
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Bureau of American Ethnology
Bulletin 149

Symposium on Local Diversity in Iroquois Culture

**No. 4. Some Psychological Determinants of Culture Change
in an Iroquoian Community**

By ANTHONY F. C. WALLACE



CONTENTS

	PAGE
The hypothesis.....	59
The absence of the fear of heights.....	64
The penchant for alcohol.....	65
The lack of anal-reactive character traits.....	68
Dependency attitudes.....	69
Conclusion.....	75
Bibliography.....	75



SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF CULTURE CHANGE IN AN IROQUOIAN COMMUNITY¹

By ANTHONY F. C. WALLACE

THE HYPOTHESIS

It is almost axiomatic today in the social sciences that culture is a major determinant of personality. Less widely accepted, at least within anthropology, is the proposition that personality is a determinant of culture. The work of Roheim and Kardiner illustrates the latter position.² They argue, for example, that the religious institutions of a society constitute displacements of basic attitudes toward parents, attitudes which are implicit in the personality structure characteristic of individuals in that society. But it is easy to point out, in a sort of rebuttal favored by culturologists, that these very attitudes are culturally determined in the socialization process. From here on it becomes almost a chicken-or-the-egg dispute; the original point can be almost forgotten, namely, that regardless of priority, the culture and modal personality structure of any society are complementary functions of one another.

A collateral line of research in the personality-and-culture field has recently been opened by Hallowell: the relationship between modal personality structure and culture change. In a recent paper reporting the results of investigations by him and his students among the Ojibwa, Hallowell has indicated that a culture can undergo drastic modification while the personality structure of the society yields only slightly, and that in a regressive way (Hallowell, 1949; see also Caudill, 1949).

¹ I wish to make acknowledgment to several individuals who have read and discussed this paper with me, to my profit: Dr. W. N. Fenton, Dr. A. I. Hallowell, Dr. Weston LaBarre, Mr. A. F. Brown, Miss Doris West, Dr. George Snyderman, and Dr. Floyd Lounsbury (anthropologists); and Dr. E. S. C. Ford (psychoanalyst). The paper was read in abbreviated form in New York, November 17, 1949, at a meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

² See Roheim (1932) and Kardiner (1939) for basic statements of this position. They do not assert that because personality is a determinant of culture, therefore it is its historical antecedent or "cause." Their concept of the relationship approximates the mathematical statement that x is a function of y : i. e., that a change in y will be accompanied by a change in x , and vice versa.

In the course of his long-term study of Ojibwa culture and personality, Hallowell and his students have demonstrated, for this one tribal group, an amazing psychic conservatism. Comparing the Ojibwa of the seventeenth century, as they are described in the narratives of early missionaries and travelers, with the relatively little acculturated "Inland" Ojibwa of the Berens River today, he finds that the two populations, at either end of the time-span, are psychologically almost indistinguishable. Writes Hallowell:

My own observations of the Berens River Sauteaux and the Rorschach records that I obtained from them corroborate the older descriptions. Among the less acculturated Indians of the upper reaches of the river in particular, the emotional structure to be observed is almost identical with that of the Northeastern Indians of an earlier period. [Hallowell, 1946, p. 218.]

Not only are the *least* acculturated Ojibwa close to their ancestors in personality structure, but even the *most* acculturated Ojibwa community studied in the Hallowell project, at Lac du Flambeau in northern Wisconsin—where most of the Indians speak English, the children attend a Government school, many families have radios, etc.—was still fundamentally Ojibwa in personality structure, still recognizably similar to the northern hunters whose way of life they have apparently abandoned. Thus Hallowell speaks of—

a persistent core of psychological characteristics sufficient to identify an Ojibwa personality constellation, aboriginal in origin, that is clearly discernible through all levels of acculturation yet studied. For this reason all the Ojibwa referred to are still Indians, in a psychological sense, whatever the clothes they wear, whatever their occupation, whether they speak English or not, and regardless of race mixture. While culturally speaking they appear more and more like whites at "higher" levels of acculturation, *there is no evidence at all for a basic psychological shift in a parallel direction.* Thus terms like "borrowing" and "diffusion" which are entirely appropriate to describe the acculturation process in a cultural frame of reference are misleading, inept and inappropriate if the acculturation process is viewed from the standpoint of a psychological frame of reference. At least in the situation described no identifiable constellation of psychological "traits" have been "borrowed" by the Ojibwa or "diffused" to them as a result of their contacts with whites . . .

While these [data] show, as I have said, the persistence of an aboriginal character structure among the Ojibwa, this must not be interpreted to mean that no psychological modifications have been produced in the acculturation process . . . The impression one receives is of a personality structure which, under the varying pressures of acculturation . . . is being pushed to the limits of its functional adequacy. If, for example, we compare the Indians of Level 2 (Inland group in the Berens River) with those of Level 4 (Flambeau) we obtain a psychological picture in which the latter represent a *regressive* version of the northern group. [Hallowell, 1949, pp. 10-12. First italics mine.]

Hallowell's observation formulates what I think has been a general impression among ethnographers working with supposedly "acculturated" primitive societies: that in many ways acculturation is only skin deep; that they are still "native" underneath. To put the Ojibwa

case, for example, very crudely, something has made it possible for them to take over a great many White culture elements without taking over many White personality traits too. This phenomenon may be termed "psychic conservatism"; the term may be applied to any occasion in which culture change is not accompanied by significant psychological change.

Reformulating the Ojibwa situation, we may put it again as follows: Something or other has selected for inclusion in their cultural stock-in-trade, out of the welter of possible alternatives, those new traits and institutions which are most agreeable to their kind of personality structure, and has tended to exclude those traits and institutions which are most disagreeable. Hence the modal personality structure has had to adapt itself only minimally. This is not to say that the Ojibwa have been able to avoid all psychic dislocation; only that it is minimal in proportion to the grossness of the overt cultural change.

This paper offers the following hypothesis to explain the seeming paradox: *The psychological characteristics (particularly modal personality structure and its derivatives) characteristic of the individuals who compose a society, act as a screen, tending to accept as new culture elements forms of behavior which are psychologically congenial, and tending to exclude forms of behavior which are psychologically uncongenial. The psychological structure thus acts like a sorting screen, letting through items of the right size and shape, and keeping out those of the wrong. Only those forms of behavior tend to be accepted which are within the range of behavior possible to a person with the old psychological structure. Any form of behavior which would require a different sort of psychological structure tends to be excluded.*³

I need hardly advise the reader that this "screen" is not perfectly efficient, and that incongruous elements do creep in. Linton and

³ After writing the above "hypothesis," I happened to re-read Linton's "Foreword" to Kardiner (1939). Here he makes much the same generalization as I have made, in the following terms: "Turning from the static to the dynamic aspects of culture, the basic personality structure concept may provide a key to certain little-understood phenomena of culture change. It has long been realized that the reactions of societies to cultural innovations are highly selective and that the selection cannot be satisfactorily explained on a mechanistic basis. While certain innovations may be rejected because they are in direct opposition to existing behavior patterns, or because they would nullify the results of such patterns, others are rejected for no immediately discernible cause. Conversely, new patterns which entail a good deal of readjustment in the preexisting behavior patterns may be accepted and retained even at the cost of considerable inconvenience. *The explanation for this condition would seem to lie in the compatibility or incompatibility of the new patterns with the already established personality structure of the society*" (Linton in Kardiner, 1939, p. x. Italics mine). Again, in Kardiner (1945), Linton writes: "Unfortunately, we have had few opportunities so far to investigate the interrelations of basic personality and culture in changed situations, but there can be little doubt that the basic personality type plays an important part in determining a society's reaction to innovations. *Innovations which are congenial to the personality type probably are accepted and incorporated into the society's culture much more readily than those which are uncongenial*" (Linton in Kardiner, 1945, p. ix. Italics mine).

Kardiner's classic description of the change from dry-rice to wet-rice culture on Madagascar is an illuminating example (Kardiner, 1949, pp. 282-290, 329-337). As they point out, the change in economic organization entailed shifts in social structure, affecting the most intimate relationships of family life, which were extremely difficult for the dry-rice people to accept. Indeed, rather than accept them, some returned to dry-rice culture after a period of experimentation with the new technique. Others took over the new process permanently and carried through the wholesale cultural readjustment. At this point, however, the psychological structure itself began to change. A major cultural change, in other words, could in this case not be completed without an accompanying change in the personality structure.

Thus psychological structure may change over time. But this somewhat larger question—how and when the psychological structure itself changes—is not under discussion here. I also want to remark, before going on, that of course there are many other determinants of culture change which operate to reinforce or contravene the specific influences of the psychological structure; these too are in large measure being artificially excluded from consideration.

On one further conceptual issue, however, it may be well to enlarge. Anthropologists have, of course, for long been aware that a society does not admit any and all available new traits into its culture. The general formula for expressing this has been somewhat of the following order: *The culture pattern as it exists tends to exclude incongruous elements and hence tends to remain stable; those elements which are accepted are admissible because they fit into the pre-established pattern.* With such a formulation, this paper does not, and need not, have any quarrel. "Pattern," as it is used above, is analogous to what I have called the "psychological screen." There are, however, important conceptual differences between culture pattern and psychological screen as determinants of culture change.⁴ In the first place, the conventional usage of the phrase "culture pattern" is ambiguous in that it does not distinguish between what everyone would agree is cultural, and what many would call psychological. Without trying to solve the vexed question of how to distinguish in practice between a psychological and a cultural trait, I assume that most anthropologists agree that there are the two sorts of phenomena.⁵ Hence there are really two questions in the pattern formula, instead of one: (1) What is the relation between cultural innovations and existing

⁴ Dr. W. N. Fenton, in correspondence with me, drew my attention to the necessity of discussing the relationship between the two concepts.

⁵ In a more philosophical vein, however, one must recognize that the boundaries between psychological and cultural phenomena are so blurred that hard and fast distinctions may obscure the essential continuity of the two classes of phenomena.

culture? (2) What is the relation between cultural innovations and psychological structure? In any attempt to elucidate the relations between culture change on the one hand, and enduring psychological traits on the other, it would be inadvisable to work with a concept like "pattern" which has already so many ill-defined psychocultural connotations—which, indeed, denies the distinctiveness of the very classes of phenomena whose interrelationship one is trying to determine

Thus in the following pages I shall be talking about four *psychological* traits exhibited by a community of Iroquois Indians: (1) The absence of a fear of heights; (2) the chronic longing for alcoholic intoxication; (3) the lack (relative to White norms) of anal-reactive character formations; (4) and (again relative to White norms) an oral type of personality. The reservation culture is well integrated with these traits; one might properly include them in a discussion of the over-all pattern of Iroquois culture. But, in the conventional usage of those terms, they are psychological not cultural phenomena.

It is not necessary, in order to confirm the "screen" hypothesis, to demonstrate that the psychological selecting mechanism functions in every instance of culture change, or even that it is always effective when it does function. All that is necessary for our present purposes is to show that a psychological selecting mechanism can and does sometimes work. A more precise evaluation of its mode and effectiveness may be left to future research. The nature of culture change is such that it depends upon the interaction of a multitude of factors, which may or may not be the same from one instance to another. There undoubtedly are culture changes which go against the psychological grain, so to speak, or that are difficult to relate to psychological factors at all. These are presumably explicable, in terms of our present hypothesis, as the result of the interaction of forces which completely override psychological resistance, or as the result of the activities of a psychologically deviant member of the community.

The data which I am presenting, as a demonstration of the effects of the psychological characteristics of a people upon changes in their culture, are taken from a study, now in progress, of the personality and culture of a community of Iroquois Indians. Historical sources are being consulted and field work is being done on the Tuscarora Reservation in New York State, where I spent the summers of 1948 and 1949.⁶ There are a number of psychological traits, and syndromes of traits, which the Tuscarora Indians displayed in the early eighteenth century, and which they still display. The observations of John Law-

⁶Hence my observations on the Tuscarora cannot be safely generalized to cover other Iroquoian communities in the United States and Canada (although I suspect that there exists a substantial core of similarities).

son, between 1701 and 1709, are my source in this paper for the Tuscarora psychological past (Lawson, 1714); my own observations, for the present. I want particularly to emphasize that I am not offering, in what follows, a sketch of Tuscarora modal personality structure. A few traits only are being presented, brutally ripped out of context—a procedure justified by the purposes of this investigation.

THE ABSENCE OF THE FEAR OF HEIGHTS

One of the things which struck Lawson about the Tuscarora Indians, in the early eighteenth century, was the absence in them of the fear of heights. Writing in 1714, he said in admiration:

They will walk over deep Brooks, and Creeks, on the smallest Poles, and that without any Fear or Concern. Nay, an *Indian* will walk on the Ridge of a Barn or House and look down the Gable-end, and spit upon the Ground, as unconcern'd, as if he was walking on *Terra firma*. [Lawson, 1714, p. 172.]

The fewness of individuals who are afraid of heights is a notable feature of the Indian society even today. A large proportion of the younger men are professional ironworkers, whose business it is to assist in the construction of the open steel framework of tall buildings, bridges, power-line towers, and the like. Many Tuscarora choose the parachute troops or the air corps when they enter the military service of the United States. They have traditionally, and still do, build their own two- and three-story houses. Even old men of 60 and 70 will take, and efficiently perform, such jobs as pruning high trees, painting the roofs of buildings, and carpentry work on scaffolds. There seem to be very few Tuscarora who experience enough anxiety in high places to deter them from taking jobs which require them to work at a dangerous height above ground, even though they are perfectly aware of the real hazards involved. Compared with White communities, these Indians are relatively free of the mildly phobic fear of high places which afflicts a high proportion of even normal people in White society.

This psychological capacity has been an important determinant of culture change. Ironwork is regarded today by the Tuscarora themselves as a sort of national profession. I do not yet have statistical data on the exact number of the younger (and sometimes older) men who are ironworkers, but a rough estimate is about 25 or 30 percent. It seems evident that this would be impossible if the members of this community of Iroquois were not unusually free of the fear of heights. Actually, the matter extends farther than that: Iroquois Indians from various reservations in New York State are often preferred as ironworkers by the contracting companies. Thus, their psychological predisposition (if I may use so strong an expression) to work on high steel has served as "open sesame" to the trade. Iroquois Indians pre-

fer to be, and are preferred as, ironworkers because they are better able to behave in this way than are average Whites.⁷

The cultural consequences to the Tuscarora of entering into the highly paid construction work (as well as into other White industries) in such large numbers can only be sketched out. One important effect has been to markedly reduce the number of men engaged in agricultural work, the chief business of the Tuscarora Reservation in the nineteenth century. Many farm lands are now either allowed to lie fallow, or are rented, in some cases to Whites, and in other cases to one of the three or four professional Indian farmers. One of these professional farmers may farm as many as 600 acres, which represents approximately one-tenth of the total area of the reservation. These farmers are able to control their operations by using the labor of their sons and sons-in-law. Another effect has been to further integrate the Indian population with the surrounding White economy. Leaving the reservation every day, joining labor unions, working beside white men, and returning to the reservation only at night, has tended to break up the old Indian socioeconomic structure.

All these effects are dependent, among other things, upon the psychological trait of not being afraid of heights. These far-reaching cultural changes are thus based partly upon the maintenance of at least one element of the old personality structure.

THE PENCHANT FOR ALCOHOL

The case of the ironworkers is a limited one and involves a very specific psychological trait. Let me now take up a somewhat more general characteristic: the penchant for alcohol. Lawson remarked in 1714:

Some of them refrain drinking strong Liquors, but very few of that sort are found amongst them . . . They never are contented with a little, but when once begun, they must make themselves quite drunk; otherwise they will never rest, but sell all they have in the World, rather than not have their full Dose. [Lawson, 1714, p. 202.]

With some qualification, his remarks are as pertinent today as they were over 200 years ago. The qualification consists in the observation that certain cultural techniques have been acquired and developed to solve the moral problem faced by a people who disapprove, probably more strongly than Whites, of intrafamily and intracommunity brawls, but who discover that liquor, which they crave, seduces them into the open and socially disrupting expression of hostility. Thus

⁷ See Mitchell, 1949, for an account of the Caughnawaga Mohawk ironworkers. Ironwork is also a popular trade among the St. Regis Mohawk and the various bands of Seneca in New York State, all of whom are Iroquois and all of whom share with the Tuscarora an indifference to heights. The profession seems to have been discovered first by the Caughnawaga band, and diffused from Caughnawaga to the other reservations.

there is much less social disorder occasioned by drinking than there seems to have been in Lawson's time, although probably much more liquor is drunk today.

In Lawson's time, the Tuscarora were well aware of the moral issue and were trying to solve it in three ways: by imploring the Whites to stop the rum trade; by blaming offenses committed while drunk on the rum, not the drunkard; and by suppressing the urge to drink. None of these methods was successful. Liquor has never ceased to be available to the Tuscarora Indians, whether illegally or not; the rum trade has been too profitable to the Whites and too desirable to the Indians. Denial of moral responsibility simply provided an excuse for drinking and thus ultimately heightened the conflict. The suppression of the urge to drink is effective only in a few cases of persons who have been traumatized by childhood experiences with drunkards or who have reformed in middle age after what they consider to have been a wicked youth. *Most* (not all) of the population either drink, have drunk, or will drink.

But, as I have said, the moral conflict affects everyone, drinkers and nondrinkers alike; and so, in the 250 years since Lawson's time, certain institutions have been developed to canalize drinking behavior into socially tolerable channels. These Indian institutions function in conjunction with certain White institutions. Thus, the sale of liquor to an Indian by a white man is technically illegal, and the discovery of a white man smuggling liquor onto the reservation, or setting up a disorderly bar on the edge of the reserve, would subject him to severe penalties. But a bartender who serves an Indian at a tavern in a neighboring town will normally not be disturbed by the police; and certain bars specialize in the Indian trade. The Tuscarora by and large respect this gentleman's agreement and do not smuggle liquor in significant quantities; the local culture prescribes that convivial drinking be done in one of the "Indian hangouts" in the cities. There is some drinking on the reservation, but most of it is done outside. This arrangement has the effect of physically isolating Indians while they are drinking, and placing them, furthermore, under the surveillance of police and of bartenders who are responsible to the police for maintaining a reasonably orderly house. Another, not inconsiderable, deterrent to excessive drinking is the need for at least one member of each party to remain sober enough to drive a car back to the reserve. These and other various mechanical arrangements have the effect of preserving the social structure of the reservation itself from too-immediate contact with that solvent of social organization, alcohol; and they thereby reduce the anxiety of the Tuscarora themselves over the possible damage they may in the future do while

drunk, and eliminate the guilt feelings they would feel over damage done in the past.

Certain other institutions exist which directly reward Indians who do not drink, and punish those who do. These institutions cannot be regarded as having been acquired or created *solely* to solve the liquor problem; but one of the determinants in their adoption has undoubtedly been the desire to set up cultural mechanisms of defense against an unwanted drive.

Nearly all of the community are members of the Baptist congregation and attend, more or less regularly, the church on the reservation. This congregation, which, of course, has many other important social functions, lays down stringent injunctions against the use of alcohol. The church membership, by scolding gossip, punishes members who do drink. Those who are teetotalers, or who repent, confess, and reform, are warmly praised, not merely in an implicit fashion, but directly by their friends, relatives, and neighbors. Annual revival meetings, of which house-to-house visits and public confession are conspicuous features, serve to bring the whole liquor conflict into direct association with the established network of social relationships. Confession and repentance thus not only tend to relieve an internal sense of guilt, but also openly reward the reformed drinker by giving him love, support, and warm face-to-face relationships with people.

The Temperance Society, which was organized early in the nineteenth century, also functions to reward people for giving up, or at least restricting, their drinking proclivities. It holds periodic meetings of a sociable nature, with music, food, and conversation available to persons who do not drink. Any White person familiar with life on an Iroquois reservation will recognize the almost inconceivably great satisfaction these people get out of what seems, to an outsider, to be a very desultory occasion.

These two institutions—the Baptist Church and the Temperance Society—certainly do not stamp out drinking. But they do significantly reduce its incidence and severity. Needless to say, both are innovations since 1714; and while I could not assert that they were determined solely by the psychological problem presented by alcohol, I can hardly avoid recognizing that one of the determinants of their acceptance was the desire to find institutions which could handle the liquor conflict as it was felt by individual Tuscarora Indians. The aboriginal Iroquois religions (before Handsome Lake, who incidentally did not reach the Tuscarora Reservation) seem to have been powerless to cope with the psychological conflict engendered by the use of liquor.

THE LACK OF ANAL-REACTIVE CHARACTER TRAITS

So far I have been discussing cultural changes which have been facilitated by enduring elements of personality structure. Now I should like to give an example of a group of possible cultural changes which did not occur, in spite of pressure on their behalf, partly because they implied behavior for which the Indians were not psychologically prepared.

The Tuscarora could not be accused, even by their worst enemies, of possessing what psychoanalysts have called "anal-reactive" character. The anal-reactive person, according to Fenichel, is frugal, orderly, and obstinate; he is likely to be concerned with saving money and with time schedules; he is greedy and likes to collect things for the sake of collecting (Fenichel, 1945, pp. 278-284). (This, of course, is a superficial description; but there is no need to attempt a more analytical definition of anal character here.) Lawson, whose own greediness for their land led to his execution by the Tuscarora, continually remarked on their indifference to time; their lack of concern with property, savings, or profit; their untidy (but not dirty) cabins; their general complaisance (Lawson, 1714, pp. 179, 197, 199, 203, et passim). His observations parallel my own. The community has, for instance, a different emotional attitude toward time from white people's; there is even a word for it—"Indian time." "Indian time" means that if you are to meet a person at 4 o'clock, he will probably be there by 5; perhaps later that evening; and perhaps not at all. The Iroquois are not frugal, not over-orderly, and (when they are not drunk), too agreeable ever to be really obstinate. Where a white man will obstinately "stand up for his rights," the Tuscarora will tend either smilingly to give in, or if giving in would be too severe a threat to his security, he will try to avoid meeting you.

Now, in White schools and industries, in fact, in White society in general, a very high value is placed on the anal character. Punctuality, orderliness, frugality, and drawing-the-line-somewhere are traits which we admire; and when they are combined with an avid desire to collect and retain money, we reward them with public veneration. For 150 years, at least, the relatively "oral" Tuscarora have been surrounded by relatively "anal" Whites who have done their best, by punishment, precept, and example, to make the Indians "anal" too.⁸

The results have been generally disappointing to the Whites. The Tuscarora cannot behave in an anal way, and so their culture has

*The reader should recognize that I am using the words "oral" and "anal" in this paper as convenient terms to denote syndromes of certain character traits which are often found together. No implication is made that either term, by itself, could adequately describe either Iroquois or White personality structure, any more than the words "agricultural" or "hunting" could completely define a culture.

remained, from the average white man's point of view, a rather slipshod affair. The White farm lands around the reserve, for instance, are neatly rectangular and divided by fences. The Tuscarora fields are laid out every which way; they have irregular, rounded shapes; and they are divided by "wasteful" hedgerows. The Whites conscientiously keep their automobiles repaired and painted. The Indians' cars are used and misused until they simply disintegrate into dusty, rumbling wrecks, to be abandoned finally in a backyard. The Whites go in for contractor-built houses, where the fixtures are all complete and the second floor is finished; the Indians, who put up their own houses and cabins, generally leave a number of things unfinished—stairways, second floors, and clapboarding (especially in the back of the house), and the paint work, in particular. The Indians have great difficulty in saving money, although many have respectable incomes; indeed, when money is on hand, they will spend it indiscriminately, particularly on food, liquor, clothes, and gifts. The one lucrative grocery store on the reservation is in the hands of a white man, although it is on the property of an Indian. There are two gasoline stations on the reserve, one of them at the grocery store, and the other operated by another white man married to an Indian woman. The Indians despise persons who are greedy for money; an Iroquois Horatio Alger hero would find it harder sledding after he succeeded than before. There are a very few well-to-do Indians living on the reservation; but they tend to regard themselves, and to be regarded, as "different" from the normal reservation Indians.

Fundamental personality changes would have to be effected before the Tuscarora could ever become a people with an ethical system that demands frugality, punctuality, and systematic neatness; with a value-attitude system that rewards money grubbing; with a culture that runs by the clock, is measured by the dollar, and is laid out by surveying instruments.

DEPENDENCY ATTITUDES

I have already suggested that the Tuscarora are relatively more "oral" than the Whites, who by contrast are "anal," and I have duly apologized for making use of these two catchwords. Catchwords, however, are useful because they *do* catch—if one is aware of their implications—a multitude of related variables. The concept of oral character does not restrict itself to a superficially homogeneous class of personalities. People may be oral in very disparate ways. The red thread of community is the presence of extreme (from the point of view of a psychoanalyst working with European and American subjects, who are as good a basis for comparison as any other, and are the only ones we have to work with) attitudes with regard to

taking and receiving. These attitudes are partly determined by infantile experiences with the mother and her substitutes. Fenichel gives the following discussion of oral character:

All positive or negative emphasis on taking and receiving indicates an oral origin. Unusually pronounced oral satisfaction results in remarkable self-assurance and optimism that may persist throughout life if frustration following this satisfaction has not created a state of vengefulness coupled with continuous demanding. Exceptional oral deprivation, on the other hand, determines a pessimistic (depressive) or sadistic (redress-demanding) attitude. If a person remains fixated to the world of oral wishes, he will, in his general behavior, present a disinclination to take care of himself, and require others to look after him. In conformity with the contrasting aims of the two substages of oral eroticism, this demand for care may be expressed through extreme passivity or through a highly active oral-sadistic behavior. . . . It has been mentioned several times that oral characters are dependent on objects for the maintenance of self-esteem. They need external supplies not only for oral-erotic satisfaction but also for the narcissistic gratification of their self-esteem.

Thus both marked generosity and marked niggardliness may be attributed to conflicts around oral eroticism. Some persons show their receptive needs obviously; unable to take care of themselves, they ask to be taken care of, sometimes in a demanding, sometimes in a begging tone. Others repress such desires and refuse exaggeratedly to "impose" on anyone, refuse all presents or are unable to ask for anything. Very often people need to be dependent and yet pretend to be entirely independent. Unconscious longings for passivity may be overcompensated by an apparently extremely active and masculine behavior. [Fenichel, 1945, pp. 488-490. Copyright, 1945.]

This somewhat extended quotation is necessary, I think, in order to make explicit the meanings attached to the term "oral" in this paper.

Lawson, about 1709, was impressed by at least one oral characteristic of the Tuscarora, remarking—

They are a very craving People, and if a Man give them anything of a Present, they think it obliges him to give them another; and so on, till he has given them all he has; for they have no Bounds of Satisfaction in that way; and if they give you any thing, it is to receive twice the Value of it. They have no Consideration that you will want what you give them; for their way of Living is so contrary to ours, that neither we nor they can fathom another's Designs and Methods. [Lawson, 1714, p. 232.]

This trait of demandingness is notable in Tuscarora national character even today, although it is somewhat masked in casual social relationships. The mask consists of efforts by the Tuscarora to appear, to themselves as well as to others, independent and self-sufficient, strong and silent. Thus a matter of etiquette on the reservation is to insist on paying a driver for a "lift" in a car. No matter if it be only a few hundreds yards, an old woman will insist on paying the ethnographer a dollar to drive her home—even though he was going by her house on his own errands! Mothers, knowing that begging is lowly regarded by the Whites, severely scold their children who, as children will, plead for candy. These little rituals, however, are perfunctorily

performed; they are feeble efforts to resist the undertow of dependency wishes.

What happens in certain minor stress situations is revealing of the nature of these dependency wishes. A regular and predictable cycle of events occurs. The "independent-and-self-sufficient" mask collapses, and an extravagantly dependent attitude, to whoever seems able to offer support, becomes apparent. Thus, for instance, a group of people is informed that the ethnographer will provide automobile transportation to a social gathering, but that he cannot call to bring them home later because of a previous obligation to be elsewhere at that time. The family accepts the ride to the place, with the foreknowledge that they will have to find their own way home. But, when the ethnographer has delivered them and is about to leave, he is told to come back at the given hour! He explains again, in some embarrassment: he has another engagement, he simply can't make it. "But we don't have any way to get home." The ethnographer repeats their previous assurance that they could easily find a ride with someone else. "Then you aren't coming back?" "No." The group marches away in stony silence, making the ethnographer feel that he has been mean and inconsiderate; and on next meeting, they take occasion to punish him, by subtle slights and disparaging comments about the heartlessness of white people to little children.

The tone of the demand is usually as quiet as in the instance cited; it is a demand so tempered by the (inherently aggressive) assumption that it will be met, that it does not sound at first like a demand. If support is extended, the relationship is stabilized on a pleasant level; and inasmuch as the Indians among themselves are very cautious about making such demands, which are regarded as demands by other Indians, refusal is rare. Indeed, scarcely any request will be refused point-blank, for fear, perhaps, of the enormous hostility refusal would arouse. For any refusal of support is a highly traumatic experience for an Indian. (It would seem that Whites normally are less sensitive to the pain of a denial of support, precisely because that support is psychologically less necessary to them.) As with the case of the frustrated automobile riders, denial of a dependency wish elicits a surprisingly bitter resentment. The frustrating object (or another related object upon whom the hostility may be displaced) is conceived as an agent of active, even malevolent persecution.

Needless to say, this process is not confined to the members of this Indian community. All persons have dependency wishes; and no one wholeheartedly enjoys the experience of their frustration. It is conceivable, however, that one people may, because of the prevailing mode of formative experience, characteristically be more dependent in their impulses than another. In aboriginal times, when

the kinship organization was stronger, such dependency impulses presumably had more effective intracommunity implementation than the reservation culture provides today. Lawson's observation of the ancient predominance of giving presents over commercial exchange suggests the same thing.

The strong tide toward dependency has had, and still has, far-reaching effects in channeling the relationships between the Indians and the Whites. The formal, institutionalized relationships between the reservation community and the State and Federal governmental bodies, in particular, shows the effect of the Indian dependency attitude. It is a commonplace that all Indians resent the stealing of (or trifling payment for) their lands. The Iroquois in particular, including the Tuscarora, resent the injustices practiced upon them by citizens of the State of New York, especially during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when large tracts of Iroquois land were alienated under, very often dubious, legal sanction. Nevertheless, the Iroquois communities, and especially the one under consideration here, are radically dependent upon the State government for certain vital services which their own culture does not provide and which are not available through the Federal Service, and toward which they pay only the excise taxes on White-manufactured goods. The State furnishes virtually the entire school system, paying for the materials used in the grammar school on the reservation (the Indians provide a large part of the labor), paying the teacher's salary, and sending buses onto the reservation to take the older children to the consolidated schools in a neighboring city. The State builds roads—macadam highways, some of them numbered through-routes which would, from the white viewpoint, be a great commercial asset. There are only a few stretches of dirt or gravel now remaining in the reservation road system. The New York State Department of Welfare, through the county welfare administrations, provides medical care and unemployment compensation.

The State courts, in the past, have been available to Indians for the settlement of civil cases, and still are; and although the chief's council has the customary civil jurisdiction, many Indians prefer to abide by State law and judicial settlements in their private affairs. The chief's council has the right to summon the State police to their aid in enforcing their own legal decision or in quelling any public disturbance. The lacrosse games, for instance, are policed by the State; State traffic laws (particularly concerning licenses, speeding, and drunken driving) are now being introduced onto the reservation and enforced by State police patrols. In the past, the Federal Government was responsible for the administration of criminal law; criminal jurisdiction has recently been transferred by Congress to

the State of New York. But the reservation and its inhabitants are exempt from State taxation of real estate and other property.

In addition to these and other institutionalized, "official" dependency relationships, the Tuscarora community (like all communities in western society) is economically dependent upon other communities all over the world, both near and far, for supplies of food and other necessary goods which are obtained in commercial transactions. Particularly, the reservation is dependent upon the neighboring towns in the State of New York to make available groceries, clothes, transportation, etc. These articles are, of course, normally bought with money. But even in such commercial transactions as these, the dependent position of the Indians appears! It seems that a white man cannot recover from an Indian an article such as an automobile or a refrigerator which is being purchased by installments and on which payment is in default. Nevertheless, credit is extended (and, in the vast majority of instances, the debt is honored by the Indian).

Thus, for over 150 years this community has remained tax-free on its own reservation; no land has been alienated; the tribal government has continued without interruption. During this time—and I think partly as a result of their kind of personality structure—the community has gradually become more and more dependent upon the largesse of the State of New York for various services necessary to maintain the existence of the community, and it has frankly accepted the White language and material culture as its own. Large areas of the nonmaterial culture have been replaced by extensions of the State administration, which provides virtually the entire formal-educational, charitable, medical, transportation, and legal systems. The striving has been to identify with the Whites even in religion, social structure, and standard of living, insofar as White norms in these areas can be translated into workable Indian equivalents. The Indians, in sum, have put themselves into the position of a corporate child, dependent upon and trying to identify with the corporate parent—New York State.⁹

Yet, while accepting these services (and, indeed, complaining bitterly if they are not generously provided), the community nourishes the notion that the State of New York has sinister plans to tax and seize their land. It protests violently against the Federal Government's investing the State courts with legal jurisdiction, although it has made use of the State courts for generations. It agitates for the

⁹ Parenthetically, one might speculate on the possibility that the phenomenally rapid and successful acculturation of this community during the nineteenth century was a mass dependency reaction, possible only for a relatively "oral" people. The less oral, more conservative and retentive Algonkians have, by and large, been less plastic in culture contact and have either withdrawn from contact where possible by simple migration (e. g., the Delaware) or have been broken in their efforts at resistance.

payment of old scores, presenting early treaties which are not properly ratified or fulfilled. There is absolutely no question that many of the claims are just, from a technical legal standpoint. There is also no question that such Indian claims arouse guilt feelings in Whites. Looking at the matter coldly, however, it is apparent that the combination of a continuously demanding dependent relationship with persistent charges of persecution represents a cultural formulation of a deep-seated psychological pattern. The dependent demands are couched in such terms as to make them superficially appear to be claims for the payment of old scores. But the bitterness of the criticism of the State, or of white people in general, suggests more than an attempt to rationalize the demands. There is the petulant, nagging tone, the sort of tone one finds, among white people, in persons who conceive their friends and relatives as potentially all-satisfying, and who will not give up the attempt to extort from them the maximum of support. It is the "state of vengefulness coupled with continuous demanding" of which Fenichel speaks.

These observations of mine may be liable to gross misinterpretation both by partisans of Indian rights and by partisans of a policy of assimilation. Therefore, I want to say, very explicitly, that this analysis of the situation, as I see it, is not intended to support either party in a controversy. The question of values—which is *better*, to preserve the status quo or to change it, and if so, in what direction—is not under discussion here. It would be well to point out, however (and without denying the inevitability of change), that *at this time* it would be psychologically impossible for the people of the Iroquois reservations, as communities, to survive the abrupt discontinuance of their present dependence upon the State and Federal Governments. Any change which faced the Tuscarora with the possible loss of their reservation and with the necessity of competing economically with the Whites would result in their disappearance as a community, and would throw the survivors into a low economic status which would arouse the prejudice of ill-informed Whites.¹⁰ A

¹⁰ A similar, but even more serious, problem apparently exists in New Zealand, where the Maori, the original inhabitants of the country, at present occupy a position of respectable status in the eyes of the Whites, as do the Iroquois of New York in America. The Maori personality structure makes it practically impossible for them, as a group, to compete successfully with the Whites in the economic world. Apparently they are not obsessive-compulsive enough to be able to tolerate the meticulous synchronization of White technology and working habits. The result is a gradual decline of Maori socioeconomic status, with a future prospect, if the process is not arrested, of the Maori almost uniformly occupying the lowest and most insecure rungs of the socioeconomic ladder. Since this would probably mean the development of an identification of low status with Maori lineage—in other words, "race" prejudice—New Zealand social scientists are seriously considering ways and means for radically changing Maori personality structure to make it possible for them as a people to live in a White economy on equal terms with the Whites. [Beaglehole, 1950.]

few individual Indians might survive the change. As a group, however, the community would disintegrate and its members would be cast adrift in a world which did not understand their values. White culture is usable only by persons with a relatively "anal," competitive sort of personality; the Indians, with a different sort of personality, are not able to behave in the same way, and cannot make full use of White culture in consequence.

CONCLUSION

The implication of the phenomenon of psychic conservatism, in its restriction of the possible avenues of culture change, should be considerable for applied anthropologists—indeed, for anyone interested in the practical matter of the improvement of human happiness. If we grant that all peoples have a definable modal personality structure; that this structure is inflexible within one generation; and that this structure (in conjunction with other factors) determines what cultural forms can be implemented in behavior—then we may conclude that no cultural form can be successfully introduced, within the space of one generation, which requires behavior which is uncongenial to that personality structure.

The Iroquoian community reported upon in this study represents a case in point. The psychological characteristics of the Tuscarora have permitted some innovations in behavior which were psychologically feasible, and excluded other suggested patterns which would have been psychologically incongruous.

The interactions here shadowed forth are only one of several functional relationships between personality and culture change. This paper has discussed an hypothesis explaining how culture may change radically, yet the underlying psychic structure very little. Ahead lie problems such as: How are innovations that are uncongenial to the personality structure admitted into currency? How does the psychological structure itself change? What sort of changes in culture follow changes in psychological structure?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEAGLEHOLE, ERNEST.

1950. Contemporary Maori culture. *Bull. Philadelphia Anthropol. Soc.*, vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 1-3.

CAUDILL, WILLIAM.

1949. Psychological characteristics of acculturated Wisconsin Ojibwa children. *Amer. Anthropol.*, vol. 51, pp. 409-427.

FENICHEL, OTTO.

1945. *The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis.* New York.

HALLOWELL, A. I.

1945. Sociopsychological aspects of acculturation. *In* *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, ed. by Ralph Linton. Columbia Univ. Press. New York.
1946. Some psychological characteristics of the Northeastern Indians. *In* *Man in Northeastern North America*, ed. by Frederick Johnson. Robert S. Peabody Found. Arch. Andover.
1949. Ojibwa personality and acculturation. (Paper read in abbreviated form at the 29th Int. Congr. Amer., New York, Sept. 6, 1949. Mimeographed.)

KARDINER, ABRAM.

1939. *The individual and his society*. Columbia Univ. Press. New York.
1945. *The psychological frontiers of society*. Columbia Univ. Press. New York.

LAWSON, JOHN.

1714. *The history of Carolina*. London.

MITCHELL, JOSEPH.

1949. The Mohawks in high steel. *The New Yorker*, Sept. 17, vol. 25, No. 30, pp. 38-52.

ROHEIM, GEZA.

1932. Psychoanalysis of primitive cultural types. *Int. Journ. Psychoanalysis*, vol. 13, pts. 1 and 2.