extremely valuable primary document.

A most interesting question is raised by the fact that publication has had to wait until now. Susman says that she was informed of its original rejection by Ruth Benedict, "who told me that my chapter would not be included because some of the material might be challenged in court as libelous." Dr. Susman speculates further about this, and then says, "If, as is more likely, the compelling fact was that the publisher feared Collette, who was at that time representing many Indian tribes in Washtington, D.C., and had started suit against Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for libel, I could easily have deleted reference to him." She refers here to William G. Collette who led a group called Indian of California, Inc., and who had been instrumental in bringing several legal actions on behalf of various California Indian groups. Susman's references to Collette are more sympathetic than the reverse and would seem hardly to have been the basis of a libel suit.

My own view is that the key is to be found in a statement on p. 70 under the heading Editor's Summary and presumably written by Ralph Linton:

> Although treatment of American Indians by the Whites has generally been bad, the Round Valley situation finds no close parallels among the other studies included in this volume. It is unique in the complete domination of the Indian by the White group, the speed with which this domination was achieved, and the frankness and thoroughness of White exploitation.

He might also have added ruthless and brutal to his descriptive terms.

The fact is that this account was simply the pure quill about White treatment of American Indians and such straight medicine was unacceptable somewhere along the line. Whether the manuscript stopped with the publisher or with Linton is hard to say; Linton was one of the most fearless anthropologists, so I would be inclined to attribute the decision to the publisher. The entire anthropological profession must be blamed to some extent, however. Almost no one at that time wanted to rock the boat by pointing out (in detail anyway) the inhumanity of our conquest of this continent. While it would be a mistake to insist that everyone has the obligation to be a crusader, what appears to be the case here is that in order to avoid the appearance of being a crusader there was a compromise of scholarly integrity. Dr. Susman's account is not a piece of rabble-rousing rhetoric, it is an unbiased account of an abominable situation. It was Linton's obligation as a scholar to fight this through and if the pugnacious Ralph Linton failed in this obligation, what are we to conclude about his more timid brethren?

Ethnogeographic and Ethnosynonymic Data from Northern California Tribes. *C. Hart Merriam* (Assembled and edited by *R.F. Heizer*). Contributions to Native California Ethnology from the C. Hart Merriam Collection, No. 1. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility. 1976.

Ethnogeographic and Ethnosynonymic Data from Central California Tribes. *C. Hart Merriam* (Assembled and edited by *R.F. Heizer*). Contributions to Native California Ethnology from the C. Hart Merriam Collection, No. 2. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility. 1977.

Reviewed by M.A. BAUMHOFF
University of California, Davis

These two volumes (the second has *Northern* rather than *Central* California on the cover as a typographical error) are further results of R.F. Heizer's long range plan to publish the whole record of Merriam's re-

search on California Indians. Merriam, after having been a physician and then director of the U.S. Biological Survey, turned in 1910 to ethnography and for the last 30 years of his life devoted himself to this subject, mostly in California. After his death, Merriam's heirs turned over his notes on this subject to the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. In the 1950's A.L. Kroeber and R.F. Heizer saw to the publication of the nearly finished articles in this collection, and these appeared in 1955 in the volume *Studies of California Indians*. In the preface to that volume Kroeber noted that this represented only a skimming of the great volume of material, the remainder of which needed organization.

In the years since then more than a thousand pages of this material have been published one way or another, all of it through the efforts of R.F. Heizer, who has assembled and edited notes, cajoled or threatened colleagues and students to do the same, and promoted or arranged publication of the results. As a consequence, the largest part of the Merriam material is now available for general use. I am told that there still remains some unpublished parts of the collection, now housed in Bancroft Library, and it is to be hoped that this too will see the light of day.

The volumes under review contain lists of tribal, tribelet, and village names assembled according to Merriam's own recording and classification. With each name is given precise location as well as all other published names for the entity to which Merriam referred. This is of course modeled on the synonomies of biological nomenclature.

The advantage of Merriam's material is its great specificity and accuracy. Although it is not always possible to identify informants from the material given here, it is always possible to distinguish material given Merriam by a local informant from that obtained from another source. The material from other sources, which Merriam placed along side his, is given with abbreviated citation and without complete bibliographic reference. This, however, is no drawback since anyone working, for example, with Pomo ethnogeography will have no difficulty in identifying (Barrett 1908) as Barrett's *Ethnogeography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians*. I found years ago when working with the Merriam material on California Athabascans (an instance of Heizer's cajolery) that for boundary location Merriam's data were often superior to Kroeber's precisely because Merriam had actually been in these very locations in the company of informants, while this was often not true of Kroeber.

The material compiled here will probably be useful primarily to the specialist. Anyone working on the detail of ethnography or archaeology of a particular area of northern or central California will find it essential.

The Mary W. Harriman Foundation is to be congratulated for supporting the publication of this material. Merriam was supported while he gathered it by funds provided by Mrs. Harriman; she was the widow of E.H. Harriman, the railroad financier, and mother of Averell Harriman, sometime governor of New York.