still incubating:

"...the Department of Anthropology, despite its name change, continued to be focused on Southwestern archaeology. Much of what Malinowski was professing was simply beyond the interest and understanding of the department's students. Malinowski, apparently, was seen by most in Tucson as an oddity. His presence did not generate a great deal of interest" (Troy 1998:148-9).

#### **Harry Getty's Intellectual Journey through Grad School: Berkeley or Chicago?**

By late summer, 1939, Getty and his wife, Justine, had moved to California so that Getty, with Haury's encouragement, could pursue a Ph.D at UC- Berkeley. Spicer, having just completed his dissertation at Chicago, returned to Tucson with his wife, Rosamond (Roz), to fill the temporary vacancy created by Getty's absence. The Spicers also house-sat for the Gettys, and there is much correspondence between the couples about gardens, flood damage, and the anxieties and pleasures of departing and returning to Tucson. Over several years, Harry and Ned pondered the worthiness of the two dominant paths of American anthropology - the historical-diffusionist school centered around



**Figures 24 and 25.** (left) Harry Getty and (right) Edward Spicer. Faculty photos taken in 1967. Images courtesy of the Arizona State Museum Archives.

Berkeley, and the emergent functionalist school embedded in Chicago. Having failed the required language exams in German and French at Berkeley, Getty had sent a telegram to Spicer soon after his arrival, wanting out of California. He then expanded on his initial impressions of Berkeley in a letter of October 1, 1939:

*...As Justine said in her letter to Roz, we have not yet decided to stay here. The first few skirmishes here left me very discouraged and bewildered, particularly my failure in the two language exams (even tho it is customary). But that meant that I could take no graduate courses at all. I sent my wire to you at the time that I was feeling most discouraged, and believe me,*

*I appreciate more than I can tell you the time you took from your rush work there to write me. Your advice and counsel was not in vain, even tho it might seem that way. There were two things mainly that kept me from tearing right out for Chicago. One was the matter of money...Well, the other thing that restrained us was that actually I didn't have much basis for forming an opinion of things here. My feelings are based pretty much on what others said. Of course, I'll agree that when more than 75% of the grad students seem to be highly dissatisfied with things, there must be something wrong.*

*...But as to the setup here, I still am not ready to pass any final judgment. I cant seem to get much interest in Kroeber and his work, undoubtedly due largely to that inane Pro-seminar every graduate*



student must take before being admitted to the graduate courses. We are taking the section on the hoop-and-pole games in BAE 24, Culin's "Games of the Amer Inds", and completely working it over to see if we can arrive at any distributional conclusions. Culin, of course, simply presents the games of the various tribes without any attempt at analysis. Lowie seems to have more on the ball, and seems to look at things more from a social point of view. He agreed to let me audit the only graduate course he gives, a seminar on acculturation. It has met twice so far, but so far he hasn't been in action very much, its been straight student reports. But, while Lowie is the stronger of the two men mentally, the brains of the outfit as it were, yet Kroeber still runs the roost, definitely so. Kroeber strikes me as being an old-school, classical, historical anthropologist. Gifford is also a stalwart historical anthropologist, with innumerable quantities of traits at hand with which to befuddle one, and I suspect himself too at times.

...The offerings to graduate students here seem to me to be along historical and distributional lines, plus what one may be able to get along social lines from Lowie, but even that seems to be strongly tinged with history and distribution...

As I see it now, my problem is going to shape itself into a question of getting the historical-distributional approach here, or getting a broader social-functional approach such as I understand it to be at Chicago.... As I said in a letter to John Provinse this past week, it seems to me that ethnologic studies now should be more than mere ethnographic studies.

Ned, I know darn well that I would never make a social anthropologist, my mental setup isn't the kind for a social anthropologist. But I do feel that I could do ethnographic work that was largely tempered by the social viewpoint. If in going to Chicago I would have to be a social anthropologist or else, then I had better not think about going there; but if I could plan to work heavily in ethnography, and temper it largely with social anthrop then I could feel very happy about it. What do you think?

You said in your letter from Chicago to me, that you never felt quite right about me coming here. One reason I came here was that I thought I would fit best into the type of anthrop they seemed to give here, and I sincerely thought that. But since getting here in the middle of it, I question very strongly whether I was right. Perhaps my contact with Malinowski planted a germ that isn't getting much nourishment here. Sometimes it takes a very severe jolt to make us see the light. Another reason why I came here, was to try to establish relationships between here and Tucson. But I don't believe there is much interest in such a contact so far as this end of the line is concerned, and I don't see that we would benefit a great deal thereby at Tucson.

...Sometimes I think what the Hell is all the uproar about, get the degree in any way and get it over with. On the other hand, as I said to Doc Provinse, it seems to me I should get some real inspiration and stimulus from this graduate work. What do you think about it, having just finished the work. Any light you can throw on the financial situation at Chicago will be a big help. You and Roz must

*have made it through without any great amount of finances.*

*I guess the two fraus have pretty well discussed the house matters so I wont say anything about that. Except that I hope you two enjoy the place as much as we did – it made leaving Tucson just that much tougher.*

Spicer responded quickly on October 5, first commending Getty for staying on through the semester and noting that Haury agrees that an early departure, after the results of the mandatory language exams were discouraging, would not have given Getty adequate time to assess the potential of Berkeley's program. Then Spicer turns to an assessment of the Berkeley offerings and Getty's other concerns:

*Frankly, I can't believe that Kroeber and Lowie have nothing to offer, though I think it may be possible to get most of what they have in a fairly brief contact. I feel very much that Kroeber is out of touch with more recent developments in cultural anthropology, that he simply does not understand the approaches of men like Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski, Redfield, and even Linton. His seminar at Chicago two years ago was very unpopular and although students went religiously and took notes, I have talked with no one who came out of it with any inspiration or any new ideas. I think that Kroeber's latest work on trait distribution (with Driver, etc.) is a*

*sort of reductio ad absurdum of the distributional approach, that he has carried the method to the point where its results are no longer significant in any way. The weakness of the work is based, I think, in a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of culture, which could be corrected (in a younger person) by a simple reading of Linton's chapters on Function, Historical Reconstruction, and Classifications. I have a hunch, in other words, that study under Kroeber is likely to lead up one of the blind alleys of anthropology rather than to lead out into the very fruitful paths that have been developing in the last fifteen years elsewhere.... Lowie has a great deal more to offer. You can't beat his Crow Indians for deep insight into the workings of a culture and all along he has shown an interest that goes much deeper than mere geographical distribution. His point of view has been broader in most ways than Radcliffe-Brown's, for instance. A seminar in acculturation with him ought to be very, very good. I would envy the chance to take it, providing Lowie hasn't got himself too far removed from the actualities of field work in the past few years...*

*Anyway, I am glad you are going through the intellectual turmoil which seems to be assailing you, unpleasant though it may be at the moment. It makes me think of my return to Chicago with the Yaqui material. I turned in an outline (fifteen pages or so) of a report on the work to Redfield and then went in for a conference with him. He ripped the outline up and down, told me I had no formulated problems in conjunction with it which had any general significance, and said that*

*it looked as if ethnologists were getting so that they made merely more and more complete ethnographies but were failing to synthesize their data in any significant way. I contemplated suicide for a couple of weeks after that. But I struggled on, working with the Culture Contacts seminar, thinking, discussing, and writing and eventually thought my way out into an approach that satisfied Redfield and which has borne much fruit for myself ever since. It was a very tough experience, but it was an experience and as a result of it I find that I thought through most of the basic problems of social anthropology. I had to do that in order to save my life, as it were. Consequently the writing of my thesis was for me the most important thing I have ever done. It was not a routine task at any point. It was forged out of direct personal contact with Redfield's brain....*

*You wonder in your letter whether you will have to be a social anthropologist or else. You won't, but you will have to understand that culture is something more than shreds and patches, or at least that the patches are cut to fit certain holes. If you want to be a historian of culture, and why shouldn't you?, you will get plenty of inspiration and assistance. Fred Eggan is working out the history of kinship terminologies and usages all the time.... The thing is that ethnology and social anthropology aren't separated at Chicago, in the sense that you are supposed to be able to interpret culture history without reference to culture processes. You use the latter all the time in working out the former and you use the former as a source of material for the study of the latter. I don't*

*believe you when you say you haven't got the "mental set-up" to understand social anthropology. Maybe you don't have the interest in the mechanics of culture, but there is little chance that you lack the ability to understand the fundamentals (in as far as they are known) of how culture works and grows and its parts fit together. Once you master those fundamentals, then you can go on to an interest in purely historical developments in the Southwest.*

By November, the Gettys, Harry and Justine, had made up their minds. In a brief note to the Spicers on November 19, Harry announces:

*Well so far as we're concerned we are going to Chicago. After weeks of mental wrestling the die is cast. I may be letting myself in for many months of mental torture at Chicago U, but that seems much more preferable to me than a slow-death here. I still think the Egyptian mummy-case just inside the door at the Anthro Bldg is very symbolic.*

One of Getty's first letters, January 12, 1940, to Spicer after settling in at Chicago is up-beat. On their apartment, Getty writes:

*We have our Indian things in the main room, so its quite homey. I got some lumber and built a book-case... its stained and looks very nice. Our windows don't do us much good except for ventilation, as there is only a blank brick wall immediately op-*

*posite. From the Catalina Mts to a brick wall. But we are very comfortable....*

*As to school. I am greatly pleased with everything here. There is no comparison between the atmosphere here and at Berkeley...I have had a hell of a time getting on to Redfield, but in the Folk Society he just goes great guns, he's a veritable streak of greased lightning. He talks fast, sort of mumbles at times, and is talking a lingo that I'm not to yet – though I'm improving day by day...he's definitely stimulating, he constitutes a distinct challenge, and that's what I did not find at Berkeley. My short paper in the Mexico course will be on the Ball Courts of America.*

Getty proceeded to take the comprehensive exams for a Master's degree in early 1941 (he already had a UA Masters degree for his archaeological work on the Upper Gila in 1932), and his letter to Ned and Roz on March 17, 1941 will resonate with many current and former graduate students at the University of Arizona:

*For the last three months study and review has taken absolute preference over everything and everybody else. The enforced slavery became a bit monotonous at times, but it paid dividends, so I feel it was well worthwhile... When I talked to Fred [Eggan] about the exams early in January, the faculty was quite willing to excuse me from the exam in archaeology, so I took advantage of the fact. I felt there were good reasons for my doing so, even though you, Ned, advised against do-*

*ing so. I felt that I had the fundamental knowledge of archaeology generally, well enough in hand to warrant my being excused from the exam, and the preparation I would have done would have been getting in hand illustrative specific material. So I felt it would be much better for me to apply that time instead to getting a better grasp of the subjects that were less familiar to me – socl anthrop and linguistics – and I believe the results fully justify my action.*

*... Well, I'm glad that's behind me. It's a bit of a strain, at least it was for me, and apparently it was for others as well. The extent of the body of knowledge for which one is held on those exams, not only generally but in detail, is enormous. I have always been skeptical of 'comprehensive exams', and since participating in these exams and observing the preparations made by others as well as myself I am still more skeptical. However, I admit I am not just certain what I would do in their place.*

He continued course work at Chicago and passed what were essentially qualifying exams for the Ph.D. He would return to Tucson in late 1941 or early 1942, teaching his signature course on World Ethnography. He contemplated several different dissertation topics, but settled on a study of Mexican-American relationships with other ethnic groups in Tucson. He offers Spicer a progress report in a June 8, 1945 letter:

*I am pressing work on my thesis again this summer at full speed. The teaching load was too heavy this past year to permit me to do anything much on the thesis. This next year will be even worse. Believe it or not I am scheduled for seven classes the first semester, but two are almost certain not to materialize – they just can't. You can well see how much we need another staff member.*

He submitted his dissertation, "Interethnic Relationships in the Community of Tucson," to his Chicago advisors, W. Lloyd Warner and Robert Redfield, in 1949. After some revisions, Getty was awarded his Ph.D in 1950 (Getty 1976). Spicer's activities War Relocation Authority came to an end and he accepted Emil Haury's offer of a position in the Department of Anthropology.

### **William Kelly's Bureau of Ethnic Research**

A native of Arizona, Bill Kelly graduated with a BA from the University of Arizona in 1936 under Byron Cummings. He went on to Harvard for a Ph.D, working under the tutelage of Clyde Kluckhohn and Leslie Spier. In the acknowledgements of his revised 1944 dissertation, published in the *Anthropological Papers of the U of A*, he related the approach he



**Figure 26.** Image of William Kelly, from Kelly's faculty profile printed in the December 1964 edition of the *Atlatl*. *Atlatl* reprint courtesy of the Arizona State Museum Archives.

took in his Cocopa ethnographic work: "Southwestern ethnographies prior to 1940 were written in the tradition of history: one of the primary interests was to recover an account of the pre-European cultures before the memory of an earlier way of life was lost. Since this was my interest, I chose to write a monograph in a style reminiscent of those written by Alfred Kroeber, E.W. Gifford, Grenville Goodwin, and Leslie Spier" (1977:vi).

One of these mentors, Spier, had argued when he was editor of the *American Anthropologist* that acculturation studies were polit-

ical science and had no place in anthropology (Vincent 1990:198). But when Kelly was hired by Emil Haury to direct the newly-established Bureau of Ethnic Research, he would bring applied anthropology to bear against the mounting efforts in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Congress to terminate reservations and speed up assimilative processes. One of Kelly's first salvos came in his assessment of applied anthropology in the Southwest, decrying the reversal of even the contested efforts of Commissioner John Collier to seek the advice and service of anthropologists such as Solon Kimball and John Provinsse:

The great block to the application of social science principles remains nearly as effective today as twenty years ago when Collier first attempted to make use of them. The Indian Service is the product of people, and it is constantly recruiting people who possess a deep-seated American assumption that, by and large, instruction and example are all that are needed to bring the American Indian into our way of life. This is accompanied by the belief that no unusual injury to the Indian need result from the process of acculturation and that no special knowledge and no special techniques are required to bring

about the desired changes (Kelly 1954:714).

Kelly's paper was part of a special 200-page issue of the *American Anthropologist* devoted to assessing the state of anthropology in the Southwest. Edited and prefaced by Haury, the papers and commentary were first presented at a symposium, organized by Spicer and Haury, at the annual AAA meetings held in Tucson in December, 1953. The topical papers cover perhaps the full extent of what Haury envisioned for a "program in anthropology": hunters and gatherers (Paul Kirchhoff), Southwestern archaeology (Walter Taylor), Southwestern cultural interrelationships (Joe Ben Wheat), the history of the Pueblo Southwest (Erik Reed), physical anthropology (J.N. Spuhler), linguistics (Stanley Newman), intercultural relations in the greater Southwest (Ruth Underhill), Spanish-Indian acculturation (Spicer), culture and personality (Clyde Kluckhohn), Kelly's applied anthropology, and a concluding paper by E. Adamson Hoebel, "Major Contributions of Southwestern Studies to Anthropological Theory." There were 22 commentaries from a virtual "who's who" in American anthropology at the time.

When Collier resigned from

the BIA in 1945, termination and assimilation talk gained ascendancy. The Hoover Commission's report in 1948 strongly recommended that the federal government should remove itself from the Indian business as quickly as possible. Under Indian Commissioner Glenn Emmons, a New Mexico banker, a heavy emphasis was placed on employment assistance, including adult vocational training and off-reservation placement efforts. These portended a significant population shift off-reservation to surrounding communities. And, with the passage of Public Law 83-280 in 1953, Congress authorized some states to take legal jurisdiction over tribes, and allowed other states to assume jurisdiction – and provide services – whenever they chose to do so (Officer 1984:79). It was this specter of state responsibility for tribes that surrounded the establishment of the Bureau of Ethnic Research by the state in 1952:

This is something of a revolution in the policy of state governments in that this action of the Board of Regents indicates their appreciation of the importance of research and the gathering of facts before important state policies must be formulated...The greatest immediate problem, so far as the state is concerned, is

the possibility of increasing tension in Indian-white relations in towns nearest the reservations. Arizona's citizens are, on the whole, ambivalent in their feelings towards the Indians. There is a high degree of tolerance, and even a tendency to glorify the Indian, while at the same time giving verbal expression to the usual expressions that Indians are lazy, unreliable, et cetera. It is the hope of the University that an educational program will help to establish realistic attitudes towards Arizona's Indians before behavior becomes crystallized and before the Indian population becomes more numerous in white communities (Anon. 1952:40).

Kelly and the Bureau of Ethnic Research were also concerned that, even if the termination movement was averted, Indians on reservation and off, many of whom were returning war veterans, would need assistance. Fundamental to this effort was the collection of information on the conditions of Native Americans in Arizona. The Bureau's first annual report received a positive review in the *American Anthropologist*: "Mr. Kelly and the University of Arizona must be commended for this first big step in establishing an easily obtainable source of basic information for one of Ari-

zona's largest minority groups" (Olson 1954:333).

Through the 1950s the fervor for termination did wane as opposition groups lobbied Interior and Congress. When President Kennedy nominated an anthropologist, Philleo Nash, as Commissioner, federal involvement in resource development and education and larger appropriations became matters of policy (Officer 1984:81). Ironically, had the termination policies and the predicted flood of Native Americans into nearby communities occurred, Getty's baseline study of interethnic relationships in Tucson would probably have obtained a higher profile.

### Consolidation

By the 1950s, sociocultural and applied anthropology were on firm footings in the department, ratifying the vision of Emil Hauray and his predecessor, Dean Cummings, for a broad program in anthropology. Many of the figures in this genealogy got their start in archaeology, then honed their interests in these subdisciplines. Their own intellectual and personal genealogies were deeply intertwined. Spicer and Getty, and their spouses, shared theoret-

ical ideas and practical interests. Provinse, in his brief academic stint at Arizona, mentored both Getty and Spicer, and would be a continuing model for Spicer of the role of anthropology in the policy world. Kelly, the undergraduate student of Bryon Cummings, formed an applied unit in a department that had been primed for such an endeavor. Kelly's Bureau then served as a training ground for a number of respected anthropologists, including James Officer, Robert Hackenberg, Harland Padfield, and John van Willigen. Getty carried out a heavy teaching load and was appointed as the first academic advisor to American Indian students. And Spicer, once his Radcliffe-Brownian and Chicago days were behind him, would quickly turn his attention to issues of history, culture change, and acculturation, as evidenced in his major edited volume in 1961, *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*. By the 1970s, Spicer would become a leading theorist of what he chose to call "persistent cultural systems" (Spicer 1971). Although not recognized at the time, this piece in *Science* is something of a subaltern manifesto.



## References

- Anon.  
1952 "People and Projects." *Human Organization* (Spring):39-40.
- Gallaher, Art, Jr.  
1984 Edward Holland Spicer (1906-1983. *American Anthropologist* 86(2):380-385.
- Getty, Harry T.  
1935 New Dates for Spruce Tree House, Mesa Verde. *Tree-Ring Bulletin* (April):28-29.  
1963 The San Carlos Indian Cattle Industry. Tucson: *Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona*, No. 7.  
1976 *Interethnic Relationships in the Community of Tucson*. New York: Arno Press (reprint of dissertation, 1950, University of Chicago).
- Haury, Emil W.  
1995 Wherefore A Harvard PhD.? *Journal of the Southwest* 37(4): 710-742.
- Kelly, Lawrence C.  
1980 Anthropology and Anthropologists in the Indian New Deal. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16(1): 6-24.  
1985 Anthropology in the Soil Conservation Service. *Agricultural History* 59(2):136-147.
- Kelly, William H.  
1954 Applied Anthropology in the Southwest. *American Anthropologist* 56(4):709-714.  
1977 Cocopa Ethnography. Tucson: *Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona*, No. 29.
- Kimball, Solon T., and John H. Province  
1942 Navajo Social Organization in Land Use Planning. *Applied Anthropology* (July-August-September):18-25.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw  
1939 The Group and the Individual in Functional Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 44(6):938-9.
- McGuire, Thomas R.  
1980 *Mixed-Bloods, Apaches, and Cattle Barons: Documents for a History of the Livestock Economy on the White Mountain Reservation, Arizona*. Arizona State Museum, Archaeological Series No. 142.  
1986 *Politics and Ethnicity on the Rio Yaqui: Potam Revisited*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Olson, Walter O.  
1954 Review of *Indians of the Southwest: A Survey of Indian Tribes and Indian Administration*

- in Arizona*, by William H. Kelly. 56:332-333.
- Officer, James E.  
1984 The Indian Service and its Evolution. In Sandra L, Cawalader and Vine Deloria, Jr., eds. *The Aggressions of Civilization: Federal Indian Policy since the 1880s*. Pp. 59-103. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Smith, Watson  
1983 The Archaeological Legacy of Edward H. Spicer. *Kiva* 49(1/2):75-79.
- Spicer, Edward H.  
1940 *Pascua: A Yaqui Village in Arizona*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
1954 Potam: A Yaqui Village in Sonora. *American Anthropological Association Memoir 77*. Menasha, Wisconsin.  
1966 John H. Province, 1897-1965. *American Anthropologist* 68(3):990-994.  
1971 Persistent Cultural Systems. *Science* 174:795-800.
- Spicer, Edward H., ed.  
1961 *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thompson, Raymond H.  
2005 Anthropology at the University of Arizona, 1893-2005. *Journal of the Southwest* 47(3):327-374.
- Troy, Timothy  
1998 Professor Bronislaw Malinowski's Visit to Tucson. *Journal of the Southwest* 40(2): 129-186.
- Vincent, Joan  
1990 *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wilder, Carleton Stafford  
1963 The Yaqui Deer Dance: A Study in Cultural Change. Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, *Anthropological Papers*, No. 66.