Anthony F. C. Wallace created a corpus of anthropological work remarkable not only for its quality and quantity but for the breadth of scholarly interest it reflects. From Rorschach-based modal personality studies to cultural revitalization movements, from Native American communities to small towns in Pennsylvania during the Industrial Revolution, from cognitive mazeway re-synthesis to the institutional and cultural matrix of technological innovation, Wallace helped to chart the course of American cultural anthropology for more than five decades.

Wallace began his higher education in 1941 at Lebanon Valley College, in Pennsylvania, but enlisted in the army the following year and returned after his World War II service to earn a B.A. in history (1947) and an M.A. (1949) and Ph.D. (1950) in anthropology from the University of Pennsylvania. He spent his entire career in association, in one way or another, with the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. He was not only an educator but a skillful administrator, serving as director of clinical research at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute (1960-61) and then as chair of Penn’s Anthropology Department (1961-71). He also founded the long-lived Ethnohistory Program at the university.

Born in Toronto, Ontario, on April 15, 1923, Anthony Francis Clark Wallace—Tony, to his friends and colleagues—grew up in the small town of Annville, Pennsylvania, and became an American citizen. His father, Paul A. W. Wallace, taught English literature at nearby Lebanon Valley College, where he pursued research interests initially in French-Canadian folklore and then, later, in the oral literature of the Iroquois and Delaware Indians. The latter research pointed the scholarly pathway along which young Tony would embark. Tony noted that his father, who studied Latin and Greek as well as French and German, was fond of quoting Matthew Arnold. Intriguingly, it was Arnold’s view of culture—what anthropologists came to think of as “high culture”—that formed
the foil against which the development of the culture concept within anthropology would take shape. The latter concept is the one the younger Tony adopted in his subsequent research.

Tony also regarded his mother, who was British, as an important influence, though her primary fascination was with Egyptian antiquities. Her own father would visit India, where, according to Tony, he served as agent for a cotton manufacturer. Is it a coincidence that Tony later studied an American cotton-mill town, examining its transformation in the 19th century through the introduction of machinery. The book arising from that study, *Rockdale: The Growth of an American Village in the Early Industrial Revolution*, was not published until much later (1978), but it also reflected a major interest Tony had in the relationship between innovation and culture. His three essays on invention during the early industrial revolution were assembled as a book and published just four years later under the title: *The Social Context of Innovation* (1982).

Tony’s post-secondary education began in 1941 at Lebanon Valley College, where his father was a professor. After completing the first semester of his second year, he interrupted his education by enlisting in the army. Tony’s war years are vividly recounted in his final book manuscript, *Exploring the Boundaries of Kinship: A Scholar’s Journey in the World of War*. The manuscript, which remains unpublished as of this writing, reflects Tony’s own awareness of the role his family played in his scholarly trajectory, as well as the influence of the great world events unfolding around him during his lifetime—not only World War II, but also the Cold War and atomic era, McCarthyism, and the Vietnam War.

Tony underwent basic training, but was then selected for the Army Specialized Training Program at the University of Cincinnati, where he studied electrical engineering for one year. Later assigned to the 14th Armored Division, he landed in southern France in October 1944, seven months before the end of the war in Europe. Tony formed part of a radio crew, traveling together in a half-track vehicle as the division worked its way through Alsace. They crossed over into Germany about a month before the war’s end. The numerous experiences Tony had at that time, especially his exposure to the concentration camp at Dachau, informed his later attention to war as a topic for study.

After the war, Tony did not return to Lebanon Valley College but enrolled instead at the University of Pennsylvania, where he received his B.A. in history in 1947. That same year he published his first scholarly article, “Woman, Land, and Society: Three Aspects of Aboriginal Delaware Life,” simultaneously beginning graduate training in the
Department of Anthropology at Penn. Tony notes that he was inspired to pursue anthropology after reading James George Frazer’s *The Golden Bough*.

At the time Tony began his graduate studies, the Penn anthropology program had nearly collapsed—the North American ethnologist Frank Gouldsmith Speck was the sole remaining faculty member. The department quickly rebuilt, however, with A. Irving Hallowell returning from Northwestern University and Ward Goodenough, a freshly minted Ph.D., coming from Yale. Loren Eiseley was brought in from Oberlin College to assume the role of department chair (Kopytoff, 2006:33-34). Tony’s main mentors were Speck and Hallowell.

In a 1980 biographical memoir of Hallowell, Tony recognized the scholarly lineage of which Hallowell and he were part, a lineage going back to the enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant. The line had undergone significant revision as it passed through the neo-Kantians in Germany under whom Franz Boas—regarded by many as the father of American cultural anthropology—had studied. Speck in turn had been a student of Boas at Columbia, though his degree came from Penn. And Hallowell had been a student of Speck.

Tony opined that Boas had generalized the “Kantian view of epistemology to include a concern with the way in which the ‘genius of a people’ determines their perception of the material world, of the cultural repertoire presented to them for acceptance by their neighbors, and even of themselves.” Tony concluded that Hallowell, and thus by implication he himself, “carried forward the investigation of one of the great problems of epistemology and of the philosophy of science” (Wallace, 1980:201). As much as Tony’s interests in Native America can be traced to his biological father, therefore, they evidently also owe much to his academic parents at Penn.
Tony received his M.A. in 1949, with a thesis entitled: A Psychocultural Analysis of the Life of Teedyuscung, a Delaware Indian, 1700-1763. The thesis was published that same year under the title King of the Delawares. In it Tony examined the life and times of Teedyuscung, a man caught up in the great transformation wrought on his community by European settlers. In Tony’s words, Teedyuscung “is a man who tried to bridge in one lifetime the cleft between two worlds—the white man’s world and the Indian’s world; and he died an alien to both” (Wallace, 1949:1-2). Published when Tony was just 26 years old, the book contains the germs of his later fascination with the interrelationship between culture and psychological processes, no doubt stimulated by his mentor, Hallowell.

After completing his M.A. work, Tony began to experiment with psychological testing as a way to explore the relationship between culture and personality. He earned a Ph.D. in 1950 with a dissertation entitled: The Modal Personality Structure of the Tuscarora Indians: As Revealed by the Rorschach Test, which was published two years later as Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 150.

**Culture and personality**

Tony’s Ph.D. research properly belongs together with a longer phase of post-doc work in which he combined psychological methods with ethnographic and ethnohistorical approaches to explore issues of culture and personality, continuity and change. As part of his modal personality research, he administered Rorschach tests to 103 Tuscarora individuals. He ended up using 70 in his study, employing the 21 scoring categories commonly used at the time. This enabled him to select the 26 individual records that constituted the “modal type” —modal in the mathematical sense of the most commonly occurring values in a set of numerical values, as distinguished from the mean or median.

Importantly, in this work he was aware of the broad range of variation among the Tuscarora. Setting his own investigations in the context of the national character studies prominent at the time, Tony appreciated the significance of variation for the culture concept: “Culture can be regarded as a constitution of recipes for behavior…which are taught and learned on various levels of awareness; not all of the individuals in any society know all these recipes; and many of the recipes are alternative to one another” (Wallace, 1952:61-62). While recognizing such variation, he pressed onward with his characterization of the modal personality type.

---

1 Cora Du Bois (1944) had already used the term “modal personality” in her book, *The People of Alor*, but Wallace gave it a more empirical, statistical meaning.
Once he established the type, his question became: What did the mode indicate? Was it evidence of the continuity of culture, even though the Tuscarora at the time were nearly indistinguishable, in outward appearance, from the surrounding white society in the Niagara Falls area they inhabited? Hallowell had conducted similar Rorschach tests among the Ojibwa across the border in Canada. Tony compared the results, finding significant differences. He took these differences to be evidence of the influence of culture on modal personality. He was aware, however, that the differences might not be due to factors stemming from the aboriginal cultures of the two groups, or not solely to those factors. He concludes: “It may be suggested as possible that the differences… are a function…of differing levels of acculturation” (Wallace, 1952:109)—that is, of cultural transformation, one of his lifelong interests.

While he was still an undergraduate at Penn, Tony and his wife, Betty, née Shillott, celebrated the arrival of their first son, Anthony. Betty was an accomplished pianist and supported the family by giving lessons throughout Tony’s student days. A second son, Daniel, was born around the time Tony was completing his Ph.D. Tony

The ‘saucer’ diagram of modal personality and its variation among the Tuscarora from Wallace’s Rorschach study.

Wallace with Dan Smith and Nellie Gansworth at recording session during Tuscarora research in 1948.
(Anthony F. C. Wallace Papers, American Philosophical Society.)
immediately received job offers from the University of Wisconsin and Yale but turned them down to stay in the Philadelphia area.

The decision to remain in Philadelphia meant that he had to find a way to support himself and his family. Already while a graduate student he had been an instructor at Bryn Mawr. After receiving his doctorate he held a series of temporary positions at Penn, and then in 1955 he became senior research associate at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, an association that continued until 1980, just before its closure. From 1955 until 1960, he was simultaneously at the institute and also visiting associate professor in the Department of Anthropology at Penn. In 1960 he was appointed director of clinical research at the institute, but gave up that position a year later to join the faculty at Penn full time as professor of anthropology and department chair.

The 1950s proved to be a time of remarkable ferment for Tony, during which he produced a stream of papers charting the course for much of his later work. Many of these articles are ethnographic and ethnohistorical, dealing with eastern woodland Native American cultures. Among them, particularly noteworthy was “Handsome Lake and the Great Revival in the West,” which appeared in 1952 and was the precursor to his widely known book, The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca, published 18 years later. Another early breakthrough piece during the era was his 1956 article “Mazeway Resynthesis: A Biocultural Theory of Religious Inspiration,” along with its 1957 companion piece, “Mazeway Disintegration.” These articles formed the basis for his subsequent thinking about religion and revitalization movements.

The 1950s also brought the Cold War era, as the threat of nuclear disaster grew. During this period, the National Academy of Sciences sought to know whether large cities, as potential targets for nuclear attack, could be evacuated, and, if not, what disaster preparedness measures might they take. William Fenton, an anthropologist and Iroquois specialist, headed a committee to study the matter. Fenton asked Tony to join the committee. One of Tony’s tasks was to look at the aftereffects of a tornado that had struck Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1953. The report he produced in 1956, “Tornado in Worcester: An Exploratory Study of Individual and Community Behavior in an Extreme Situation,” was in some respects the precursor to his widely known community studies Rockdale and St. Clair.

A final major paper from this period, co-authored with colleague and mathematical anthropologist John Atkins, was “The Meaning of Kinship Terms” (Wallace and Atkins, 1960). Tony argued for a distinction between “structural” and “psychological” adequacy
of formal analyses of kinship terminologies. His insights here would lead him later to propose a method for investigating psychological adequacy by studying how people actually talk about kin relations (Wallace, 1970a). He found that they do so, in the case of contemporary America, using a relational rather than, or in addition to, a class logic.

An offshoot of this work was his critique of the “cultural account” of American kinship proposed by David Schneider (see Wallace, 1969). Though other specialists largely ignored the critique, it contained original insights concerning, among other matters, the ambiguous role of cousins in American kinship reckoning—are they more like siblings or more like potential mates with whom one can flirt? More widespread recognition of this ambiguity might have brought together the study of American kinship with that of cross-cousin marriage systems around the world. Tony would come back to kinship during his final years, pondering its connection to war.

An appropriate closing date for this period of intellectual ferment is 1961, when Tony’s synthetic book, *Culture and Personality*, was published. This was the same year he also assumed the Anthropology Department chair. In the book he explained the concept of the “mazeway,” which “may be compared to a map of a gigantic maze, with an elaborate key or legend and many insets” (Wallace, 1961:16). The map would represent “goals and pitfalls,” “the ‘self’ and other objects,” and “plans, processes, or techniques” (Wallace, 1961:16). This mazeway can become disorganized or may disintegrate. And it can be resynthesized, and can, indeed, lead to cultural revitalization.

The book also encapsulated Tony’s view of society, which could be looked upon, he suggested, from two different points of view: in terms of the “replication of uniformity” and in terms of the “organization of difference.” He had already recognized both aspects in his Ph.D. dissertation on the results of Tuscarora Rorschach testing, where the modal personality reflected the former, but the simultaneous wide variation in test results reflected the latter. Tony made clear in this gem of a book that we should be as interested in cognitive “non-sharing” as we are in sharing. His view of culture in many ways anticipated the critiques of cultural essentialism that developed in the field two decades later.

There is much in this little volume to recommend it to modern-day readers, including his discussion of the co-evolution of culture and the human brain; his discussion of cultural change, with the insight that some societies are following a trajectory in which “the inevitable consequence of the uninterrupted operation of their own internal laws” is their demise (Wallace, 1961:157); his view that culture can not only induce neurosis but can also play a therapeutic role; and much more.
Religion and revitalization

During the next phase in Tony’s long career, religion came progressively into focus, along with its role in enabling cultural revitalization. It was, for him, a period of consolidation rather than ferment and also one in which his role as administrator surged to the fore with his decade-long chairmanship of the Anthropology Department. Family changes occurred at this time as well. At around age 40, Tony and Betty began to adopt children, eventually augmenting their biological nuclear family by four.

Perhaps his major defining work of this period was *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca*, originally published in 1970. Tony’s core intellectual insights had already been forged in papers from the 1950s. Indeed, *Death and Rebirth* is in many ways an ethnographic and historical elaboration of those papers. “Rebirth” now becomes the word used for the “mazeway resynthesis” described in Tony’s 1956 paper. And the person around whom rebirth takes place is Handsome Lake, the same Iroquois prophet from upstate New York whose visions and founding of a new religion formed the basis for Tony’s 1952 paper, as well as the 1956 piece.

Intriguingly, the word “mazeway” is nowhere to be found in this book, with the exception of the title of the 1956 paper in the bibliography. Why? The answer would appear to lie in the audience Tony imagined for the book. *Death and Rebirth* brought the technical ideas and findings of the earlier period to a much broader readership. The book opens with an ethnographic account of the contemporary Handsome Lake Followers who live today mainly in New York State, and in Quebec and Ontario, Canada. Part I recounts the heyday of the Iroquois during the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Handsome Lake was born in 1735, at the end of that heyday and at the onset of cultural decline.
The decline is documented in Part II, the last chapter title of which evokes its content: “Slums in the Wilderness.” The Iroquois were demoralized and dispirited. The scene is set for Part III, the “renaissance” of the Iroquois. It begins in 1799 as “Handsome Lake lay on his bunk, bound in sickness,” fearing death. It recounts his visions and the teachings that gave rise to the Code of Handsome Lake, along with a new religion.

The expansion of Tony’s intended audience can be detected in this dejargonized, evocative prose:

> No longer do the old gray houses stand among the patchwork of pale green fields and dark green forest... No longer do the flies buzz in the long grass down on the flats, or the elms and walnut trees wave softly in the wind that flows gently down from the hills. But the words of Handsome Lake still resound in the longhouses, for as the prophet said, ‘Gaiwiio (the Good Message) is only in its beginning (Wallace, 1970b:337).

The imagined readership can be detected as well in the overall structure of the book. This is a story of redemption, a story in many ways iconic of broadly Christian and western literary themes. This iconicity perhaps contributed to its popular appeal.

The expansion of audience was, in some respects, congruent with the growth Tony’s family underwent. Perhaps more significantly, it reflected the intellectual procreativity in which Tony engaged through the mentoring of M.A. and Ph.D. students. Among the early and prominent ones was Raymond D. Fogelson, who had been initially attracted to Penn by the work of Hallowell. Fogelson finished his Ph.D. under the “dual generation pattern” of mentorship of Hallowell and Tony (Darnell, 2006:5). As Fogelson was one of my own principal mentors at the University of Chicago, I feel justified in considering myself Tony’s “grandstudent.”

Fogelson received his M.A. in anthropology in 1958 and his Ph.D. in 1962. Tony had only a handful of co-authors during his long career, and Fogelson was one of them. Together they published a piece on “Culture and Personality” in 1962, and then a research paper on “The Identity Struggle” in 1965 in which they examined the relationship between the “real identity, ideal identity, feared identity, and claimed identity” (Wallace and Fogelson, 1965:380). Thanks to his many years on the anthropology faculty

---

2 Between 1955 and 1990, the years when Tony was actively engaged with Penn graduate students, the Penn library has records for 214 Department of Anthropology theses and dissertations. Tony is listed as a committee member on 23 of those and as principal supervisor on another 11, for a total of 34. He also worked with students from other departments, including Folklore, History, and American Civilization.
at the University of Chicago, Fogelson proved an important purveyor of Tony’s thinking and research as he trained generations of North Americanist ethnohistorians.

The middle phase of this period in Tony’s intellectual life also saw the publication of a perhaps lesser-known work of his, Religion: An Anthropological View. The book deals with ideas about religion, and, hence, would seem to contradict the proposition that Tony was endeavoring, during this generative phase of his career, to reach wider audiences with his writings. In fact, however, a case can be made that it was actually a re-worked version of a course on the Anthropology of Religion. During the early 1960s and up to the 1966-67 academic year, Tony taught “Primitive Religion,” which covered the subject matter of a considerable portion of this book. In the same period, he also taught a course entitled “Revitalization Movements,” material also covered in the Religion book, which was published in 1966. Tony placed ritual at the core of religion, employing classification schemes to distinguish different constituents and types of ritual. His central argument is that religion reflects a human instinct to “increase the organization of cognition and perception” (Wallace, 1966:39). One can see here echoes of his insight regarding mazeways stemming from the 1950s.

While engaged in intellectual procreativity, Tony was also, during much of this period, serving as Department of Anthropology chair. He was the spearhead behind the creation of a new academic wing of the University’s Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, where the department is housed today. Indeed, my office is next to his old corner office on the 5th floor. Given Tony’s enormous contributions to scholarship, his role as administrator can easily be overlooked.

Francis E. Johnston, who had been a graduate student in anthropology at the time of Tony’s tenure as chair, and who in the 1980s himself became chair of the department, described Tony’s leadership style:

Tony is one of those people who has always handled things with as minimum fuss as possible. He was always conscientious about whatever had to be done, just doing it—but he might forget to tell you he had done it (Quoted in Davis, 1983:24).

While my own interactions with Tony were confined to a time when he was already retired, my sense from him then, as well as from the comments of former students and colleagues, is that he led by example rather than command—an academic analog of
Max Weber’s “exemplary prophet,” epitomizing the great scholar and able administrator, showing others one pathway into the future, not ordering or cajoling them.

**Innovation and community**

The next, and penultimate, phase of Tony’s scholarly career began around 1971, when he completed his term as department chair. It stretched until 1988, when he retired from Penn, becoming University Professor of Anthropology Emeritus. It was a period of accolades and awards, and had among its high points two community studies, *Rockdale* (1978), in which he focuses on change in a 19th century textile town near Philadelphia, and *Saint Clair* (1984), concerned with a Pennsylvania mining town. This was also the period in which Tony’s interest in technological change and invention came into focus.

Sometime around the early 1970s, Tony found a research site close to home, literally. Reminiscing in 1983, he told an interviewer: “I had lived in Rockdale since 1954, and I had always been curious about what were those old factories down by the stream and the old stone houses that were clustered around them” (Quoted in Davis, 1983:27). He learned that they were cotton factories dating from the early and mid-19th century. He wrote:

> As I leave my house on the outskirts of the village, drive the car along the roads twisting among the mills, tramp in the weeds by the old dams and races, stroll along the paths in the cemetery,...I sometimes feel that I can almost reach out and touch the people I have come to know from their letters and diaries and ledgers, that they are near, behind a thin veil of time (Wallace, 1978:3).

I had not known Tony well in person. We had lunch together a few times when I invited the emeriti faculty after I became department chair at Penn in 2001. I had also arranged to have Tony tell the origin story of the department to our entering graduate students. After reading *Rockdale*, I realized that the community about which he wrote was not far from where I live today. Accordingly, I hopped into my own car, drove the 6.6 miles over to Tony’s former house in the actual Rockdale, in order to retrace my predecessor’s steps. And, yes, I was almost able to sense Tony’s continuing presence “behind a thin veil of time.” In truth, however, I did not see much evidence of the old factories. I guess you have to know precisely where to look.

*Rockdale* was hugely successful, being awarded the Bancroft Prize in American History and the Philadelphia Athenaeum Literary Award. It also gave a past to the people inhabi-
iting the tiny area within Aston Township, Pennsylvania. The mills are now historic sites, and an Internet search of “Rockdale PA” turns up “Rockdale, Historic Village…” the lead page of which contains quotes from Tony's book.

*Rockdale* was not just a local community history, however. Beneath the poetic description lies a probing investigation of intellectual questions regarding technological innovation, social change, and community. We learn about the textile industry and the machines that transformed it, including the throstle frame and the spinning mule, the latter “the supreme machine of the spinning industry” (Wallace, 1978:140). We read about innovators versus exploiters of technology, and the broader problem of social change manifesting itself in the local developments at Rockdale during the 19th century. And we learn about the struggles for definition of the nature of community that took place between the Enlightenment Socialists (who felt that the workers should own the machinery) and the Christian Industrialists (who believed in machinery as private property, but also that the owners were obliged to foster the good of the broader community through the profits they made). By the time of the Civil War, the latter had won out. Tony’s work in local communal history turns out, on closer inspection, to be a far-reaching exploration of culture and social relations, along with their transformation over time.

If *Rockdale* tells a progressive story of technology and social change, Tony’s next major book, *Saint Clair* (1987), recounts a contrasting tale of mining in another Pennsylvania town. Here, unsafe conditions for workers, while recognized, nevertheless persisted far
longer than reason would dictate. The mining enterprises themselves were perpetually losing money, the entrepreneurs driven on, it seems, by a desire for social approval. Promising starts ended in failure; workers repeatedly suffered and died. We are reminded here of one of the insights of the 1961 *Culture and Personality* book, that some societies, and in this case some enterprises, are guided by their own internal principles along a pathway to their own demise. *Saint Clair* was the 1989 winner of the Dexter Prize from the Society for the History of Technology.

Several of the insights of this period, assembled into the volume entitled *The Social Context of Innovation* (Wallace, 1982), were papers originally given as the Stafford Little Lectures at Princeton. In them, Tony looks at three major 19th-century technological innovations—steam power, the use of coke in iron smelting, and the ventilation of coal mines, the last a key part of his later *Saint Clair* book. Tony endeavors to illuminate the institutions and social conditions that make possible not only invention, but also the refinement and implementation of the invention.

**Return to Native America**

The preceding period in Tony’s long career picked up on strands that were already apparent early on—interest in American towns manifested in the Worcester tornado study from the 1950s; concern with change manifested in the culture and personality work and in revitalization; and the relationship between the individual and the group. Studying Rockdale perhaps even rekindled in Tony memories of his own experiences as a youth growing up in Annville, Pennsylvania. His works of this period, however, also represented a significant shift away from a lifelong concern with Native Americans. The final period of Tony’s scholarly activity would be one of return.

Tony’s 1988 retirement from Penn marked the onset of this final phase, but if one imagines retirement as indulgent leisure—sipping margaritas while rocking in a hammock—nothing could be further from the reality in Tony’s case. Giving up the menial tasks of everyday academic life opened up time for a new phase of scholarly productivity. Tony returned to the ethnohistorical investigations of Native America that he had inherited from his father growing up and from his mentors at Penn.

The intellectual shift he made during this period was, as in much of cultural anthropology, toward critical assessments of power relations—in the case of Tony’s research, of the historical treatment of Native Americans in the United States. All three of his major books from this period employ a critical lens. The first, intended “for students of history and others,” was *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians* (Wallace, 1992),
dealing with the removal of the so-called “Five Civilized Tribes” from the Southeast to Oklahoma, the legislation for which was passed in 1830, during the presidency of Andrew Jackson.

The removal has long typified for anthropologists and historians, not to mention the affected populations themselves, the unfair and often cruel treatment to which Native Americans had been subjected. The forced march came to be known as “The Trail of Tears.” What makes Tony’s book more than a re-telling of a well-known story, however, is his attempt to link evolutionary and racial theory of the 19th century, within U.S. anthropology, to a “blame the victim” mentality covering over guilt on the part of the formulators. The theory, Tony concludes, was used to justify the treatment on the grounds that the tribes occupied lower rungs of an evolutionary ladder.

The sharpest sting of Tony’s critique during this final phase was delivered in his 1999 book, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans*, where he engages in a detailed examination of Thomas Jefferson’s contradictory attitudes toward Native American peoples. As Tony, in characteristically precise and evocative prose, put it, Jefferson “played a major role in one of the great tragedies of recent World history, a tragedy which he so elegantly mourned: the dispossession and decimation of the first Americans” (Wallace, 1999:viii). Of course, Tony understood that as the architect of a new nation, Jefferson invariably put the interests of that nation first, and so his critique, thanks to his evenhandedness, has the ring of validity to it.

Still, what alternative did Jefferson have? If Tony had left the matter at critique, the book would have seemed disconnected from his previous thought, a lament without an alternative. In fact, however, he returns at the very end of *Jefferson and the Indians* to a key contrast laid out already in his 1961 book *Culture and Personality*, described in the latter work as a challenge for government “not to enforce uniformity but to orchestrate difference” (Wallace, 1999:338). He concluded that Jefferson had chosen the former path when he relegated Native Americans to the past rather than to the future of the United States: “Would that Jefferson and Madison,” he continued, “had also applied their considerable intellectual powers to the writing of a second set of Federalist Papers, one that devised institutions capable of weaving together the strands of ethnic diversity in the republic, instead of pulling them apart” (Wallace, 1999:338). This was a theme he would take up in his final published book, *Tuscarora: A History* (Wallace, 2013).

Tony and Betty had been contemplating a return visit to the Tuscarora community in upstate New York, where Tony had conducted Rorschach research for his Ph.D. back in
1947-48. But in 2003, before they could realize this dream, Betty died. The couple had been married for some six decades. Though the loss was devastating for Tony, he decided to carry on and visit his Tuscarora friends. He ended up living there for the next decade.

This proved to be a remarkable return, in which Tony resumed field research but this time cooperatively, apologizing for his insensitivity during the Rorschach research phase, joining now a local history group studying the past of the Tuscarora. The book he wrote during this period is also a memoir, recalling his earlier field research as well as the more recent phase, and contrasting the two. When he set out to write the history of this community, he followed the trajectory mapped in the conclusion to Jefferson and the Indians. He wanted

...to interpret Tuscarora values, beliefs, and institutions not as relics of the past, not as a step on the acculturation ladder to the successful emulation of White culture...but as a viable way of life that can stand on its own as an alternative among other American life styles (Wallace, 2012:27-28).
Tony spent his final years pondering the meaning of his lifelong research and how it might contribute to building a better world. He worked on a last manuscript dealing with kinship and war. Significantly, the importance of his own kin was never far from view. He had already donated his papers to the American Philosophical Society, where they have been ably organized and categorized. He wanted them to be conjoined with those of his father, Paul A. W. Wallace.

Also never far from view were the broader reaches of kinship. Tony’s remaining immediate family comprised his two biological children (Anthony C. M. and Daniel D. S. Wallace), two Korean-born children (Elizabeth Sun Ai and Samuel S. W. Wallace), and two Native American children (Cheryl and Joseph Wallace). In view as well, during his final years, were his Tuscarora friends—another adopted family of sorts—and the Native American cultures to which he had devoted so much of his scholarly life, and for which he had such respect. He viewed their teachings, especially the seventh-generation concept,3 as essential to the survival of humanity more generally. And his concern ultimately, throughout his scholarly life, was the broader stream of culture that flowed through humanity from the past into an uncertain future. He has left to us a legacy of concepts and empirical studies that enable us to better comprehend, and, hopefully, cope with that flow.
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3 Tony (2012:242) refers to the Iroquois idea that “…it is each generation’s responsibility to preserve the world for the seven generations to come.”
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