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Anthropology in Argentina

Ezequiel Grisendi (PHAC-IDACOR-CONICET)

From its beginning in Argentina, “Anthropology” included sub-disciplines such as archaeology, ethnology, folklore studies, biological anthropology, linguistics and social anthropology. This national configuration of knowledge, far from being unique, produced singular modulations throughout its history between the academic and the political fields.

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

The earliest course of anthropology in Argentina began in the second half of the nineteenth century and involved the consolidation of political and military borders against neighboring countries and the control of internal resistance of some provinces. The cultural unification of the territory produced a nationalization of the scientific field. The Argentine Scientific Society in Buenos Aires and the National Academy of Sciences of Córdoba were founded in 1870s. Both institutions were decisive in the organization of research in anthropology. In this period, this research brought together specialized scholars Juan Ambrosetti (1865-1917) and Samuel Lafone Quevedo (1835-1920) with the respected self-taught researches Salvador Debenedetti (1884-1930) and Félix F. Outes (1878-1939). Ambrosetti worked in the Argentine Geographical Institute where he created the Anthropological, Geological and Geographical Museum in 1895. With Lafone Quevedo, Ambrosetti took the chair of “American Archaeology” (Figoli, 1990).

Research in Archaeology and Ethnology in Argentina has a long history dating back to the founding of the Museum of Natural Sciences of La Plata (1884) and the Ethnographic Museum of the University of Buenos Aires (1904). These institutions competed for leadership in prehistoric archeology and paleoanthropological research in the country. On the one hand, Florentino Ameghino (1854-1911), a paleontologist who supported de ideas of a great antiquity of humans in Argentina, became an internationally recognized scholar (Podgorny, 2015). He represented "transformational" evolutionism, on the path of Lamarck, interested in the study of fossils and geological succession. On the other hand, the naturalist Francisco P. Moreno (1852-1919) and the German ethnologist Robert Lehmann-Nitsche (1872-1938) produced innovative research dedicated to ethnology folklore and linguistics at the National University of La Plata. Lehman-Nitsche was Professor of the chair of “Anthropology” with Felix F. Outes as assistant professor at the University of Buenos Aires (Ballestero, 2013).

The research was extended to other parts of the country since the creation of research institutes: Tucumán in 1928 (founded by Alfred Métraux), Mendoza in 1940 or Córdoba in, 1941. In 1936 the Argentina Society of Anthropology was founded and two years later began to publish Relaciones, journal still active. During the first Peron
government, the national State created an Ethnographic Bureau in the Ministry of Interior, the National Ethnic Institute (1946) and the National Institute of Tradition (1948), both state agencies that sought to strengthen population policy with the cultural ideals of the process of nation building.

Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)

Under state modernization processes carried on in Latin America during the postwar period, anthropology gained legitimacy as the discipline for the investigation of the “other inmates” of Latin American nations. In the 1940s and 1950s in Argentina, some European anthropologists dominated the discipline, such as the Croato-Serbian fascist Branimir Maleš (1897-1968) exiled from Socialist Yugoslavia, the Swiss archaeologist Juan Schöbinger (1928-2009), the Spanish Salvador Canals Frau (1893-1958), the Austrian Oswald Menghin (1888-1973) and the Italian José Imbelloni (1885-1967). While Menghin arrived in Argentina in 1948, he was engaged with nazi ideology in Austria and devoted to the study of prehistory. Imbelloni, who was trained in physical anthropology in the 1920s, criticized the evolutionism of the first Argentinean naturalists from his “Science of America,” a combination of diffusionism and phenomenological ethnology called “cultorology.” Imbelloni became director of the Institute of Anthropology of the University of Buenos Aires and founded the institutional journal called Runa (Arenas, 2011). Other Argentine academics such as Enrique Palavecino (1900-1966) and Fernando Márquez Miranda (1897-1961), were politically and ideologically opposed to Imbelloni. They produced original research on ethnohistory and archaeology from the German historical-cultural school or the boasian cultural particularism perspectives (Soprano, 2014).

After the military coup d’État against peronism in 1955, Argentinean universities were part of a broad institutional and intellectual renewal. The first two Bachelor degrees in anthropology were created at the national universities La Plata (1957) and Buenos Aires (1958). The centrality of these two institutions began to be tempered by the evolution of dynamics poles in Rosario and Córdoba during the 1960s. One of the first developers of the new undergraduate degree in anthropological sciences in Buenos Aires was the Italian Marcelo Bórmida (1925-1978). A dominant figure, he held a chair at the research institute of the University of Buenos Aires (UBA), at the Ethnographic Museum and in CONICET (Silla, 2012). First, his initial commitment with racist positions of Imbelloni and, second, his defense of ethnology following the German historical-cultural school, turned him in the main point of criticism among the new anthropologists during the early 1960s. An example is Alberto Rex González (1918-2012), an archeologist trained with Julian Steward at Columbia, who was the most important diffuser of the theoretical frameworks of neo-evolutionism and the first to introduce the Carbon 14 dating method in the country (Gil, 2010).

Argentine anthropologists, who staged major modernization movements, were mostly trained in the United States. In the 1950s, Alberto Rex Gonzalez was central to the process of institutionalization. During the 1960s, social anthropology starts to distinguish itself from the ethnological tradition, which was closely related to
museums, with research projects led by Esther Hermitte (1921-1990), historian at UBA holding a PhD from Chicago University. Social anthropologists in Argentina claimed it to be an “engaged social science,” committed to the study of development in the different regions of the country. This autonomization process of social anthropology was interrupted for institutional and political reasons: on the one hand, the dominant group of professors in the UBA who supported Bormida’s leadership and phenomenological ethnology were rejected into social anthropology. On the other hand, most social anthropologists were persecuted and punished during the military coup of 1966 (Guber and Visacovsky, 2007).

**Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)**

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, most innovative research in social anthropology was made viable by government agencies or private institutions outside universities. While the latter were limited to two centers of private studies, the former included the Federal Investment Council, the National Institute of Agricultural Technology and the National Institute of Anthropology (created in 1964). Yet private institutions concentrated a large portion of research in anthropology and served as a space of intellectual sociability during military interventions at universities. One was the Social Anthropology Section of the Centre for Social Research at Di Tella Institute and the other the Center for Social Anthropology at the Institute for Economic and Social Development (IDES), both institutions were led by Esther Hermite. In the Di Tella Institute, Hermite gathered young researchers such as Santiago Bilbao (1930-2006), Eduardo Menéndez (1935-), Hugo Ratier (1934-), María Rosa Neufeld (1941-), Mirtha Lischetti (1939-) or Carlos Herrán (1939-2013), all of them became key figures in the (re)institutionalization process during the 1980s.

At the outset of the 1970s, some social anthropologists who were educated in foreign universities returned to Argentina to conduct fieldwork for their PhD. For instance, Eduardo Archetti came back from Paris where he studied with Alain Touraine; Hebe Vessuri returned from Oxford and Leopoldo Bartolomé arrived from Wisconsin University. This brief but intense expansion of anthropology in the Argentine academic world generated the most important professional association to date: the Colegio de Graduados en Antropología, founded in 1972 (Guber, 2009).

In 1969, Bachelor degrees were created at the universities of Rosario and Mar del Plata. Two years later in Salta and in 1975, in Posadas, Bartolomé created a dynamic center for Social Anthropology that survived the military repression. These four institutions centrally taught social anthropology. This was a milestone of progressive differentiation from the so-called tradition of general anthropology that had prevailed until then, based on the parallel teaching of archeology, social and cultural anthropology, and bio-anthropology. However, the clear separation of the traditional sub-disciplines is completed in the 2000s, with the multiplication of master and doctoral degrees.
The political violence between different peronist factions and the economic crisis of 1974-1975 combined to initiate the migration of researchers, which intensified with the coup d’état of 1976. Academic activity in the area of anthropology stopped by means of brutal political repression, which closed down universities and research institutes across the country. Centers of teaching and research all restricted their functions, with the exception of the Bachelor of Social Anthropology of Posadas led by Bartolomé.

The gradual normalization of public and cultural life in Argentina after the “Guerra de Malvinas” against United Kingdom in 1982, allowed the recovery of spaces for the academic research and training in anthropology. With the academic and financial support of UNESCO, the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) settled in Buenos Aires in 1974. During the military years, FLACSO served as a refuge for researchers in the area of social sciences. A graduate seminar in social anthropology and politics, created in 1982, became an important center for teaching. With the democratic recovery in 1983, university careers reopened in anthropology and previously exiled researchers returned. The First Congress of Social Anthropology was held at Posadas, with the support of Bartolomé and other key figures of the field (Ratier and Ringuelet, 1997)

It is from this border space of Posadas where the influence of Brazilian anthropology began to grow. In the 1990s, dozens of Argentine anthropologists completed their postgraduate training in Brazil, balancing and even surpassing the United States as a place for the recent renewal of social anthropology (Ringuelet, 2007). Graduate studies in Argentina grew during the 1990s and were recently consolidated at the outset of the 2000s. Once again, the economic crisis of 2001 and corresponding decline in public funding for research and education called into question the possibility of a stable scientific field. Since 2003, with the stabilization of the argentine economy, the universities and the most important scientific agency in the country, the CONICET, increased their budget for applied research and scholarships. Although it did not resolve inequalities within anthropology, this expansion process led to increased funding for research in anthropology and the PhD in the area (Perelman, 2015; Ferrero, 2015).

With this renewed scenario for social anthropology, new academic journals flourished along existing ones such as Runa or Emia : Cuadernos de Antropologia Social, Revista de Investigaciones Folklóricas, Revista Andes, Revista del Museo de Antropología, Estudios de Antropología Social (Romanos de Tiratel, 2007). This expansion of academic journals was accompanied with a progressive development of editorial series of books on anthropology, both in university and commercial publishers.
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Anthropology in France

Clarisse Fordant (CESSP, CNRS)

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

The slow development of ethnology and anthropology took place outside the university, within learned societies (Karady, 1982). Very early, from 1800 until 1804, the Société des Observateurs de l’homme welcomed a network of naturalists, doctors, philosophers, writers, historical linguists, orientalists and antique dealers (Chappey, 2002). Later on, William Frédéric Edward, an Englishman born in Jamaica who studied medicine in Europe before obtaining French citizenship, founded the first Société d’ethnologie in 1839. Devoted to the study of the physiology of peoples and races, this society was not very active and disbanded in 1847 (Blanckaert, 1989).

Despite their fairly short lifespans, these two entities offered both a research program and an institutional model to Paul Broca (1824-1880), a doctor specialized in anatomy and biological anthropology, who founded the Société d’anthropologie de Paris in 1859. In other European countries, analogous structures came into being between 1863 and 1870: London (1863), Madrid (1865), Moscow (1866), Berlin (1861), Munich (1870), etc. (Reynaud-Paligot, 2006). Later on, Paul Broca created a laboratory of Anthropology at the École pratique de la Faculté de médecine in 1867. In 1868, he joined the École Pratique des Hautes Études, where he delivered weekly lectures and practical workshops. He also founded in 1875 the Association pour l’enseignement des sciences anthropologiques, more commonly known as the École d’anthropologie. During its first year, the school provided courses on anatomical anthropology, biological anthropology, prehistoric anthropology, linguistic anthropology, demography and medical geography to nearly 8,000 listeners. With growing success each year, the association was state approved in 1889.

Concomitantly, at the Muséum national d’histoire naturelle, from 1855 until his death, Armand de Quatrefages (1810-1892) a physician and specialist in natural history, occupied the chair of Anthropology, previously called chair of anatomy and natural history of man. His successors, notably Ernest Hamy (1842-1908) and René Verneau (1852-1938) kept alive his research and teaching orientations towards "anatomo-physiology" and, more broadly, towards physical anthropology.

Several anthropology and ethnology courses were offered in the 1870s and 1890s at the École pratique des hautes études, the École libre des sciences politiques and the Université de Lyon.

Moreover, L’Année sociologique, a journal founded in 1898 by Émile Durkheim (1858-1917), has since its creation constituted an important space of diffusion of ethnological knowledge thanks to numerous reviews written by Henri Hubert, Robert Hertz (1881-1915), Émile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss (1857-1939), who also published certain founding texts of the discipline in France such as The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1913) or The Gift (1925).
The creation of the *Institut universitaire d’ethnologie* in 1925 by Marcel Mauss, Lucien Lévy-Bruhl (1857-1939), and Paul Rivet (1876-1958) extensively modified the organization of education and research in ethnology (Jolly 2001). Not long after its founding, the Institute supervised the courses in ethnology and attracted more and more students. The Institute centralized funding coming from private foundations and to a lesser extent from the Ministry of Public Instruction. The research undertaken at the CNRS, founded in 1939, was exclusively financed and promoted by the Institute, which insured the management of objects collected during research missions.

The establishment of this *Institut universitaire d’ethnologie* was also the occasion for an epistemological redefinition of the discipline. Indeed, the Institute allows for the combination of several movements: biological anthropology (Paul Rivet), colonial ethnography (Henri Labouret), and the French School of sociology (Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Marcel Mauss). However, through the reversal of the paradigm proposed by Paul Broca, the social sciences (notably linguistics and ethnography) were, within the new Institute, publically recognized to the detriment of natural sciences (biology, anatomy, etc.). Under the influence of the Durkheimians, more attention was given to methodology; sites of investigation were limited, closely fitting the borders of the colonial empire, whose geography offered its specializations to the discipline of ethnology thus restructured. One can also notice a large interest in the African continent within the Institute while the *Société des africanistes*, still active today, was established in 1930. Indeed, unlike in the countries of central, eastern, and northern Europe, close relationships developed in France between the field of ethnology/anthropology and the work of colonization initiated during the 3rd Republic. In this context, the *Institut d’ethnologie de l’université de Paris*, for example, proposed a degree in colonial ethnology studies, intended to train civil servants and produced knowledge about the colonies where they were stationed.

French and European societies are the focus of studies in what is called national ethnology in the context of folklore studies lead notably by Arnold van Gennep (1873-1957). The interwar period is indeed a time of large investigations led throughout the French territory under the supervision of the *Musée des arts et traditions populaires* (ATP) founded in 1937 within the *Musée du Trocadéro*. Leading to the collection of data in more than 2,000 French towns and dating at times back to the 17th century, folklore studies were guided by a concern for exhaustiveness and motivated by the progressive disappearance of rural traditions due to industrialization and the desertification of the countryside.

**Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)**

The revision of the institutional landscape of education and research in anthropology took place during the period between the 1940s and the 1960s. In 1936 in Senegal, the Governor-General of French West Africa (AOF) Jules Brevié founded the *Institut Français d’Afrique noire* (IFAN). Becoming the *Institut fondamental d’Afrique noire* in 1966, its mission was to promote the "scientific study of black Africa in general and of French West Africa in particular, countries, its inhabitants, its history, its evolution, its resources and its productions" (decree of 1945/3, article 2).
Later on in November of 1942, the Office de la recherche scientifique d’outre-mer (ORSOM) is created which in 1944 is renamed ORSTOM (Office de la recherche scientifique et technique d’outre-mer) before becoming the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD) in 1998.

These two organizations, the IFAN and the ORSOM, were responsible for meeting the local colonial Governors’ demands for knowledge and were therefore in competition with the CNRS, given its role as an unrivaled national authority of scientific regulation), a role that it did not assume again until 1960, when the French colonial empire collapsed (Gaillard 1989).

At the same time, Marcel Griaule held the first university chair in Ethnology created in 1943 in Paris. In 1944, the academic tenured position of Maîtrise de conférence in colonial ethnography was created in the Geography department at the University of Lyon and held by André Leroi-Gourhan. Within the École pratique des hautes études (EPHE), a new department dedicated to economics and social sciences opened up in 1947 with the support of the Ford Foundation. This “sixth section” of the EPHE, which in 1975 became the École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) welcomed Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009) as professor in 1948, before he held the first chair of anthropology at the College de France in 1959. In 1961, he created with Emile Benveniste (1902-1976) the journal L’Homme, based on the American publication American Anthropologist and the English journal Man, with the interdisciplinary aim to link together anthropology and geography, linguistics and prehistory (Lévi-Strauss & Eribon 2009).

In 1968, the undergraduate degree in ethnology was officially created and led to the creation of university chairs of ethnology, generally attached to the Facultés de lettres et science humaines (Leservoisier & Vidal 2007). At the same time, a growing interest for the countries of South America supplanted the strong enthusiasm for the African continent, notably thanks to the success of Levi Strauss work. Lessons from the anthropology of the French terroirs, renewing the work of Van Gennep, also developed from the 1970s.

During this period, anthropological (but also archeological) research activities mostly took place within public organizations under the administrative supervisions of:

- the Ministry of Education (chairs, academic departments within social science and humanities universities, laboratories and research centers, CNRS),
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (ORSOM, Direction générale des Relations culturelles, scientifiques et techniques)
- the Ministry of Culture (national or regional Museums with ethnographic collections which often have important documentary collections and can be likened to research centers).
In the 1970s, while learned societies no longer hold the driving role that they once held in the 19th century but continue to offer opportunities for publishing and intellectual exchange, the Association française des anthropologues (AFA) was founded in 1979 following an international conference on "the current situation and the future of anthropology in France" held in 1977 in Paris. Since its creation, it edits the Bulletin de l’AFA, which in 1990 became the Journal des anthropologues. Open to young scholars, today, the association seeks to make anthropological knowledge accessible to the general public.

Largely composed of researchers and scholars, the Association pour la recherche en anthropologie sociale (APRAS) was created ten years later, following mobilizations surrounding the revision of disciplinary sections of the CNRS at the end of the 1980s.

These two associations, the AFA and the APRAS, contributed to the creation of the Association française d'ethnologie et d'anthropologie (AFEA) in 2009 following the "Summit on anthropology and ethnology" in 2007. This association aims to bring together anthropologists and ethnologists to reflect on the institutional future of the discipline, its job market and the diversity of its paradigms.

**Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)**

When a new section dedicated to anthropology, ethnology and prehistory was created in 1983 in the Conseil supérieur des universités (CNU), the major university centers of anthropology and ethnology (universities Lyon 2, Paris 10, Paris 5, Aix-Marseille and EHESS) have long been established. Today, a five-year course, dedicated exclusively to these subjects, is offered at Lumière Lyon 2, Toulouse Jean-Jaurès, Strasbourg, Bordeaux, Aix-Marseille, Paris Ouest-Nanterre-La Défense P10). Other universities, such as Lille 1 or Vincennes-Saint-Denis (Paris 8), offer multidisciplinary licenses and masters focusing on sociology and anthropology. Sometimes, professional or research-oriented master's programs are offered in the absence of an undergraduate degree. This is the case, for example, in Réunion, Paris Diderot (Paris 7), Paris Descartes (Paris 5) or the EHESS.

However, since the 1980s, anthropology and ethnology have become somewhat disaffected and no longer attract as many students as before. Other disciplines are better suited to the academic game such as sociology, history, political science. About the proportion of women professors in 2010, they represented 50% of the 124 associate professors and 18% of the 72 full professors of anthropology, prehistory and biological anthropology.

In France, the term "anthropology" primarily meant biological anthropology, while "ethnology" established itself as designating what is known as social and cultural anthropology. In the 1940s, the content of the "anthropologic" discipline still referred to natural sciences such as medicine and physiology. After Levi-Strauss, anthropology replaced ethnology to designate social and cultural anthropology, in
favor of a label that distinguished anthropology as the study of "others" and sociology as the study of contemporary European societies. Lévi-Strauss, proposed a synthesis between the figures of the fieldwork ethnographer, the ethnologist specializing in a geographic area and the generalist anthropologist. However, the division persists today: "ethnology" is principally used inside the university while "anthropology" is preferred by the CNRS (Macdonald 2008).

The work of Lévi-Strauss has and continues to profoundly impact the field of French ethno-anthropology. Nonetheless, other paradigms have developed which rethink and critique the structuralist movement. The reshaping of the Parisian museum landscape at the onset of the twenty-first century offers the representatives of these paradigms an occasion to distance themselves yet again from the author of Tristes Tropiques. The opening in 2006 of the Musée Quai Branly (MQB) or the Musée des arts et civilisations d'Afrique, d'Asie, d'Océanie et des Amériques, recognized by Claude Lévi-Strauss, who participated in its inauguration, provoked numerous critiques on behalf of anthropologists such as Alban Bensa (1948-), Benoit de l'Estoile (1967-) or Jean-Loup Amselle (1942-) (Grognet 2007). They spoke out against the presentation of the objects displayed in the museum as fundamentally artistic and aesthetic, lacking a scientific, ethnographic, and anthropological approach. According to them, this aestheticization of objects showed a certain inability, on behalf of those behind the project, to escape prior colonialist and predatory relationships formed between French and non-Western populations.
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Anthropology in Germany

Matthias Duller, University of Graz

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

To speak of anthropology in the sense of modern Anglo-Saxon social and cultural anthropology is slightly misleading in the German case. The subject most closely corresponding to that has been called *Völkerkunde* or *Ethnologie*, and is distinct from *Volkskunde* (folklore) and to a lesser degree from *Anthropologie*. *Volkskunde*, the study of the people (singular), studies German folk culture. *Völkerkunde*, the study of peoples (plural), studies all cultures and peoples except the German (and its close neighbors). The two disciplines, though intellectually similar, have had little personal or institutional overlap largely sticking to this division of labor.

*Anthropologie*, on the other hand, has also somewhat different intellectual roots from ethnology, but its differentiation has been less clear over time. *Anthropologie* covers physical or biological anthropology, paleoanthropology and, as a German specialty, philosophical anthropology. The latter’s influence on ethnology has been rather limited, while its key authors Max Scheler (1874-1928), Helmuth Plessner (1892-1985), and Arnold Gehlen (1904-1976) gave important impetuses for sociology (Fischer 2016). In particular, paleoanthropology, prehistory, and biological anthropology have been at different times closely related to ethnology.

Lastly, the terms *Völkerkunde* and *Ethnologie* themselves have been associated with slightly different connotations over time. The term *Ethnologie* has often been used to emphasize a theoretically grounded scientific discipline synthesizing and comparing histories and ethnographies of peoples from around the world as opposed to *Völkerkunde*, which has been preferred by adherents of a tradition that aimed at detailed description and material collections who found their homes in ethnological museums. In other national contexts, this corresponds to the subdiscipline of ethnography. With the gradual decline of the empiricist ethnographic tradition, *Ethnologie* has become the dominant label for the discipline since about the 1970s. Speaking of ethnology, we cover this range of subtleties: *Völkerkunde, Ethnologie, Ethnografie*, but not folklore (*Volkskunde*) and only if explicitly stated, other branches of *Anthropologie*.

German enlightenment scholarship from the 18th century is recognized as a major starting point for all modern disciplines referred to as ethnology, ethnography, cultural and social anthropology. Enlightenment ethnology was concerned with the comparative study of all peoples and nations, which is understood as historical rather than biological (racial) entities. The intellectual origins were thus rather different from physical anthropology, which received major impulses during the same time from a field called ‘natural history of man’ (Vermeulen 2015: xiv).
Though the distinction remained intact, the fields of ethnology and physical anthropology developed closer to each other in the course of the 19th century. Theodor Waitz's (1821-1864) *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1859) proposed the monogenetic hypothesis of the common origin of all humans. Franz Boas and his disciples later received it as a founding document of cultural anthropology. Its title also contains the classical formulation of ethnology’s object of study as *Naturvölker*, peoples whose life is fundamentally determined by a strong exposure to natural conditions. Notwithstanding a certain prominence of evolutionist thinking, German ethnologists of the turn to the 20th century were overwhelmingly humanistic, in particular historical, in their intellectual orientation.

First university docent in 1869 (i.e. before Tylor in Oxford, 1884, and Boas in Worcester, 1888) and founder of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (also 1869) was Adolf Bastian (1826-1905). An autodidact as an ethnologist, Bastian undertook extensive travels as ship’s doctor and produced a massive and largely unreadable opus of more than 80 partially multivolume books and hundreds of articles. Though an extreme example, Bastian’s obsession with empirical detail and material collection with little or no theoretical pretensions became typical for a second thrust of German ethnologists, who found their home in an uncommonly high number of ethnological museums and collections in many small and mid-sized towns.

The first university professorship (Ordinariat) was established in 1920 in Leipzig. By 1945, this number had grown to five (Hamburg 1923, Göttingen 1934, Jena 1936, Köln 1940). In 2012, Haller counted 23 university departments, 59 professorships, and 57 ethnological museums and collections (Haller 2012, 19, 43). Well into the 1960s, it was common that museum directors were in the same time university professors. In 1929, the Society of Ethnology was founded.

Different from the United Kingdom or France, German ethnology was little concerned with colonial administrative practices, even if some prominent ethnologists such as Richard Thurnwald (1869-1954) and Eugen Fischer (1874-1967), called for the utilization of the discipline for colonial enterprises.

Following Bunzl and Penny (2003, 17), ethnology turned from a liberal cosmopolitan discipline into a *völkisch* discipline in the early 20th century. In spite of internal differentiations, the discipline’s intellectual traditions is, according to Streck's diagnosis (2000), represented by elements of authoritarianism, archaism, aestheticism, racism, anti-judaism, and milleniarism. With the rise of National Socialism, the discipline increasingly incorporated biological and racial theories from physical anthropology and a large number of ethnologists became direct supporters of the Nazis, some of them, e.g. Wilhelm Emil Mühlmann (1904-1988), having active roles in the colonial projects of the Nazis in Eastern Europe, the politics of *lebensraum* (Haller 2012, 47).
Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1945-1970s)

Since the end of the Second World War, German ethnologists have had a marginal, if any, influence on the discipline as a whole. Global histories of the discipline, even if written by a German scholar like Werner Petermann’s (2004), refer to historical precursors from Germany of the 18th to the early 20th century, to Franz Boas’s (1858-1942) German origins or to the influence of Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) on Clifford Geertz (1926-2006), but do not include German developments in the discipline more recent than the 1920s (Haller 2012, 14). More than other disciplines, ethnology has had troubles finding a legitimate place within the new societal environment of the Federal Republic. Accordingly, Dieter Haller’s history of postwar ethnology in Germany identifies as the central common self-conception of ethnologists an understanding of a discipline in crisis (Haller 2012, 25).

After 1945, three theoretical traditions dominated German ethnology: Kulturmorphologie, Kulturhistorie and a German variant of what was called Ethnosoziologie. Biological anthropology has been marginalized within the discipline, even if individual scholars never distanced themselves entirely from racial thinking throughout their careers.

Kulturmorphologie was dominated by Catholic clerics who aimed at proving the historical primacy of monotheism as the original form of human religion and had their center in Vienna during the first three decades of the twentieth century. Most notably, the German padres Wilhelm Koppers (1886-1961) and Wilhelm Schmidt (1868-1954), both members of the missionary order Societas Verbi Divini (SVD) continued an older German ethnological tradition called diffusionism—the idea that cultural similarities are the product of cultural contact between neighboring peoples or migration. Being closed down by the Nazis and their members sent to the front, the Kulturmorphologie-school was the only ethnological subdivision largely unburdened by the Nazi past in 1945. It re-opened after the war in Frankfurt and was re-named after its founder to Frobenius-Institut in 1946. A journal associated with this group, Anthropos, has been published since 1906. Its romanticist vision of culture as a self-sustained entity, its reliance on intuition as a methodological category, and the role of charismatic thinkers have been early criticized as unscientific.

After Schmidt and Koppers had to leave Vienna in 1938, Hermann Baumann (1902-1972), from Berlin, inherited the chair. Baumann, though in the cultural historical tradition, developed an explicitly racist theory in Vienna, which he had partially adopted from his rampantly racist teacher, anthropologist and anatomist Eugen Fischer. Nevertheless, cultural historical ethnology (Kulturhistorie) remained influential after World War II and Baumann became one of the dominant figures in postwar ethnology in Germany (Haller 2012, 55). More generally, Kulturhistorie emphasized studying cultural change as a process and reaching far back in historical time.
The third classical tradition was called *Ethnosoziologie*, as coined by the Austrian Richard Thurnwald who sought to incorporate sociological concepts into ethnological studies. Thurnwald’s student Emil Mühlmann was an outspoken proponent of a racist ethno-sociology and a Nazi. After the war he was able to translate his work into a language more appropriate to the democratic environment and became a towering figure in German ethnology. Mühlmann is only one example of the general trend that almost no ethnologist had to wait long in order to continue his career after 1945, no matter their relation to the Nazis in the years before (Haller 2012, 58). The list of racist and anti-Semitic ethnologists was a long one, even among the few opponents of National Socialism.

With the old generation being still in place after 1945, the younger folks did little to challenge their teachers, but rather sought their intellectual satisfaction in overseas expedition that became increasingly available during the 1950s through money from the German Research Fund (DFG). While this younger “grey generation” did not oppose its elders (that was called the “black generation”), from which they were professionally and personally dependent, none of the theoretical programs that they inherited, were in any way attractive to develop further. In the context of a modernizing discipline in the line of British social anthropology or US-American cultural anthropology, German historicist thought with its metaphysical terminology appeared helplessly outdated and the Nazi shame of their proponents did little to alleviate. Likewise, the Ex-Nazis were not in the position to tie on international developments, because they were either treated unkindly by international audiences or felt ashamed to travel to international conferences. In addition, German ethnologists rejected any notion of linking their academic work with current political themes in the “Third World”, be it through development policies or in public debates about de-colonization. Politicization, it was felt, was the major mistake of the Nazi years and was to be avoided at any rate. These were the conditions for an increasingly a-theoretical, a-political defensive intellectual climate in German ethnology that remained unquestioned until the student protests of the late 1960s.

**Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)**

After the opening to the world had been sought during the 1950s methodologically through increasing concentration on ethnographical field work and a rejection of theorizing in general, only the 1960s saw the first serious attempts to catch up theoretically with international trends from the USA, UK, and France. Nevertheless, the discipline remained in a rather stagnant mode both intellectually and institutionally. The number of academic personnel hardly rose even during the second wave of educational expansion under the social-liberal governments of Brandt and Schmidt and participation in political discourses was further very hesitant, leaving German ethnology with practically no public resonance. Over dealing with its particularly troublesome Nazi-past, German ethnology has lost its traditional traits that seemed entirely illegitimate under the new moral coordinates of the Federal Republic, while the continuing adherence to old German intellectual virtues of depth and detail has prevented the discipline of catching up with newer trends dominated by Anglo-Saxon intellectual culture.
German anthropology produced at least two journals of some standing: As early as 1869 the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* started to publish overseas research; the journal still exists. Also *Sociologus* founded 1925 by Thurnwald still appears in print; it has now a subtitle *Journal for Social Anthropology* and publishes bi-lingually in German and English. The physical anthropology wing, organized in its own association, started in 1949 a follow-up to the discredited *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde* a new journal: *Homo. Zeitschrift für die vergleichende Forschung am Menschen*. It ceased to exist in 1990 and re-appeared after the German unification which brought with it the unification of East and West biological anthropologists under a new umbrella Society for Anthropology and a new outfit *Anthropologischer Anzeiger: Journal of Biological and Clinical Anthropology*.

Anthropology’s professoriate has been comparably strongly feminized. In 2008, 42 percent its professors were women, while this rate for its entire academic full-time personnel has been above 50 percent for the last ten years.
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Ethnography in Hungary

Victor Karady, CEU (Budapest)

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

The discipline was closely connected to the nation building process of the late feudal society, a post enlightenment development starting in the early nineteenth century. Its main target focused on folkways (especially literary traditions) of the local peasantry. Studies of folk traditions and living conditions of people beyond the frontiers almost exclusively concerned supposedly kin populations in East European or Asiatic regions. Modern type ‘cultural anthropology’ of other “archaic groups” emerged only recently in post-communist times in a country lacking colonial ties.

Early efforts at professionalization began in the nineteenth century with collections of folktales and the gathering of specialists. The Ethnographic Museum (1872) was one of the first national institutions (as a department of the National Museum) of the autonomous state, after the 1867 political compromise. The Folklore Society of Hungary was born in 1889, one of the first in Europe, with a monthly journal Ethnographia and 12 ethnic sections (since ethnic-linguistic minorities constituted over 60 percent of the population of the kingdom). The Society was renamed in 1895 at the height of political nationalism Hungarian Folklore Society (without ethnic sections) and attached to the Hungarian Academy of Science (HAS). Mother tongue (or first language used) had been recorded since the earliest demographic studies in the eighteenth century, to become a staple variable (together with religion) in population censuses. A national census of Gypsies was organized as early as 1893 by the Central Statistical Office.

The dismantlement of the historic state strengthened political interests in folklore studies. The Faculty of Arts of Szeged University was the first to have a chair in folklore studies (1929), followed by the sister faculty in Budapest (1934). An Institute for the Study of the Landscape and People (1938), integrated in the Teleki Institute (1941-1948) was the first state sponsored research center outside universities. Still, the most decisive steps in the development of ethnographic studies were accomplished by leftist as well as rightist activists of the so-called ‘populist’ movement, engaged in monographic studies of rural life, both equally critical of the ruling political establishment. A number of high quality works focused on the darkest sides of the peasant world, poverty, infant mortality, ethnic inequalities, violence in village life, feudal type relations of power and authority in the latifundia, ‘nativist’ escapism in sects outside historic Churches in the rural proletariat, etc. Ferenc Erdei (1910-1971) and his circle, the student cluster of ‘Szeged Youth’ around Gyula Ortutay (1910-1978), Zoltán Szabó (1912-1984), Géza Féja (1900-1978) and the poet Gyula Illyés (1902-1983) were among the main protagonists of this movement. A first synthetic overview of the Folklore of Hungarians was published in four volumes (1933-37).
Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)

There was no significant change during the transition years to communism and under Stalinism. Ethnography was one of the few social disciplines that suffered the less under the canonization of Marxism Leninism, mandatorily replacing most other ‘bourgeois’ study branches among human sciences. University chairs, study tracks, the Ethnographic society and its journal were all maintained (though the latter degraded to a quarterly) with a low academic profile – thanks largely to the protective care of scholars like Ferenc Erdei or (more directly) Gyula Ortutay, influential fellow travelers of communism (both holding ministerial posts during years). Thanks to Ortutay the HAS started in 1950 the publication of an Acta etnographica hungarica in foreign languages.

This did not prevent the regime to suspend between 1951 and 1957 the teaching activities of the known Szeged folklorist Sándor Bálint (1903- 1980). He was appointed university professor without chair in 1944 (together with the leftist Gyula Ortutay).

Under the authority of the composer and folk music scholar Zoltán Kodály (1882-1967), one of the cultural heroes expropriated by the regime, a Folk Music Research Group (1949) could even be organized, source of an important collection of publications and a considerable impact on the development of musical instruction in the country. It was later incorporated in the Hungarian Academy of Science (1953). Folklore studies were touched, but not deeply affected by official Marxism to which lip service was paid only as a mandatory ritual in topical publications.

Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)

Like for other social studies, inherited from the old regime, a new phase of state sponsored development started after the years of post-1956 repression around cc. 1964. At that time the majority of folklorists were active in the Ethnographic Museum and the Folk Music Research Group. The latter was integrated in the Musicological Institute of the HAS (1977) To this was added in 1966 a Folklore Research Group under the Academy, becoming in 1967 an institute proper of the HAS, publishing a journal of its own Folk Culture – Folk Society (1968) and taking in charge the publication of a new Encyclopaedia of Hungarian Folklore (1977-1982). In 1973 the Ethnographic Museum was transferred into the impressive building of the former high tribunal facing the parliament in Budapest. No dominant personalities emerged from the roster of highly qualified specialists at that time, who could henceforth renew more intensive contacts than earlier with their Western partners. Still, Hungarian ethnography on the whole remained rather aloof – if not quite unaffected - from relevant Western developments since the 1960s, like linguistic structuralism, the new anthropology à la Lévi-Strauss or the Kulturwissenschaft initiated by Hermann Bausinger. The best documented monographic study of the discipline, recognized worldwide after its publication in America, was carried out in the village of Atány by Edit Fél (1910-1988) and Tamás Hofer (1929-2016).
No immediate changes were generated by the fall of communism in 1989, a negotiated transition to democracy. It left unchanged but expanded the institutional setting and eliminated all still preserved obstacles to international contacts. This included extended cooperation with partner scholars in neighboring countries with large Magyar minorities, like Transylvania, Slovakia or Serbian Voivodina. There was at the Romanian-Hungarian University of Cluj/Kolozsvár an important department of Hungarian ethnography, working hand in hand with the local János Kriza Folklore Society (1990). In Slovakian Somorja the Forum Institute of Minority Research (1996) has an important ethnographic section. Ethnography and later cultural anthropology were introduced with special departments in all established Faculties of Arts in Hungary, notably in the universities of Debrecen and Pécs.

The Folklore Institute of the HAS brought out a remarkably modern general survey of the discipline in eight volumes (1988-2011) and a Cultural historical encyclopaedia in 14 volumes has also been completed recently (2003-2014). Among leading folklorists of the period Vilmos Voigt (1941-) and Attila Palády-Kovács (1932-) – the first of the discipline to be elected as member of the HAS – may be mentioned.

A major intellectual development concerned the timid but successful institutionalization of cultural anthropology of exotic societies with a new university department next to folklore at the University of Budapest. A Hungarian Cultural Anthropological Society (1996) founded by Lajos Boglár (1929-2004) first chair of the discipline. In 2006 a Hungarian Africa Society was also born with the partial function to support field research in Africa. This multiplication of the institutional network led to the appearance of new specialized journals of local and country-wide circulation, additionally to the classical scholarly organs.

Ethnography represented a small sector of the broadening field of the social sciences. Since 1950 within the whole set of social studies and humanities 2,2 percent of those having published scholarly papers or books belonged to the discipline, 1,6 percent of all candidates and 2,3 percent of all doctors of the HAS in these study branches as well as 1,4 percent of the staff of related doctoral schools in the 1910s. As to the process of feminization, it was by the 2010s among the SSH disciplines with the highest proportion of women: 43,5 percent of doctoral school staffs (against an average of 29 percent in the SSH) 37 percent of ‘candidates’ (against an average of 24 percent) and 19 percent of doctors of the HAS (against an average of 13 percent).
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Anthropology in the Netherlands

Rob Timans, Erasmus University Rotterdam

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

Before the outbreak of the Second World War, chairs in anthropology were founded at the universities of Leiden, Amsterdam and Utrecht. The first chair in anthropology was established at the University of Leiden in 1877. It was dedicated to the geography and ethnography of the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia), and was held by the theologian Pieter Veth (1814 – 1895). This strand of anthropology was strongly orientated toward what was the Dutch colony of Indonesia at the time; Veth taught the subject to students of Indology, a curriculum aimed at educating prospective civil servants who were to work in the colony.

Indology was taught at the universities of Leiden (1902) and Utrecht (1925). Before that, an extraordinary chair had been established in Utrecht, first held by Jacob Kohlbrugge (1865 – 1941) in 1913. The Utrecht Indology curriculum was founded at the instigation of large firms doing business in Indonesia. It was established as a counterweight to the Leiden Indology curriculum that was seen as insufficiently receptive to the colonial interests of these firms. Apart from its direct effect on the development of anthropology in the Netherlands, Indology also had an indirect effect. Upon their return to the Netherlands, a number of Indology students embarked on writing a dissertation based on their observations during the time they spent in the colony.

Besides Indology, which was formally recognized as an academic curriculum in 1921, the early development of Dutch anthropology was also influenced by geography. The first chair of which ethnology (as opposed to ethnography) was part of the ordinance was created at the geography department of the University of Amsterdam, also in 1877. Its first occupant was Cornelius Kan (1837 – 1919). He was succeeded by Sebald R. Steinmetz (1862-1940) in 1907. Steinmetz is also regarded as one of the founding fathers of Dutch sociology. He developed a sociographical approach as an ‘ethnography of civilized society’ that was influential in the early years of the development of Dutch sociology. In 1918 a similar chair in the Geography and Ethnography of the Netherlands East Indies was created at the Agricultural University in Wageningen.

Another important early figure was Jan Josselin de Jong (1886 – 1964). He became professor at an endowed chair in Leiden in 1922, and full professor in 1935. Josselin de Jong was a linguist who developed a structural anthropology (influenced by Marcel Mauss and Émile Durkheim) at the University of Leiden some years before Claude Lévi-Strauss advanced a similar approach in France. Other important names are Johan Fahrenfort (1885 – 1975), the successor of Steinmetz for the ethnology chair in 1933 (although he did not become full professor until 1946), and Henri
Fisher (1901 – 1976), successor to Kohlbrugge (who was his PhD supervisor) in Utrecht and one of the first students to graduate as a geographer.

In 1898, the Dutch Anthropological Association (Nederlandsche Anthropologische Vereeniging, NAV) was founded. This was late compared to many other countries, where learned societies were established earlier. In 1917 ethnologists started to meet yearly in what became known as the ‘gatherings of ethnologists’ (Etnologen Dagen), marking their ambition to have an outlet separate from the physical anthropologists that were amply represented in the NAV. In 1922 another organisation called the Dutch National Bureau for Anthropology (Nederlandsch Nationaal Bureau voor Anthropologie, NNBA) was founded in Amsterdam. The first anthropological journal, the Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde (Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia) was established before that, in 1853. It was a broad, multidisciplinary journal with a strong orientation towards the region of Southeast Asia.

Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)

After the Second World War, additional chairs in anthropology were founded at the Universities of Nijmegen (1948), and the Free University in Amsterdam (1956). In Nijmegen the practice of anthropology initially was heavily orientated towards an applied anthropology aimed at supporting the Catholic mission. The first chair holder was the priest Bernard Vroklage (1897 – 1951). At the Free University of Amsterdam the linguist Louis Onvlee (1893 – 1986) became professor on cultural anthropology in 1956. Onvlee had worked in Indonesia for the Dutch Bible Society and based his anthropology on a biblical notion of humanity. At the University of Groningen no chair in cultural anthropology was established, but the subject did become part of the sociology and social geography curricula in 1950.

The independence of Indonesia in 1949 meant that the teaching of Indology became obsolete. In order to preserve the expertise established in this line of work a new subject was created: the sociology of non-Western people (SNW; at first it was called Non-Western Social Studies). Chairs in SNW were created at the Universities of Leiden (1950), Wageningen (1955) and Utrecht (1955). The Leiden and Wageningen chairs were both held by the historian Rudie van Lier (1914 – 1987). Van Lier, who was born in Surinam, wrote an influential study on Surinam (Samenleving in een Grensgebied) in 1949. The book was translated into English in 1971 as Frontier Societies. A similar subject was also developed at the University of Amsterdam. This chair – ordained as encompassing the modern history and the sociology of Indonesia - was held by Wim Wertheim (1907 – 1998) in 1946.

SNW was recognized as a separate curriculum in 1952. In that same year, inspired by US-American nomenclature, ethnology was renamed ‘cultural anthropology’ and became a complete curriculum. This dual identity of anthropology is a distinct feature of Dutch anthropology that persists to this day, although the institutional borders are
not as stark as in the beginning. In 1963, cultural anthropology and SNW became part of the Faculty of Social Sciences as separate departments.

At the end of the 1960s, anthropology was targeted specifically by a round of budget cuts and task reallocation programs. The minister of education came to the conclusion that there were too many anthropology and SNW departments (six at the time) in the Netherlands, and there was too much overlap in research. This resulted in anthropology departments at different universities being required to specialise in certain themes or regions. As a result of this operation, the SNW curriculum disappeared in Utrecht in 1969.

In 1949, the NAV merged with the NNBA to become the Dutch Anthropological Society (Nederlands Genootschap voor Anthropologie). In 1951, the Society established a separate section for cultural anthropology. From 1971 until 1993, anthropologists had a separate department in the Dutch Sociological Association (NSV).

Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)

More general anthropological journals appeared during this stage, such as Focaal (1985) and Etnofoor (1988). Focaal was established at the University of Nijmegen, while Etnofoor was based at the University of Amsterdam.

Budget cuts in the 1980s had a profound effect on anthropology in the Netherlands. In 1989, these budget cuts eventually led to the demise of the anthropology department in Groningen. Because of declining student numbers and staff reductions anthropology is a small discipline in the Dutch academic landscape, both in terms of the number of students as well as staff.

The introduction of a new two-phase structure of academic education meant that research had to be organized in research institutes. For anthropology, this resulted in cooperation with sociologists in Amsterdam (in the Amsterdam school of Social Research, ASSR), cooperation with linguists and historians in Leiden (in the Centre for non-Western Studies, CNWS) and organization around the theme of development studies in Nijmegen, Utrecht and Wageningen (in the Centre for Resource Studies, CERES). Most of anthropological research in the Netherlands is focused on the non-Western world; studies of Dutch communities are relatively rare.

In the early years of the institutionalisation of the discipline, the share of female students was very low: on average, only 10 percent of the students who graduated in anthropology each year (over the period 1955-1970) were female. In the early 1980s, this share increased to around 33 percent. A big rise in the ensuing years resulted in a majority of students now being female: their average annual share of graduated students was 80 percent on the first decade of the 2000s. The share of chairs held by
female professors with the designation ‘cultural anthropology’ in their ordination (NARCIS database) remained far below that, however (23 percent in 2015).
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Social Anthropology in the United Kingdom

Marcus Morgan, University of Cambridge

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

Social Anthropology came to the fore in Britain near the end of the nineteenth century through figures such as E. B. Tylor (1832-1917) [who, in 1896, was appointed the first Professor of Anthropology at Oxford University] and James George Frazer (1854-1941), whose foundational multi-volume work *The Golden Bough* (1890), exerted an immense influence not only over many subsequent British anthropologists, but also writers of literature and philosophy too.

The first major British ethnographic expedition was led by Alfred Haddon (1855-1940) and the larger-than-life polymath W. H. R. Rivers (1864-1922), who set off in 1898 to Melanesia on their famous Torres Straits Expedition. Haddon set out as a zoologist, and Rivers as an anthropologist, but as a psychologist in order to study the islanders’ psyches. Nevertheless, whilst out there he became deeply interested in genealogy descent and marital relationships amongst the islanders, and pioneered the anthropological study of kinship.

One of Rivers’s students, Alfred Radcliffe-Brown (1881-1955) was also to have a huge impact on British anthropology, most notably through his founding the theory of Structural Functionalism. Radcliffe-Brown occupied the first chair of social anthropology at Oxford University in 1937, though Robert Marrett (1866-1943), had first established the department there in 1914.

Whereas ‘cultural anthropology’ became popular in America through the influence of the German émigré Franz Boas, British anthropology defined itself instead as ‘social anthropology’, in large part under the sway of Polish emigre Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942). Malinowski’s influence over the discipline in Britain is difficult to overestimate and, alongside Radcliffe-Brown, he more or less defined British social anthropology as functionalist anthropology (drawing abundantly upon the French sociologist Emile Durkheim). Much of his influence came firstly, through his famous weekly seminars at the London School of Economics (LSE) in which he established a form of apprenticeship into the discipline and to which many figures from outside the LSE were drawn, secondly, through his pioneering the participant observation method of field research in which research participants’ accounts of the behaviour could be contradicted by observed behaviour, and thirdly, through his training (during the 1920s and 1930s) of so many of the figures who came to lead and dominated the discipline after World War II, including Firth, Evans-Pritchard, Fortes, Leach, Parsons, as well as some important female anthropologists too, such as Audrey Richards (1899-1984) and Lucy Mair (1901-1986). Even those who were being trained elsewhere, often travelled to London in order to attend his seminars.
The clubby characteristic of early British anthropology is frequently noted, and it remained a feature for a long time to come, reinforced as it was by the remarkably small size of the discipline, and its location in a handful of elite universities.

Edward Evans-Pritchard (1902-1973), who had studied history at Oxford, and then anthropology at the LSE under Malinowski, gained fame for his study of the Azande (the first intensive fieldwork of an African people by a trained anthropologist). He went on to produce a very famous study of the Nuer, and was professor of Social Anthropology at Oxford from 1946 to 1970. Prior to this he had found great difficulties securing an anthropological job in England, due to his falling out with Malinowski (a fact which again demonstrated the immense power Malinowski held over the entire discipline in Britain prior to the war). After Malinowski’s death (in 1942), Evans-Pritchard in many ways became the leading figure of British anthropology (therefore shifting the centre of gravity from London to Oxford), and like Malinowski, many of his students, such as Talal Asad (1933–) and Mary Douglas, went on to become leaders of the discipline throughout the world.

Anthropology was of course strongly linked to colonialism from its inception and almost all early British anthropological research was conducted in British colonial territories. Part of the link however, can be explained as a strategy by anthropologists to gain funding for their research, which they argued could be useful to colonial administration. This funding took place in part through the Colonial Social Science Research Council, which was established in 1944 and allowed for the establishment of various institutes of social research in the colonies (significantly the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in Northern Rhodesia, and the African Institute of Social Research founded in 1950 in Uganda). In reality however, their work rarely fed into colonial policy or practice (Kuper 1996: 95). Links to racist forms of anthropometry did exist though, and the assumed separation of ‘savage’ or ‘primitive’ from ‘civilized’ societies upon which much early anthropological work was unreflectively based involved a strong implicit justification for the necessity of colonial governance for those who were presumably not civilized enough to govern themselves.

However, in taking native cultures seriously—often through very close contact with, intimate involvement in, and respectful learning of that culture—anthropology was also in tension with the more explicitly racist aspects of the mentality upon which colonialism was based, and indeed was seen as highly suspect by many of the British colonial settler communities. In cataloguing, recording, and demonstrating the enormous complexities, advances, and subtleties of ‘peripheral’ cultures anthropological fieldwork threatened, as much as it also abetted, the colonial mission. Anthropology itself should also not be seen as an automatic effect of colonialism, for neither Spain nor Portugal developed anthropology in any significant manner (ibid.).

Due to these ties however, decolonization and the decline of the British Empire in the second half of the twentieth century inevitably effected the discipline of anthropology like no other; as empire slowly retreated, so too did the traditional laboratory of anthropological research.
Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)

British Anthropology enjoyed a rapid expansion in numbers following WWII, and in many ways this was the first period in which it became a proper profession and viable career path. The Association for Social Anthropologists (ASA) was set up in 1946 as a professional alternative to the partly amateur Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI), and was chaired by Radcliffe-Brown. Malinowski’s influence at last waned and new chairs were created in University College London (UCL), the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), Manchester, and Edinburgh. Firth took the chair vacated by Malinowski at LSE in 1944; Ford at UCL in 1945; Evans-Pritchard succeeded Radcliffe-Brown at Oxford in 1946; Gluckman took the chair in Manchester in 1949 (initiating the ‘Manchester School’), Fortes in Cambridge in 1950; Nadel in Durham in 1948; and Furer-Haimendorf at SOAS in 1951. This entirely male group of Professors dominated the profession for the next two decades.

Edmund Leach (1910-1989), arrived in Cambridge, where he had previously been an undergraduate, from the LSE in 1953, and became Provost of King’s College in 1966. He was awarded a chair in 1972 and was influential in marrying Malinowskian functionalism with a modified Levi-Straussian structuralist perspective. Rodney Needham (1923-2006) (Oxford) and Mary Douglas (1921-2007) (UCL) likewise promoted structuralism during the late 1950s and 1960s.

In 1973, Jack Goody (1919-2015) was made the William Wyse Professor at Cambridge, which he occupied until 1984.

The post-war expansion of anthropology was not repeated again in the early 1960s, and though anthropology had been better established than the other social sciences in the older universities, in relative terms it did not fair at all well with the Robbins expansion of higher education and the establishment of the new plate-glass universities (Evans-Pritchard, 1967), the strong emergence of Sussex University as a training ground for graduates being an exception to this rule (Spencer 2000). Sociology, on the other hand, though generally considered less prestigious, was expanding faster than it could fill its teaching posts, leading to various trained anthropologists moving into posts in sociology departments during the 1960s. Though the situation was not good for British anthropology in the 1970s as the Old Guard were retiring, Marxism and feminism did emerge as innovative forces in study what were now post-colonial societies, though their influence was in part an attack on the enterprise itself. Kuper notes how the era of a distinctly ‘British’ anthropology was over (it had, according to him, lasted for approximately 50 years, from the early 1920s and 1930s, i.e. Malinowski’s’ seminar, to the end of Empire), and it gave way to a more cosmopolitan project.
Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)

During the 1980s as American anthropology rose to prominence and the postmodernist vogue came into play, there were financial strains in the UK, freezes on appointments, and encouraged early retirement. As ‘cultural studies’ was gaining ground in the UK elsewhere in the 1980s, very little communication occurred with anthropology.

During the 1990s, important British figures included Marilyn Strathern (1941-) and Henrietta L. Moore (1957-). The depressing outlook of the 1980s was somewhat alleviated with the institutional expansion of Higher Education in the 1990s and significant substantive new research areas include medical anthropology and applied anthropology. Although many undergraduate programs now exist, for the vast majority of its history, anthropology in the UK has been above all a graduate pursuit. Slowly the discipline became more feminized, with women occupying a majority of teaching posts after 1989 (Spencer 2000: 10).
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Anthropology in the United States

Aube Mezières and Leonora Dugonjic-Rodwin (CNRS-CESSP)

First Institutionalization (until 1945)

In the 1830s, phrenologists such as Charles Cadwell believed in the hierarchy of species. Scientific racism was dominant among naturalists, phrenologists and archeologists. American anthropology developed in this context as an activity that shed light on the pressing issues of the times: forging a national identity, advancing territorial expansion and justifying a slave-based economy in the southern states (Patterson 2001). Between 1879 and 1900, most individuals who earned their living from anthropology were employed by one of the three government agencies with overlapping histories: the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum and the Bureau of Ethnology. However, at the turn of the twentieth century, the profession's center moved from the federal government to museums and universities. For instance, the Smithsonian Institution asked for anthropological information based on exploring missions, which mainly concerned American Indians. Museums also participated in the development of anthropology. For example, Frederick W. Putnam (1839-1915) of Harvard ran the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology and created an anthropological program at the Field Museum in Chicago in the 1890s.

Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881), the first to study the Iroquois kinship system, might be considered as the founding father of anthropology (Silverman 2005). John W. Powell (1834-1902), first director of the Bureau of Ethnology, established by Congress in 1879, played a central role in the founding of professional anthropology. After conducting a survey ordered by the Smithsonian Institution in 1868, he published a guide about collecting Indian vocabulary. The ethnologist Franz Boas (1858-1942) shaped the discipline since he started lecturing at Columbia in 1895, where he established an anthropology department in 1899. He contributed to institutionalizing the discipline in universities and museums. He developed four subfields of anthropology: ethnology, linguistics, archeology and biology and was the first to be awarded a PhD in the field.

Franz Boas turned anthropology into an academic discipline (Stocking 2002). One of his students, Alfred L. Kroeber (1876-1960) founded a department of anthropology at Berkeley, California, in 1901. Then Frank Speck (1881-1950) also founded a department at the University of Pennsylvania. Boas also worked with Putnam in Harvard where they extended anthropology courses to undergraduates in 1894. Anthropology was then also taught in Columbia, and a year later in Chicago too. Graduate training programs in anthropology emerged at Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Berkeley and Pennsylvania. By 1912, 20 PhDs had been awarded. In 1917 the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) established a permanent committee on the teaching of anthropology (De Laguna and Hallowell 2002). Foundations such as Carnegie or Rockefeller granted funds. Thanks to them,
Chicago emerged as a major center of anthropology in the 1920s, and the domain of anthropology became autonomous from sociology.

Anthropology gained a public existence promoting cultural relativism in the 1930s. However, the discipline remained small. In the meantime a strong new influence on anthropology came to Chicago with Alfred Radcliffe-Brown’s urban sociology. Malinowski came to Yale and injected some British social anthropology into the American discipline (Darnell 2001). During the two World Wars, anthropologists were hired by the government, mainly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with orientations such as acculturation studies, race relationships in the US and colonial rule in Africa, Asia and Oceania.

Postwar Renewal and Expansion (1940s-1970s)

After 1945, the discipline organized itself within the new political context. The American Anthropological Association (AAA), founded in 1902, reintegrated linguists, applied anthropologists and archeologists according to the Boasian paradigm, which remained predominant. Cultural anthropology developed in the late 1940s with Margaret Mead (1901-1978) and Ruth Benedict (1887-1948), both students of Boas. However, anthropologists such as Leslie White (1900-1975) or Julian Steward (1902-1972) challenged the Boasian paradigm. They represented materialism and promoted a new explanatory model of culture and cultural development by giving priority to material conditions. White spent 40 years at Michigan where he built one of the strongest departments in the country. The period between 1950 and 1970 was the golden age of anthropology with numerous job opportunities in new world areas. Studies on the Third World were also determined by political priorities. This expansion can be seen in the growth of anthropology departments.

The late 1970s and the global crisis in American society led to a difficult time for anthropology. The politicization of the discipline gave visibility to minorities yet also marked its divisions, for instance on the issue of Vietnam. Led by Peggy Golde (-2003) feminist anthropology too emerged at this time. The AAA made efforts to raise consciousness on the position of women in the discipline and a survey highlighted serious discrimination and drew attention to the fact that native perspectives needed to be better incorporated into the discipline. During this period of struggle for anthropology, there was greater multidisciplinary and new theories emerged, for instance Clifford Geertz’s symbolic anthropology.

Albert Gallatin founded an Ethnological Society in 1842. The Anthropological Society of Washington (ASW) was founded in 1879, and with it the journal *American Anthropologist* in 1889. Mathilda Coxe Stevenson founded the Women's Anthropological Society in 1885 and organized joint meetings with the Anthropological Society of Washington. However, women were elected as members of the ASW in 1889, and in 1902, William McGeed founded The American Anthropological Association (AAA) as a merger of the two societies. The AAA is
today composed of 40 sections and counts about 10,000 members. The **Linguistic Society of America** was established in 1925 and the **American Association of Physical Anthropologists** in 1929. The latter published the **American Journal of Physical Anthropology**. Founded in 1941, the **Society for Applied Anthropology** publishes two journals: **Human Organization** and **Practicing Anthropology**. A group of anthropologists who wanted to break down barriers that prevent their full participation in the discipline established the **Association of Black Anthropologists** in 1970. **Cultural Anthropology** is a quarterly published since 1986 by the AAA on behalf of the **Society for Cultural Anthropology**. **Human Biology**, a peer-reviewed journal, is published by the **American Association of Anthropological Genetics** since 1929. Published by the University of Chicago since 1974, the **International Journal of American Linguistics** was founded by Franz Boas in 1917 (Murphy 2002).

When the discipline institutionalized, two schools of thought were opposed. The end of the 19th century was marked by racist views, however scholars such as Franz Boas and sociologist and racial equality defender **W.E.B. DuBois** (1868-1963) criticized cultural evolutionary thought. Enduring until after WWI, three conceptions were in vogue. First, Boas and his students promoted a cultural anthropology, however in the museums, **Ales Hrdlicka** (1869-1943) asserted the primacy of biology and attempted to establish a physical anthropology. Against these two, **Charles B. Davenport** (1866-1944) promoted a racist anthropology and eugenics. These three scholars fought for the lock hold over the Committee of Anthropology, created in the National Research Council in 1916. During the 1920s, cultural determinists, Franz Boas and Margaret Mead reasserted their hegemony within the profession and challenged the dominance of the eugenicists.

**Ruth Benedict** (1887-1948), the first woman to be recognized as a leading anthropologist worked on the relations between individual creativity and cultural patterns. Cultural anthropologist **Margaret Mead** carried out fieldwork in Samoa studying Samoan youth. **William Allison Davis** (1902-1983) pioneered research on class and race in the American South and on the intelligence quotient. In 1942, he was the first Afro-American to obtain a full faculty position in anthropology at Chicago. Founder of the School of Social Science in 1970, **Clifford Geertz** (1926-2006) focused on Indonesia and drew attention to the role of symbols in constructing public meaning. The American Anthropological Association was most receptive to women leaders, with five women presidents between 1941 and 1969 (Rossiter 1995, 312).

**Contemporary Development (1970s-2000s)**

Economic restructuring in the 1970s had a devastating effect on anthropology as fewer students completed their PhDs. This academic situation kept going. In the 1990s, there were few jobs in anthropology. However, jobs in applied anthropology increased. Biological anthropology rose with genetics, and so did archeology. Linguistic anthropology suffered because it was stuck between two disciplines (anthropology and linguistics). Cultural anthropology changed the most and diversified as shown by the reorganization of AAA's sections in 1983.
Since the 1970s, feminization has been the most striking change in American faculty demographics. The proportion of women among full-time faculty members has doubled from approximately one in six (17.3 percent) in 1969 to more than one-third (35.9 percent) in 1998 (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006, 51). Although this growth has been steady within successive new-entry cohorts since 1970, the extent of feminization varies significantly across institutional sectors, disciplinary fields and employment status. Since the 1980s, numerous women entered the labor market, earning close to a third of all PhDs in anthropology, however they were often employed as part-time teachers. By the late 1980s, 45 percent of the PhD were awarded to women (Patterson 2001, 162).
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