ESSAY 2
Assembling, Assessing and Annotating the Source Materials for the Study of the 1926 Expedition

Paul Michael Taylor

Soon after his return from New Guinea, Matthew Stirling outlined the history of the expedition in a three-page article within the May 1927 issue of The California Monthly, the magazine for University of California alumni such as himself (Stirling 1927). Discussing specifically the portion of the trip spent among the Pygmies (“Negritos”) of the Nassau mountains, he writes “During our three months’ visit, we made ethnological studies and took measurements of the people which will shortly appear in book form.” (Stirling 1927:[488]). No such book ever appeared, though there are in the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archives some loose pages of ethnographic observations about the people at Tombe and other Dem villages that appear to be short drafts for such a publication.

It is interesting that Stirling made no such statement about plans for publication of comparable data about measurements or ethnological studies of Papuans in the lowlands of the Lakes Plain, along the Mamberamo, or even on the New Guinea coastal areas. Yet he or other expedition members took photographs, film footage, and anthropomorphic measurements of lowland populations along his route, and they obtained ethnographic collections along the Mamberamo and Rouffaer rivers, en route to the Pygmies in the highlands. But his 1927 statement about his publication plans, and the lack of surviving draft manuscripts about ethnography of any lowland people comparable to his notes on the Dem, is consistent with the idea that Stirling’s goal in this expedition (as well as for future publication) was primarily to reach the pygmies in the highlands.

Still, one must remember that the other goal of the expedition, besides finding the pygmies, was to explore a previously unexplored area, and the aerial observations, photographs, film footage, and other records (along with the topographic measurements for which his Dutch counterpart C.C.F.M. le Roux of the Batavia Museum was responsible) all along his route helped fulfill that goal. Furthermore, the data on the Pygmy population would only be most useful in the context of comparative study to determine the status of a pygmy population (“race”) in light of a larger comparative racial or cultural history, for which comparative information would be necessary. Over time, particularly after Stirling’s 1928 appointment as Chief (and later Director) of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and his increasing focus on American Indian studies and Middle American (especially Olmec) archeology, he abandoned plans to publish the scientific results of the expedition, other than the journal of the expedition itself. For the publication of his journal (which, however, has never properly been published before now), he assembled a number of draft ideas and notes for an editorial foreword or introduction1, leaving many other forms of the expedition’s original source materials unused.

1 Stirling’s unfinished draft material, mostly prepared to serve as introductory matter for the Journal, is included as appendices in Essay 3 below.
Music, Word Lists, Anthropometric Measurement, Ethnographic Collections, and More

This publication primarily focuses on the written accounts of the expedition itself, to which other kinds of source materials may be added later. Before turning to a description of how the “data” (written, photographic, and motion-picture film records) were assembled and edited, it may be useful to review the range of other materials that survive and might someday be added.

While photographs and field journals describe American expedition members’ involvement in recording Papuan music with the grammophone, the recordings themselves seem to have gone to the Dutch side with le Roux’s division of collections. Le Roux later asked ethnomusicologist Dr. Jaap Kunst to study these recordings, and his resulting book (Kunst 1931) wrestles with a classification of the musical forms and their influences, in light of the expedition’s anthropological questions concerning the status of Pygmy (Negrito) and Papuan populations.

Each wax cylinder seems to have contained several short tunes, and the name of the singer or singers were noted as well as location where the recording was made. Kunst even includes a photograph attributed to le Roux (Kunst 1931:frontispiece) of a Kauwerawet tribesman singing into the grammophone. (Figure 1). No record of any such recordings have been found in American collections, another indication of the importance of searching and publishing the records in Dutch collections as well.

Figure 1. Kauwerawet man singing into the grammophone. Photo by C.C.F.M. le Roux, published in Kunst 1931: (frontispiece).

Unfortunately, the phonographic apparatus was not included in the luggage taken to the Dem pygmies of the central highlands (Kunst 1931:20); but le Roux memorized some simple melodies which he sang or whistled for Kunst upon his return to Weltevreden, and which Kunst included in his analysis alongside other information that had been written on highland New Guinea musical forms.
Besides musical forms, other forms of data collected include word lists and anthropometric measurements. The mode of dividing up these data is not recorded in the American journals available to us, but at least some of the word lists collected, as well as the anthropometric measurements made, are currently in the central registrar files of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution. They have not yet been transcribed and remain an as-yet-unpublished challenge for a future stage of this project. Word lists particularly would be most useful in conjunction with fieldwork in the area or with commentary by linguists now working among descendants of the peoples from whom such lists were collected. A model for such studies could be the multi-volume compilation of *The J.C. Anceaux Collection of Wordlists of Irian Jaya Languages* compiled by Smits and Voorhoeve (1992-1998) within the framework of the Irian Jaya Source Materials project of IRIS (the Irian Jaya Studies Project, a cooperative project involving the Indonesian Institute of Sciences [LIPI] and the University of Leiden, among others).

Stirling also mentions other tangible results of the expedition: the collections he has assembled, and the film footage and photographs which he hopes to present in an American lecture tour:

Some four or five thousand specimens were collected also for the National Museum, representing the culture of both the Negritoes and the Papuans. Peck exposed thousands of feet of motion picture film, and obtained hundreds of still pictures. Some of these will be exhibited next winter for the first time, in conjunction with a lecture tour of the United States, which it is my hope to make. (Stirling 1927:[488])

It is certain that very many photographs were also taken by Dutch expedition members including all those used in the publications by le Roux. All the film footage initially went directly from Batavia to California for processing. The only surviving copy of the self-standing finished film, whose English title was probably “Adventures in Pygmyland” is the Dutch version (“Wonderen Uit Pygmyland”), with Dutch intertitles. It was a modified version of the American silent film whose exact sequence of intertitles is unknown, although several drafts or intertitles remain among papers in the National Anthropological Archive. No copy of the original (English-language) finished film is known to exist. The Human Studies Film Archive has surviving original film footage, to which was later added (probably in the 1960s) a voiced narrative of recollections about the expedition, by Matthew Stirling. This latter footage (with narrative) has been edited and digitized into 30 film selections in the sequence that Stirling narrated them, totaling approximately 2 hours, and made available for viewing online as part of this publication.

The figures for ethnological objects currently located in the Smithsonian collections are less than those in some press reports, which is perhaps consistent with the fact that Stirling and his Dutch counterpart le Roux had amicably divided the collection in half, one-half each to their respective American and Dutch scientific institutions. The American side of the expedition had no botanist like Docters van Leeuwen, and apparently did not receive any portion of Docters van Leeuwen’s botanical or insect collections.

---

2 See Essay 1, footnote 8.
The Matthew Stirling New Guinea expedition collections are currently (2005) catalogued within the Ethnology Collections of the Anthropology Department, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution. The total numbers present at this time are most accurately counted by “catalog number” or catalog entry, and in the catalog we find a total of 1,264 entries. However, one catalog number is sometimes given to a set of similar objects or a set of objects that are thought to belong together (“small awl-case with awl,” etc.). Therefore, the total number of actual objects exceeds the number of catalog entries; but since sets belonging together can be counted separately or as a unit, the number of actual objects varies.

The collection generally has very brief field labels, and object labels generally give the cultural category (e.g., “Papuan” – see below), but lack detailed information on the exact location where the objects were found, and the date of collection. That is one reason why this overall project to publish the 1926 expedition’s collections began with the detailed study of the archival records and field photographs rather than the objects, since the former can be used to help provide further information on the latter. Nevertheless, in potential future comparative studies with Dutch collections (including those illustrated for example in le Roux 1948-50), and also potential future follow-up fieldwork in New Guinea, substantial additional documentation and contextual information about these objects can surely be obtained.³

Six different cultural categories appear in the catalog records, based on the way they were categorized (either by Stirling or presumably someone working with him on this task). These categories are “Pygmy,” “Negrito,” “Pygmy Negrito,” “Negrito Pygmy,” “Papuan,” and in one case the anomalous Lebit Papuan [sic] by which is presumably “Sebit Papuan.” Individual labels sometimes give more detailed information about provenance but also provide one of these cultural categories. The most numerous catalog entries are identified as “Pygmy,” covering 32% of the total records (408 catalog entries). The “Papuan” category follows with 31% (386 catalog entries), “Pygmy Negrito” with 23% (291 catalog entries), “Negrito Pygmy” with 8% (102 catalog entries), and “Negrito” with 3% (44 catalog entries); leaving “[S]ebit Papuan” with less than 1% of the records (one catalog entry). 3% (32 catalog entries) of the records give no cultural affiliation; and many of the individual collection items have lost their original labels.

Although six cultural categories appear in the catalog, Stirling most likely intended to indicate that he and others were collecting from only two cultural groups. In his journal, he only distinguishes between “Pygmy” and “Papuan.” Stanley Hedberg also associates the term “Negrito” with “Pygmy” and the equivalence of “Pygmy” and “Negrito” for Stirling and the expedition members has been noted in other published and

---

³ Stirling corresponded from the field and also after his return with Walter Hough, curator in the Smithsonian’s Anthropology department, regarding his collections, often providing lists of objects with some geographical provenance data besides the name of the cultural group (Papuan, etc.) who produced the objects. For example, on August 24, 1926, he wrote from the Upper Rouffaer stating he had over a thousand specimens just from the Rouffaer thus far, and giving a partial list. He adds, “Most of the articles named are strikingly characteristic of this region. The total material collected is double what I have named as of course one half goes to Batavia. This is the half which goes to the National Museum.” The current catalog numbers cannot easily be matched to the archival lists at the present time, though this should be possible particularly if the effort were to include careful comparison to the archival photos and writings, and to the Dutch portion of the collection, and especially also new fieldwork in the region.
unpublished references, e.g. Stirling’s (1927) article in *The California Monthly*. Hedberg, for example, makes the following comment in his journal on September 8, 1926 {F3.72}:

“They [Pygmies] are real negritos according to Doc [Stirling]…” Therefore, it seems most likely that “Pygmy,” “Negrito,” “Pygmy Negrito,” and “Negrito Pygmy” are all intended to be the same group. The anomalous “Lebit Papuan” is also not mentioned in Stirling’s journal and probably belongs to the same group as “Papuan,” presumably the Papuans at Sebit4 (thus “Lebit” can be considered an error of transcription). With the new consolidated categories, “Pygmy” covers 66% of the catalog entries, while “Papuan” still covers 31% of entries, as shown in the following pie chart.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of categories](image)

Compare the consolidated chart below of 1926 expedition collections, Ethnology Division, Dept. of Anthropology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian History.

---

4 Stirling discusses collecting materials during his encounters with Sebit Papuans in his July 18, 1926, journal entry; Hedberg’s journal entry the same day, though not referring to Sebit, gives more information on Stirling’s and le Roux’s trading for artifacts, which took place even though the “soldiers reached for their guns to have them ready.”
From these numbers of specimens in storage now, however, it appears that many objects were grouped together in the cataloging process, with several individual similar (or related) objects assigned a single Ethnology Division catalog number. It would be a worthy future task for someone to try to relate the lists of objects in various packing lists and correspondence sent with these materials (now within the registrar’s office of the National Museum of Natural History) to the existing computerized catalog record, and the objects themselves. Such an effort is best undertaken in relation to the half of the collection that went to the Dutch side of the expedition (with le Roux), and ideally also in relation to current memories and explanations about these objects, based on images of them, that could be provided by the descendants of the people from whom they were collected. Many lists also indicate the field numbers given to groups of objects, so information tied to field numbers on those lists can be related to the objects themselves in cases where original labels with field numbers remain on the objects. All such collection-based efforts, however, are best carried out after the organization of the archival records of the expedition, which has been the initial focus of efforts within this project.

The field journals

It is interesting that although Matthew Stirling proposed upon his return a book about the ethnography and anthropology of Pygmy populations in the Nassau Mountains, he seems over time to have abandoned the idea, and considered his field journal to be the primary publication that should result from the expedition, aside from his short popular articles in *The California Monthly* (Stirling 1927) and *World’s Work* (Stirling 1928a, later condensed to a two-page version in *Reader’s Digest* Stirling 1928b), and the information or examples from this expedition that were included within the Smithsonian War Background Series book on *Native Peoples of New Guinea* (Stirling 1943), that Stirling
prepared for use by soldiers in the region, as a contribution to the war effort. The only other written record of the expedition is to be found in the press releases regularly penned by expedition members (primarily Stanley Hedberg, who had the background in public relations and in newspaper reporting), and sent to press organizations in America.

However, even though Stirling did frequently express a hope or plan to publish scientific results of the expedition (and his journal) in some form, it is also very likely that Stirling considered the collections he had brought back to be very adequate and acceptable scientific results in themselves, without further publication. Museum collections in biology, for example, were being studied on a comparative basis for the description of new species by comparison of specimens from many areas, and there was still a sense among many anthropologists that the comparative study of collections in themselves could help answer questions of human cultural history in a comparable way, even without presenting contextual cultural documentation on local symbolism or uses. This paradigm for the use of museum specimens made the rapid accumulation of trade objects on an expedition, with little opportunity for ethnographic fieldwork, more valuable to science than it came to seem later in the twentieth century. (See Sturtevant 1969 on the increasing irrelevance of museum collections within American anthropology after about 1900, as evolutionary studies using the comparative studies of artifacts fell out of fashion. Specifically for Dutch East Indies or Indonesian material, see also Taylor 1995 and 2002 on how changes in the ways ethnographic collections were used led to a decline in interest in museum collections, until recent paradigms since the 1960s began encouraging their use and reinterpretation.)

Stirling’s Dutch counterpart, C.C.F.M. le Roux, also seems to have considered the collection of objects, photographs, and sound recordings at least as important as the publication of the results. He did, however, also prepare ethnographic reports and a report on observations from the airplane from his camp in the field during the expedition, and sent them to be published as one article in Batavia (le Roux 1926). In addition, le Roux’s later 3-volume book (finished posthumously) includes a number of references to events and recollections of the expedition (le Roux 1948-50)5.

Consequently, when I first surveyed the archival material available about the 1926 expedition, Stirling’s field journal seemed to be the only substantial document that was available outside archives by anyone from among the American members of the expedition. However, the only available non-archival version of this expedition journal is

---

5 During the expedition itself, le Roux sent to Batavia for publication three articles presenting findings, with maps and photographs and a schematic architectural drawing of the men’s house at Piesano village (or “Pisano” in updated spelling using le Roux’s transcription; this is the village Stirling calls “Bisano”). The three articles were published together as le Roux (1926): “Expeditie naar het Nassau-gebergte in Centraal Noord Nieuw Guinee” Tijdschrift voor het Bataviënsch Genootschap voor Kunst en Wetenschappen 66:447-513. In addition, le Roux later published several recollections or comparative statements that directly discuss events of the 1926 expedition within his De Bergpapoua’s van Nieuw-Guinea en hun woongebied (le Roux 1948-50). These include the full citation of long passages of one day’s journal entry (Sept 2, 1926), from le Roux’s own otherwise (still) unpublished archival field journal of the expedition (quoted in le Roux’s vol. 2, pp. 94-95). The “Atlas” (vol. 3) includes photos and illustrations of objects collected on the expedition (among other highland western New Guinea photos and objects); while passages providing other details or recollections about this 1926 expedition are provided as follows in volumes 1 and 2: Vol. 1: pp. xxii-xxii, 7, 43, 61, 85, 173, 195, 201, 256, 303, 326, 332, 407, 409, 425, 458, 477, 481; Vol. 2: pp. 492, 498, 575, 600, 607, 617, 651.
the incomplete, microfilmed typescript that can now only be found in two research libraries. That very ephemeral (microfilm) “publication,” carrying the title *The Journal of a Dutch Expedition to New Guinea*, was microfilmed and distributed as Film # 1702 by (ironically) the “Records Division AGO, for the U.S. Inter-departmental Committee for the Acquisition of Foreign Publications.” This typescript text of Stirling’s journal had earlier apparently been distributed in stencil (an early reproductive process). The Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archive (NAA) and its Human Studies Film Archive each have one copy of this stencil text, which however has the title *The Netherlands-American Expedition to New Guinea: 1926.*

Since Stirling’s original journal is the most complete and continuous record of the expedition among the American expedition members, the structure of the overall website about this expedition has been based on a division of dates and events corresponding to the phases of the expedition as described within that journal. Other expedition source materials have then been (and can continue to be) linked to this framework. As described below, the expedition has been divided into 25 “location/subject categories,” which allows for the grouping and linking of all expedition photographs from a particular location. A reader can reach these photos through links from Matthew Stirling’s journal or in other ways.

Still, there are many indications that Stirling himself did not consider this typescript a final publication of his Journal. As noted below, one copy of the typescript journal now in the National Anthropological Archives contains handwritten modifications (in Stirling’s hand). In addition, there are lists of captions by Stirling for several of the photographs; these seem to indicate that he was drafting them for inclusion in a future (never published) version of this Journal.

Since the typescript of the Journal distributed in stencil form and also microfilmed represent a version that is later or “improved” by the author himself compared to the original handwritten field journal (which survives in the archives), this transcript can be considered a better standard to use, against which variations (in other versions) can be noted. Our “V1” version of this used here is the transcript in the National Anthropological Archives with Stirling’s handwritten notes for improvements (presumably in the future published version that never appeared). However, as detailed in the information published here, the basic V1 transcript version had already been purged of many frank passages (such as some that comment about other expedition members) which can still be seen in the original handwritten journal. In short, a carefully edited variorum edition of Matthew Stirling’s field journal was called for.

Thus the publication of Stirling’s journal provided here is the result of a comparison of these ephemerally “published” (extant microfilm or stencil) texts, one of which (“V1”) has Stirling’s notes for future improvements, with Stirling's original handwritten field journal books in the National Anthropological Archives, as well as with the two stencil copies in Smithsonian archives. Thus, the edition presented here includes the considerable amount of text in Stirling's original, hand-written field journal (stored in the NAA), that was left out of the typescript (microfilm) version. The text of the

---

6 According to the WorldCat online catalog of library catalogs, two copies of the microfilm are in library possession: one in Charlottesville, Virginia, USA, and one in Canberra, Australia. For this project only the one in Virginia has been examined but it is catalogued as the same microfilm as the one in Canberra.

7 See below, “Notes on Subject/Location Divisions”
resulting variorum edition notes the differences between these various texts, as will be explained further below.

The selection of photos presented here to accompany the print-friendly *Journal* results in part from an examination of the prints and archival materials (including draft captions) within the National Anthropological Archives, but it is nevertheless an editorial selection. This editorial selection of illustrations related to the text, each of which is captioned only by a quote from the text, imitates a publishing convention sometimes used for novels in the 1920s, and is simply intended to make the print-friendly version more informative and enjoyable to read from beginning to end. It is not clear what photographs Stirling himself would have included. None of the typescript or stencil versions of the *Journal* is illustrated.

As with Stirling’s ethnographic object collections, many photographs without captions are labeled or grouped (within the archives) by the very limited number of provenance terms that the expedition used (often just consisting of “Papuan” or “Pygmy” or a generic location name such as “mid-Rouffaer River”). Soon after I began working with this collection, it became clear to me that not all photographs within the “Stirling Papers” within the National Anthropological Archive resulted from this expedition. During World War II (long after this 1926 expedition), when Stirling contributed to the war effort by writing the book *Native Peoples of New Guinea* for the “Smithsonian Institution War Background Series” (Stirling 1943), he acquired or duplicated photographs from many other people and institutions, depicting indigenous people of both western and eastern New Guinea, from areas he had never visited. The photos he assembled for that book (including many not selected for that publication) became intermixed with the 1926 expedition photos, though I have included here only the available photographs that can positively be identified as being from the 1926 expedition (mainly because of field series numbers given to the photos, as well as the content of the photos), along with a few photographs of the airplane with expedition members as they were setting out to travel to New Guinea.

The inclusion of these photographs makes this publication one of the most extensive sources of historic visual images about western New Guinea, and one of very few published that includes extensive photographs of the upper Rouffaer region.

Finally, Stirling’s own handwritten draft materials that seem to serve as introductory matter for the journal, or summaries of the expedition’s accomplishments, are also included here as appendices to Essay 3. These drafts provide no new ethnographic information, but they do summarize the scientific importance of the expedition as Stirling reflected upon it sometime after his return. The existence of this unfinished draft introductory material (along with the unpublished photo captions) clearly indicates that Stirling himself wanted to see the Journal published in some more prominent and accessible format.

Besides presenting new information on the collectors and on interactions among the expedition members themselves, this variorum edition of Stirling’s expedition journal, supplemented by previously unpublished photographs from this region, will hopefully serve one of the purposes Stirling originally intended – as a useful guide to this historic expedition’s scientific data on the peoples of the upper Mamberamo region.
Conventions for the Editing, Annotation, and Presentation of Source Materials

Here, I shall first describe the sources and the conventions used for the scholarly editing for Stirling’s journal, then describe the conventions used for all surviving fragments of the journal of Stanley Hedberg. In the course of this project, a scrapbook of notes and an autobiographical account by expedition mechanic Albert (“Prince”) Hamer was also located, in the private possession of his descendants. Though annotations of the other sources may include references to these Hamer documents, they remain unpublished at this time.

Conventions for the Editing, Annotation, and Presentation of the Journal of Matthew Stirling

The publication of Matthew Stirling’s journal provided here is based primarily on an ephemeral “published” (extant microfilm or stencil) text “[V1]” (for Version 1) entitled, *Journal of an Expedition to Dutch New Guinea in the year 1926*. The manuscript is located in the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archives (NAA). Original page numbers from this text [V1] appear throughout as “{p. 1}, {p. 2}, etc.” Handwritten marks and corrections were made on this typescript (microfilm) version (most likely by Stirling); and these are all indicated in brackets as “[V1:___]”.

There are also certain passages that appeared in Stirling's original, handwritten field journal [V2] (also stored in the NAA), which were left out of the typescript (microfilm) version. All text that appears in brackets as “[V2: ___]” are from Stirling’s original, handwritten field journal. These passages were mainly undiplomatic and critical of the Dutch and the politics involved in the expedition. In fact, one passage from the handwritten journal has been thoroughly obliterated by being scratched out in ink; that is noted also.

Attached on the next few pages are an example of how the V1 and V2 manuscripts appear and an instance in which a passage from V2 was omitted from V1:

---

8 There are two other titles that appear on the cover pages of this document as well: *Netherlands-American Expedition to New Guinea 1926* and *The Journal of a Dutch Expedition to New Guinea 1926*.

9 There are also two less primary sources of Stirling’s *Journal*:

First, the initial single-spaced, typed summary done by Stanley Hedberg while on the expedition, with several copies for distribution to the press. The Smithsonian Office of the Registrar Accession No. 87036 includes carbon copies of such pages. Hedberg himself records on three occasions in his own journal that he spent time typing up Stirling’s journal: On June 27, 1926, he notes “Matt and I busied ourselves getting out a general “Dear Folks” letter most of the day. I copied it from his diary. It should prove interesting reading to the folks back home for we selected the high spots or [sic, = of] our stay here so far. It made twenty one pages and runs considerably {F1.136} over 18,000 words. It is true that that is a rather long letter but we hope that it will be enjoyed. It will also make good news material for the folks to furnish the papers who have been clamoring for news of the expedition. It includes the flights of the plane to date in New Guinea as well as Matt’s trip to a neighboring Papuan village.” Then on June 28 he records “Yesterday Matt and I worked on his diary. We turned out about 18,000 words on the Corona. Today we continued the task and as a result now have over 20,000 words on interesting material to send home. It was a big task.” Finally, on August 14, he records “Yesterday I finished 15 single spaced sheets (seven carbons) of Doc’s diary to send back. Hope to finish it today together with other necessary correspondence.” These are not included here since they are very derivative of the original.

Second, newspaper reports (presumably from this or other copies of passages of the journal, possibly embellished from interviews or imagination) sometimes quote Stirling’s “diary” or “journal”; such passages are not included systematically here, except whenever such alleged quotes were published as photo captions for archival photographs, then they are listed among the variant photo captions.
and the rest of the party. There had been a number of incidents at Albatross camp during our absence. A soldier was lost in the jungle and could not be found. We have practically given up hope for him now. Also three convicts escaped down river, taking with them a Dyak canoe. They have practically no chance because if the Papuans do not get them they have not enough food to take them to the border and it is doubtful at best if they could make the coastwise trip by canoe.

This afternoon at 5 o'clock two convicts who had been caught stealing were whipped with the rattan in the main "plaza" of the camp. A big whipping post in the shape of a cross was erected back of our house and in the presence of the other convicts the rather medieval scene was enacted. The ceremony of the whole affair, the elaborate lashing of the convicts to the post, the air of expectancy, the trimmings, such as the doctor in attendance, the sterilizing of the rattan whipping rods, the formal reading of the crime and sentence by a sergeant, made it a somewhat gruesome and impressive spectacle. As a matter of fact, the actual whipping of five lashes did not amount to much. The whipping was across the buttocks, not the back, and the culprits had their pants on. The physical pain could not have been much more than a good stinging. Also, because of the petty thieving and the escape of the three convicts, a stockade is now being built around the convicts' quarters within which they must all be after sunset.
Here is the same June 3rd journal entry as it appears in Stirling’s handwritten field journal (V2). The section that begins with the sentence, “There are more difficulties in the way of transport,” has been omitted from V1.

practically given up hope for here now also there consists scattered about river taking with them a Dyak canoe. They have made us chance because if the Papuans don’t get them they have not enough food to take them to the border and it is doubtful over if they could make the coastwise trip by canoe. There are more difficulties in the way of transport. We have been told that the canoes will not carry the load that has been calculated good, and they are afraid they cannot bring sufficient food to the stockade to keep the expedition into the rainfall mountains. The making of the expedition an unreasonable affair is a mistake which now is can plainly set. Administration cooperation means administration in the way and the way of the Dutch is not your way. They had much too convenient in the first place until too ready to say “impossible” or “It can’t be done” in the second place. If there is no precedent they are at a loss how to proceed. They have not the slightest conception of being able to go with force of people with any measure of their time of hardships, camps, chains, food deprivation and many other articles that I should never think of bringing. The idea of doing any physical work is unthinkable. This result is that each Dutch guegler requires a rubber canoe and all of it is this person sells it costly. The idea of carrying a book or other books is constant, that the literate pay very constant and getting the food tough and long large started up the ninety the million making an elaborate construction.ermany and的概念 it could be practically described as soon as the river has been completed.
Here the omitted text continues, with a section that has been completely scribbled out:
The June 3rd entry continues with “This afternoon at 5 o’clock…” which is recorded in V1 as the second paragraph on page 111. In this example, almost two pages from V2 have been omitted from V1:

This afternoon at 5 o’clock two convicts who had been convicted of stealing were whipped with the rattan in the usual “plag” of the camp. A big whipping post in the shape of a cross was erected both of our houses and in the presence of the other convicts the rather religious scene was enacted. The ceremony of the whole affair, the elaborate lashing of the convicts, such as the doctor in V2 describes, the treatment of the rattan whipping rods, the formal reading of the crime and sentence by a sergeant made it a somewhat gruesomely and impressively spectacle. As a matter of fact the actual whipping itself lasted did not amount to much. The full force was across the buttocks not the back and the culprit had their pant off. The physical pain could not have been much more than a good stinging. Also, because of the petty trimming out the except of the three convicts, a stockade is now built around the convict quarters, within which they must all be after sunset.

June 4th. Hans and Prince have been putting in a new tarp for the plane the old one having been damaged by the sun. Tomorrow according to plan, Hans is going to start freighting food across the rapids and the von potschi and Prince and a camp. Yesterday a cow was slaughtered and today we had the benefit of fresh beef that there was enough. The lads began to furnish even additional rice black five small leaves of bread East. Night Dick developed my 30 pictures taken at Barimo. They all came out very well for which I am thankful as the subject matter was most interesting and there will probably never be a chance to duplicate them.

June 5th. I told Hans and Prince to take off at 4 o’clock and with a load of 25 tons of food weighing 3212 kilos flew to Datavu camp. There was a strong wind blowing at the camp that raised weeds a foot high on the river. They landed early and returned to Allatans and the flight regained about 4-5 minutes later.
The dates for each journal entry were sometimes written slightly differently. For example, in 1926, the original handwritten V2 has “May 13” and “June 6th” and “August 11th”; V1 has “May 13th” and “June 6” and “August 11”; in such cases, the V1 entry prevails here.

In some cases, typographical errors were made in V1 that do not appear in the original handwritten journal (V2). Where found, these errors are marked as such: {*}; that “{*}” may be read as: “as corrected from original handwritten version.” This will explain to anyone with access to the microfilm why our transcript occasionally differs from that text. For example, on page {p.149} of V1 (July 13th journal entry), Stirling writes, “8 Malays were sucked down by the shirlpool just below…” Because Stirling had, in fact, written “whirlpool” in V2, “shirlpool” is a typo unique to V1. So, in this instance our transcript reads, “8 Malays were sucked down by the whirlpool {*} just below…” This assumes that Stirling had the chance to correct some things from V2 so those corrections are recognized as valid. However a few typographical errors crept in and those are re-corrected and noted with: “{*}”.

Conventions for the Editing, Annotation, and Presentation of the Journal of Stanley Hedberg

The journal of Stanley Hedberg was typed in the field using a Corona typewriter. This typescript is also located in the Smithsonian National Anthropological Archives and has never previously been published. It is incomplete however, with some journal entry dates missing. Thus, it appears here in four fragments, each fragment individually numbered indicating the original typewritten pages “{F1.1}, {F1.2}, etc.” for Fragment 1, “{F2.1}, {F2.2}, etc.” for Fragment 2 and so forth. Each fragment consists of the following journal entries:

{FRAGMENT 1: End of May 22, 1926 through June 29, 1926}  
{FRAGMENT 2: July 18, 1926 through July 22, 1926}  
{FRAGMENT 3: End of July 31, 1926 through September 24, 1926}  
{FRAGMENT 4: September 25, 1926 through November 7, 1926}

Hedberg frequently uses Malay words in his journal, but typically misspells them. In these cases the following is added next to the word: “[sic, = correct word/spelling (Malay)].” The definition of the Malay word can then be accessed by the online reader by clicking on “[sic, = correct word/spelling (Malay)].” For example:

“He took a piece himself and then told them that it was macon [sic, = makan (Malay)].” (Hedberg, F1.9)

By clicking on “[sic, = makan (Malay)]” the reader can open a separate window with the following annotation: “makan” is a Malay verb meaning “to eat”; the noun “makanan” means “food”.

Hedberg frequently abbreviates camp names such as A.C. (Albatross Camp), M.C. (Motor Camp), H.C. (Head Camp) and E.C. (Explorators Camp). In these cases, the full name is spelled out the first time the abbreviation occurs in the text, but not noted otherwise. E.g.: H.C. [Head Camp].

Hedberg sometimes replaces “ight” with “ite” such as in delite, rite, brite, lite, daylite, nite, and tonite. These words are not noted with a “[sic]” except for the word site
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when it is meant to mean sight, and the one occurrence of the word mite when it is meant to mean might.

Some sentences do not have a subject…but these are not marked with a “[sic]” E.g.: “Will have to tune in on the radio housewives hour and see if I can’t pick up a good recipe.” {F1.38}. Also, when a telegram is quoted, only the spelling errors have been noted with a “[sic]” – since telegrams (paid by the word) typically reduced the number of words to a (technically ungrammatical) minimum. In the first few journal entries for Fragment 4, Hedberg has omitted nearly all first person subjects (singular and plural). In sections such as this, where the grammar is consistently poor and left uncorrected in the original, the overall passage is left intact and grammatical errors are not marked unless doing so will substantially improve understanding of the passage.

General Editorial Conventions for both the Journals of Matthew Stirling and Stanley Hedberg, and Proposed for other source materials on this website

All words or phrases that have been annotated are underlined and appear in a different color font on the web page. By clicking on these underlined words/phrases the online reader can then open a separate window in which the annotation appears.

For example, an early annotated word in Stirling’s journal is “Soerabaia”. When a reader clicks on this highlighted word a window will open with the following text: “Surabaya” in current spelling, located in East Java. This convention for annotations also serves to keep such simple spelling updates “invisible” to the reader already familiar with the history of Indonesian spelling changes, so they can be skipped. Nevertheless the correct current spelling is thereby embedded in the text and, as a result, a text search for the word “Surabaya” (rather than Soerabaia) will locate the passage.

For readers who print out the journals using the “print-friendly” option, all of the annotated words and phrases appear as endnotes and are printed in chronological order at the end of the journal text. The endnotes are listed in three columns by the Date of the Note: “April 7, 1926”; the Keyword(s): “Soerabaia”; and then the text of the Note: “Surabaya” in current spelling, located in East Java.

Grammatical and spelling errors in both Journals are marked with a “[sic]” or “[sic, = correct word/spelling]” when doing so is likely to improve understanding; thus:

“We are told now that the War Department wishes to see all movie and still film taken from the aid [sic, = air] in New Guinea.” (Hedberg, F1.2)

In some cases, proper names of people and places can be handled with the above method, especially when there is clearly one correct method of spelling, e.g.:

“Jodans [sic, = Jordans]” (Hedberg, F1.1)

However, such annotations here stop far short of copy-editing, and often-repeated grammatical or typographical errors are left in the original when the correct meaning is clear. In addition, many Indonesian place names and other words in Malay or in indigenous languages of New Guinea did not have standard spellings. Words that appear in the texts in more than one variant form are annotated the first time they appear in the text, with an explanation listing variant forms of that term in the same text; then not indicated again thereafter (though each variant could be located, based on that first annotation, using text search functions). This method is also used here for those words that are written incorrectly so often that they can be considered an idiosyncratic variant spelling – for example, Hedberg refers to “Albatros” Camp and to the ship “Albatros” -
incorrectly spelling “Albatross” throughout his journal, though Stirling and others spell the word correctly. It is presumably less distracting to the reader to find a single annotation indicating this incorrect spelling as a variant in Hedberg’s text, rather than hundreds of textual insertions of the form “Albatros [sic, = Albatross].” Stirling and Hedberg often use different spellings for various names and locations, not only between themselves but also throughout their own journals.

In some cases, words, commas, and other punctuation marks are added in square brackets “[ ]” to correct grammatical errors and allow the reader to better understand the original intent of the writer, e.g.:

“Army Sparks[,] the chap we call High Tension[,] is not getting good results with his short wave set and wants to use the navy set[-]up with his short wave.” (Hedberg, F1.31)

This kind of correction is optional, however, and used only when it helps make the meaning clear, or when adding a corrected spelling will help with readers’ text searches. The frequent errors of capitalization, for example, are not generally indicated with “[sic]” since the meaning is clear.

Notes on Location/Subject Divisions

The 1926 expedition has been broken down into 25 location/subject categories, listed here in chronological order, using Stirling’s preferred spelling. These provide a framework for grouping photographs and other information:

Airplane (the “Ern”) at Maywood, Illinois (1925)
Java (Soerabaia)
Makassar
Ambron
Manokwari
Soeroei (Soeroe), Japen
Mamberamo River
Albatross Camp (Base Camp)
Airplane Flights
Papuans of Bisano
Batavia Camp
Sebit Tribe
Van der Willigen River
Junction of the Rouffaer and Van Daalen Rivers
Rouffaer River
Motor Camp
Brown River
Head Camp (Lower & Upper)
Overland Trail/Upper Rouffaer/Nogullo River
Explorators Camp/Tombe Village
Damunenu Village
Tombage
Agintawa District
Return to Batavia, Java
Miscellaneous
Each of these categories is linked to journal entries (from both Stirling and Hedberg) and photographs that pertain to these location/subjects, with the exception of “Airplane (the “Ern”) at Maywood, Illinois (1925)” and “Miscellaneous” which are just only linked to photographs and no particular journal entry. The former includes photos that were taken of the expedition members and the airplane in 1925, before they departed to New Guinea. The latter includes all photographs that (based on evidence in the photo or its sleeve or captioning) do come from this expedition but do not fit into a specific subject or could not be specifically identified with a particular location on the expedition.

Using the “Geographic Navigator” functions of this online publication will allow the reader to see the journal entries, photographs, and film footage from any of these locations.

Matthew Stirling provided his audio narration of the 1926 film footage long after the expedition, probably in the 1960s. In this narration he refers to several highland locations shown in the film as “Damuneru” but this is unlikely to be correct for all locations so named, since the expedition journals record that filming took place in other locations but there is no mention of filming at Damuneru (where they did not stay long). Thus, in the Geographic Locator method of following the expedition (which links journal text, photos, and film footage from any particular location), all highland film footage is here linked to all five highland locations.

Notes on the Presentation of Original Expedition Photographs

The images that appear on this web site were scanned from the originals at the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archives. Seven hundred and sixty-two images have been identified as definitely from this expedition, and sorted into the 25 location/subject categories listed above. Seventy-seven of these images (including 3 scans taken from Stirling’s handwritten field journal, V2, such as his sketched drawing of a house) have been inserted into Matthew Stirling’s Journal with a quoted text caption that relates the image to the text.

For example, below is a photograph that has been inserted into Stirling’s May 15th Journal entry, the quoted text from that date serves as a descriptive caption for this image as well as an effective visual illustration of the specific events that Stirling records in his journal:

“Prince stood on the wing and cranked her and when the motor started jumped into the motor boat and let us go.”
As another example, here is a photograph that has been inserted in Stirling’s Sept. 8th Journal entry, the caption is quoted from Stirling’s text of that date:

"Many of them were wearing the huge circular hats called tam bu made of cassowary feathers and which look like big fur muffos."

Stirling has also identified this particular photo separately with the following caption: “A group of men at Damuneru in full dress. Two of the men are wearing large headdresses of black cassowary feathers called by the pigmies “tambu”. These men are dressed for ceremony and their faces and bodies are painted with red ochre and black charcoal.”

There are 5 possible photo captions included here for each image, in addition to this editorial selection of a quoted text caption that appears with the inserted photos, as follows:

**Caption 1:** (C1) Information added by the Editor.

**Caption 2:** (C2) Text written (probably by Stirling himself) on the back of a photographic print or a negative sleeve (sleeve containing the negative of the photo).

**Caption 3:** (C3) Text of the photograph description (or draft caption) on an untitled, typed list of information about selected photos, undoubtedly prepared by Matthew Stirling (presumably as a draft for future publication), and now surviving as a document located in the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archives.

**Caption 4:** (C4) Matthew Stirling’s caption as published in his 1943 book, *The Native Peoples of New Guinea* (Smithsonian Institution War Background Studies, Number 9, 1943).

**Caption 5:** (C5) Caption associated with a photo in cases where a photo was distributed as part of a press release; or caption published with the photo (or other text specifically about the photo) within published newspaper or popular press accounts.

**Quote from Stirling Journal:** Quotation from Matthew Stirling’s expedition journal, relating to the image included here to illustrate a particular passage, date, or entry in the journal, purely as an editorial selection. Neither the image nor the selected quotation was chosen by Stirling himself.

Images that have no information for a particular caption are marked as “N/A”. Below is an example of the 5 possible photo captions (in addition to the text selection
which has been editorially added to all photos inserted directly in Stirling’s Journal), for a photo that is inserted on May 17th:

Location/Subject: Mamberamo River
Filename: W061

Captions
Caption 1: N/A
Caption 2: Ambonese holding flying fox with wings extended.
Caption 3: Two photographs [W061, W061b] showing an Ambonese soldier holding a Kalong or flying fox, one of the giant bats which are very numerous along the Mamberamo. These animals are nocturnal in their habits, during the day hanging in great clusters from the trees or sailing in low circles over the top of a cane swamp.
Caption 4: [War Bkgd. #9, plate 18, Netherlands New Guinea; a giant fruit bat from the Mamberamo River]
Caption 5: N/A
Quote from Stirling Journal: "These giant bats have a wing spread of about four or five feet." (May 17)

As shown in the above example, each of the photographs from the National Anthropological Archives also has a “filename” corresponding to the archival identification number of that photograph. (The filename is “W061” in the above example.) Each of these 1926 expedition photographs within that archive bears either an original field identification (presumably assigned by someone on the 1926 expedition), consisting of a prefix of one or two letters followed by a number, or it has an “Arb” series number. The “Arb” numbers were assigned later by Archives staff in cases where no field identification was available, emphasizing the arbitrariness of the designation by using this prefix “Arb” for “Arbitrary.” Thus, the identification number for each NAA photograph in this publication will be from one of the following series:

ER [Note this is an abbreviation for “En Route”]
A
B
C
D
W
Y
Z
Arb [this series consists of photographs given an “Arbitrary” number by staff of the National Anthropological Archives]
Notes on Film Clips and Selections

The 30 film selections have been edited and digitized from a beta-cam copy of the original film located in the Smithsonian’s Human Studies Film Archive: OC-87.4.1: [“Stirling New Guinea Expedition, 1926-1927”]. The selections (1 to 30) have been arranged in sequential order as they were narrated by Stirling, and depict scenes that were filmed throughout the 1926 expedition. The film was narrated many years later (probably in the 1960s) by Matthew Stirling. By breaking the film into these sections, and making sure the narration correctly relates to the section with which it is associated, it becomes possible to watch the surviving film footage that is associated with the localities and dates of the expedition as they are indexed in the other expedition records, such as field journals and photographs.

A Note on Maps

The two archival maps used on this website, entitled Map of the Mamberamo Netherlands New Guinea and The Country of the Nogullo Pygmies are re-drawn from lantern slides in the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archives. Presumably these lantern slides were used during Matthew Stirling’s lecture tours subsequent to the expedition. They have been re-drawn in color with printed (rather than handwritten) text for this online edition. By way of the Geographic Navigator feature of this online publication, using these maps, readers can navigate directly to the source materials from the area indicated by the cursor. A broader contextual map of the Dutch East Indies (later: Republic of Indonesia) has also been added. These maps provide an alternative method of browsing through photos and sources, though not a comprehensive one because many photographs or original sources cannot be fit into such sections (e.g. miscellaneous photos that cannot be indexed to a specific geographic region). Nevertheless, for anyone looking for detailed information on a particular region, the map is designed to offer an efficient portal for going directly to data, within this expedition’s source materials, available about that place.
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