

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The Collecting of Bones for Anthropological Narratives

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hb1g6b8>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 16(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Biedler, Robert E.

**Publication Date**

1992-03-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## The Collecting of Bones for Anthropological Narratives

ROBERT E. BIEDER

---

Responding to a question directed to him by François Barbe Marbois, secretary of the French legation in Philadelphia, regarding Indian monuments, Thomas Jefferson wrote of his investigations in opening an Indian burial mound, "I conjectured that in this barrow might have been a thousand skeletons." Although Jefferson may have been the first to dig into a burial mound, both Americans and Europeans were preoccupied with the study of racial differences between American Indians and Caucasians. The search for answers led, especially in the nineteenth century, to the collection of Indian remains and the development of American archaeology and physical anthropology.<sup>1</sup> So any story about collecting Indian remains is also a narrative about these two sciences and the shifting, value-laden cultural context in which they developed.

Historian of science Donna Haraway reminds us that physical anthropology is a political discourse about the body, with multiple representations; to a lesser extent, this description also may be attributed to archaeology. Accordingly, both physical anthropology and archaeology produce multiple narratives "adapted to engage in particular kinds of social struggles . . . ." Both fields create "contentious constituencies" where, at times, certain stories or plots are privileged, while others are no longer acceptable.<sup>2</sup> In recent writing, anthropologist Clifford Geertz holds similar views and acknowledges that anthropological stories—perhaps even text building itself—should be subjected to critical scrutiny. Ac-

---

Robert E. Bieder is Soros Foundation Professor of American Civilization at L. Kossuth University, Debrecen, Hungary.

According to Geertz, the epistemological foundations of anthropology have been shaken “by a general loss of faith in received stories about the nature of representation,” and he speaks of “ethnological descriptions” as the “describer’s descriptions, not those of the described.” The narratives produced by physical anthropology and archaeology also are the “describer’s descriptions” and are constructed out of the political and scientific discourse of an age.<sup>3</sup> These narratives were considered necessary because the Indian had to be “correctly” described and placed into the context of Western civilization. Such descriptions, however, reflected Western attitudes and Western conceptions of what it meant to be civilized. The gathering and interrogation of Indian remains—the work of nineteenth-century physical anthropology and archaeology—can be discussed only briefly here and focuses primarily on the gathering process.

In the current defense of physical anthropology and archaeology, or rather in defense of how the bones that constitute the data base of the former were collected, one anthropologist admitted that “there is little doubt that some collectors of human burials were insensitive to the feelings of the Native American people, but my impression is that this is rare.”<sup>4</sup> Another museum anthropologist, not so equivocal, bluntly stated, “[O]ur collections were gathered according to the legal and ethical standards of the time . . . [T]here’s no way you can go back and rejudge the past.”<sup>5</sup> This paper is not about rejudging the past but will offer evidence that the collecting of Indian remains was of questionable legality and was, at least from the Native American perspective, unethical. There is evidence that such collecting has been producing anger among many Indian groups for a long time.

For both Indians and non-Indian scientists, bones possess meaning. For many, if not all, Indians, ancestral bones retain a spiritual significance and power.<sup>6</sup> This power, according to some tribal beliefs, continues to reside and emanate from the bones after the death of the body. For the early nineteenth-century scientist, bones and also the body began to hold different meanings. As Dorinda Outram argues in her book *The Body in the French Revolution*, beginning around the end of the eighteenth century the body in science became depersonalized and desacralized. The whole concept of the body—symbolically, politically, and scientifically—underwent change. Gradually liberated from its religious moorings, the body—according to scientists—ceased to be the temple of the soul and became data. The rise of the hospital in the 1790s

allowed doctors (scientists) to collect bodies for observation. Quoting Michael Foucault, Outram notes that “in the new hospital medicine, . . . older ways of seeing the body disappeared. In their place came a penetrating medical gaze that used new techniques of observation to make the deepest recesses of the body transparent to the medical eye.” Under the medical gaze, the body became docile, transparent, and analyzable. The moment when “calculable man” was substituted for “memorable man” was the “moment when the sciences of man became possible, the moment when a new technology of power and a new political anatomy of the body was developed.”<sup>7</sup>

To be sure, there was resistance to the new political anatomy. Medical studies in the late eighteenth century demanded bodies, and, in New York City in 1788, few noticed when the graves of paupers and Blacks were emptied for science, but riots flared when students tampered with the graves of “people who mattered,” i. e., people of property. These riots, known as the “Doctor Riots” or the “Anti-Dissection Riots,” led to legislation in New York in 1789 and eventually in Congress in 1790 prohibiting such practices; the legislation made available for science only the bodies of persons convicted of murder, arson, or burglary. Compliance with these laws made medical studies difficult, so “body snatching” continued but predominantly in rural areas. Poor people and nonwhites continued to make the greatest sacrifices to science.<sup>8</sup>

Despite these protests, science increasingly handled bodies objectively and without sentiment. For many, religious scruples were compromised in the name of medicine or science. These scruples proved even weaker when the bodies involved belonged to other races. Such bodies could be manipulated by science or by the state. But, while Europeans and Americans were redefining the body in political, scientific, and social terms in order to tell a particular story, it is doubtful that many Indians made this symbolic or value shift.

The study of human variability and its political significance engendered a growing debate among intellectuals in the late eighteenth century. Ethnologists, especially those interested in language and culture, saw human variations as environmentally induced, while anthropologists tended to see differences between groups as innate. In the eighteenth century, however, the commitment to the concept of universal progress—resting on the psychic unity of humankind—prevented most scholars from accepting the anthropological argument. Evidence began to mount during the

first half of the nineteenth century, however, in favor of innate differences, or the polygenist stance.<sup>9</sup>

Scholars in Europe, including Johann Blumenbach at the University of Göttingen, Peter Camper in the Netherlands, and Charles White in England, began observing human and animal skulls and drawing certain conclusions. For Blumenbach, human crania were useful in suggesting answers to questions of race. Examining crania from various parts of the world, Blumenbach concluded that there were five basic races. Although some scholars were already taking the unorthodox position, which would become more popular later, that the differences among races were of a magnitude to constitute a difference in species—that is, polygenism—Blumenbach held to the opinion, expressed in his *On the Natural Varieties of Mankind* (1755), that these differences were not great and that races were only varieties of a single species. He did conclude, however, on the basis of the shape of the crania, that Caucasians were the most beautiful of the races. More importantly, Blumenbach's research contributed to seeing humanity grouped into separate categories or distinct groups.<sup>10</sup>

Camper, who devised an analytical approach based on the facial angle formed by a line extending from the ear to the nose and from the forehead to the front teeth and the protrusion of the lower jaw, discovered in his samples that the angle was smallest and the protrusion greatest in lower primates and nonwhite races. This led Camper to theorize that nonwhites were more primitive than whites. The English physician Charles White also drew upon such distinctions in his rhapsodic *Account of the Regular Gradation of Man* (1799) to rank the various races and assert their separate origins. Nonwhites, accordingly, were inferior to whites.<sup>11</sup>

Increasingly, the geography of the skull was used to make political as well as scientific statements. The rise of the science of phrenology further articulated the use of the cranium to address questions of racial difference. According to phrenological theory, as propounded by its Austrian founder Josef Gall and his German disciple Johann G. Spurzheim, the brain was divided into sections or faculties that controlled intelligence and personality. The strength of these faculties could be determined by the shape of the skull. As one phrenologist noted in regards to Indians, "[E]ach tribe has a well marked national form of head, and between the several tribes there is frequently an immense difference of cranial configuration." Differences, yes, but not so great as between races. While crania varied within a racial group, larger variations, according to

phrenologists, were to be seen among races, and hence each race possessed a "national skull." Because of the demands of craniologists and phrenologists, numerous crania were needed.<sup>12</sup>

Americans studying medicine in Europe at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century absorbed craniological and phrenological theories. One who came under the influence of both sciences during his studies at Edinburgh and Paris was Samuel G. Morton. While the revolution in body concept was being enacted in France and elsewhere in Europe during the early nineteenth century, Morton, "father" of American physical anthropology, was studying medicine in Paris.<sup>13</sup> When he returned to the United States in 1823, Morton assumed teaching posts at the Philadelphia Hospital and at Pennsylvania College. Annoyed at finding no crania to use in his anatomy classes, he began his own collection. Although he gathered crania from all races, Morton's own interests and investigations were directed to the study of the crania of American Indians and Blacks.<sup>14</sup>

Morton rejected the theory that environment had a major influence on mental and physical development. He firmly believed that his study of Indian crania would show that the environment had little effect on either Indian intelligence or physique. In an 1837 letter to his phrenologist-physician friend, John Collins Warren of Boston, Morton explained what he wished to do: "My plan . . . is to give a preliminary view of the *Five Races* of men as proposed by Blumenbach, and to illustrate each by genuine specimens. I shall then go on with the American series, in which, however, I am yet considerably deficient, but am promised assistance from so many different sources."<sup>15</sup>

Collectors—fellow physicians, amateur archaeologists, army medical doctors, and military officers—were eager to supply Morton with Indian remains. One enthusiastic midwesterner, Samuel Hildreth, not only sent Morton Indian remains from the Ohio and Mississippi rivers but also urged his friends from the region to do likewise.<sup>16</sup> South Carolina physician John Bachman sent Morton crania from Florida, while another southerner, William Powell, not only sent crania to Morton but inquired if Morton knew Europeans who might desire American Indian remains, noting that he could provide between four hundred and five hundred "Indian skulls" to those interested in phrenology.<sup>17</sup>

Just as in 1788 when New Yorkers of property resisted grave robbing, so, too, did many Indian groups. One Tennessee collector noted to Morton that he would attempt to procure one or more

Indian crania, "but those fellows do not like that anybody disturb the bones of their dead."<sup>18</sup> Another reported,

It is rather a perilous business to procure Indians' skulls in this country—The natives are so jealous of you that they watch you very closely while you are wandering near their mausoleums & instant & sanguinary vengeance would fall upon the luckless \_\_\_\_\_ who would presume to interfere with the sacred relics . . . . There is an epidemic raging among them which carries them off so fast that the cemeteries will soon lack watchers—I don't rejoice in the prospects of death of the poor creatures certainly, but then you know it will be very convenient for my purposes.<sup>19</sup>

Yet another collector writing from Iowa, fearful of reprisals, informed Morton that he could send the crania of two eminent chiefs once the Indians were removed from the area.<sup>20</sup>

Morton's researches led to the racial findings expressed in several articles and in his monumental study *Crania Americana* (1839).<sup>21</sup> Evidence gleaned from single crania were projected to characterize whole tribes. American Indians were presented not only as intellectually deficient but also probably separate, inferior human types unaffected by environmental factors and biologically incapable of change. For many Americans, Morton's findings would shape the thinking about race long after his death in 1851. His findings and methodology would lay the foundation for the science of physical anthropology and legitimize anthropology's interest in searching out Indian remains.

But Morton was not the only physician collecting remains. Others interested in craniology or phrenology were busy establishing their own collections or crania "libraries." Medical officer Dr. Lyman Foot at Fort Brady, Sault Ste. Marie, paid "a good price" to a soldier for three Indian heads, which Foot then proceeded to boil down at night, causing "a most abominable stench" at the post hospital.<sup>22</sup> The mounds in the Ohio and Mississippi drainage became a much exploited source for Indian remains. One mound in particular, the Grave Creek Mound, near present-day Wheeling, West Virginia, became a tourist attraction where, for a fee, visitors were allowed to view skeletons on exhibit.<sup>23</sup>

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the collecting of Indian remains proceeded at a time when American attitudes toward Indians were changing. Instead of incorporation into American society, their exclusion was now sought and pursued with a sense

of political urgency. The polygenetic theories of Morton and others who stressed the inferiority of the American Indian abetted this emerging policy. These scientists disagreed with those who hoped for the eventual “civilization” of Indians and who saw Indian removal to the West as a strategic move to gain more time for their acculturation. Morton and his followers stood convinced that the Indians’ innate deficiencies as a separate species doomed them to extinction.

By the end of the Civil War, phrenology had fallen into disrepute as a science, and the writings of Charles Darwin had dealt a severe blow to polygenism, although some forms of polygenistic thinking continued in anthropology into the twentieth century. Nevertheless, these changes did not lessen the need for Indian crania. Indeed, as one scholar states, “[C]raniology flourished as never before in the period after 1860.”<sup>24</sup> Physical anthropologists, assuming humans could be divided into distinct racial groups, were committed to see each group as a basically homogeneous type. Stressing typology, physical anthropologists chose to ignore individual differences and focused on group characteristics. Anthropometric studies of soldiers, white and Black, conducted by the United States Sanitary Commission during the Civil War contributed to ideas of racial inferiority. Skeletal structure, hair texture, facial angle, and skin color continued to be important, but after the war, physical anthropology shifted its focus to the head, believing that investigation of the cranium and brain would reveal the quality of the mind and its fitness for civilization.<sup>25</sup>

To further such anthropometric investigations, the Army Medical Museum was founded in 1862. Although the museum sought human remains of all races, from 1865 to 1880 it gathered—because of their proximity—primarily Indian remains and especially skulls. This was accomplished mainly through the cooperative efforts of medical officers posted in forts throughout the West. According to the surgeon general, the collection of Indian skulls would “aid in the progress of anthropological science.” Hence “medical officers stationed in the Indian country or in the vicinity of ancient mounds or cemeteries in the Mississippi Valley or the Atlantic region” were solicited as collectors.<sup>26</sup>

Medical officers and others responded with enthusiasm. Battle sites, reservation cemeteries, and mounds became “happy hunting grounds” for the collectors of Indian remains. Army hospitals proved convenient laboratories for preparing “specimens” to send to the Army Medical Museum. Letters sent with specimens



frequently narrate the use of such facilities and the method of collection. A young Yanktonnais woman, a "squaw having remarkable beauty," was, upon her death and burial, dug up by the post surgeon, her head severed and sent to Washington as "a fine specimen."<sup>27</sup> At Fort Concho, Texas, a post surgeon dissected for the museum a Comanche woman "of middle age, good physique, etc."<sup>28</sup> Another surgeon wrote in one letter referring to a recently killed Kiowa male, "[H]is scalp and the soft parts of the face and neck were carefully dissected up from the skull, atlas and axis, and these were subsequently boiled and cleaned for the Army Medical Museum. The skull was carefully cleaned and then steeped in solution of lime for 36 hours . . . ." The surgeon further reported that he had just acquired "a fresh Indian brain for the Museum. It is now being soaked in Erlick's fluid and will be ready for shipment in a week . . . It comes from a full-blooded adult male Apache."<sup>29</sup>

Despite military control of large sections of the West, making collecting attempts less dangerous than formerly, there was still an uneasiness and fear of Indian retribution among the collectors. As one army physician noted, "I had already obtained for the Museum the skull of one of the Pawnees, killed in the fight you speak of, & would have had all had it not been that immediately after the engagement, the Indians lurked about their dead and watched them so closely, that the guide I sent out was unable to secure but one."<sup>30</sup> Another officer in the Dakotas, who sent the museum a box of twenty-five "Indian crania" reported that, "in making this collection, I could get the co-operation of no one, except my guide Hecke . . . on account of the hazardous nature of the undertaking."<sup>31</sup>

Others related tales of bravado in their attempts. One medical officer wrote of taking the head of an old man whose father was a Yankton and whose mother was a Brulé. The old man

died at this post on the seventh day of Jan. 1869 and was buried in his blankets and furs in the ground about a half mile from the Fort, within a few rods of the tippees [*sic*] occupied by his friends. I secured the head in the night of the day he was buried. From the fact he was buried near these lodges, I did not know but what I was suspected in this business, and that it was their intention to keep watch over the body. Believing that they would hardly think I would steal his head before he was cold in his grave, I early in the evening with two of my hospital attendants secured this specimen.<sup>32</sup>

Dark nights offered the best protection for grave robbing. One officer who sent in fifteen crania pointed out that the cemetery was "in plain sight of many Indian houses and very near frequent roads. I had to visit the country at night when not even the dogs were stirring . . . [A]fter securing one [cranium] I had to pass the Indian sentry at the stockade gate which I never attempted with more than one, for fear of detection." As he further related, his greatest fear was that some Indian would "miss the heads" and ambush him.<sup>33</sup>

Not all who sent crania were army officers. A William A. Collins sent in the skeleton of an eight-foot Indian. Hiring someone to steal it from the grave, Collins "took the body to a rendering establishment and with the assistance of the proprietor boiled the flesh and grease out of the bones in a clean kettle, so that no bone was lost or none added."<sup>34</sup> Another contributor was anthropologist Franz Boas, who sold three crania from the Northwest Coast to the museum for ten dollars. Boas, at first, found it "most unpleasant work to steal bones from a grave . . ." Writing to his wife from the Northwest Coast in 1886, Boas sought to justify his digging: "Yesterday I wrote to the [Army Medical] Museum in Washington asking whether they would consider buying skulls this winter for \$600; if they will, I shall collect assiduously. Without having such a connection, I would not do it."<sup>35</sup> Eventually, Boas would amass a collection totaling about one hundred skeletons and two hundred crania. Boas found it difficult to peddle this collection. He finally sold half of it to German physical anthropologist Rudolf Virchow in Berlin and the rest to the Field Museum in 1894.<sup>36</sup>

During the last half of the nineteenth century, the Army Medical Museum was not the only museum collecting Indian remains. Several American and European museums competed for skeletal collections. The Museum of Comparative Zoology, founded in 1859 at Harvard and directed by the brilliant Swiss zoologist Louis Agassiz, collected scientific specimens from all over the world, including turtle eggs, photographs of European racial types, and "one head of a North American Indian, in alcohol." In January 1865, Agassiz, eager to increase the number of Indian bodies for study, wrote to secretary of war Edwin M. Stanton requesting, "Now that the temperature is low enough . . . permit me to recall to your memory your promise to let me have the bodies of some Indians; if any should die at this time . . . I should like one or two handsome fellows entire and the heads of two or three more."<sup>37</sup>

By the end of the century, an intense rivalry had developed

between the American Museum of Natural History and the Chicago Field Museum as each tried to outdo the other in gathering American Indian artifacts and remains. This competition continued into the early years of the twentieth century.<sup>38</sup> One who helped to make the Field Museum competitive in this race was Warren K. Moorehead. Although educated at Denison University and serving on the staff of the Smithsonian Institution, Moorehead was largely self-taught as an archaeologist. Hired by Frederic Ward Putnam of the Peabody Museum and Harvard University to collect for the archaeological exhibit of the 1893 Chicago World's Columbian Exposition, Moorehead enthusiastically dug into graves and village sites in the Ohio River valley. Between 1891 and 1893, he shipped hundreds of Indian remains to Chicago for the exposition. After the exposition, these remains became part of the collection of the Field Museum. Moorehead's field notes do not reveal the precision and care that one associates with the techniques and recordings of modern archaeologists. Rather, they narrate a story of ravage and plunder that would become a common practice in museum competition for Indian remains and artifacts on the Northwest Coast in the early twentieth century.<sup>39</sup>

Dr. C. F. Newcomb, the main collector for the Field Museum on the Northwest Coast, is a good example of how some collectors hired by museums operated. Newcomb not only bribed Indians to hand over skeletal remains, thereby exploiting the extreme poverty they suffered around 1900, but he also robbed graves in communities plagued by epidemics. Gold prospectors hired by Newcomb on the Northwest Coast often found greater wealth in digging for bones than for gold. The competition among American and European museums for house posts, totem poles, boxes, crests, and human remains stripped whole villages.<sup>40</sup>

Writing in 1894, Franz Boas began questioning the scientific usefulness of osteological collections and believed none were sufficient to "delineate in a satisfactory manner the distribution of types of men in North America . . . . Investigations of osteological material particularly on material collected among modern tribes, are always unsatisfactory in that the identification of the skull, regarding its tribe and sex, often remains doubtful." Throwing further doubt on its usefulness was the difficulty in determining whether the skull was from an individual of mixed tribal descent, from a full-blood, or from a mixed-blood.<sup>41</sup>

The effects of Boas's critique of research based on osteological collection are not known, but by the early twentieth century the

collection of remains for science decreased. Anthropological research became more focused and depended less on acquiring skeletal remains. Boas's work perhaps led the way, calling for an anthropology of North American Indians based on living individuals. Physical anthropologists, however, continued to collect remains in order to supplement their data base, and their theoretical outlook did not change. The basic theoretical assumptions derived from earlier nineteenth-century research continued—that nonwhites were biologically and intellectually inferior to whites. Eugenics, a science of "race improvement," while not hesitating to draw on the conclusions of nineteenth-century craniologists, depended more on observations and measurements of the living. There still were, of course, many who dug up Indian graves, but they were primarily amateur archaeologists who dug and collected for the pure enjoyment of digging.<sup>42</sup>

One anthropologist who did continue digging and collecting Indian remains was Aleš Hrdlička, supporter of eugenics and founder of the American Association of Physical Anthropology. He argued strenuously on the scientific need for such collections and also denied vigorously that his digging antagonized Indians. A recent study of Hrdlička's work in Alaska, however, throws such denials into question.<sup>43</sup> Regardless of whether or not Hrdlička was insensitive to Indian feelings, his statements on measurements and race made during and just prior to World War II now produce an embarrassing resonance.<sup>44</sup> The atrocities of the war tended to curb statements about racial inferiority, and the cranial museum established by the Third Reich dampened the enthusiasm of archaeologists for cranium collecting. Interest had deteriorated so much by the 1950s that, as Douglas H. Ubelaker and Lauryn Guttenplan Grant have pointed out, "archaeologists did not bother to preserve human skeletal remains apparently for lack of awareness of their research value."<sup>45</sup>

During the nineteenth century, narratives of physical anthropology and archaeology related to American Indians presented texts rich in the semiotics of power and race. They were narratives whose meaning, significance, and power were considered too important to be left to the Indians themselves, who were not in a position—philosophically and morally—to appreciate their condition of inferiority, their low position in society, or their deficiencies in civilization. In short, they were not to be trusted to represent themselves; they had to be represented. Thus, negotiating the boundaries of difference—ranking—and bestowing meaning on

these differences became political as well as scientific acts.<sup>46</sup>

To those in the nineteenth century who dug up remains and calculated meanings, the story was not complex. American Indians were either innately inferior and doomed to extinction—this could be either good or bad, depending on the perspective of the individual making the judgment—or “they have the skulls and brains of barbarians and must grow towards civilization.”<sup>47</sup> For the contestants who argued over the issue, the proof was to be found in the grave.

Those in physical anthropology and archaeology who claim that the digging and collecting were entirely legal and ethical distort their own science’s history. One’s theoretical or political stance often determines what one will see as well as how one will interpret the narrative itself. The view that anthropologists and archaeologists hold regarding collecting and the body as text shapes the historical reality they see. This, however, is no less true for American Indians who contest the narratives written by physical anthropologists and archaeologists.

Recently, many archaeologists and physical anthropologists have manifested greater sensitivity in their collecting and assert that their research contributes to our understanding of the Indian past and also informs medical research for the benefit of all. Whether such collecting and the new definition of scientific goals constitute legitimacy or illegitimacy is a matter of debate among those “contentious constituencies” to which Haraway referred.<sup>48</sup>

## NOTES

1. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 92–96.

2. Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions* (New York: Rutledge, 1989), 188.

3. Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988), 135.

4. Don Ortner, “Memorandum to: Anthropology curators and unit managers,” copy in possession of the author.

5. Quoted in Douglas J. Preston, “Skeletons in Our Museums’ Closets,” *Harper’s Magazine* (February 1989), 70.

6. See, for example, Harvey Arden, “Who Owns Our Past?” *National Geographic* 175 (March 1989), 376–93; and Vicki Quade, “Who Owns the Past?” *Human Rights* 16 (Winter 1989): 24–29, 53–55.

7. Dorinda Outram, *The Body in the French Revolution: Sex, Class and Political Power* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 45–46.

8. William A. Heeps, *Riots, U. S. A.*, rev. ed. (New York: Seabury Press,

1970), 19–29.

9. Robert E. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian: A Study of the Early Years of American Ethnology, 1820–1880* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 56–57; Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 25.

10. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian*, 61; John C. Greene, *The Death of Adam: Evolution and Its Impact on Western Thought* (Ames, IO: Iowa State University Press, 1959), 190–92.

11. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian*, 61–62.

12. Paul Alfred Erickson, “Phrenology and Physical Anthropology: The George Combe Connection,” *Current Anthropology* 18 (March 1977): 92–93; John D. Davies, *Phrenology: Fad and Science: A 19th-Century American Crusade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955); Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian*, 60–77.

13. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian*, 56–57.

14. *Ibid.*, 55–103.

15. S. G. Morton, Massachusetts Historical Society (his emphasis), to Johns C. Warren, 27 February 1837.

16. Samuel Hildreth to S. G. Morton, 12 February 1833; 20 June 1833; 5 March 1834, Morton Papers, American Philosophical Society (APS).

17. John C. Bachman to S. G. Morton, 17 March 1837, Morton Papers, APS.

18. Gerald Troost to S. G. Morton, March 1837, Morton Papers, APS.

19. Galiotti to S. G. Morton, 27 December 1841, Morton Papers, APS.

20. Alton to S. G. Morton, 22 July 1845, Morton Papers, APS.

21. Samuel G. Morton, *Crania Americana; or, a Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America, to which is Prefixed an Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species* (Philadelphia: n. p., 1835). See also Samuel G. Morton, *Brief Remarks on the Diversities of the Human Species, and on Some Kindred Subjects* (Philadelphia: Merrihew and Thompson, 1842) and *An Inquiry into the Distinctive Characteristics of the Aboriginal Race of America* (Boston: Tuttle and Dennett, 1842).

22. Henry R. Schoolcraft to \_\_\_\_\_, 21 August 1826, Schoolcraft Papers, National Archives; Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian*, 66.

23. Bieder, *A Brief Historical Survey of the Expropriation of American Indian Remains* (Boulder, CO: Native American Rights Fund, 1990), 15.

24. Russett, *Sexual Science*, 31; Elizabeth Fee, “Nineteenth-Century Craniology: The Study of the Female Skull,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 53 (1979): 426.

25. Russett, *Sexual Science*, 31–34; John S. Haller, Jr., *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority: 1859–1900* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 19–34.

26. “Memorandum for the Information of Medical Officers,” 1 September 1868. Quoted in D. S. Lamb, “A History of the United States Army Medical Museum: 1862–1917,” n. d., ms. 56–56b, National Museum of Health and Medicine.

27. S. P. Hachenberg to \_\_\_\_\_, 8 January 1869, box 2, Army Medical Museum-National Anthropological Archives (AMM-NAA).

28. William Buchmann to the surgeon general, 8 February 1873, box 4, AMM-NAA.

29. W. Matthews to S. Millings, 16 June 1891, box 8, AMM-NAA.

30. B. E. Fryer to G. A. Otis, 2 February 1869, AMM-NAA.

31. \_\_\_\_\_ to Joseph K. Barnes, 18 January 1869, box 2, AMM-NAA.

32. S. P. Hachenberg to \_\_\_\_\_, two letters, both dated 18 January 1869, box 2, AMM-NAA.

33. Z. T. Daine to J. S. Billings, 27 June 1892, box 8, AMM-NAA. For other night grave-robbings, see A. I. Comfort to George A. Otis, 23 December 1876, box 5, AMM-NAA.

34. William A. Collins to D. L. Huntington, 12 June 1882, box 6, AMM-NAA.

35. Quoted in Ronald P. Rohner, *The Ethnography of Franz Boas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 88.

36. Douglas Cole, *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985), 121, 168.

37. Edward Lurie, *Louis Agassiz: A Life in Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 304, 338.

38. Bieder, *A Brief Historical Survey*, 25, 29; Aldona Jonaitis, *From the Land of the Totem Poles: The Northwest Coast Indian Art Collection at the American Museum of Natural History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 57–69; Cole, *Captured Heritage*, ch. 3.

39. Bieder, *A Brief Historical Survey*, 24–28. See also Patricia S. Essenpreis and Michael E. Moseley, "Fort Ancient: Citadel or Coliseum? Past and Present Field Museum Explorations of a Major American Monument," *Field Museum Natural History Bulletin* 55 (June 1984): 20–21; and Essenpreis, "The Anderson Village Site: Redefining the Anderson Phase of the Fort Ancient Tradition of the Middle Ohio Valley" (Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1982).

40. See correspondence, Charles F. Newcombe to George A. Dorsey, 1897–1923, but see especially three notes from Newcombe to Dorsey dated 3 December 1902, Dorsey Papers, Field Museum of Natural History.

41. Franz Boas quoted in George W. Stocking, ed., *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883–1911: A Franz Boas Reader* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 191–92.

42. Walter W. Taylor, *A Study of Archaeology*, memoir 69 of the American Anthropological Association (1948), 23.

43. Gordon L. Pullar, "The Hrdlička Legacy and Koniag Spirits" (Unpublished paper presented at the Circum-Pacific Prehistory Conference, 1989). For Hrdlička interpretation, see Aleš Hrdlička, "The Ancient and Modern Inhabitants of the Yukon," in *Explorations and Field Work of the Smithsonian Institution in 1929* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1930), 137–46; "Anthropological Survey in Alaska," in *Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution 1928–1929* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1930); "Anthropological Work on the Kuskokwin River, Alaska," in *Explorations and Field Work of the Smithsonian Institution in 1930* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1931).

44. Aleš Hrdlička, *Practical Anthropology* (Philadelphia: The Wister Institute of Anatomy and Biology, 1939), 50.

45. Douglas H. Ubelaker and Lauryn Guttenplan Grant, "Human Skeletal Remains: Preservation or Reburial?" *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* 32 (1989): 252.

46. Haraway, *Primate Visions*, chs. 1 and 8, and passim.

47. The quote is from Lewis Henry Morgan, "The Indian Question," *The Nation* 27 (28 November 1878): 332–33.

48. For the best discussion of these issues, see Ernestene L. Green, ed., *Ethics and Values in Archaeology* (New York: Free Press, 1984). See also Lawrence Rosen, "Give American Indian Remains Back to Tribes," *New York Times*, 15 November

1988; Rosen, "The Excavation of American Indian Burial Sites: A Problem in Law and Professional Responsibility," *American Anthropologist* 82 (1980): 5-27; and Deward Walker, "Anthropologists Must Allow American Indians to Bury Their Dead," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 September 1990. This article drew responses; see under "The Dispute over the Return of Skeletal Remains," letters by Leslie E. Eisenberg and Cynthia R. Kase, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 10 October 1990.