



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 31
Issue 1 *June 2004*

Article 1

January 2004

Volume 31, Issue 1

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han>

 Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), and the [History of Science, Technology, and Medicine Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2004) "Volume 31, Issue 1," *History of Anthropology Newsletter*. Vol. 31 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss1/1>


This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss1/1>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.



**HISTORY OF
ANTHROPOLOGY
NEWSLETTER**

Volume 31:1

June 2004



HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

Volume 31:1

June 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes on the History of Anthropology—"Anthropology in the World Court: The 1966 South-West Africa Case" Robert J. Gordon	3
Research In Progress	12
Recent Dissertations	12
Recent Bibliography	12
Recent and Forthcoming Volumes of <u>History of Anthropology</u>	22
Announcements	22
Upcoming Professional Meetings	24
Website via http://ccat.sas.edu/hss2/hss	

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Henrika Kuklick
Editor

Joy Rohde
Assistant Editor

CORRESPONDING CONTRIBUTORS

Regna Darnell
rdarnell@uwo.ca
Christian Feest
christian.feest@ethno-museum.ac.at
Curtis Hinsley
Curtis.Hinsley@NAU.EDU
Esteban Krotz
kroqui@prodigy.net.mx
H. Glenn Penny
h-penny@uiowa.edu
George Stocking
g-stocking@uchicago.edu

Nélia Dias
Nelia.Dias@iscte.pt
Robert Gordon
rgordon@uvm.edu
Edgardo Krebs
Krebs.edgar@nsmh.si.edu
Joyce Ogburn
jlogburn@u.washington.edu
Lyn Schumaker
lynschumaker@yahoo.co.uk

HAN depends very much on our readers to contribute bibliographic notes, research reports, and items for our other departments.

Direct all correspondence relating to editorial matters to: **HANpenn@sas.upenn.edu**.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Each volume contains two numbers, June and December.

Individual Subscribers, North America	\$6.00
Student Subscribers	\$4.00
Institutional Subscribers	\$8.00
Subscribers outside North America	\$10.00

Checks for renewals and new subscriptions should be payable (in U.S. Dollars only) to:

HAN and addressed to:

Henrika Kuklick
Department of History and Sociology of Science
University of Pennsylvania
Logan Hall Suite 303
249 S. 36 St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE WORLD COURT: THE 1966 SOUTH-WEST AFRICA CASE

Robert J. Gordon
University of Vermont

The 1966 International Court of Justice's refusal to hear a complaint against South Africa for not administering South-West Africa according to the League of Nations Mandates charter might be a minor blimp in the Court's history, but it generated an exceptional amount of mental and intellectual effort and energy. The source of the conflict lay in South Africa's refusal to recognize the United Nations as the legal successor to the League of Nations. Thus, South Africa refused to hand over its Mandated Territory of South-West Africa to the United Nations to be administered as a Trusteeship Territory, and continued to administer South-West Africa as if it were still a Mandate. Six years before, in 1960, Liberia and Ethiopia, two countries that had been members of the League of Nations and thus had the necessary *locus standi in judicio*, had taken South Africa to the World Court. Charging that the United Nations was the legal successor to the League of Nations, Liberia and Ethiopia had demanded that the Mandate awarded to South Africa by the League to administer South West Africa be revoked on the grounds that South Africa had acted in bad faith by neglecting to fulfill Article 2 of the Mandate—"To promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory." South Africa's rejoinder was that the ultimate end it was pursuing in the Territory—*Apartheid*--was in accordance with enlightened and liberal opinion.

The South African Government took this case seriously. Not only did it believe that Namibia represented its Achilles heel in international affairs but it also saw the Court proceedings as an important occasion to justify *Apartheid* to an increasingly skeptical international audience. As the leader of the South African legal team, D.P. de Villiers, put it, their task was to "restore some objectivity to the matter." The Applicants' 62 page *Memorial* resulted in a ten volume *Counter-Memorial* that sought to refute the allegations against South Africa and demonstrate that "self-determination" was the most "practical course"; it claimed that Namibians were educationally and economically better off than residents of other African countries, that South Africa's policies enjoyed the support of the "great majority," and that existing policies did not represent expressions of racist ideology "but merely practical recognition of existing differences between various groups in culture, language modes of living, outlook and stages of development"(de Villiers 1968:14). Sparing no expense, South Africa presented copious documentation to substantiate its case, justified on the grounds that the Applicants' charges were broad and vague, and failed to provide a background for a "proper appreciation of the issues raised." South Africa's legal volumes contain a wealth of material, not only on the Territory but also on the rest of Africa. Indeed, they provide an ironic update of Hailey's famous *African Survey*. Moreover, South Africa presented a list of 38 "Expert Witnesses" who could be called to testify about the situation in the Territory. In public hearings held from July 1 to October 21, 1965, thirteen of these were called, including three anthropologists.

The three anthropological witnesses, Messrs Eiselen, Bruwer and van Zyl, all Afrikaans-speaking, identified themselves not as *volkekundiges* or even as ethnologists, but as social anthropologists, in a move considerably at variance with conventional representations of South African anthropology.¹ The most important anthropological witness, and the focal

point of this brief paper (which is part of a larger, ongoing project), was Johannes Petrus van Schalkwyk Bruwer, who was the State's resident ethnological expert on Namibia, the first Commissioner-General for the Native Peoples of South West Africa, a member of the so-called Odendaal Commission (South Africa's 1964 *Commission of Enquiry into South West African Affairs*, which developed a comprehensive plan for the socio-economic development of the Territory), and later Foundation Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Port Elizabeth, Bruwer was called to provide expertise on the crucial question of differences among various Namibian population groups, their consciousness of separate identities and their wishes to maintain them, and the likely effects of removal of measures to ensure "differentiation"--in essence, the ideological justification of *Apartheid*. Bruwer was examined and cross-examined more extensively than any of the other expert witnesses. Throughout the proceedings, he constantly stressed his anthropological expertise. His testimony was littered with the qualifier, "As an anthropologist . . ."

Namibia, Bruwer claimed, was divided into two main groups, the Khoisan and Bantu, who were distinguishable not only linguistically but also on "perceivable physical differences." Khoisan consisted of Bushmen and Nama, while among the Bantu would be classified the Herero, the Kaokoveld cluster, the Ovambo people, and the Kavango and Eastern Caprivi people. But this classification was befuddled by the Damara, who were linguistically Khoisan but physically Negroid. And while the Bantu-speakers had preserved their oral traditions, the Khoisan had not. All these groups spoke mutually unintelligible languages (ICJ 1966 Vol X:246). In addition to linguistic differences, there were major differences in kinship: the Ovambo-Kavango cluster were matrilineal, Herero practiced double-descent and the Nama were patrilineal. Moreover, in terms of subsistence, Ovambo-Kavango people were agriculturalists, Herero were cattle pastoralists, Nama were sheep pastoralists, and Bushmen and Damara were hunters. Save for a few isolated individuals among them, these diverse peoples had no inclination to form an overarching single "integrated unit." Separate development, he concluded, was the only workable policy: it represented respect for the achievements of African peoples, allowed flexibility in adaptation in an evolutionary way to changing situations, and did not necessitate abandoning people's "sacred heritage" (ICJ 1966, X:263).

Integration, defined by Bruwer as "where you create a society by giving rights and privileges to members of other groups, who have already got their rights and privileges in another area", had not occurred because people lacked political and property rights, or more precisely, legal rights (ICJ 1966 X:296). Fundamental to Bruwer's view was the notion of a dual economy, a modern cash-sector controlled and dominated by Whites, coexisting with the multitude of "traditional" ones found in the reserves. Conceding that the White economy was dependent upon natives, he denied that it was an "integrated one": it was simply a "school for learning for these people" (ICJ 1966, X:277, 300) as the cash economy was "alien to these (Herero) people" because their "basic" culture was pastoralist and thus not "a money type of economy." He denied that Namibia had an integrated economy because all groups did not have rights and privileges connected to the economy, e.g. land rights (ICJ 1966, X:297). Bruwer insisted that "traditional economies" emphasized group rights, and that "group membership" could not be lost in a life-time as ties of lineage and clan linked individuals to the larger group. Group rights were necessary to protect members of the group against other groups, although individual rights could be exercised within the group.

With mantra-like regularity, Bruwer reiterated his position that "differentiation" was necessary to protect a group against other stronger groups; while measures designed to

preserve it imposed limitations on individual freedom, it was for the good of the group and in the interests of all the people. This, in a nutshell, was Bruwer's expert testimony. He was well prepared and practiced for it, having done extensive ethnographic fieldwork in the Territory, and having served as a key member on the Odendaal Commission.

The Life and Striving of Johannes P van S Bruwer ²

Bruwer represents an important figure in the second-generation of South African anthropologists. Born in the Cape in 1913, and educated at the Wellington Teachers Training College, he had spent fifteen years as a Dutch Reformed Church missionary in Northern Rhodesia and to the end of his life he remained a devout Christian. He became fluent in Chewa, and occupied a number of important mission positions. Like most Afrikaner anthropologists, he earned all of his degrees from a single University, which in his case was the University of Pretoria. He obtained a BA degree through extra-mural study, then earning an MA in 1949 (cum laude) and a doctorate in 1955, with a thesis on the kinship basis of social organization among matrilineal Bantu communities with special reference to the Kunda. (He apparently had no direct contact with the famous Rhodes-Livingstone Institute located in Northern Rhodesia.) In 1951, he was appointed Senior Lecturer in *Volkekunde* at the University of Stellenbosch, and three years later, he was promoted to Professor.

Stellenbosch in those days was an intellectually exciting place. An important influence there was F.D.Holleman, a South African-born Dutchman who had been a Judge in Indonesia and had succeeded the famous Adat law scholar, van Vollenhoven, at Leiden University, before taking early retirement and accepting the Chair of Bantu Law at Stellenbosch. Holleman brought to the discussion of *Apartheid* a concern for "jural communities." His 1952 mimeographed notes on *Bantoeregsameenskappe* (Bantu legal communities) were still being used for teaching in the late sixties, and were derived from his study, not of Calvinism, but of Indonesian "Adat Circles." Holleman also informed Stellenbosch academics about Furnivall's conceptualization of Plural Societies, and this probably accounts, at least in part, for the rhetoric that Bruwer used in his marathon evidence at the ICJ. At Stellenbosch Bruwer was also heavily involved in SABRA, the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs, an Afrikaner think-tank which was trying to provide a scientific rationale for *Apartheid* and the *Afrikaanse Broederbond*, the secretive organization which sought to consolidate Afrikaner nationalism and saw *Apartheid* as one of the crucial mechanisms in achieving this. Bruwer rapidly rose to prominence in this powerful organization, serving at one stage as acting Chair of the *Broederbond*.³ From at least 1963 to his untimely death in an airplane crash in 1967, he served as convener of the Oversight Committee on Bantu Affairs, one of the committees whose recommendations to the *Broederbond*'s Executive Council invariably become Government policy.⁴ It is especially notable that the Minister of Native Affairs was invariably a *Broeder* (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:196-201). Bruwer was heavily engaged in *Volksdiens* (Service to the Afrikaner nation): not only did he author two editions of a Standard Eight (Grade Ten) school text on *Race Studies* for the Transvaal Education Department, but he also gave a series of radio lectures on topics like *Ons Mandaat, Suidwes-Afrika*, later published in pamphlet form (Bruwer 1961), and wrote *Die Bantoe van Suid-Afrika* (1957), which was the first ethnographic textbook in Afrikaans.

Bruwer became enamored of South-West Africa during his first study tour in December 1954. Undoubtedly, professional interests figured in its appeal for him. Its

Ovambo and Kavango inhabitants were part of the so-called matrilineal (kinship) belt, which extended to Mozambique and of which he had first-hand experience. Moreover, he grasped the strategic importance of the Territory for South Africa. It formed a wedge-route to and from the rest of Black Africa, and thus the goodwill of the indigenous population was crucial. During this first trip he recalled being struck by the “backward nature of indigenous society,” and by officials’ lack of interest in and ignorance of it. Subsequently, he made periodic visits to the Territory as a tourist and speaker at (*Broederbond*) meetings and Day of Covenant celebrations. In December 1958, Bruwer undertook his first research tour aimed at making closer contact with indigenous peoples, and even then he felt that it was apparent that indigenes were moving away from supporting the South African government and would unavoidably continue to do so, unless strong action was taken to counter their increasing alienation, the activities of SWAPO (the fledgling liberation movement that would form the first government in independent Namibia in 1990), the continued “interference” of the Reverend Michael Scott, and the increasing number of petitions by local individuals to the United Nations. All of these phenomena, he claimed, were only the **visible** signs of deep undercurrents that were increasing in strength. In particular, two things caught his attention in Ovamboland: first, the poverty and stagnation symbolized by the South African flag flying over a termite-eaten *rondawel* office; and second, the growing success of SWAPO, exemplified by nightly meetings about which white officials were blissfully unaware. So concerned was Bruwer that he wrote a confidential report to various Cabinet Ministers about the deteriorating situation, suggesting options for action.

Early in 1959, he commenced six months work in Omedi, Kuanyama Tribal Area, selecting it as his field site because he believed that SWAPO agitation was greatest there. He traveled extensively to “get to know the people” and assess SWAPO’s activities, and in the expectation that he could neutralize SWAPO through personal contact. Thus, he traveled east to the Kavango River region and west to Kaokoveld, where he found individuals who were traveling to Botswana to meet priests, ostensibly for religious-nativistic reasons but, he felt, really to consolidate ties with Herero exiles. And he determined that it was the situation in Kuanyama, the most populous area in Namibia, that required urgent attention in order to divert interest from SWAPO. For this purpose, Bruwer proposed two strategic actions: organizing an agricultural show, which would keep people busy and give them something to talk about; and erecting an imposing building for the Kuanyama Tribal Council in order to bolster the prestige of the Headmen. These suggestions were enacted by a sympathetic (Afrikaner) Bantu Affairs Commissioner. The first show was held in May 1959: “As researcher I could propagate the matter objectively and it was quickly apparent that the matter had a calming influence.” It took many visits to neutralize the SWAPO-inspired “under-currents.” Bruwer justified these visits as being part of his clan survey. In two months, he visited 333 wards and met groups representing 11,234 households. He worked an average of 17 hours per day, and claimed to have made contact with more than 25,000 people in Kuanyama, 31% of the total population.

Bruwer spent the second half of 1959 as a visiting professor at Johns Hopkins University courtesy of USSALEP (United States Leadership Exchange Program), and was unable to return to Namibia until December 1961. He found that the situation had deteriorated further, and expressed his concerns to de Wet Nel, the South African Minister of Bantu Administration who had oversight responsibilities for South West Africa. He repeated his concern about subversive “under-currents” and the need to mobilize goodwill, and reiterated his plea for a well-organized plan of development as soon as possible. Bruwer also pleaded for an experienced anthropologist to be appointed, preferably as a

Commissioner-General⁵, who could liaise and co-ordinate the development plan. The Commissioner-General should have broad and intensive contact with indigenes in order to promote acceptance of South African overrule. He should be a person, Bruwer wrote, who would be willing to work tirelessly, who would know how to interact with local people, and who would have the necessary status in his relations with the central government to be able to act effectively. The government approach the struggle wholeheartedly, and should take steps to attract foreign sympathizers. Bruwer concluded, "We will never satisfy the UN and the leftists, but if we can get the large majority of the population on our side, we can achieve much despite all our problem" (letter to de Wet Nel, Minister of Bantu Administration, January 15, 1962).

The Minister responded quickly, arranging for Bruwer to return to Namibia almost immediately, leaving his teaching post at Stellenbosch. His ostensive purpose was to do research, but he was specifically charged with promoting goodwill and cooperation, especially important in view of the impending visit of the United Nations Carpio/d'Alva delegation (in May), and with inducing the various Ovambo groups to accept a central tribal authority. So important were his tasks that Bruwer had private discussions with South African Prime Minister Verwoerd, who arranged for special leave for a year and for special research funding for Bruwer to be channeled through the University. Bruwer wrote a letter to the newly appointed Adjunct Minister for South West African Affairs in which he elaborated his plan of action. Officially, he said, he was going to do research on land tenure systems in Kaokoveld, Ovamboland and the Kavango; "this will properly cover my presence and mobility in all these areas and if necessary officials can be informed so that I can have at all times the necessary freedom of movement." And it was also important that he keep his University affiliation as a cover:

For practical purposes then I remain in the employ of the University and maintain thus my objectivity as researcher to the outside world. ... Apart for my striving for trust and goodwill and the other matters that have been given to me, the research itself will also have practical utility. Further I might be able in various regards be able to give confidential advice about affairs of the day... There is only one valid consideration here---love for the case of SWA-- for me it can only bring sacrifice. I have nothing to gain, possibly even much to lose (Letter to van der Wath, February 23, 1962, my translations).

By the time Bruwer reached Kuanyama he realized that SWAPO had heard of the impending United Nations visit, and were organizing a 50, 000 person mass protest demonstration. Through his "contacts," he learned that SWAPO was now in league with traditional authorities, and that each ward had its own organizer. Desperate, he met with Toivo ya Toivo, the local SWAPO leader, as well as the various ward organizers, supposedly surprising them by knowing of their role. Expending over R3, 000 (the equivalent to about US\$3,000 in those days) of his own funds, he claimed to have managed to persuade the demonstration organizers to accept a compromise to stage only a local demonstration. Eventually, only seventy demonstrators turned up to meet the UN team. During this episode, local white officials were unaware of what was going on.⁶ Whenever possible, Bruwer provided advice informally. Thus, he managed to dissuade Bantu Administration from introducing 43 Apartheid-style "tribal authorities" in Ovamboland in 1963 (on the expert advice of a Pretoria University *volkekundige*), arguing that his research had shown that the traditional authorities wanted a centralized system.

Bruwer was a busy scholar. While doing fieldwork, he was also helping to prepare the South African defense at the ICJ. In this effort, his involvement dated no later than early April, 1961. Originally it was decided that the (South African) Chief Government Ethnologist, van Warmelo, would provide the basic ethnological background, while Bruwer would prepare the section of the government's brief devoted to history, as well as provide the ethnological justification for *Apartheid*. However, van Warmelo's work proved to be unsatisfactory, and it was decided that Bruwer's research should provide the basis for the South African rejoinder (McGregor letter 26th March 1962). It is easy to understand why van Warmelo's 48 page Memorandum on the "Inhabitants of South West Africa from an ethnological point of view" was unacceptable to the team preparing for the World Court hearings. It described the eleven "racial groups," and concluded with a section on "Differences between Europeans as a group, and non-Europeans". After mentioning physical distinctions and *odor*, van Warmelo discussed language, dress and finally manners. His concluding two paragraphs *in extenso*:

(Native) practices in connection with micturition and defecation are to Europeans nauseously filthy, and though non-Europeans often wonder why Europeans don't like to shake hands with them, there are very good reasons. There is no guarantee that a well-dressed Native is not nevertheless still most primitive and loathsome in his habits. Europeans, seeing these people daily cannot but note how Native gentlemen put a finger to a nostril to blow the other.... So they draw their own conclusions. The sight of a Native latrine, or a visit to a Native homestead where Nature all around serves as latrine just like with the animals, should make it clear why Europeans insist on living apart from Natives...The differences here cannot be gone into without describing the institutions themselves, which has been done elsewhere. But such fundamental concepts as the role and duties of the sexes (man as gentleman, woman as worker), the relative unimportance of the marriage tie and illegitimacy, the importance of status and of seeming important against the relative unimportance of really being respectable, the spendthrift attitude towards waste, leisure, time and opportunity, all these and many other characteristic attitudes are a cause of Europeans not being able to establish real communication, or to work together except where the one directs the activities of the other.⁷

By January 1963 Bruwer was completing his conclusions. As he informed the South African Agent: "I am busy rewriting the ethnic exposition to **emphasize differences. I am also going to examine the violent struggles among the indigenous groups which raged until the end of the previous century in order to indicate that the groups could not live together in peace as a unit**" (Letter to McGregor, 14th January 1963, my emphasis). Later, he described the structure of his memorandum; the purpose of Section 3 was to "show that the groups could not live in peace before the whites came." Section 5 would emphasize "only basic and fundamental differences" and Section 6 would analyze cultures to "show the basic differences" again (Letter to McGregor 31st January 1963). In February 1965 he was asked to make himself available as a possible "Expert Witness."

Bruwer is more important for understanding Namibian society than his paltry publication record⁸ or "Expert Witness" status would suggest. To be sure, his tragic death in 1967 curtailed a most fascinating career. Bruwer's significance for Namibian anthropology is to be found in a variety of achievements. He attracted and sponsored a number of students who undertook fieldwork in the densely populated northern areas, in the Kavango and

Ovambo regions. More important, one has to examine Bruwer's influence on Government policy, especially his role in the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, his part in the *Commission for South West African Affairs*, and his performance as inaugural Commissioner-General for the Indigenous Peoples of South West Africa. He evidently played a leading role in guiding the *Commission for South West African Affairs*, and tried to oversee the implementation of its recommendations in his capacity of Commissioner-General; significantly, the South African Government committed large sums to try to implement the commission's major recommendations. Arguably, the South African government used Namibia as the site of a pilot project, giving *Apartheid* a trial run there by creating twelve separate homelands. Indeed per capita more people were forcibly removed (including whites) in Namibia than in South Africa. In large part, the *Apartheid* fantasy was given ostensive credibility by anthropologists such as Bruwer. The interesting aspect of Bruwer's career is that he resigned his Commissioner-Generalship prematurely, holding the post for less than a year. Like a good secretive *Broeder*, he purged his papers of any suggestions as to why he resigned, but a contextual reading of them suggests that he had a major disagreement about the viability of *Apartheid* with Dr. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister and driving force behind *Apartheid*. Unfortunately, he did not explain his differences with Verwoerd before he died, so we will never know what they were.

Conclusion

This brief paper forms part of a larger ongoing project on the role of expert ineptitude in the making of Namibia. Its story of how good, intelligent people with high moral principles were so thoroughly wrong in their interpretations and interventions is a lesson in humility, which is what some of us would argue is what anthropology is about. Although the project is incomplete, several tentative conclusions can be drawn from its preliminary findings.

Among students of South African anthropology, there has been a vigorous re-assessment of the role of anthropology in elaborating the ideology and policy of *Apartheid*. After an initial critique suggesting anthropologists' culpability (West 1988; Sharp 1981; Gordon 1988), there has been a counter-attack, insisting that the critics were too sweeping in their critique (Coertze 1999; 2000). This short note has been intended to provide sufficient empirical evidence on this point. Coertze has certainly been the major writer on this topic, and what is striking about his whole corpus on the history of *volkekunde* is that he has focus inordinately on his father, P. J. Coertze, ignoring the anthropologists who belonged to a later generation, such as Bruwer. Indeed in Coertze's vision of the world, Bruwer barely registers. Even his pioneering Afrikaans textbook is ignored. Bruwer contributed a chapter to the second edition of P.J.Coertze's *Inleiding tot die Algemene Volkekunde*, but his chapter was not included in the third edition. Did this indicate stresses and strains between the Coertzes and Bruwer? Coertze (1991; 1998) grounds his history of Afrikaans anthropology on the Universities of Stellenbosch and Pretoria, but ignores the wider socio-economic impact the universities' anthropologists might have had. Even in his twenty year delayed response to the critics, Coertze (1999) still downplays the role of anthropology in the wider community, and its policy impact in particular. Adam Kuper (2001) has made a plea for a less polemical assessment, and has pointed to the diversity of approaches, many of which were hotly contested, even in South Africa. Clearly, however, anthropological diversity was not found in Namibia. There, only Bruwer's opinion counted. The only other anthropologists in the Territory were a few German-émigré Government anthropologists attached to the Department of Native Affairs from 1948 to 1972: Lehmann, Wagner, Kohler, and Budack. They were hired by van Warmelo, both because he had a high opinion of German

anthropology and because they were conservative. Moreover, as foreigners dependent upon the state for their jobs, they could be trusted to avoid any sort of controversy. At best they functioned as technicians, not policy advisors. Recently, the historian Hermann Giliomee (2002) has traced the roots of the *Apartheid* idea not so much to anthropologists as to missionaries, such as G.B.A Gerdener. Clearly, however, the case of Bruwer, a missionary turned anthropologist, suggests that the two disciplines or callings have not been entirely separate entities, but have joined in all sorts of creative configurations.

¹ The question of whether there are two anthropologies in South Africa--a British-oriented Social anthropology and a Germanic-inspired *Volkekunde*--is a contentious one (Kuper 1999:xii-xiii; Gordon 1989). Bruwer seems to have split the difference: in 1956, he listed himself as in a Department of *Volkekunde* but wrote about Social and Cultural Anthropology; in 1958, he listed his academic home as the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology. It has been suggested that both he and Eiselen saw *Volkekunde* as synonymous with Social Anthropology, and that they were reacting to the culturological emphasis which the Coertzes were giving *Volkekunde* at the University of Pretoria (M.de Jongh, personal communication. See also Kuper 2002).

² Included in his papers at the Institute for Contemporary History at the University of the Orange Free State is an autobiographical essay entitled "My Life and Striving in the Interests of South West Africa. 1958-1964" (PV 123 2/11/1). That he should choose such a title is significant as one of the martyrs of Afrikaner nationalism, Jopie Fourie, also wrote a biography entitled "My Life and Striving." This section is derived largely from material found in this deposit.

³ "These committees work in total secrecy and consist of prominent Broeders who "see that Broeders get effective control of key areas, check that they perform their duties properly, and advise Cabinet Ministers on policy matters" (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:397).

⁴ Fellow World Court witnesses Eiselen and van Zyl were also members of this Committee at one time or another. Other anthropologists who served on it included Prof. E.F.Potgieter, later also a Commissioner-General and Dr Piet Koornhof who exceptionally did his doctorate at Oxford and famously placed an embargo on it. Prof P.J.Coertze the doyen of *volkekunde* was an associate member (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:398-399).

⁵ Commissioner-Generals were political appointments made in the various South African ethnic groups with the purpose of providing direct links between the population groups and the South African Prime Minister. The purpose of their appointments was to try to circumvent the cumbersome civil service. A surprisingly large number of these Commissioner-Generals consisted of *volkekundiges*.

⁶ For alternative accounts from a local perspective, see Ndadi (1974) and Shituwete(1990).

⁷ It is difficult to reconcile these paragraphs with Hammond-Tooke's recent conclusion, based in part on personal experience, that van Warmelo had "extensive, shrewd and essentially practical knowledge of indigenous life (and was) skeptical of grand theory and ideological preoccupations" (Hammond-Tooke 1997:114).

⁸ Indeed, his most significant works are probably a stencilled study entitled *The Kuanyama* and an unpublished manuscript entitled *Die Matrilinere Orde van Kavangoland* (The Matrilineal Order of the Kavango). He wrote a number of general articles (e.g. Bruwer 1965) and a popular book *South West Africa: The Disputed Land*, which is essentially a summary of the arguments he made to the World Court.

Bibliography

- Bruwer, Johannes Petrus. 1957 *Die Bantoe van Suid-Afrika*. Johannesburg: Afrikaanse Pers.
- 1961. *Ons Mandaat, Suidwes-Afrika*. Johannesburg: Suid-Afrikaanse Uitsaaikorporasie.
- 1966 *South West Africa: the Disputed Land*, Cape Town: Tafelberg
- Coertze, Roelf D. 1991 "Aanvang van Volkekunde aan Afrikaanstalige universiteite in Suid-Afrika". *South African Journal of Ethnology* 14: 25-34.
- 1998. "Antropoloie aan die Universiteit van Pretoria. Die grondleggers en hulle invloed tot 1972." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 21(1):1-31.
- 1999. "Kommentaar op geignoreerde kritiek." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 22(3):81-96.
- 2000. "Repliek op Sharp se 'One nation, two anthropologies?'" *South African Journal of Ethnology* 23(1):34-38.
- De Villiers, David .P. 1968 "The South West Africa Case." *UCLA African Studies Papers*
- Giliomee, Hermann. 2003 "The Making of the Apartheid Plan 1929-1948." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29:373-392.
- Gordon, Robert J. 1988. "Apartheid's anthropologists: the genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology." *American Ethnologist*. 15(3):535-53.
- 2000. "The stat(u)s of Namibian anthropology: a review". In: *Cimbebasia*, Vol. 16, pp1-23.
- Hammond-Tooke, D. 1997. *Imperfect Interpreters*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) 1966. *Pleadings, Oral Arguments, Documents. South West Africa Cases*. The Hague: International Court of Justice.
- Kuper Adam. 1999. *Culture: The Anthropologist's Account*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 2001. "Afterword: the usual suspects." *Patterns of Prejudice*. 35(2):81-86.
- 2002. "Today we have naming of parts; the work of the Anthropologists in Southern Africa" *Anthropology Southern Africa* 25(1& 2):7-16.
- Ndadi, Vinnia. 1974. *Breaking Contract*. Vancouver: LSM Press.
- Sharp, John. 1981. "The Roots and Development of Volkekunde." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 8:16-36.
- Shituwete, Helao. 1990. *Never Follow the Wolf*. London: Kliptown Books, London.
- South Africa. 1964. *Report of the Commission of Enquiry into South West Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- van der Wath, Johannes G.H. 1983. *Johannes van der Wath van Suidwes-Afrika*. Windhoek: Auas.
- West, Martin. 1988. "Social anthropology in a divided society." Inaugural Lecture. University of Cape Town.
- Wilkins, Ivor and Hans Strydom. 1978. *The Super Afrikaners*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- Institute for Contemporary History, University of the Free State. Personal Papers of J.P. van S. Bruwer.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Tucker Childs (Applied Linguistics, Portland State University) is preparing short historical sketches of a number of African linguists.

Neil Fligstein (University of California, Berkeley) has won a Guggenheim Fellowship for a study of the “process of Europeanization.”

Daniel Moses (Social Studies, Harvard University, danielmoses36@hotmail.com) is working on an intellectual biography of Lewis Henry Morgan.

Robert Richards (History of Science, University of Chicago) has won a Guggenheim Fellowship for a study of Ernst Haeckel and the battle over evolution in Germany.

Charles L. Vaughn (London School of Economics) is conducting research on the anthropological career of Charles Wisdom (1903-1965) in connection with his own doctoral research on the Maya Chorti of Honduras.

Bennett Zon (University of Durham, Bennett.zon@durham.ac.uk) is writing a book titled “Constructing the Musical Orient in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” which includes an exploration of the early ethnomusicological work of C.S. Myers within the framework of ethnopsychology and early attitudes toward race.

RECENT DISSERTATIONS

L'Estoile, Benoît. 2004. *L'Afrique comme laboratoire: Expériences réformatrices et révolution anthropologique dans l'empire colonial britannique (1920-1950)*. Thesis, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris.

Ruiz, Apen. 2003. *Insiders and Outsiders in Mexican Archaeology 1890-1940*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Safier, Neil Franklin. 2004. *Writing the Andes, Reading the Amazon: Voyages of Exploration and the Itineraries of Scientific Knowledge in the Eighteenth Century*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University.

RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

[Occasionally, readers call our attention to errors in the entries, usually of a minor typographical character. Typing the entries is a burdensome task, and under the pressure of getting HAN out, some proofreading errors occasionally slip by. For these we offer a blanket apology, but will not normally attempt corrections. We call attention to the listings in the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, the entries in the annual bibliographies of *Isis*, and those in the *Bulletin d'information de la SFHSH [Société française pour l'histoire des sciences de l'homme]*—each of which takes information from HAN, as we do from them]. Please note that the format of the bibliography has changed. We will include recent dissertations, recent work by subscribers, and work suggested by our readers in the same bibliography. We continue to welcome and encourage bibliographic suggestions from our readers.]

- Ahmed, A.G.M. 2003. Anthropology in the Sudan: Reflections by a Sudanese Anthropologist. Utrecht: International Books.
- Anderson, Gail, ed. 2004. Reinventing the museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives. Altamira Press.
- Apter, Andrew. 2002. On imperial spectacle: The dialectics of seeing in colonial Nigeria. Comparative Studies in Society and History 44(3):564-596.
- Arias, Patricia and Rodolfo Fernández. 2001. Miradas antropológicas al campo jalisciense. Estudios del Hombre [Universidad de Guadalajara], 13-14:119-163.
- Baker, L. D. 2004. Franz Boas and the ivory tower. Anthropological Theory 4:29-51.
- Barragán Trejo, Daniel and Rosa H. Yáñez Rosales. 2001. Investigaciones sobre las lenguas indígenas en Jalisco, siglo XX. Estudios del Hombre [Universidad de Guadalajara], 13-14:61-93.
- Bertrand, Frédéric. 2003. Des expositions de papiers: Musée et objet ethnographiques dans l'URSS des années 1930. GradHiva #34:29-37.
- Bhatia, Sunil. 2002. Orientalism in Euro-American and Indian psychology: Representations of 'natives' in colonial and postcolonial contexts. History of Psychology 5:276-98.
- Bindman, David. 2002. Ape to Apollo: Esthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18th Century. London: Reaktion.
- Boskovic, Aleksander. 2003. Phantoms of Africa: Michele Leiris and the anthropology of the continent. GradHiva #34:1-6.
- Blanckaert, Claude. 2003. Of monstrous métis? Hybridity, fés of miscegenation and patriotism from Buffon to Paul Broca. In P.S. Tyler, ed. The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France, 42-70. Duke University Press.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. 2003. Dark vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800-1930. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Braunstein, Jean-François. 2003. Psychologie et physiologie au XIX^e siècle. In M. Donzelli, ed., La Biologia: Parametro Epistemologico del XIX Secolo, 187-211. Napoli: Liguori Editore.
- Braunstein, Jean-François. 2003. Modelo medico contre democrazia: Il "caso" Lombroso. In Maria Donzelli and Regina Pozzi, eds. Patologie della Politica. Crisi e Critica della Democrazia tra Otto e Novecento, 319-340. Rome: Donzelli Editore.

- Brown, Mark. 2003. Ethnology and colonial administration in nineteenth-century British India: The question of native crime and criminality. British Journal for the History of Science 36:201-219.
- Calgano, James, ed. 2003. Biological anthropology: Historical perspectives on current issues, disciplinary connections, and future directions. Special Issue of American Anthropologist 105(1).
- Carey, Daniel. 2003. Anthropology's inheritance: Renaissance travel, romanticism and the discourse of identity. History and Anthropology 14(2):107-26.
- Carey, Daniel. 2004. The political economy of poison: The kingdom of Makassar and the early Royal Society. In Daniel Carey, ed. Asian travel in the Renaissance. London and New York: Blackwell. Reprinted from Renaissance Studies 17:3 (2003):517-43.
- Caspari, Rachel. 2003. From types to populations: A century of race, physical anthropology, and the American Anthropological Association. American Anthropologist 105(1):65-76.
- Cinco, Mónica. 2001. Los chinos en México: Recuento bibliográfico. Inventario Antropológico 7:88-108.
- Cole, Sally. 2004. Ruth Landes: A Life in Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Coleman, Simon. 2002. From the sublime to the meticulous: Art, anthropology and Victorian pilgrimage to Palestine. History and Anthropology 13(4):275-290.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip and J. Brett Hill. 2004. Mapping history: Cartography and the construction of the San Pedro Valley. History and Anthropology 15(2):175-200.
- Corbey, Raymond. 2003. Destroying the graven image: Religious iconoclasm on the Christian Frontier. Anthropology Today 19 (August):10-14.
- Corbey, Raymond. 2003. Iconoclasm and conversion: Ritual riddance on the Christian frontier. In G. Persoon and P. Nas, eds. Framing Indonesian Realities: Essays in Symbolic Anthropology in Honor of Reimar Schefold, 113-132. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 209, Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Corbey, Raymond, Robert Layton and Jeremy Tanner. 2004. Archaeology and art. In John Bintliff, ed. A Companion to Archaeology, 357-379. London and New York: Blackwell.
- D'Agostino, Peter. 2002. Craniums, criminals, and the 'cursed race': Italian anthropology in American racial thought, 1861-1924. Comparative Studies in Society and History 44(2):319-343.

- Dain, Bruce. 2002. A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic. Harvard University Press.
- Dávila, Alejandra. 2000. César Augusto Sáez Vargas (1916-1998). Actualidades Arqueológicas, Vol. 4, Nr. 21.
- Davis, T. W. 2004. Shifting Sands: The Rise and Fall of Biblical Archaeology. Oxford University Press.
- De Bont, Raf. 2003. The creation of prehistoric man: Aimé Rutot and the Eolith controversy, 1900-1920. Isis 94(4):604-630.
- De la Peña, Guillermo. 2001. Apuntes sobre los indigenismos en Jalisco. Estudios del Hombre [Universidad de Guadalajara] 13-14:95-118.
- De la Torre, Renée. 2001. Los estudios sobre el fenómeno religioso en Jalisco. In Estudios del Hombre [Universidad de Guadalajara] 13-14:165-188.
- Del Villar, Mónica. 2000. Merle Greene Robertson: Una artista misionera en Palenque. Arqueología Mexicana VIII, Nr. 45.
- Dias, Nélia. 2003. Les localisations cérébrales des organes des sens: Anthropologie et biologie en France dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. In M. Donzelli, ed. La Biologia: Parametro epistemologico del XIX secolo, 121-148. Napoli: Liguori Editore.
- Diaz-Andreu, M. 2004. Britain and the other: The archaeology of imperialism. In H. Brockelhurst and R. Phillips, eds. History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain, 227-251. Palgrave.
- Edison, Paul. 2003. Conquest unrequited: French expeditionary science in Mexico, 1864-1867. French Historical Studies 26:459-95.
- Fábregas, Andrés. 2001. Diez años de antropología e historia de Chiapas: Una presentación de los "Anuarios" del CESMECA y del IEI y de la Revista "CIHMECH". Inventario Antropológico 7:123-152.
- Fa-ti Fan. 2004. British Naturalists in Qing China: Science, Empire and the Cultural Encounter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fichman, Martin. 2004. An Elusive Victorian: The Evolution of Alfred Russel Wallace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fowler, Don & David R. Wilcox. 2000. De Thomas Jefferson a la conferencia de Pecos: Las cambiantes agendas antropológicas en el Suroeste de Norteamérica. Relaciones XXI (primavera) Nr. 82.
- Fowler, Don & David Wilcox, eds. 2003. Philadelphia and the Development of Americanist Archaeology. University of Alabama Press.

- Fuhrmann, Wolfgang. 2003. Propaganda, Sciences, and Entertainment. German Colonial Cinematography: A Case Study in the History of Early Nonfiction Cinema. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Gershenhorn, Jerry. 2004. Melville Herskovits and the Racial Politics of Knowledge. University of Nebraska Press.
- Gómez Izquierdo, Jorge. 2000. El discurso antirracista de un antropólogo indigenista: Juan Comas Camps. Desacatos, Nr. 4.
- González, Omar. 2000. José Vasconcelos y los intelectuales peruanos: Cartas con José de la Riva Agüero. Antropología, Nr. 59, julio-septiembre.
- Goodrun, Matthew R. 2002. Biblical anthropology and the idea of human prehistory in late antiquity. History and Anthropology 13(2):69-78.
- Gosden, C. & C. Knowles. 2001. Collecting Colonialism: Material Couture and Colonial Change. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Grieg, A., F. Lewis, K. White. 2003. Inequality in Australia. Cambridge University Press.
- Grimaud, Emmanuel. 2003. Le trésor de Toutânkhamon: Objets, guides et visiteurs au Musée du Caire. GradHiva #34:15-28.
- Grube, Nikolai and Matthew Robb. 2002. Yuri Valentinovich Knorozov (1922-1999). Actualidades Arqueológicas 4, Nr. 22.
- Hau, Michael. 2003. The Cult of Health and Beauty in Germany: A Social History, 1890-1930. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hodge, J. and G. Radick. 2003. The Cambridge companion to Darwin. Cambridge University Press.
- Huhndorf, S. M. 2004. Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination. Cornell University Press.
- Inglis, Fred. 2000. Clifford Geertz: Culture, Custom and Ethics. Oxford: Polity.
- Isaac, Benjamin. 2004. The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Izard, Michel. 2002. Pierre Smith (1939-2001). L'homme, Nr. 161, January-March, pp. 7-14.
- Johnson, C. 2003. Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years. Cambridge University Press.

- Kaplan, Sam. 2002. Documenting history, historicizing documentation: French military officials' ethnological reports on Cilicia. Comparative Studies in Society and History 44(2):344-369.
- Keane, Webb. 2003. Self-interpretation, agency, and the objects of anthropology: Reflections on genealogy. Comparative Studies in Society and History 45(2):222-248.
- Kenny, Michael G. 2002. Toward a racial abyss: Eugenics, Wickliffe Draper, and the origins of the Pioneer Fund. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 38(3):259-283.
- Kerns, Virginia. 2003. Scenes from the High Dessert: Julian Steward's Life and Theory. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Koelsch, William A. 2004. Franz Boas, geographer, and the problem of disciplinary identity. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 40(1): 1-22.
- Kraus, Michael and Mark Münzel, eds. 2003. Museum und Universität in der Ethnologie. Bamberg: Curupira.
- Krautwurst, Udo. 2002. The joy of looking: Early German anthropology, photography and audience formation. Visual Anthropology Review 18 (1 & 2):55-79.
- Krotz, Esteban, ed. 2001. Inventario antropológico: Anuario de la antropología mexicana, vol. 7, 624 pp. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa.
- Krotz, Esteban. 2002. Guillermo Bonfil Batalla (1931-1991), Mexikanischer Anthropologe. Wiener Zeitschrift zur Geschichte der Neuzeit. 2(1):85-87.
- Krotz, Esteban. 2003. Die Kulturenvielfalt indigener Völker als Entwicklungsproblem in Lateinamerika. Das Beispiel der mexikanischen Indigenismuspolitik. In: G. Faschingeder, F. Kolland & F. Wimmer, eds. Kultur als umkämpftes Terrain, 137-154.
- Kumar, Krishan. 2003. The Making of English National Identity. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuntz, D. and S. Bachrach, eds. 2004. Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race. University of North Carolina Press.
- Kuper, Adam. 2002. Today we gave naming of parts: The work of the anthropologists in Southern Africa. Anthropology Southern Africa 25 (1 & 2): 7-16.
- Kuper, Adam. 2002. Incest, cousin marriage, and the origin of the human sciences in nineteenth century England. Past and Present 174:158-83.
- Kurella, Doris and Dietmar Nietzsche, eds. 2002. Amazonas Indianer: LebensRäume, LebensRituale, LebensRechte. Stuttgart: Reimer.

- León, L. Vásquez. 2003. El Leviatán Arqueológico: Antropología de una Tradición Científica en México. 2nd ed. México, D.F.: CIESAS.
- León-Portilla, Miguel. 2000. Bernardino de Sahagún: Pionero de la Antropología. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (Serie Cultura Náhuatl, monografías 24).
- Lindberg, Christer. 2003. "The Bureau of American Ethnology," European Review of Native American Studies 17(2):35-46.
- López Mestas Camberos, Lorenza and Carlos López Cruz. 2001. La arqueología del Occidente de México durante el siglo XX. Estudios del Hombre [Universidad de Guadalajara] 13-14:14-60.
- Lyman, R. Lee and Michael J. O'Brien. 2004. Nomothetic science and ideographic history in twentieth-century Americanist anthropology. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 40(1):77-96.
- MacKinnon, Katherine, ed. 2003. Behind many masks: Gerald Berreman and Berkeley anthropology, 1959-2001. Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers 89/90.
- Majd, M.G. 2003. The Great American Plunder of Persia's Antiquities: 1925-1941. University Press of America.
- Maldonado Alvarado, Benjamín. El indio y lo indio en el anarquismo magonista. Cuadernos del Sur 6, Nr. 15.
- Meijer, Miriam Claude. 2004. The Century of the orangutan. XVIII: New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century 1:62-78.
- Murray, Stephen & Regna Darnell. 2002. Margaret Mead and paradigm shifts within anthropology during the 1920s. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 30:557-73.
- Navarrete, Carlos. 2000. Alfonso Villa Rojas (1906-1998). Anales de Antropología XXXIII:1996-1999.
- Neiburg, Federico and Mauricio Goldman. 2001. Teoría, política y ética en los estudios antropológicos del carácter nacional. Alteridades 11 (22):95-110.
- Nelson, G.B. 2003. Men before Adam!: American debates over the unity and antiquity of humanity. In D. Lundberg & R. Numbers, ed. When Science and Christianity Meet, 161-81. University of Chicago Press.
- Newton, Michael. 2003. Savage Girls and Wild Boys: A History of Feral Children. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Patterson, R. & C. Orser, eds. 2004. Foundations of Social Archaeology: Selected Writings of V. Gordon Childe. Altamira Press.
- Peace, William J. 2004. Leslie A. White: Evolution and Revolution in Anthropology. University of Nebraska Press.
- Penny, H. Glenn. 2003. The politics of anthropology in the age of empire: German colonists, Brazilian indians, and the case of Alberto Vojtěch Frič. Comparative Studies in Society and History 45(2):240-280.
- Penny, H. Glenn and Matti Bunzl, eds. 2003. Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pérez López, María Soledad. 2000. Etnología o folclor: Fray Bernardino de Sahagún y el registro de la palabra indígena. Cuicuilco 7, Nr. 18.
- Pierpont, C. W. 2004. The measure of America: How a rebel anthropologist waged war on racism. New Yorker (3/8/04):48-63.
- Pluciennik, Mark. 2001. Archaeology, anthropology and subsistence. The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N. S.), 7, Nr. 4, December:741-758.
- Prats, A.J. 2004. Invisible Natives: Myth and Identity in the American Western. Cornell University Press.
- Price, David. 2004. Remembering Archie Phinney, A Nez Perce Scholar. Journal of Northwest Anthropology 38 (1):21-32.
- Prins, Harald and Jay Ruby, eds. 2001-2002. North American Contributions to the History of Visual Anthropology. Special Issue of Visual Anthropology.
- Proctor, Robert. 2004. Three roots of human recency: Molecular anthropology, the refigured Acheulean, and the UNESCO response to Auschwitz. In L. Daston & F. Vidal. Moral Authority of Nature, 466-90.
- Roscoe, Paul. 2003. Margaret Mead, Reo Fortune, and Mountain Arapesh Warfare. American Anthropologist 105(3):581-591.
- Roskamp, Hans. 2000. El doctor Nicolás León y los documentos pictográficos de Oaxaca. Cuadernos del Sur Vol. 6, Nr. 15.
- Rossiianov, K. 2002. Beyond species: Il'ya Ivanov and his experiments on cross-breeding humans with anthropoid apes. Science in Context 15:277-316.
- Rozat Duyperon, Guy. 2000. Identidad y alteridades: el Occidente medieval y sus "otros". Desacatos Nr. 4.

- Rumsey, Alan. 2004. Ethnographic macro-tropes and anthropological theory. Anthropological Theory 4 (3):267-297.
- Savarino, Franco. 2000. La transición al positivismo en la "Historia de Yucatán" de Eligio Ancona. Historias Nr. 45, January-April.
- Shanefelt, Robert. 2003. How Charles Darwin got emotional expression out of South Africa (and the people who helped him). Comparative Studies in Society and History 45(4):815-842.
- Shimizu, A. & J. van Bremen. 2003. Wartime Japanese Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Silverman, Sydel, ed. 2004. Totems and teachers: Key Figures in the History of Anthropology. 2nd ed. Altamira Press [reprint of first edition, with additional bibliographical material on the contributors, a piece by Eric Wolf on Robert Redfield, and a new chapter on Margaret Mead, consisting of an obituary by Rhoda Metraux and a biographical sketch by Silverman].
- Solomon, C. 2002. Tatiana Proskouriakoff: Interpreting Ancient Maya. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Starkey, Janet C. M. 2002. No myopic mirage: Alexander and Patrick Russell in Aleppo. History and Anthropology 13(4):257-273.
- Staum, Martin. 2003. Labeling People: French Scholars on Society, Race and Empire: 1815-1848. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Steinmetz, George. 2003. 'The devil's handwriting': Precolonial discourse, ethnographic activity, and cross-identification in German colonialism. Comparative Studies in Society and History 45(1):41-95.
- Stern, Alexandra. 2000. Mestizofilia, biotipología y eugenesia en el México posrevolucionario: hacia una historia de la ciencia y el estado, 1920-1960. Relaciones Vol. XXI, Nr. 81.
- Stone, Dan. 2003. Nazism as modern magic: Bronislaw Malinowski's political anthropology. History and Anthropology 14(3):203-218.
- Stone, Dan. 2001. White men with low moral standards? German anthropology and the Herero genocide. Patterns of Prejudice 35(2):33-45.
- Sullivan, Gerald. 2004. A four-fold humanity: Margaret Mead and psychological types. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 40(2):183-206.
- Tattersall, Ian. 2003. The Monkey in the Mirror: Essays on the Science of What Makes Us Human. San Diego: Harvest Books.

- Throop, C. Jason. 2003. Minding experience: An exploration of the concept of "experience" in the early French anthropology of Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, and Lévi-Strauss. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 39(4):365-382.
- Trautmann-Waller, Céline, ed. 2004. Quand Berlin pensait les peuples: Anthropologie, ethnologie et psychologie (1850-1890). Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Tzanelli, Rodanth. 2003. 'Disciplining' the Neohellenic character: Records of Anglo-Greek encounters and the development of ethnological historical discourse. History of the Human Sciences 16(3):21-50.
- Van Wolputte, Steven. 2004. Subject disobedience: The colonial narrative in northwestern Namibia, c. 1920-1975. History and Anthropology 15(2):151-173.
- Vasquez Leon, Luis and Guillermo de la Peña, eds. 2002. La antropología sociocultural en el México del milenio: Búsquedas, encuentros y transiciones. Tizapán, San Ángel: Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- Varela, Roberto. 2000. El Departamento de Antropología de la UAM-Iztapalapa: caminos andados y por andar. Alteridades 10, Nr. 20.
- Velasco Orozco, Juan Jesús. 2000. Sobre la investigación en la Facultad de Antropología de la UAEM (1990-1999). Antropoformas n. 3, May-July.
- Visser, Max. 2003. Gregory Bateson on deuterio-learning and double bind: A brief conceptual history. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 39:269-278.
- Wagoner, Phillip. 2003. Precolonial intellectuals and the production of colonial knowledge. Comparative Studies in Society and History 45(4):783-814.
- Wallace, A.F.C. 2003. Revitalizations and Mazeways: Essays on Cultural Change, Vol. 1. University of Nebraska Press.
- Wheelhouse, F. & Smithford, K.S. 2001. Dart: Scientist and Man of Grit. Sydney: Traspareon Press.
- Wilder, Gary. 2003. Colonial ethnology and political rationality in French West Africa. History and Anthropology 14(3):219-252.
- Williams, Melvin. 2002. An Academic Village: The Ethnography of an Anthropology Department. Lewisburg, NY: Mellen Press.
- Winther, Paul. 2003. Anglo-European Science and the Rhetoric of Empire: Malaria, Opium and British Rule in India, 1756-1895. Boulder, Co.: Lanham.
- Wolff, Gregor, ed. 2001. Die Berliner und Brandenburger Lateinamerikaforschung in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Personen und Institutionen. Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin.

Zerilli, Filippo. 2004. Du Déménagement comme coupure épistémologique: Durkheim and ethnographical sources. *Revue Européenne des sciences sociales* XLII (129):349-361.

RECENT AND FORTHCOMING VOLUMES OF HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

The tenth volume of the *History of Anthropology* series, edited by Richard Handler, has recently been published by the University of Wisconsin Press. Entitled "Significant Others: Interpersonal and Professional Commitments in Anthropology," the volume looks at "several kinds of personal relationships that have been important to anthropologists as they practice their craft." After an introductory essay on "Anthropology's Other Others," the volume opens with two essays on the works and lives of anthropological couples: Matthew Engelke's "The Endless Conversation?: Fieldwork, Writing and the Marriage of Victor and Edith Turner," and Harry G. West's "Inverting the Camel's Hump: Jorge Dias, His Wife, Their Interpreter, and I." There are three essays on various types of relationships between younger and more established professionals: Lyn Schumaker on "The Director as Significant Other: Max Gluckman and Team Research at the Rhodes-Livingston Institute"; Michael Silverstein on "Boasian Cosmographic Anthropology and the Sociocentric Component of Mind"; Robert Brightman on "Jaime de Angulo and Alfred Kroeber: Bohemians and Bourgeois in Berkeley Anthropology." Focusing on the relationship of an anthropologist to his adopted son, and on his own relationship to his anthropological mentor, George W. Stocking, Jr. writes on "A.I. Hallowell's Boasian Evolutionism: Human Ir/Rationality in Cross-Cultural, Evolutionary, and Personal Context." Finally, Joy Rohde contributes "It was no 'Pink Tea': Gender and American anthropology, 1885-1903."

The eleventh volume (forthcoming, 2005) will treat various instances of the relationship between centers and peripheries in the history of anthropology. Included will be essays by George Stocking ("Unfinished Business: Robert Gelston Armstrong, The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the History of Anthropology at Chicago and in Nigeria"); David Koester ("The Power of Insult: Ethnographic Publication and Emergent Nationalism in the 16th Century"); Brad Evans ("Where Was Boas During the Renaissance in Harlem: Race, Diffusion, and the History of Anthropology"); Kath Weston ("Escape from the Andamans: Tracking, Offshore Incarceration, and Ethnology in the Back of Beyond"); Arthur Ray ("Kroeber and the California Claims: Myth and Reality"); by Ira Bashkow & Lise Dobrin ("The great arc of human possibilities and a small circle of friends: The social microcosm of Mead's Sex and Temperament"); and by Lise Dobrin & Ira Bashkow ("Arapesh warfare: Mead and Fortune's clash of ethnographic temperament").

Volume twelve is tentatively planned to examine the uses of biography in the history of anthropology. Scholars who might wish to contribute biographically oriented essays of various types (individual, dyadic, dialogical, collective, institutional, comparative, etc.) as well as essays discussing the uses and theory of biography as applied to work in the history of anthropology, should contact the editor, Richard Handler at rh3y@cms.mail.virginia.edu.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

School of American Research Fellowship. The School of American Research (SAR) has instituted a summer scholar fellowship program for scholars pursuing research and writing projects in the history of anthropology—The William Y. and Nettie K. Adams Fellowship in

the History of Anthropology. The application deadline is December 15 for the eight-week summer term, June 15-August 15. Housing, an office, allowance account, library and other support are provided. At present, no stipends are offered. This fellowship, which was instituted in 2001, was made possible through a generous gift from William Y. Adams, Professor Emeritus of anthropology at the University of Kentucky, and his wife Nettie K. Adams, an authority on prehistoric textiles. Additional information, including a downloadable application form, is available through their web site at www.sarweb.org.

Early Career Award for Historians. The Forum for the History of Human Science (FHHS) and the Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences encourage researchers early in their careers to submit unpublished manuscripts for the annual John C. Burnham Early Career Award, named in honor of this prominent historian of the human sciences and past-editor of JHBS. The journal will publish the winning paper with a notice of the award, and the publisher will provide the author of the paper with an honorarium of US \$500. Guidelines: Unpublished manuscripts dealing with any aspect(s) of the history of the human sciences are welcome. Eligible scholars are those who do not hold tenured university positions (or equivalent); graduate students and independent scholars are encouraged to submit. "Early career" is interpreted to include the period up to seven (7) years beyond the Ph.D. Since competition may be high in any given year, people are encouraged to re-submit in subsequent years, as long as the manuscript has not already been submitted to some other journal and the submitting scholar is still in early career. The paper submitted is the most important aspect of the competition, but since this is an "early career award," the prize committee will also consider professional activities, including (though not limited to) participation in annual meetings of the History of Science Society and other scholarly work. The submission consists of three copies of the paper and three copies of the candidate's c.v. The paper must meet the publishing guidelines of the JHBS; for conference papers, these guidelines generally include revision and expansion to create an article-length paper. The committee will acknowledge receipt of each submission and will promptly confirm its eligibility. The committee's selection of the prizewinner (the nominee to JHBS editors) will be announced at the annual History of Science Society meeting (held October or November). (If there are no appropriate submissions in any given year, no award will be given for that year.) FHHS will promptly notify JHBS of its endorsement, and the manuscript will go through the regular refereeing process of the journal. After the editors of the JHBS have accepted the nominated paper for publication, it will be published on their timetable and the publisher will issue the honorarium. Although it is technically possible that someone might win the Burnham Early Career Award and not receive the honorarium, FHHS and JHBS do not expect this to happen under normal circumstances. Deadline: April 30. Send three copies of unpublished manuscript and of c.v., to Nadine Weidman, Secretary of FHHS, 138 Woburn St., Medford MA 02155. For more information, see the FHHS website: www.fhhs.org.

Histories of Anthropology Annual. This exciting new publication from the University of Nebraska Press encourages the visibility of History of Anthropology as a specialization within anthropology by collating the scattered literature for an anthropological audience. The HOAA explicitly fosters a complex and pluralist sets of frameworks for studying our disciplinary past, and for linking those studies to contemporary practice and to

future possibilities. The editors seek the widest possible definition of disciplinary history and place no thematic constraints on research. They solicit work on all subdisciplines, and work that transcends subdisciplinary boundaries, from any national traditions. We welcome research that contextualizes the developments in anthropology within broader frameworks of interdisciplinary histories. HOAA invites articles, commentary, and book reviews or review essays. The first volume has just gone to press and will appear in the fall of 2005. Manuscripts should be sent to either of the editors:

Regna Darnell	Frederic W. Gleach
Dept. of Anthropology	106 East Lincoln St.
London ON Canada N6A 5C2	Ithaca NY 14850
rdarnell@uwo.ca	fwg2@twcny.rr.com

UPCOMING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

The Fifth British-North American Joint Meeting of the British Society for the History of Science, Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science, and History of Science Society will be held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, August 5-7. Sessions of interest to historians of anthropology include: "Networking Human Origins: Case Studies in the History of Anthropology and Archaeology", "Exhibiting Human Beings in the Nineteenth Century", and "Colonialism and the Human Sciences." For the complete program, visit: <http://www.hssonline.org/3Societies/index.html>.

Alexander von Humboldt: From the Americas to the Cosmos" will be held at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York on 14-16 October. For more information, see <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/humboldtconference/home.htm>.

The 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association will be held November 17-21 in San Francisco at the Hilton Towers. The theme will be "Magic, Science and Religion."

The History of Science Society will meet 18-21 November 18-21 in Austin, Texas, at the Hyatt Regency.

The Seventh Annual Philosophy of Social Science Roundtable will be held in New York at Barnard College, Columbia University on March 11-13, 2005. The Roundtable brings together philosophers and social scientists to discuss philosophical issues raised in and by social research. The conference organizers welcome one page abstracts on any topic in the philosophy of the social sciences. The deadline for submission is December 15, 2004. Selected papers from the roundtable will be published in an annual special issue of Philosophy of the Social Sciences. For more information, go to: <http://bc.barnard.columbia.edu/~awylie/RoundtableIndex.html>.

The 26th American Indian Workshop will meet April 11-13 2005 in Munich. The meeting's theme is "New Buffalos—New Ways? Traditions and Transitions in Native American Culture." The deadline for paper submissions is October 31, 2004. For more information, visit: <http://www.amerikahaus.de/program/events/AIW26/AIW26.html>.

HAN
c/o Henrika Kuklick
Logan Hall 303
249 South 36th Street
Philadelphia, PA
19104