



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 31
Issue 2 December 2004

Article 1

January 2004

Volume 31, Issue 2

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 2," *History of Anthropology Newsletter*. Vol. 31 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss2/1>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss2/1>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.



**HISTORY OF
ANTHROPOLOGY
NEWSLETTER**

Volume 31:2

December 2004



HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

Volume 31:2
December 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes on the History of Anthropology—“Looking for a New Direction: The
Museum of Ethnology in Vienna”

Christian Feest 3

Notes on the History of Anthropology—“Anthropology in Israel:
Professionals in Stormy Days”

Orit Abuhav 9

Research In Progress 17

Recent Dissertations 17

Recent Bibliography 17

Announcements 23

Upcoming Professional Meetings 23

Website via <http://ccat.sas.edu/hss2/hss>

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Henrika Kuklick Editor	Joy Rohde Assistant Editor
---------------------------	-------------------------------

CORRESPONDING CONTRIBUTORS

Regna Darnell rdarnell@uwo.ca	Nélia Dias Nelia.Dias@iscte.pt
Christian Feest christian.feest@ethno-museum.ac.at	Robert Gordon rgordon@uvm.edu
Curtis Hinsley Curtis.Hinsley@NAU.EDU	Edgardo Krebs Krebs.edgar@nsmh.si.edu
Esteban Krotz kroqui@prodigy.net.mx	Joyce Ogburn jlogburn@u.washington.edu
H. Glenn Penny h-penny@uiowa.edu	Lyn Schumaker lynschumaker@yahoo.co.uk
George Stocking g-stocking@uchicago.edu	William Sturtevant sturtevant.william@nsmh.si.edu
Susan Trencher strenche@gmu.edu	Elizabeth Williams williea@okstate.edu

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—New Rates for 2005

Each volume contains two numbers, June and December.

Individual Subscribers, North America	\$7.00
Student Subscribers	\$4.00
Institutional Subscribers in North America	\$9.00
Individual Subscribers outside North America	\$10.00
Institutional Subscribers outside North America	\$12.00

Subscription rates will remain at 2004 rates for members of AAA, Cheiron, and the Forum for the History of Human Science with proof of membership upon payment.

Individual Subscribers, North America	\$6.00
Individual 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

LOOKING FOR A NEW DIRECTION: THE MUSEUM OF ETHNOLOGY IN VIENNA

Christian Feest

Museum of Ethnology, Vienna

According to different readings of the evidence, the Museum of Ethnology (Museum für Völkerkunde) in Vienna looks back at a history of 76, 128, or 198 years. Its oldest collections can be traced to the late sixteenth-century *Kunstkammer* of Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, where rare and curious things from the newly discovered corners of the globe were displayed next to excellent examples of European art and craftsmanship. It was only in 1806, as a result of the purchase by the Austrian Emperor at the sale of the Leverian Museum in London of a large group of artifacts assembled on the three circumnavigations of Captain James Cook, R.N., that a separate Ethnographic Collection (k.k. Ethnographische Sammlung) was established within the Imperial Cabinet of Natural History. The word "ethnography" had been coined in 1770 in Göttingen, and the voyages of the Enlightenment—especially those of Cook—had provided an opportunity for systematic collecting of exotic products as cultural documents within a new paradigm inspired by Linnean principles of taxonomy. The Ethnographic Collection grew rapidly for the next forty years, but the lack of specialized curators as well as of forms of systematic academic discourse on the subject matter led to a general neglect of the material, which was ultimately removed from public view to linger in boxes in the attic of the Natural History Cabinet.¹

In the course of the transformation of the former Imperial collections of art and natural history into national museums during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the ethnographic artifacts (including those transferred from Tyrol to Vienna) became the core of an Anthropological-Ethnographic Department at the Court Museum of Natural History (Naturhistorisches Hofmuseum). Established in 1876 by the first director of the Natural History Museum, a geologist and a veteran of the first Austrian circumnavigation in the 1850s, the new department was modeled after then current French ideas about the unity of the anthropological sciences, and was therefore made up of separate collections of physical anthropology, prehistory, and ethnography. Under the direction of the first head of the department, Franz Heger, who was also a geologist with pronounced ethnographic interests, the three collections gained increasing independence and ultimately became separate departments. The beneficial effects of unity were never achieved because the largely non-European ethnographic material was historically unrelated to the largely Austrian prehistoric and physical anthropological collections. At the same time, an assistant curator, Arthur Haberland, trained as a philologist, who felt uncomfortable in the company of scientists, used the small collection of Austrian ethnographic material as the basis for the establishment of a new Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art (Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde). Practical and personal considerations thus led both to a growing exotification of non-European ethnography and to its gradual removal from the context of natural sciences.

Exhibition space at the Natural History Museum had been planned to fit the needs of the material available in the 1870s (and there were no storage facilities provided). By the time the museum opened to the public in 1889, the ethnographic collection had grown from about 5,000 to 24,000 objects. When the Austro-Hungarian monarchy came to an end in 1918, the count stood at about 90,000, and after some discussion it was decided that the ethnographic collection should be moved from the crowded Natural History Museum to the now deserted Imperial castle, which already housed the huge ethnographic collection

assembled in 1892/3 during a voyage around the world by the late Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria. Thus in 1928 the Museum of Ethnology gained independence as a federally funded museum independent of Natural History—one year before the separation of physical anthropology and ethnology at the University of Vienna and the creation of a Department of Ethnology (Institut für Völkerkunde) located in the same building as the museum.

While the culture-historical Vienna School of ethnology had ultimately derived some of its methodological instruments (such as the "criteria of form and of quantity" used for the demonstration of presumed historical relationships among cultures around the world) from museum practice, material culture studies had already begun to lose importance in academic anthropology (see Sturtevant 1969, Fischer 1971). At the time of the opening of the new museum, heated discussions regarding the proper mode of exhibiting objects (especially those produced in Asian civilizations) as either ethnography or art signaled the rise of a discourse on the universality of art in general and on "primitive art" in particular. Although much of the debate was carried out outside the museum community, it began to affect the public perception of the museum's mission. It reappeared with new vigor in the 1960s, when ethnographic museums worldwide suffered the onset of a severe identity crisis.

In German-speaking countries, the culture-historical method was now repudiated, and academic anthropology embraced the teachings of functionalism, structuralism, and other schools for which material culture (or even "culture") carried little significance. Some ethnographic museums, faced with their desertion by the discipline at large and the attendant loss of social status, attempted to reinvent themselves as non-Western art museums—generally with limited success. Others accepted their fate as lowly instruments of public instruction—an equally lost cause, given the overwhelmingly historical nature of their holdings and in view of a rising demand to explain a rapidly changing contemporary world; the choice was between romanticizing about lost worlds and dealing with questions about the Third and Fourth Worlds without appropriate collections, and all too often without appropriate theory.

In Vienna, where new trends generally arrive a decade or so later than elsewhere, and then in a diluted and less radical version, the Museum of Ethnology was also affected by these developments, but the problems were partially disguised by better government funding since the 1970s. Academic anthropology still maintained a historical component, represented by a local brand of ethnohistory, although a presentist orientation of the discipline was clearly on the rise. In an unrelated transnational development of the 1990s, federal, state, and local governments all over Europe tried to consolidate their budgets by "privatizing" their money-losing museums through various strategies. In Austria, the Museum Law of 1998 removed federal museums from the bureaucratic control of the government, transformed them into "scientific institutions of public law," and froze federal subsidies at the level of the 1997 budget in the expectation that these now liberated institutions would be able to generate profits through private enterprise, or at least attract corporate sponsors willing to spend some money for the public good in exchange for an improvement of their image. The law thus favored prestigious art museums over less prestigious institutions, such as museums of natural history or ethnology, and it helped to pave the way for what was generally perceived as a "hostile takeover" of the Museum of Ethnology by the Museum of Art History (Kunsthistorisches Museum) in 2001, which thereby acquired a world-class collection of non-Western art and material culture, as well as a significant amount of cheap exhibition space in a central location. The departure of the former director of the Museum

of Ethnology, his deputy, and the chief conservator on a pre-retirement plan was the most visible sign of the deep identity crisis resulting from the loss of its independence.

Having served as a curator at the Museum of Ethnology from 1963 to 1993, I had left the museum to teach North American Indian ethnology at the University of Frankfurt for a number of good reasons. I felt that museums (especially of ethnology) were moving in a wrong direction, that thirty years in one institution seemed to have more or less exhausted the possibilities for my intellectual and professional development there, and that I had no desire whatsoever to become the museum's director and spend the rest of my life as an administrator in the company of other bureaucrats. Although I quickly turned into an outspoken critic of the world of ethnographic museums (see Feest 1993, 1994, 1996, 1999a, 2001), I also found myself developing courses on museum anthropology and attempting to explain to my students what I thought museums should be. With my students I guest-curated two fairly successful exhibitions in and around Frankfurt ("Sitting Bull: The Last Indian?" and "Indian Times: News from Native North America" [Feest 1999b, 2002]), and continued to do research in museums on Native American art and material culture and on the history of ethnographic collecting and representation.

Given these circumstances, no one could have been more surprised than myself when in 2003 I accepted the offer to become director of the Museum of Ethnology in Vienna. Although I still find it easier to explain why I left Vienna than why I returned, a number of new challenges posed by my position were sufficiently powerful to inspire me: (1) The complete renovation of the building, now under way and fully financed, and the subsequent total reinstallation offer an opportunity to literally reinvent the museum, especially if accompanied by structural changes in its organization. (2) The museum's mission statement, which has become part of Austria's museum law of 1998 (Museumsordnung 2001), defines the purposes of the museum as largely those of a scholarly institution with an explicit mandate to pursue and promote research both on its own collections as well as on the cultural contexts necessary for their understanding. (3) If these local developments designed to narrow the gap between museum and academic anthropology were successful, they could have beneficial effects for similar institutions elsewhere. While much will depend upon appropriate funding, a number of important changes may be initiated irrespective of the financial situation.

The complete reinstallation of the museum provides an opportunity to rethink some of the basic principles upon which most permanent displays in museums of ethnology² have been based for the last century or so. With minor exceptions representing the Pitt-Rivers tradition of organizing displays by series of artifact types, these museums have always been primarily ethnographic—ideally focusing on specific non-Western cultures, but more commonly organizing displays by regions, countries, or even continents. Especially for the Americas, an inadequately understood version of the theory of culture areas was widely regarded as a satisfactory solution to the problem of collections insufficient for the representation of specific cultures. Irrespective of Kroeber's insight that culture areas were the products of history rather than of environmental adaptations, museums often explicitly stressed the connection between culture and habitat and generally neglected the historicity of the artifacts and of the cultures they were meant to represent. Focusing on the representation and explanation of the specific (in whatever muddled fashion), ethnological museums had largely become "ethnographic" to the near exclusion of comparative approaches stressing the range of variation across cultures or the cultural differences in coping with identical or similar problems. Interestingly enough, special exhibitions devoted to thematically based comparison (such as on drugs or on gender relationships in Cologne or

on death in Frankfurt in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s) had all turned out to be particularly successful with the public. One of the reasons, in my view, why such modes of display were not more often attempted or even included in the permanent galleries is the fact that curators are generally hired for their regional expertise and are therefore less likely to be interested in or qualified to undertake comparative approaches.

The new installation in Vienna (to be opened beginning in 2007) will depart from past precedent by devoting more than a third of the floor space of the "permanent" exhibition to non-regional, thematic displays. These will include halls devoted to the history of ethnographic collecting and representation from the sixteenth to the twentieth century, to a broadly-based discussion of alterity and identity, to a comparative view of architectural forms, to forms of exchange, or (especially relevant in the context of the museum's position with the Art History Corporation) to anthropological perspectives on art. These exhibitions should lessen the exotification inherent in stressing cultural otherness, and should be more consistent with the explanatory demands of cultural difference within an increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society. While the partial redirection in the choice of the subject matter will have to be put into effect with the present curatorial staff, the long-term goal associated with it is the creation of a separate curatorial "department of theory" for the planning and coordination of comparative and other thematic exhibitions, which still need to be based on the available regional collections.

Because of the nature of the existing collections, regional modes of representation will continue to dominate in the foreseeable future, but they will need to avoid some of their past shortcomings, including those indicated by indigenous critics of museums of anthropology. First of all, museums will have to withstand the temptation to follow the universalist or encyclopedic tradition of both the old Wunderkammer and the nation-state museum, simply because no museum in the world has the collections to be truly encyclopedic. Because museums can only show what they have in their collections, the regional experts will be encouraged to combine the historical perspective required for an understanding of historically constituted collections with an eye for collectable material that will help to visualize for future generations the local and global cultural phenomena observable today.

By virtue of their archival function of preserving cultural documents, the material museums are able to use in exhibitions is primarily historical in nature, but the new installation in Vienna will attempt to give some space to the present in all of its exhibitions. This appears to be a necessity in order to offer a vantage point from which it may be easier for viewers to understand the historicity of those cultural documents which formerly have all too often been presented in a manner inviting perceptions of "archaic" cultures as existing in a state of a perpetual, "traditional" past, justly criticized by spokespersons for contemporary indigenous communities (see West 2000, Feest 2001).³ Given the selective nature of the collection, it will be more difficult to do justice to the embeddedness of local cultures in regional and global settings, whose representation is necessary for a better understanding of the agencies underlying cultural change. The notion that it is possible to represent Native American cultures as isolated from the rest of the world rather than in connection with their relationships to the dominant society is, of course, preposterous, but is maintained by the absence of collections illustrating non-Native American cultures and by the past practice of preserving only materials that reflected "traditional" aspects of Native cultures. Even so, it will be possible on the basis of the material available at the museum to illustrate the pervasive past and present importance of globalization and hybridity, and the increasing role of pluralism in "traditional" societies.

Bringing the larger world into the picture of cultures heretofore represented as remote and isolated may also help to overcome the practice of exotification. In the case of Vienna, it may be helpful that, largely due to political pressures, the Museum of Ethnology is now actively involved in discussions that may lead to some kind of strategic alliance or even fusion with the Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art, with its extensive European collections.

The most important challenge for museums willing to play an active role in the anthropological community, however, may lie in the need to clarify the epistemological status of material cultural documents (alone and in conjunction with other historical verbal and visual records) in anthropological research. Here, as well as in the problem of cultural representation in museums, the historical nature of the artifacts presents a problem in the face of the presentist orientation of a cultural anthropology that defines itself primarily through the method of participant observation. Museum anthropology thus shares some of the problems inherent in other historical approaches to the subject, and should find it useful to position itself within existing "ethnohistorical" discourses in the broadest sense. Since such an effort cannot be effectively made by one museum in isolation, the Museum of Ethnology in Vienna will actively seek cooperation with other museums beyond the exchange of exhibitions to promote research based on their specific resources.

The function of museums as "anthropological data banks" (Sturtevant 1973, Osgood 1979) clearly goes beyond their preservation of material documents of cultures. A special emphasis will be given in Vienna to other historical material, such as its collection of historical ethnographic photographs. The museum will also actively advertise its willingness to preserve and make available to other researchers fieldwork records and other papers by anthropologists for which, at least in German-speaking countries, there has so far been no widely recognized archive.

It may be recalled that with a renewed systematic interest in material culture during the last decades of the twentieth century, not only by prehistoric anthropologists but also by social and economic historians, art historians, and folklorists, it has become apparent that cultural anthropology (including museum anthropology) had moved so far away from its early preoccupation with artifacts that it was unable to suggest answers to the questions raised by artifacts or even to point in a direction where answers might be found. Without abandoning its educational obligations to the public, museum anthropology will thus have to make decisive efforts to re-establish its expertise in a theory-based study of material culture. It may, after all, be the best and perhaps last chance to avoid the threat of "Disneyfication" of museum of anthropology (e.g. Terrell 1991, Haas 1996).

¹ The following summary of the history of the museum is largely based on Feest 1980; see also Plankensteiner 2003.

² Although many European museums, especially those originating within the context of natural history museums, had originally followed the idea of the unity of the anthropological disciplines, representing mankind in its biological, prehistoric, and recent cultural expressions, nearly all of them became museums of ethnology with no reference to physical anthropology and an attention to prehistory limited only to selected non-European populations, generally including the Americas, but excluding not only Europe, but often also Near Eastern civilizations, which are usually represented in art (and fall within the separate province of classical archaeology).

³ The solution offered by the new National Museum of the American Indian in Washington to represent Native American cultures as existing in a state of perpetual present is convincing and has

led to the near exclusion of its important collection of historical artifacts from the displays. This strategy clearly privileges a view of the continuity of "tradition" and identity over the often erratic changes and discontinuities revealed by the historical record.

Bibliography

- Feest, Christian. 1980. Das Museum für Völkerkunde: Ethnographische Sammlungen in Österreich vor 1876; Die Anthropologisch-Ethnographische Abteilung des Naturhistorischen Museums; Das Museum für Völkerkunde. In: *Das Museum für Völkerkunde* (Salzburg: Residenz-Verlag), 13–34.
- 1993. Needs and Opportunities for Research in Ethnographic Museums. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 118: 87–95.
- 1994. Notes on Ethnographic Museums in the Late Twentieth Century. *Anales del Museo Nacional de Antropología* 1: 11–28.
- 1995. "Repatriation." A European View on the Question of Restitution of Native American Artifacts. *European Review of Native American Studies* 9(2): 33–42.
- 1996. Ethnologie an Museen und Universitäten: Ein Lagebericht. *Baessler-Archiv*, N.F. 44(2): 1–13.
- 1999a. Ethnologische Museen. In: W. Kokot und D. Dracklé (ed.), *Wozu Ethnologie? Festschrift für Hans Fischer* (Berlin: Reimer), 199–213.
- (ed.) 1999b. *Sitting Bull. "Der letzte Indianer."* Darmstadt: Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt.
- (ed.) 2000. *Das Ding. Die Ethnologie und ihr Gegenstand.* Archiv für Völkerkunde 51.
- 2001. Museum Representations of Native Americans. Issues in an Ongoing Debate. *Acta Americana* 9(2): 6–16.
- 2002. *Indian Times. Nachrichten aus dem roten Amerika.* ERNAS Extra 1. Altenstadt: European Review of Native American Studies.
- Fischer, Hans. 1971. Völkerkunde-Museen. *Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg*, N.F. 1: 9–51.
- Haas, Jonathan. 1996. Power, Objects and the Voice for Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 37(Supplement): S1–S22.
- Museumsordnung. 2001. 2. Verordnung des Bundesministers für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur betreffend Museumsordnung des Kunsthistorischen Museums mit Museum für Völkerkunde und Österreichischem Theatermuseum. *Bundesgesetzblatt für die Republik Österreich* 2001, II, 2: 9–19.
- Osgood, Cornelius. 1979. Anthropology in Museums of Canada and the United States. *Publications in Museology* 7. Milwaukee
- Plankensteiner, Barbara. 2003. "Völlige Fühllosigkeit dem Künstlerischen gegenüber ..." Der Streit um den "asiatischen Kunstsaal" anlässlich der Neueröffnung des Museums für Völkerkunde in Wien im Jahre 1928. *Archiv für Völkerkunde* 53: 1–26.
- Sturtevant, William C. 1969. Does Anthropology Need Museums? *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 82: 619–649.
- 1973. Museums as Anthropological Data Banks. In: Redfield, A. (ed.), *Anthropology Beyond the University*. Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings 7. Athens 1973: 40–55.
- Terrell, John. 1991. Disneyland and the Future of Museum Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 93: 149–153.

West, W. Richard et al. 2000. *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures*. Washington, DC: National Museum of the American Indian—Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN ISRAEL: PROFESSIONALS IN STORMY DAYS

Orit Abuhav

Beit Berl College, Israel

This overview seeks to draw the history of anthropology in Israel in broad strokes and with a contextual perspective from the mid-1920s to the beginning of the 21st century.¹ Studies of the characteristics of national anthropologies have assumed that the state—a social/political/bureaucratic/cultural/national body—is a legitimate unit of analysis. National anthropologies deal with the sociopolitical and historical context of producing anthropological knowledge. The linkage between processes of nation building and anthropology in 50-year-old Israel makes the literature on anthropologies in the new independent states and the developed world relevant to the Israeli case (Ben Ari and Van-Bremen, forthcoming; Alatas, 2001). Some works that deal with the complex center-periphery relations in anthropology, such as Gerholm and Hannerz (1982) and Gupta and Ferguson (1997), shed light on the discipline in Israel. As a national anthropology, anthropology in Israel should be viewed in the light of wider social processes in Israeli society, the changing agenda of world anthropology, and the human nature of its carriers, the anthropologists. My investigation of Israeli anthropology has been inspired by studies in the history of anthropology which show the complexity and multifaceted situations within which anthropology was done, such as those by Kuklick on British anthropology (1991) or Schumaker (2001) on the Rhodes-Livingston Institute in Central Africa.

Anthropology as an idea entered the domain of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem from the mid-1920s, as that institution was being established, but only in the mid-1960s did it begin to be institutionalized in Israeli universities. Why was it neglected, even rejected, while its importance and relevance to the new society was recognized? The discipline's rejection by academe for many years is testimony to the intellectual and ideological preferences of the Jewish community of pre-state Palestine and of the state itself during its first decade. The reversal in attitudes towards the discipline which took place after that was based on utilitarian reasons, reflecting changes in Israeli society's objectives, as well as the availability of manpower and resources for attaining those objectives. The gradually increasing strength of the discipline becomes clear against the backdrop of the expectations placed upon it on the one hand, and the personal, social, political and global agenda of its members, on the other.

Anthropological research in Israel had its beginnings in the early 1920s, when the country was governed under the British Mandate established by the League of Nations. During this period, ethnographic field studies of small communities of Palestinian Arabs were conducted, which were soon followed by sociological and ethnographic studies of the Jews of Palestine. Hilma Granquist, (1891-1942) a Finnish anthropologist, came to the village of Artas near Bethlehem anticipating that the life patterns of the Palestinian villagers could serve as a source for the understanding of everyday life in Biblical times (Granquist, 1935). She shared her interest in their daily life, folklore and material culture with Tewafiq Canaan (1882-1964), a local physician (Canaan, 1927, 1932).

A few years later, two Jewish researchers, Zionist immigrants from central Europe Erich Brauer and Raphael Patai, became the pioneers of ethnographic research on Jewish groups in Palestine (Abuhav, 2003). Both were products of the Orientalist scholarship and tradition in Germany and Hungary, and their interest was Jews who had immigrated to Palestine from the Middle East—"Oriental Jews"—focusing on those who lived in Jerusalem (Brauer, 1934, 1992; Patai, 1946a, 1946b). The researchers of both groups, Jewish and Palestinian alike, sought to document cultures which in their view had preserved traditional life patterns for centuries, and which now stood on the threshold of great changes. Like many anthropologists of their generation, they viewed their principal role as recording ways of life that would supposedly soon disappear. They did not address the social changes that were being effected in Palestine because of the constant flow of immigrants and the efforts of British Mandate authorities, changes that the researchers saw merely as destructive influences that made their salvage efforts crucial. Eventually, Patai would be influenced by American anthropologists' studies of acculturation and would discuss life in contemporary Palestine (1946a).

Conspicuous by their absence from the Palestinian field were British anthropologists, who spread themselves over a broad geographical area, but they showed no great interest in the eastern tip of the Mediterranean. Perhaps the peoples of the region, Jews and Arabs alike, were not considered sufficiently "primitive" for the functional-structural approach that dominated British social anthropology at the time.

Why were the promising beginnings of Palestinian and Jewish anthropology nipped in the bud? Brauer and Patai tried to establish anthropology in the Hebrew University, the only university teaching humanities or social science at the time, but their efforts were defeated. One of their problems was that it was difficult to define anthropology. Was it physical? cultural? both? Where would it be housed in the university? Another of their problems, linked to the first, was an ideological-ethical one: anthropological inquiry had long been linked with race theories. There had been many debates about whether the Jews were a single race, a number of races, or whether they should be viewed in terms of race at all—and about whether there was reliable evidence that could be used to resolve questions of Jewish identity (Efron, 1994; Hart, 2000). Nazism and World War II made physical anthropology that 'measured' Jews a questionable enterprise (Goldberg and Abuhav, 2000). Ultimately, Brauer's untimely death and critical views on Patai's anthropology shut the window of opportunity on the establishment of anthropology in Jerusalem.

During the time of pre-state Israel, the Jewish community was built upon a project of massive Zionist emigration. With the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, the Jewish population tripled in only a few years, enlarged by both immigrant refugees from post-war Europe and immigrants from the Middle East. Israeli society underwent dramatic changes: the Arab-Jewish armed conflict in 1948 (Israel's War of Independence); the expulsion and flight of the majority of the Arabs from the new state; the economic hardship that was part of Israel's first years; and changes in state institutions. New social and cultural orders were emerging, and with the establishment of the state, numerous resources were diverted to the training of a professional cadre of public servants who required a basic academic education—from which anthropology was excluded.

During the 1950s, anthropological activity was effectively limited to a few individuals from abroad who came to conduct research or to explore possibilities for work. In the 1960s, however, a few anthropologists and sociologists undertook research missions deriving from Zionist objectives: state settlement and integration of new immigrants. As people

whose image was 'experts on Others'—the new immigrants from the Middle East—social scientists were given the task of understanding what had gone wrong with programs of modernization, settlement and immigrants' absorption. Later, anthropologists of this generation were called to task for having been recruited to the Zionist project and having been blind to power relations and the colonial aspect of their work. For example, Van Teeffelen (1977, 1980) Berenstein, (1980), and Ram (1995) criticized Jewish anthropologists of European origin who studied Oriental Jews, and Rabinowitz criticized Jewish anthropologists who studied the Palestinians (Rabinowitz, 2002). But these critiques ignored the complex products of this anthropological endeavor. Researchers had not simply provided recommendations for controlling the immigrants to the Jewish Agency or other bodies that had employed them; rather, they created a nuanced and sophisticated ethnography that gave voice to the emigrants and their dilemmas, although this did not run counter to basic Zionist positions (Weingrod, 1966; Willner, 1969; Deshen and Shokeid, 1974). Looking at the making of anthropological knowledge through the narrow lens of power and colonial relations sterilizes it from human agency, serendipity and other motivations which I shall discuss later. At the time, it was therefore hardly surprising that the establishment chose to put anthropology on hold and prevent its development. This decision fell into line with the internal balance of power within the only academic institution that then existed, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The impressive 1970s breakthrough of anthropology in Israeli academe was a consequence of the aspirations of an Anglo-Jewish philanthropist, Lord Bernstein, to assist national Israeli-Zionist projects, and serendipitously he greatly contributed to the development of anthropology. He enlisted Max Gluckman, who then headed the Manchester University Department of Anthropology, to guide and supervise ten Ph.D. studies on Israeli society. Gluckman's theoretical influence and that of the Manchester school left their mark on Israeli anthropology for many years (Marx, 1975). The significance of this project is worthy of comparison with Gluckman's influence on the anthropology of Central Africa at a later period in his career (Schumaker, 2001).

The generous (colonial?) contributions to anthropological research brought about the introduction of the discipline to Tel Aviv University. The early 1970s saw a heightened demand for higher education worldwide and in Israel, and large resources were diverted to its advancement. Immigrant anthropologists, motivated by their Jewish identity and Zionist ideology, came to fill posts and reinforce their few Israeli colleagues who had initially shouldered the burden of the discipline. Tel Aviv was followed by the other new universities—Haifa, Bar-Ilan and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev—which all included anthropology, and left with no choice Jerusalem followed suit. However, to this day not one of them has given anthropology organizational autonomy, and with the exception of Ben-Gurion (where anthropology is part of behavioral sciences, including psychology), anthropology and sociology are joint departments.

The late 1960s and early 1970s were also when a window was opened in Israeli society for the expression of ethnic diversity and a relinquishing, if only rhetorically at first, of the ideals of a "melting pot" and a "merging of the diasporas." There were the beginnings of a willingness to look into the mirror and see Israel's pluralistic and multicultural image. In the new climate, the anthropologists were given the opportunity of creating knowledge compatible with their agenda without clashing with the establishment credo. Employing accepted anthropological tools, they studied other Jewish immigrants on the one hand,

(Deshen, 1970; Shokeid, 1971; Goldberg, 1972; Lewis, 1979; Palgi, 1983), and Palestinians on the other (Cohen, 1971; Marx, 1977; Ginat, 1980).

Another focus of anthropological work was the kibbutz that emerged in the first decades of the twentieth century. It was prominent in the growing Jewish society in Mandatory Palestine and in the Zionist ethos leading to the establishment of the state. The kibbutz was studied intensively by anthropologists from abroad, like Melford Spiro (1963, 1972) and Stanley Diamond (1957), and ethnographically by the local sociologist Yonina Talmon-Garber and her students (1972). Researchers were curious and fascinated by the unique collective ideological "social experiment" on issues such as family, social roles, children, education, economic equality, and so forth. The kibbutz and the Moshav, a cooperative village which was the setting for major projects of settling immigrants, were perceived as small, isolated, integrated communities and therefore an ideal field for anthropological field research.

The new approaches gained impetus from the 1970s onward, while Israeli anthropology began to diversify in line with trends in the discipline elsewhere. Consciousness of the role of the state and other formal institutions led to the continued study of bureaucracy, such as the welfare system (Marx, 1976; Handelman, 1980; Hertzog, 1999). The arrival of the Ethiopian immigrants in the 1980s and 1990s brought in its wake studies of ethnic communities, some of which emphasized the bureaucratic power relationships and dependency that shaped the experience of these immigrants.

The role of social power in defining identities and relationships is well documented in the gender studies that were developed in the 1980s. These studies emerged against the background of feminist awareness and writings both in Israel and the world at large, in divergent contexts: the family, the community, the labor market, the army, and so forth. These studies highlighted the ways women dealt with their inferior status in society and in the family by mobilizing alternative power resources and manipulating them in a society that structured women's social and economic weakness and marginality. Women's voices were expressed in multiple works (Katzir, 1983; Wasserfall, 1990; Abu-Rabia, 1994; El-Or, 1994; Sered, 2000) which shed new light on female endeavors to maneuver in settings in which they lacked formal power. Attention to gender also boosted the study of subjects like masculinity and war (Weiss, 1998; Lomsky-Feder and Ben-Ari, 2000), or the family and the welfare state.

During the same period of time, anthropologists turned the middle class into a research subject. Research in the 1980s and 1990s posed questions regarding the cultural discourse and social patterns created and consumed by the members of this category. Some examples are: culture and communication (Katriel, 1991), wedding gifts (Abuhav, forthcoming), birthday parties (Shamgar and Handelman, 1991), Arab women forging new roles through shopping patterns (Forte, 2002), and Israelis living in New York (Shokeid, 1988).

These social developments and research foci also called for new research paradigms and methodologies. In contrast to the early years of anthropology during which "classic" fieldwork in defined settings (often villages and small towns) was the major method, new orientations were utilized to deal with urban life, its populations and settings, such as the social world approach (Hazan, 1990), or an emphasis on life stories and life-history (Lomsky-Feder, 1995; Bilu, 2000). The overlap between anthropology and other disciplines also became more apparent, for example in many sociological studies based on ethnography and social historical studies (Deshen, 1989; Goldberg, 1990), in works that bridged anthropology and folklore (Salamon, 2001), or in analyses of rabbinic tradition that utilized anthropology

(Cooper, 1987).

Almost all of the anthropologists who worked in the post-Brauer and Patai phases of the discipline are still alive, and interviews with them show that the search for the exotic and romantic were only secondary incentives for Israeli anthropologists. Anthropological science in Israel had never dwelt in remote castles or ivory towers. The combustible materials that fueled the research of these individuals were greater commitment to the subject studied (rather than to the body that commissioned it), curiosity about The Other, intellectual stimulus, and a connection with universal scientific endeavor. These factors were complemented by the drives, motivations, choices, and randomness of anthropologists' experience as human beings, some of which were no less decisive in scientific practice than rational considerations and intentional actions.

Anthropological work in Israel is characterized by 'anthropology at home' on Israeli society and within its geopolitical borders. Initially, Israeli anthropologists constructed their 'Other' as Middle Eastern Jews and Palestinians. With the changes taking place in world anthropology and Israeli society, 'The Other' and the researcher moved closer to one another and the research subjects became 'Us'. The idea of 'Anthropology at home' contributed to Israeli anthropology's status in anthropology internationally. The 'home' of the first anthropologists was the national home that enlisted them, emotionally and practically, to participate in its formation. The close familiarity with the people studied and the fact of speaking their real and symbolic language imbues Israeli anthropology with insights that a foreigner would have difficulty producing. This close proximity also creates problems that originate in acceptance of, resemblance to, and participation in basic Zionist/Jewish assumptions, and which emanate from the researcher's commitment to and involvement in the subject population. But it does not keep anthropologists from posing trenchant questions about the social situations in which they are involved. The anthropologists' play of identity, between national and global identities, between Judaism and Israeli-ness, or between Ashkenazi-ism and Sephardi-ism, is strongly manifested in their work on Israeli society. The researchers' subjects are beset by similar questions of identity and thus are able to identify with the anthropologists' studies.

Anthropology in Israel was and is an arena for an epistemological encounter between British social anthropology and American cultural anthropology. (There are only a few instances of anthropologists trained in France.) Israeli anthropology was sufficiently broad and flexible to absorb both schools which, from the 1960s, moved closer to one another in world anthropology. The influence of the Anglo-American world centers of knowledge was manifested in the introduction of critical approaches developed in the 1980s. These challenged the anthropological status quo with regard to its borders, the nature of ethnography, researcher-subject relations, and its methodology. All of these brought about changes in the research agenda of Israeli anthropology, from the adoption of innovative methodologies of narratives and life stories, to methodologies borrowed from cultural studies and textual analysis, and to renewed definitions of research fields. The majority of Israeli anthropologists have studied abroad, although by now there are some who have done their doctoral work at Israeli universities, and they view themselves as part of an international community of professionals.

In the wake of the dismantling of collective identities in Israeli society, for veteran and new anthropologists alike, both subversives and the establishment-oriented, a certain distancing from local identities, national and Zionist, took place. The structuring of identities occurs in an interaction with social processes, circumstances and influences unique to Israeli society—a demanding and ideological society that was collectivist in the past and which,

with the passing of the years, placed more and more emphasis on individualism. If the monolithic identity has been dismantled into the numerous identities running around inside us, then the professional-anthropological identity surely has a contribution to make to the understanding of these processes in light of the social changes taking place. It is desirable not to ignore the tension between intentions, planning, aspirations, desires, ideology and motivation on the one hand, and the randomness that cannot be controlled, the personal choices that are not directly linked to career, and the aleatory dimension of randomness on the other. Despite these tensions, Israeli anthropologists still engage in involved and committed anthropology, if not for national causes then for social struggles and ethical objectives.

Defining anthropology as a science dealing solely with 'the Other' restricts the field of vision. Much can be learned from anthropology, not only about the Other, but also about ourselves. The discipline possesses unique characteristics deriving from the context in which anthropological knowledge is produced and processed. It influences, assists, undermines and shapes the definition of national objectives and is at the same time shaped by those objectives. The Israeli case calls into question the possibility of imposing the model of colonialist anthropology on it, and it challenges the model of center-periphery relationships between the powerful exploiters and the powerless dominated. The relationship between academe and society in Israel is linked to changes that have taken place in the nature of expectations of anthropologists during the eighty-odd years of the presence of the idea of anthropology in Israel, in the dramas that accompanied the development of Israeli society, and the crucial changes in world anthropology.

¹ This paper is based on my doctoral thesis on the development of Israeli anthropology, which I recently submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I am grateful to the University's social science faculty and Beit Berl College for their support of my research.

Bibliography

- Abu-Rabia, A. 1994. *The Negev Bedouin and Livestock Rearing: Social, Economic and Political Aspects*. Oxford: Berg.
- Abuhav, O. 2003. The Human Countenance: The Contribution of the Ethnologists Erich Brauer and Raphael Patai to the Anthropology of the Jews. *Jerusalem Studies of Jewish Folklore* 22:159-178 (In Hebrew).
- (Forthcoming). Wedding Gifts: The Wrapping and the Content, in Hertzog et al. (eds.) *Israel: Local Anthropology*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Alatas, S.F. 2001. The Study of the Social Sciences in Developing Societies: Towards an Adequate Conceptualization of Relevance. *Current Sociology* 49(2):1-19.
- Ben-Ari, E. and J. Van Bremen. (Forthcoming). An Introductory Essay, in J. Van Bremen, E. Ben-Ari and F. Al-Atas, *Anthropologies of Asia: Anthropologies in Asia*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Bernstein, D. 1980. Immigrants and Society – A Critical View of the Dominant School of Israeli Sociology. *British Journal of Sociology* 31(2): 246-264.
- Bilu, Y. 2000. *Without Bonds: The Life and Death of Rabbi Ya'acov Wazana*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Brauer, E. 1934. *Ethnologie der jemenitischen Juden*, Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek, 1st series (Ethnologische Bibliothek) vol 7, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- 1992. *The Jews of Kurdistan* (ed. by R. Patai), Jewish Folklore and Anthropology Series, Detroit, 1993.

- Canaan, T. 1927. *Mohammadan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine*. London: Luzac.
- 1932. The Palestinian Arab House: Its Architecture and Folklore. *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 11:15-36.
- Cohen, E. 1971. Arab Boys and Tourist Girls in a Mixed Jewish Arab Community. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 12(4):217-233.
- Cooper, S. 1987. The Laws of Mixture: An Anthropological Study in Halakhah. In *Judaism Viewed from Within and From Without: Anthropological Studies*. H. E. Goldberg (ed.). Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 55-74.
- Deshen, S. 1970. *Immigrant Voters in Israel: Parties and Congregations in a Local Election Campaign*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- 1989. *The Mellah Society: Jewish Community Life in Sherifian Morocco*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deshen, S. and M. Shokeid (eds.). 1974. *The Predicament of Home Coming*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Diamond, S. 1957. Kibbutz and Stetl: The History of an Idea. *Social Problems* 5:71-90.
- Efron, J. 1993. *Defenders of the Jewish Race: Jewish Doctors in Fin-de-siècle Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- El-Or, T. 1994. *Educated and Ignorant: Ultraorthodox Women and Their World*. Boulder: Rienner.
- Forte, T. 2002. Shopping in Jenin: Women, Homes and Political Persons in the Galilee. *City and Society* 13(2): 211-243.
- Gerholm, T. and U. Hannerz. 1982. The Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47(1-2):3-35.
- Ginat, Y. 1987. *Blood Dispute among Bedouin and Rural Arab in Israel: Revenge, Mediation, Outcasting and Family Honour*. University of Pittsburgh Press and Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies.
- Goldberg, H. E. 1972. *Cave Dwellers and Citrus Growers: A Jewish Community in Libya and in Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1990. *Jewish Life in Muslim Libya: Rivals and Relatives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg H. and O. Abuhav. 2000. "Race Places: Jewish Identities in Anthropological Perspective," paper presented to the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.
- Granquist, H. 1935. *Marriage Condition in a Palestinian Village*. Helsingfors: Akademische Buchandlund.
- Gupta, A. and J. Ferguson (eds.). 1997. *Anthropological Locations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Handelman, D. 1980. Bureaucratic Affiliation: The Moral Component in Welfare Cases, in E. Marx (ed.) *A Composite Portrait of Israel*. London: Academic Press, pp. 257-282.
- Hart, M. 2000. *Social Science and the Politics of Modern Jewish Identity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hazan, H. 1990. *A Paradoxical Community: the Emergence of a Social World in an Urban Renewal Setting*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Hertzog, E. 1999. *Immigrants and Bureaucrats: Ethiopians in an Israeli Absorption Center*. Oxford: Berghan.
- Katriel, T. 1991. *Communal Webs: Communication and Culture in Contemporary Israel*. Albany: SUNY.
- Katzir, Y. 1983 Yemenite Jewish Women in Rural Development: Female Power versus Male Authority. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 32(1):45-61.

- Kuklick, H. 1991. *The Savage Within: Social History of British Anthropology: 1885-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, A. 1979. *Power, Poverty and Education: An Ethnography of Schooling in Israeli Town*. Ramat Gan: Turtledove.
- Lomsky-Feder, E. 1995. The Meaning of War Through Veterans' Eyes: A Phenomenological Analysis of Life Stories. *International Sociology* 10(4):463-482.
- Lomsky-Feder, E. and E. Ben-Ari. 2000. *The Military and Militarism in Israeli Society*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Marx, E. 1975. Anthropological Studies in a Centralized State: Max Gluckman and the Bernstein Israel Project. *The Journal of Jewish Sociology* 17(2):131-150.
- 1976. *The Social Context of Violent Behavior*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 1977. The Tribe as a unit of Subsistence: Nomadic Pastoralism in the Middle East, *American Anthropologist* 79:343-363.
- Palgi, P. 1983. Mental Health, Traditional Belief and the Moral Order among Yemenite Jews in Israel, in L. Roumanucci-Ross et. al. (eds.) *The Anthropology of Medicine* New York: Bergin, pp. 319-335.
- Patai, R. 1946a. Palm Leaves on Boat's Prows in Palestine. *Man* 46: 47.
- 1946b. Anthropology during the War: V. Palestine. *American Anthropologist* 48:477- 482.
- Rabinowitz, D. 2002. Oriental Othering and National Identity: A Review of Early Israeli Anthropological Studies of Palestinians. *Identities* 9:305-325.
- Ram, U. 1995. *The Changing Agenda of Israeli Sociology: Theory, Ideology and Identity*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rosenfeld, H. 2002. The Idea is to Change the State, not the 'Conceptual Terminology'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(6):1083-1095.
- Salomon, H. 2001. Political Bumper Stickers in Contemporary Israel: Folklore as an Emotional Battleground. *Journal of American Folklore* 114(453):1-32.
- Schumaker, L. 2001. *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sered, S. 2000. *What Makes Women Sick? Maternity, Modesty and Militarism in Israeli Society*. Waltham: Brandeis University Press.
- Shamgar-Handelman, L. and D. Handelman. 1991. Celebration of Bureaucracy: Birthday Parties in Kindergartens. *Ethnology* 30(4):293-312.
- Shokeid, M. 1971. *The Dual Heritage: Immigrants from the Atlas Mountains in an Israeli village*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Spiro, M. 1963. *Kibbutz, Venture in Utopia*. New York: Schocken Books.
- 1972. *Children of the Kibbutz*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Talmon-Garber, Y. 1972. *Family and Community in the Kibbutz*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Van Teeffelen, T. 1977. *Anthropologists on Israel: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Amsterdam: Papers on European and Mediterranean Societies no. 9, University of Amsterdam.
- 1980. The Manchester School in Africa and Israel: A Critique, in S. Diamond (ed.) *Anthropology: Ancestors and Heirs*. The Hague: Mouton, Pp.347-375.
- Wasserfall, R. 1990. Bargaining for Gender Identity: Love, Sex and Money in an Israeli Moshav. *Ethnology* 29: 327-340.
- Weingrod, A. 1966. *Reluctant Pioneers: Village Development in Israel*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Weiss, M. 1998. Engendering Gulf War Memories: Israeli Nurses and the Discourse of Soldiering. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 27(2): 197-218.
- Willner, D. 1969. *Nation-Building and Community in Israel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Dennis Bryson, Department of American Culture and Literature, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey, has received a grant from the Rockefeller Archive Center to investigate foundation support for the study of culture and personality during the 1920s and 1930s.

RECENT DISSERTATIONS

- Couttenier, Maarten. 2004. "Fysieke antropologie, koloniale etnografie en het museum van Tervuren. Een geschiedenis van de Belgische antropologie (1882-1925)." Proefschrift aan de Katholieke Universiteit Leuven ("Physical Anthropology, Colonial Ethnography and the Museum of Tervuren: A History of Belgian Anthropology, 1882-1925").

RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

[Occasionally, readers call our attention to errors in the entries, usually of a minor typographical character. 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. We welcome and encourage bibliographic suggestions from our readers.]

- Adams, J. and D. Gorton. 2004. Southern Trauma: Revisiting cast and class in the Mississippi delta. American Anthropologist 106: 334-45.

- Álvarez Roldán, Arturo. 2002. Writing ethnography: Malinowski's fieldnotes on Baloma. Social Anthropology 10(3):377-393.

- Arnold, Ken and Danielle Olsen, eds. 2003. Medicine Man: The Forgotten Museum of Henry Wellcome. London: The British Museum Press.

- Ballantyne, Tony. 2004. Science, Empire and the European Exploration of the Pacific. Burlington: Ashgate.

- Balter, Michael. 2005. Catalhoyuk: An Archaeological Journey to the Dawn of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster/The Free Press.

- Banner, Lois W. 2003. Intertwined Lives: Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Their Circle. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Bashkow, Ira, Matti Bunzl, Richard Handler, Andrew Orta, and Daniel Rosenblatt. 2004. "In Focus. A New Boasian Anthropology: Theory for the Twenty-First Century." American Anthropologist 106: 433-494. Includes an introduction by all of the authors, each of whom has contributed an essay.
- Bennett, Tony. 2004. Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bertholet, Denis. 2003. Claude Lévi-Strauss. Paris: Plon.
- Bertrand, Frederic. 2002. L'anthropologie Soviétique des Années 20-30: Configuration d'une rupture. Presses Universitaire de Bordeaux.
- Blatt, Jessica. 2004. 'To bring out the best that is in their blood': Race, reform, and civilization in the Journal of Race Development (1910-1919). Ethnic and Racial Studies 27: 691-709.
- Borofsky, Robert. 2005. Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn from It. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bucher, Gudrun. 2002. "Von Beschreibung der Sitten und Gebräuche der Völker": Die Instruktionen Gerhard Friedrich Müllers und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Ethnologie und der Geschichtswissenschaft. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Calloway, C., G. Gemunden and S. Zantop, eds. 2002. Germans and Indians: Fantasies, encounters, projections. University of Nebraska Press.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. 2001. How to write the history of the New World: histories, epistemologies, and identities in the eighteenth-century Atlantic world. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Carneiro, Robert. 2004. Can anthropology be made a science? A retrospective glance. Ethnos 69(2): 268-288.
- Chappey, Jean-Luc. 2002. La Société des observateurs de l'homme, 1799-1804: Des anthropologues au temps de Bonaparte. Paris: Société des études robespierristes.
- Cifuentes, Bárbara. 2002. Lenguas amerindias en la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística (1833-1874). Dimensión Antropológica 9(24):113-138.
- Cole, Sally Cooper. 2003. Ruth Landes: A Life in Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Daily, D.W. 2004. Battle for the BIA: G.E.E. Lindquist and the missionary crusade against John Collier. University of Arizona Press.

- Darnell, Regna. 2001. Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- De la Peña, Guillermo. 2002. Costumbre, ley y procesos judiciales en la antropología clásica. In Esteban Krotz, ed., Antropología jurídica: perspectivas socioculturales en el estudio del derecho, pp. 51-68. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Dias, Nelia. 2004. La mesure des sens. Les anthropologues et le corps humain au XIXe siècle. Paris, Aubier.
- Dracklé, Dorle and Iain R. Edgar, eds. 2003. Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology. New York: Berghahn.
- Durington, Mathew. 2004. John Marshall's Kalahari family. American Anthropologist 106:589-94.
- Edelman, M. and A. Haugerud, eds. 2004. The anthropology of development and globalization: From classical political economy to contemporary neoliberalism. Blackwell.
- Elliott, Michael. 2002. The Culture Concept: Writing and Difference in the Age of Realism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fine-Dare, K. 2002. Grave injustice: The American Indian repatriation movement and NAGPRA. University of Nebraska Press.
- Fox, Robin. 2004. Participant observer: Memoir of a transatlantic life. Piscataway, N.J.: Transaction Press.
- Gaisenhainer, Katja. 2002. "Rasse ist Schicksal": Otto Reche (1879-1966) - ein Leben als Anthropologe und Völkerkundler. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt (Beiträge zur Leipziger Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Reihe A, Band 1).
- Gershenhorn, Jerry. 2004. Melville J. Herskovits and the Racial Politics of Knowledge. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Gigson, M.A. 2004. John Uzo Ogbu (1939-2003) American Anthropologist 106:644-46.
- Graham, Ian. 2002. Alfred Maudslay and the Maya: a biography. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gregor, T.A. and D.R. Gross. 2004. Guilt by association: The culture of accusation and the American Anthropological Association's investigation of Darkness in El Dorado. American Anthropologist 106: 687-98.

- Guthrie, Robert V. 2004. Even the rat was white: a historical view of psychology. 2d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hagner, Michael. 2003. "Toward a History of Attention in Culture and Science," MLN, Literatur und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 108: 670-687.
- Hagner, Michael. 2004. Geniale Gehirne. Zur Geschichte der Elitegehirnforschung. Gottingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Harris, C.H. and L.R. Sadler. 2004. The archaeologist was a spy: Sylvanus G. Morley and the Office of Naval Intelligence Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Hawkins, Sean. 2002. Writing and colonialism in northern Ghana: The encounter between the LoDagaa and the "world on paper." Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Hieb, Louis A., with research assistance from Susan E. Diggle. 2004. A Question of Authorship: A. M. Stephen's Catalogue of the Keam Collection [1884]. Kiva. The Journal of Southwestern Archaeology and History 69: 399-421.
- Howe, K. R. 2003. The Quest for Origins: Who First Discovered and Settled the Pacific Islands. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Jackson, J.B., R.D. Fogelson, & W. Sturtevant. 2004. History of ethnological and linguistic research. In R.D. Fogelson, volume editor, Southeast. Vol. 14 of Handbook of North American Indians, W.C. Sturtevant, general ed. 31-48. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Janiewski, D. & L. Banner, eds. 2004. Reading Benedict/Reading Mead: Feminism, race and imperial visions. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, Christopher. 2003. Claude Lévi-Strauss: the formative years. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Greta and Robert A. Peel, eds. 2003. Herbert Spencer: The Intellectual Legacy. London: The Galton Institute.
- Joyce, Barry Alan. 2001. The Shaping of American Ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Jung, Carl. 2002. Karosse und Kimono: "Hottentotten" und Japaner im Spiegel des Reisebereichs von Carl Peter Thurnberg (1743-1828). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Kate, Herman F. C. ten. 2004 [orig. 1885]. Travels and Researches in Native North America, translated and edited by Peter Hovens, William J. Orr, and Louis A. Hieb. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- King, Richard. 2004. Race, culture and the intellectuals, 1940-1970. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Krotz, Esteban. 2002. La otredad cultural entre ciencia y utopía: un estudio sobre el origen, el desarrollo y la reorientación de la antropología. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/UAM.
- La Fontaine, Jean. 2004. Isaac Sahapera (1905-2003). American Anthropologist 106:647-49.
- Lagier, Raphael. 2004. Les races humaines selon Kant. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. 2004. Rolling in ditches with shamans: Jaime de Angulo and the professionalization of American anthropology. University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Lomnitz, L.A. 2004. Family, Networks, and Academics. Ethnos 69(1): 113-126.
- Lyons, Andrew P. and Harriet D. Lyons. 2004. Irregular Connections: A History of Anthropology and Sexuality. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Majd, M.G. 2004. The great American plunder of Persia's antiquities, 1925-1941. University Press of America.
- Mauzé, Marie, Michael Harkin, and Sergei Kan, eds. 2004. Coming to Shore: Northwest Coast Ethnology, Traditions and Visions. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Mills, David. 2002. British Anthropology at the End of Empire: The Rise and Fall of the Colonial Social Science Research Council, 1944-1962. Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines #6.
- Nolasco Armas, Margarita. 2003. Medio siglo de indigenismo en el INI. México Indígena 2(4):7-13.
- Ortiz García, Carmen. 2003. La antropología pedagógica en España durante el primer tercio del siglo XX. Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares LVIII (Cuad. Seg.):71-92.
- Ortiz García, Carmen. 2003. Cultura popular y construcción nacional: la institucionalización de los estudios de folklore en Cuba. Revista de Indias LXIII (229):695-736.
- Palsson, G., ed. 2001. Writing on ice: The ethnographic notebooks of Vilhjalmur Stefansson. University Press of New England.
- Patterson, T.C. and C.E. Orser, Jr. 2004. Foundations of social archaeology: Selected writings of V. Gordon Childe. Alta Mira Press.

- Peabody, Sue and Tyler Stovall, eds. 2003. The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Peace, William J. 2004. Leslie A. White: Evolution and Revolution in Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (From the Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology Series).
- Pellicer, Dora. 2002. Las lenguas de México y sus hablantes en los estudios científicos (1833-1874). Dimensión Antropológica 9(24):139-154.
- Pérez Montfort, Ricardo. 2000. Folklore e identidad: reflexiones sobre una herencia nacionalista en América. In Ricardo Pérez Montfort, Avatares del nacionalismo cultural, 15-34. Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social / Centro de Investigación y Docencia en Humanidades del Estado de Morelos.
- Pérez Zevallos, Juan Manuel, ed. 2002. La visita de Gómez Nieto a la Huasteca (1532 – 1533). Mexico City/San Luis Potosí: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social/Archivo General de la Nación/Centro Francés de Estudios Mexicanos y Centroamericanos/El Colegio de San Luis.
- Que Dzul, Guadalupe. 2003. Mirada retrospectiva de Agustín Romano (1916-2003). México Indígena 2(4):28-31.
- Ryang, Sonia. 2004. Japan and national anthropology: A critique. New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Sahlins, M. 2004. Apologies to Thucydides: Understanding history as culture and vice versa. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schafft, G.E. 2004. From racism to genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich. University of Illinois Press.
- Scubla, Lucien. 2002. Hocart and the royal road to anthropological understanding. Social Anthropology 10(3):359-376.
- Sibeud, Emmanuelle. 2002. Une science impériale pour l'Afrique? La construction des savoirs africanistes en France, 1878-1930. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales.
- Sigaud, Lygia. 2002. The vicissitudes of 'The Gift'. Social Anthropology 10(3):335-358.
- Sillitoe, Paul. 2004. Making links, opening out: Anthropology and the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Anthropology Today 20(6):10-15.
- Slotten, Ross A. 2004. The Heretic in Darwin's Court: The Life of Alfred Russel Wallace. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Stocking, G.W., ed. 2004. Franz Boas: A formação da antropologia Americana, antologia. [translation of Franz Boas and the shaping of American anthropology, 1882-1911] Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.
- Stocking, G.W. 2004. Antropologia em Chicago: A fundação de um departamento independente, 1923-1929. In F. Peixoto, H. Pontes, & L. Schwarca, eds. Antropologias, Histórias, experiências, 15-59 (Belo Horizonte, editora UFMG, Brazil).
- Sylverman, S. 2002. The beast at the table: Conferencing with anthropologists. Walnut Creek, CA.: Altamira [accounts of 25 years of Wenner-Gren conferences].
- Tambiah, Stanley J. 2002. Edmund Leach: an anthropological life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watson, P. J. 2004. Robert John Braidwood (1907-2003). American Anthropologist 106: 642-44.
- Weikart, Richard. 2004. From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany. New York: Palgrave.
- Wilcox, Clifford. 2004. Robert Redfield and the Development of American Anthropology. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Young, Michael W. 2004. Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884-1920. New Haven: Yale University Press.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

William Y. Adams' The Philosophical Roots of Anthropology (Stanford, 1998) has appeared in a Spanish language edition, Las Raíces Filosófica de la Antropología (Editorial Trotta, Madrid, 2003). A Chinese language edition is also in preparation, and will be published by the Central Institute of Minorities in Beijing.

For American Anthropological Association members, there is a valuable new resource for historical research, AnthroSource, The Virtual AAA Library. AnthroSource is an online, digitized collection of AAA periodicals. To access it, log onto the AAA website, www.aaanet.org, using your member ID and password.

UPCOMING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

The American Association of Geographers will hold its annual meeting on April 5-9, 2005, in Denver, CO. This year, the theme of the meeting is "Epistemic Spaces."

The Seventh Annual Philosophy of Social Science Roundtable will meet at Barnard College, Columbia University March 11-13, 2005. This Roundtable will continue a tradition of meetings that bring together a diverse group of philosophers and social scientists to discuss a wide range of philosophical issues raised in and by social research. The keynote speakers this year will be Margaret Gilbert (Department of Philosophy, University of

Connecticut) and Philip Pettit (Politics Department, Princeton University). Selected papers from the Roundtable will be published in an annual special issue of *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (see any March issue of *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* from 2000 onward for papers from prior Roundtables). News and updates about the roundtable are available at: <http://bc.barnard.columbia.edu/~awylie/RoundtableIndex.html>.

The History of Science Society will hold a joint meeting with the Society for the History of Technology at the Hyatt Regency in downtown Minneapolis, Minnesota, 3 - 6 November 2005. The Call for Papers will be issued in early January, 2005. Please visit the HSS and SHOT Web sites for updates on this conference. Readers of this newsletter are likely to be especially interested in the activities of an interest group within the History of Science Society, the Forum for History of Human Science, which sponsors sessions at HSS meetings and awards prizes for outstanding dissertations and articles. For information, consult the group's Web site: <http://www.fhhs.org/>

Cheiron, The International Society for the History of Social and Behavioral Sciences, will hold its 37th meeting at the University of California - Berkeley, June 23-26, 2005. The Fall-Winter 2004-2005 Newsletter is now available [pdf]. The Cheiron Web site address is: <http://people.stu.ca/%7Echeiron.staff/>

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