physical and intellectual races which have acted upon man in all ages, and which to this day influence him differently in every quarter of the globe."[44]

In his approach to the study of physical anthropology, Boas and his research assistants collected measurements, looked for the pattern, and incrementally and painstakingly built a scientific picture that formed the basis for Boas's teaching and would come to undergird his work for social justice. In the 1930s Boas used the research on race, the compiling and compounding of physical measurements over decades, to combat racism and Aryan theories.

In "The Cult of Franz Boas and his 'Conspiracy' to Destroy the White Race," Baker places Boas in the unenviable position of being the "Godfather of the Multicult Nightmare' and the fabricator of the 'egalitarian dogma." Boas is widely known and vigorously pilloried by white supremacist and anti-Semites for his work on race. Baker writes, "As one pundit opined, the idea that there were no pure races was 'a hoax contrived by Franz Boas, a twisted little Jew, who popped into the United States, [and] was, for undisclosed reasons, made Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and founded a school of fiction-writing called 'social anthropology.'"[45]

George Lincoln Rockwell, founder of the American Nazi Party, writes repeatedly of Franz Boas and his theory of race, both anathema to Rockwell. In a 1966 *Playboy* interview conducted by Alex Haley, Rockwell says, "Don't you know that all this equality garbage was started by a Jew anthropologist named Franz Boas from Columbia University?" In "From Ivory Tower to Privy Wall: On the Art of Propaganda," Rockwell writes, "The Jews first got a few of their boys into top university spots . . . with the express purpose of giving academic respectability to their 'there-is-no-such-thing-as-race' lie. One of the first and most important of these was Franz Boas. . . . The whole of Jewry pitched in to boost their boy. Boas was praised in every Jewish-owned newspaper and periodical and given every academic prize they could promote. Little by little, Boas gained such 'stature' by this Jewish mutual-admiration technique that he became an 'acknowledged authority' in social anthropology and ethnology." His students, Rockwell continued, "spread his doctrine far and wide, deliberately poisoning the minds of two generations of American students."

As Baker opines, “By exploring how explicitly racist people used and interpreted Boas’s work outside of the discipline, one comes away with an understanding that perhaps anthropology *was* more important and did have a larger impact and audience outside of the academy than scholars have realized, especially as it concerns concepts of race and culture.”[46]

Far to the other side politically and intellectually and from within the academy, Mark Anderson offers a critique of Franz Boas and his students, whom he collectively refers to as “the Boasians,” and their “liberal project.” In *From Boas to Black Power: Racism, Liberalism, and American Anthropology*, Anderson frames his approach to Boas, his students, and the study of race: “Cultural anthropology in the Boasian tradition was an Americanist liberal project that contributed to key paradoxes of liberal discourses on race and racism in the United States.” Anderson makes only brief mention of Boas’s foundational and seminal work on *The Mind of Primitive Man* (1911) and “Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants” (1911, 1912, 1940). Herbert Lewis writes in his book review of Anderson, “Why didn’t he start in 1886 when Franz Boas arrived in America when it was tightening Jim Crow laws, where both scientific and popular opinion was assured of the permanent and ineradicable biological differences among ‘races’ with ‘the white race’ always on the top and the ‘Negro race’ always on the bottom? This was the cause that Boas first took on.” Nor did Anderson discuss Boas’s early statement of his approach to the study of race in his vice presidential address to Section H of the AAAS in 1894, “Human Faculty as Determined by Race.” William Willis lauded Boas for this profoundly important speech: “Boas presented his initial remarks on racial differences in his vice-presidential address . . . . In this eloquent tour de force, Boas employed the essential arguments that were later incorporated into *The Mind of Primitive Man*. Therefore, *The Mind of Primitive Man* did not initiate the intellectual attack on the prevailing extreme racial determinism. Rather it was the culmination of an attack that had started nearly twenty years earlier.”[47]

Du Bois “reflected on the profound and riveting impression Boas had made” on him in 1906 when Boas delivered the graduation speech at Atlanta University, writing in *Black Folks Then and Now* (1939): “Franz Boas came to Atlanta University where I was teaching History in 1906 and said to the graduating class: You need not be ashamed of your African past; and then he recounted the history of black kingdoms south of the Sahara for

a thousand years. I was too astonished to speak. All of this I had never heard and I came then and afterwards to realize how the silence and neglect of science can let truth utterly disappear or even be unconsciously distorted."[48]

This division over Franz Boas—between the white supremacists on the far right and the academics on the far left—bleeds out in black-and-white print eighty years and counting after Boas's death. His response would undoubtedly be the same in the twenty-first century as it was in May 1915, when Boas wrote his parting remarks, "To the Class Anthropology 102," at Barnard College. (He was not able to deliver these himself, since he had been hospitalized due to emergency surgery for a growth on his parotid artery.) "Ladies, I am sorry that illness prevents me from completing our course, as I hoped to be able to do. I bid you good bye, therefore, with these lines." He continued, "I want to say a few words on the subject matter that we have studied together during the past year. You will undoubtedly forget many of the details that we have discussed, but there are one or two points that I hope I may have been able to impress upon you and which I should like to think you will not forget in the future." Boas referred to the topic of "the artificiality of the concept of race when applied to individuals."[49]

Boas laid stress always on the individual. Therefore, he envisioned overcoming racial prejudice in the individual as a means of nullifying racial prejudice in the wider society. As Baker conveyed to me, "One of the contemporary critiques of Boas was that he never fully comprehended the fact that institutional and systemic racism was far more devastating than personal prejudice."[50] Boas's approach to the understanding of race was nonetheless melded to his conception of the importance of the individual. In his remarks to his class in 1915, Boas reinforced this idea that enlightenment and equality would emerge from the individual. He advised his students:

> We should always remember that in all parts of the world, among all races and among all nations and tribes there are families or hereditary strains of equal value and that the distribution of these strains is only slightly different in different groups of mankind. . . . and nothing justifies the branding of an individual as inferior or regarding him as superior, because he happens to belong to one race or the other. The so-called racial instinct is, in this sense, only an expression of racial

> prejudice, that has been carefully nursed for centuries and that it is difficult to overcome. But if you have been convinced by our conversations of the correctness of our views, then it is your duty to overcome racial prejudice.[51]

Boas could always say it best: “It is your duty to overcome racial prejudice.” Would that we could all be so simple and straightforward in the statement of our goals.

4

Folklore and Ruins in Mexico and Puerto Rico

For years Boas had been looking for fieldwork sites and funding for his students outside of North America; for example, in June 1902 he had written to the Carnegie Institution about the need to expand the area of research beyond it. “While it is natural,” Boas wrote in a report to the Carnegie Committee of Anthropology, “that the attention of American anthropologists should be primarily directed to their own continent, this specialization is so great that no opportunity is offered to young anthropologists to familiarize themselves with the broader problems of this science.” Boas’s intent was always to internationalize the study of anthropology. His shift from his earlier focus on Asia and northwestern United States and Canada to southern research fields, to Central and South America and to Puerto Rico, was part of an overall strategy to open up new areas of study. His approach to the field research, however, was of a piece with his earlier work. He was still employing anthropometry to measure the population, though he was asking new questions. What was, for instance, the effect “of the tropical environment on the development of man?”[1] He was also interested in investigating the provenance of folk narratives with respect to Spanish, Indian, or African origin. While he brought these new questions to the research in Mexico and Puerto Rico, his approach was ever the same: intensive, thorough work; reliance on carefully accumulated facts; recognition of the importance of training young field researchers; and reliance on the expertise of the local population.

By 1905 Boas was writing about his desire to create “an Archaeological School in Central America” and to begin developing courses on “Latin America, the Far East, and the Colonies.” In this same year Boas and Charles Bowditch, a specialist in Mayan hieroglyphics, began a correspondence that provided the seed for the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico. In June 1905 Bowditch asked Boas, “Would it not be worthwhile to find a man, who would take up the ethnology and linguistics of Mexico, especially in that part where the Maya and Nahuatl races had a very decided inter-influence upon each

other? For instance, the state of Oaxaca and all the territory, which is the seat of the Zapotec civilization, might very well be worked up in the next four years. If such work should be mapped out, do you know of any young man who would be competent and willing to undertake the work?" Bowditch hoped that the student Boas selected would be ready to begin work in December 1905.[2]

With no student prepared for this area of study, Boas recommended Robert Lowie for the American Archaeological Institute scholarship: "Our college year opens now; and if Mr. Lowie should have a prospect of receiving an appointment, I should want to direct his work accordingly." To prepare Lowie Boas needed to know whether the work would be in Central America or in Mexico. Boas wrote Bowditch that Lowie was "rather reluctant to give up his systematic studies before taking up a special field of investigation; so that, while he is very anxious to go, he will not be ready to take up fieldwork of the kind until 1907, and this of course is too late for our purposes." He concluded, "I fear, therefore, that we have to give up Mr. Lowie's candidacy for the time being."[3]

In 1906 Boas wrote Archer Huntington, philanthropist and founder of the Hispanic Society of America, about the plans to work with "the Archaeological Institute of America and some universities in the establishment of an archaeological school in Mexico, Central America, or South America." Boas struck on the means for staffing such a school: the Loubat fund could be transferred "for a year or two to Mexico or to some other Central American country to help establish an Archaeological School." Boas continued, "Columbia University would of course sacrifice, by such an arrangement, certain courses that are given here: but I believe that in the long-run we should be the gainers, because as it is now Mexican archaeology is not a strong field of activity in the University." Boas suggested that if Columbia moved in this direction, then other universities might join as well. Specifically, Boas thought of those with Loubat chairs in American archaeology—the University of Berlin, Collège de France, and, of course, Columbia.[4] Boas wrote Butler of the need for "a school parallel to the Archaeological Schools of Rome, Athens, or Palestine." Raising the same idea as he had with Bowditch, Boas suggested to Butler that the universities with Loubat chairs in archaeology might agree to send their professors to Mexico for a year or two and pay their salaries.[5]

Boas wrote Butler of his vision for the International School: “What we desire to achieve particularly is to organize opportunity for young investigators to familiarize themselves with the problems of Mexican archaeology in that field where the remains themselves exist, where the languages of the people of antiquity survive, and where the most extensive collections of antiquities are available.” As Boas saw it, “the primary object for which we are striving is not exploration, but instruction and scientific discussion of the materials collected in Mexican museums or open to view in Mexican ruins,” and concluded, “If the Mexican Government should look favorably upon this proposition, which would be intended to train young men—Americans as well as Europeans and Mexicans—for careful scientific work on the ancient history of Mexico, it would seem desirable to induce the best available men to give instruction in Mexico for the periods of one or two years.”[6]

The goal of the International School was fourfold: 1) to strengthen the instruction of archaeology in the United States, and particularly at Columbia; 2) to expand the field for archaeological research south to Mexico; 3) to train young scholars in the study of archaeology and ethnology, as well as to cultivate Mexican anthropologists; and 4) to draw European and Canadian universities into the work of Mexican archaeology. Boas wrote to Canadian geologist Robert Bell that “many of our most important archaeological problems relate to ancient Mexico. For this reason,” he emphasized, “it is exceedingly important that opportunities should be given to young men to study ethnology and archaeology on the spot.”[7]

Such a school could be easily realized, Boas wrote Butler, “provided you propose the establishment of international courses in American archaeology to the Minster of Instruction of Germany, France, and Sweden.” These countries, along with the United States, would send one of their experts for a year to Mexico. Boas added that once agreements had been reached with the foreign governments, then agreements could be drawn up between the governments and universities and brought to the attention of the Mexican government “by the diplomatic representatives of the various countries concerned.” Hopefully, the Mexican government would provide housing and, perhaps, additional support. While it took four years to organize, Boas had essentially laid out the schema for establishing the International School in this 1906 letter to Butler.[8]

Boas chaffed at the inefficiency as he wrote Kroeber in 1907: “Meanwhile my own plan for an archaeological school in a wider sense is making headway very slowly, largely owing to the offhand way in which all such matters are treated at our University. President Butler has passed the matter over to [John] Barrett, the director of the Bureau of American Republics, and I am not able to do more than a very modest amount of prodding.” Of course there were diplomatic and political contacts that had to be made. Boas wrote to German anthropologist and pre-Columbian scholar Eduard Seler that Butler had decided to approach the Mexican government. In turn Boas had spoken with Huntington of the Hispanic Society, “who is very much interested in matters of this kind, and a man of considerable influence.” Huntington had written to Mexican president Porfirio Díaz; he also had “considerable influence at the court of Madrid, and he is going to ask the King of Spain to write to President Díaz in favor of the plan.”[9]

Boas identified American anthropologist and archaeologist Zelia Nuttall, who resided in Mexico, as the best mediator for the establishment of the International School. Boas determined to provide a fellowship for a person to come to Columbia from Mexico to study with him as part of his goal to train Mexican anthropologists. Nuttall wrote Boas, “Mr. Gamio has already won recognition here, and has been appointed assistant in history at the Museum, where he has been employed in the Archaeological Department for some time past.” George G. Heye—whose North American Indian artefact collection formed the corpus for the Museum of the American Indian, founded in 1916—provided a fellowship for Manuel Gamio. The Mexican government granted him leave with salary and paid his traveling expenses. Zelia Nuttall wrote Boas that Gamio was “rushing his work so as to leave as soon as possible.” She continued, “His English is not very fluent, but I am sure that he will soon acquire what he lacks. What I hope most is that you will give him a thorough knowledge of *Museum* work so that someday soon he can be made the Director of the Archaeological Section of the National Museum here and Inspector of Monuments. . . . Of course you and he will decide what his studies are to be—but I want only to tell you what is needed most here—a thoroughly trained Museum director and Archaeologist acquainted with modern methods.”[10]

Boas worked with Gamio, but suspected that he was not profiting from his stay because of his challenges with English. Boas wrote Nuttall that his

greatest trouble was “a certain vagueness in his approach of subjects, which is undoubtedly due to a general method of training. It seems, he has rather learned the contents of books and lectures than gained experience in independent research.” He was nonetheless heartened by the way Gamio was “taking up the new points of view . . . and the way in which he gradually develops critical insight.” To encourage such a critical perspective, Boas gave Gamio books that “from my point of view do not seem to me to be up to the mark. I let him report on them, and then criticize the author’s view and have him defend it if he can.” With care to shaping Gamio’s work, Boas gave him many volumes on art in order to clarify “his views of symbolism and development of Mexican ornament, and I believe he has profited from this.” Additionally, he encouraged him to work with Bandelier on sources from northern Mexico, the Southwest, and from northwest South America; and with Saville on South American material.[11]

After the first year Boas felt that Gamio needed to return to Columbia for another year of study. “I do not believe that we can get more this year,” Boas wrote Nuttall, “than to give him a rather vague and hazy idea of rigid methods of research.” Gamio would need time to take up “under our direction some special piece of research work, where his methods should be broad and constantly checked.” Nuttall conferred with Ezequiel A. Chávez, subsecretary of public education and fine arts—a position he held from 1905 to 1911—who agreed to allow Gamio to remain at Columbia for an additional year. Boas arranged for Gamio to accompany Saville to Ecuador for an archaeological expedition funded by the Heye Museum of the American Indian so that he could gain practical experience under “the guidance of some experienced archaeologist.” Gamio completed his master’s thesis, “Archaeological Researches in Chalchichuites, State of Zacatecas, Northern Mexico,” and returned to Mexico in 1911.[12]

Boas described Eduard Seler as “the first among the living students of Mexico” and wanted him to serve as the initial director of the school. “The feeling among us,” he wrote Seler, “is most decidedly that, if anything of this kind is to be a success, you ought to inaugurate it.” Appointed as the German representative, Seler did indeed serve as the first director of the International School for 1910–11. With formal flourish, the twenty-two articles of incorporation for the Escuela Internacional de Arqueología y Etnología Americana, dated September 14, 1910, were signed by the following delegates: Eduard Seler for Prussia; George B. Gordon for the

University of Pennsylvania; Franz Boas for Columbia University; Roland B. Dixon for Harvard University; Ezequiel A. Chávez for Mexico; and L. Capitan for France, a signature to be added when France granted final approval. Boas had tried to garner the support of the Smithsonian for the International School but, due to U.S. government regulations against such agreements, he did not succeed.[13]

The International School was officially announced at the Congress of the Americanists in Mexico City, September 8–14, 1910. That year two sessions of the Congress were held, one in Buenos Aires and the other in Mexico City, in order to mark the centennial celebrations of both countries —Argentina's on May 25, 1910, and Mexico's on September 16, 1910. Boas made certain that the session of the Congress held in Mexico would coincide with the centennial of the Mexican War of Independence from Spain, which was also the occasion for the "celebration of the foundation of the National University of Mexico." "During the congress," George Grant MacCurdy notes, "a committee of delegates from Mexico, France, Germany, Harvard University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia University, met and agreed upon the foundation of an International School of Archaeology in the city of Mexico."[14]

In August 1910 Boas wrote his daughter Helene that the Mexican government had invited him to lecture for two months in Mexico and "to travel around as much as I wish," following the Congress. However, as Boas had written to Albrecht Penck of the University of Berlin, "we are all staying in Grantwood this summer, because I have to go to the city every day to attend to the calculations required for the immigration report." Unable to put aside his work for the U.S. Immigration Commission, Boas and his wife came home following the Congress with plans to return to Mexico in December.[15]

Boas wrote Sapir, "The trip to Mexico was very interesting, and I am glad to say that the International School of Archaeology and Ethnology has been founded." He wrote Butler that they had drawn up the statutes of the International School. Boas would be the first anthropology professor "at the new National University." He was keen to have his teaching announced by Chávez as being situated at the National University of Mexico and combined with the work of the International School. While the school had officially opened, there were complex arrangements still to be made. Boas wrote Huntington, "I am glad to say that the Governments of Mexico and

Germany have accepted the proposition finally, that France is on the point of accepting, that Austria has requested us to let her join the enterprise. A similar request has come from Spain." The universities of Harvard, Columbia, and Pennsylvania were "committed to the project." Boas would leave for Mexico at the end of the fall term and remain from the end of November to mid-February.[16]

In preparation for his return trip to Mexico, Boas wrote Seler that he hoped to begin research immediately without loss of time. "For my own work," he explained, "I should be very much obliged to you if you could make some preliminary inquiries in regard to the possibility of engaging an Indian interpreter in the city. I mean someone who can speak either Mexican [Nahuatl] or Otomi fluently and who knows Spanish at the same time."[17] Boas wrote Chávez about plans for his trip: he desired "to give as much time as may be necessary to work at the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology." He continued, "My idea would be to teach a few students, preferably to some who have studied philology, methods of reducing to writing Indian languages and methods of discussing texts." He also wanted to work with ophthalmologist Dr. Manuel Uribe y Troncoso "in the attempt to systematize and to get the best possible results from the records of measurements of school-children—a subject in which I am much interested—and if any students should desire to learn the methods of statistical treatment of material of this kind, I should be delighted to give them whatever I can."[18]

Boas and Marie sailed on the SS *Mexico City* departing from New York with a one-day stop in Havana and in Yucatan and a disembarkation in Vera Cruz in December 1910. On this return trip to Mexico during Columbia's winter break, they took the narrow-gauge railway from Vera Cruz to Oaxaca. Boas wrote that the arrival at train stations seems to be "the event of the day and one sees hundreds of Indians standing and sitting around. The appearance of the mass of peaked white-brimmed straw hats, red woolen blankets in which they drape themselves, the blue kerchiefs of the women, the masses of fruit and cakes that they are trying to sell give a remarkable picture. Beggars are everywhere who beg 'for God's sake' that one should give something to a blind or crippled person. Even the dogs sit in front of the train and beg with their paws." Mrs. Seler met them and took them to their hotel. Boas described it as an old Spanish building, two stories high, "with a court surrounded by columns, and in which bananas and other

plants grow. The rooms have tiled floors and the ceilings are of oak beams. We look right down upon the main square, where grapefruit and apricots hang on the trees." On the day before Christmas, Eduard Seler and his wife took Boas and Marie around Oaxaca. To Helene Boas described piñatas, or "large dolls of paper, filled with sweets. The children, blindfolded strike them with sticks until the bonbons fall out. If possible we will bring you some, although they are very large." He added, "Then Seler and I bought out a whole store of medicinal herbs." In the afternoon, Boas said, he worked with a Zapotec Indian "so I could break my tongue on his language."[19]

Boas had written to Chávez that he had a course of lectures in Spanish on "race and cultural development, which will occupy ten sessions of about one hour each." Boas asked if Chávez would like for him to give five lectures on "important problems of primitive culture." While Boas's own preference would be to "devote more time to the more advanced instruction," he would follow Chávez's suggestions. Boas had been writing his remarks in Spanish for months. To Helene he had written in August about his talk to be delivered to the Congress of the Americanists: "My lecture for Mexico is finally finished. I have read it to a few persons and they believe that I can well read it in Spanish. So I think I shall take the risk."[20] In December 1910 Boas was writing Helene from Mexico about the two public lectures and two five-hour seminars he was to give. Boas posited, "How that will go with the difficulties of Spanish [we] will have to wait and see." He had also completed "a long conference about the International school which by and large was very satisfactory and I hope that everything is going to be well under way soon." Of Boas's teaching J. Alden Mason recalled that he "lectured several days a week on statistics at the National University. His Spanish was quite good, though he found it hard not to mix it with French."[21]

Boas wrote Butler, "The whole organization of the School is proceeding very satisfactorily. I have begun work, and Dr. Seler is going to begin tomorrow. We have about five students, and are doing serious archaeological and ethnological work." In January 1911 Boas sent numerous copies of the following announcement: "I beg to advise you of the formal opening of the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology which occurred on Friday, January 20th in the Hall of the

National Museum of México. The school was opened by President Porfiro Díaz."[22]

Ricardo Godoy notes, "One of the primary objectives of the school was to provide promising advanced graduate students an opportunity to study archaeology, folktales, myths, and languages in Mexico under explicitly professional guidance." With the cooperation of Nuttall and the Mexican government, Boas had already worked with Manuel Gamio as a Columbia Fellow (1909–11). In November 1910 he recommended to Butler that Isabel Ramírez Castañeda (1881–1943) be appointed a Columbia Fellow at the International School. "Miss Castañeda has been assistant at the National Museum of Mexico," Boas wrote, "and has studied one year with Prof. E. Seler of Berlin, who recommends her very highly." She had worked with Mexican archaeological artefacts in the museum and studied the Nahuatl language. Boas continued, "[She] promises to make an excellent contributor to work on American, particularly Mexican, archaeology and ethnology." As a Columbia Fellow, Castañeda would receive $500, and "in return she is to devote her time to study at the International School."[23]

Boas wrote Huntington that there were "two Harvard men, one man from Philadelphia, and one from California" who wanted to be fellows, provided he was director. In an earlier letter to Putnam, Kroeber had written about Mason, who had come to him from the University of Pennsylvania, where he had studied with Sapir, Speck, and Gordon, and Kroeber had sent him to do fieldwork with the Indians near Monterey. In his recommendation to Boas, Kroeber wrote, "Mr. J. Alden Mason, at present University Fellow in Anthropology with us, . . . has done very satisfactory work here, and I should be glad to have him remain with us, but this is impossible as we have no vacancies and he will not be eligible for a renewal of his fellowship on account of taking his degree this year. He is scarcely eligible for teaching, on account of stuttering, but is capable of good work in the field or museum." Kroeber noted that Mason had spent the year "studying the nearly extinct Salinan stock. His thesis will deal with the ethnology and this will be followed by an account of the language."[24]

Roland B. Dixon of Harvard recommended William H. Mechling for the study of linguistics with Boas. "He is a little exuberant or youthful," Dixon wrote, "but I believe if he gets once started well in the work, will make a good man." In his application for the fellowship to the International School, Mechling wrote the secretary of the Hispanic Society to say that he was a

PhD candidate at the University of Pennsylvania. He had completed fieldwork among the Maliseet (Malecite) Indians during the summer of 1910 and would be conducting fieldwork the forthcoming summer for the Geological Survey of Canada among the same tribe. He could provide references from Edward Sapir, Roland Dixon, and Frank Speck. In June 1911 Mason and Mechling took the steamer together for Vera Cruz. In 1912–13, under Tozzer's directorship of the International School, Mason served a second year as a fellow, sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania. Paul Radin was sponsored by Columbia and Harvard, and Clarence Hay was sponsored by Harvard.[25]

Boas wrote that he was anxious to have "good staff and . . . students who are well prepared to take up serious work." He wrote Kroeber of the advantages of the way the school had been organized, to give students opportunity "to study in close contact with a great variety of men, and to bring the methods developed in different scientific centres in closer touch with each other." Boas was also intent on encouraging "more systematic study of this field" in Mexico and Central America. At the end of Columbia's midterm break, Boas wrote Butler, "A week from Friday I am going to close my work here and shall come right home to New York." Boas included a translation into English of his remarks to Chávez about the needs for instruction. Students, Boas wrote, needed to "reach a better understanding of the relation between observation and theory" and to develop "independent judgement" rather than memorizing "what has been said." Instruction "should be based . . . not on lectures," Boas continued, "but on investigations of small and well selected problems, to be undertaken by the students themselves."[26]

The International School was organized with two tiers consisting of patrons and protectors. The patrons were obligated "to send directors with their full salary" and "to appoint fellows with stipends." Thus, the patrons of Columbia, the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard, the Hispanic Society of America, and the governments of Prussia and Mexico "agreed to elect and send fully salaried yearly directors to the school on a rotating basis." Seler served as director in 1910–11; Boas in 1911–12; Tozzer in 1912–13; geologist and anthropologist Jorge [George] Engerrand—who had come to Mexico from France in 1907—in 1913–14; and Gamio in 1914–15. The second tier of protectors allowed for the inclusion of those institutions that wanted to participate but could not afford to send directors; they "had the

right either to appoint a fellow or to give funds for scientific research." With this second-tier participation, as Godoy explains, the protectors were entitled to "specimens gathered by the school that were not desired by the National Museum of Mexico. Russia, Austria, and Sweden joined under this stipulation."[27]

The provision for the right of first refusal accorded to the National Museum of Mexico was intended to protect the Mexican archaeological artefacts from cultural appropriation. However, the measure was only as good as the people who watched over the antiquities. Boas wrote Tozzer in 1914 about Leopoldo Batres, who was director of the archaeological section of the National Museum and inspector of monuments: "In the *Mexican Herald* for October 17th is an account of a publication by Gamio on the outrages of Batres. He tells of selling collections to the New York Museum (Saville) and to others. He mentions the work at Teotihuacan and the way Batres took money given by the Government for buying the land around the monuments. Fortunately," Boas concluded, "our skirts are clear."[28] Such willful abuse of the archaeological patrimony of the Mexican government was antithetical to the organizing principles of the International School. Boas stressed this in his 1915 summary: "It has been the opinion of the Patrons and Protectors of the School that the essential scientific results of the work of the School should be placed in the Mexican Republic," and "for this reason it is deemed essential by all the participants that not only the most important parts of the collections . . . should be deposited in the National Museum of Mexico . . . but also that the important publications of the School should be made in Mexico so far as this may be feasible."[29]

Mason wrote Kroeber of Boas's work: "Boas has finally become an ardent archaeologist and a good part of the time and funds of the school has been spent in investigations and excavation of the valley of Mexico, the first time anything systematic has been done here." In "Summary of the Work of the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico, 1910–1914," Boas wrote that the focus had been from the first and in subsequent years on the "sequence of civilizations in the Valley of Mexico." In addition to his excavation of Palenque, Seler worked on the archaeological history of the Valley of Mexico, which Gamio continued in 1911–12, with "one single excavation in a brick-yard at San Miguel Amantla near Atzcapotzalco." The results, Boas wrote, determined that there had been "three distinct civilizations" in the Valley of Mexico: the

earliest, or primitive stage; the second, “identical with that of San Juan Teotihuacán”; and the third one, the Aztec. This sequence came to be called “the Archaic, Classic and Post-Classic.” Boas concluded, “Thus the problem before the School may be summarized as centering around the accurate investigation of the succession of civilizations in the Valley of Mexico and the effort to establish an exact chronology.”[30]

Additionally, as Boas wrote, researchers at the school focused on an “inquiry into the structure and distribution of languages of the country. For this purpose an accurate phonetic examination of the Mexican was undertaken.” Boas detailed the focus on specific languages: “The School was guided in this largely by the urgency of the case; and one of the Fellows, Dr. J. Alden Mason, spent two seasons among the Tepecanos of Jalisco, whose language is confined at the present time to a few individuals of one single village; while Dr. Paul Radin studied the Huave near Salina Cruz, which is also bound to disappear within a short time. In connection with his studies in Tuxtepec, Mr. W. H. Mechling made collections of the Mazatec and Chinantec.” In the third year, Boas explained, Radin conducted “a preliminary phonetic survey of the Zapotecan dialects.” With a focus on the influences of the Spanish on the “Mexican Indians,” researchers compared the collections made of Indian folklore with Spanish sources. “The folkloristic side of this work,” Boas wrote, “was carried on by all the Fellows, whose work was chiefly devoted to linguistic and ethnological researches and also by Miss Ramírez Castañeda. The strictly philological inquiry was carried on by Dr. Leopold Wagner.”[31]

Boas was caught off guard by two unanticipated organizational snags. One was a minor annoyance and an embarrassment. Boas’s command of Spanish was judged by Mexican officials as inadequate for him to serve as director. However, this was undoubtedly linked to the other complication, a political and permanent game-changer: the Mexican Revolution. Without the slightest inkling that there would be a problem for him as director of the school, Boas had written Huntington, “I rather feel that I ought to go myself, because I consider it very important that there should be continuity in our efforts during the first few years.” Boas added that it wasn’t that he felt he could do these things better than others, but that he had “put more time and thought to it than anyone else.” With the approval of Butler, he planned to arrive in Mexico by July 20, 1911, and to remain until February 1912. In preparation for his coursework, Boas wrote Ezequiel A. Chávez in

his capacity as subsecretary of public education and fine arts. Boas hoped to teach a course on Art and Society in August—September 1911. “The contents of this course,” Boas wrote, “will refer particularly to the methods of studying art and mythologies, the various theories developed in regard to their origin, and a description of the fundamental types of art and mythology and of their psychological meaning.” Boas was keen to have the students take up research work in connection with the course, which he planned to offer two hours a week for the general class of students, and “two consecutive hours additional for students who specialize in anthropology.” As he had done during his previous visit to Mexico, he also wanted to teach a class on linguistics, but this time with a focus on the principles of grammatical analysis. In a June letter to Chávez, Boas named the courses: “Decorative Art and Mythology, Methods of Study of Indian Languages, and Anthropometry.” Boas added, “I conducted all these courses last year in Spanish such as I have at my command, because I saw very soon that this was the only way of doing effective work with the students.”[32]

At the beginning of July 1911, Boas received a telegram from José López-Portillo y Rojas, a lawyer, politician, and author who had replaced Chávez as subsecretary of public instruction and fine arts. The telegram read: “Contract rescinded correspondence goes to office.”[33] Days later a letter arrived with more detail. José López-Portillo wrote:

> The President of the Republic, without ignoring your merits, which motivated him to appoint you . . . professor of Anthropology and Ethnology in the Escuela Nacional de Altos Estudios, on the basis of which your contract was established . . . that you are to teach in Spanish, and that you do not speak this language with facility that is required to be a professor, which would mean that the course would not have the success it would have had, the same Prime Magistrate has had to declare the said appointment unenforceable . . . and declare at the same time null the contract mentioned.

On June 30, 1911, when López-Portillo had written the letter rescinding Boas’s contract, he referenced the “President of the Republic.” A month earlier, in May 1911, Porfirio Díaz had resigned as president and on May 25 had left Mexico for exile in France. Thus, the dictatorial president, Porfirio

Díaz, who had been supportive of the founding of the International School, had left the country and was replaced in November 1911 by a new president of the republic, wealthy landowner Francisco I. Madero (1873–1913).[34]

Boas contacted Alfonso Pruneda, who was the son-in-law of Batres, the director of the archaeological section of the national museum and inspector of monuments. Pruneda was himself director of the National University of Mexico. Boas wrote that he was "very much surprised" when he received the July 7 telegram:

> Today I received a letter confirming the telegram and stating as the reason for the action that all instruction is to be given in Spanish and that my Spanish was not good enough for a Professor. I am not so vain as to believe that in the short time that I have occupied myself with Spanish, I have mastered the language, but the point seems to me irrelevant. At the time when the contract was made, your Government knew how little Spanish I speak, so that nothing new has developed in that respect. I might say by the way that the essays sent to me by the students I hold as proof that they understood me perfectly well.

Boas added that he fully supported the policy "of selecting Mexicans as professors; as a matter of fact, I urged Mr. Chávez in a letter written on Jan. 24 to move in this direction as soon as possible." He continued,

> It is quite obvious, that a foreigner who does not know in detail the preparation of your students, and who lectures for only two months, or a little more, can only help in the initial stages of your University work, and neither I, nor, I am sure, Mr. Chávez ever looked at my work in any other way. We do the same thing here. When a new subject is introduced, we often invite a foreigner for a limited time to get the ball rolling, and take it up ourselves when we are ready for it, but when we have asked a foreigner to help us in this way, we abide by our invitation.[35]

Boas wrote, "I am exceedingly sorry that I am not in the position simply to drop the whole matter, but the agreement between your Government and myself for the present year was so definite, that I had to let all other work go that presented itself." He listed opportunities that he had turned down: "I declined an invitation to lecture in Chicago, got a substitute for summer

work in Columbia, declined lecturing in England, and postponed some literary work for the State Museum of Sweden—, all on account of the obligation which I had undertaken for your Government." Boas wrote that he had "lost a considerable income which I need and I trust that your Government will see the justice of my claim." He concluded, "I have sympathy with a policy that looks towards more regular, consecutive instruction than what I can give. I beg to assure you, that I shall continue to have the greatest interest in the development of Mexican Anthropology." In a draft of a letter addressed to the secretary of public instruction and fine arts—with no personal name—Boas acknowledged receipt of the June 30 letter, which he said had just reached him. "I beg to repeat," Boas emphasized, "that I am willing to release your University from the contract for an indemnity, which compensates me for my losses amounting to 3200 pesos, and that I await your answer by August 1."[36]

José López-Portillo y Rojas wrote Boas on August 1, 1911, that, following his consultation with his attorney, the fundamental portion of the contract had stipulated that "the course in anthropology must be given in Castilian and should deal with the principle problems of anthropology." Since Boas could not deliver his lectures in "the Castilian language," this was enough for "the contract with him to be void." For good measure López-Portillo repeated

> that Professor Boas has already failed to comply with his contract, by which he was obliged to teach Anthropology in Castilian, and in the absence of such an indispensable condition, there should be no such contact. . . . And it is not enough to say that Mr. Boas can understand and speak some of the Spanish language; . . . that the class of Anthropology had to be given in a certain language, this must be understood in the sense that the Professor of Matter had to have absolute dominion over the same, because it is not enough to express and understand a few words of a language to say that it is spoken and owned.

Boas replied to López-Portillo that his contract required him to give one course of lectures in Spanish: "This has been done by me. Some of the lectures in the exact form in which they were given, have been printed by the Escuela de Altos Estudios, and are evidence that they were rendered in

intelligible Spanish." Boas concluded that López-Portillo must not have "been familiar with the true facts of the case," and that, likely, due to the false charges made against Boas, López-Portillo had "been entirely misinformed." Boas concluded, "I know, when you inquire among those competent to judge, you will find that I did all that the letter and spirit of my contract with your Secretaría demanded, and much more; that I took up my duties conscientiously, and carried them through successfully."[37]

As an extra measure of caution, Boas wrote the U.S. secretary of state that he had met all the terms of his contract, "and the Mexican Government fulfilled all its terms until June 30, 1911. After engaging passage for Mexico, I received, on July 9, a telegram cancelling the contract, and a formal communication (Enclosure 2) reached me on July 19. Since the alleged facts do not reveal any condition that was not known to the Secretaría at the time of signing the contract, and since there is ample evidence that the contract was considered as binding until June 26, I cannot accept the arbitrary revocation of the agreement." Boas concluded that he had no desire "to insist on rendering educational services that are not wanted," but that he did feel "entitled to an appropriate indemnity" to cover the expense he had incurred and the income he had foregone, an amount that totaled $1600. The acting secretary of state replied that no assistance could be rendered by the U.S. Department of State.[38]

With all the sound and fury of the correspondence, Boas nonetheless went to Mexico to direct the International School, as had been originally planned. On November 4, 1911, López-Portillo wrote Boas that the president of the republic had reconsidered, and that the Escuela Nacional de Altos Estudios now counted Boas "among its most distinguished professors, and the relative contract will remain in force." The issue of Boas's contract might have been settled by dint of sheer persistence; still the rumblings of the political unrest were ever present. Boas wrote Seler, "Naturally the disturbed condition of affairs in Mexico does not make progress of our affairs easy, and I fear very much that nothing to speak of will be accomplished before I leave here again for Mexico. It worries me particularly that I know so little about what is happening there; but I presume that cannot be helped." Boas said that he hadn't been able to arrange everything for next winter, "but, with all the uncertainties of the political position in Mexico, I feel rather strongly, that, as long as you cannot be there, it will be best for me to be there. We two are most

intimately familiar with the development of matters." In December 1911 Butler wrote Boas that his letter of October 20 "gives me more information than I have heretofore had on the actual situation in Mexico," and that "I can quite see how a savant of the type of Dr. Seler would not have seen the wisdom, and indeed the necessity, of first gaining a standing for the school with public opinion. This is obviously the first thing to do, in order that there may be a basis on which scientific work may be built."[39]

Leopoldo Batres held no goodwill for the International School. Porfirio Díaz had appointed Batres as director of the agency for the inspection and conservation of archaeological monuments of the Mexican Republic when the department had been created in 1895. Batres occupied this position until both he and Díaz were exiled in 1911. Prior to his exile, Batres was well positioned to obstruct the work of Boas, Seler, and the International School in its entirety. In a postscript to a letter of June 24, 1911, Gamio wrote Boas, "I have seen in the press that Mr. Batres is trying to accuse Prof. Seler for a supossed [*sic*] destruction of the Palenque ruin. What do you think about that, Prof?" Gamio observed that Batres was "very near to resign his old position." Gamio had heard "that Mr. Batres is working against the International School of Archaeology. Many things are going to happen very soon and I'll be glad by telling you everything that has interest for you."[40]

As "an ardent loyalist" to Porfirio Díaz, Batres had worked "zealously to enhance federal control over the nation's archaeological monuments—and, not coincidentally, to increase his own power as well." He, however, was caught up in the political upheaval. As Larissa Kelly points out, "The transfer of power from Díaz to Madero was not so placid, however, that Leopoldo Batres could maintain his comfortable position of power and prestige. Less than two months after the departure of Díaz, Instrucción Pública officials ordered Batres to formally turn the archives and physical property of the Inspección over to Francisco Rodríguez, the newly appointed Inspector of Archaeological Monuments." Batres left Mexico to live for several years in Barcelona. There was an "exodus of staff" from the agency for the inspection and conservation of archaeological monuments and from the National Museum in 1911 and 1912.[41]

With the overthrow of the presidency from Porfirio Díaz to Francisco Madero—the latter held office from November 6, 1911, to his assassination on February 22, 1913—came a change of attitude towards the International School. As Carmen Ruiz notes, "The school was designed during the last

period of the Porfirian regime, when foreign investment was most welcomed (and therefore foreign archaeological explorations were encouraged) and it ended with hatred sentiments towards Americans." University of Chicago anthropologist Frederick Starr had been consistently dire with his warnings about the school: "It is about just that I should say frankly that I do not believe the school will have a long career. I know Mexico pretty well and have seen various brilliant launchings. I shall be surprised if the second year is carried through and my surprise will be great indeed if a third year is ever begun." He concluded by remarking on "a pronounced anti-foreign (and especially anti-American) sentiment" and prophesized, "I believe the fate of the school is certain!" Two months later Starr returned to his grim view: "From my own personal experience of Mexico I doubt whether anything will come of your plans. You must realize now what was perfectly evident in September—that the whole population is against the regime that is passing." Starr was right: just one week later, Porfirio Díaz was exiled from Mexico. As Godoy observes, "Contrary to what Boas and Mexican statesmen wanted to believe, it was not the centennial anniversary that made 1910 important in Mexico's history. Elections were coming up then, after twenty-six years of Díaz's dictatorial rule, and everywhere . . . elements were waging a vigorous challenge to the Porfirista regime."[42]

Boas focused with tenacity on all the complex organizational pieces that he was trying to put in place, minimizing the earth-shattering significance of the political unrest. In October 1912 he wrote to Homer Earle Sargent, who had generously funded his and James Teit's researches among the Indians of the Northwest: "Notwithstanding the difficulties in Mexico, our work has progressed quite satisfactorily, and I am glad to say that during this summer I obtained the co-operation of Russia, Bavaria, and Saxony, all of whom will join the School as Protectors." However, he was anxious about "the change of administration in Mexico and how it may influence both the School and the University." He wrote Seler that he was keen to know if Chávez would retain his position and expressed the hope to be independent of the Mexican government. "I think if we can take this attitude," he continued, "there will be very little doubt that any sensible government will continue to support us."[43]

Boas could not remain in denial of the danger for long. Mason wrote him, "This letter is more to report my existence in health than anything else. I

suppose the Mexican papers have reported the presence of Zapatistas in Colotlán and Totatiche." Four days later Mason wrote from El Salitre, "All the Americans have left this region." Boas wrote Engerrand in October 1912 about the "new eruption in Vera Cruz." Initially he had thought "that this might mean a serious revolution, but I feel very much encouraged by the thought that the outbreak has been localized." Amid the political disruptions in Mexico, Engerrand had been appointed director of the International School to cover the period of time before Tozzer was in place. Boas wrote Seler that he was relieved to have Engerrand in this position, since this would solve the difficulty of potential delay before Tozzer could take over. "I should not like to predict whether other difficulties may not come up."[44]

Boas wrote Engerrand, "I wish you would insist, in the cases of both Dr. Radin and Dr. Mason, that they finish their fieldwork at such a time that they may be able to complete, or at least nearly complete, their report before the close of the school year, that is to say, about the 1st of July." He anticipated that both Radin and Mason would be working for the Canadian government the following year. By the next month, Boas reconsidered his suggestion that Radin complete his work by July 1:

> It looks to me as though he were working with the same energy as he has been doing here, and that he is getting an enormous amount of material. He has been collecting a number of texts in various Zapotecan dialects in order to determine the distribution of different dialects in that country, preparatory for work of later students. Judging from my experience with matters of this sort, it is quite out of the question that his texts can be worked up properly and published before some time has passed, and I think we ought to try to get from him a description of the distribution of dialects in Zapotecan and a description of their phonetic characteristics, leaving the publication of texts until some later time.

Boas added that Radin would also need to provide a description of the folklore material that he was collecting.[45]

With trepidation Tozzer was preparing to depart for Mexico. He wrote Boas about information he had received from Nadine Nuttall, who lived with her mother, Zelia, at Casa Alvarado in Coyoacán, just outside of

Mexico City: “A letter from Nadine Nuttall states that the conditions are getting steadily worse. ‘I only wish we were safely out of it. There seems to be no chance for improvement for a long time to come. . . . You can’t forget the revolution, not if you try to.’” With a brave face, Tozzer wrote, “This sounds discouraging, doesn’t it? But I am not an alarmist and I shall not worry. If I am going to Mexico, I want to go next year. I should be much disappointed to have to postpone the trip.” Boas responded, “I do not think we need to worry about the Mexican affairs, although they are discouraging. Engerrand, Gamio, Mason, and Radin have all worked so far without any difficulties.” This was not to continue. Boas wrote Engerrand the next month, in the latter part of February, that he was “very anxious to learn of the safety of all our Mexican friends. The last weeks must have been a terrible time for all of you.”[46]

Radin responded to the political disruption by abruptly departing. Boas wrote Engerrand, “I was very much surprised on Saturday, and annoyed, when all of a sudden Radin came in here.” He went on,

> You know, of course, that his wife and his mother were also in Mexico; and he went to the American Consul and asked him whether it would be safe for him to stay in Mexico; and of course he said that if there was nothing urgent to hold him, he better go back. . . . Radin was led to his decision to return, as he states, by the consideration that both you and I had been very insistent on his not collecting more material during the year than he could work out, and he defended his act by saying that he could work more quietly and effectively here on his material than in the disturbed conditions of Mexico.

Boas concluded, “My own feeling about the matter is that he ought not to have left, and I told him so. However, he is here now, and he will have to stay here and work out his material.” Radin had wanted to communicate with Engerrand but “the telegraph office would not accept any telegrams to Mexico City.” Days later Boas was still fulminating: “Radin’s return here irritates me more than I can say.”[47]

While Radin had fled Mexico, Mason remained. Just at the completion of his work in Azqueltán, Mason had received Boas’s letter suggesting that he plan his work in such a way as to be able to complete it by July 1, to free him up in case he was employed by either the museum at UC-Berkeley, or at

the AMNH for the next year and thus unable to return to Mexico. Mason had left on January 31 for Zacatecas, where he had gone to see Engerrand the next day. On February 2, during a truce, he went to the Mexican National Museum to find, with relief, that his notes had arrived safely. At noon he went to buy provisions, and the truce broke down. He was stranded until the next morning, when he was able to walk to Tacuba, where he stayed with Gamio and visited with Engerrand. He wrote,

> Houses on both sides of us have been burnt and the street torn to pieces, but we are uninjured. Little did I think I should be answering [your letter] in a bombardment. While very close to the scene of action, we are very safe here, except that we cannot go out of our alley. All the streets around us are desolated, and a hail of lead traversing them, but so far we are all unharmed here. Our greatest danger was this morning when the YMCA building was shelled. Before they got the range some shells exploded uncomfortably near us, but to date the extent of our troubles are due to the failure of electric light and water, inability to secure provisions and headaches from the continuous noise. I will add more particulars when the battle is over.

Two days later Mason continued his letter:

> This is the fourth day of continuous fighting, but we are still safe. Machine guns are on the roof and shells bursting very close, but hardly a bullet has fallen in our alley. We sneak out every morning with a white flag and buy a day's provisions, but water is running short. It is, however, practically impossible to do any work in the incessant racket, and all this week we have merely existed. I am in the same Calle Privada in which we lived last year. (Just a moment ago an almost entire shell fell on my balcony, but did little damage.)

Replying to Mason's letter of February 12–19, Boas wrote that he was greatly relieved to know that he was safe. "I want to tell you how much I appreciate your energy and perseverance," Boas assured him, "and your faithful interest in your work, even under the most difficult conditions. You may be sure that I shall do everything I can to recommend you wherever opportunities may present themselves."[48]

In the midst of the battles, Boas continued the plans for the International School. He wrote to Seler, Gordon, Chávez, and Butler that Bavaria, the City of Leipzig, and the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences all wanted to join as protectors. By the end of March, Boas had received notification from St. Petersburg that Russia would join as a patron and had paid $500 for the year spanning March 1913 to March 1914. Boas continued the negotiations with the University of California with respect to "the form in which they are to join the School."[49]

Boas had held back on robust fundraising due to the political disruptions in Mexico. He had written to Gordon, "Owing to the political conditions in Mexico, I am not trying this spring to get the society of which I spoke to you formally under way, but I am trying to raise for this year the sum of $2500, in order to make sure that we shall have satisfactory scientific results." He asked if the University of Pennsylvania could contribute $500. While Boas had stated that he was constrained with respect to raising funds, he nonetheless wrote numerous letters requesting contributions for the International School. In May 1911 Boas wrote Helene that he was trying to get the Carnegie Institution to pay $15,000. The Carnegie denied the request and responded that there were already sufficient funds. "How the good man figured that out," Boas observed, "I do not know, but I have become quite hardened to such disappointments."[50]

Boas also approached Elsie Clews Parsons, who had returned from Mexico quite impressed with Engerrand. Boas wrote Engerrand, "Mrs. Parsons saw me after her return, and was very grateful to you for your attention. You certainly succeeded in interesting her in your work." Boas wrote Parsons asking her to "take an interest in the further prosecution of our work" in the International School: "With the present disturbed conditions in Mexico, I do not like exactly to go before the general public with our enterprise, because it is not generally understood that in reality scientific work does go on in Mexico just as smoothly and evenly as before. I had a letter from Professor Engerrand only yesterday in which he says that since the overthrow of the Madero government, everything is going very well indeed." He invited her to join "our little group" by donating $25.00 in annual support. Thus began the enduring philanthropic support from Elsie Clews Parsons of Boas and his research, and that of his students.[51]

Mexican president Francisco Madero and vice president José María Pino Suárez were assassinated in a military coup in Mexico City on February 22,

1913, and General Victoriano Huerta declared himself president. Tozzer wrote Boas from London, where he had seen Nadine Nuttall: “Her reports of Mexico are so discouraging. . . . She says there are fewer people in Mexico City than ever, practically all the American women have left.” Tozzer hoped that things would clear up so that he would have no fear of taking his new wife, Margaret, along with him. Somewhat unconvincingly he added, “I shall still plan to go until the last possible moment.” Toward the end of August, Tozzer wrote, “Today’s Mexican news looks grave—Wilson ordering all Americans out of the country. And the murder of Nadine Nuttall’s husband brings things rather mean. Poor Nadine left with three small children and no money!” Tozzer suggested that the work in the fall be postponed, and that if things settled down, he would go in the spring. Roland Dixon, who was Tozzer’s senior colleague at Harvard, conveyed his worries to Boas: “I am much troubled about Tozzer’s going to Mexico. It does seem as if it were foolish to try to attempt it, and really, as it looks now, dangerous.”[52]

Boas wrote Tozzer, “The situation is very awkward. I can of course fully appreciate your hesitation in leaving at the present time.” He suggested that Tozzer delay his decision until a week after the election. Boas added, “If I had known just what was coming, I believe I should have proposed to you in summer to take my place in Columbia this winter, and I should have gone. Of course I appreciate your difficulty fully, and I do not feel that I should have any right to blame you if you should say that you do not want to go at all under present uncertain conditions.” Tozzer expressed relief that Boas understood his hesitancy about delaying his departure for Mexico until late November. “I am interested in your suggestion,” Tozzer added, “that I might have taken your place . . . at Columbia. I don’t see if you with a wife and a family of children could go, why I with a wife and no children couldn’t go far more easily.” Boas replied, “I have not the remotest idea what we could do in case you should not go.” The only thing he could think of would be to appoint Engerrand. However, Harvard would then have to pay both Tozzer’s salary and Engerrand’s. Tozzer offered to come to New York to discuss the problem, but Boas replied that he doubted if another trip to New York would help clarify the issue. Again Boas voiced his reluctance to give Tozzer advice: “All I can say is how I personally should feel about it. I might say my position would be somewhat like that of an officer of the Army who is assigned a post that might entail some inconveniences,

perhaps even dangers, but who would not find any reason in this to resign. I do not by any means impose this point of view upon you." He acknowledged that he knew many people would feel differently, "but that is the way I should feel." Boas had sent a telegram to Engerrand alerting him of Tozzer and his wife's plans and asking Chávez and Engerrand to send a telegram if it would be "more advisable to delay their departure." Boas added, "Personally I should not hesitate to go, but I feel of course a certain responsibility, because it is not I who is concerned in the matter." Tozzer and his wife departed for Mexico on November 13, 1913.[53]

Boas sent a detailed seven-page account with Tozzer for the International School, including financial information, addresses of all patrons and protectors, and lists of ongoing projects. He made note of the region of Azcapotzalco "for the study of the sequence of deposits" and detailed the excavation that he had conducted:

> I wish to call your particular attention to a small place where a test excavation was made during the last few weeks of my visit in Mexico. Ask Gamio for the exact place of the excavation in the brick-yard north of San Miguel Amantla. The workmen there probably can also point out the exact place. In making this excavation we struck an old river-bed. It seemed to me desirable to investigate the conditions on the banks of this river, and accordingly a trial excavation was made by Gamio about 70 yards west of the excavation, in the brick-yard on the other side of the road.

Boas continued, "In this excavation [Gamio] found a number of painted potsherds of the oldest civilization—the only safe proof that I have up to this time of the existence of villages of this culture in the bottom-lands of the Valley." This, Boas thought, would be a "very valuable" clue to follow up on. He also counseled Tozzer to call on all the ambassadors of the countries that supported the school, as well as the French ambassador's wife, who was very interested in matters pertaining to it. He added, "You will find the Russian Ambassador particularly interested." Boas advised optimistically, "In laying out your plans, be sure to leave some money for next year, particularly $200 gold for the journey of the next Director to Mexico."[54]

In similar fashion, Boas prepared notes for Dr. Max Leopold Wagner, the fellow from Prussia, a philologist who specialized in Sephardic folklore. While appointed by the Prussian government, Wagner's fieldwork expenses were to be paid by the Hispanic Society for the specific purpose of "studying Mexican folk-lore and Spanish dialect." Boas advised Wagner, "Presumably Professor Engerrand will help you more than anyone else; also try to keep up the interest of Mr. Chávez, who is a very busy man, and needs a good deal of stimulation, but he may be of much help to you." If Engerrand was replaced, "call on the Director, whoever he may be." He suggested that Engerrand should introduce Wagner to "Señorita Isabel Castañeda Ramírez, who has been appointed Fellow of the School by the Mexican Government. She can help you contact informants." She should be encouraged "to collect folk-lore in the modern Mexican spoken in the Valley of Mexico." With respect to Wagner's own work, Boas wrote,

> if you try to collect near Mexico City, I should advise you to try to move for some time to Guadalupe, where a very large number of people come together on pilgrimages from all parts of the country. Besides this, a great deal may be had in the villages northwest of Guadalupe. . . . I recommend to you particularly a family that live in Zacatenco at the entrance to the village. The road is cut through a little slope, and there is a slight rise on the left side of the road, while in all other places the road is higher than the ground to the left. Going over this elevation, just beyond a deep excavation, you will find a courtyard and some houses; and if you speak there about Don Francisco, who used to come and gather archaeological specimens and walked about with the two boys, you can easily find these two boys. Their father and their relatives are a storehouse of tales.

Boas suggested Culhuacán as "another good place" for fieldwork: "In order to get there, you take the car on the Zócalo to Iztapalapa. Get off at Mexicaltzingo and walk . . . to the first bridge, at the foot of the Cerro de la Estrella. Turning to the left, enter the first house, and give the people the regards of Don Francisco, who used to collect the potsherds (tapalcates). The man drinks some, but he is very nice and obliging, and will help you a great deal in getting information in that place." Boas concluded that he did not want to convey that "these places are better than others. I only happen

to know about them." He also recommended Córdova in Vera Cruz and suggested that Wagner stay in the Hotel Francia, "and if the same porter is still there, he will be able to bring you into touch with good informants." He had practical advice for Wagner as well: "Be careful of un-boiled water and alkaline water. It may be better on long tramps to take a flask of cold coffee along. Outside of the city it is best to dress very inconspicuously, in loose shirt with belt."[55]

Boas suggested that Wagner pay attention to "the dissemination of favorite literature from the monasteries." For this investigation he would need to contact "some of the high Catholic dignitaries. In this I cannot help you, but I do not think it is difficult." Wagner was successful in making these contacts. Boas wrote him in January 1914, "I am very much interested in what you say about the literature that was found in the monasteries in Mexico during the Colonial time, and I trust you will try to clear up that matter as definitely as possible. . . . There is of course no reason why you should not collect a Romancero, but please do remember that for the present purposes of the School, and according to the present plan, the fairy tales, animal tales, and so on, stand in the front rank of our interests."[56]

To Chávez Boas wrote that he hoped "our new Director of the School and the German and American Fellows will have arrived in Mexico by this time." He expressed "a good deal of worry," acknowledging that "the whole condition in Mexico must, of course, be exceedingly distressing to all serious-minded citizens. It is quite impossible to form any sort of clear opinion as to what is passing in your unfortunate country; but I cannot help having the impression that the United States, by their policy, are not by any means helping matters. I cannot see what business we have to dictate to Mexico what is to be done; and, furthermore, the demands made seem to be based on a complete misunderstanding of conditions."[57]

Boas wrote Tozzer, "I am pleased to see in the papers today that all the Americans who have been frightened away from Mexico are going back." Tozzer reported that he and his wife were in Mexico City against the advice of President Wilson's special ambassador John Lind, who had replaced the former ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, implicated as he had been in the assassination of Mexico's president and vice president. "We are here," Tozzer wrote, "against the advice of Mr. Lind . . . to gather with practically all the Americans in Vera Cruz. We see no reason to feel sorry that we came." Everyone, Tozzer related, expected "something to happen," but

since this had been the expectation “for two years we hope it will continue nothing more for some time longer.”[58]

Tozzer reported that Mechling had arrived at the beginning of December; Mason was expected in two weeks, and Wagner had begun his work. “As for conditions here,” he went on, “they are terrible. Intervention is inevitable so everyone thinks.” The government had to pay cash for everything. “They are cutting expenses everywhere and the poverty of the population is most obvious—far more so than in former years.” With respect to the administration of the International School, Tozzer reported, “My troubles have begun. The Mexican appropriation has not been paid. It has been promised but there is no money in the Treasury for *anything*.” Boas advised that if he were in Tozzer’s position, he would put the matter of payment of funds “right up to the Mexican Government.” He wrote Engerrand, “I do hope that your poor Government may see its way clear to paying the 6000 pesos. If they do not do so, I presume Dr. Tozzer will not be able to carry the work through the year.” Chávez advised Tozzer to visit with the various ministers and to “ask them to use what little influence they had” to get the government to pay its allotment.[59]

While the revolution punctuated their undertakings, the work of the International School continued. Isabel Castañeda had been writing her report under Tozzer’s direction: “Now her brother has gone to war and her father is in the hands of the Zapatistas so I don’t know when she will finish.” Gamio was compiling “his explanation of your album,” but hadn’t started on his report from last year. “And now about our work,” Tozzer reported. “The Zapatistas are all about us. They came to Xochicalco last night and two were hanged in the Cerro de Guadalupe [Hill of Guadalupe] a short time ago. Culhuacán and the work to the north are not possible at present. We are at San Miguel Amantla. Our site is in the river bed where we hope to trace the sides of the river. Down to 4 m[eters] it is *all* Teotihucan. . . . We are screening everything and the work necessarily goes very slowly.” Tozzer evaluated the fellows and the workers: “Hay is of the greatest help. Gamio’s brother is also excellent. He is interested and most faithful in his work. Mechling is absolutely *no good*. . . . He is full of criticism and sits around reading a book.” In spite of all the revolutionary upset, Tozzer noted, “we are so well situated here at the Isabel [Hotel] that life is very pleasant. We return each night so completely tired out that we go to bed at 8:30.”[60]

Boas hoped Tozzer could obtain the money that Mexico owed to the school. “Otherwise,” he observed, “I do not suppose that you will be able to go on for a very long time.” With optimism in the face of adversity, Boas opined, “Even if financial conditions get desperate at the present time, better times will surely come.” Boas suggested discussing plans for a “large exhibition Museum” with the Mexican officials involved with the International School and “an unpretentious building in which they can store” material. “It should be our particular purpose,” he stated, “to try to contribute our share to the development of thoroughly scientific work in Mexico, and, with the establishment of such a storage museum in later times, the necessity of the special research members (‘Protectors of the School,’ as we have them now) will become less.” Finally, after calling many offices of the Mexican government, Tozzer succeeded in getting the allotment of 1,000 pesos. He credited Alfonso Pruneda, director of the Escuela Nacional de Altos Estudios, with making it happen.[61]

Boas remarked to Tozzer that Pruneda was “most reliable.” To Pruneda Boas wrote, “I am very glad to think that you are willing to take charge of the local interests of the International School. I have felt ever since I left Mexico that it is very important to have somebody who is in close touch with the general interests of education in Mexico [to] take charge of the interests of the School, so as to preserve a certain continuity.” The financial woes for the International School continued; Prussia hadn’t paid its portion. In February 1914 Boas wrote to German geologist and ethnographer Karl Weule of Leipzig: “Tozzer has been working for you and the other participants ever since last December, and we have been relying upon your sending the money.” By April 1914 Boas was again trying to obtain funds from Mexico: “I am very much afraid that the failure of your Government to pay over the balance of their contribution may make the work for next year very difficult. I am of course exceedingly anxious that there should be no interruption.”[62]

On April 21, 1914, the U.S. Atlantic Fleet under the command of Rear Admiral Frank Friday Fletcher seized the waterfront and the city of Veracruz. Tozzer wrote Boas from Galveston, Texas, where he, his wife, and other Americans had been evacuated:

> And we are still glad we came and mighty glad we came out on the last train to leave before the trouble began. We reached [Vera Cruz] on

> Tuesday morning [April 21] at 9:00 and the firing began at 11:30. We were in the [Gran Hotel] Diligencias with Mexican soldiers on the roof and the hotel under fire from 12:00 Tuesday until 10:30 on Wednesday when our marines took the Plaza and the hotel. We had no food except a little bread. Our fear was confined to what the Mexicans might do to the women. Rumors of return of the rebels caused us to find refuge in the Esperanza on Wednesday afternoon.

They set sail for Galveston and had "been here in quarantine since Saturday," April 25. Wagner was in Cordova and was "undoubtedly all right." He hadn't heard from Mechling and was worried about him, but did not feel "justified in waiting in V.C. I fear you would have waited." Tozzer assured Boas, "The collections are all in Mexico City," and he had all of his "notes, plans, and many of the drawings of the objects from my excavation."[63]

Boas responded to Tozzer, "I felt very much relieved when I received your telegrams and your letter of the 28th of April. I am sorry that you and Mrs. Tozzer had such a hard time in getting out. I feel very much depressed on account of the whole situation." Concluding his letter Boas queried, "What shall we do next year? I presume the question is more easily asked than answered." The next day Boas proffered an answer to his own question: "My present feeling is that we ought not to try to do any work next year," but should pay someone in Mexico to "keep matters going." Boas made arrangements to have Pruneda "take charge of the interests of the School," asking him to serve for the year: "The most important matter, in my mind, at the present time, is the protection of the collections and other property of the School." Tozzer had advised that these be kept where they currently were "in the rooms rented by the School," but Boas thought it would be wiser to have the collections sent to the embassies. Tozzer wrote Boas, "I think it unlikely that we can do anything in Mexico for eight months or a year. I think however with conditions reestablished the School can start with very little lost ground." He concluded, "We are only just beginning to feel ourselves again after the refugee business."[64]

Boas wrote Tozzer, "Very unexpectedly Engerrand with wife and one of his children turned up here yesterday, on his way to Europe." On May 7 Engerrand had seen Wagner, who was returning to Germany. By August Boas had heard from Chávez that he had resigned his position as president

of the National University of Mexico. By December 1915 he had learned that Wagner was in the German army. Boas and Tozzer continued writing of their hopes and plans for the International School. The "objects illustrated in the Album," Tozzer wrote Boas, "are safe under glass in the exhibition room to the right of the entrance at the Museum. They are still classified in groups. Gamio has been through them in writing his description of the Album. This is completed."[65]

Three months after the United States invaded Vera Cruz, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria was assassinated in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914. Boas wrote Pruneda, "Owing to the European war, I have been quite unable to get into communication with the Patrons and Protectors of the School abroad." In a draft letter to Pruneda, Boas summarized the situation with respect to the war in Europe and the school in Mexico: "After the occupation of Vera Cruz by American troops, the future of Mexico seemed very uncertain, and later on, owing to the outbreak of the European war, I have not been able to make arrangements for the appointment of a Director of the International School for the current year." Boas had expected either Dr. Aurelio Espinosa of Stanford University or Dr. Walter Lehmann of Munich "would be nominated by the University of Pennsylvania or the Government of Prussia." Boas continued, "Since the European conditions make it impossible for me to communicate with the Patrons abroad, I think we are compelled to defer the appointment of the new Director until a later time." As Godoy summarizes, "Revolutionary activities in Mexico and the American invasion of Veracruz in the spring of 1914 created an atmosphere so uncongenial for foreign-sponsored anthropological fieldwork that late that year the operations of the school were suspended, never to resume again."[66]

The International School was never formally disbanded. Boas and Seler's grand plans for fostering the study of archaeology and ethnology in Mexico had been thwarted on both sides of the Atlantic—first by the Mexican Revolution, and then by the European conflict, which burst into a conflagration soon to engulf the entire world. Boas tried to assist those colleagues who had fled Mexico in finding employment either in the United States or in Canada. Engerrand was one of the first to ask for assistance. Addressing Boas as "Cher Maître," Engerrand wrote, "I think that one can consider Mexico as finished for many years," especially for what men of science would need. "The institutes have been closed for a time . . . and the

foreign scientific element" has disappeared. He needed to find employment to support his family, and he was seeking Boas's counsel, which he said was "precious" to him. With a particular challenge due to anti-German sentiment, Boas worked hard to find employment for Karl Reiche, who had gone to the University of Mexico in 1910 and could not return to Germany because of the war. Ezequiel Chávez, central to the establishment of the International School, had also fled Mexico. Leo Stanton Rowe, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, helped Boas secure a position for Chávez at the University of Cincinnati.[67]

The door was closed to the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico. Ruiz depicts its demise: "The School ended in the midst of the Mexican Revolution, in an intense anti-American atmosphere, when North American troops landed in Veracruz, and Alfred Tozzer the director of the School at the time had to escape from Mexico, leaving the School in a complete state of chaos." With tenacious adherence to his vision for the school, Boas did his best to keep the flame alive. He maintained contact with Gamio and the others who were trying to attend to the vestiges of the school. He worked to have the collections that had been designated for the patrons and protectors shipped to the United States for the duration of the Mexican disturbances and the European war. He tried to have the works of the International School published in Mexico, which had always been part of the plan. However, since this was not possible in Mexico, Boas and Tozzer worked to bring out the publications through the BAE.[68]

Boas held out hope of reopening the International School. With Venustiano Carranza as president of the provisional government, Boas thought that things would "begin to look up in Mexico," and that, within a year or two, they would be able to reopen the school. Boas asked Gamio to write him from time to time about the conditions in Mexico, particularly in the "open country, so that I may know when we may move to begin our work again." Boas added, "European co-operation will of course be impossible until the end of the war."[69]

While awaiting a propitious time to reopen the International School, Boas felt compelled to undertake two additional projects: one that would involve training supervising teachers in Mexico to work in rural schools and to teach "the children practical work based on the local conditions in various parts of Mexico"; another that would bring Mexican students to the United

States for graduate work. At Boas's request Chávez drew up a proposal: "Tentative outline for the foundation and organization of an International College and Normal School in Mexico." Boas wrote Chávez, "I urged very strongly" that if such a school were formed "Mexicans should be sent, not Americans." To Francisco Vázquez Gómez, a prominent Mexican politician in exile in San Antonio, Boas wrote, "I feel that Americans owe something to Mexico, because, without many of the things that have been done by us, conditions in Mexico would probably not be what they are at the present time."[70]

Boas wrote Tozzer about trying to provide opportunities for graduate education for Mexicans: "I think we should do everything we possibly can in order to help the Mexicans to educate a new crop of young men, after they have been so successful in getting rid of the old crop." Of the three young Mexicans eager to study in the United States, only one, Eduardo Noguera, was able to gain a scholarship to Harvard University from 1917 to 1920. Neither the establishment of the Normal School in Mexico, nor the recruitment of young Mexicans for graduate education in the United States gained purchase.[71]

Long on hope Boas approached Zelia Nuttall in 1928 about the possibility of reestablishing the International School. Nuttall offered no encouragement. She related to him that "as a member of leading Mexican scientific societies I am in close touch with the Mexican intellectuals. While they are sympathetic with my project [to establish an institution for the promotion of science in Mexico], I know they would oppose yours." Perhaps this was a manifestation of what Ross Parmenter attributed to Zelia Nuttall: a propensity to pounce on the "errors of male colleagues."[72]

Puerto Rico

With all hopes for the International School in ruins, Boas turned his face east, toward Puerto Rico.[73] "I am sending Dr. J. Alden Mason to Porto Rico to do some anthropological work," Boas wrote his friend and colleague Henry Donaldson, that he would have Mason measure schoolchildren to study "growth in the tropics." He continued, "Mason has no experience in this kind of work, but I want him to obtain some necessary preliminary information and test how the people behave." Months earlier Mason had written Kroeber, who was his mentor at Berkeley and under whom he had

taken his PhD: “Boas wants me to spend the summer finishing up my Mexican material and then spend the winter working in Porto Rico.”[74]

At the end of 1913, in notes marked “Anthropological, Porto Rico,” Boas wrote about the “investigation of the ancient aboriginal inhabitants and their civilization, and the development of the modern population of the island,” which he saw as part of the “wider problem of the early history of the West Indies.” Boas continued, “The anthropological study of the modern population of Porto Rico . . . offers a number of exceedingly important and attractive problems.” These he listed as the “effects of race-mixture with reference to form of heredity in man” and the “effect of tropical environment upon the development of man.” He noted, “For the purpose of studying these data, an experienced anthropologist should be sent there to organize anthropometrical and psychometrical studies of families, and similar observations in schools.” He anticipated that the research in the schools would last five years.[75]

Boas worked in coordination with Nathaniel L. Britton, American botanist and taxonomist and co-founder of the New York Botanical Garden, and with geologist Edmond O. Hovey of the AMNH. In November 1913 Boas wrote to Rico Arthur Yager, governor of Puerto Rico from 1913 to 1921, about the proposed five-year project on the island, sponsored by the New York Academy of Sciences in cooperation with the AMNH, the New York Botanical Garden, Columbia University, and the Puerto Rican government. The title of the project was “Scientific Survey of Porto Rico and the Virgin Islands.” Fieldwork would be conducted throughout the main island and on the smaller islands for a “collection of many thousand specimens of rocks, minerals, plants, and animals,” with specimens provided for a museum in Puerto Rico. The minutes of the meetings of the New York Academy of Sciences made clear, however, that Boas had reservations about the research. Specifically, he was concerned that the academy would not be able to provide for proper administration or conservation of the collection. Boas was also reluctant to have the academy duplicate the efforts of other researchers, such as J. Walter Fewkes, who in 1902–4 had been sent by the BAE to the newly acquired territories of Puerto Rico and the West Indies.[76]

While cautious about the research scope that the New York Academy of Sciences had planned for Puerto Rico, Boas was nonetheless cognizant of the crucial need to tie his own plans to recognized, reputable research

entities. Thus he continued to work with the academy. In February 1914 he wrote Edward M. Bainter, commissioner of education in Puerto Rico from 1912 to 1915, that Nathaniel Britton was about to leave for Puerto Rico to gather botanical specimens for the survey. He also remarked on Henry R. Crampton's report "to the Committee of the New York Academy of Sciences on the Exploration of Porto Rico, the very kindly reception that he has had in Porto Rico, and the interest that you and many others are taking in the proposed work." Boas's own portion of the work, he wrote, involved "the anthropology of the island," and he had planned as "a first step in this investigation, an inquiry into the physical development of men under tropical conditions"; he wanted to focus on the "growth of children according to the racial descent." With Bainter's assistance Boas planned to collect "data in the schools of the island." He stressed that the investigators would make "every effort to put themselves into friendly relations with the families, so as to supplement this material by measurements of the parents and of their young children." Thinking it best to begin the work "when the schools are in full session," he would therefore defer work until January 1915.[77]

In November 1914 Boas wrote Bainter a letter of introduction for J. Alden Mason, who would be working "on behalf of the Survey of the Island": "Dr. Mason is to make a special study of the folk-lore of the Island, which presents a number of interesting problems." In addition he would be conducting anthropometric work: "I am quite certain that a great deal of the work that he wants to do can be greatly facilitated by the assistance of the school-teachers, and I shall be greatly indebted to you for any assistance that you may be able to render him."[78]

Bainter promptly sent a letter of introduction about Mason "to Supervising Principals, PR," on December 10, 1914: "Mr. J. A. Mason of the New York Academy of Sciences is visiting the island for the purpose of making a collection of the folk lore of Porto Rico." He would be focused on "the traditional and legendary knowledge of the natives of Porto Rico," and, therefore, literary sources were not needed. Mason was interested, Bainter said, in gathering "stories from school children to help him in getting an insight into the life of the people." Each child above grade three was to "write a story . . . as naturally as possible, in the style generally used in storytelling and not in an elaborate and artificial style. They may be written in Spanish, the language most familiar to the pupils." The children should

take stories from “verbatim dictation of a person who has lived many years in Porto Rico and is acquainted with some old legend or tradition. Old illiterate people oftentimes can tell stories which are not found in books.” He elaborated on the types of lore that the children should collect: “Stories of all kinds, songs, proverbs, riddles, etc., are desired. Not only the usual fairy tales involving royalty and witchcraft, but also simple stories, animal stories like the Uncle Remus tales of the negroes, and local traditions are very much wanted. A few such as Juan Bobo, La Zorra, El Conejo, Los Dos Compadres, Juan el Oso, etc.” Bainter concluded, “Dr. Mason wants a large number of different stories, so it is necessary that the children write independently of each other.” Bainter’s letter turned the trick, as Mason wrote Kroeber: “My principal work here is to collect the folk-lore and I am getting an enormous pile, with the cooperation of the department of education. I have a pile sixteen inches thick now and [will] probably get as much more before I quit. What I am ever going to do with it I don’t know.”[79]

Mason wrote Boas of a twelve-day “reconnaissance and field trip to Utuado.” The trip, he said, was successful “as far as folk-lore and philology are concerned, but fruitless as regards archaeology and anthropometry.” He planned to spend a week in San Juan writing up his results, “working them over and digesting them and shall then probably return to Utuado again for a week or two weeks more.” Mason noted that there was “a great mass of folklore . . . exclusively Spanish in origin.” It was easy to collect because people were “willing to tell stories all day for half a dollar.” With respect to his collection, he explained:

> In about ten days of work in Utuado I got 198 pages in dialectic text and I can probably get several times as much more if I stay there long enough. . . . I had a surplus of informants and have left some men quite disappointed because I didn’t have time to work with everybody. I have got three very good informants in the neighborhood of Utuado who claim to know many more stories and I shall go back with them as soon as I can. When I exhaust their repertoire there are a number of others anxious to work with me. . . . All the stories are told by illiterate persons who have learned them from others. Most of them are learned at “Velorios,” wakes held over the dead. The assembled company tell stories all night to keep awake and those with good reputations as story

> tellers take pains to increase their repertories. . . . I think there is small doubt that they have been handed down from mouth to mouth for a very long time.

Mason said that “the most interesting part of the investigation has been on the dialect, which is quite peculiar.” He noted that even “the most cultured classes use more or less of the characteristics of the island dialect in their ordinary speech. . . . On the other hand, it is almost impossible to find a ‘Gibaro’ who does not unconsciously correct his speech when talking for dictation. I have not yet been able to get one who will talk to me absolutely naturally.”[80]

Mason wrote Boas, “I have been at Utuado on my second trip now for nearly two weeks; it does not seem that long.” He had gathered ten copy books full of tales. “All of this is in text and considerably better than what I sent you,” for he had gotten “some better men now who do not try to improve on their natural speech when dictating to me.” The tales, he remarked, were “nearly identical with Mexican material”:

> I was very much pleased this morning when the local school superintendent brought me the stories written by the higher pupils in response to the circular letter of the Commissioner. They grasped exactly what was wanted and wrote a very fine collection of stories, practically all different and traditional. They are very well written, in many cases the source of the story is given and in a few cases the pupils have even used the dialectic forms of their words. Many of them end the story with a customary couplet or saying. I expected better results from this place than any other because the authorities here have naturally taken a personal interest, but the results exceeded my hopes. And the results from the country schools are yet to come. If the responses from the remaining districts at all approach those from here we shall have a very big collection.[81]

Mason admitted to being “all at sea with regard to the plans I should pursue here. I suppose you are too ignorant of conditions here to give much advice but I want more light concerning general arrangements.” The instructions that Boas had given him, Mason wrote, yielded enough work “to take several years yet I have no idea how long I am to be here.” His