brought up in various ways by other people, such as Dr. Taba—that learning in process is really the way you change people—was quite definitely brought out by the occurrences here.

Other things, such as what we do mean by values—we've been ignoring them largely. I think, in anthropology for various reasons; it becomes quite clear where they fit in, both at the most abstract level and also at the more practical level. And I have suddenly discovered that these two levels are not so far apart, that you cannot discuss one without the other. Also, I think that in regard to the original bias that I personally had—that education was something practical, and not particularly related to what we other people think we're doing—I have developed a more healthy respect for the complexities which applied problems have to face, and that in many ways it's more difficult than the clear theoretical statements; we're quite able to spin theories without having to be brought down to earth.

Roland Force: I find most of the things that I was going to comment on have been covered by the other people who have just spoken. There are a lot of minor points of personal observation that could be brought up, but I would rather convey an over-all impression. I've been reminded from the very first of an article that appeared in the American Anthropologist (April 1954), in which the author, John Bennett, commented on his own experiences in working in interdisciplinary research; and I'm afraid I brought some of his conclusions with me. I must say at this point, I'm inclined to be encouraged. The view that I had after reading Bennett's article, in which he related his own experiences which were not entirely favorable, was not a happy one. I see now where a number of issues have been resolved in terms of interdisciplinary communication here.

I quite agree with Louise (Spindler) that this is a good example of cultures in contact. This I think is a realization that we've come upon independently because we haven't communicated this conclusion between ourselves. I think it's worth saying that perhaps one of the reasons this may be so, that the bridge across disciplinary lines has been made, is the nature of the disciplines. The disciplines represented here are broadly eclectic, both of them, and perhaps this is particularly advantageous.

Spindler: Thank you for your comments. Now may I ask Margaret (Mead) if she will give the summary she has been planning as a result of an invitation by our Stanford planning group?

Summary by Margaret Mead

Mead: I am not going to attempt to summarize the whole conference. And I'm not going to attempt to repeat the things that have been said. I was asked to give a paper and decided not to, as long as I had to give this summary. Therefore, some of the things that I will say will be my points that nobody may have said yet, or that no one has said at this conference in this particular way. So that it will be a combination of some of the things I might have said if I had written a paper, and what I have distilled out of this conference. I suppose it could be described as what I've learned out of this conference, most of which I was not quite certain of before, and I'm going to try to put it in some communicable form.

First, this problem of cooperation between educators and anthropologists. This is a particularly complicated subject. Educators, after all, live in culture, change culture, work with culture, have students of different cultures, and so on, so that they feel qua educators a certain, sometimes very large, confidence in their understanding of cultural differences or cultural transmission, and so forth. And anthropologists teach, as Steve (Hart) pointed out, went to school, have children in schools, serve on school boards, and in a variety of ways are active participants in the educational system, sometimes are formal educators for large parts of their lives in many ways. And Fee (Keesing) as an educational administrator of a department in a complex university setting must spend almost as much time on educational problems as many educators here. Now I know that educators are bad enough in some ways when they're not competent; we all know about the amateurs who think that they know all about any subject involving human beings. We know about the people who know about marriage because they were married, and so on. But this is a still more complex problem, because we're both competent acting practitioners in the field of the other's area of competence. It comes up, for instance, in Bill Martin's statement that he wouldn't hire an anthropologist to do a particular job in this case, deal with a school board. In that case, you wouldn't hire an anthropologist but you would hire somebody who knew about school boards, and he might be an educator who knew a lot about social structure and anthropology or he might be an anthropologist who knew a lot about school boards and education. As we work together in any kind of conference like this and in future discussions, these points need to be pinned down—the extent to which each person, each group, has competence in the other group's area of competence.

Now I want to discuss very briefly the formal possibilities of cooperation. This has been set up as a co-operation between the group called anthropologists and the group called educators. We've had some demonstrations in terms of preferences, of value, and of behavior here that there are many kinds of anthropologists: if you order somebody who's a Fellow of the American Anthropological Association you don't necessarily get anyone who can contribute to education except at the sheer content level of his particular area of professional specialization, whether
with Bernie Siegel's models, I think you will find that his organizational model bore some traces of sociometry, although he may not feel that accurately. The other model came from Kurt Lewin's channel theory which was developed in Lewin's psychology in answer to anthropological questions. And then John Henry used in information theory or communication theory model for communication, and that set up the communication between Jules (Henry) and Art (Coladarc). And  Larry Frank all the way through has been using a very large body of interdisciplinary material out of which he moved in every sort of direction to do. It motion in this discussion.

There is a high probability that one of the best ways of getting communication between anthropologists and educators is to use those anthropologists and those educators who are themselves interdisciplinary, and especially interdisciplinary in their use of psychology and personality theory—those who do it is very important that the individual should be included as well as the society. Maybe this is the fertile spot of interdisciplinary communication.

When one comes to the question of areas in which we can have fruitful classes of cross-disciplinary communication, I'm not going to try to make this list exclusive at all. We've had a whole series of suggestions; but I think it's probably very important to distinguish between the use of anthropology—this comes because the anthropologist has learned to have research findings on such points as the relationship between adolescence and conformity, and the need for some specific awareness and to take into account the psychological and sociological implications. This awareness is important that the individual should be included as well as the society.
and that there are possibilities of resetting the whole pattern. But everything that’s being done in cross-cultural studies at present is relevant to that problem for the educator at a different level from the need to use anthropological material in order to increase sensitivity or widen students’ horizons.

The same thing, I think, may be true of the whole question of social organization and social structures. We want the student to learn about different sorts of social structures and to become conscious of the existence of social structures, so that a teacher knows she’s in a school system, and she knows it is a system and not just an arbitrary set of pressures. That is rather different from the research level of what we know at present about institutional change, and the limits of institutional change. Jules (Henry) brought up the point about the areas where one feels one can’t move at all—where one’s position is perceived as a cog in a system and the only thing to do is to get out if you don’t like it. Hilda (Taba) then showed that in teaching teachers she could show them that much of what they thought they didn’t want was a cog. That’s one part of the picture, where the relative “cogness” could be discussed, but there’s another level that’s closer to what Ted (Bramsled) is interested in— that is, where you can really make an institutional change—and what do we know about social systems? We haven’t gone there? So I think in this conference from time to time there has been a confusion between these levels. When do you need an anthropological description of Centerville in order to operate in Centerville? When do you need an anthropological description of Centerville in order to teach people who will go into a Centerville? And when do we need material on what happens in rapidly growing communities, at a quite different sort of theoretical level?

In terms of interchange or borrowing of methods from one discipline to the other, the whole emphasis on the natural history approach is one that I think can fit in very well with the history of education and what we teach students about it. But in the anthropological statements here, I think there’s often been one striking omission, which may conceivably even be a very bad omission in the structure of the conference, that is, in a conference ten years from now. That is, I think that history ought to be here too. Ten years from now the distinctions between anthropology and history will not be such as they are now; those gaps are going to close, they are going to close very rapidly. It will depend on several things, such as how many historians the directors of the Ford Foundation Behavioral Science Center decide have anything to do with human beings; it will depend on how many historians have time to learn any biology. It will depend on a lot of things, and the specific applications of natural history and of historical methods to education will fit in quite differently from the way they’re fitting in now.

There’s one other methodological problem, which I think has vexed educators and anthropologists for quite a while when they’ve worked together, that perhaps ought to be made explicit. It came up once or twice. I think Fee (Keesing) made it more explicit than anyone else here did; and it also came out of Professor Kroemer’s statement about the different sources of anthropology. There is such a thing as collecting data in such a way that you minimize bias. But that does not mean you get rid of bias completely; it doesn’t mean that you get rid of your perceptual modalities; it doesn’t mean that your data on a particular society aren’t going to be more visual than auditory. There are uncounted levels of the intervention of subjectivity into material. Nevertheless, with the adequate use of machine recording—with film and tape recordings and various devices of that sort—we’re going to be able to get chunks of material that are multidimensional, that are large enough. In such chunks, data may be readeliminated, so that even if the anthropologist did say, “I’m going to take a four-hour shot,” somebody else could carve a thirty-seven-minute shot out of the middle of it that the anthropologist did not plan to carve out, and look at it later. We’ve had arguments in the past, severe arguments, as to whether it’s introducing recording into the school system would interfere with the children’s learning in some way, and then the educator had to protect them. With the growth of machine recording of various sorts, the participan=anthropologist’s data being a cow wasn’t as important and therefore such a thorn in the flesh of the local social system as he almost always is. If primitive people had school principals, probably no anthropologist would ever have been allowed to get in and study the native tribe. There is usually nobody in the social systems that could be used by the “I don’t want life disturbed,” and so the anthropologist can get in. But anthropologists are not angels of noninterference and they usually make a certain amount of trouble in the village, and they can make a great deal of trouble in the school system. But if machine recording we’re going to be able to get away from that. We’re going to be able to collect large chunks of material without too much active participant observer intervention in the system, on the one hand, and with increasing minimization of the distortion of the potentials of the view of the collector. In this way, we can separate the material from the interpretation, which is, I think, one of the points of view that the anthropologist, as a field scientist, is going to continue to stand for.

There’s another use of anthropological materials that’s been raised here also, and that’s the use of anthropological records of primitive societies; or one may, from the point of view of a cultural analysis, look at ancient societies, exotic societies, and so forth, as living models that will widen our picture of the potentials of what human society could be. One of the sources for new cultural invention is what other people have done. It is from that point of view that Steve (Hunt) presented his material on initiation. This is something that cultures have done; this is the way it is done; these are the elements that recur. This gives us something to think about, not in order to transfer it directly, or to create a Utopia (for Utopias are extraordinarily deadly)—no one wants to live in one after they’ve read about it, but it gives us an element that we might be neglecting at the present moment, or that we might combine with something else.

In the areas where educators and anthropologists are going to cooperate, we’re not in these are normative. At the research level, you can call in an anthropologist to make a study of Centerville and give you the data if you want to. But the minute you want to change the teachers in Centerville or give the children in Centerville an experience their par-
now, with respect to what Ted (Brameld) was calling for here, it seems to me he was calling for tough-mindedness and dedication, for people who were interested in change and who would take into account everything we know from all the social sciences about the difficulty of moving forward in a direction of social change. On the one hand, the anthropologist, educator—a whole group of people—will work on the problems of social change, the anthropologist who doesn’t notice the lack of the kind of dedication that Ted (Brameld) was calling for, because he’s merely motivated by delight in curiosity, and he’s more sophisticated in the humanist position, and he’s so happy being led from fact to fact, from theory to theory, he’s completely motivated, but his dedication is of another order from the necessary dedication to social change. Then there’s the educator who is happy with the job of teaching a new group of youngsters—something new. So such educators in turn are not preoccupied with social change. They’ve got their own regenerative devices.

Next, I’d like to say a little about the question of lag. Some of the ideas that we’ve been working with here are on the edge of being superseded. I want to illustrate this by one point. Almost everything that we’ve said here today, in the last four days, takes off implicitly from the conditions which are involved in the ups-and-downs of attempting to introduce change. This is a statement of opinion that I think can be pretty well documented with the breakdown rate for overseas technical assistance. The thing is, the most violent advocates of doing something will stress, “But you have to grow.” Hilda (Taba) gave us a very clear statement of what she regards as the steps in change. Coral’s (Douglas) paper discussed the process going to have to work, the steps that change has to take. Then comes the stage of learning and change. I suspect that in the next five years our major emphasis is going to be on the fact that if you have enough speed you can have a great deal of change. That is an idea that was very fashionable twenty years ago. It was fashionable because the ideas of change were partial. We were trying to work with little bits; we were trying to put a tractor into a medieval economy; we were trying to lead people to new hygienic measures where they’re living in the same house, going to bed in the same bed that he’s got, and yet wanting to give them a little bit of change. Now, what we see in many instances is that rapid total change—for instance, where a population if they’re going to work in a factory also go to live in a new kind of town—and that’s a very possible to build new patterns extraordinarily rapidly. Take, for example, the present marriage pattern in the United States since World War II, which differs in about a hundred significant respects from the pre-World War II marriage pattern. It’s been built under conditions of speed of migration and change in the whole social structure. There are a whole series of areas where possibly speed that doesn’t give a chance to mobilize resistance, that doesn’t give a chance for the partial learning to become picked and crystallized, is going to be very important.

Now, I would like to discuss another problem that I don’t pretend to understand well at all. This is the tendency of educators to take up fads or to produce things in cliché form, which, stated in more general terms, is the tendency to form cults rather than to remain social systems. The little hit that we know about cults (and my recent Mannus study is probably the most detailed study that’s ever been made in this of the fight between becoming a cult and remaining a part of the society, which struggle is what the Mannus community is going through at present) suggests that the cult may be related to types of pressure. It may be related to the fact that the innovating educator has been under too much pressure, has been too much alone, and therefore has been on the defensive, and has tended to crystalize his thinking because he’s been forced to do this almost to the limit of convention. We know that one of the things that leads to this crystallization of nativistic cults is the conflict that goes on to get the particular new point accepted. But I think it’s something, as Ted suggested, of which we as students of wider cultural processes should be extremely and who have a dedicated commitment to change in some way—enough so they want to work on it—this is the whole conference, need to do it to their own good. We know that one of the things that leads to this crystallization of nativistic cults is the conflict that goes on to get the particular new point accepted. But I think it’s something, as Ted suggested, of which we as students of wider cultural processes should be extremely and who have a dedicated commitment to change in some way—enough so they want to work on it. We hear this often in the ups-and-downs of attempting to introduce change. This is a statement of opinion that I think can be pretty well documented with the breakdown rate for overseas technical assistance.

Next, I’d like to say something about the question of lag. Some of the ideas that we’ve been working with here are on the edge of being superseded. I want to illustrate this by one point. Almost everything that we’ve said here today, in the last four days, takes off implicitly from the conditions which are involved in the ups-and-downs of attempting to introduce change. This is a statement of opinion that I think can be pretty well documented with the breakdown rate for overseas technical assistance. The thing is, the most violent advocates of doing something will stress, “But you have to grow.” Hilda (Taba) gave us a very clear statement of what she regards as the steps in change. Coral’s (Douglas) paper discussed the process going to have to work, the steps that change has to take. Then comes the stage of learning and change. I suspect that in the next five years our major emphasis is going to be on the fact that if you have enough speed you can have a great deal of change. That is an idea that was very fashionable twenty years ago. It was fashionable because the ideas of change were partial. We were trying to work with little bits;
structure of metaphor in English is different from the structure of meta-
phor in Russian, that when you're using an image in English poetry such as "He flew like an eagle" you get a very different imagery structure from "Not like an eagle he flew, but like a man" in Russian. If you think of all those things at once, can you ever write a poem? That was Sapir's position, and it was a very important one. There seems to be no doubt that people who have a lot of half-baked unindividually realized new scientific ideas in their heads produce very peculiar poetry, and very peculiar fiction, bad plays, and imperfect music. There is undoubtedly a process of assimilation that is necessary if we're going to have genuine aesthetic experience and genuine artistic work by individuals.

This is probably equally true of cultures in respects that we don't know. We don't know where the insight level operates. Now, I'm going to give you a kind of brief intermediate example, and that is McCarthyism. I think that if we could have found and invoked the analysis of the people who know most about McCarthyism, who know most about the Soviet Union, who started to think about interaction between the United States and Germany, Britain, and the United States in the late 'thirties, they would have been able to work out a series of predictions and we would have been able to give more liberals in this country the perfectly adequate prediction that (a) McCarthyism was predictable, and (b) it wouldn't turn out exactly as expected; but this would have harmed rather than helped the vibrant furious indignation that has made the prediction actually work out. So that you lose, in communicating the insight, the very thing on which your prediction is based. Thus every time you communicate an insight or an awareness, you change the course of history. Do you actively want to change the course of history in this particular respect? Yet I agree with Ted that we are committed to building a society in which we have more and more insights and awareness. And Larry has made the point that we want a society that is regenerative spiritually in the sense that it continually reassesses its goals, and at the same time, hopefully, will set up better mechanisms for reassessing its goals—which of course, of course, a conscious educational system is one definition of mechanism. But I'm not sure we haven't solved. It's a subject on which a great many people are reacting today, and they're reacting in a variety of ways: some with a return to neo-orthodoxy, some with a desire for various and sundry sorts of control, some with a desire to return to the three R's. There are dozens of these reaction formations against uncontrolled insights that we don't yet understand.

I've kept saying, as an aim, "How are you going to get people to recognize that feelings are facts?" but we have not discussed methods at all. And this is an area where the anthropologist has traditionally been a specialist and where we are going to have to evaluate not only awareness, but the forms in which awareness can safely come: the places, for example, where it is safer to leave the awareness to the arts than to the expository, and the degree to which it is possible to direct the arts without making them the sterile, hopeless implementers of an economic or social point of view that they became in the 'thirties in this country, that they became in the Soviet Union today—in which they are so harnessed with some internal social purpose that they lose all freedom. I think that's about the strength of what I'd like to say.

**OPEN DISCUSSION**

**The Anthropologist in the School as a Field**

*Henry, Mead, Spinder*

*Henry:* Margaret (Mead), I want to talk for just a moment on a point you raised. In this group we are emphasizing the importance of co-operation between anthropologists and educators, and one of the things that anthropology can do — you might say in a sense, its birthright — is to observe directly in a natural history way. And one of the things it seems to me you were doing was emphasizing the extent to which the anthropological observation itself could distort and upset the situation. Of course I was touched by this in my narcissism; I was also touched by this in regard to the profession. My students and I have observed in classrooms almost without causing a ripple, and these students were completely untrained for this. I would say that we paved the way very carefully throughout this school system before we went in to observe, and this may be one of the reasons why no trouble ensued.

The other point I want to make involves what has been called traditionally, and I think rather naively, distortion. And this insight came to me not out of my own perception of the situation, but from the people I spoke to when I went to Washington to talk to the U.S. Public Health Service. I said to them, "Now these are situations which I distorted," and gave quite a number of examples. And they replied, "Why do you call that distortion? These are situations which you observed, which because you observed them and recorded them can be exploited therefore as particular experimental insights." I think that you have taken a rather traditional position as to what a distortion really is, and also have overemphasized how anthropologists can upset the situation.

*Mead:* Yes. I agree that we've experimented for years — feeding back into the group the results of the on-going process. And you can do that, and we've done it very many times. Nevertheless, the observer when he enters in does add to the situation and change it. Now, the word "distort" is evaluative. I've been in many experiences of doing research in the field, and have listened to the educators, social workers, and psychiatrists complain about anthropologists or social psychologists (any kind of research worker, it isn't just the anthropologist), that they were interfering in some way. On the whole, if you can use forms of observation in which you don't have quite as active an intervention, it may be better: that's what I meant by machine recording, that we have now available means of recording that don't require quite as active intervention and therefore don't cause quite so much trouble.

*Henry:* It cannot be doubted that naive and inexperienced observers can mess up certain situations; but I would be very much disappointed if this got into the record as an official anthropological point of view—that there's so much danger that the anthropologist is going to mess up the situation.
Section X

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON SEGREGATION: EDUCATIONAL CONSEQUENCES

EIGHTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE
Chairman: George D. Spindler

Spindler: We have as our topical area for the last session of this conference the educative and social problems consequent to the recent Supreme Court decision on segregation. This was added to our program because it presents to anthropologists and educators reality problems and issues of significance that are of a crucial nature for American society and the educational system. We cannot expect, of course, to solve the complex problems subsumed within this topic, even at the symbolic level, but we can indicate what anthropologists would conceive as essential guidelines toward dealing with such problems, and what reactions educators may have to these guidelines.

I would therefore like to turn the meeting over to Sol (Kimball), who will present some materials he has organized for our reaction.

Analysis by Solon T. Kimball

Kimball: On May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States, as you know, handed down a decision of great import for the United States and of particular significance for the South. This was the unanimous decision which banned segregation in the public schools. This was the event which triggered this particular session.

I should like to tell you first how I shall organize what I have to say. Following the analysis I will open the meeting for discussion—and I hope that the general problems that we have been considering previously will have specific application in this case.

The sequence of my presentation will be, first, the Supreme Court decision itself. Second, I will present briefly the history of this issue and in particular the history of the relationships of the Supreme Court to segregation. This will be followed by a brief history of the South, which will be descriptive of the over-all pattern with which we are concerned. Last, I should like to talk about the South, as anthropologist. (Such remarks should be considered as an example of the kind of specific material which an anthropologist might come up with during the course of his study, although we all recognize that types of anthropologists with different emphases see things somewhat differently.) Following that, I will open the meeting for discussion.

The Supreme Court decision was one which had two significant aspects to it. One was the decision itself to abolish segregation. The other significant aspect was that those who were affected by this decision had