



A · M · E · R · I · C · A · N
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

WILEY

The North Alaska Eskimos: A Culture and Personality Perspective

Author(s): Arthur E. Hippler

Source: *American Ethnologist*, Aug., 1974, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Aug., 1974), pp. 449-469

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/643360>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Anthropological Association and *Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Ethnologist*

the North Alaska Eskimos: a culture and personality perspective

ARTHUR E. HIPPLER—*University of Alaska*

introduction and methodological note

An extensive literature of varying degrees of intensity and completeness exists concerning various aspects of North Alaska Eskimo personality.¹ None of these works, however, has attempted a broad overview of the structure and dynamics of a "modal" Eskimo personality.² This paper proposes a start in that direction. To this end we suggest a general organizing perspective based upon the apparent interrelationships between Eskimo socialization patterns, social organization, and social control within the framework of North Eskimo culture, on the one hand, and the resultant modal personality pattern, on the other.

There are few difficulties in describing the basic elements of Eskimo culture. Adequate literature and our own observations make possible statements about the elements of Eskimo culture with a reasonable degree of certitude, and we are secure in the belief that our findings are replicable.³ More serious problems arise in a discussion of Eskimo personality. But these problems themselves are related to documented aspects of the overall culture of Eskimos.

If we analyze the fundamental elements of Eskimo culture (leaving aside material culture items, housing styles, etc.), we may find two constellations of behaviors, values, and attitudes which appear in the literature. The first constellation consists of essentially positive elements such as gregariousness, openness, cooperation, friendliness, and values which proscribe interference with others and violence. The second constellation is concerned with such elements as high levels of interpersonal violence, fear of shamans, poor treatment of women, and associated egocentric and antisocial attitudes.⁴

We have attempted to delineate these constellations in some detail, in the process of which many apparently contradictory elements may actually be seen to be related to each other. The next step of our analysis has been to determine, using psychoanalytic theory, the most likely unconscious mechanisms operating to produce such values and behaviors and the kinds of early socialization processes that would be supportive of or lead to an expansion of such unconscious processes.

The seemingly paradoxical aspects of Eskimo culture and personality can be parsimoniously related to an Eskimo "cultural personality" whose roots in the socialization experience may explain much of adult Eskimo behavior. This concept is also useful in analyzing precontact "legal" systems and the two changes which have occurred since then.

In the process of such analysis, it has also been necessary to include social structural, as well as other cultural, and even ecological factors that may modify or reinforce such tendencies.

Furthermore, since all adult behaviors and unconscious processes are multidetermined, we must look for the most elegant solution that takes into account the largest number of variables in making our analysis. In so doing we shall attempt to discover the presence or absence, in Eskimo enculturation practices, of those elements and constellations of practice that would theoretically account for these behaviors.

Finally, we shall look for confirmation of our analysis by examining the social control system of Eskimos through time in order to determine how the elements of Eskimo culture which we believe reflected cultural personality were exemplified in its operation.

Obviously, in order to discover the fundamental psychodynamics of the members of a group, a representative sample of the population should be psychoanalyzed. Likewise, the best way to study child socialization practices is to observe them in detail for many people over an extended period of time. However, to our knowledge, no Eskimo patients in Alaska have been psychoanalyzed. In compensating for this lack we had recourse to several expedients: information from psychiatric practitioners about their findings concerning Eskimo patients, observations of our own and other knowledgeable observers concerning Eskimo behavior and attitudes, the ethnographic record insofar as it can be interpreted for similar findings, and psychodynamic analysis of Eskimo affective expressive behavior such as folklore, festivals, etc.

Similarly, because no long-term study of Eskimo child socialization practices has been undertaken, we had to rely on other kinds of information. We were equally dependent, in this regard, upon observations recorded in the ethnographic literature, our own observations, and the observations of other qualified observers of such phenomena.⁵

Clearly, no absolute certainty can be developed concerning aboriginal personality or enculturation processes. Because changes in these processes have occurred, though we believe them to have been fewer and less significant than in other aspects of culture, we must reconstruct the past situation as well as analyze what is happening in the present. Within these limits and following these caveats, we believe that generally sound conclusions can be reached.

Finally, we are guided by an underlying assumption that a "cultural personality" does exist and can be described. It is our belief that at least two fundamental factors make this possible. First, the accumulation of information concerning many different groups, covering a substantial range of time, will allow us to "wash out" relatively minor variations from the norm in some individuals. Also, we are convinced that the press of cultural norms molds individual behaviors into generally similar patterns even if some individuals have relatively unique personality configurations.⁶ Such a process could not either describe an individual very well nor predict his unique responses. But because statistical analyses of mortality tables such as those used by insurance companies can provide very accurate *group* descriptions and predictions, even though they are not necessarily applicable to any one individual, we feel our description and analysis of Eskimo groups can be equally valid.

cultural personality

Although it has been argued that the modal personality approach is never completely adequate because there appears to be multimodal personality structure in all societies (Wallace 1952), nonetheless, it is a valuable tool, both as a heuristic device and as an

ordering concept to explain group behavior. The key issue in such an analysis is obviously the meaning of the term "personality." G. Murphy (1947) suggests that personality be viewed as a theoretical construct consisting of three levels of complexity:

- (1) A personality a distinguishable individual, definable in terms of a qualitative and quantitative differentiation from other such individuals.
- (2) A personality is a structured whole, definable in terms of its own distinctive structural attributes.
- (3) A personality is a structured organism-environment field, each aspect of which stands in dynamic relation to each other aspect. There is organization within the organism and organization within the environment, but it is the cross organization of the two that is investigated in personality research (Murphy 1947:7-8).

What is missing from Murphy's definition is the concept of culture. As DeVos and Hippler (1969:324) note,

theories of personality organization are never totally separable from theories of social organization. One cannot develop a valid theory of personality independent of sociological considerations. In studying particular forms of human behavior in culture, we are studying a particularized region of continual interaction in comparative contexts, defined as variant cultures.

What we are suggesting, then, is that at least for small, relatively intimate cultural groups that are isolated to a significant degree, cultural norms and values, which are themselves derived from dominant personality structures and are internalized as a "cultural personality," set behavioral and attitudinal patterns that tend to mold somewhat divergent personality structures into constrained modes of operation. We believe that, in the process of being internalized, this very constraining function of shared norms, beliefs, and attitudes creates pressure for certain aspects of ego organization to develop similarly.

In our opinion, although Wallace's (1961) findings are technically correct, their implications are misleading. That is, Wallace is correct in noting that there are varied modes of primary process and defense-mechanism organization within a group. He is misleading in the sense that he does not also make it clear that these essentially unconscious, idiosyncratic structures still must respond to the reality constraints of a given cultural group. Wallace (1961) attempts to handle this problem in his discussion of "mazeways," which we find psychologically unsatisfying. We prefer to discuss the problem as one of the analysis of "cultural personality."

By "cultural personality," we mean that integrated whole of unconscious concerns and interests, defenses and coping mechanisms that can be said to characterize the members of a cultural group. "Cultural personality" also includes those institutionalized expressive behaviors which reflect defensively or creatively these fundamental concerns, and which are part of the shared heritage of the group.

One very important aspect of such a perspective is the question of the stability of a "cultural personality." While it is, we believe, true that fundamental aspects of defense systems and coping mechanisms change very slowly, since they arise from infant socialization practices whose unconscious messages remain invariant through substantial periods of time, this is not necessarily true of "cultural personality." As we use this construct, it includes behavioral elements that may (even though grounded in unchanging personality characteristics) become modified through time due to changes in the realities of adult life. Thus, some behaviors may change dramatically while the *structure* and unconscious meanings of these behaviors are only slightly altered, if at all (Jacques 1957).

"Cultural personality" also includes shared elements, conscious and unconscious, overt and covert, that are carried by the individual members of the group. The definition does not demand that all individuals in the group have identical unconscious structures and

defenses. It does, however, suggest that what diversity exists is to some degree overridden by the internalized pressure and molding potential of that which is shared.

“Cultural personality,” a concept which we derive in part from Devereux’s (1956) “ethnic consciousness,” comes into existence when individuals internalize values, norms, and behavioral expectations as aspects of “good parental” imagos. That is, the culturally ideal and the overt behaviors that support it are internalized even though the role models from which some of these ideals are derived may be other than the parents. These attitudes and behaviors become internalized aspects of a “generalized parent” for the members of the group.

Thus, even though some adult behavior diverges from the ideal, superego pressures (aspects of the internalized parents) tend to distort what the individual perceives into the idealized pattern. This process aids ego development in a direction that presses the individual to conform even to norms which might otherwise not be wholly comfortable to him because of idiosyncratic elements of his own personality. The individual, then, tends to use these internalized models as the standard against which he gauges his own behavior.

Obviously, this will create conflicts in the individual who does not “fit” his own idealized, culturally shared norm. He will respond creatively or pathologically, depending upon a number of factors, but even his pathological responses (his tendency to be “abnormal”) will be determined in large part by the way he has internalized attitudes toward people and things (his culture) as parental imagos.

In using this construct we hope to avoid the problem so cogently stated by Spiro (1951) in which he notes that an abstraction such as culture has been (but should not be and logically cannot be) used both to describe realities of behavior and somehow to act as the cause of such behavior. Thus, we integrate the third aspect of Murphy’s definition of personality, namely, that culture must be internalized in order to act as a force in individual behavior. Once it has been internalized, it *is* an aspect of the personality. However, apart from the most personal aspects of personality formed through individual idiosyncratic vicissitudes of emotional development, it also includes conscious elements shared with other members of the social group and superego-distorted notions about the “cultural ideal” which are unconscious.

Thus, “cultural personality,” as we define it, is that behavioral organizational scheme common to members of a group which acts as a centripetal force upon the emotional and cognitive structures of individuals in such a way that it may be said to override the peculiarly individual aspects of personality, at least to some extent.

For Eskimos, the critical intrapsychic phenomena which must be dealt with and whose resolution is crucial to becoming an “Eskimo” as opposed to anything else are the manipulation of aggressive urges of all types, including autonomous intrusion into any aspect of life, and the problem of self-other distinction and dependency needs. These problems are interrelated; they are resolved in direct relationship to each other rather than independently.

The information upon which we base our discussion of Eskimo personality in culture includes an analysis of all materials published in English to date that we were able to discover concerning North Alaska Eskimos (see Hippler 1970), conversations with other researchers who have worked among Alaska Eskimos, and fieldwork of varying durations over a five and one-half year period, as well as the use of Thematic Apperception Tests for North Alaska Eskimos.

The North Alaska Eskimos, for the purpose of this paper, include the Eskimo population from Kaktovik on the border between Alaska and Canada to the village of Wales on the Seward Peninsula, the Nunamiut people of Anaktuvuk, and the people of the Noatak River region. Characteristically, this was a semi-sedentary population. Some of these groups moved from place to place following caribou herds; others lived in permanent communities such as Tigara (Point Hope) or Barrow, but nonetheless moved at certain times of the year to fishing camps or hunting areas. The coastal population lived primarily off sea mammals, fish, birds, and caribou. The more interior North Alaska Eskimos traded caribou meat and fur for seal oil and maritime products.

The dwellings of these people ranged from semi-subterranean driftwood, animal skin, and packed earth homes in the winter to tents in the summer. The former were occupied by a nuclear family or a bilateral or patrilineal extended family; there were rarely more than ten people in such dwellings.

By most accounts, though Stefansson (1913) takes some issue with this, these Eskimos were extremely competent hunters. Because of their knowledge of sea ice and the landmarks of the area and their skill in manufacturing the implements necessary for exploiting their environment, they have generally been considered to be among the most competent hunting and gathering peoples on earth.

As a result of their efficiency in exploiting sea mammal populations, the coastal groups were able to live in sizeable villages (several hundred people), unlike their neighbors, the interior Eskimos or the subarctic Athabascans, who were faced with game-poor environments.

Eskimo socialization practices, which we shall discuss at length below, tended to be extremely lenient. The child was viewed as the reincarnation of a recently deceased relative and was kindly treated, partly for this reason. Enculturation was accomplished by example more than exhortation and rarely involved corporal punishment.

This attitude was reflected in adult life by a generally non-interfering cooperative attitude among adults, the lack of formal leaders, and a belief, supported by the cosmology, that all men and animals and indeed the universe were systematically bound to each other and part of each other.

In seeming paradox, individual murder was common, as was suicide; intergroup violence, though less common, was not rare. Interfamilial feuding was endemic. Nevertheless, sharing of the proceeds of the chase was the rule and, in the case of some sea mammals, highly formalized.

Eskimo values stressed cooperation, avoidance of aggression, subordination of oneself to others, honesty, openness, sharing of goods (and even marital partners under some circumstances), and the pragmatic reliance on reality-testing in all aspects of life.

At the same time, shamanism and witchcraft were ubiquitous. People feared many aspects of the supernatural, which they did not distinguish clearly from the natural world. Nearly all activities in life were circumscribed by a complex set of taboos that no one could avoid breaking and thus bringing on some personal or group misfortune.

Further, much of the interpersonal violence was caused by sexual jealousy and though they believed that goods existed in order to be shared, there was much resentment over those who abused this value. Nearly all misfortune was attributed to supernatural intervention and to shamanism, but the shaman was considered necessary for bringing game and healing the sick (who nearly always became ill because of the acts of another shaman or because taboos were broken).

Although putatively leaderless and egalitarian, they suffered periodically from local “bullies” who would simply dominate local areas, arrogating privileges, goods, and wives to themselves. While Eskimos tended to be friendly, open, and smiling, they often stole from visiting whaling ships and were always unsure how to interpret each other’s behavior if it strayed from the norm.

The foregoing seemingly paradoxical listing of attributes and attitudes is, we believe, incomprehensible until the core personality dynamics which underlie them are understood. These can best be isolated by an analysis of the impact of child socialization procedures, which produced the basic personality substrates upon which adult behavior was based, and which was further molded through the press of social structure into the Eskimo “cultural personality.”

Eskimo cultural personality

In general terms we would describe Eskimo personality as producing a world view of fatalistic optimism. Since the assumptions or connotations of “fatalism” and “optimism” seem diametrically different, it is necessary to explain this apparent paradox or contradiction. By fatalistic optimism we meant a set of attitudes which assumes the universe to be generally benign and/or in potential control by the individual. However, this benign universe is also unpredictable and sometimes beyond the individuals’ control, which is a fact he accepts along with its general benignancy. But his passive tolerance often masks both his anxiety and anger. The individual Eskimo tended to be incapable of dealing with frustration that he might try to cope with by ignoring the frustrating circumstance, attacking it, or helplessly accepting it. The first and last alternatives were preferred modes of response to frustration.

socialization

The Eskimo infant received very intense, continuous, and warm early maternal care. The quality of care that the infant Eskimo under one year of age received was apparently more nurturant and supportive than in nearly any other society reported in the literature on cross-cultural socialization, with the possible exception of the Buganda of Uganda (Geber 1958). Eskimo children, who were carried in a parka hood on the mother’s back, were in continuous skin-to-skin contact much of the time and rarely separated from the mother even for short periods.⁸

We postulate that this intense closeness and nurturance had a beneficial effect on Eskimo personality. It generated a sense of security about the universe and feelings of trust and competence. We have observed some extraordinary capacities of Eskimos, such as their widespread ability to write their names upside down, backward and forward, and as a mirror image with equal facility, their tolerance of upside-down pictures, and their ability to repair internal combustion engines, to take them apart and put them back together again after minimal exposure to them. At least one investigator (Kleinfeld 1970, 1971) has systematically tested for these unusual cognitive and perceptual abilities and established their existence through psychological tests. In any event, we believe that it was this intense and early nurturance that assisted the psychological development of Eskimo infants and provided the basic core of their personality in later life.⁹

Eskimo children, in fact, were so intensely close to their mothers at this early stage that from the infant’s perspective, they were undoubtedly fused. The infant was fed on demand and as often as he wished. Moreover, his mother often used the breast to pacify

him. The Eskimo mother, as Briggs (1970) has pointed out and our observations support, was, however, not very tolerant of a crying or fussy child. She communicated her distaste for such behavior by the stiffening of her body against which the child was almost always held. She then pacified the child with her breast, but usually only after the child had begun to quiet down. Thus the mother used the infant's fusion needs to control him.

This earliest signal, and it is one which was reinforced again and again, strongly suggests to the child that his well-being is dependent upon his pleasing his mother. In later years this is generalized to society at large.

This general, but controlled, indulgence of Eskimo children usually continued for many years, but the critical period we believe to have been approximately the seven- to ten-month period of life, when infants usually begin learning self-other distinctions. Eskimo children seem to be retarded in this respect. They do not distinguish between the "good" (present feeding-mother) and perceived "bad" (absent non-feeding-mother) (Lewis 1950; Klein 1950, 1957) until later. We hypothesize that it is this retardation of self-other recognition which forms the core of egocentric "selfishness" of Eskimo character; it is the cornerstone upon which further character development is laid, in particular the tendency to avoid violence and to express friendliness with everyone.

Specifically, the infant, who was massively indulged during this period, came to view the self and the mother and, consequently, the self and the universe, as coterminous. Because of this, the maturing Eskimo never lost the feelings of oceanic involvement with all life, the interconnectedness of all things, the powerful boost of a very secure optimistic and nearly omnipotent ego.

Finding its wishes anticipated and gratified at nearly every turn, with minimal frustration, the child could not help believing that the universe (with which it was unconsciously coterminous) was essentially benign. Unlike Athabascans, who tend to internalize feelings of interior "badness" (Hippler 1973), the major introject at this stage for the Eskimo child was a feeling of supremely confident nearly omnipotent "goodness."

This intimacy, which was one aspect of the early socialization, is, we believe, the genesis of the global, nearly egocentric Eskimo personality.¹⁰ The Eskimo comes to consider himself as the center of the universe; others exist only insofar as they are meaningful to him. He has difficulty granting autonomy to others. In adult life such egocentrism is impossible; thus, we believe the avoidance of intruding into another's life space is a coping mechanism developed, in part, to deal with this egocentric tendency.

But, as we have noted, the child with a core of feelings of goodness was also subject to intense fusion needs, which were supported by maternal behavior and used to control the infant. The infant was forced to become very sensitive to subtle behavioral cues. The egocentrism of the child led it into rages against these intrusions by his mother's will and also, we shall see, by the will of others, at the same time that he remained dependent upon these external objects.

In his second year, the infant began to be the object of occasional unpredictable and sometimes very harsh teasing by other relatives. The teasing often took the form of jibes about his desire for the breast and threats to withhold it from him. His dependency needs were denounced as infantile, and he was ridiculed because of them.

Furthermore, the infant was teased and shamed at this age for defecating and urinating inappropriately (though no attempt was made prior to this to inculcate "proper" behavior); this usually sent the child into rages of frustration, and he rushed back to his mother for support. The mother, in contrast to her usual manner, would not comfort him very much. From then on, this pattern of response tended to become the dominant one for the Eskimo child. Overt frustration, for which he had minimal tolerance because he

had received so little of it as an infant, was met with rage. When his rage was socially disapproved of, the child suddenly felt isolated and fearful. He then turned to his sole source of comfort, his mother.

We stress that these teasings, in which the mother often took part, were occasional, sporadic, and unpredictable. In addition, they ended as abruptly as they began, and all things went back to "normal." The probable effect of these teasings upon the child, who was enraged and furious about it, was that it impressed upon him that the universe, no matter how nurturant, was occasionally unpredictable.

Furthermore, the child's mother, who might take part in these teasings, did not permit the child's emotional response to reach its full climax. After the child had become enraged because of the teasing, his mother would cluck with disapproval for his rage, smile at him, nuzzle him, and quiet him down much more quickly than he apparently would have wished. Freeman, Foulks, and Freeman (1972), especially, note this and suggest that this behavior also seems to indicate the mother's attempts to control the infant's hostility by moving herself from a passive to an active position. The child learns to control himself "in order to elicit the desired response from the *external* object, his mother" (Freeman et al. 1972). Nevertheless, the infant had by then long since passed the maturational stage at which he would normally begin to distinguish self and other and had acquired a residue of ego which could not support a belief that the universe (or the self) was essentially bad.

Usually, whenever his rage failed to achieve the desired goal of putting an end to his persecution, the infant would become sulky and withdrawn; the result was that withdrawal became the appropriate technique for avoiding unpleasantness in life.¹¹ The residue of rage, however, seems to have resulted in a somewhat different set of attitudes. The infant learned that the moral of the behaviors he observed was that one should get away with persecution, or indeed the fulfillment of any desire, if one could. In fact, only the threat of danger to the self was an effective deterrent to persecution. Essentially, the child learned that the only critical elements of control were *outside the self*. Thus, regardless of the overt freedom of action he was permitted, he came to feel that such freedom was ultimately dependent upon subtle external cues. As a result, he tended to alternate his responses between periodic outrage against impositions on his autonomy and anxious dependence upon the view others had of his own worth.

It is possible that one of the reasons for the teasing on the part of adults (and older siblings) was jealousy of the infant. The fact that the Eskimo infant was treated with such indulgence undoubtedly stirred jealous rage in others. By being displaced into teasing, it trained the child in the need to control his overt response to powerful beings. But it was not always displaced. Many Eskimo families had and have the custom of classifying their children as "favored" or "despised." Paradoxically, both types of children were treated in nearly the same fashion. After the first two years or so of indulgence, the favored child was spoken to harshly, was given difficult tasks to perform and old clothes to wear, and so forth. The parents' rationale for this treatment was that it prevented the spirits from taking the child away through death. That is, if the spirits did not know that a child's parents loved him, they would not be tempted to hurt the parents by robbing them of their child.

We suggest that, among other things, this rationale is consistent with the concept of an inexplicable universe, which was arbitrary, capricious, and cruel, much as parents, relatives, and siblings were on occasion, and justifies jealous rages directed against the child as actions on his behalf.

The least favored child received precisely the same treatment because “we don’t like him.” This overt statement of angry feelings toward a child, we feel, tends to support our above analysis. In fact, there was little to be gained from being either the most or least favored child; we may assume that their identical treatment stemmed from similar emotions and explanations.

On the other hand, the growing child of around three, four, and five years of age was not specifically toilet trained, nor was he punished for incontinent behavior, apart from the inconsistent teasing. His exploratory urges were encouraged, and he was assisted in developing a sense of mastery over his physical environment. “Don’t touch” is a command still rarely heard in Eskimo villages, and it is almost never directed at the very young child. Open masturbation or playing with the anus or feces are not discouraged, and socialization is only stringent when it concerns violence or interfering with the lives of other people.

On the other hand, we have also observed the apparent paradox of children as old as four or five years, who are, in many cases, quite fearful of straying very far from the mother. The mother’s early indulgence of the child and her manipulation of the child through his own needs prevented full individualization. The child was confident only as long as he was with his mother. For a small infant this is not a serious problem; at a later age it greatly reduces the child’s mobility. There appears to be an “invisible string” that ties the child to his mother; when the child reaches the end of this string, it returns to mother for reassurance.

Another aspect of the explanation for the seeming paradox between the “encouragement of exploratory behavior” and the child’s fear of actually exploring might be the fact that the overt and covert messages of the mother are not consistent. At an earlier stage in the second year of life, the mother distracts the child from actions she does not wish it to undertake or which may prove harmful, rather than actively stopping him. The child eventually has to uncover the meaning behind the distractions for himself. Freeman et al. (1972) suggest that:

The Eskimo child here begins to hypercathect and overidealize the mother in response not only to his doubt about autonomous activity but to several others as well. The most important relates to the child’s pent up, frustrated hostility to the mother which threatens the illusion of narcissistic reunion, and is accordingly split off from the mother and projected outside, leaving only the idealized good mother.

The authors note that the mother encouraged these projections and fostered fears of *tunuks* (‘white men’) and dangerous monsters in the tundra.

It must, of course, be obvious that the socialization against aggression was carried out at the same time that the child observed the teasing of younger siblings, but even though he was occasionally permitted to join in the teasing, he was generally discouraged from doing so. Very quickly the growing child learned to displace his anger and aggression automatically. Small Eskimo children customarily torture young mammals and small birds and may, over a period of hours, patiently collect enough rocks to stone a tied-down puppy to death. In adult life Eskimo dogs are treated harshly and routinely kicked *en passant*. Grown dogs are kept chained at all times as they quite naturally have a tendency to retaliate violently against children, and many Eskimo children have been attacked by loose dogs or by chained dogs into whose range they strayed.

This displacement of aggression onto animals clearly had a positive survival aspect. Adult Eskimos often candidly admit that they enjoy killing the animals as much as hunting them. “We like to slaughter the caribou.” But such aggression, even when it was displaced, was not uncontrolled. The killing of animals, whether sea or land mammals,

was in the past, and is often at present, attended by ceremonial attention to the corpse. After killing a caribou, its throat was slit "to let the spirit out so it won't tell caribou not to come."

There are at least two explanations for this attitude. The first is that there is only one caribou, who is Caribou. In some sense all caribou are one and the spirit of any caribou can communicate instantly with all other caribou. This is consistent with the stated Eskimo belief that all living things are somehow part of each other, and more importantly, somehow part of the self and other humans.

Second, it suggests that ceremonies are used for propitiation so that there will be no retaliation for killing the animals. Otherwise, the caribou will not come back, and the Eskimos will not have them as food. We speculate, furthermore, that this also reflects the child's fear that his mother will retaliate against his oral devouring urges.

The same kind of rite applies to the killing of sea mammals. Whale, walrus, and oogruk (bearded seal) must all be offered a drink of fresh water after they have been killed, or they, too, will never come back. The gesture appears to be a kind of statement of "no hard feelings."

The unconscious dynamics leading to such a world view, however, are not solely grounded in the maternal-infant relationship. The oedipal situation builds upon this unique socialization its own basic difficulties. First of all, the child who enters the oedipal period is usually optimistic, but has an underlying anxiety concerning maternal separation. To some extent this is modified by the internalization of the maternal object. The mother is always with the child unconsciously and often in reality. But any kind of separation from this kind of mother produces anxieties which we believe the mythology shows to be primarily fears of ego destruction or body destruction fantasies.

The facts that mother-self individuation has never been fully achieved and that increasingly strong individual ties have been developed with the mother inevitably increases the influences of oedipally based castration fears which rework and focus earlier diffuse body destruction anxiety.

For an Eskimo baby, the father is literally the only person in the universe who can separate the mother from her child. Our own observations and reports from Eskimos and other observers of Eskimos suggest that male Eskimos customarily take their sexual pleasure of their wives with little preliminary affection. Normally, the Eskimo father simply physically removes, with no particular gentleness, the child (or children) lying on or about the mother, mounts her, and dismounts with little concern about her sexual fulfillment.

The father's behavior is probably motivated by a constellation of factors such as self-centeredness, envy of the child, and a vague anger at the maternal object. However, the net result is that the child tends to view sexual activity as essentially, even though unconsciously, aggressive. He is physically displaced for a direct sexual encounter. He cannot deal with this overtly and must learn to control his sexual impulses and to fear any aggressive impulses that might be aroused by his father's actions.

The strong socialization against aggression and interpersonal violence, we surmise, is necessary for the child who is to become an Eskimo. He is not only fearful of eliciting his father's rages, a fantasy based upon his pre-oedipal impoverished superego precursor development, but is also affected by the reality of his father's physical treatment of him in bed.

After an essentially unfrustrated infancy, which blends into a period of subtle emotional maternal controls, the child is exposed to the periodic and apparently arbitrary cruelty of others; the child finds these increasing but inconsistent frustrations very

difficult to handle. On the interpersonal level he learns to shy away from situations he cannot control or which appear to pose threats of further frustration or infringement on the self, or in which he cannot safely vent his rage. During the oedipal period, the child's need to control his rage, with reference to an external object, the father, is, of course, intensified.

On the other hand, secure in his belief that he can master the physical universe, which is a residue of warm early nurturance, he is capable of great patience in pursuit of his ends. The Eskimo adult overtly appears to be magnificently secure about his competence. Nonetheless, his sense of security appears to need continuous reinforcement, and he is dependent on the good opinions of others to enhance his feelings of self worth. He is always wondering "how people feel about him." In the final analysis, nothing that he does, or is, is finally the responsibility of the self. Good luck is not good luck unless someone notices it.

Bad luck is not, however, attributed to negative qualities in the self but to the apparent arbitrariness of the universe; this may be set off by some accidental breakage of a taboo and is reminiscent of the way a mother sometimes responds to some minor act of her infant by momentarily withdrawing nurturance and symbiosis. Aboriginally, and to some extent today, this unpredictability of the universe was expressed by an incredible array of taboos. They were so all inclusive that they were impossible to avoid, just like the urgings of the mother to act in accord with her will and the inexplicable teasing for what could not be helped (i.e., being a baby). They provided the continual ego syntonic excuse for bad luck in hunting. Such violations of taboos could always be rectified by phobic or counterphobic activity (the individual could do what the universe desired even though he could not understand why it was desired any more than the infant can understand his mother's anger at his crying). Eventually game animals always returned (just as, for the infant, his mother's warmth returned), confirming the hunter's belief in the efficacy of the taboo and countermagic system.

Another aspect of Eskimo life betrayed their continuing anxiety about the universe. Shamans (*angatqoqs*) were used to "call game" and to propitiate offended spirits, thereby bringing game. Shamans were also believed to be capable of magical flight and could use dangerous magic against those whom at other times they might help; they were powerful and omnipotent like the fantasized parents. The shaman made use of his easy access to primary process thinking, and though we believe that many Eskimos were relatively comfortable with primary process thinking, shamans were more so and thus feared more.^{1,2}

We have noted that the principal concerns in Eskimo life seem to have developed around the control of aggression. We have suggested this was very necessary because the expected adult personality which would emerge from the massively indulgent early childrearing would have difficulty in making self-other distinctions, which was further complicated by dependency needs and the need to control the aggressive rages resulting from these various frustrations. Because of this, the individual would be predisposed, at least on a primitive level, to see all objects in the universe as extensions of his self. But the objects would also be viewed as external to the self, and they would control the self for their own selfish ends. Thus, other persons would tend to be viewed instrumentally even for expressive ends.

It was common, though vaguely disgraceful, for Eskimo men to copulate with dogs, though they might masturbate openly. We assume that it was the narcissistic gratification of sexual urges which was the Eskimo man's primary interest rather than the development of intense interpersonal contact with a woman. Moreover, Eskimo men treated women

quite cruelly at times and nearly always as inferior, which was probably also an expression of repressed rage against their inconsistent mothers.

Adults like these were often intolerant of interpersonal frustration. In aboriginal times, men took precautions when hunting and traveling to make sure that their companions did not murder them for some slight or perceived insult. Often men traveled with one hand on their knives. The avoidance of conflict under these and other circumstances was achieved by the simulation of an open, friendly posture.

In fact, friendly and smiling appearances were so important that a sulking man was regarded as dangerous and might be peremptorily killed by neighbors as a preventative measure in case he should fly into a murderous rage. In more isolated communities, such as those of Diomedea, and even at times in mainland villages, men still go armed into homes where they fear the possibility of violence. Bogojavlensky and Fuller (1973) provide a striking illustration of this for King Island, where they report that communal activity such as sweat baths provokes such anxiety over potential assault that men hide knives in the pots of cold water from which they splash their faces to cool themselves. A knife close at hand not only provides security, but also symbolizes the terror of unprovoked attack. In Eskimo society, then, there was a strong predisposition not to interfere with another person for fear of eliciting his rage.¹³ Paradoxically, this seemingly democratic attitude resulted in a kind of social anarchy in which Eskimos acted as totally independent agents, constrained only by their pragmatic evaluation of the personal danger that might be attendant upon their acts. In essence this meant that they were concerned with whether others would or could harm them, in extreme cases, and whether others would or would not approve (if they knew) of their wishes and acts. They had a positive need for continual approbation and, we assume, some covert rage at the need for approbation, as well as rage when approbation was not forthcoming. The truth of these observations will be even clearer when we analyze the system of social organization and social control.

social organization and social control

The basis of Northern Eskimo social organization was the nuclear family and the extension of bilateral kinship and fictive kin ties to an ever-widening range of people. As Heinrich (1960) has noted, each individual was surrounded by a close network of kinfolk with whom he had clearly defined and unavoidable relationships. There were, in addition, more distant relatives with whom he could interact as he chose. Beyond that was the rest of the world. But even with this residual group he could establish fictive ties through the mechanisms of wife exchange, feast partnerships, or trading partnerships.

As we have noted elsewhere (Hippler and Conn 1973), what was important about Eskimo kinship organization was that instead of creating many ties with many people and therefore leading to corporate structures, it tended to create a series of mutually exclusive circles which were occupied solely by one individual or his nuclear family. For the individual, the effect of being related to everyone meant that, in reality, he was related to no one and fundamentally stood alone. Thus, the bilateral Eskimo kinship system functioned to support a highly egocentric personality but one which needed continual external feedback, though it was often angered by it. Inevitably, this was reflected in other aspects of social organization and social control as well.

Eskimo social organization and social control were further characterized by a tendency to denigrate authority, to avoid interference in the lives of others (unless one could get away with it), to accept the leadership of others only for limited purposes or because of

coercion or bribing, and to respond violently to wrongdoers if their victims were able. Even though North Alaska Eskimos developed some techniques of social control, these were never formalized to the extent that we have noted for the Interior Athabascans (Hippler and Conn 1972).

We have noted that coercion and bribing were two means of bringing people together in groups, apart from kinship ties. Sometimes the *umealit* ('rich men/boat owners/hunt leaders') imposed their will on others physically. This, however, was usually counter-productive in the long run. Either such a man would eventually be killed, or his putative "employees" would simply move far enough away to be out of range of his control.

The same was true of the local "bully," who was an institution in many Eskimo villages. The apparent paradox of a village "bully" in a society of conflict-avoiding individualists can be explained if we realize that Eskimos with "bullying" tendencies were surrounded by neighbors who had developed no formal adjudicative techniques for handling such people. Because they did not believe in interfering with others, they had only three options: submit, move away, or murder him.

Because the consequences of coercion were often undesirable, individual *umealit* preferred softer approaches. The *umealit* could not act arbitrarily for fear of losing his tenuous control over the given subsistence activity and because he was acting *primus inter pares*.

In light of such difficulties, Eskimo communities met their need for cooperative activity by making use of the established Eskimo procedure of indirection, which precluded violence. As we note (Hippler and Conn 1973:26):

In essence it was accomplished by men acting in concert with "no one being boss." But this normative statement actually hides the operation of such events. In reality if a man wished to initiate activities which demanded the assistance of his peers, he would raise the question by indirection, never forcing a yes or no answer and thus, in addition to not putting another in a difficult social position of refusing, also saved his own feelings from the disappointment of a negative response. By a series of subtle and indirect references within a community, all the individuals relevant to a given project could be made aware of the forthcoming event, and if it were done subtly enough, no one would ever have to openly admit that he even knew what was being suggested.

Men gifted at this sort of social interaction became informal communal and action leaders by virtue of their competence both at their procedure and at the tasks to be undertaken. Moreover, no one ever was forced to take credit for it. The very socially competent man could so indirectly indicate what must be done that no one need ever be offended. Naturally, the crude, boisterous or unsubtle individual put such interactions in peril. But his activities were never rewarded by high prestige within the group.

Thus, while an apparent picture, and indeed an accurate one of social anarchy and dangerously low levels of social control, describes one aspect of traditional Eskimo life, within the shadows, as it were, the necessary work of the social group got accomplished through careful and not accidental subtlety. In part, we believe these two facets of Eskimo life are responsible for the sometimes contradictory impressions observers have had of Eskimos: on the one hand smiling and cooperative, on the other, violent, aggressive and demanding. Both were true.

Although it was overtly democratic, Eskimo society was in fact nearly anarchic. Without a belief in majority rule and in the absence of legitimized authority, Eskimos submitted either to bullies, social manipulators, or bribery. Because the goal of every Eskimo was to avoid conflict, as long as this did not interfere with his other goal of doing exactly as he pleased, they were potentially antagonistic to authority. "Law" in Eskimo society was what one could get away with. For the very strong there were no laws.

Only the threat of supernatural punishment by the *angatqoq*, from whom nothing could be hidden, or the threat of retaliation, limited the Eskimo's acquisitive and aggressive urges. In order to avoid violence Eskimos used euphemisms like "borrowing"

for theft. Our informants insist that they knew the difference between theft and borrowing, but they rarely mentioned it, even when they were being abused, for fear of the violence which might result.

In spite of all their attempts to avoid it, violence was endemic in the society. The literature suggests this (Spencer 1959), and the oldest informants support the view. This is apparently also true for Canadian Eskimos (Graburn 1968, 1969). Until White law was imposed (Hippler and Conn 1973), there was no security of life, limb, or property among Eskimos, and the incidence of anti-social behavior was high.

Thus the socialization of Eskimo children tended to produce an adult personality which was at one and the same time dependent and cooperative, egocentric and violent. That is, they tried to placate the universe and everyone in it in order to avoid the inexplicable displeasure that would result from their minor intrusions; they expressed this attitude by appearing to be tolerant, smiling, and non-interfering. For the Eskimos knew that intrusions would result in the quivering rage which could and often did lead to mortal violence, and they strove to avoid eliciting them.

It was actually only under the impact of contact with Euro-American culture that Eskimos were eventually able to develop a system of social control which had universal application and which permitted Eskimo creativity in interpersonal relations to flourish.

Among the most important innovations brought into Eskimo life by White contact was the missionary. Apart from his other impacts, he brought an answer to the problem of the shaman. The shaman was viewed ambivalently in Eskimo society as he was in many other cultures. His close contact with the supernatural world not only gave him the power to bring game, but it also made him capable of bringing illness and death. Eskimos believed that most disasters resulted from either the breaking of taboos or shamanistic intervention.

The missionaries fearlessly faced down the shamans and, with characteristic pragmatism, the Eskimos abandoned their belief in, or at least the use of and concern with, shamanism. The shamans almost stopped practicing entirely in the face of missionary competition. Moreover, the missionaries assured the Eskimos of a secure afterlife, which could be attained through the simple expedient of abandoning the old taboo systems and adopting a very few new ones. The afterlife had, until then, been a nebulous concept for the Eskimos. In most Eskimo communities this idea was accepted with alacrity.

These changes were accompanied by the introduction of U.S. law in the persons of U.S. commissioners and Coast Guard cutters whose infrequent appearances to show the flag also brought some semblance of U.S. legal authority and at least pro-forma courts. Very quickly the Eskimo village council structure emerged. The village council dealt not only with what might be termed substantive issues of criminal law and interpersonal disputes, but it also expanded its interest into nearly all aspects of behavior by members of the community which could affect other persons.

By council directive, all murderers or extremely violent people were removed by U.S. Marshals or the Coast Guard. Retaliatory violence against the council was impossible because it was backed by the armed might of the United States. There was, of course, no possibility at all for successful violence against the Coast Guard. Since one of the traditional aspects of Eskimo behavior, which we have related to Eskimo "cultural personality," was a pragmatic recognition that violence was limited by the possibility of getting away with it, the Eskimos adapted to this new circumstance very quickly. Our own researches suggest that during the village council period, roughly 1920 to 1950, there was nearly a complete absence of mortal violence in North Alaska Eskimo communities.

The reasons for the success of the council need clarification. In precontact and early contact times, there were almost no organizational mechanisms for social control. Yet the new mechanisms quickly became all-pervasive and effective. The key to understanding the council's success is to realize that the council sat as a group. No single individual ever had to bear the opprobrium for making a decision. Decisions were made by unanimous consent. Individuals called before the council did not have to face accusers, but only interested questioners. All aspects of the individual's life were considered pertinent, and the ends of council investigation were reintegration, reindemnification, and socially productive cooperative activity. Punishment as such was eschewed.

Thus provided with absolute outside authority for which no Eskimo had to take responsibility, the strong tendency toward conciliation was given full play. Since no Eskimo felt coerced by any other single Eskimo "authority" and since the councils acted as a buffer between the wrongdoer and outside authority, there was little antagonism at council decisions. One was merely responding to the subtle cues of others, but now without the fear of violence.

Eskimo communities quickly formed village councils, which they used to settle disputes as amicably as possible and to reintegrate the offender; they called on the absolute authority which backed them only when necessary.

The council's procedures were to avoid direct confrontation between antagonistic witnesses by reporting verbally the gist of one witness's comments to the next. It also investigated fully the entire life style and character of each defendant in order to determine the appropriate disposition of the case. It deliberated at length and applied only consensual judgments. Its punishments were models of correction and deterrence. A man who had destroyed property would not be jailed but, instead, would be forced to rebuild the property and by so doing publicly acknowledge guilt and repentance. More abstract crimes such as public disturbances would be dealt with by having the offender perform a general service for the community, such as cutting wood for an old woman, painting the council hall, etc.

Our analysis of (written) council records and magistrates' records from two large North Alaska villages demonstrates that defendants apparently accepted such correction in good faith; when they did not, community pressure eventually forced them to act.

There was great continuity in this change. No one person put himself over others, people continued to share responsibility and goods, and overtly friendly interpersonal relations now could become even more relaxed as a result of elimination of the fear of murder. Wife sharing, which appears in many cases to have really been coerced, could be stopped on the grounds that it conflicted with religion, although if individuals felt motivated to share their wives, they could continue the practice covertly. Above all, the terror of uncontrolled violence was removed. (See Conn and Hippler [1973] for a detailed discussion of the operation of the village councils during this period.)

It was actually during this period that much of the extant ethnographic work on Eskimos in Alaska was done. Hughes (1966), for example, notes this change to the council system and its effects among St. Lawrence Island Eskimos. The extreme ease of Eskimo life—especially in interpersonal relations—during this period may well have skewed general opinion concerning the peacefulness of Eskimos. This halcyon period, however, ended with the post-World War II era.

the magistrate system

By the 1950s and increasingly in the 1960s and 1970s, judicial authority in Alaska Eskimo communities had moved into the hands of magistrates appointed by the Alaska

court system. This change also occurred in the context of other changes. In the post-World War II era, missile site and airbase construction, expanded efforts by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Public Health Service, and increasing interest on the part of the state of Alaska in its Eskimo citizens had several general results (see Hippler 1968, 1970, 1971).

Eskimos began to agglomerate in larger communities more and more, attracted by schools, possibilities for employment, and medical care. Since employment was episodic, this increased the dependency upon government transfer payments for many Eskimos who were no longer leading a subsistence hunting and fishing life. Increased medical care meant both larger numbers of older survivors and, most critically, enormous increases in the number of living children. This increase in the dependent population put strains on the traditional, and even contemporary, cash economies to cope with it. Moreover, larger numbers of children increased the problems of socialization and social control.

It was at this juncture that the Eskimo magistrate first made his/her appearance. The effect on social control was startling. When the council system gave way within the last decade to appointed magistrates, Eskimos were once more forced to direct their hostility toward single authority figures. Indeed, most Eskimo magistrates felt equally ill at ease. The net result has been a massive increase in interpersonal violence and an almost complete absence of law enforcement.¹⁴ Placing a single Eskimo "in charge" was tantamount to having no one in charge. Since there would now be no enforcement, Eskimos were constrained in their (often alcoholically induced) personal violence only by a realistic assessment of the personal power of the would-be victim.

Faced with increased accessibility to alcohol, a more sedentary and unemployed population, and larger numbers of children and teenagers to control, there was a normal increase in disruption, interpersonal violence, and juvenile delinquency. However, the old attitudes of non-interference held sway. Eskimo magistrates and citizens alike disliked the notion of a single Eskimo authority sitting in judgment. They disliked and felt uncomfortable with the requirements of formal complaints, written accusations, and the like. They further disliked the often tedious delays between offense and resolution of the case.

Finally, the increasing presence of state troopers and even village policemen reinforced the avoidance ethic and reduced the citizens' sense of local responsibility. More and more, complaints and action were left to the state trooper, who would subtly, and sometimes not so subtly, use his greater knowledge of law and procedures to elicit a preferred judgment from the magistrate, who wanted nothing more than to get rid of the case.

Where in the council days each dispute and concern would be carefully investigated, discussed, and decided by a council which was truly representative of the community, and whose judgments were felt to be unassailable, more and more, under the magistrate system, there were no trials at all. Pleas of guilty to any and all offenses charged by the trooper and automatic maximum sentences became the rule. On the other hand, the magistrates, who wished still somehow to ameliorate the uncomfortable situation facing the community, would suspend imposition of sentence in 40 to 60 percent of all cases brought before them.

Thus, effectively the law stopped being enforced. People stopped coming with complaints to the magistrate for fear of being entangled in a formal process they poorly understood. Crimes, especially violent ones, began to skyrocket as the deterrent effect of community discussion and sentencing disappeared, and the great number of suspended sentences meant that little punishment of any kind was enforced. Finally, the situation

has now deteriorated to a point where interpersonal violence has increased to its apparent precontact level.

We suggest in the foregoing that the single most crucial issue in understanding the responses of the North Alaska Eskimo to changes in law ways as well as their general responses to cultural change is the cultural personality of the group. Changing structural factors either permitted the efflorescence of that cultural personality in a creative fashion or depressed its active function, depending on the "fit" of such changes with that cultural personality. This unique "cultural personality," then, still informs much of Eskimo life, though the social systems through which it must operate have changed dramatically.

conclusions

In this communication we have shown that the many often seemingly paradoxical aspects of Eskimo culture and behavior can be parsimoniously related to an Eskimo "cultural personality" whose roots in the socialization experience may explain much of adult Eskimo behavior. This proposed personality, we have suggested, is best reflected in the social control system, and changes in its form through time have been effective or ineffective depending upon its "fit" with the still important "cultural personality."

notes

¹Such works include, but are not limited to, those of Chance (1965), Chance and Foster (1962), Lantis (1953, 1960), Parker (1962), J. Murphy (1964), Murphy and Hughes (1965), and Preston (1964). Lantis' and Murphy's works actually deal with Southwest Alaska Eskimos, but we believe that their findings are similar to those for North Alaska. Indeed, the findings of Ferguson (1960) and J. and I. Honigmann (1953) for Canadian Eskimos are dramatically similar.

²An exception to this, for Southwestern Eskimos, is Lantis' work (1953, 1960). Lubart (1971) has also attempted similar analyses for Canadian Eskimos.

³Our discussion of Eskimo culture is based upon the extant ethnographic record noted below and upon field observations in thirty-five Alaska Eskimo communities over a period of six years as well as upon reconstruction based on material derived from approximately one hundred informants. This work was supported by National Science Foundation Grant #G.S. 3026, grants under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1964, and the Ford Foundation. We are especially grateful for assistance in organizing our data from Drs. Peter Giovacchini and Bryce and Ruth Boyer, though we take full responsibility for their formulation here.

⁴This set of circumstances reflects the famous "Pueblo culture problem" in which divergent ethos were proposed for Pueblo Indians by different investigators. Bennett (1946) suggests that the answer to the Pueblo problem lies in the values of the observer. We believe the answer to the "Eskimo problem" we are proposing lies in a somewhat different, though related, direction.

⁵These include psychiatrists at Alaska Psychiatric Institute, the Native Health Service Units in Alaska, social workers, and others. The synthesis is our own.

⁶This theoretical orientation is presaged by numerous authors from Kardiner (1939) to Wallace (1961) and is a modification of Spiro's (1951) approach which recognizes the essential internalization of culture in a way similar to that of personality.

⁷The general cultural description of the North Alaska Eskimos is based upon the published works cited below and our own fieldwork. The ethnographic reconstruction is presented as a whole, without the interruption of numerous citations, to make reading easier. Jenness (1953); Lantis (1947, 1959, 1960); Murdoch (1885), M. Spencer (1954), Van Stone (1958), Weyer (1932), Stefansson (1913), R. Spencer (1959).

⁸A number of authors have commented on the remarkably permissive Eskimo childhood: Pettit (1956), Simpson (1875), Fejes (1966), Heinrich (1955), Gubser (1965), and M. Spencer (1964) are only a representative sampling.

⁹Giovacchini (personal communication) suggests that one may consider the earliest development levels of the child (that is, those prior to the development of the child's capacity to fantasize) always to be enhanced by non-frustration and indulgence, since this permits full development to occur. Of course, later use of judicious frustration at more mature levels of development also acts as a spur to

further development, but this depends upon the child's capacity for symbolism and fantasy.

¹⁰We are not suggesting here that this massive early indulgence was "bad" *per se*. However, occurring as it did in conjunction with the development of a maternal style which manipulated closeness for the mother's own self interest, it made it difficult for the child to break away from his mother at a time when his sense of security should have been growing and consequently left the child with a residue of continued need for this dependent oceanic feeling in later life.

¹¹Preston (1964) is puzzled by the responses on Eskimo Rorschachs from the N.W. Alaska region because they are so dominated by form, which is usually an indication of emotional inadequateness or inaccessibility. On the one hand, it fits well with our assumption that control over interpersonal affect is a significant aspect of Eskimo life. On the other hand, an unusual incidence of anatomical responses on Rorschachs and of nude figure drawings and even X-ray type drawings suggests to us the availability of deep primary process content, which we believe, however, is under a significant degree of control. The hiding of hands, which she found difficult to explain, we see as probably an expression of hidden controlled aggression. Passivity, helplessness, and card responses (essentially rejections) to the intensely personal thematic apperception tests also suggests the fatalistic insecurity in interpersonal relations and retreat from conflict we have noted. The depressive tendencies, which she also finds inexplicable, we believe to be the most likely response in adulthood to the loss of the intense maternal affect.

¹²Boyer (1962) and Boyer et al. (1964) have remarked extensively on this unique property of shamanistic performers.

¹³This attitude is very strongly present in the customary Eskimo response to nearly any question or request. Requests are met with "yes" and even those which the individual does not wish to comply with are responded to with "maybe." "No" is felt to be too harsh an answer, and indeed, it is feared it may create anger in the recipient. To avoid a dissenting opinion, Eskimos customarily say "I don't know." It is our opinion that "yes" merely means "I am here" and has little to do with expressing a true state of approbation or agreement.

¹⁴Other factors have, of course, contributed to the rise of antisocial behavior. That the Eskimo communities seem incapable of handling the problem, however, we attribute to their discomfort with a single authority.

references cited

- Beechey, F. S.
1831 Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Bering Strait, Vols. I and II. London: H. Colburn & B. Bentley.
- Bennett, John W.
1946 The Interpretation of Pueblo Culture: A Question of Values. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 2:361-377.
- Bogojavlensky, Sergei, and Robert W. Fuller
1973 Polar Bears, Walrus Hides and Social Solidarity: Social Problems among the People of King Island. *The Alaska Journal* 3(2):66-76.
- Boyer, L. Bryce
1962 Remarks on the Personality of Shamans. *In The Psychoanalytic Study of Society*, Vol. II. Warner Muensterberger and Sidney Axelrad, Eds. New York: International Universities Press. pp. 233-254.
- Boyer, L. Bryce, Bruno Klopfer, Florence R. Brower, and Hayao Kawai
1964 Comparisons of the Shamans and Pseudo-Shamans of the Apaches of the Mescalero Indian Reservation: A Rorschach Study. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment* 28(2):173-180.
- Briggs, Jean L.
1970 *Never in Anger*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chance, Norman A.
1965 Acculturation, Self-Identification and Personality Adjustment. *American Anthropologist* 67:373-393.
1966 *The Eskimo of North Alaska*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chance, Norman A., and Dorothy Foster
1962 Symptom Formation and Patterns of Psychopathology in a Rapidly Changing Alaska Eskimo Society. *University of Alaska Anthropological Papers* 11(1):32-42.
- Chance, Norman A., and John Trudeau
1963 Social Organization, Acculturation and Integration among the Eskimo and the Cree. *Anthropologica* 5(1):47-56.
- Devereux, George
1956 Normal and Abnormal: The Key Problem in Psychiatric Anthropology. *In Some Uses of Anthropology: Theoretical and Applied*. Washington: Anthropological Society of Washington. pp. 23-48.

- DeVos, George A., and Arthur E. Hippler
 1969 Cultural Psychology: Comparative Studies of Human Behavior. *In* The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 4 (2nd ed.). Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, Eds. pp. 323-417.
- Fejes, Claire
 1966 People of the Noatak. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Ferguson, Frances N.
 1960 Eskimo Personality in the Light of Nine Rorschachs from the Great Whale River Eskimo. University of North Carolina, Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, Research Previews 8(1). Chapel Hill. pp. 8-13.
- Freeman, D. M. A., E. Foulks, and P. A. Freeman
 1972 Eskimo Arctic Hysteria and Superego Development. Paper presented to Symposium on the Use of Psychoanalytic Theory in Anthropology. American Psychoanalytic Association Meeting, New York.
- Geber, Marcelle
 1958 The Psychomotor Development of African Children in the First Year and the Influence of Maternal Behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology* 47:185-195.
- Graburn, Nelson
 1968 Imcariat: The Killings. Paper presented at the Symposium on Primitive Law, Annual Meetings, American Anthropological Association. Seattle.
 1969 Eskimo Law in the Light of Self and Group Interest. *Law and Society Review* 4(1):45-60.
- Gubser, Nicholas, J.
 1965 The Nunamiut Eskimos: Hunters of Caribou. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hawkes, Ernest W.
 1913 The 'Inviting In' Feast of the Alaskan Eskimo. *Memoirs of the Canadian Department of Mines* 45:1-20.
- Healy, M. A., J. C. Cantwell, S. B. McLenagan, and C. H. Townsend
 1887 Report of the Cruise of the Revenue Marine Steamer Crowin in the Arctic Ocean in the Year 1885. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Heinrich, Albert
 1955 An Outline of the Kinship System of the Bering Straits Eskimos. M.A. thesis, University of Alaska.
 1960 Structural Features of Northwestern Eskimo Kinship. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 16:110-126.
- Hippler, Arthur E.
 1968 Unplanned Consequences of Planned Culture Change. *In* Higher Latitudes of North America: Socio-Economic Studies in Regional Development. University of Alberta, Boxal Institute, Occasional Publication 6. pp. 11-28.
 1970 Eskimo Acculturation: A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Alaskan and Other Eskimo Acculturation Studies. University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research, Report 28. College.
 1971 Patterns of Migration, Urbanization and Acculturation. *In* Alaska Public Policy: Current Problems and Issues. Gordon Scott Harrison, Ed. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research. pp. 307-313.
 1973 The Athabascans of Interior Alaska: A Culture and Personality Perspective. *American Anthropologist* 75:1529-1541.
- Hippler, Arthur E., and Stephen Conn
 1972 Traditional Athabaskan Law Ways and Their Relationship to Contemporary Problems of Bush Justice. University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research Occasional Paper 7. Fairbanks.
 1973 Traditional Northern Eskimo Law Ways and Their Relationship to Contemporary Problems of Bush Justice. University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research Occasional Papers, 10. College.
- Honigmann, John V., and Irma Honigmann
 1953 Child Rearing Patterns among the Great Whale River Eskimos. *University of Alaska Anthropological Papers* 2(1):31-47.
- Hughes, Charles C.
 1966 From Contest to Council: Social Change among the St. Lawrence Island Eskimos. *In* Political Anthropology. Marc J. Swartz, Victor W. Turner, and Arthur Tuden, Eds. Chicago: Aldine. pp. 255-264.
- Jacques, Elliott
 1957 Social Systems as a Defense against Persecutory and Depressive Anxiety. *In* New Directions in Psychoanalysis. Melanie Klein, Paula Heinmann, and R. E. Monykyrle, Eds. New York: Basic Books. pp. 487-497.
- Jenness, Diamond
 1953 Stray Notes on the Eskimo of Arctic Alaska. *University of Alaska Anthropological Papers* 1(2):5-14.

- Kardiner, Abram
1939 *The Individual and His Society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Klein, Melanie
1950 *The Psychoanalysis of Children*. London: Hogarth. (First pub. 1932.)
1957 *New Directions in Psychoanalysis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kleinfeld, Judith S.
1970 *Cognitive Strengths of Eskimo Students and Implications for Education*. University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research, Occasional Paper. College.
1971 *Visual Memory in Village Eskimo and Urban Caucasian Students*. *Arctic* 24(2):132-138.
- Lantis, Margaret
1947 *Alaska Eskimo Ceremonialism*. New York: J. J. Augustin.
1953 *Nunivak Eskimo Personality as Revealed in the Mythology*. University of Alaska Anthropological Papers 2(1):109-174.
1960 *Eskimo Childhood and Interpersonal Relationships: Nunivak Biographies and Genealogies*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lewis, Bertram D.
1950 *The Psychoanalysis of Elation*. New York: Norton.
- Lubart, Joseph
1971 *Psychodynamic Problems of Adaptation—Mackenzie Delta Eskimos*. Ottawa: Northern Science Research Group, MDRP 7.
- Milan, Frederick A.
1964 *The Acculturation of the Contemporary Eskimo of Wainwright, Alaska*. University of Alaska Anthropological Papers 11(2):1-85.
- Murdoch, John
1892 *Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition*. Washington: U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology. 9:3-441.
- Murphy, Gardner
1947 *Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure*. New York: Harper.
- Murphy, Jane M.
1964 *Psychotherapeutic Aspects of Shamanism on St. Lawrence Island, Alaska*. In *Magic, Faith and Healing*. Ari Kiev, Ed. New York: Free Press. pp. 53-83.
- Murphy, Jane M., and Charles C. Hughes
1965 *The Use of Psychophysiological Symptoms as Indicators of Disorder among Eskimos*. In *Approaches to Cross-Cultural Psychiatry*. Jane M. Murphy and Alexander H. Leighton, Eds. New York: Cornell University Press. pp. 108-160.
- Nelson, Edward William
1899 *The Eskimo about Bering Strait*. U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology, 18th Annual Report, 1896-1897. Washington.
- Parker, Seymour
1962 *Eskimo Psychopathology in the Context of Eskimo Personality and Culture*. *American Anthropologist* 64:76-96.
- Pettit, George A.
1956 *Primitive Education in North America*. *American Archaeology and Ethnography* 43:1-182.
- Preston, Carolyn
1964 *Psychological Testing with Northwest Coast Alaska Eskimos*. *Genetic Psychology Monograph* 69:323-419.
- Rainey, Froelich
1947 *The Whale Hunters of Tigara*. American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers 41(2):229-283.
- Rasmussen, Knud
1952 *The Alaskan Eskimos*. In *Report of the Fifth Thule Expedition 1921-24*. H. Ostermann, Ed. Copenhagen: Gyldendal. pp. 1-291.
- Ray, P. H., and John Murdock
1885 *Ethnographic Sketch of the Natives of Point Barrow*. Washington: International Polar Expedition, 1882-1883.
- Simpson, John
1875 *Observations on the Western Eskimo and the Country They Inhabit*. *Arctic Geography and Ethnology*. pp. 233-275.
- Spencer, Marietta
1954 *The Child in the Contemporary Culture of the Barrow Eskimo*. University of Alaska, 1952 Alaskan Science Conference Proceedings 3:130-132.
- Spiro, Melford E.
1951 *Culture and Personality: The Natural History of a False Dichotomy*. *Psychiatry* 14:19-46. (Reprinted in Bobbs-Merrill reprint series in the Social Sciences, A211.)

Stefansson, Vilhjalmur

1913 *My Life with the Eskimo*. New York: Macmillan.

Van Stone, James

1958 An Eskimo Community and the Outside World. *University of Alaska Anthropological Papers* 7(1):27-38.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.

1952 The Modal Personality of the Tuscarora Indians as Revealed by the Rorschach Test. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 150. Washington.

1961 *Culture and Personality*. New York: Random House.

Weyer, Edward

1932 *The Eskimos: Their Environment and Folkways*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Date of Submission: June 18, 1973

Date of Acceptance: December 20, 1973