



CHICAGO JOURNALS



The "Fateful Hoaxing" of Margaret Mead: A Cautionary Tale

Author(s): Paul Shankman

Source: *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (February 2013), pp. 51-70

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of [Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/669033>

Accessed: 03/04/2013 14:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

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.



The University of Chicago Press and Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Current Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The “Fateful Hoaxing” of Margaret Mead

A Cautionary Tale

by Paul Shankman

CA+ Online-Only Material: Supplements A and B

In the Mead-Freeman controversy, Derek Freeman’s historical reconstruction of the alleged hoaxing of Margaret Mead in 1926 relied on three interviews with Fa’apua’a Fa’amū, Mead’s “principal informant,” who stated that she and another Samoan woman had innocently joked with Mead about their private lives. In turn, Freeman argued that Mead believed these jokes as the truth and that they were the basis for her interpretation of adolescent sex in *Coming of Age in Samoa*. The unpublished interviews with Fa’apua’a became the centerpiece of Freeman’s second book on the controversy, *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead* (1999). Yet an analysis of Mead’s relationship with Fa’apua’a demonstrates that she was not an informant for Mead on adolescent sex, and an examination of the three interviews used by Freeman does not support his interpretation of them. In fact, responding to direct questioning during the interviews, Fa’apua’a stated that Mead did not ask her questions about her own sexual conduct or about adolescent sexual conduct. Nor did she provide Mead with information on this subject. Crucial passages from these interviews were omitted by Freeman in his publications on the alleged hoaxing. Based on the interviews themselves, there is no compelling evidence that Mead was hoaxed.

Derek Freeman’s assertion that Margaret Mead’s view of Samoan sexual conduct was the result of a “prank” or “hoax” by Samoans has been the most damaging part of the Mead-Freeman controversy for Mead’s reputation. After all, what could be worse for an ethnographer than to be fooled by one’s informants and collaborators? Over a period dating from 1983 to 2001, Freeman advanced different versions of how Mead was “hoaxed” into believing that Samoan girls were sexually permissive, ranging from his general observation that Mead may have been misled by Samoans (1983:289–290) to his unequivocal statement that Mead was “completely” and “grossly hoaxed” by the joking of two young women on a specific evening in 1926 (1997:68, 1999). Responding to critics of the hoaxing argument in *Current Anthropology*, Freeman reiterated his belief that Mead’s portrayal of adolescent sexuality could “only” have been the result of Samoan joking (2000a:621).

Freeman first published evidence of the alleged hoaxing in a commentary in the *American Anthropologist* (1989). He reported that as the result of an interview in 1987 with Fa’apua’a Fa’amū, an 86-year-old Samoan woman whom Freeman iden-

tified as Mead’s “principal Samoan informant” (1989:1017), there was now an explanation of how Mead came to believe that Samoan adolescent girls engaged in permissive sexual conduct.¹ In the interview, Fa’apua’a stated that she and her friend Fofoa had innocently joked with Mead when she asked what they did at night, not realizing that Mead sincerely believed what they said as the truth, and which she then published as fact in *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928).

For Freeman, the interview with Fa’apua’a was a personal revelation, far beyond anything that he had anticipated in his research on Mead. Here was a Samoan of high rank, a woman, Mead’s “principal informant,” her “closest” Samoan friend, and a living witness to Mead’s research over 60 years earlier testifying that Mead was not only mistaken about Samoan sexual conduct but that she and Fofoa were the source of Mead’s error (Freeman 1999:6,14). Indeed, Freeman believed that the day of the interview with Fa’apua’a was “the most significant day of his life” (Oxley 2006).

Moreover, Fa’apua’a swore on the Bible that her testimony was true and accurate; for Freeman, this was the kind of evidence that could be presented “in a court of law” (Freeman 1999:7). Her testimony shifted the focus of the controversy away from Samoa and toward the fieldwork competency of

Paul Shankman is Professor in the Department of Anthropology of the University of Colorado–Boulder (233 UCB, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A. [shankman@stripe.colorado.edu]). This paper was submitted 31 VIII 11, accepted 7 III 12, and electronically published 4 I 13.

1. Freeman has used Fa’apua’a’s familiar name—Fa’apua’a—rather than her full name—Fa’apua’a Fa’amū—in his writing about her, and I have followed his usage. For a description of how she received this name, see Freeman (1989:1018).

Mead herself. After two additional interviews with Fa'apua'a in 1988 and 1993, Freeman would argue with great authority and certainty that Mead was not only hoaxed but "fatefully hoaxed," that is, she was not simply a victim of a Samoan prank but also the victim of her limited experience in the field, her lack of knowledge of Samoan custom, and her prior beliefs about the role of culture in human behavior. As he stated in his second book on the controversy, *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead: A Historical Analysis of Her Samoan Research*, her hoaxing was "virtually inevitable" (1999:14). Freeman was even able to assign an exact date and place to the hoaxing—March 13, 1926, on the island of Ofu. He would conclude that "by patient and protracted historical research the truth of what happened on the island of Ofu in March 1926 has finally become known" (1999:15).

Beyond the narrow confines of academic scholarship, Freeman imagined a far-reaching revision of Western intellectual history due to the significance of the hoaxing. As he asserted:

We are here dealing with one of the most spectacular events of the intellectual history of the twentieth century. Margaret Mead, as we know, was grossly hoaxed by her Samoan informants, and Mead, in her turn, by convincing others of the "genuineness" of her account of Samoa, completely misinformed and misled virtually the entire anthropological establishment, as well as the intelligentsia at large. . . . That a Polynesian prank should have produced such a result in centers of higher learning throughout the Western world is deeply comic. But behind the comedy there is a chastening reality. It is now apparent that for decade after decade in countless textbooks, and in university and college lecture rooms throughout the Western world, students were misinformed about an issue of fundamental human importance, by professors who by placing credence in Mead's conclusion of 1928 had themselves become cognitively deluded. Never can giggly fibs have had such far-reaching consequences in the groves of Academe. (Freeman 1997:68)

These allegations about the hoaxing of Mead have been widely accepted both inside and outside of the academy. As one scholarly review of *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead* stated, "Freeman's enthralling study is a chilling exposé of self-deception in academia" (Hicks 1999:370). In this way, the sense of high drama that surrounded Fa'apua'a's testimony extended the life of the Mead-Freeman controversy, elevating Freeman's stature while further diminishing Mead's.

This article reviews Fa'apua'a's relationship with Mead, analyzes how the interviews were conducted, reported, and interpreted, and questions the fundamentals of the hoaxing argument. To summarize briefly, Freeman believed that Mead's exclusive reliance on Fa'apua'a and Fofoa as primary informants coupled with her lack of understanding of Samoan adolescent sexual conduct and Samoan joking led to her being hoaxed. However, an analysis of Mead's published work on Samoa and her field materials demonstrates that Fa'apua'a was not a primary informant for Mead nor was she an informant

on adolescent sex. More important, according to Fa'apua'a's actual testimony, Mead did not ask her about her own sexual conduct or the sexual conduct of adolescent girls. Nor did she provide Mead with information about the sexual conduct of adolescent girls. Where, then, is the evidence of Mead's hoaxing?

The Unpublished Interviews

In his description of the interviews with Fa'apua'a, Freeman praised her memory (1989:1020) and stated that the interviews as transcribed and translated were of "exceptional historical significance" in establishing the hoaxing of Mead (1999:ix). Yet only one brief section from the three interviews related to the hoaxing was ever published (Freeman 1989). That is, less than a page, from more than 140 handwritten pages of interview material with Fa'apua'a, has been available for review and analysis. For this reason, there has been no independent verification of Freeman's interpretation of their overall content by other scholars. Although there has been discussion of the one published section from the first interview by James Côté (1994, 2000c), Martin Orans (1996, 2000), Serge Tchekétoff (2001), and myself (Shankman 2009b), previously unexamined material from the first interview, as well as the other two interviews, suggests that much of what we thought we knew about this part of the Mead-Freeman controversy has been based on Freeman's misrepresentation of Fa'apua'a and her testimony.² In retrospect, had Freeman published or otherwise made available the entire first interview from 1987, the hoaxing argument might never have gained the widespread acceptability that it has.

To his credit, Freeman bequeathed his large archive, including the interviews from 1987, 1988, and 1993, to the Mandeville Special Collections at the Geisel Library of the University of California, San Diego. The archive also contains information on how the interviews were conducted.³ The cru-

2. Because Freeman had published what appeared to be the relevant section from the first interview, I assumed—mistakenly—that it was not necessary to examine all of the first interview. As it turned out, I should have examined it in its entirety because the first interview is crucial to understanding how Freeman misrepresented Fa'apua'a and misinterpreted her testimony.

3. The interviews with Fa'apua'a were supposed to provide crucial documentation for Freeman's hoaxing argument. Yet this kind of documentation cannot be taken for granted. Interviews and the interviewing process have received considerable attention in the literature on ethnographic method, including questions about the context in which interviews are conducted, the representativeness of informants and collaborators, structured versus unstructured interviews, and the effects of interviewer bias. In addition, there are the subtleties of paralanguage and nonverbal behavior by interviewers and informants that may be missing in the recorded document. The transcription and translation processes themselves may lead to a glossing of indigenous meanings, a smoothing out of discontinuities, and the attribution of coherence where there may be inconsistency. In the case of interviews about historical events, problems of individual memory and social memory are particularly relevant. During the process of interpretation, all of these issues deserve expli-

cial first interview was the result of a documentary film project on the Mead-Freeman controversy based on Freeman's book, *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth* (1983). This interview was conducted by a high-ranking Samoan official on the island of Ta'ū in American Samoa with Freeman and the film crew present. The excerpt from this interview that became the centerpiece of Freeman's argument on the alleged hoaxing appeared in the award-winning documentary film, *Margaret Mead and Samoa* (Heimans 1988), although a complete videotape of the interview is not in the Freeman archive.

The first interview itself was relatively brief, informal, and unstructured, consisting of only 13 questions and taking about 20 minutes. In the original translation, it ran about three and one-half legal-sized pages, typewritten and double-spaced. Leulu F. Va'a, then a lecturer in Samoan studies at the National University of Samoa in Western Samoa, was responsible for the original transcription and translation, although he had not been present at the interview himself. Leulu had received an MA in anthropology in 1986 from the Australian National University, where he was a student and colleague of Freeman; in a previous career, he had been a journalist in Samoa. Leulu would also conduct the second and third interviews with Fa'apua'a in 1988 and 1993, again on the island of Ta'ū. During these years, Leulu acquired the high Samoan title Unasa and became Unasa Leulu F. Va'a. Unasa received his PhD in anthropology from the Australian National University in 1996.

To better understand Freeman's interpretation of the first interview, in early 2011 I requested and received copies of the audiotape of it in Samoan, the original transcription of the audiotape in Samoan, the original translation in English, interviews with other Samoans, and other materials from the Mandeville Special Collections Library. I then had the audiotape and original transcription in Samoan independently translated by Allitasi Pouesi, a Samoan translator in California. For this article, I have used her translation, with the exception of the single previously published section from the first interview (Freeman 1989:1020), because it is somewhat more thorough than the original. The two translations are similar, and both are available in the online version of this article (see CA+ online supplements A and B).

Although I had not seen the first interview until 2011, I had previously accessed and used the second and third interviews with Fa'apua'a for my book on the controversy (Shankman 2009b). These interviews were much longer, far more structured, and more detailed than the first interview. Freeman himself handwrote the dozens of questions for them in English on legal-sized paper and provided them to Unasa

to administer on Ta'ū; Freeman was not present at the interviews. During these interviews, which took several hours each, Unasa translated Freeman's questions into Samoan for Fa'apua'a and wrote down her answers (mostly in English), as well as his own comments on the questionnaires.⁴ At the conclusion of each of these interviews, Fa'apua'a was given US\$100. The questions and answers were then sent to Freeman at his home in Canberra. No audiotape of these interviews is available in the Freeman archive, so I have used Unasa's original translations of them.

Who Was Fa'apua'a?

Margaret Mead did most of her fieldwork on Ta'ū, the largest of the three islands in the remote Manu'a group in American Samoa. She had arrived in the islands in late August 1925. After spending over 2 months on the main island of Tutuila, Mead moved to Ta'ū in November 1925 and met Fa'apua'a in January 1926. Fa'apua'a was slightly older than Mead and had recently been appointed a *taupou*, or ceremonial virgin, by Tufele Fa'atoia, a high-ranking chief who was also the district governor of Manu'a. Other high-ranking chiefs also had the prerogative of appointing *taupou*, but since the system of institutionalized virginity for the daughters of high-ranking chiefs was in marked decline, Fa'apua'a was the only *taupou* in all of the villages in the Manu'a group. At age 24, she was older than most *taupou*, who were often adolescent girls. Fa'apua'a was also somewhat unusual in that she was unmarried in her midtwenties; most Samoan women married by their early twenties. Her close friend, Fofoa, also slightly older than Mead, was unmarried as well.

In March 1926, about 6 months into her fieldwork, Mead planned a trip to Olosega and Ofu, small islands in the Manu'a group that she had not yet visited. At the last minute, Fa'apua'a and Fofoa asked to accompany her, and they became members of Mead's traveling party, a formal arrangement that was approved by Tufele Fa'atoia. During their 10 days together, the women often engaged in ceremonial activities. Mead was traveling as an honorary *taupou*, having been given this title by the mother of Tufele Fa'atoia. On the ceremonial occasions for which Mead was a *taupou*, Fa'apua'a and Fofoa acted as her talking chiefs or *tulāfale*, a very important and memorable role for them. They assisted Mead with ceremonial protocol, speech making, and ritual gift giving, as well as enjoying feasting and dancing. Although Fa'apua'a herself was an authentic *taupou* and the highest-ranking unmarried woman in the Manu'a group, on this trip she played a supporting role for Mead. It was during their travel to the island of Ofu, according to Freeman, that the alleged hoaxing occurred.

4. Freeman reported that in the second interview, "Fa'apua'a's statements were recorded verbatim in Samoan" (1999:6). However, both the second and third interviews were recorded mostly in English with some Samoan, and in these interviews some of her answers appear to be condensed versions of longer answers.

caution. For examples of the literature on interviews in ethnographic fieldwork, see Bernard (2002:203–279); Levy and Hollan (1998); Pelto (1970: 95–98); Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte (1999:121–164); Spradley (1979); and Weller (1998). On the problems with historical memory, see Berliner (2005) and Bourguignon (2005).

Fa'apua'a believed that she was Mead's principal Samoan informant. During the first interview, she described how she and Mead were like "real sisters" and that she was Mead's talking chief in their travels to Olosega and Ofu. Yet, at the time of the first interview in 1987, she did not fully comprehend that Mead's primary purpose in American Samoa was conducting research. Nor did she know that Mead authored two books on Samoa. Even decades after Mead's fieldwork, Fa'apua'a did not realize that Mead was an anthropologist and that she had written a best seller about Samoan adolescence. Fa'apua'a had not read *Coming of Age in Samoa* because, while literate in Samoan, she said that she did not read English. When informed by the interviewer during the first interview, "You should understand then that there are concerns with the book this woman wrote," she responded, "I didn't understand because after all I don't know the language."⁵

While they corresponded briefly after Mead left American Samoa in 1926, Fa'apua'a did not know what had become of Mead thereafter and did not know that she had died in 1978, although this was international news and Fa'apua'a was living in Hawaii at the time. She also did not know of Freeman's book, his critique of Mead, and the controversy that it had generated.⁶ It was in the context of the first interview that she learned of these things for the first time.

Like Fa'apua'a, Freeman also portrayed the Mead-Fa'apua'a relationship as being very close, noting that Fa'apua'a was Mead's "foremost friend" (1999:2), "the closest of all Margaret Mead's Samoan friends" (1999:6), and her "principal informant" (1999:117). Indeed, Freeman stated that Fa'apua'a's friendship with Mead was "by far the most momentous relationship of her young womanhood" (1999:5). Yet Fa'apua'a and Freeman did not seem to have been aware of how Mead herself viewed this relationship. In the acknowledgments for *Coming of Age in Samoa*, Fa'apua'a and Fofoa were listed among the many Samoans Mead had known in the islands who provided hospitality and assistance to her. While the two women were her traveling companions and talking chiefs for 10 days, this arrangement was at their request, not Mead's, and Mead regarded them as her "merry friends" rather than key sources of information (Orans 1996:96).

Orans carefully reviewed Mead's field materials in his examination of Fa'apua'a's role as a possible informant during Mead's fieldwork. He was unable to find a single statement attributable to Fa'apua'a in *Coming of Age*. Nor was he able to find a single piece of information, including information on sexual conduct, attributable to Fa'apua'a in Mead's field materials (1996:92). As a result, Orans concluded that, for

5. Interview 1, 1987, Derek Freeman Papers (MSS 522), Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego (hereafter interview 1), 3.

6. Interview 3, 1993, Derek Freeman Papers (MSS 522), Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego (hereafter interview 3), 23, 25.

Mead, Fa'apua'a appears to have been "no kind of informant" (1996:152).

In his review of Fa'apua'a's role in Mead's research, sociologist James Côté also asked why, if Fa'apua'a and Fofoa were so close to Mead and such important sources of information about adolescent sex, they received so little attention in *Coming of Age in Samoa* (2000b:579–580). In the book's chapters, Fa'apua'a was one of a number of Samoans described, receiving no special attention or recognition. The pseudonym that Mead used to protect Fa'apua'a's identity was Pana. In her book, Mead described Pana in the space of just four sentences; she was presented as a ceremonial virgin, part of the Samoan system of rank, with no reference to adolescent sex or sex of any kind (Mead 1928:52). Yet, even after Freeman became aware of her identity in *Coming of Age* and thus her relatively insignificant role in the book, he continued to refer to Fa'apua'a as Mead's "principal informant" (Freeman 1999:117).

Freeman pursued Fa'apua'a's relationship with Mead in the second interview, inquiring if she was Mead's closest Samoan friend and main informant, to which she replied, "Yes."⁷ Yet Fa'apua'a resided across the island from Mead during much of her fieldwork. Thus, when asked later in the same interview if she actually worked with Mead as an informant at Mead's residence, she replied, "Only once" (interview 2, 67). When asked what kinds of questions Mead posed to her on that occasion, Fa'apua'a said that she could not remember. Unasa, the interviewer, commented on the interview transcript that "Fa'amū gives the impression that she was not a good informant for Mead. If she did not know anything, she told Mak'erita [Mead] so, and encouraged her to ask others" (interview 2, 68).

The Context of Filming the First Interview

Over 60 years after the alleged hoaxing occurred, filmmaker Frank Heimans would record Fa'apua'a's testimony when he and Freeman were in American Samoa as part of a documentary film project on the Mead-Freeman controversy. Freeman and the filmmakers had not known that Fa'apua'a was alive before arriving in the islands, but the government official who was Heimans's contact in the islands made the connection. Galea'i Poumele, the Secretary for Samoan Affairs in the government of American Samoa and a high-ranking Samoan chief, had known of the controversy about Mead's Samoan research, had read Freeman's first book about Mead, and was quite critical of Mead. Poumele also knew that Fa'apua'a had been associated with Mead because, by sheer coincidence, he was the son of Fofoa, Fa'apua'a's close friend and supposed accomplice in the hoaxing. Fofoa had died decades earlier.

In September 1987, over a month before the actual inter-

7. Interview 2, 1988, Derek Freeman Papers (MSS 522), Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego (hereafter interview 2), 25.

view and apparently without the prior knowledge of Heimans or Freeman, Poumele contacted Fa'apua'a and asked her if she would be willing to participate in the film project (interview 3, 28). She agreed. When Freeman and the film crew arrived on Tutuila, they were informed by Poumele that he had "someone of importance" that he wanted them to meet (Freeman 1999:2). The next day, Freeman, the film crew, and Poumele flew to the island of Ta'u where Poumele was welcomed by Fa'apua'a, "who announced that she had something to say and would like to have it recorded on video so that all might know it" (Freeman 1999:2).

Poumele was responsible for conducting the interview with Fa'apua'a, and his views shaped the direction and tone of the interview. Prior to the interview, according to Freeman, Poumele had expressed his view that Mead's account of adolescent sexual conduct was "preposterous," believing that Mead had characterized his own mother, Fofoa, as a "nothing but a slut" (Freeman 1987:2, 4). During the interview, Poumele explained to Fa'apua'a that the purpose of the interview was to correct "the lies she [Mead] wrote in her book, lies that insult you all" (interview 1, 6).

When Did Fa'apua'a Become Aware That She Hoaxed Mead?

According to Freeman, after listening to Poumele's opinion of Mead and her alleged characterization of adolescent sex, Fa'apua'a "suddenly realized" that she was the source of the idea that Samoan girls were sexually active and felt that, as a devout Christian, she should make a "confession" of her wrongdoing, that is, a confession of her innocent lies to Mead. As he reported:

Fa'apua'a had made this confession, she later explained, because when she had been told by Galea'i Poumele and others about what Mead had written about premarital promiscuity in Samoa, she suddenly realized that Mead's faulty account must have originated in the prank that she and her friend Fofoa had played on her when they were with her on the island of Ofu in 1926. Innocuous though it seemed at the time, that prank, she had come to realize, had the unintended consequence of totally misleading a great many people about Samoa. And so she had decided to set the record straight. (1999:3)⁸

Freeman's account leaves the impression that it was Fa'apua'a's idea to put her testimony on film and that she was aware of its significance. Given the position that Fa'apua'a found herself in and given the information about Mead provided to her by Poumele, she may have sincerely felt that she was responsible for Mead's views—or what had been portrayed to her as Mead's views—and that she should acknowl-

8. According to Freeman, during the initial filming of the interview, Fa'apua'a's testimony about Mead's questions and her answers were so unexpected and startling that he let out an involuntary "yelp," and the sequence had to be reshot (Heimans 2001:85).

edge her role in the formation of these views. Yet, as we have seen, it was over a month earlier that Poumele had introduced this possibility to her, and during the interview Fa'apua'a was responding to questions from Poumele rather than initiating a confession.⁹ Moreover, in the 1993 interview, when asked specifically about whether she or Poumele had the idea of putting Fa'apua'a on film, she responded that it was his idea (interview 3, 27). Indeed, there is some question as to how well Fa'apua'a understood the rationale for the first interview since, at the conclusion of it, she did not seem to remember why it was taking place and asked Poumele who it was that wished to know about Mead in the 1920s (interview 1, 5).

The Question of Memory

Freeman and Unasa had been impressed with Fa'apua'a's "remarkable" memory. Despite being 86 years old at the time of the first interview, Freeman stated that she was "without question, *encore tres lucide*" (1989:1020). Yet there is evidence in that interview that her memory was not always accurate. For example, Fa'apua'a asked Poumele if Mead had returned to Samoa subsequent to her fieldwork in the 1920s. He responded that she had returned. Her memory apparently rekindled, Fa'apua'a replied that "Yes. She came back to Samoa recently. . . . She had aged. When she came back I saw that her looks had changed." Poumele then asked Fa'apua'a whether or not she had spoken to Mead during that brief visit in 1971. Her reply was, "No. I didn't speak to her because when she came over that time she didn't stay with me, but went to another family instead" (interview 1, 4). Yet Freeman independently reported that Fa'apua'a did not see or speak with Mead in American Samoa in 1971 because she was living in Hawaii at the time. "Fa'apua'a never saw Mead again after mid-1926" (Freeman 1989:1022).¹⁰

Fa'apua'a's memory was also unclear about the languages that she and Mead spoke during their conversations, and Fa'apua'a and Freeman offered differing accounts of Mead's language proficiency in Samoan and Fa'apua'a's proficiency in English. Although Freeman stated that Fa'apua'a "could speak English" based on his description of the first interview (Freeman 1989:1018), Fa'apua'a did not make this claim her-

9. From the interview transcript itself, it appears that Fa'apua'a did not initiate the discussion of her innocent jokes with Mead or "confess" to them. These discussions may have occurred prior to the interview or after it was over. Poumele had a separate conversation with her that was not recorded. Freeman has stated that he asked Fa'apua'a his own questions on the day of the first interview, but to my knowledge these questions and answers were not recorded (1989:1017). In the interview itself, Fa'apua'a simply refers to the jokes told as innocent lies, not recognizing them as a sin requiring confession or forgiveness. Nor does she seem to be apologetic about them.

10. In 1971 Fa'apua'a was living in Hawaii, as she had been since 1962. In Mead's account of her visit to American Samoa in 1971, she does not mention Fa'apua'a, although she does mention Andrew Napoleon and her favorite village on Tutuila (Mead 1972). Fa'apua'a periodically visited American Samoa while living in Hawaii, but did not permanently return to her home until 1979.

self. In the second interview, she said that she spoke to Mead in Samoan and English. When asked by Unasa, "How well could Makerita [Mead] speak the Samoan language?" she responded that "by March 1926, she was speaking it smartly" (interview 2, 23). Based on his own evaluation of Mead's Samoan language ability, Freeman confirmed that by March 1926, when the hoaxing allegedly occurred, Mead was "reasonably fluent" in Samoan (1999:139, 123, 125) and could work without a translator. Yet, when asked why Mead took her joking seriously, "could it be due to Makerita's inadequate knowledge of the Samoan language?" Fa'apua'a replied, "perhaps she could not understand well" (interview 2, 28).

Shortly after the 1988 interview, Fa'apua'a was contacted by *Geo* magazine for another interview in which she stated that Mead spoke little Samoan and that a translator was "always" used for their conversations (Gartenstein 1991:23). Pursuing this line of inquiry further in 1993, Unasa asked Fa'apua'a if Mead questioned Fa'apua'a and Fofoa in English or Samoan or both? Fa'apua'a responded that they were questioned in Samoan. He then asked if Fa'apua'a knew English well enough to speak it with Mead? Her answer was no, that she did not speak English, and that she "always" spoke to Mead in Samoan because Mead spoke Samoan well. When asked if there was anyone else present at the hoaxing besides Fa'apua'a, Fofoa, and Mead, Fa'apua'a replied that no one else was present (interview 3, 43).

In 1989, following the first and second interviews, George Stocking expressed skepticism about the reliability of Fa'apua'a's memory (Freeman 1999:12). Freeman responded by arranging for a third interview with her in 1993. After reconstructing a chronology of Mead's fieldwork through her papers in the Library of Congress, Freeman assembled a more detailed set of questions to pose to Fa'apua'a that would presumably lead to more systematic answers by her. After reviewing her answers from the third interview, Freeman felt that he had laid Stocking's concerns to rest. He wrote that in 1993 Unasa had found Fa'apua'a still "lucid" at age 92 and "still able to remember well" (Freeman 1999:13). But in this interview, as in the others, there is evidence that Fa'apua'a's memory was problematic. So, according to Unasa, in 1993 Fa'apua'a had forgotten that Mead had died, an event that she had learned of in 1987 and that she remembered in her 1988 interview. When Unasa reminded her of Mead's death once more, she expressed her sympathy as if just learning about it (interview 3, 6).

If Fa'apua'a's memories about Mead were sometimes inconsistent and/or inaccurate, so were her memories of Samoa in the 1920s. In the second and third interviews, Freeman posed questions to check the reliability of her memory of the 1920s, and after doing so he once again found that "there was quite substantial evidence that Fa'apua'a, in 1993, as in 1988, had substantially accurate memories of Manu'a in 1926" (1999:13). On a number of matters this was true, but on other matters her memory was not as reliable. For example, in 1988, Fa'apua'a was asked about a number of cultural

practices on Ta'u in 1926. When asked if elopement (*avaga*) occurred at that time, she responded that she had not heard of any cases, although it was the most common form of marriage (interview 2, 33a). Nor could she remember any specific cases of adultery, illegitimate children, rape, or Samoan boys surreptitiously visiting unmarried girls in their homes at night (*moetotolo*; interview 2, 33b, 34, 34b, 35–38). In notes to himself on the interviews, Freeman placed question marks concerning Fa'apua'a's answers on these subjects, probably because they were not in accord with what he knew about Samoa and Manu'a in the 1920s (interview 2, B). Regardless, Freeman continued to vouch for Fa'apua'a's "precise memories" and the "historical reliability" of her testimony (1999:12, 13).

Freeman also used Fa'apua'a's memories about the place and time of the alleged hoaxing to verify his own reconstruction of this event. He reported that the hoaxing took place on the island of Ofu on the evening of March 13, 1926. And he stated that this place and time were corroborated by Fa'apua'a's testimony. However, in the 1988 interview, Fa'apua'a provided information that was not consistent with Freeman's reconstruction. Unasa, using a question provided by Freeman, inquired:

Question: When and where was it that Makerita questioned [Fa'apua'a] Fa'amū about what she said other girls did at night?

Answer: She asked during ordinary conversation at Fitiuta. Fofoa was also there. (Interview 2, 29)

If Fa'apua'a's answer was correct, the alleged hoaxing could have not occurred on Ofu, because the village of Fitiuta is on the island of Ta'u, and because on March 13, 1926, the women were on Ofu. It is only later in the same interview that Fa'apua'a answered that the hoaxing occurred on the trip to Ofu. In the 1993 interview, after helpful assistance from Freeman's questions about the exact chronology and location of the hoaxing, Fa'apua'a was able to state that it had occurred in the evening on Ofu or during their travels between the closely linked islands of Ofu and Olosega (interview 3, 42).

In terms of the date of the hoaxing, Freeman hypothesized that it occurred on a single occasion on the evening of March 13, 1926, and structured his questions to Fa'apua'a around this hypothesis. When asked in 1988, "Did Makerita often ask Fa'amū (and the mother of Galea'i Poumele [Fofoa]) what they did after dark?" she replied, "No." In a follow-up question, she was asked about how often Mead questioned them about what they did at night. Fa'apua'a answered, "Not often" (interview 2, 30). These answers imply that the hoaxing might have occurred on a single occasion. Yet, in the first interview, Fa'apua'a had responded positively to a question about the "numerous times" Mead questioned them about what they did at night (Freeman 1999:3). And in the third interview, Fa'apua'a stated that she and Fofoa had joked with Mead over an "extended period" of time (interview 3, 43). In his notes

on the transcript of the third interview, Unasa wrote that "What Fa'apua'a is saying is that there is no one specific time when she and Fofoa misled Mead about Samoan sexual mores" (interview 3, 42). The *Samoa Times* subsequently published Unasa's view that the hoaxing may have occurred over a period of time rather than just once (Orans 1996:94), but Freeman did not mention this inconsistency in his publications on the alleged hoaxing.

The Key Excerpt from Fa'apua'a's Testimony

If the time, place, and language in which the alleged hoaxing took place were unclear in Freeman's argument, what of Fa'apua'a's testimony involving the hoaxing itself? At the outset of the first interview with Fa'apua'a, Poumele asked her a general question about what she remembered about Margaret Mead, to which she replied that Mead was good to her and that they were like "real sisters." She also remembered that Mead was a *taupou* in their traveling party, that Mead was reluctant to give gifts on ceremonial occasions even though as a *taupou* she was required to do so, and that Mead cried about the gifts that she had given away.

Poumele then inquired if Mead had asked about what she and Fofoa did at night and *if they joked* with her about this. These leading questions were part of the following exchange in what Freeman called the "key excerpt" from the interview:

Galea'i Poumele: Fa'amū, was there a day, a night, or an evening when the woman [i.e., Margaret Mead] questioned you about what you did at nights, and did you ever joke about this?

Fa'apua'a Fa'amū: Yes, we did; we said that we were out at nights with boys; she failed to realize we were just joking and must have been taken in by our pretences. Yes, she asked: "Where do you go?" And we replied, "We go out at nights!" "With whom?" she asked. Then your mother, Fofoa, and I would pinch each other and say: "We spend the nights with boys, yes, with boys!" She must have taken it seriously but I was only joking. As you know, Samoan girls are terrific liars when it comes to joking. But Margaret Mead accepted our trumped up stories as though they were true.

Galea'i Poumele: And the numerous times that she questioned you, were those the times the two of you continued to tell these untruths to Margaret Mead?

Fa'apua'a Fa'amū: Yes, we just fibbed and fibbed to her. (Freeman 1999:3)

This excerpt was so important to Freeman's hoaxing argument that he published it in a number of different venues (1989, 1991, 1999), and, as mentioned, it appeared on film in the documentary *Margaret Mead and Samoa* (Heimans 1988) as well as in the BBC documentary *Tales from the Jungle*:

Margaret Mead (Oxley 2006) and in *Heretic* (Williamson 1996), a play about the controversy. Along with the second and third interviews with Fa'apua'a, Freeman deemed this section of the first interview to be of such "exceptional historical significance" (1999:ix) that it "effectively solved" the question of how Mead got Samoa wrong (1999:14).

Freeman's interpretation of this excerpt focused on Fa'apua'a's general statement that she and Fofoa spent "the nights with boys," which he thought that Mead had interpreted to mean that Fa'apua'a and Fofoa themselves and "other young women of Manu'a were sexually promiscuous and out night after night, with a succession of different young men" (1989:1020). He therefore maintained that, "According to the sworn testimony of Fa'apua'a, Mead put to Fofoa and herself the preposterous proposition (so it seemed to them) that, despite the great emphasis on virginity in the *fa'aSamoa* [Samoan custom] and within the Christian church, unmarried Samoan girls were, *in secret*, sexually promiscuous" (2000b: 611). In other words, for Freeman, Mead had asked Fa'apua'a explicit questions about adolescent sexual conduct, and Fa'apua'a's answers referred directly to that conduct, leaving the impression that this was the essence of what Fa'apua'a had to say on the matter. Yet Poumele's general question to Fa'apua'a did not specifically refer to the sexual conduct of the two women in their midtwenties or the conduct of adolescent girls. And, for Poumele, his question and her answer were but a prologue to a longer, unpublished exchange that focused on the sexual activities of Fa'apua'a and Fofoa.

Did Mead Ask Fa'apua'a about Her Own Sexual Conduct?

After Fa'apua'a stated that she and Fofoa "fibbed and fibbed" to Mead, Poumele asked her to "go on." She replied, "What?" Poumele then told her to proceed with what she was saying in response to Mead's questions about what the two women did at night. Fa'apua'a continued with an extended discussion of Mead's role as a *taupou* and her reluctance to give gifts on ceremonial occasions—a topic that seemed to be of importance to her, given the amount of time she spent talking about it.

To direct the conversation towards sexual conduct and clarify what spending "the nights with boys" actually meant, Poumele's next question was more pointed and personal.

Question: Did Margaret Mead ask you both, my apologies . . . whether you had sex with boys at night?

Answer: Absolutely not.

Question: Nothing like that happened to you?

Answer: No. Nothing ever happened. Don't know about her [Mead], whether that happened to her. But for us, no.

Question: Nothing like what she is saying happened?

Answer: What did she say? That boys came over and slept with us?

Question: Slept with you and had sex with you.

Answer: Liar. [referring to Mead]. (Interview 1, 2–3)

In this exchange, when Fa'apua'a was asked directly if Mead inquired about whether the two women engaged in sex with boys, her answer was an emphatic "no." Freeman, in his publications on the hoaxing, simply omitted Poumele's questions about whether Fa'apua'a and Fofoa were sexually active, as well as Fa'apua'a's answers in the negative. In this exchange, Fa'apua'a also reminded Poumele that it would be impossible for Samoan boys to sleep with them because their families were always present and because, after visiting and dancing, the organization of unmarried women (*aualuma*) and the organization of untitled men (*'aumāga*) slept in a different locations. Fa'apua'a also wondered whether Mead engaged in sex with Samoan men, but then insisted that this too was impossible.

Near the end of the interview, as noted earlier, an exchange between Fa'apua'a and Poumele suggested her puzzlement and curiosity about the purpose of the interview and his questions. Even though Freeman had stated that it was Fa'apua'a who was interested in correcting Mead's supposed misunderstanding of Samoan sexual conduct, Fa'apua'a nevertheless asked Poumele what brought him to Ta'ū and who was asking questions about Mead in the 1920s? Poumele responded, "It is the professor [Freeman] who is writing a book to correct Margaret Mead's book. . . . He is trying to correct the lies that she wrote, lies that insult all of you" (1987:5).

This exchange continued:

Fa'apua'a: What did she say?

Poumele: She said that you went out at night, all night, every night.

Fa'apua'a: She is such a liar. No. We did no such thing.

Poumele: Maybe Mead was right when she said that you were always out?

Fa'apua'a: How can we always go out? In Samoan culture, it is considered a disgrace for someone like myself, who is a *taupou*, and Fofoa, who is a talking chief, to behave like that. We would show up only when the village *'aumāga* [the organization of untitled men] came over. We tell ourselves we had better behave. People would certainly talk and criticize us if we behaved in a way that would dishonor the village, because of the title I hold as a *taupou*. (Freeman 1987:6)

To be clear, Mead did not write in *Coming of Age* or elsewhere that the two women were sexually active and "out at night, all night, every night." Poumele, with Freeman present, misled Fa'apua'a about what Mead had written, in turn lead-

ing Fa'apua'a to believe that Mead had betrayed their friendship by making derogatory and insulting remarks about the two women's sexual conduct and about Samoan sexual conduct in general.

Although Fa'apua'a had been misled by Poumele, Freeman nevertheless assured readers that she had sworn on the Bible and signed a statement confirming that her answers to Poumele's questions in the first interview, as well as her answers to Freeman's questions in the second interview, were "true and correct in every way" (1989:1021). Fa'apua'a may have been genuinely sincere in her oath, but it is unclear how much of the first interview she actually remembered and could therefore reliably swear to, because the oath, administered by Unasa, was given almost 6 months after the first interview took place. The oath, authored by Freeman, who had remained in Canberra, and given to Fa'apua'a to sign on Ta'ū, was handwritten in English, a language that she said that she did not read.

Did Fa'apua'a Provide Mead with Information about Adolescent Sexual Permissiveness?

According to Freeman, the second and third interviews with Fa'apua'a provided further support for his hoaxing argument. At points in these later interviews, Fa'apu'a did reaffirm that she and Fofoa had innocently joked with Mead about what they did at night and that Mead had believed their innocent lies. But beyond these assertions, Fa'apua'a's memory of what they had said to Mead was either unclear or contradicted Freeman's interpretation of her earlier testimony.

To clarify the sexual activities of the two women and adolescent girls as well, Unasa posed the following questions from Freeman to Fa'apua'a in the 1988 interview:

Question: Did Makerita often ask [Fa'apua'a] Fa'amū (and the mother of Galea'i Poumele [Fofoa]) what they did after dark?

Answer: No. Told Makerita about *mua* of *'aumāga* to *aualuma* visitors. No sleeping together. Just dancing. [That is, she told Mead about how the organization of untitled men (*'aumāga*) and the organization of unmarried women (*aualuma*) would feast and dance into the evening after which they withdrew to separate sleeping quarters.]

Question: What are some of the things that Fa'amū told Makerita (Margaret Mead) when she asked her what the girls of T'aū did at night? (Please seek specific answers and record them in Samoan as necessary.)

Answer: Can't remember except *tau fa'alili* [lies that deliberately tease, mock, or provoke], mentioned before.¹¹

11. On *tau fa'alili*, see Freeman (1989:1021). Samoans distinguish between innocent lies (*tau fa'ase'e*) and lies that intentionally tease, mock,

Question: In her writings about Samoa, Makerita (i.e. Margaret Mead) stated that a Samoan girl (i.e. in T'aū in 1926), before she married, would make love with (i.e. copulate with) many different young men, staying out all night with each of them in turn before returning to her home at dawn. Did Fa'amū say anything like this to Makerita?

Answer: No. (Interview 2, 30–31)

In this section of the second interview, Fa'apua'a denied that she told Mead about sexual promiscuity among adolescent girls on Ta'ū. So, how did Freeman infer that Mead was hoaxed in response to questions that Fa'apua'a said were not directly asked of these women by Mead and by answers that, according to Fa'apua'a, she did not provide?

What If Fa'apua'a and Fofoa Had Hoaxed Mead?

Let us assume for the sake of argument that Fa'apua'a and Fofoa did tell Mead innocent jokes about their own sexual conduct and that of adolescent girls. For a hoaxing to have taken place, it is not sufficient for the two women to have perpetrated a hoax; it is also necessary for Mead to have found their innocent lies believable. Freeman reported that Fa'apua'a herself "realized that Mead had believed every word of their outlandish stories" (1999:142). However, Orans found no evidence that Mead had relied on their jokes or believed them in *Coming of Age in Samoa*, in her field materials, or in her personal correspondence with close friends back in the United States (1996:91). Freeman's argument rests on several assumptions about Mead's fieldwork, including that after more than 6 months in the islands, Mead knew so little about adolescent sexual conduct that she had to rely on Fa'apua'a and Fofoa for this knowledge; that she was fooled by their joking; that she ignored Fa'apua'a's status as a *taupou*; and that only the alleged hoaxing could explain Mead's interpretation of Samoan sexual conduct. However, Mead had already collected data from a number of adolescent girls and others prior to her trip to Ofu (Orans 1996:33–73), knew the requirements for becoming a *taupou*, and understood the nature of Samoan joking. None of Freeman's assumptions about her fieldwork were warranted.

Mead was well aware of the possibility that Samoans could present alternative versions of the truth. This became a work-

or provoke (*tau fa'alili*). At different times in the interviews, Fa'apua'a used both terms to describe her alleged jokes to Mead. Freeman himself argued that Fa'apua'a was only joking, harmlessly deflecting Mead's allegedly inappropriate questions rather than to deliberately misleading her. Thus, in his published version of the crucial segment of the first interview, Freeman translated the Samoan word *pepelo* as "fibs" rather than "lies" to indicate their "lighthearted" nature (1989:1021). However, Freeman's translator, Unasa, used the word "lies" rather than "fibs" in his original translation and stated to Freeman that both meanings were used by Fa'apua'a; Freeman has acknowledged that *pepelo* could also refer to "culpable lying" (Freeman 1989:1021–1022).

ing assumption of her fieldwork. As her field notes make clear, she knew about Samoan joking, including sexual jokes and "recreational lying" (Orans 1996:73; Freeman 1999:125). By March 1926, Mead had reached a point in her research where, according to Freeman, she spoke Samoan proficiently enough to work without an interpreter (1999:139). So it is unlikely that she would have consistently misinterpreted Fa'apua'a and Fofoa's jokes or that she would have accepted their very general answers ("We spend the nights with boys") as adequate testimony about their private lives from which she could then derive the details of Samoan adolescent sexual conduct that appeared in her book.

Given that Fa'apua'a was a *taupou*, Mead would have been hesitant to ask Fa'apua'a and Fofoa questions about their sexual activities, knowing that they would be considered offensive and inappropriate. Although the *taupou* system was in decline, those still appointed were required to be virgins; as Mead observed, their chastity was highly valued by the village as a whole, and they were carefully guarded.¹² Therefore, if Fa'apua'a had told Mead that she and other girls were sexually active, and if Mead had believed her, then Mead should have written in *Coming of Age* that ceremonial virgins engaged in premarital sex. Instead, Mead wrote that the entire village protected the virginity of the *taupou*, a statement with which Freeman agreed (Orans 1996:90). Moreover, Orans found no change in Mead's description of the chastity of the *taupou* in Mead's field notes before and after the alleged hoaxing took place (1996:97).

Although Freeman stated that Mead's information about sexual conduct could "be traced to no other source in Mead's fieldnotes" than Fa'apua'a and Fofoa (2000b:611), as noted earlier there is no information on sex from these two women in Mead's field notes. And again, according to Fa'apua'a herself, she provided no such information to Mead. The significance that Freeman gave to the one brief section of Fa'apua'a's testimony is undermined by the importance of the systematic data that Mead collected on 25 adolescent girls of whom over 40% were sexually active according to Mead (1928:282–294). Furthermore, there were other informants during Mead's fieldwork, including men, who were recog-

12. The decline of the *taupou* system was one of the most significant issues in the Mead-Freeman controversy, with Freeman contending that the system of institutionalized virginity was intact before, during, and after Mead's fieldwork in 1925–26. When I questioned this argument using historical sources (Shankman 1996), Freeman wrote a scathing rejoinder in the *American Anthropologist* entitled "All Made of Fantasy" (1998). However, further investigation into Freeman's own Samoan research in the early 1940s confirmed the decline of the *taupou* system. In Freeman's unpublished postgraduate diploma thesis for the London School of Economics, he stated that, "the *taupou* system has become virtually defunct in Western Samoa" (1948:245) and then described the reasons for its eclipse in some detail. The thesis has recently been published (Freeman 2006). On this issue and Freeman's omission of other relevant evidence in the controversy, see Shankman (1996, 1998, 2001, 2006, 2009a, 2009b:175–189).

nized by Mead as being valuable sources of information on the subject of sexual conduct.

Among the most important of these sources was Andrew Napoleon (later known as Napoleone A. Tuiteleapaga), a young schoolteacher who Freeman also knew to be a key source in providing Mead with extensive and graphic information in English on Samoan sexual conduct from a male perspective (Freeman 1999:123–128). Indeed, Mead had interviewed a man, possibly Napoleon, and had taken explicit interview notes on sexual conduct just days before her trip to Ofu in March 1926 (Freeman 1999:126–128; Orans 1996:49–52). In 1987, just prior to the first interview with Fa'apua'a, Napoleon was interviewed as part of the Heimans film project. In this lengthy and complex interview, he stated that he “truthfully” told Mead that he and other Samoan young men had a number of girlfriends (Napoleone A. Tuiteleapaga interview, 1987, Derek Freeman Papers [MSS 522], Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego, 1987, 37).

Given these other, more important sources of information on Samoan sexual conduct, Freeman's unqualified use of one brief section of Fa'apua'a's testimony is difficult to understand. As Orans observed from his examination of Freeman's sources of information on Samoan sexual conduct,

When one compares the data on sexuality that Mead had collected from sources other than Fa'apua'a and Fofoa with the paltry data to which Fa'apua'a testifies, it is evident that such humorous fibbing could not be the basis of Mead's understanding. Freeman asks us to imagine that the joking of two women, pinching each other as they put Mead on about their sexuality and that of adolescents, was of more significance than the detailed information she had collected throughout her fieldwork. (Orans 1996:99)

Evidence versus Interpretation

After examining the three interviews, it is apparent that the components of Freeman's hoaxing argument are deeply problematic, and this was the case from the first interview on.¹³ Fa'apua'a and Fofoa were not informants for Mead on Samoan sexual conduct, and there is no evidence in Mead's field materials on sex that can be attributed to these two women. The questions put to Fa'apua'a by Poumele and Freeman were sometimes leading, sometimes misleading, and sometimes inflammatory. At the time of the interviews, Fa'apua'a's memory was inaccurate on crucial points and inconsistent on others, including when and where the hoaxing took place and in what language it transpired. The most basic facts necessary for an accurate historical reconstruction are at best unclear and at worst contradictory.

13. In my book (Shankman 2009b:200), I stated that Freeman must have known about the problems in the interviews from the third interview in 1993 onward. After reviewing the 1987 interview, I would now say that he should have known of the problems at that time.

In terms of the hoaxing argument, Freeman selectively edited the interviews down to the single section that he used to support his interpretation. Although Poumele had encouraged Fa'apua'a to say that Mead had asked her and Fofoa about their sexual own activities and those of adolescent girls, Fa'apua'a denied that this occurred. Freeman omitted this part of her testimony and made it appear that Mead had asked Fa'apua'a these explicit questions and that Fa'apua'a's answers unequivocally supported the hoaxing argument. In addition, Freeman neglected Unasa's comments about Fa'apua'a's testimony that did not support his argument while including those that did.¹⁴ And he overlooked information on Samoan sexual conduct from Samoans, such as Napoleon and the sample of 25 adolescent girls who were Mead's primary informants on this subject and who did influence what she wrote in *Coming of Age in Samoa*.

To give credence to Freeman's interpretation of Fa'apua'a's testimony requires minimizing each of these problems and accepting Fa'apua'a's statement that the two women were out “at nights with boys” literally meant that the two women, as well as Samoan adolescent girls, “were sexually promiscuous, and were out night after night, with a succession of different men” (Freeman 1989:1020) while at the same time rejecting Fa'apua'a's denials that this is what she told Mead.

Nevertheless, as the controversy continued, Freeman placed increasing reliance on Fa'apua'a's testimony. She was his key witness, and he presented her as the authentic voice of Samoans who had been demeaned by Mead's allegedly false portrait of their lives. For Freeman, Fa'apua'a was a person of great dignity who spoke the truth about a mythic anthropologist that had been hidden for decades. In his words, she was “a lady of rank, who has come to occupy a unique position in the history of twentieth century anthropology” (1999:15). Freeman reinforced the centrality of Fa'apua'a's testimony not only in his publications but in the 1988 and 1993 interviews with Fa'apua'a herself. He reminded her of the impact of the innocent lies that she and Fofoa had allegedly told Mead for the world at large and encouraged her to think of her own newly found fame. Thus, Freeman prefaced

14. In a personal communication to Freeman, Unasa stated that Fa'apua'a and Fofoa had joked with and teased Mead in response to her embarrassing questions. Unasa concluded that “Mead was either too proud or too naive not to question further the authenticity of her informant's answers. But whether too proud or too naive, the result has been the same. She was already predisposed to believe what she heard. And her informants fed on her gullibility because having set the stage, Fa'apua'a continued to tell more lies in order to protect the first lie. I say this because of the background with which she provided me” (in Freeman 1989:1022). Subsequently Unasa supported Freeman's interpretation that Mead was hoaxed (2001), and since he translated the first interview and conducted the second and third interviews, his support for the hoaxing argument is noteworthy. Yet the interviews themselves raise a basic question. If Fa'apua'a had provided Mead with answers and information about adolescent promiscuity, why did she explicitly deny doing so in the interviews?

the third interview with Fa'apua'a with the following directions to Unasa:

Please impress on her how important a figure she has become, being known to many thousands of anthropologists throughout the world. The information that she can still provide is thus of the greatest importance. As a Christian, she has made full amends for the hoaxing of Mead in March, 1926. Please convey my *alofa*, my appreciation of her action in telling the truth about the hoaxing of Mead, as well as my very best wishes for her future. (Interview 3, 1)

It seems that Fa'apua'a had become a medium for Freeman's own views about Mead. He constructed a narrative about Mead's hoaxing and carefully culled her testimony for evidence to support it. The now obvious problems in conducting, reporting, and interpreting the interviews with Fa'apua'a were dismissed by Freeman as he continued to assure his audience about the accuracy of Fa'apua'a's memory, her role as Mead's principal informant, and the unassailable character of her sworn testimony about Mead. When Côté, Orans, and Tcherkézoff published their critiques of the hoaxing argument (Côté 1994:25–29, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c; Orans 1996:90–100, 2000; Tcherkézoff 2001), Freeman responded swiftly and sharply, while keeping the problems with Fa'apua'a's testimony to himself (2000a, 2000b, 2001). The interviews were filed away and, contemplating the significance of the hoaxing argument, he observed "that the 'youthful jollity' and 'wanton wiles' of two high-spirited young Samoan women could have led to such an outcome is one of the more bemusing marvels of twentieth century anthropology" (Freeman 1999:162).

Conclusion

The contrast between the lack of evidence for the hoaxing argument and the remarkable claims that Freeman made for it is striking. Recall that, according to Freeman, Mead was not merely hoaxed but "fatefully," "completely," and "grossly" hoaxed as the result of her youth, gullibility, lack of knowledge of Samoan culture, and her commitment to "absolute" cultural determinism. The evidence for hoaxing was so convincing, Freeman declared, that it could be presented "in a court of law." He had finally discovered, through patient scholarship, "the truth about what happened on Ofu." Fa'apua'a's testimony was of such "exceptional historical significance" that it "effectively solved" the problem of how Mead got Samoa wrong. For Freeman, "no sequence of events has had a greater effect on anthropology in the twentieth century" (1999:27).

Freeman did not hold Mead entirely responsible for the alleged hoaxing. He believed that she was "misled" by Samoans rather than consciously and intentionally misleading her readers. But Freeman did not acquit her either. He argued that while Mead was not a deliberate cheat, she was a foolish young woman who never realized the nature of her error. In

making the argument that Mead was the unwitting victim of her own inexperience and preconceptions rather than a conscious perpetrator of ethnographic fraud, Freeman saw himself as salvaging Mead's reputation from certain ruin. He was absolving her of being a charlatan by finding that she was "in a state of cognitive delusion" (1991:117), her "fateful hoaxing" the result of her own "self-deception." As he stated in an interview for the *New York Times*, "there isn't another example of such wholesale self-deception in the history of behavioral sciences" (McDowell 1990:213). This extension of the hoaxing argument was ingenious, but it assumed adequate support for the hoaxing argument in the first place, support that is missing in the interviews with Fa'apua'a.

If, as Freeman argued, *Coming of Age in Samoa* was a reflection of Mead's "self-deception," what of her little-known but highly regarded professional monograph, *Social Organization of Manu'a* (1930)? This ethnographic study for a scholarly audience provides an important window on Mead's field competence in Samoa and her theoretical sophistication.¹⁵ In his published work, Freeman paid scant attention to *Social Organization of Manu'a*, dismissing it in print (1972). In a private moment, though, he expressed admiration for Mead's ability to gather data on the complex subject of Samoan social organization and to present it clearly. As Theodore Schwartz, who worked with Mead on Manus during the 1950s and 1960s, recalled:

in 1993 I spent a pleasant morning with Derek Freeman at his home in Canberra and was astonished when he told me how greatly he admired Mead's other book on Samoa, *Social Organization [of] Manu'a*, to which he reacted as I had, wondering how she had learned so much in such a short time. He thought that must be what she was doing when she supposedly was studying Samoan adolescents. I asked him why he had not given the slightest indication in his "refutation" [of *Coming of Age in Samoa*] that there was anything in Mead's work on Samoa of which he approved. It never occurred to him, he said. (Schwartz 1999:56)

What of *Coming of Age in Samoa* itself? If Mead's portrayal of Samoa as a sexually permissive culture was not the result of hoaxing and self-deception, is there an alternative explanation? One plausible explanation is that Mead's interpretation of Samoan adolescence was the result of data that she collected from Samoan adolescent girls and from Samoan men and women, from her comparison of Samoa and America in the mid-1920s, and from the social agenda that she advocated given her own personal background and interests (Shankman 2009b). Contrary to Freeman's view, Mead was well aware of what she was doing and for whom she was writing. *Coming of Age*, a popular trade book, was replete with social commentary for a broad American audience; it was the first popular anthropological work of its kind. Mead and her publisher, William Morrow, knew that she was pushing the "limits of

15. On this important ethnographic work, see Shankman (2005).

permissibility” in her interpretation of Samoan sexual conduct, as their correspondence surrounding the book’s publication indicates (Shankman 2009b:101–115; Tiffany 2009: 184–189). As a result, her data, conclusions, and willingness to popularize have been open to criticism ever since its publication in 1928. Mead’s interest in reaching a wide swath of the American public gave *Coming of Age* its high profile and durability over many decades, as well as its vulnerability to criticism.

Based on an analysis of the three interviews with Fa’apua’a and our current knowledge about the relationship between Mead and Fa’apua’a, there is no compelling evidence that Mead was hoaxed. Freeman’s treatment of the interviews with Fa’apua’a was truly misleading. Employing systematically skewed evidence in tandem with exceptional claims about hoaxing, Freeman repeatedly misrepresented and misinterpreted Fa’apua’a’s testimony not simply to revise the ethnographic record but to damage Mead’s reputation in a deliberate and personal manner. He could have criticized Mead’s work, revised it, and improved our knowledge of Samoa without diminishing her abilities as an ethnographer, without the allegation of hoaxing, and without the attribution of self-deception. Regrettably, Freeman’s flawed caricature of Mead and her Samoan fieldwork has become conventional wisdom in many circles and, as a result, her reputation has been deeply if not irreparably damaged. And this is no joking matter.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the staff of the Mandeville Special Collections Library of the University of California, San Diego, for providing the interviews with Fa’apua’a and related materials in the Derek Freeman Papers (MSS 522). I would also like to thank Derek Freeman for encouraging me to visit his archive. I have benefited greatly from the work of Martin Orans and James Côté, two of the long-term participants in the Mead-Freeman controversy, and I appreciate their comments on an earlier version of this article; Anne Allison, Dennis McGilvray, and Unasa Leulu F. Va’a also provided valuable comments. Some of the arguments in the article have appeared in my earlier publications on the controversy (Shankman 2009a, 2009b). A version of this article was presented as the 2011 Distinguished Lecture in Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History.

Comments

James E. Côté

Department of Sociology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada (cote@uwo.ca). 16 VII 12

The Falsification of Evidence by Derek Freeman: Self-Deception or Fraud?

Professor Shankman has done the academic community a great service by exposing Freeman’s manipulative and selective release of information about the alleged hoaxing of Margaret Mead, a key component in what has been called one of the “great feuds” of all times in science (Hellman 1998).

My involvement in this controversy began while researching a book on the changing transition to adulthood in contemporary Western societies (Côté and Allahar 1994). Mead’s book was one of many pioneering texts in this field, so when I came upon Freeman’s virulent critique and the strong reactions it provoked, my interest was piqued. On the one hand, her general conclusions about the nonuniversality and cultural sources of “adolescent storm and stress” had been verified over the decades by studies carried out in anthropology, sociology, psychology, and psychiatry (Côté and Allahar 2006). On the other hand, Freeman’s dramatic claims about the far-reaching relevance for the history of social science of Mead’s portrayal of Samoan culture, especially the nature-nurture debate, appeared to be worthy of investigation.

As a sociologist, I had no particular investment in who was “right” in this anthropological fracas, and at first blush Freeman seemed to present some rather compelling arguments. However, as I examined the primary evidence for his claims I became increasingly skeptical about their merits. Subsequently, I took a fact-finding trip to Samoa, which among other things allowed me to assess some sociohistorical arguments Freeman had made based on archived government records.

The findings of these and other inquiries were subsequently published (Côté 1992, 1994). Suffice it to say that after sorting out the complex issues proposed by Freeman, I found little merit in many of his points of contention with Mead’s research, leaving me skeptical about his representation of other “facts,” like Mead’s supposed hoodwinking. My subsequent inquiries were stymied by a lack of access to Mead’s correspondence and the primary evidence of the events surrounding the “confessions” of Mead’s alleged hoaxer. Thanks to Catherine Bateson, I gained access to Mead’s archived correspondence, the contents of which cast further doubt on Freeman’s claims about the hoaxing (Côté 2000c, 2005). I made these letters, and other primary evidence, available online a decade ago (<http://sociology.uwo.ca/mead/>). Now, finally, Shankman has revealed the facts surrounding the interviewing of Mead’s putative primary informant and hoaxer, mercifully putting the matter to rest.

The remaining curiosity concerns why Freeman would retain evidence in his files that is so damning to a legacy that was apparently crucially important to him. My first reaction to Shankman’s exposé was to identify Freeman’s behavior as a clear case of academic fraud. However, it does not make sense that Freeman would leave a “smoking gun” in his files that would prove that he egregiously misrepresented the in-

interviews that supposedly proved his case. One explanation for this anomaly comes from a reading of Broad and Wade (1982), who argue that many of the cases of deceit in the history of science are more likely instances of self-deception than conscious dishonesty. They see the two as "extremes of a spectrum, the center of which is occupied by a range of actions in which the [researcher's] motives are ambiguous, even to himself [or herself]" (108). They further argue "scientists are not guided by logic and objectivity alone, but [can] also [be blinded] by such nonrational factors as rhetoric, propaganda, and personal prejudice" (9). It is thus ironic that Freeman charged that Mead had deceived herself and that all who believed her are "cognitively deluded," when he failed to objectively handle these interviews in question.

Broad and Wade also note that the nature-nurture debate in particular has been fertile ground for both fraud and self-deception because of the stakes involved: nature views appeal to conservatives because beliefs in innate abilities justify existing privilege, while nurture views are popular with liberals because of their beliefs in both the malleability of abilities and the lack of hereditarian justification for social privilege. In this light, there is little mystery as to why Freeman gained most of the support in his crusade against Mead from political conservatives wedded to genetic views of human nature (Côté 2000a). By using Mead and her popularized work in Samoa as a lightning rod for these strongly held beliefs, he was able to convince many intelligent people of implausible happenings, apparently because they really wanted to believe such things.

Broad and Wade also note that science has a tendency to expunge errors, even if it takes decades. With the efforts of Professor Shankman and others, Freeman's errors concerning a "fateful hoaxing" have finally been expunged. It remains to be seen how long it will take for Mead's reputation as an ethnographer to be restored.

Peter Hempenstall

School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Emeritus, University of Newcastle, NSW 2308, Australia (peter.hempenstall@canterbury.ac.nz). 18 VII 12

Paul Shankman runs two subtly connected arguments in his paper on the alleged hoaxing of Margaret Mead. The first, forensically assembling evidence against Freeman's claim, is well sustained. The confusions of an informant already in advanced old age, about events that occurred 60 years before, and the circumstances in which Freeman's questions were put to her are all evidence against Freeman's elation in his 1999 book that here was the "silver bullet" to prove Mead was duped by a pair of joking Samoan maidens into her false claims about adolescent sexual behavior among Samoans.

But for the historian weighing up the nature and quality of evidence, Shankman's equally confident conclusion that

there is a lack of evidence for the hoaxing is less than clear-cut. Questions can be asked about Shankman's use of interviews 20–30 years after they were taped and translated, and the motives with which he was undertaking their analysis. His caution in footnote 3 about the interviewing process applies equally to him. He seems to be relying at one point on condensed versions of longer answers (see n. 4). He is certainly looking for incriminating evidence against Freeman, rather than trying to strike a judicious balance between likely explanations. Part of that agenda is to destroy Fa'apua'a's credibility by undermining her belief that she was Mead's "foremost friend" and significant informant. Shankman presents Fa'apua'a and Fofoa in mere supporting roles to the great researcher as though Mead did not need her "merry friends" as her talking chiefs in ceremonial meetings with Samoan elites. If this was the case it strengthens the view that Mead did not fully understand the configuration of social hierarchies and precedence that governed such meetings. This is reinforced by Shankman's report of Mead's reluctance to give gifts on ceremonial occasions, and her crying.

It is clear that Fa'apua'a was responding to leading questions long after the events, and Freeman's weakness was his readiness to take everything that was said literally, a sign of his narrow positivism and his own driven mission. But the absence from Freeman's publications of Fa'apua'a's denials that she was sexually active with boys is not Shankman's "silver bullet" either. Is it not possible Fa'apua'a and Fofoa were joking about others' sexual activity while denying their own as *taupou* and talking chief? Shankman seems to know that Mead "would have been hesitant" to ask Fa'apua'a about sex because she was a *taupou*, but his presumption is not empirical evidence that Mead did not ask, especially if Fa'apua'a were closer to Mead than Shankman believes and Mead was unfamiliar with aspects of Samoan culture. Shankman tucks away the best counter to his arguments in footnote 11, where he concedes the support of Unasa Leulu Felise Va'a—who translated the first interview and conducted the second and third—for the hoaxing is "noteworthy": Unasa was best placed to read the tone, body language, and contexts of the interviews.

Shankman assumes there must be a 1:1 correspondence between things allegedly said or not said in conversations in 1926 and what Mead wrote in *Coming of Age*. But her book is not a tick-box approach to a multiple-choice test; rather, it is a synthesis of views and judgments where the ideas are more important than the exact weight of each individual testimony. We have no clear view of any of these interviews, and the same applies to Freeman, who was not present for two of them; they are a messy area of interpretation. Freeman placed too much reliance on the interviews in a high-stakes gamble to close off the Mead controversy—a Popperian farce about eliminating error.

Shankman's second argument is more openly partisan and ideological: that Freeman wanted to damage Mead "in a deliberate and personal manner." Shankman's last paragraphs

widen his interview analysis to suggest Freeman acted with malice aforethought. The language is more accusatory: Freeman was guilty of a “flawed caricature” of Mead, “systematically skewing” evidence. Freeman’s argument that the hoaxing of Mead ameliorated the blame attaching to her Samoan researches is regarded as insincere. Shankman’s approach has all the hallmarks of the “get Freeman” campaign, another building block in the assemblage of publications (Shankman’s are the most impressively consistent) to rehabilitate Mead and vilify Freeman. Freeman is far from an innocent victim. He compromised his later scholarly life by his obsession with Mead, and he was an intellectual bully in many ways, but he was sincere in admiration for Mead’s intellectual stature, the more so the older he became. His archive at UCSD comprises 70 linear feet, 188+ boxes of papers, 50% of which are not about Samoa. To make the claim that Freeman was bent on damaging Mead personally, without studying the comprehensive reach of Freeman’s papers, is as unwarranted as extrapolating from three messy documents that Freeman deliberately manipulated his evidence.

Herbert S. Lewis

Department of Anthropology, Emeritus, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, U.S.A. (hslewis@wisc.edu). 7 VIII 12

Whatever one may think of Margaret Mead’s research and writings—so extraordinary in their volume and variety—there is hardly any field of learning associated—rightly or wrongly—with one person the way American anthropology is with Margaret Mead. (The exception, of course, is physics and Albert Einstein.) Derek Freeman’s single-minded and long-lasting assault on her reputation could not fail to have an impact on the reputation of anthropology, and it is quite proper that so much effort has gone into the examination of Freeman’s case against Margaret Mead.

After Paul Shankman’s further demonstration here of how shoddy Freeman’s long campaign against Mead was, one would hope that fair-minded readers would no longer be able to credit Freeman, but he had considerable success convincing many in the intellectual and scholarly world that Mead had been bamboozled by teenage Samoan girls and in turn had flummoxed America’s reading public. As Shankman writes, “Regrettably, Freeman’s flawed caricature of Mead and her Samoan fieldwork has become conventional wisdom in many circles and, as a result, her reputation has been deeply if not irreparably damaged. And this is no joking matter”—especially because it reflects upon American anthropology as a whole. It is worth considering some of the reasons that so many were so willing to accept uncritically Freeman’s indictments of both Mead and “Boasian” anthropology.

As Shankman noted (2009b:206–210), Freeman’s line of attack gave sociobiologists, evolutionary psychologists, and

genetic determinists of all stripes a welcome cliché to use as a weapon in their cause. Shankman cites nonanthropologists Steven Pinker, David Buss, and Matt Ridley. Here is an example from “evolutionary psychologists” John Tooby (anthropologist) and Leda Cosmides (psychologist): “the professionally cultivated credulousness about claims of wonders in remote parts of the world, which has led anthropologists routinely to embrace, perpetuate, and defend not only gross errors (see Freeman 1983, on Mead and Samoa; Suggs 1971, on Linton and the Marquesas) but also obvious hoaxes (e.g., Casteneda’s UCLA dissertation on Don Juan; or the gentle ‘Tasaday,’ which were manufactured by officials of the Marcos regime)” (Tooby and Cosmides 1992:44).

While some anthropologists saw Freeman’s book as a useful tool for attacking cultural determinism and relativism that they considered unscientific (e.g., Appell 1984), it was also a timely fit for criticism from the intellectual right. Alan Bloom (1987) and Dinesh D’Souza (1995) were exercised by what they conceived of as the guilt of anthropologists as midwives and purveyors of cultural relativism, multiculturalism, and the celebration of diversity. D’Souza retells Freeman’s tale with relish (1995:149–151; see Klass 1990 on Bloom).

From the late 1960s anthropology was absorbing attacks from “the left” as well. In addition to the general accusation that anthropology developed as the child and handmaiden of colonialism (e.g., Gough 1968), there were several “scandals”: the unfortunate affair of the Tasaday, beginning in 1971 (Headland 1992), “the Great Kalahari Debate” (see Barnard 1992; Kuper 1993; Kurtz 1994; Wilmsen 1989), and, of course, much later, the Yanomamo case (Borofsky 1995; Dreger 2011). The first two involved critiques of anthropologists for their supposed naïveté and capture by the trope of “the noble savage,” but these debates were largely internal to the discipline; Derek Freeman’s sustained campaign had the greatest impact outside of anthropology. The unremitting attacks on anthropology from the 1970s, with the zestful participation of “critical theorist” and “posties” gave the impression that anthropologists were the gang that couldn’t think straight.

Despite the early fame it brought her, Samoa was but a minor moment in Margaret Mead’s long life in anthropology and her uncountable activities and achievements. She was always a (hyper)active participant at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association. In the 1960s alone, she took part in the 1961 symposium “Research on Conditions of Disarmament and Peace”; her paper in 1966 was titled “Cultural Anthropological Research and the Self-Image of Emerging Peoples”; in 1967, as Vietnam came on the agenda, she gave a talk on “Alternatives to War” for the massive symposium “Anthropology and War”; in New Orleans in 1969 she organized, with Edward Storey, an “Experimental Session: ‘Going Hungry’”—on “the problem of ‘going hungry’ in America”; she participated in an “Experimental Session on Women in the Professions,” with graduate students; and she submitted a resolution in support of UNESCO initiatives for the protection of the biosphere and for their

"efforts to include the social sciences within these expanded responsibilities for the conservation of the environment." In 1970, together with Philleo Nash and "Indian Discussants," she gave a paper in the "Symposium on Anthropology and the American Indian: Did Custer Die for *Our Sins*?" (see Lewis 2009).

Given Margaret Mead's role at the center of anthropological prominence and her amazing energy and range of concerns and abilities, it is not surprising that she should have been at the forefront of public debate on vital issues from the 1920s, when sexual behavior was on the agenda of public intellectuals, through the decades until her death in 1978. Margaret Mead, right or wrong, had more ideas in her than any other contemporary social scientist. Derek Freeman is remembered for but one.

Nancy McDowell

Department of Anthropology, Emeritus, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin 53511, U.S.A. (mcdowell@beloit.edu). 21 VIII 12

I vividly remember walking through Vermont woods in autumn with Rhoda Metraux, Margaret Mead's collaborator, companion, and literary executor, 2 years after Mead's death. We stopped to rest on a fallen log, and as she sat, Rhoda sighed and said, "I am tired of this Margaret Mead business." If Rhoda were alive today, she might say, "Why aren't you tired of this Derek Freeman business?"

Indeed, why aren't we? After more than 25 years, why does the controversy still matter?

There are, of course, no small number of anthropologists who are tired of, or indifferent to, the Mead-Freeman controversy. But for a variety of reasons, many continue to be engaged with it. Clearly for the people of Samoa, these questions matter very much; they have more than a significant stake in how they are portrayed. Researchers who work to understand Samoan history and culture must necessarily be concerned as well. Historical accuracy matters. "Were Samoans, or were they not . . .?" is not an easy question to answer, if there are answers at all.

The questions available to intellectual historians pertain to currents in twentieth-century Western thought. It is easy to dismiss Freeman's exaggeration that his work speaks to "one of the most spectacular events of the intellectual history of the twentieth century," but it is not easy to ignore the intellectual content of the debate as irrelevant. That Mead substantially influenced American public thinking during her lifetime is certain, and thus the questions extend beyond anthropology. For example, is the Mead-Freeman controversy a reappearance of the old nature/nurture debate, just another manifestation of the simplistic and naive dichotomy of biology "vs." culture? Is it perhaps a fascinating example of Australian versus American national allegiances (although the correlation is by no means perfect, there was a significant

division between who "sided" with Mead and who "sided" with Freeman)? The controversy is rich with such potential queries.

Many, if not most, of the questions raised by this controversy are central to theory and methodology in anthropology. The epistemological foundations of the discipline are being interrogated here. Shankman addresses many of these: What is the nature of "evidence?" How reliable is "memory," both the anthropologist's and the informant's? Can meticulous field, historical, and archival research to some extent alleviate the dangers of historical reconstruction? What is the nature and value of "interpretation?" In what ways and to what extent does context in field research matter? How might anthropological understandings of a people or culture increase (dare I say progress?) over time?¹⁶ These and related issues have bedeviled anthropology since its beginnings, and the example provided by the Mead-Freeman controversy may help us to further our understanding.

Margaret Mead was one of the dominant iconic figures in the United States during the middle part of the twentieth century, both as a public figure and as a leader within the discipline. She had a strong and powerful personality that attracted fiercely loyal adherents from a variety of settings. Mead was an especially powerful symbol for many women and feminists; her work had important meaning for them. Their allegiance to her provoked them to her defense, and their enduring concern with her reputation contributes to the continuing interest in Freeman's accusations.

And reputation matters here. Mead was a symbol for the discipline of anthropology in the public realm. Even today, her name recognition as an anthropologist continues to be strong. It was her clear intention to bring anthropology and its insights into public awareness; she wrote monographs for the general reader, wrote a column (with Rhoda Metraux) for *Redbook*, and gave public lectures on a wide variety of subjects. Disciplinary "purists" criticized her for doing so, often incorrectly implying that her sophistication in anthropological theory was minimal.¹⁷

The Mead-Freeman controversy remains vital because, for many, she is still identified with anthropology. In the eyes of the general public, tarnishing Mead's reputation tarnishes the discipline and questions not only its findings but also its applicability. The association is apparent for the baby boomers, but the tarnish lingers in later generations. At a time when an initiative to increase the presence of anthropology in public consciousness is seriously underway in the United States, we ought to evaluate and perhaps even redeem the

16. I wonder what the result might have been if Freeman had "built on those who went before," as Annette Weiner did in *Women of Value, Men of Renown* (1983), in which she counterposed and complemented the work of Malinowski.

17. Many ignore the fact that Mead wrote for both audiences, her anthropological peers as well as the general public. More technical works include *Social Organization of Manu'a* on Samoa (1930) and *Kinship in the Admiralty Islands* on Manus (1934).

woman who might be said to have initiated “public anthropology” in the first place.

Leasiolagi Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel

Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa,
To’omatagi, P.O. Box 7622 Apia, Samoa (m.meleisea@nus.edu.ws).
20 VII 12

Paul Shankman offers a fine forensic refutation of Derek Freeman’s assertions (1999) that Mead’s depiction of Samoan sexual mores (1928) was based on error, due to a hoax perpetrated by her key informants. As we have maintained since our sole published contribution to this debate (Schoeffel and Meleisea 1983), Mead’s data on female premarital sexual experience was probably accurate (see Orans 1996), but she was wrong to claim that adolescent female promiscuity was socially accepted in Samoa, and Freeman was equally wrong to insist that actual behavior reflected Samoan social values. Shankman exposes Freeman’s shameful manipulation of poor Fa’apua’a and his selective use of the material from interviews with her. He demonstrates Fa’apua’a was not among Mead’s primary informants. Shankman points out that Mead knew very well, as evidenced from her ethnography of Manu’a (1930), that virginity was mandatory for *taupou* such as Fa’apua’a and that girls of her rank were closely chaperoned. He shows how improbable it was that Mead could have fallen for Fa’apua’a and Fofoa’s hoax, supposing they ever actually attempted it.

What are we to make of the role of those elite Samoans who collaborated in Freeman’s project to refute *Coming of Age in Samoa* and to expose Mead as a dupe and a fool? In particular, Galea’i Poumele was instrumental in facilitating Freeman’s access to Fa’apua’a and encouraging her cooperation by telling her that Mead had published lies that insulted Samoan girls and women. Unasa, an academic anthropologist, assisted and upheld Freeman’s efforts to demolish Mead. Freeman’s Samoan associates provided indigenous validation and enabled him to present himself as not only a defender of scientific rigor in anthropology but also of Samoan’s and their culture and moral values. In fact, the few Samoans who know or care about the Mead-Freeman controversy, or have had anything to say about it, are much more likely to prefer Freeman’s account to Mead’s. This is quite understandable from an emic perspective. Since the eighteenth century the West has cherished romantic images of Polynesian sexuality (see Tcherkézoff 2004), and in 1928 Mead gave these preconceptions scholarly credence, depicting Samoa as a land devoid of sexual anxiety and inhibition (just as Robert Flaherty in 1926 had provided suggestive visual images for such notions in his carefully staged film *Moana*). However, Samoans are mostly discomfited by such perceptions. In the 1830s—almost a century before Mead went to Manu’a—they embarked on a cultural revolution based on nonconformist Protestant

Christianity, in which the pagan past came to be characterized as a “time of darkness.” Ancient norms of aristocratic virginity were gradually conflated with Christian doctrines of female purity, which enjoin premarital chastity upon all unmarried girls. For well over a century, Samoans have associated premarital female virginity with the honor and dignity of the family and community (see Meleisea 1995; Schoeffel 2011). Appearances matter; dissonance between ideals and realities is uncomfortable and is better not mentioned. It is therefore unsurprising that a number of Samoan leaders and intellectuals have encouraged and now endorse the explanation for Mead’s “lies”—that she fell for a well-known Samoan device of ridicule and mockery by deception; *tau fa’ase’e* and *tau fa’ailli*. Shankman’s exegesis is indeed a cautionary tale, and it is one we think reflects poorly on both Mead and Freeman. They both became victims of their own celebrity and never allowed a nuanced consideration of the evidence to stand in the way of an attention-getting analysis.

Virginia Yans

Department of History, Rutgers University, Van Dyck Hall, 16
Seminary Place, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901, U.S.A.
(virginianyans@earthlink.net). 15 VIII 12

Paul Shankman has successfully assailed Derek Freeman’s scientific credibility. In this essay and a previous book (2009b), Shankman shows Freeman manipulating evidence, misrepresenting quotations, and rigging interview questions. In 2011 Shankman consulted Fa’apua’a’s first testimony now housed in Freeman’s papers at the Mandeville Special Collections Library. Retrospectively, Shankman admits that he initially “mistakenly” assumed that it was “not necessary to examine” this entire interview; he trustfully assumed that “Freeman had published what appeared to be the relevant section” (see n. 2). While his critics are accused of leveling ad hominem attacks on Freeman, the man, in presenting the interview evidence, Shankman here attacks Freeman, the scientist.

It is the matter of evidence (used or not used) in the Mead-Freeman controversy that I, as an outside observer and historian, find not only disturbing (in Freeman’s case) but also puzzling (in the case of the otherwise vigilant Shankman). A fellow historian of anthropology and an anthropologist himself who was confirming my observation noted that ethnographers in the Mead-Freeman controversy have proven themselves “curiously inattentive” to relevant archival evidence.¹⁸

Shankman’s retrospective admission of his error in failing to verify a full interview suggests a larger pattern. Unlike Shankman, few ethnographers speaking authoritatively on the subject have consulted the voluminous archival evidence concerning Mead’s fieldwork. In 1983, already deeply immersed

18. Telephone conversation with Gerald Sullivan, August 11, 2012.

in Mead's huge Library of Congress archives, I was astonished, given the gravitas of his allegations concerning Mead's fieldwork, that Freeman did not consult her Samoan field notes, letters, and other documents contained there (Freeman 1983). Excepting Mead's daughter Mary Catherine Bateson and Lowell Holmes (1974, 1987), ethnographers on both sides of the controversy during its early stage failed to consult or show awareness of these unpublished written records.¹⁹ If referees recommending publication did mention Freeman's failure to consult the written records, that did not inhibit Harvard University Press from publishing the book and mounting an unprecedented publicity campaign.²⁰ A decade or later Martin Orans (1996), Freeman himself (1999:x), Sharon Tiffany (2009), and Shankman (2009b) recognized their importance, consulted, and wrote about them. This is no small matter. Consulting even portions of available evidence early on as Shankman later did could have altered the initial discussion. As Shankman's essay now reveals, Freeman's scientific credibility clearly merits scrutiny. How did this long-time "curious inattentiveness" come to pass?

Ethnographers conduct their research with living people in the field; they rely upon spoken, first-person accounts; generally, they are not concerned, as historians are, with what the dead have written or with correspondences between spoken and written words. Ethnographers are unfamiliar with "the archive," where one cannot simply "go to a file" labeled "Samoan field notes" and find everything relating to Mead's research. They do not relish, as historians do, rooting through vast, impossible to index files of an extraordinary archive such as Mead's Library of Congress collection. Ethnographers and historians value, use, interpret, prioritize, and perhaps even corroborate and evaluate evidence differently. Logical imperatives do not mandate these disciplinary distinctions or suggest the impossibility of corroborating truth claims and evidence produced in the field and in the archive. Habitual practice drives the differences. Anthropology's distinct methodology, fieldwork, privileges living persons and their words over archival, textual research. From the beginning of the Samoa controversy until now, that privileging has caused mischief allowing Freeman to continue sully Mead's research with impunity. It seems from what Shankman has now told us that the absence of due diligence to the archive inhibited the achievement and confirmation of accurate knowledge. Recently drawn back to the archives, Shankman found evidence waiting to inform him of something he simply had not imagined about the interviews: Freeman had without doubt very seriously misrepresented the evidence.

19. While the archives were not completely processed by 1983, much of it was, and Mary Catherine Bateson entertained legitimate scholarly requests to examine unprocessed materials.

20. The Bradd Shore review for Princeton University Press is mentioned as one of two positive reports in Caton (1990:282–283), where it is also excerpted; see also additional comments from Shore in Caton (1990:285–286) explaining why he recommended publication of Freeman's book excerpted from the *American Anthropologist* (1987).

A number of ironies appear. While others have reacted to Freeman's criticisms by defending Mead's methods and findings, arguing that she was "mostly right" and attempting to correct Freeman's misconceptions of Boasian and cultural anthropology, Shankman bids us in another direction: Freeman's version of Fa'apua'a's recorded words finally uncover Freeman's strategic irresponsibility. Donating many of his papers including the three interview transcripts to the Mandeville archive, Freeman himself understood that the written record, historians of science, and history would be his final judge. His bequest reveals his alleged dedication to open, responsible scientific discourse. But the evidence he donated, much of it created by himself, proves Freeman's own failure to follow the ethics of scientific investigation and reporting. And he failed to fulfill a necessary requirement for any behavioral scientist: critical, reflexive examination of himself as an investigator. Ad hominem charges are no longer needed: Freeman has become a damning witness against himself.

Reply

I want to thank the seven scholars for their thoughtful comments on my article and, more broadly, on the Mead-Freeman controversy. All of the commentators agree that Fa'apua'a's testimony in the first interview—the crucial evidence for *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead*—falsifies Freeman's hoaxing argument. However, there is a difference of opinion about what this means and what it says about Freeman. For most, Freeman's hoaxing argument was the result of "shoddy" scholarship (Lewis), the "selective release of information" (Côté), and a "failure to follow the ethics of scientific investigation and reporting" (Yans), as well as the "shameful manipulation" of Fa'apua'a (Meleisea and Schoeffel). However, for historian Peter Hemenstall, the hoaxing argument is a "messy area of interpretation." Since Hemenstall offers a critical perspective on my article and a conjectural argument for the hoaxing of Mead, I would like to address his concerns in some detail.

Hemenstall notes that while my argument against Freeman's claim of hoaxing is "well sustained," the argument that there is "a lack of evidence for the hoaxing is less than clear-cut." According to him, this is due to my questionable use of the interviews with Fa'apua'a and my motives, which Hemenstall deems to be "partisan and ideological." He maintains that it is necessary "to strike a judicious balance between likely explanations," because "We have no clear view of any of these interviews. . . ." Here Hemenstall is inviting us to enter the realm of possibility in which there may be someone, possibly Fa'apua'a herself, who may have hoaxed Mead, although not in the manner that Freeman presented as definitive historical evidence.

Hemenstall concedes a lack of evidence for Freeman's

version of the hoaxing, noting that Freeman took “everything that was said [by Fa’apua’a] literally.” The problem, though, is not simply that Freeman took one small section from one of the interviews literally, but rather that he *omitted* virtually all of her other relevant responses in the three interviews, including her immediate denial in the first interview that she told Mead that she and Fofoa had sex with boys. It was only by this omission that Freeman could advance his argument. Figuratively speaking, he put words in Fa’apua’a’s mouth. Had he presented the next section of the interview, the hoaxing argument would not have been credible. This is not a “messy area of interpretation” but rather a matter of Freeman’s clear misrepresentation of Fa’apua’a’s testimony, a point the Mel-eisea, Schoeffel, Yans, and Côté underscore.

Hempenstall also asks, “Is it not possible [that] Fa’apua’a and Fofoa were joking about others’ sexual activity while denying their own as *taupou* and talking chief?” In the second interview, Freeman anticipated this question by specifically asking Fa’apua’a about the sexual activities of adolescent girls, as I document in my article. Fa’apua’a replied that the two Samoan women did not discuss the sexual conduct of adolescent girls with Mead, testimony that Freeman again omitted. So, from Fa’apua’a’s own testimony it is not possible to argue that they were joking about others’ sexual activity.

Is it possible there is evidence for the hoaxing argument elsewhere? Here Hempenstall cites Freeman’s Samoan translator/interviewer, Unasa, as supporting the hoaxing argument. Yet Unasa did not always agree with Freeman. As I noted my book and article, it was Unasa who, on the interview transcripts, commented that, contrary to Freeman, Fa’apua’a gave “the impression that she was not a good informant for Mead”; he also noted that Fa’apua’a stated that the hoaxing did not take place at a single time, again contradicting Freeman (Shankman 2009b:199). So Unasa, while agreeing with parts of Freeman’s hoaxing argument (Unasa 2001), also noted testimony from Fa’apua’a that contradicts Freeman.

Since Unasa was Freeman’s translator/interviewer, and because he is a colleague and friend, in March 2012 I sent him a copy of my article in manuscript form and asked him for his opinion. Due to professional commitments, he was not able to respond in the manner he would have liked. He is certainly welcome to do so at any time. The questions that I raised remain. Why should credence be given to the argument that Mead asked Fa’apua’a about adolescent sex if, as Fa’apua’a testified, she did not do so? And if Fa’apua’a was not an informant on Samoan sexual conduct, as Mead’s field materials indicate, why should we believe that she hoaxed Mead?

Hempenstall cautions that I may have used condensed answers by Fa’apua’a and that such usage is methodologically suspect. The condensations were Unasa’s, not mine. To avoid this potential problem in the translation of the first interview, I had it independently translated from the original audiotape, and I used excerpts from it in the article because it was somewhat more complete than Unasa’s earlier translation. Both

translations are part of the electronic version of this article for those readers who wish to compare them (see CA+ online supplements A and B).

Hempenstall also contends that I am for “looking for incriminating evidence against Freeman, rather than trying to strike a judicious balance between likely explanations.” As a likely explanation for hoaxing, Hempenstall suggests that Fa’apua’a was a more significant informant for Mead than I allow, even though Fa’apua’a provided conflicting testimony on this point, even though Unasa commented that Fa’apua’a herself gave the impression that she was not a good informant for Mead, and even though there is no mention of Fa’apua’a as an informant in Mead’s field notes. These lines of evidence make the argument for a “judicious balance between likely explanations” implausible.

Nevertheless, Hempenstall believes that Mead needed Fa’apua’a and Fofoa as “talking chiefs in ceremonial meetings with Samoan elites. If this was the case it strengthens the view that Mead did not fully understand the configuration of social hierarchies and precedence that governed such meetings.” Where is Hempenstall’s evidence for such an argument? Some years ago, Martin Orans (1996:90–100) explicitly addressed this question using Mead’s own field notes. He noted that Fa’apua’a and Fofoa invited themselves on a 10-day excursion with Mead; she did not invite them. Mead noted that they “came tumbling into my room and announced they were going with me; I decided that would be expensive but pleasant” (Orans 1996:95). So who needed whom?

Mead wrote that Fa’apua’a and Fofoa were her “talking chiefs, functionally speaking. They made all the speeches, accepted and dispersed, gifts, etc. For this I bought them each three new dresses” (in Orans 1996:95–96). She went on to describe their role on her trip without ever referring to them as informants or their possible contributions to her research, although she did mention that “I found a most excellently old and wise man and got all that I wanted” (Orans 1996:95). Mead’s one reference to meetings with chiefly elites on this trip notes that one evening in the village of Sili, her “gracious hosts killed a pig for us and the whole tiny village made merry, while the high chiefs told me anecdotes, illustrated of the days of cannibalism, and a most gaunt and pitiful madman who believes he is [chief] Tufele danced and sang for us” (Orans 1996:95). Orans quoted Mead at length about this trip to disabuse people of the notion that Fa’apua’a and Fofoa were anything more than Mead’s “merry friends,” stating that Mead regarded Fa’apua’a as “no kind of informant” (Orans 1996:152).

Hempenstall also writes that I reported that Mead was reluctant to give gifts on ceremonial occasions on the trip and that she cried when doing so, reinforcing his argument about her alleged lack of understanding of Samoan elites. This is what Fa’apua’a herself reported in the first interview, not what I reported. Mead knew in advance that the trip would be, in her words, “expensive but pleasant,” and she did not complain about such expenses in her field notes. Indeed, she wrote that

the trip was enjoyable for both her and the two women. As for Mead's understanding of Samoan elites, her solid scholarship on this subject is easily demonstrated in her major ethnographic work, *Social Organization of Manu'a* (1930).

Hempenstall's suggestion that there may be information somewhere indicating that Mead was somehow hoaxed neglects the best available evidence from Fa'apua'a and Mead. As for his belief that I am part of the "get Freeman" campaign and that I have sought to "vilify" him, Hempenstall knows better. In his review of my book he states that I presented an "interesting and honest" account of my relationship to Freeman (2010:283). Indeed, Hempenstall's own portrayal of Freeman is hardly flattering, characterizing him as "crusading, morally puritanical and Popper-obsessed." He writes that Freeman was "his own worst enemy" and "an intellectual bully in many ways." And he links Freeman's personality to his critique of Mead, observing that Freeman had an "obsession with Mead" and that he "ruined his later life with this obsession" (2010:284). We do not know whether Freeman's critique of Mead was the result of self-deception as Côté suggests or intellectual dishonesty as some suspect. We may never know. At this point it does not matter; the outcome for Mead's reputation has been the same.

There can be little doubt that, contrary to Hempenstall, Freeman's critique of Mead was "deliberate and personal." Freeman carefully selected evidence to support his hoaxing argument. How else can Hempenstall explain Freeman's choice of a single section from over 100 pages of Fa'apua'a's testimony in support of the hoaxing of Mead coupled with his neglect of the rest of her testimony? Are we to believe that this was somehow inadvertent or accidental? Moreover, from the beginning of the controversy, Freeman clearly understood the consequences of his critique for Mead's reputation. Prior to the publication of *Margaret Mead and Samoa* (1983), he stated that her reputation would descend at the rate of a "falling body" (32 feet per second squared) and that he "may have written a book that will create the greatest denouement in the history of anthropology so far, not excepting Piltdown man" (Howard 1983:67). After the publication of *Margaret Mead and Samoa*, he stated that, "There isn't another example of such wholesale self-deception in the history of the behavioral sciences" (McDowell 1990:213) and, after the publication on the hoaxing argument, he determined that Mead was in a "chronic state of cognitive delusion" (Freeman 1991:117). Moreover, in his private conversations with me in Canberra in 1984, Freeman disparaged Mead openly and often, including his belief that she was a woman of questionable morality, an allegation that he reiterated in print. So, yes, Freeman trashed Mead's reputation in a deliberate and personal manner.

As Lewis, McDowell, Côté, and Yans note, Freeman also damaged the reputation of anthropology. Indeed, he offered his critique of Mead in the name of anthropology, science, and the Samoan people. None of these causes were well served by Freeman's flawed scholarship. Nevertheless, 3 decades after

the controversy began, Freeman's arguments are still widely believed, embraced, and repeated in the world outside of anthropology. To understand the harm he has done, one need only search the Internet using Margaret Mead in combination with the words hoax, fraud, liar, and scandal. Although Freeman's hoaxing argument has collapsed in light of the interviews with Fa'apua'a and other evidence, its consequences for the reputations of Mead and anthropology continue to be felt. At the same time, many people have tired of the controversy and moved on to other, more current issues. This is understandable and perhaps inevitable. But it does not diminish the significance of the evidence from these interviews or lessen Freeman's responsibility for the misuse of this evidence.

—Paul Shankman

References Cited

- Appell, George N. 1984. Freeman's refutation of Mead's *Coming of age in Samoa*: the implication for anthropological inquiry. *Eastern Anthropology* 37:183–214. [HSL]
- Barnard, Alan. 1992. *The Kalahari debate: a bibliographical essay*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. [HSL]
- Berliner, David. 2005. The abuses of memory: reflections on the memory boom in anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly* 78(1):197–211.
- Bernard, H. Russell. 2002. *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster. [HSL]
- Borofsky, Robert 1995. *Yanomami: The fierce controversy and what we can learn from it*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [HSL]
- Bourguignon, Erika. 2005. Holocaust, exile, and the return of the suppressed. *Anthropological Quarterly* 78(1):63–88.
- Broad, William, and Nicholas Wade. 1982. *Betrayers of the truth: fraud and deceit in the halls of science*. New York: Simon & Schuster. [JEC]
- Caton, Hiram, ed. 1990. *The Samoa reader: anthropologists take stock*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America. [VY]
- Côté, James E. 1992. Was Mead wrong about coming of age in Samoa? an analysis of the Mead/Freeman controversy for scholars of adolescence and human development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 21:499–527. [JEC]
- . 1994. *Adolescent storm and stress: an evaluation of the Mead-Freeman controversy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- . 2000a. The implausibility of Freeman's hoaxing hypothesis: an update. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 29(5):575–585.
- . 2000b. The Mead-Freeman controversy in review. In *Special issue: the Mead-Freeman controversy in review*. James E. Côté, ed. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 29(5):525–538.
- . 2000c. Was *Coming of age in Samoa* based on a "fateful hoaxing"? a close look at Freeman's claim based on the Mead-Boas correspondence. *Current Anthropology* 41(4):617–620.
- . 2005. The correspondence associated with Mead's Samoa research: what does it really tell us? *Pacific Studies* 28:60–73. [JEC]
- Côté, James E., and Anton Allahar. 1994. *Generation on hold: coming of age in the late twentieth century*. Toronto: Stoddart. [JEC]
- . 2006. *Critical youth studies: a Canadian focus*. Toronto: Pearson. [JEC]
- Dreger, Alice. 2011. *Darkness's* descent on the American Anthropological Association: a cautionary tale. *Human Nature* 22(3):225–246. [HSL]
- D'Souza, Dinesh. 1995. *The end of racism: principles for a multiracial society*. New York: Free Press. [HSL]
- Freeman, Derek. 1948. The social organization of a Samoan village community. Postgraduate diploma thesis in anthropology, London School of Economics.
- . 1972. *Social organization of Manu'a* by Margaret Mead: some errata. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 81:70–78.
- . 1983. *Margaret Mead and Samoa: the making and unmaking of an anthropological myth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1987. Notes on an interview with Galea'i Pomele by Frank Heimans, November 13, 1987, interview 3, 1993:1–6, Derek Freeman Papers (MSS)

- 522), Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.
- . 1989. Fa'apua'a Fa'amū and Margaret Mead. *American Anthropologist* 91(4):1017–1022.
- . 1991. There's tricks 'r th' world: an historical analysis of the Samoan researches of Margaret Mead. *Visual Anthropology Review* 7(1):103–128.
- . 1996. *Margaret Mead and the heretic: the making and unmaking of an anthropological myth*. Ringwood, Australia: Penguin.
- . 1997. Paradigms in collision: Margaret Mead's mistake and what it has done to anthropology. *Skeptic* 5(3):66–73.
- . 1998. "All made of fantasy": a rejoinder to Paul Shankman. *American Anthropologist* 100(4):972–977.
- . 1999. *The fateful hoaxing of Margaret Mead: a historical analysis of her Samoan research*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- . 2000a. Reply. *Current Anthropology* 41(4):620–622.
- . 2000b. Was Margaret Mead misled or did she mislead on Samoa? *Current Anthropology* 41(4):609–614.
- . 2001. Words have no words for words that are not true: a rejoinder to Serge Tchekézoff. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 110(3):301–312.
- . 2006. *The social structure of a Samoan village community*. Peter Hempenstall, ed. Canberra: Target Oceania.
- Gartenstein, Larry. 1991. Sex, lies, Margaret Mead, and Samoa. *Geo* 13(2):16–23.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1968. Anthropology and imperialism. *Monthly Review* 19:12–27. [HSL]
- Headland, Thomas. 1992. *The Tasaday controversy: assessing the evidence*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association. [HSL]
- Heimans, Frank. 1988. *Margaret Mead and Samoa*. Cinetel documentary film. Recorded interview with Derek Freeman, February 12, 2001, Oral History section, National Library of Australia, Canberra.
- . 2001. Recorded interview with Derek Freeman, February 1, 2001. Transcript, Oral History section, National Library of Australia, Canberra.
- Hellman, Hal. 1998. *Great feuds in science: ten of the liveliest disputes ever*. New York: Wiley. [JEC]
- Hempenstall, Peter. 2010. Review of *The fateful hoaxing of Margaret Mead* by Paul Shankman. *Journal of Pacific History* 45(2):283–284.
- Hicks, David. 1999. Review of *The fateful hoaxing of Margaret Mead: a historical analysis of her Samoan research* by Derek Freeman. *Quarterly Review of Biology* 74(3):369–370.
- Holmes, Lowell D. 1987. *Quest for the real Samoa: the Mead/Freeman controversy and beyond*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey. [VY]
- . 1974. *Samoan village*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. [VY]
- Howard, Jane. 1983. Angry storm over the south seas of Margaret Mead. *Smithsonian* 14(1):66–75.
- Klass, Morton. 1990. The closing of the "bazaar of cultures": anthropology as scapegoat. *Education and Urban Society* 22(4):356–363. [HSL]
- Kuper, Adam. 1993. Post-modernism, Cambridge and the great Kalahari debate. *Social Anthropology* 1:57–71. [HSL]
- Kurtz, Donald V. 1994. Winnowing the "great Kalahari debate": its impact on hunter-gatherer studies. *Political and Legal Anthropological Review* 17(1):67–80. [HSL]
- Levy, Robert I., and Douglas W. Hollan. 1998. Person-centered interviewing and observation. In *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. H. Russell Bernard, ed. Pp. 333–364. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Lewis, Herbert S. 2009. The radical transformation of anthropology: history seen through the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, 1955–2005. In *Histories of anthropology annual*, no. 5. Pp. 200–228. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. [HSL]
- McDowell, Edwin. 1990. New Samoa book challenges Margaret Mead's conclusions. In *The Samoa reader*. Hiram Caton, ed. Pp. 211–213. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Mead, Margaret. 1928. *Coming of age in Samoa*. New York: Morrow.
- . 1930. *Social organization of Manu'a*. In *Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin*, vol. 76. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- . 1934. *Kinship in the Admiralty Islands*. In *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. 34, pt. 2. New York: American Museum of Natural History. [NM]
- . 1972. Return to Samoa. *Redbook* 139(3):29–34.
- Meleisea, Malama. 1995. "To whom gods and men crowded": chieftainship and hierarchy in ancient Samoa. In *Tonga and Samoa: images of gender and polity*. J. Huntsman, ed. Pp. 19–34. Christchurch, NZ: Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies. [LMM/PS]
- Orans, Martin. 1996. *Not even wrong: Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp.
- . 2000. Hoaxing, polemics, and science. *Current Anthropology* 41(4):615–616.
- Oxley, Peter. 2006. *Tales from the jungle: Margaret Mead*. Documentary film. London: British Broadcasting System.
- Pelto, Perti. 1970. *Anthropological research: the structure of inquiry*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schensul, Stephen L., Jean L. Schensul, and Margaret D. LeCompte. 1999. *Essential ethnographic methods: observations, interviews, and questionnaires*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Schoeffel, Penelope. 2011. Sexual morality in Samoa and its historical transformations. In *Sexualities in anthropology*. A. P. and D. H. Lyons, eds. Pp. 222–231. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell. (First published in *A Polymath Anthropologist: Essays in Honour of Ann Chowning*. Claudia Gross, Harriet D. Lyons, and Dorothy Ayers Counts, eds. Pp. 63–69. Auckland: Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland.) [LMM/PS]
- Schoeffel, Penelope, and Malama Meleisea. 1983. Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman and Samoa. *Canberra Anthropology* 6(1):58–69. [LMM/PS]
- Schwartz, Theodore. 1999. Residues of a career: reflections on anthropological knowledge. *Ethos* 27(1):54–61.
- Shankman, Paul. 1996. The history of Samoan sexual conduct and the Mead-Freeman controversy. *American Anthropologist* 98(3):555–567.
- . 1998. All things considered: a reply to Derek Freeman. *American Anthropologist* 100(4):977–979.
- . 2001. Interethnic unions and the regulation of sex in colonial Samoa, 1830–1945. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 110(2):119–147.
- . 2005. Margaret Mead's other Samoa: rereading *Social organization of Manu'a*. *Pacific Studies* 28(3/4):46–59.
- . 2006. Virginity and veracity: rereading historical sources in the Mead-Freeman controversy. *Ethnohistory* 53(3):479–506.
- . 2009a. Derek Freeman and Margaret Mead: what did he know and when did he know it? In *The gang of four: Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Reo Fortune, and Margaret Mead in multiple contexts*. Gerald Sullivan and Sharon Tiffany, eds. *Pacific Studies* 32(2/3):202–221.
- . 2009b. *The trashing of Margaret Mead: anatomy of an anthropological controversy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Suggs, R. C. 1971. Sex and personality in the Marquesas: a discussion of the Linton-Kardiner report. In *Human sexual behavior*. D. S. Marshall and R. C. Suggs, eds. Pp. 163–186. New York: Basic. [HSL]
- Tchekézoff, Serge. 2001. Is anthropology about individual agency or culture? or why "Old Derek" is doubly wrong. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 110(1):59–78.
- . 2004. *First contacts in Polynesia: the Samoan case (1722–1848), western misunderstandings about sexuality and divinity*. Canberra: Journal of Pacific History and the Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies. [LMM/PS]
- Tiffany, Sharon W. 2009. Narrative, voice, and genre in Margaret Mead's *Coming of age in Samoa*. In *The gang of four: Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Reo Fortune, and Margaret Mead in multiple contexts*. Gerald Sullivan and Sharon Tiffany, eds. *Pacific Studies* 32(2/3):163–201.
- Tooby, John, and Lisa Cosmides. 1992. The psychological foundations of culture. In *The adapted mind: evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. J. Barkow, Lisa Cosmides, and John Tooby, eds. Pp. 19–136. New York: Oxford University Press. [HSL]
- Unasa Leulu F. Va'a. 2001. The Mead-Freeman debate in retrospect. Unpublished manuscript, Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa, Apia, Samoa.
- Weiner, Annette. 1983. *Women of value, men of renown*. Austin: University of Texas Press. [NM]
- Weller, Susan C. 1998. Structured interviewing and questionnaire construction. In *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*. H. Russell Bernard, ed. Pp. 365–409. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Williamson, David. 1996. *Heretic: based on the life of Derek Freeman*. Melbourne: Penguin.
- Wilmsen, Edwin N. 1989. *Land filled with flies: a political economy of the Kalahari*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [HSL]