

Exposing Ourselves: Live Ethnological Exhibitions in Museums and Anthropology.

**The Case of the Native, Ishi, and the Anthropologist,
Alfred Kroeber¹.**

by **Fernando Monge**

Spanish Council for Scientific Research (CSIC)

fmonge@ih.csic.es

[Unpublished Paper presented at the *IUAES Inter-Congress, Racism Many Faces*, University of Pardubice, Pardubice, Czech Republic, 2005]

PLEASE, QUOTE THE PAPER AND AUTHOR PROPERLY.

A couple of years ago I began to research on a series of live ethnological exhibits held between 1887 and 1900 in Madrid, Spain². I was intrigued by the way these exhibits of different ethnic groups from

¹ This paper was written right after my return from my second research visit and 'fieldwork' at the University of California, Berkeley. It is written out of my field notes impressions and not yet very elaborated work. Prof. Nancy Scheper-Hughes, kindly and enthusiastically has not only mentored my research but also greatly helped it, however she is not responsible of what is here written. I would like also to thank all the people that has collaborated with my endeavors: Peter Rawitscher, Mickey Gemmill, Art Angle, Nancy Rockafellar, Stanley Brandes, Jed Riffe, Orin Starn, Paul Rabinow, James Clifford, Doug Sharon, Ira Jacknis, Suzanne Calpestri. Both research periods at Berkeley and the area were financed by the Madrid Regional Government (2004, 2005).

² This research has been economically supported by the Madrid Regional Government (2003-2005).

Philippines, Africa, and America were related with the origins of anthropological museums, the development of anthropology and, in a surprising way to me, with the renewal of old urban spaces. In all the cases I was dealing with the exhibits took place in the heart of a Royal Park opened to the public a few years before. This Park, the political authorities asserted should be instrumental in transforming the old plebeians into a new class of citizens. Different Philippine ethnic groups, African Ashanti, and Labrador Eskimo³ composed in the park a designed 'natural' landscape intended for the education and amusement of the would be citizens. The shows promoted were thus part of a social engineering strategy that linked in curious and unexpected ways the origins of anthropology and anthropological museums with the social transformations happening during the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth. It also centered in Museums an important part of the institutional building of anthropology.

Besides these proper and scientific exhibitions of exotic natives, and in the very same years all around Europe and North America, a whole show business of so-called popular exhibits of animal and human freaks prospered. World and Universal Exhibitions also exhibited natives in both popular and scientific fashions during those years. What were the relationship between these popular ethnological and freaks exhibitions with those promoted and held in the new Museums of Natural History and/or Anthropology?

It seemed to me that the clear boundaries classic anthropology draw between our discipline and these racist popular amusements were not so clear as it was supposed to be. Both anthropologist and ethnological show business entrepreneurs took advantaged of exotic natives supposedly hired or just kidnapped. No matter how different the goals of anthropologist and show business entrepreneurs were, the ethnological exhibits seemed to me an excellent way of approaching a historical contextualized understanding of the development of anthropology as well as the relationship of this discipline with some contemporary racist perspectives.

* * *

³ The Filipinos were part of a General Exhibition of the Philippine Isles held in 1887. African Ashanti and Labrador Eskimo were exhibited in the same area of the park in 1897 and 1900 respectively.

In order to understand better the cases I was dealing with in Madrid I decided to widen the area of my interest and to deal with other ethnological exhibitions held in Europe and the United States of America. The new aims and the comparative framework I was deployed led me to review those instances where scientific and popular ethnological exhibits converged and soon, one case seemed to me particularly relevant. This was the case I have titled of the anthropologist, Alfred Kroeber, and the native, Ishi.

In August 28, 1911 a Native American appeared in a slaughterhouse in Oroville, northern California. The next day, the local newspaper, the *Oroville Register*, published a long article about the native's capture. The article began saying:

“An aboriginal Indian, clad in a rough canvas shirt which reached to his knees, beneath which was a frayed undershirt that had been picked up somewhere in his wanderings, was taken into custody last evening by Sheriff Webber and Constable Toland at the Ward slaughter-house on the Quincy road. He had evidently been driven by hunger to the slaughter-house, as he was almost in a starving condition, and at the Sheriff's office ate ravenously of the foot that was set before him.

Not a single word of English does he know, nor a single syllable of the language of the Digger Indians, the tribe which lived around here. Where he came from is a mystery. The most plausible explanation seems to be that he is probably the surviving member of the little group of uncivilized Deer Creek Indians who were driven from their hiding place two years ago”⁴.

More news followed this shocking discovery. Local as well as metropolitan newspapers published day after day the news of his 'capture' or 'surrender' to civilization, the primitive ways he showed as well as what they could learn about the native's past by reading his sign language and pantomime.

In San Francisco, Franz Boas' disciple, Alfred Kroeber wrote the Oroville sheriff and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to secure the wardship of an Indian, as Kroeber later would write, which was “the last 'un-

⁴ *Oroville Register*, August 29, 1911. Reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 92.

contaminated' aboriginal American Indian in the United States"⁵. For Kroeber and his assistants this Native American was like strike gold.

When the Native American who was going to be known by the name of Ishi, the man, stumbled into civilization, Alfred Kroeber was already working on a survey of California Native Americans which was going to be published years later as the *Handbook of the Indians of California*⁶. Kroeber was also going to inaugurate in a few weeks time the University of California's Museum of Anthropology located in San Francisco⁷. Kroeber who was also the founder and first chairman of the University of California's Department of Anthropology at Berkeley, was clearly fascinated with a Native which at last, was "like a drop of oil in a tank of water. He has been all his lifetime -- Kroeber stated-- surrounded by civilization, yet never a part of it; in fact, absolutely unaware of its meaning"⁸. So far from those 'Indians in overalls'⁹ Ishi was, that there were no other better place to keep him safe from the ravages of civilization than the very materialization of civilization lore itself: the Museum.

Ishi in the Museum (1911-1916)

A week after his appearance in Oroville, Ishi made his first trip in train from the Oroville jail to the San Francisco Museum of Anthropology. Accompanied by Thomas T. Waterman, Kroeber colleague and assistant, Ishi arrived to San Francisco the evening of September 6, 1911, and was lodged at the Museum of Anthropology. By keeping him at the Museum many of the problems a Native like Ishi originated were solved. Indians were not yet citizens of the United States and all of them were considered wards of the Federal Government. In California the recent genocide and destruction of the Native world, as well as the still less structured reservation system made survival more difficult to the Natives

⁵ *San Francisco Call*, December 17, 1911. Reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 112.

⁶ Though finished many years earlier the *Handbook* was not going to be published by the Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78, till 1925. The text on the Yana and Yahi was written by Kroeber a year after Ishi's death (1917).

⁷ The Museum was on the top of Parnassus Hill, there were the Affiliated Colleges.

⁸ *San Francisco Call*, December 17, 1911. Reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 113.

⁹ I have taken this expression from Jaime de Angulo's ethnography *Indians in Overalls* (1990, 1st ed. 1950).

than in other areas of the United States. Ishi was clearly unable, according to the white people who had met him, to gain a living in the civilized world, so two possible solutions were considered. First send him to a reservation with Natives of other groups; and, second, to keep him protected at the Museum.

In fact, this 'protective' measure has been used before in a more unfortunate way. When Ishi was discovered in the slaughterhouse the Sheriff who kept custody of him decided the safest lodging the Native could have was the jail and the best way of carrying him there was handcuffed! By hiring Ishi as Janitor at the Museum Kroeber solved the riddle giving Ishi not only the economic means to sustain himself in a controlled environment but also making him the first Native American employee to be in the payroll of the University¹⁰.

Ishi's story was amazing, after more than four decades of hiding¹¹ in the Sierra Nevada's mountains of North California, this Native stumbled into history appearing into a slaughterhouse in August 28, 1911. Alfred Kroeber described in his non-academic paper on "Ishi, the Last Aborigine", how Ishi, "the last wild Indian in the United States" "stepped off the ferry boat into the shouting of hotel runners, and the clanging of trolley cars on Market Street" in San Francisco. "He was -- adds Kroeber in the paper-- a curious and pathetic figure in those days. Timid, gentle, an ever-pervading and only too obvious fear held down and concealed to the best of his ability, he nevertheless started and leaped at the slightest sudden sound. A new sight, or the crowding around of half a dozen people, made his limbs rigid. If his hand had been held and was released, his arm remained frozen in the air for several minutes" (Kroeber 1912)¹².

But soon, according to Kroeber, Ishi felt much better at the museum, "his mind became more receptive for smaller things" and "by this time Ishi had come to look upon the Museum as his home". "He saw everyone else wearing clothes and would never take them off again, he

¹⁰ A circumstance, Gerald Vizenor, a Native American writer and Professor of Native American Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, ironically stated (quoted in Starn 2004: 147).

¹¹ The Yahi suffered during the 1860s a series of massacres that nearly finished them all. In 1871, Ishi, born in the decade of 1860s, went into hiding with the last remnants of his people. This 'Period of Concealment' lasted till 1908. This last group of hidden Yahi, it should be noted, were not the last Yahi as some of them travelled north and south and integrated in other surrounding groups.

¹² Reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 119, 120.

said with metaphorical emphasis”¹³. He was well treated by the anthropologist, janitors and assistant curators who took his care. They show him the city and take him to a vaudeville show, invited him to their homes and, soon, Ishi was eating in a well mannered way according to the white world etiquette. Yet, Ishi’s pocket coats were full of “junk worthy of a small boy”, and his, according to Kroeber, “reluctance to learn English” “stood out against his progress toward real civilization”¹⁴. Though he was a quick learner, he is portrayed more like a kid, equal in his mind to any other citizen but unable to live by itself. He felt more at home with the neighborhood kids, and with them, he wandered in the nearby parks. Service to others soon became one of his most outstanding abilities. He visited the patients at the nearby University hospital and comforted them singing them songs. There he befriended Saxton Pope, physician and instructor in surgery at the hospital since 1912, and they became a sort of pals by means of their common passion for archery.

Ishi, as soon as the Museum opened one month after his arrival to the city, became the major attraction and the key element of the Museum success. Crowds of citizens visited the Museum on Sunday afternoons to assist to Ishi exhibitions. He showed his abilities in chirping or crafting arrowheads, he later gave them to the public, making fire or attracting or calling animals with the sounds he made. Alfred Kroeber, whom Ishi termed “chiep” stayed by his side and explained the crowds Ishi’s past history and the amazing ‘lost’ qualities of the arts practiced by the Yahis¹⁵.

Kroeber knew well, even before the Museum opened his doors how a valuable asset to the Museum success Ishi was. Sunday’s Ishi exhibitions attracted by far many more visitors than the other other, dead, exhibit halls the rest of the week. During the first weeks of stay of Ishi at the Museum, a lot of salvage activity were carried out by Kroeber and Waterman. A lot of sound recordings were made of his tales, and a frenzy of learning as many Yahis words as possible and note taking were carried out. According to the *Los Angeles Times* newspaper: “As the university does not hope that the almost prehistoric creature will long survive the limitations of civilization, the faculty has taken phonographic

¹³ Kroeber 1912. Reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 121, 122.

¹⁴ Kroeber 1912. reproduced in Heizer and Kroeber, eds., 1981: 122.

¹⁵ Both Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2001, 2003) and Orin Starn (2004) offer excellent overviews of how was Ishi’s life at the Museum.

records of his unknown tongue. If this man had not been captured and his vocabulary had not been preserved by phonographic enunciation, the language would have been extinct at his death"¹⁶.

Ishi was, as clearly stated the newspaper already quoted, the "man of the hour", the scientist of the American Institute of Archaeology that was going to be reunited in Los Angeles next October 1911 wanted Ishi to attend his meetings¹⁷, the Vaudeville show entrepreneurs of San Francisco wanted to contract Ishi at any cost¹⁸, and the press informed Ishi 'advances' into civilization as well as joked about the 'cave man.' Once the excitement of scientist and public subdued Ishi's life at the Museum became much quieter. Though his friends and wards never forgot Ishi could be seriously affected by a white man's disease, Ishi interacted not only with visitors or any other people in the streets, he was also a frequent visitor of the hospital. We can guess that, according to Kroeber, Waterman, Gifford, or even Pope, Ishi health seemed strong enough not to take any sanitary measure to help keep him alive. Yet less than three months after his appearance in Oroville, Ishi got his first respiratory infection (though the TB test physicians did to Ishi was negative). Tuberculosis was then a major illness and it was part of the life any citizen live with. Actually Kroeber's first wife, Henriette Rothschild, had TB and died because of this illness in 1915.

By the summer of 1914, Ishi accompanied Kroeber, Waterman, Pope and Pope's son to the area he had been living in hiding. There he explained the anthropologists how he lived and photographs of him were taken once his friends were able to convince him of taking off his clothes. One year later, already affected by Tuberculosis, Ishi worked for three months with linguist and anthropologist Edward Sapir. In August 22, 1915 Ishi was hospitalized again, Tuberculosis had returned and his health progressively deteriorated, and in March 25, 1916 Ishi died at the University hospital. 'Chiep' and friend Kroeber was in New York, enjoying a sabbatical leave for writing the *Handbook of Californian Indians*, though well informed of Ishi's deterioration he remained at New York and was really touched by his friend death. Waterman and Gifford, also affected by Ishi's death cremated and treated the Native's remains respectfully. All was well care of, the story then suggested. Only one de-

¹⁶ *Los Angeles Times*, September 10, 1911.

¹⁷ *Los Angeles Times*, September 10, 1911.

¹⁸ *Los Angeles Times*, February 6, 1912.

parture of Ishi's and Kroeber's original wishes were taken: an autopsy was routinely performed in Ishi¹⁹. Kroeber upset by his friend death and autopsy, the story goes, never again wrote a word about Ishi and, once the *Handbook*, was written, he never again returned to work with Native Californians.

Ishi in Two Worlds (1961)

Though Ishi's public memories faded soon, the old 'last wild Indian' remained alive in the academic environment he inhabited the last years of his life. Theodora Kroeber, Alfred Kroeber second wife, was the person who in the sixties of the past century was going to return Ishi to notoriety again. By the end of the nineetenfifties, according to his son, Clifton Kroeber, Theodora asked Alfred and his colleague, archaeologist Robert Heizer, when they were going to write about Ishi. More that forty years had passed since Ishi's death. The anthropologists answer was clear, "Why don't you do it yourself?"²⁰ Though this version may not be accurate, the fact is Theodora did write the book. Robert Heizer passed her all the written material and her husband, Alfred Kroeber, became the informant. *Ishi in Two Worlds* (1961)²¹, published shortly after Alfred Kroeber's death, became an instant bestseller and Theodora, already in her sixties, a famous writer. Since that day, *Ishi in Two Worlds*, has become the main source on a life story and a topic whose interest has been kept alive till today. Every kind of people has been attracted by Ishi's life as told by Theodora Kroeber. The one million copies sold of her book attest for the great impact this academic press book have had on public imagination. Readers of any kind has approached the book and Ishi's life as a source of inspiration. Nostalgia of the past gone, the quest for a balanced life or a new relationship with nature, the New Age reawakening to a new life, the horrors of California genocide are among the reasons *Ishi in Two Worlds* have had such a wide audience.

¹⁹ The hospital at Parnassus Hill was a University Hospital and all the patients who died there were dissected. As seen from this perspective, Ishi's autopsy was more a case of regular procedure than departure from the Native's wishes. Yet, the very autopsy was unusual in some other regards (Nancy Rockafellar, personal communication).

²⁰ This story, as well as other, less enticing one, were told in Orin Starn's book *Ishi's Brain. In Search of America's Last "Wild" Indian* (2003: 58).

²¹ Theodora Kroeber (1961). *Ishi in Two Worlds. A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Theodora Kroeber not only had a good story to tell she had also the ability to strike in the right places and deploy a well crafted narrative with a few known facts about Ishi life which included a crude narration of the genocide suffered by the California Indians. In her book, we not only get reconstructed the life of Ishi both in concealment and in San Francisco, but also in a significant way we get hidden in the narration the very ideas shared by those who promoted the Civil Rights movement. Ishi remind us of the brutalities of the Nazi genocide as well as the United States involvement in Vietnam. Theodora Kroeber's book inscribed the history of California natives into a new way of understanding the world. After World War II the Jew's genocide and Civil Rights Movement fight gave Ishi's story new meanings. Her rendering of the anthropologist, and particularly, Alfred Kroeber's relation with Ishi is embellished and the sense of loss is balanced with a sense of healing aroused out of "the triumphs of human spirit" as Orin Starn (2003:59) and other scholars who had wrote about this book pointed out. The message is optimistic nevertheless, and besides the amazing life of Ishi, a sense of survival of Yahi culture is passed to us, readers. Yet, it should be noted, the survival of Yahi culture we are talking about has been kept only in the book and in the Museum, no hint of Native life out of the academyc worlds is given. After years of oblivion, Ishi returned, refashioned to the second half of the twentieth century.

* * *

Last year, while carrying out a brief research stay at Berkeley's Department of Anthropology I was struck by the strong reactions the very mention of Ishi elicited among my colleagues. Ishi's story was deeply embedded in the foundation history of the University of California's Museum and Department of Anthropology, as well as of his founder Alfred Kroeber. It was obvious to me that in Berkeley, Ishi, was a topic I should deal with. Actually, one of the main reasons I was staying there for a brief period of time was just for carrying out a research related with the Live Ethnological Exhibits. By asking my colleagues about Ishi, the world turned upside down. Instead of dealing with the role Live Ethnological Exhibitions played in the development of anthropology I found myself doing fieldwork among the anthropologists. Any of the colleagues I questioned about Ishi offered me, more and less willingly, a different version of how Ishi was treated by Kroeber and his colleagues. In a sur-

prising way the Live Ethnological Exhibits more than exposing Natives exposed ourselves, anthropologists, to society and, also, to our own ways of dealing with the people we study. Once again I realized how entangled our work was with the times and world we lived in.

Ishi's Lost Brain and the Anthropological Sense (1997-2005)

What went wrong with Ishi? In 1997 an article published in *Los Angeles Times*²² described the work done by the Butte County Native American Cultural Committee, lead by the Native American, Art Angle, himself a Concow Maidu, to repatriate Ishi's remains. This sparked the scandal and controversy. Ishi, the Natives stated, should rest in his homeland to keep his soul in peace. So far, their demand was not very problematic²³. In 1990 the Congress passed a law, known as NAGPRA, which enforced that all federal and state sponsored Museums containing Native American human remains and associated burial objects to be returned, in case of demand, to their Native descendants²⁴. The real problems were not the Natives demand of Repatriation, there were the Native denunciation of Ishi mistreatment and desecration by the anthropologists, Kroeber, Waterman, Gifford, and physician Pope; and more particularly: the desecration of Ishi's body not only performing an autopsy against his wishes, and those of Kroeber, but also extracting his brain and keeping it in storage somewhere in the University of California.

Today I would like to point out two interrelated issues of concern aroused out of this denunciation: one that I am considering more academic is the way Kroeber and his colleagues built a professional and personal relationship with Ishi; the second, is more related with the position of the moral dimension of our own world. Ishi was incinerated without his brain, and Kroeber, who arguably rejected from New York the autopsy, personally offered once returned to California the brain of Ishi to Alex Hrdlicka, curator of Physical Anthropology at the National Museum

²² Mary Curtius, "Group Tries to Rebury Tribe's Last Survivor", *Los Angeles Times*, June 8, 1997.

²³ This claim would eventually become more complicated. The Butte County Native American Cultural Committee were not the closest descendants of the Yahi Yana but some members from the Redding Rancheria and Pit River Tribe, represented by Mickey Gemmill and Floyd Bucskin. For that reason, and in accordance with the law, these two last groups were the chosen ones.

²⁴ Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Public Law 101-601. Approved November 16, 1990.

of Washington -- today the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History. The sadness of the loss was, so stressed by Theodora Kroeber's biography of Ishi, was attenuated by all the information they were able to gather about the Yahi before the death of the last of his group. Since those first days of 1997 till now the dust has settled and a lot have been written and discovered about. I am not going here to dwell of the details of controversies and events that eventually led to Ishi's internment in secret place of his homeland, nor detail the arguments and what we have learned. I would just like to present a series of concluding, brief remarks and wonderings that relates this case with the topic we are dealing with here.

First, the discovery of the obvious mistreatment of Ishi has not only been the center of the public controversy but also led to a bitter clash of interpretations on Kroeber and his colleagues behavior toward Ishi by different members of the Department of Anthropology Kroeber founded. Ironically these very disputes, which took place in Kroeber Hall the building where the Museum, Department and Library of Anthropology are located, were officially resolved after reaching a difficult agreement to issue a letter of apology²⁵. Yet, the apology seemed very short for some and very strong for other members of the Department. The letter most controversial sentence said: "Despite Kroeber's lifelong devotion to California Indians and his friendship with Ishi, he failed in his efforts to honor Ishi's wishes not to be autopsied and he inexplicably arranged for Ishi's brain to be shipped to and curated at the Smithsonian"²⁶.

Besides the strong emotional content of Ishi controversy, what it has struck me more during my "fieldwork" at the Department is how what I would schematically considered as two main positions, shared a common commitment toward anthropology and its moral aspects. There were a so-called 'historicist' position, generally shared by the older generation, which stressed the historical context in which the decisions regarding Ishi's fate were taken. There were not much space to maneuver they asserted, and the very acts of Kroeber and his colleagues were a series of interconnected unfortunate events. Kroeber overall contribution to the knowledge of California Indians, as well as the advancement of Anthropology, not to mention his role as founding father of the Museum

²⁵ Stanley H. Brandes, "Assuming Responsibility for Ishi", *Anthropology News*, 40 (4), May 1999. Re-produced in Karl Kroeber and Clifton Kroeber, eds., *Ishi in Three Centuries*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 2003, pp. 87-88.

²⁶ Brandes, "Assumming ...", p. 87.

and Department, should not be desecrated to repatriate Ishi. Though all the members of the Department agree in Ishi's repatriation cause, all regret what has happened and are conscious of Kroeber's worth, there is a younger, more morally committed group of anthropologists who feel a much stronger apology should be made. Their 'critical' position claimed not only for a much stronger apology but also pointed how we should understand today the moral dilemmas Kroeber faced. The 'critics' are well aware of the need to reconnect and critically reflect on their work as well as the needs their subjects of study have.

According to Native American Writer and Berkeley Professor of Native Studies at Berkeley, Gerald Vizenor, the problem is much worse because of the white world 'Manifest Manners', that is, "the course of dominance, the racist notions and misnomers sustained in archives and lexicons as 'authentic' representations of *indian* cultures. Manifest manners court the destinies of monotheism, cultural determinism, objectivism, and the structural conceits of savagism and civilization"²⁷

Anthropologists, are also guilty of those Manifest Manners.

Second, much have been been written about anthropology past contribution to build the concept of race and the racialization of the peoples they have studied. It is possible we cannot fully escape some racist considerations in as much the same way as Kroeber did with his friend Ishi. For that reason, we need not only to continually review and reflect critically about our discipline and work, but also be exposed by other anthropologists, foreign, as well²⁸. Our mistaken conceptions, when grounded in a moral commitment can be less dangerous as long as we know the world we inhabited in is always changing. We need to remain tuned to the world we live and not to escape its more unpleasant aspects.

Third, we need also to approach and listen carefully and respectfully the natives voices. Much has been written on Ishi during the last years and very little can be ascertained from their perspective, how they knew Ishi was mistreated, how they understand what happened. I think their subaltern voice in our narration is a symptom to worry about.

²⁷ *Manifest Manners. Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Bison Books, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1999 (1st ed., 1994), p. vii.

²⁸ My research is carried out under such premises.

Fourth, no matter how well founded the 'historicist' arguments explaining Kroeber behavior is, I felt uneasy about them. I cannot but agree that Kroeber did not envision other choices to deal with Ishi's brain. Yet many people, anthropologists and other scholars are able to partially escape and modify the world they live in. Kroeber did set a path that could be certainly praised, however he did not depart of a pioneer, believer in progress frame of mind. Kroeber beliefs in modernism, somehow broken by the end of his life, in the advantages of civilization attached him to the pure, uncontaminated native Ishi was. Kroeber was a man that like his daughter, the famous science fiction writer, Ursula K. LeGuin asserted, was more prone of looking into the future and the Natives he was salvaging with his fieldwork had no future. He did not see how peculiar Ishi was, how changed his culture was by the seclusion he endured. Ishi was very possibly help by the very Indians in overalls Kroeber was not interested in. Ishi did not step into civilization when he was captured at the slaughterhouse, he was already the sad outcome of it, even while in concealment he used any Western material he can got hold on it. Instead of Theodora Kroeber's *Ishi in Two Worlds* the book should have been titled "Ishi trapped between two worlds."

The paradox in the 'historicist' position is that by claiming how much good work was then done and how the historical context the inhabited made sense of their work, they seem not to be aware of the context and much that is being done these days! It is equally paradoxical how usually the 'cinic' and 'freeze' accusations leveled against a more experimental, even postmodern anthropology fits now the apologist of classic, honest anthropological work. Once again, a world turned upside down!