



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 33
Issue 2 December 2006

Article 6

January 2006

Recent Dissertations

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

(2006) "Recent Dissertations," *History of Anthropology Newsletter*. Vol. 33 : Iss. 2 , Article 6.
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol33/iss2/6>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol33/iss2/6>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

artists took part, she argued, in order to establish Jews as a “people among peoples” in the multi-ethnic, multi-national setting of the camps, even at the risk of participating in their own racialization.

In the final session, Andre Gingrich (University of Vienna) provided a masterful set of closing remarks. He pointed out that there appeared to be stronger continuities in the social and cultural anthropological traditions of the “victors” in World War I, or at least among those who could claim not to have lost. In the anthropology of the defeated countries, now robbed of their colonial peripheries, ideological and institutional change was more common, as was a “turn inward” that focused ethnographic energies upon one’s own nation (*Volkskunde*). He further suggested that the papers had demonstrated the importance of colonial rhetoric in wartime anthropology, as well as the significance of domestic political contexts in explaining developments within the anthropological disciplines. In his view, the wartime POW studies often led to methodological and conceptual crisis, particularly because they were an attempt to gain scientific respectability made by a young generation of anthropologists. Much of the work in the camps, he suggested, foreshadowed the racist turn in German anthropology in the 1920s. Overall, the sessions in Tübingen demonstrated that the study of anthropology in wartime is an exciting new area for scholarly inquiry, providing a particularly useful prism through which scholars from disparate fields can view the national and imperial experiences that helped shape twentieth-century Europe.

RECENT DISSERTATIONS

Cook, Steven W. 2005. *Remembering and Forgetting Abram Kardiner: His Life and Legacy in the Shadow of Freud’s Influence*. Ph.D. Thesis, Emory University.

Laurière, Christine. 2006. *Paul Rivet (1876-1958), le savant et le politique*. Ph.D. Thesis. Paris, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

Montgomery, Georgina Mary. 2005. *Primates in the Real World: Place, Practice and the History of Primate Field Studies, 1924-1970*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Minnesota.

Neill, Deborah Joy. 2005. *Transnationalism in the Colonies: Cooperation, Rivalry, and Race in German and French Tropical Medicine, 1880-1930*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto.

Reid, Mandy Aimil. 2005. *“A Most Terrible Spectacle”: Visualizing Racial Science in American Literature and Culture, 1839-1929*. Ph.D. Thesis, Rice University.

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