Wenner-Gren Foundation Supper Conference

On April 23rd, a Wenner-Gren Foundation regional supper conference was held at the University Museum in Philadelphia to stimulate a flow of articles about museums for the American Anthropologist. On behalf of the editors, H. M. Wormington invited the following persons to take part: J. Lawrence Angel, Schuyler Cammann, Donald Collier, John Ewers, Alfred Kidder, II, J. Alden Mason, Frederick Pleasants, Froelich Rainey, Linton Satterthwaite, Jr., Harry Tschopik, Jr., Rodney Young. Papers and comments, prepared in advance, were on four topics: The Role and Function of Museums, Problems of Exhibition, Problems of Exhibition in the Explanation of Physical Anthropology, and The Potentialities of Television. The following article is the first stemming from this conference.—EDITOR.

The Role of Museums in American Anthropology*

DONALD COLLIER, Chicago Natural History Museum
HARRY TSCHOPIK, JR., American Museum of Natural History

THE PAST

ALTHOUGH it is scarcely necessary to trace the history of anthropology from the beginning, it would seem profitable, before considering the present relation of museums to the anthropological profession, to glance backward briefly to the formative period of American anthropology. As will be shown, some of the most pressing problems facing anthropological museums can only be appreciated when seen in historical perspective.

In a sense it is true that, just as anthropological science began as a miscellaneous collection of facts about primitive people, museums developed from miscellaneous collections of objects. The museum began, in fact, as the "cabinet des curiosités," private collections of objects collected during the great period of exploration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The transition from the private cabinet to the public, or semipublic, museum was achieved, however, by the end of the eighteenth century. Thus from the beginning the museums assumed the character of a repository, and although at first the objects housed in museums were exhibited chiefly as curiosities almost at once they began to take on a far greater significance.

It is not true, however, as has often been assumed, that the anthropological
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museums of America that are still in existence began their respective careers completely and entirely devoid of plan and theoretical orientation. At the time when these institutions opened their doors to the public, the theoretical climate of American anthropology was already well developed, and was dominated by the thinking of men such as Bastian, Bachofen, Maine, Morgan, and Tylor. In fact the basic patterns of anthropological museums in this country were established in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In 1890 the Peabody Museum at Harvard and the anthropology departments at the American Museum of Natural History and the United States National Museum were about twenty years old, and the University Museum at Philadelphia had been recently established.

During the 1880's, museum programs had been concerned mainly with the acquisition of objects by purchase or gift, and the cataloguing, preservation, and display of specimens. The scanty information available indicates that these collections were usually displayed typologically or geographically. Before 1890, there was very little systematic research or field investigation, notable exceptions being the program of archeological field work during the eighties under the direction of F. W. Putnam at the Peabody Museum, research on the collections at the National Museum, and the field investigations of the Bureau of American Ethnology, which operated as an independent branch of the Smithsonian Institution under the able direction of John Wesley Powell.

Several important personalities and events led to the great burst of museum research during the nineties. At this time, after having earlier reorganized the Peabody Museum at Harvard, Frederic W. Putnam also reorganized the department of anthropology of the American Museum of Natural History and supervised the anthropological section of the 1893 Chicago World's Fair, which led directly to the founding of the Field Museum. Shortly after the turn of the century Putnam proceeded to organize the department of anthropology and museum at the University of California. Putnam's influence extended also to the Smithsonian Institution where, according to a Secretary's report, the anthropological program was revised along the lines Putnam had established elsewhere. Of greatest significance is the fact that during the period of Putnam's museum-building activity, professional anthropologists in considerable numbers began to occupy the curatorial positions in museums, that were formerly held by interested amateurs. So great was his influence that in almost every museum where anthropology had a place there could be found a Putnam-trained student.

Of equal importance was the arrival in this country of Franz Boas in 1887, after field work in the Arctic and on the Northwest Coast. The following year Boas joined the faculty of Clark University where, incidentally, the first Ph.D. in anthropology in the United States was awarded to A. F. Chamberlain in 1892. In 1890 a graduate department of anthropology was established at Harvard under the leadership of Putnam. This department was a direct outgrowth of the Peabody Museum program, and instruction was carried on within the museum.
During this formative period pioneer expeditions were sent to Latin America. In 1891–92 the American Museum of Natural History sent Lumholtz to Mexico and Bandelier to Peru, and the Peabody Museum initiated research at Copan, Honduras. These were the first large-scale, planned museum expeditions from the United States to Middle and South America, and although they were designed primarily as collecting trips, they also produced publications of scholarly importance.

One of the most outstanding events that foreshadowed and led into the great period of development in the anthropological museums of the United States was the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893. As head of the Department of Ethnology of the Exposition, Putnam selected Boas as his assistant in the vast enterprise of gathering anthropological collections and data, and of organizing this material into exhibits. During the ensuing two years they carried out an unprecedented program of collecting and research that extended from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. Altogether, approximately a hundred persons were engaged in these activities. They included nearly all the anthropology students from Clark and Harvard, as well as established ethnologists and archeologists, government officials, missionaries, and army and navy officers. Boas organized a program of physical anthropology that collected skeletal material from both hemispheres and gathered anthropometric data from various Indian groups, as well as measurements of the children of different races from the United States, Canada, Hawaii, and Japan. These data were organized in diagrams and charts for display in the physical anthropological laboratory at the Exposition. In addition to the numerous exhibits of the Department of Ethnology, the Exposition contained an Eskimo and several Indian villages, and various ethnological and archeological exhibits organized by foreign governments.

The immediate result of the Exposition was the founding of the Field Columbian Museum, which took over most of the anthropological and natural history collections that had been assembled for the World's Fair. Of wider importance was the precedent of large-scale, systematic anthropological field work, and the crystallization of a growing interest, both public and professional, in the ethnography and antiquities of the New World. The dual result was that more persons were attracted to the pursuit of anthropology and a great deal of private money was made available to support anthropological research.

In 1894 Putnam returned to the museum at Harvard and also took over as curator of anthropology at the American Museum in New York, where he soon added Boas, Saville, and others to the staff and launched an ambitious research program. At this time there was a feeling among American anthropologists that the aboriginal cultures of the New World should be studied immediately, before the native way of life vanished forever. Professional anthropologists, moreover, had begun to distrust the accounts of travelers and other untrained observers that had, hitherto, served as a basis for theoretical speculations. Under the influence of Boas, especially, there was a growing de-
mand for accurate, detailed, monographic descriptions of native peoples. As a consequence, Saville was sent to work in Mexico, and Boas directed the Jesup North Pacific Expeditions of 1897-1902 to the Northwest Coast and Siberia. This large-scale, planned, problem-oriented, team research proved to be a milestone in American anthropology. While the Jesup Expedition was still in progress the American Museum initiated intensive field work among the Plains tribes. Within this same period Holmes and Dorsey were conducting expeditions for the Field Museum, Uhle was working for the University Museum at Pachacamac in Peru, the Peabody Museum at Harvard was expanding its field work in North and Middle America, and other museums were supporting investigations in a number of areas.

By 1900 the basic pattern of anthropological activities in American museums, which was to flourish for the next thirty years, was well established. These activities consisted of programs of exhibition, research, scientific and popular publication, contributions to journals, teaching, and popular lectures. A large proportion of the field research during this period was performed by museum men or as a part of museum-financed projects. Museum research was guided in some cases by the need for collections, and in others by the desire to follow up theoretical leads suggested by existing collections. In other instances, the collections indicated whole regions where knowledge was fragmentary or totally lacking. At this time there developed the tendency for given museums to map out areas of research activity—for example, the Peabody Museum of Harvard in Middle America and in the Southwest, the Field Museum in the Southwest, the Plains and Old World, the American Museum of Natural History in the Plains, Mexico, and Peru, and the University of California in California and adjacent regions, and Peru. The large area projects fostered regional comparisons and delimitations, and these, reinforced by the growing collections, led to the culture-area formulation, which, in turn, inspired further regional studies.

The theoretical interests of museum men, as of most American anthropologists of the period, were empirical, strongly historical, and anti-evolutionary, but with a considerable retention of the natural history approach of the nineteenth century. There was a strong emphasis on descriptive and comparative studies of material culture. Many of the most important theoretical contributions of the time came from museum men writing in their role of museum men: the importance of diffusion; the culture-area and age-area concepts, the relation of man to nature, the denial of trans-Pacific contact, and the autonomy of New World culture.

As Kroeber has pointed out (p. 765), museums during this period were the centers of anthropological teaching; or rather, museum curators formed the core of university teaching staffs. The major university departments drew heavily on the staffs of their anthropological museums or established a working relation with a nearby large museum. Most of the important teachers were museum men or former museum men: Putnam, Boas, Kroeber, Lowie, Wissler, Starr, Sullivan, Dixon, Hrdlička, to name but a few.
From an early date the museums recognized an obligation to educate the public. Their programs of popular lectures and publications achieved this objective with notable success. The theoretical positions that resulted from the great areal research programs in turn set the pattern for museum exhibits, and, by and large, these were displayed geographically—by region or culture area—or chronologically. Through detailed (and often endless) labeling, the curators applied descriptive monographic treatment to anthropological objects, with no concessions to the limits of interest and attention span of the average visitor. These areally organized exhibits—which we now think of as open storage—were arranged with a maximum of specimens and a minimum of interpretation. This was the empirical approach: the student was supposed to bring to the exhibits his own orientation, and to draw from them his own conclusions. At the time the question of whether the museum should exhibit for the professional or for the public at large seems not to have arisen. At least no attempt at differentiation for these very different audiences was made in the exhibition halls.

To sum up this review of the past, from 1890 to about 1920, anthropological museums played a dominant role in the development of anthropological research, theory, and teaching in the United States. Before the period of the great philanthropic foundations, they marshaled the financial support that made possible the steady growth of anthropology. Museum anthropologists organized and influenced the direction of a major part of anthropological field work of all types. Their theoretical views they dispensed both in monographs and technical papers, and through the medium of museum exhibits. In teaching they reinforced the empirical tendencies of anthropology and emphasized its place in natural science or as a branch of natural history. In large part they ignored or eschewed the humanistic aspects of the study of man and culture, which were left to museums of art and classical archeology.

THE PRESENT

During the past thirty-odd years the balance of influence has shifted from museum, or museum-oriented, anthropologists, who have increased relatively little in numbers, to nonmuseum anthropologists, attached to universities, government offices, hospitals, interdisciplinary programs, and the like, who have increased vastly. At the same time, the rapid growth of anthropology in the United States and the great proliferation of anthropological interests and specialties has resulted in an ever-widening gap between the total range of anthropological activity and the more slowly changing, traditional interests of museums.

Although nearly all archeologists and students of human paleontology have continued to utilize museum collections, most social and cultural anthropologists have become less and less concerned with historical problems and descriptive ethnography, and have, generally speaking, lost interest in material culture and technology, the traditional and most fruitful stock-in-trade of
museums. Similarly, many physical anthropologists who have specialized in anatomy, genetics, constitutional studies, and the like, feel more affinity for the medical school than for the museum. On the other hand, museums have not gone very far in widening their programs in the direction of the current interests of anthropology. Exhibitionwise, an occasional museum display may illustrate a "functional" approach to ethnological material. Certain others have dealt modestly with problems of cultural evolution, man and his environment, with diffusion, convergence, or other specific mechanisms of culture growth. But, by and large, these exhibits have been tentative, experimental, and restricted in proportion to others arranged along conventional areal lines. Most importantly, the newer exhibits have not, to date, reflected any systematic or integrated plan, and treatment of many problems of current theoretical interest has never been attempted.

It is probable that the research output of museum anthropologists is as great as ever. It is certain that many conduct their investigations in the newest and most fashionable fields of research and, in so doing, make important theoretical contributions. Yet such research is usually pursued in addition to, or in spite of, traditional museum activities rather than as a part of a changing or expanding program. This is diametrically opposed to the position of the university anthropologist, whose research projects not infrequently represent direct outgrowths of his teaching, and vice versa. The relationship of the research program to the seminar room needs no further elaboration here.

At best this schizophrenic role of the museum anthropologist is a difficult one to maintain, and at worst there is a tendency to slight curatorial duties by those curators who are concerned more with their professional standing as anthropologists than with the effectiveness of their museum work.

Curatorial work, in the broadest interpretation, imposes very real and unavoidable obligations. It is often not easy for a museum man to broaden his research when he is aware of how much there is at hand to be done. If he does overcome this difficulty, he is apt to draw a sharp dichotomy between his museum work and his research, and to pour his creative energy into the research rather than into constructive and original thinking regarding the museum's program, since it is in the former that he must seek the respect of his anthropological colleagues. There results the paradox that the better a man is as an anthropologist in terms of current value judgments of the profession, the poorer he is likely to be in performing traditional curatorial duties and in contributing to a more vital museum program.

Although museum anthropologists may, and usually do, keep abreast of their nonmuseum colleagues in research, there is no doubt that the role of training professional anthropologists has, with few exceptions, passed from the museum to the university. This is not to say that museum anthropologists have abandoned teaching; far from it. Most, if not all, devote at least a part of their time to teaching in universities, and many have formal professorial status as well. Yet with the great proliferation of universities and colleges during the
past thirty-odd years, many graduate students have been, and—particularly in ethnology and social anthropology—are being, trained who have never set foot in an anthropological museum, and see no reason to do so.

While universities have largely assumed the role of training of professional anthropologists, museums have, for the most part, been left the task of instructing the public. The day is not long past when it was not considered quite respectable, in professional circles, for anthropologists to write "popular" books. Public instruction, on the other hand, has been an obligation of museums almost since their inception in the United States, as witnessed by the excellent handbook series issued by most anthropological museums. This interest in public education is not dictated at the present time entirely by sheer benevolence, nor exclusively by awareness that public knowledge of basic anthropology is desirable or necessary in the face of the present world crisis. The fact is that most museums are becoming increasingly dependent upon public support, a situation reflected by the recent proliferation of public relations officers, popular membership drives, and the use made by museums of mass media such as radio, television, and motion pictures.

The publication records—both scientific and popular—of most anthropological museums are generally excellent and above reproach, but most museums have neglected their unique educational stock-in-trade, the visual presentation of anthropological materials. One of the main causes of the apparent conservatism in this respect is that museums have vested interests—financial, intellectual, and occasionally, sentimental as well—in their collections and exhibits. The majority of these exhibits are out of date in terms of the present theoretical position of anthropology, in terms of educational effectiveness for either students or the public, and in terms of the role that anthropology would like to play in the present world crisis. This lag is due in part to the factors discussed in the preceding paragraphs and in part to the high cost of exhibits, their rapid obsolescence, and the lag between planning and execution, which in turn results from understaffing and lack of money. It costs the work of many brains and hands and twenty to forty times more money to produce an effective anthropological exhibit than to produce a sound popular book covering the same range of subject matter. The book has a good chance of paying for itself or even making a profit, but museum exhibits can never pay for themselves under the present organization of museums. If it be asked, can we afford museum exhibits, and why not depend solely upon books, we would answer that we can afford museums; that exhibits, through their visual appeal, excite the interest and imagination, and offer experiences not found in books. Even if exhibits can never tell the whole story—and this has not been demonstrated because it has never been attempted—they reach many persons who will not read the kind of books we are talking about.

It is clear, then, that the relation of anthropological museums to the field of anthropology has changed radically in the United States during the past thirty years. Although they may hold their own in research and teaching, museum men, except through their writings, exert relatively little influence
on the present trends in anthropological theory. How far this development has
gone is evidenced by the number of graduate students and recent Ph.D.'s
who think of museums as intellectually low grade, if they think of them at
all. This attitude is due in part to trends toward specialization, in part to the
opinion of some university anthropologists that museums have nothing to
offer their students, and in part to the failure of museum men to keep their
exhibits abreast of current anthropological interests.

THE FUTURE

Are anthropological museums doomed to stand on the periphery of an-
thropology? Have they no choice but to become holding operations to pre-
serve and study the remnants of past cultures, with periodic forays abroad to
observe the death rattles of the fast-disappearing primitive societies? Once
these have vanished, does the museum, ethnographically speaking, close up
shop? We do not think so, and will attempt to point up our beliefs by means of
a series of questions. We do not claim to offer complete answers, but we have
some convictions and suggestions. The ramifications of these queries, quite
naturally, overlap, but this is inevitable. Although the complex problems of
exhibition techniques are beyond the scope of this discussion, some reference
to the content and organization of exhibits is unavoidable.

RESEARCH AND THEORY

What lines of research of importance to anthropology are museums best fitted
to pursue? There are several uniquely suited to the museum, and one, now
largely neglected, happens to be the museum’s traditional stock-in-trade:
namely the detailed documentation of primitive cultures before it is too late.
On virtually every continent there still remain a number of primitive tribes,
yet undescribed or only partially described, that could be studied profitably
from an essentially ethnographic point of view. If this is not done, this knowl-
dge will be lost forever, and who can say what descriptive material will be
required for the anthropological theory of the future? Obviously an ethnogra-
pher of the 1950’s will differ in theoretical orientation from one of the 1920’s;
but he should at least amass comparably complete data, and it seems to us that
in many cases this is not being done. Such investigations would be especially
appropriate for museums, because, today, it is very difficult to obtain funds
from foundations for descriptive studies of primitive people. Since museums
are traditionally acquisitive institutions, the possibility of collections should
prove an additional incentive.

While foundations favor investigations of folk culture, community studies,
applied problems, and the like, most social anthropologists concerned with
the study of acculturated peoples are either disinterested in material culture
or believe, erroneously, that “acculturated objects” hold no interest for muse-
ums.

Actually, with such collections museums could provide a hitherto unex-
ploded potential in acculturation studies. Many aspects or processes of cul-

ture change can be studied concretely in terms of material culture, yet few modern studies of this nature have been made. Investigations of contemporary or recent acculturation would enrich our knowledge of culture change generally, and would add much to our understanding of changes in the past. Such studies would be particularly valuable to archaeologists in providing insight into the meaning of comparable changes in the prehistoric past. Such a program would involve a deliberate policy of collecting material culture from contemporary cultures in transition—in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania—with accompanying contextual data, in contrast to the more traditional policy of collecting only the "native and uncontaminated" in art and artifact.

Finally, museums might aim at collecting motion picture and photographic records of primitive peoples, as well as sound recordings of their language and music. Not only are museums in a position to take advantage, for ethnographic documentation of this type, of the numerous and varied expeditions they are constantly sending to all parts of the globe; many museums have specialized departments of photography, and a few have sound technicians as well. To the best of our knowledge, few university departments have so far attempted the type of audio-visual records now being sought by some museums.

Is material culture, as a proper subject for anthropological investigation, a dead duck? We believe that material culture and technology have not yet lost their significance as subject matter for research. In fact, they offer a great potential for studies with a modern orientation. To point to a single example, anthropologists are showing an increasing interest in art—its history, as well as the problems of style, function, and values. At the same time, artists and art historians are becoming increasingly interested in anthropology. Anthropological museums house the raw materials for such studies, and could come to be the common meeting ground for this branch of the humanities and social sciences.

Are there any museum needs that necessitate research? We think that there are, and that the anthropological museum itself is a fair and necessary field for investigation. In order to plan more effective displays, which, once constructed, represent large investments of money and time, research and experimentation in exhibition techniques are essential. If museum exhibits are to be modernized conceptually, new avenues must be explored so that ways and means of displaying these concepts may be found. In this regard the fields of advertising, window display, and the theater have a wealth of suggestions to offer.

Systematic studies of audience reaction to exhibits would be equally profitable. Mass communication studies are currently fashionable in social science. Why is not the anthropological museum as a medium of mass communication itself a suitable object for study?

Are research problems best left to the interests of individual staff members, or are co-ordinated projects more desirable? Here, obviously, there can be no unequivocal "yes" or "no," nor is it likely that an official ruling along these
lines will ever be made in any museum. Yet the anthropological museum, embracing as it does archeologists, ethnologists and physical anthropologists on its staff, is in an excellent position to tackle projects that require knowledge of these three now highly specialized fields. Broad problems of culture history and/or ecology necessitate closely geared teamwork, and museums could well specialize in assembling the data and carrying out research in these fields.

Other types of useful co-operative enterprises come to mind. The natural history museum, embracing under one roof diverse subjects such as anthropology, paleontology, comparative anatomy, mammalogy, and ecology, is ideally situated to produce integrated studies of man the animal and to investigate his place in nature. This would require large-scale interdepartmental cooperation on the part of scientists from the several fields as well as the use of extensive study collections.

Finally, museums, rather than anthropologists acting as private individuals, are in a better position to arrange research projects that require cooperation on the institutional level, both at home and abroad. In the latter case, the prestige of the museum as a reputable and established institution is often in itself a factor of considerable importance, and one that greatly facilitates research.

Can museums once more contribute importantly to anthropological theory, apart from the published theoretical papers of their staff members? It is, perhaps, premature to attempt an answer to this question, but one outstanding example comes to mind. The special exhibition, "Across the Pacific," arranged by Gordon F. Ekholm at the American Museum of Natural History in 1949, stimulated professional anthropologists to reconsider the important problem of trans-Pacific contacts. This exhibition led directly to a symposium held in Philadelphia in 1950, as well as to a series of technical papers on the subject of possible Old World–New World connections. We see no reason to doubt that other museums exhibits, dealing with current and controversial issues, would have equal influence on American anthropological theory.

Teaching

How can we resolve the old problem: does the museum exhibit for professional anthropologists and advanced students, for the general public, or for both? As stated earlier, the larger museums are already committed to programs of public instruction, and are becoming increasingly dependent upon public support. Their obligation to the public can, and must, be fulfilled. Museums are potentially the most effective mechanisms for transmitting anthropological knowledge and concepts to the public at large, and in the execution of this task, exhibits are the museum's basic and unique form of communication.

Although some university museums may still be puzzled by the dilemma of whether exhibits should be designed for students or the public, most larger public and semipublic museums have taken a stand in favor of the layman, even though they are uncertain where this decision is leading them. In our opinion, this dilemma has always been a false one. Experience has indicated
that well-designed exhibits—exhibits that generalize anthropology—are more effective with students than the archaic, "open storage" displays and narrowly technical exhibits labeled with anthropological jargon. Certainly the newer types of exhibits mean more to the layman.

In opposition to the policy of modernizing anthropological exhibits along conceptual lines, some die-hards argue that "Exhibits become dated." Anything and anyone "becomes dated." What is wrong with most anthropological exhibits today is that they are dated—usually circa 1920. Yet many principles of anthropology, as well as processes and attributes of culture, are now established beyond all reasonable doubt. Future research may refine and clarify them, but essentially many will remain unaltered. The argument that exhibits "become dated" does not apply, therefore, to the central core of anthropological knowledge. There are many basic concepts of anthropology that may be put on public view without fear that the exhibits which represent them will be come obsolete before the paint is dry.

In the training of anthropology students, we believe that the museums' most important contribution, which is at present imperfectly realized, lies in the teaching of ethnography and culture history. As long as culture remains an important unifying concept in anthropology, students need to know a good deal about the history of culture, its varieties, and the ways it has changed. And every anthropologist needs to attain a certain literacy in ethnography. Many university teaching programs are inadequate in these respects, and it is here that museums can be most helpful by creating integrated and meaningful exhibits.

In order to present anthropology as it exists today, exhibits must be expanded far beyond the traditional culture history—culture area approach. It is likely that some phases of anthropology can never be demonstrated visually in museum exhibits, but the limits of what can be done are not known. Carefully planned and organized exhibits treating the following topics could be safely installed at the present time,

(2) The nature of culture: a hall describing the attributes and properties of culture, its varieties, and what it "does" for man.
(3) Culture growth and change: a hall that would describe these processes, as well as outline cultural and social evolution.
(4) A hall of cultural ecology: perhaps the utilization of a single locality or landscape by man as seen through time.

These exhibits could be arranged with the collections and materials now existing in large museums. In most of these institutions sufficient collections would remain for additional, although reduced, halls arranged along conventional culture-area lines.

Another way in which museums can contribute importantly to the training of anthropologists is to establish more effective programs for student learning by manipulation of and research on the study collections. Both students and
professionals have needs which cannot be met by exhibits. Even in the most extreme "open storage" type of exhibit, total series of specimens are almost never displayed, and, in any case, most anthropological specimens cannot be studied effectively through glass. Well-organized storage is essential for students and professionals, but in order for collections to be effectively used by scholars museums will have to improve the sadly inadequate arrangements of their study collections and the facilities for using them. This is one of the most vital and difficult problems faced by museums, and the importance of solving it will have to be sold, in some instances, to museum trustees, to foundations, and to the donors who customarily give money for expeditions or the purchase of collections.

_Can we stimulate students to study museum collections as a substitute for the increasingly expensive field trip?_ Although all large museums are literally mines of untapped material, encouragement is needed to induce gifted anthropology students to seek experience and do research in museums. The number of such students has fallen off noticeably in recent years, for reasons already discussed. Such able students are important both as a stimulus to museum staffs and as potential museum curators of the future. Presumably a revitalization of museum programs would attract more good students. In the meantime, a series of museum fellowships offered by museums and by universities would help to attract first-rate students. At another level, museums, universities, and foundations could work together to encourage a greater quantity of high-quality research on museum collections.

_How can museums keep abreast of current theoretical trends in the face of the high cost of installing exhibits?_ The obvious solution that comes to mind is the temporary exhibition hall. The anthropological museum could devote one hall to current problems. This would serve both to focus attention upon these issues and to keep the museum's displays up to date. It would also help to close the gap between current professional knowledge and that of the layman who, in science, at least, is traditionally several years or more behind.

In these ways, and in others that have not occurred to us, it should be possible for anthropological museums to serve more fruitfully both anthropology and the public. This end cannot be achieved by museums alone. The active support and collaboration of universities and of the anthropological profession as a whole is necessary as well. But in developing new programs and new approaches museums should not lose sight of their traditional and still fruitful role of linking anthropology with natural science. The natural science outlook has been one of the distinguishing characteristics of anthropology in the past. We believe that museums should strive to keep it a dynamic force in the anthropology of the future.