




**HISTORY OF
ANTHROPOLOGY
NEWSLETTER**

Volume 33:2
December 2006



HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

Volume 33:2
December 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Eyes Shut and Hands at Work: Notes on the Use of Weber's Compass in Nineteenth Century Anthropology Nélia Dias	3
The German Ethnographic Tradition and the American Connection Han F. Vermeulen	9
'Doing Anthropology in War Zones': Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Anthropology in Wartime Andrew Evans	14
Recent Dissertations	17
Recent Bibliography	17
Announcements	21
Upcoming Professional Meetings	23
History of Anthropology on the Web	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	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@nmnh.si.edu
Esteban Krotz kroqui@prodigy.net.mx	Joyce Ogburn jlogburn@library.utah.edu
H. Glenn Penny h-penny@uiowa.edu	Lyn Schumaker lynschumaker@yahoo.co.uk
George Stocking g-stocking@uchicago.edu	William Sturtevant sturtevant.william@nmnh.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

Each volume contains two numbers, June and December.

Individual Subscribers, North America	\$7.00
Student Subscribers	\$6.00
Institutional Subscribers, North America	\$9.00
Individual Subscribers outside North America	\$10.00
Institutional Subscribers outside North America	\$12.00

For students everywhere, as well as members of the American Anthropological Association, the Forum for the History of the Human Sciences of the History of Science Society, and of Cheiron, individual membership rates remain at the 2004 level.

North America	\$6.00
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
 USA

EYES SHUT AND HANDS AT WORK: NOTES ON THE USE OF WEBER'S COMPASS IN NINETEENTH CENTURY ANTHROPOLOGY

Nélia Dias

University of Lisbon

Writing in 1891 about his expedition to Cap Horn, Paul Hyades asserted that the Yahgan's "tactile sensibility, measured with Weber's compass, seems to present some differences with regard to the results of observations obtained among Europeans" (1891: 210).¹ A physician by training, Hyades (1847-1919) could assume that his readers were familiar with this instrument.² Why was this device, designed in the 1820s for physiological and medical research, put to anthropological use in the 1880s? For what reasons did anthropologists undertake measurements of tactile discrimination, and what were the implications of the values obtained?

Although there is a vast literature on the quantitative approach in sensory physiology and on the emergence of psychophysics during the 1830s and 1840s, the impact of its methodological apparatus on anthropology has been unacknowledged. One of the instruments borrowed by anthropology from other disciplines was Weber's compass, named after Ernst Heinrich Weber (1795-1878), professor of human anatomy and later of physiology at Leipzig University (Kruta 1976). Though Weber's name is usually associated with a law, articulated by Gustav Theodor Fechner,³ his compass, designed to measure the degree of distinctness of sensation in different parts of the body, was widely used in psychological and physiological research before being turned to anthropological purposes.

No later than 1826, Weber was investigating the sense of touch at a time when most research on the senses focused on vision and hearing. It was in order to ascertain the parts of the body where the sensibility was more acute that Weber devised the compass, which allowed him to determine quantitative relationships between stimulus and sensation. The most sensitive regions of the skin—the extremities of the fingers, the point of the tongue, the lips, the hairy scalp, the palm of the hand—had more nerve endings; the degree to which a part of the body responded to stimuli was proportionate to the number of nervous fibers distributed in it. The differences Weber found led him to conclude that "discrimination is most accurate where the fibres are most dense" (Boring 1944: 110). The compass was a means to differentiate thresholds of sensation in different parts of the body.

The compass itself was a simple device, easy to manipulate; but its use in research required specific procedures. "Weber's experiments consisted in touching the skin, while the eyes were closed, with the points of a pair of compass sheathed with cork, and in ascertaining how close the points of the compass might be brought to each other and still be felt as two bodies" (Müller 2003 vol.2: 751).⁴ Proper experimentation had three main features. First, the experimental subject had to close his or her eyes. The use of the compass was intended to discern differential thresholds, distinguishing degrees of sensitivity to the fact that the compass had two points. "In the compass experiment, two points applied within the same sensory circle would give rise to the stimulation of but one fibre, and thus to the perception of a single point; two points on adjacent circles, however, would stimulate adjacent fibres and give the perception of a line; and the perception of two separate points would occur only when the sensory circles stimulated were separated from each other" (Boring 1929: 110). Subjects should not have their sensations affected by what they might be able to see. This methodological premise, pointed out in the main French medical dictionary, the *Dechambre*, does not seem to have informed French anthropological queries.

In the Questionnaire de sociologie et d'ethnographie (1883), formulated by the Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, there is no reference to Weber's compass in the section entitled "General and particular sensibility"; instead the Questionnaire recommended use of the esthesiometer, described as "the simplest device" to investigate tactile sensibility (Letourneau 1883: 581). Although Hyades used Weber's compass during his stay in Cap Horn, measuring tactile discrimination among the Yahgan, he did not mention the protocols governing its use. By contrast, the third edition of the British Notes and Queries on Anthropology did not recommend the use of a specialized instrument, but did insist on the importance of having subjects' eyes shut. "The subject having closed his eyes, apply the points of an ordinary mathematical compass to different parts of the body, varying the interspace between them so as to ascertain the minimum distance, for each part of the surface tried, at which the two points cease to be felt as one" (1899: 46).

A detailed methodological description was given by William McDougall (1871-1938)⁵ in the section dedicated to "delicacy of tactile discrimination" in the Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits: "I used a small pair of carpenter's dividers with blunt metal points, the intervals between the points being measured on a millimetre scale. . . . The subject was told to keep his eyes shut, and the area of the skin operated on was further guarded from his view" (1903: 190). It is worth noting the differences in style of national traditions; whereas the French were concerned about the instrument per se (Weber's compass versus the esthesiometer), the British focused on measurement protocols and procedures. Undoubtedly, the experimenter too physically altered the subject of investigation when touching the skin with the compass; it implemented a change in the body under study and modified the conditions of a 'normal' activity. In other words, the compass test represented experimental rather than observational method.

Second, use of the compass allowed construction of a table of the degree of sensibility of different parts of the body "as evidenced by the distances at which the two points of the instrument could be felt as two distinct bodies" (Müller: 752). The smaller the difference between the two points, the greater the delicacy of sensibility. Weber identified at least forty-one regions of the body, ranging from the point of the tongue—the most sensible part—to the skin of the back, one of the less sensible regions. He also gave the average threshold of tactile discrimination for each part of the body:⁶ 1mm on the point of the tongue, 2mm on the dorsal surface of the third finger, 12mm on the back of the hand, and 5cm on the skin of the back.⁷ The reason anthropologists took to using Weber's compass was quite straightforward; values obtained by Weber, based on a "normal subject"—a European man—could serve as a basis for establishing comparisons and differences between sexes and ethnic groups. Thus, Hyades could conclude that the Yahgan were superior to Europeans in tactile sensibility.

The exploration of tactile sensibility in different parts of the body, namely at the fingertips, around the lips, and on the back was strongly recommended by the Questionnaire de Sociologie et d'Ethnographie. Since Weber's compass was not mentioned in this Questionnaire, and in the absence of an average, collectors were instructed to perform experiments on themselves in order to compile comparative data. It is interesting to note that most of the responses to the Questionnaire did not directly address the question of tactile discrimination; some travellers reported not having conducted experiments, while others confessed that they did not use the recommended apparatus to test tactile sensibility (Dias 2004: 213). From this perspective, Hyades' account is radically different.

During his stay in Cap Horn, Hyades conducted experiments on four individuals, one man and three women. On a twenty-year old man named Bibouchmagoundyis, he

measured four different skin areas—the face (near the nose), the internal surface of the arm, the external surface of the arm, and the knees. On a twenty-year old woman named Kamanakar Kipa, he measured fifteen skin areas. On a thirty-year old woman named Tçadar Kipa, he measured twelve skin areas. And on a third woman, called Chaoulouch and aged eighteen, he measured only seven skin areas. He was not concerned that his measurements of parts of the body were not identical for all subjects, even for those of the same sex, or that his sample was quite small and heterogeneous. Hyades was confident that he had established that the Yahgan's tactile sensibility was greater than Europeans. His conclusions were based on comparison between Europeans and the Yahgan using three measurements taken on the lips, the forearms and the hips. Hyades found that Yahgan's tactile sensibility was of 2mm and 3mm for the lips contrasting with 4mm in Europeans, 12mm to 21mm for the forearms by comparison with 17mm to 23mm in Europeans, and 20mm to 35 mm for the hips by contrast with 50mm in Europeans (Hyades: 212). Though he did not mention his sources of values of sensation thresholds found in European men, they were probably taken from Weber (Hyades explicitly asserted that he conducted the Weber's compass test).

Whereas Hyades measured only a few individuals, McDougall, a rigorous experimentalist, studied a sample of fifty men and twenty-five boys aged between ten and twelve, but confined his measurements to two areas—the skin of the forearm and the nape of the neck. Moreover, McDougall did not take standard generalizations about Europeans' sensibilities for granted, and did comparable experiments “on a number of Englishmen, mostly of the working classes” (192). These led him to conclude that “the skin areas tested by the Murray Islanders have a threshold of tactile discrimination of which the value, in terms of distance of two points touched, is just about one-half that of Englishmen, or we may say in other words, that their power of tactile discrimination is about double that of Englishmen” (192). The question of how to explain the variations of tactile discrimination between Europeans and non-Europeans remained open.

At the conclusion of his study, Hyades pointed to an apparent paradox: how could the Yahgan's superior tactile discrimination be reconciled with the fact that they lived almost unclothed in a rigorous climate to which their skin was exposed. Although Hyades did not solve this puzzle, the question whether the delicacy of the senses should be explained either in terms of racial features or as the product of habits of life was much debated in French anthropological circles in the 1880s (Dias 2004). McDougall provided a provisional answer: “the conclusion that this delicacy of tactile discrimination constitutes a racial characteristic receives some support from the results of similar measurements made upon the same skin area of the right forearms of ten Dayaks or Ibans of Sarawak. . . . [T]hese few cases will therefore suffice to allay any suspicion that the difference between the Murray men and Englishmen might be due to the more habitual covering of the skin among the latter” (193).

A similar debate raged about the sensitive fingertips of pianists and painters; was it a hereditary trait, as the French psychologist Théodule Ribot (1882) asserted, or the result of long experience and practice as G. Carlet, the author of the Dictionnaire des sciences médicales, argued in 1885? It is worth noting that it seemed to McDougall that “the tactile discrimination of the fingertips is much improved by practice, especially such as results from certain employments;” that was why he chose to experiment “on skin-areas that are not liable to special education of tactile discrimination through employment” (189), such as the skin of the forearms and the nape of the neck.

It is no accident that the question of tactile sensibility among non-European peoples was closely linked to the issue of susceptibility to pain.⁸ The Questionnaire de Sociologie et d'Anthropologie urged travellers to provide information regarding sensitivity to pain in two

specific situations: injuries resulting from wounds and surgery. To questions about tactile discrimination, most travellers' answers were rather vague, although they usually asserted that primitives were more tolerant of pain than Europeans. McDougall reached this conclusion in his study of the men of Murray Island: "their sense of touch is twice as delicate as that of Englishman, while their susceptibility to pain is hardly half as great" (195).

That a particular instrument, such as Weber's compass, acquires a methodological importance because the quantities it determines are valued in a specific historical moment is a phenomenon deserving of close examination (Wise 1995: 4). Underlying the very notion of differential sensory thresholds, as well as instruments to measure it, indicates an attempt to normalise and control individuals as Michel Foucault has noted (1975: 302). For anthropology, Weber's compass was undoubtedly part of a technology of power designed to solve the problems of surveillance. In addition to its disciplinary value, Weber's compass also facilitated a specific course of inquiry into the character of the human mind. In his attempt to determine quantitative relations between stimulus and sensation, Weber was aware of the role played by experience and adaptation in shaping the results of individuals' responses to tactile stimuli. The subjects' attention during tests using the compass varied with the number of experiments in which they had participated. Hyades ignored this factor; the French doctor was much more concerned about accumulating a huge number of measurements rather than with following rigorous experimental protocols. By contrast, McDougall justified confining his attention to only two skin areas. "I soon found," he wrote, "that the length of the procedure caused too great a strain on the patience of my subjects: I found too that it was undesirable to extend the observations on any subject over two or more settings, because in any setting subsequent to the first the interest of the subject was so far diminished as to make the results unreliable" (191).

Another major contrast between Hyades's and McDougall's research was the degree of attention each paid to the role played by individual variability in affecting experimental results. In his account, Hyades gave the tactile discrimination of the nipples of the three women he tested (the numbers varied from 15mm to 53 mm), but he didn't explain the differences. In their attempt to demonstrate that extraordinary sensorial skills were inherent among primitive peoples, French anthropologists disregarded the question of individual variation. By contrast, the members of the Torres Straits Expedition who were familiar with the methods and techniques of experimental psychology were very attentive to individuals' different responses to stimuli.⁹ They took into account how individuals' performances varied "from day to day, modified by transitory conditions such as fatigue" as well as variations among subjects that could be explained by "their individual differences of maturity, personality, and innate capacity" (Kuklick 1991: 143). Thus, the two national anthropological traditions differed radically in both method and theory.

Trained as physicians, Hyades and McDougall were initiated as anthropologists during their expeditions, the Cap Horn for the former and the Torres Straits for the latter. Although apparently following similar career paths and pursuing similar research projects in their investigations of tactile sensibility, they produced different results and moved in distinct theoretical directions. Making evolutionists' assumptions, Hyades concluded that the Yahgan's tactile sensibility was partly due to innate physiological differences. Had he performed tests on himself, he might not have reached the conclusions he did on the basis of experiments with the compass. Moreover, the omission in Hyades's account of the procedures he deployed precluded the possibility of replication and of verification; he paid no attention to his own "laboratory culture," making it impossible to explore "the role of the investigator's self in the making of knowledge" (Schaffer: 13). The publication of Volume

VII of the Cap Horn Expedition was almost unnoticed among anthropologists,¹⁰ and its impact on French anthropology was quite irrelevant by contrast with that made by reports of the Torres Straits Expedition. As Henrika Kuklick has pointed out, the results of this expedition and the experiments it conducted “had implications for future research in both anthropology and psychology. To anthropologists, the experiments disconfirmed conventional evolutionist wisdom about primitives’ sensibilities. To psychologists, they demonstrated the unreliability of laboratory research conducted in ignorance of subjects’ social situations” (1991: 143). It was due to his detailed account of his procedures that McDougall’s contribution paved the way for further criticism and debates among psychologists.¹¹

Retrospectively, the use of Weber’s compass appears to be a minor episode in the history of anthropology at a time when this field of investigation was trying to establish relationships and intellectual connections with other disciplines. The absence of references to tactile sensibility and to the test on two-point discrimination in the main anthropological queries of the first half of the twentieth century indicates that the issue of primitives’ sensibility was no longer a major question in anthropology. But the responses anthropologists received from their inquiries about sensorial phenomena at the turn of the century were an important element in changing the direction of the discipline.

¹ I am grateful to Henrika Kuklick for her editorial labor on this paper. The Cap Horn Expedition (1882-1883) was financed by the French government and was mainly devoted to meteorological and magnetic research. Although the report of the scientific mission was published under the names of Paul Hyades and Joseph Deniker, only Hyades conducted sensorial experiments among the Yahgan.

² Weber’s compass is widely mentioned in the main French medical and scientific dictionaries of the mid-nineteenth century such as the Dictionnaire usuel des sciences médicales - Dechambre (1885) and the Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d’Instruction primaire (1887).

³ Weber used quantitative methods in sensory physiology, namely through the study of the quantitative relationship between sensation and stimulus intensity. Although he did not formulate any specific law, he “found that two sensations are just noticeably different as long as the ratio between the strengths in each pair of stimuli remains constant” (Kruta 1976: 201). It was Fechner who gave a mathematical form to this relationship and named it “Weber’s Law”; this law states that the perceived magnitude of a stimulus is proportional to the logarithm of its physical intensity. On the distinction between Fechner’s Law and Weber’s “simple statement that the just noticeable difference in a stimulus bears a constant ratio to the stimulus,” see Boring 1929: 280-281.

⁴ The English quotations come from the translation by William Baly.

⁵ On McDougall’s career, see Boring 1929: 465-466 and Kuklick 1991: 136.

⁶ According to Vladislav Kruta, “an important feature of Weber’s examinations and comparisons was the use of the notion of threshold (although this term was not actually used)” (Kruta 1976: 200).

⁷ The values referred to here were provided by Müller, pp.751-753.

⁸ A specific device, the dolorimeter, a rod that exerts pressure, was devised to determine pain thresholds, but anthropologists apparently did not use it.

⁹ On this expedition, see Kuklick 1991 (chapter 4) and 1996.

¹⁰ W.H.R. Rivers and Charles S. Myers discussed and criticised the experiments on visual and auditory acuity conducted on the Cap Horn Expedition (vol.II, p. 11 and p. 143), but this expedition did not stimulate other debates in anthropological circles.

¹¹ See Titchener pp. 205-208 and 233-234. For an analysis of Titchener's critics, see Schaffer pp.38-39.

References

- Boring, Edwin G. 1929. A History of Experimental Psychology. New York: D. Appleton.
- _____. 1944. Sensation and Perception in the History of Experimental Psychology. New York: Appleton -Century- Crofts.
- Dias, Nélia. 2004. La Mesure des Sens. Les anthropologues et le corps humain au XIXe siècle. Paris: Aubier.
- Foucault, Michel. 1975. Surveiller et Punir. Paris: Gallimard.
- Hyades, Paul and Joseph Deniker. 1891. Mission scientifique du Cap Horn 1882-1883. Anthropologie, ethnographie. Vol. VII. Paris: Gauthier-Villars.
- Kruta, Vladislav. 1976. Weber, Ernst Heinrich. In Dictionary of Scientific Biography. Charles C. Gillispie, ed., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Vol. XIV, 199-202.
- Kuklick, Henrika. 1991. The Savage Within. The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1996. Islands in the Pacific: Darwinian biogeography and British anthropology. American Ethnologist 23: 611-638.
- Letourneau, Charles et. al. 1883. Questionnaire de Sociologie et d'Ethnographie. Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris 578: 597.
- McDougall, William. 1903. The Delicacy of Tactile Discrimination. In Alfred C. Haddon ed., Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 189-193
- Müller, Johannes Peter. 2003. Müller's Elements of Physiology (1840-1843), translated by William Baly with a new introduction by N.Wade. Bristol: Thoemmes, 4 vols.
- Ribot, Théodule. 1882. L'Hérédité psychologique. Paris: Baillièrè.
- Schaffer, Simon. 1994. From Physics to Anthropology and Back Again. Cambridge: Prickly Pear Press.
- Titchener, Edward Bradford. 1916. On Ethnological Tests of Sensation and Perception with Special Reference to Tests of Color Vision and Tactile Discrimination described in the Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 55: 204-236.
- Wise, Norton ed. 1995. The Values of Precision. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

THE GERMAN ETHNOGRAPHIC TRADITION AND THE AMERICAN CONNECTION

Han F. Vermeulen

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle

During recent years, the history of German anthropology has received increased attention, but the eighteenth-century roots of German ethnology have been relatively neglected. Zimmerman (2001), Penny (2002), and Penny and Bunzl (2003) deal with German anthropology (ethnology) during the nineteenth century. Zammito (2002) and Eigen and Larrimore (2006) have examined German physical and philosophical anthropology during the eighteenth century. Historians' lack of attention to the rich eighteenth-century German ethnographic tradition has also meant that its influence on research traditions in other European countries and in the USA has been insufficiently acknowledged. This is deplorable, since the German ethnographic tradition was important for the rise of ethnology in Europe, Russia and the United States during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. In the following I shall summarize research on the German tradition (Vermeulen 1992, 1995, 1999, 2006) and list some materials that indicate a link with early ethnological research in the United States. My main point is that the roots of socio-cultural anthropology, designated by the names ethnography and ethnology, need to be studied in an international context.

The German ethnographic tradition precedes the usual dating of the origins of socio-cultural anthropology in the English- and French-speaking world. The canonical view has been that anthropology started as the study of non-Western "others" in the work of Tylor, Bastian and Morgan in the UK, Germany and the USA from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. To be sure, there have been scholars who examined such Scottish and French Enlightenment authors as Rousseau, Diderot, Voltaire, Hume, Ferguson, and Robertson, but these philosophers have usually been relegated to the category of "predecessors."

Contrary to the standard account, the development of a descriptive type of anthropology took place not in Scotland, the United States, or France, but in German-speaking areas, including Austria, Switzerland and what later became Germany. Under the influence of German-speaking historians, natural historians, geographers and linguists, a type of anthropology was developed that focused on national diversity in the world, on what the Germans call the plurality of peoples (*Völkervielfalt*). This ethnological anthropology first emerged during a series of research expeditions in the Russian empire, undertaken from the 1720s. These expeditions were generally but not exclusively undertaken by young students trained at the Central German universities of Leipzig, Jena, and Halle, adhering to the basic principles of the early Enlightenment: critical, rational, empirical, comparative, and universal. An ethnological kind of anthropology emerged that was named "ethnography," at first in German (1740), then in neo-Greek (1767-71). The term "ethnology" surfaced later, first in Vienna (1781-3), then in Lausanne (1787), and in Jena (1787).

The first traces of such an ethnological way of thinking can be found in the work of Gerhard Friedrich Müller, one of the academic members of the Second Kamchatka Expedition led by Vitus Bering (1733-43). During the expedition Müller dealt with the history and description of Siberian peoples and conducted ethnographic studies on topics including shamanism (Hintzsche and Nickol 1996). He wrote extensive instructions to other members of the expedition, including Georg Wilhelm Steller (Bucher 2002), stimulating them to conduct ethnographic research, including the collection and drawing of ethnographic objects. Due to political problems, however, most of his ethnographic work remained unpublished. Summarizing his instructions to J.E. Fischer, which contained 923

queries, some very detailed, Müller used the German equivalent of ethnography, “Völker-Beschreibung” (description of peoples) in 1740 (Müller 1900: 83). While Müller did not use the term ethnography, this concept developed thirty years later, together with its German counterpart “Völkerkunde.”

In the early 1770s, August Ludwig Schlözer and Johann Christoph Gatterer, universal historians working at the University of Göttingen, introduced these concepts in their attempts to reform world history and expand its scope to include all of the world's peoples. The early work of Schlözer, *Allgemeine Nordische Geschichte* (1771), was important, as it succeeded in supplanting earlier “myths” with new ideas on the origins, descent and migration of nations in northern Europe and Asia, using their languages as a basis for classification—a method Schlözer borrowed from G.W. Leibniz, the German philosopher actively pursuing comparative language studies. Schlözer introduced the terms “Völkerkunde” (ethnology), “Ethnographie” (ethnography) as well as “ethnographisch” (ethnographical) and “Ethnograph” (ethnographer) to a German audience in 1771-2. Schlözer was not the first to use these terms, but he used them often and in strategic places in his argument, and he was the first to apply the ethnographic perspective in Göttingen. As far as we know, the historian Johann Friedrich Schöpferlin first used the term in a Latin text published at Nördlingen (Swabia) in 1767. Schöpferlin spelled it as “ethnographia” and contrasted it to “geographia”—possibly arriving at the coinage under Schlözer's influence (Vermeulen 1996: 8-9; 2006: 129). The main conclusion from this material, corroborated by Gatterer's work, is that “Völkerkunde” was the general concept in the German-speaking countries and that “Ethnographie” was seen as the first stage of this new discipline.

As Schlözer and Müller had been in close contact in 1761-62, when Schlözer was Müller's assistant in St. Petersburg, it is probable that Schlözer brought Müller's idea of a comprehensive description of peoples from Russia to Germany, developing it into a more general study of peoples called “Völkerkunde” (Vermeulen 1999). I once concluded that ethnography had come into being when the universal historians Schlözer and Gatterer introduced the term at the University of Göttingen in the early 1770s (Vermeulen 1992, 1995), but I now realize that the “Völkerkunde” they presented was a later development and on a more abstract level than the ethnography practiced by historians and natural historians such as Müller and Steller working in Siberia during the 1730s and 1740s. It is now clear that the idea of an interrelated series of “ethnographies” first occurred in the context of the natural and cultural-historical exploration of Russian Asia (Vermeulen 1999, 2006). Thus, the terms “Völker-Beschreibung” and ethnography first arose in the work of German historians associated with the Second Kamchatka Expedition working in Siberia, while “Völkerkunde” and ethnology appeared a few decades later in that of German-speaking historians connected to the University of Göttingen (Germany) or operating in Vienna (Austria) and Lausanne (Switzerland).

It was long believed that the term “ethnologia” had been coined by the Swiss theologian Alexandre-César Chavannes in a text written in French in 1787. But it first surfaced in the work of the Austrian-Slovakian historian Adam Frantisek Kollár in 1781-3. In a study written in Latin in 1783, Kollár defined *ethnologia* as “notitia gentium populorumque,” the study of nations and peoples. Not only was Kollár's use of the term older, it was also much closer to the meaning Schlözer had given to “Völkerkunde” than that given by Chavannes to “ethnologie,” who defined it as “l'histoire des progrès des peuples vers la civilisation” (see Vermeulen 1995: 46-47). Kollár relied on Schlözer's work and concentrated on the same research problem (the origin of peoples and nations) with the same methods, historical linguistics and the comparison of languages. Characteristic of the German tradition

was an ethnological perspective, rather than a determination to contrast levels or stages of civilization.

While ethnography as a scientific way of describing peoples or nations was first practiced in Russia and in Siberia, ethnology originated in the academic centers of East and Central Europe and dealt with comprehensive, comparative and critical study of peoples—in principle, of all peoples and nations. Thus, we must recognize that ethnography as such began when German-speaking historians started an ethnological discourse focused on the description and comparison of the world's peoples and nations during the eighteenth century.

This type of study served an apparent need and the terms ethnography and ethnology were quickly adopted by scholars throughout what later became Germany. The German ethnographic tradition reached Switzerland and Austria, and was exported to neighboring countries such as Bohemia, the Netherlands, and France. Perhaps surprisingly, the terms ethnography and ethnology were applied in the USA earlier than in France and the UK.

Ethnology was known in the United States at least as early as 1802, when Thomas Jefferson added an appendix to the Instructions issued to the Lewis and Clark Expedition (1804-06) entitled "Ethnological Information Desired" (Hallowell 1960: 17). Although Patterson (2001: 167) ascribes this text to the American naturalist Benjamin Smith Barton (1803), he mentions that Jefferson corresponded with Barton about this subject in February 1803, and gave instructions to Meriwether Lewis in June 1803. Following the Louisiana Purchase (1803), which nearly doubled the size of the United States, Jefferson and/or Barton requested that Lewis and Clark obtain "ethnological information" from each of the "tribes" they encountered regarding their health, morals, religion, history, subsistence activities, warfare, amusements, clothing, and customs (summarized in Patterson 2001: 13). Lewis and Clark undertook inquiries similar to those pursued in Siberia by Müller and others in 1733-43, though Müller's list of questions was much more elaborate.

Jefferson had an intense interest in Amerindian languages and assiduously collected Indian vocabularies, assuming that the comparative study of languages would lead to discovery of "the affinity of nations." He had contact with Native Americans beginning in his childhood, and he gave detailed descriptions as well as statistical tables in his Notes on the State of Virginia (1787). Barton published comparative ethnological and linguistic material in his New Views of the Origin of the Tribes and Nations of America (1797). Edward G. Gray places this material in an international framework and links the American studies to the linguistic work going on in the Russian empire under the supervision of the German naturalist Peter Simon Pallas (1787-89), who was working on Catherine the Great's project to assemble specimens of two hundred of the world's languages. In 1786, George Washington asked government agents in Ohio to collect Indian vocabularies which would "throw light upon the original history of this country and ... forward researches into the probable connection and communication between the northern parts of America and those of Asia" (Gray 1999: 112).

As president of the American Philosophical Society, Jefferson chaired a committee in 1798 that issued a Circular Letter, a short questionnaire in which information was sought about "the past and present state of this country." Its fourth point "inquire[d] into the Customs, Manners, Languages and Character of the Indian nations, ancient and modern, and their migrations." There was also a query relating to "researches into the Natural History of the Earth," and one dealing with archaeological remains, such as "plans, drawings and descriptions of ... ancient Fortifications, Tumuli, and other Indian works of art." In

addition, it expressed the desire to “procure one or more entire skeletons of the Mammoth, so called, and of such other unknown animals as either have been, or hereafter may be discovered in America” (Jefferson et al. 1799). This short list, following the old tradition of distributing questionnaires, was the first of its kind in the United States. In Russia, however, Müller had issued more elaborate lists seventy years earlier. Although the Letter did not mention the term ethnology, the idea was clearly present, and Gilbert Chinard (1943) saw the Letter as “the charter of American ethnology” (Hallowell 1960: 26). Therefore, the fact that Jefferson and/or Barton added an appendix on “ethnological information desired” to the instructions of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1802 (or 1803) was not an isolated coincidence. It indicates that these scholars were knowledgeable about the new study introduced in German-speaking countries.

Ethnology was first defined as “the science of nations” in the United States in 1828 in Noah Webster’s An American Dictionary of the English Language. The term appeared in France in 1829-34 in André-Marie Ampère’s classification of sciences. Not until 1842 was it used in Britain, in Richard King’s prospectus for the establishment of an ethnological society in London. Ethnological societies were founded in Paris in 1839, in Washington in 1842, and in London in 1843. The term “ethnographique” was first used in France in G. Engelmann and G. Berger’s Porte-feuille géographique et ethnographique in 1820 (Blanckaert 1988: 26), whereas “ethnographie” was first included in the dictionary of Pierre Boiste in 1823, the Dictionnaire de l’Académie française in 1835, and the Complément du Dictionnaire de l’Académie française in 1839. In England the term “ethnography” first surfaced in the Penny Cyclopaedia of 1834, the work of Cardinal Wiseman of 1835, and that of James Cowles Prichard in 1836 (Vermeulen 1995: 53-4). While I have thus far found no early traces of “ethnography” in American primary works, it remains intriguing that ethnology surfaced in the United States so much earlier than in both France and Britain.

Just exactly how the new study of ethnology found its way from St. Petersburg, Göttingen, and Vienna to Washington and Philadelphia remains to be established, but it is likely that Jefferson was familiar with scientific developments in Göttingen. Diplomatic relations between the United States and Germanic states may have influenced scholarly exchange. Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison served as ambassadors to France; the electorate of Hanover and Washington maintained diplomatic relations after the treaty between Britain and America had been signed in September 1783. As Patterson (2001: 8, 12) summarizes the situation, the American scholars had to make clear “that nature was neither hostile nor immutable in the Americas,” that “culture could ... flourish in the United States,” and “that the United States was indeed a good risk.” Jefferson corresponded with the French explorer Constantin-François de Volney and with the idéologues in Paris, who were well informed of developments in Göttingen. Alexander von Humboldt, who studied at Göttingen in 1789-91, visited Jefferson in Washington after his South America expedition (1799-1804). Von Humboldt held Göttingen in great esteem and later stated that he had received “the more noble part” of his education at “the famous university of Göttingen.”

Why these new ethnological ideas took root in North America earlier than in France or Britain is open to debate. But it is clear that there was a strong and continuous ethnographic tradition in the German-speaking countries, which did not pass unnoticed elsewhere. And it may well be that circumstances in the United States in the early nineteenth century more closely resembled those in Russia seventy years earlier than those in early-nineteenth-century France and Britain colonizing overseas.

References

- Barton, Benjamin Smith. 1959 [orig. 1803]. *Ethnological Information Desired*. In Reuben G. Thwaites, ed., Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804-1806. New York: Antiquarian Press, vol. 7, 283-287.
- Blanckaert, Claude. 1988. *On the Origins of French Ethnology: William Edwards and the Doctrine of Race*. In George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., Bones, Bodies, Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 18-55.
- 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 Verlag.
- Chavannes, Alexandre-César. 1787. Essai sur l'éducation intellectuelle avec le Projet d'une science nouvelle. Lausanne: Isaac Hignou.
- Chinard, Gilbert. 1943. *Jefferson and the American Philosophical Society*. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 87: 263-276.
- Eigen, Sara and Mark Larrimore, eds. 2006. The German Invention of Race. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gray, Edward G. 1999. New World Babel: Languages and Nations in Early America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. 1960. *The Beginnings of Anthropology in America*. In Frederica de Laguna, ed., Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1888-1920. New York: Row, Peterson & Co., 1-90.
- Hintzsche, W. and Th. Nickol, eds. 1996. Die Grosse Nordische Expedition: Georg Wilhelm Steller (1709-1746), ein Lutheraner erforscht Sibirien und Alaska. Gotha: Justus Perthes Verlag.
- Jefferson, Thomas et al. 1799. *Circular Letter*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 4, xxxvii-xxxix.
- _____. 1962 [1803]. *Letter to Benjamin Smith Barton, 27 February 1803*. In Donald Jackson, ed., Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, with Related Documents, 1783-1854. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 16-17.
- _____. 1962 [1803]. *Jefferson's Instructions to Meriwether Lewis, 20 June 1803*. In Jackson, ed., Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 61-67.
- Kollár, Adam Frantisek. 1783. Historiae iurisque publici Regni Ungariae amoenitates [Amenities of the History and Constitutional Law of the Kingdom of Hungary.] 2 vols. Vindobonae, typis a Baumeisterianis.
- Müller, Gerhard Friedrich. 1900 [1740]. *Instruktion G.F. Müller's für den Akademiker-Adjuncten J.E. Fischer: 'Unterricht, was bey Beschreibung der Völker, absonderlich der Sibirischen in acht zu nehmen'*. In Fr. Russow, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der ethnographischen und anthropologischen Sammlungen der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St.-Petersburg*. Sbornik muzeia po antropologii i etnografii poi Imperatorskii Akademii Nauk'/Publications du musée d'anthropologie et d'ethnographie de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg, vol. 1, St.-Petersbourg, 37-83, 84-109.
- Patterson, Thomas S. 2001. A Social History of Anthropology in the United States. Oxford/New York: Berg.
- Penny, H. Glenn. 2002. Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Penny, H. Glenn and Matti Bunzl, eds. 2003. Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Schlözer, August Ludwig. 1771. Allgemeine Nordische Geschichte [Allgemeine Welthistorie XXXI]. Halle: J.J. Gebauer.
- Vermeulen, Han F. 1992. The Emergence of 'Ethnography' ca. 1770 in Göttingen. History of Anthropology Newsletter XIX (2): 6-9.
- _____. 1995. Origins and Institutionalization of Ethnography and Ethnology in Europe and the USA, 1771-1845. In Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán eds., Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology. London: Routledge, 39-59.
- _____. 1996. Taal-, land- en volkenkunde in de achttiende eeuw. Leiden: Oosters Genootschap in Nederland, No. 23.
- _____. 1999. Anthropology in Colonial Contexts: The Second Kamchatka Expedition (1733-1743) and the Danish-German Arabia Expedition (1761-1767). In Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu, eds. Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania. Richmond: Curzon Press, 13-39.
- _____. 2006. The German Invention of Völkerkunde: Ethnological Discourse in Europe and Asia, 1740-1798. In Eigen and Larrimore, eds., The German Invention of Race, 123-145.
- Webster, Noah. 1828. An American Dictionary of the English Language. 2 vols. New York: Harper.
- Zammito, John H. 2002. Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zimmerman, Andrew. 2001. Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

'DOING ANTHROPOLOGY IN WAR ZONES': INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON ANTHROPOLOGY IN WARTIME

Andrew Evans
SUNY New Paltz

Despite the explosion of work in the history of anthropology over the last several decades, one area that still remains relatively unexplored is the connection between war and the anthropological disciplines. The recent conference, "Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones," held in Tübingen, Germany on Dec. 7-9, 2006, addressed this topic and raised questions that will undoubtedly energize future research. The symposium was jointly sponsored by the Collaborative Research Center on War Experiences, as well as the Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, both at the Eberhard Karl University in Tübingen. The central theme of the Tübingen Research Center is the experience of the First World War, and many— but not all— of the papers at the symposium dealt with this subject. The conference was truly international and interdisciplinary, with scholars from Germany, Austria, Russia, and the United States offering contributions from the fields of history, anthropology, art history, and science studies. Participants met in the beautiful Fuerstenzimmer (Princes' room) of the old Tübingen castle.

In his opening comments, Reinhard Johler (Tübingen) observed that the First World War has generally been ignored in the history of the anthropological disciplines, even though the War created a series of new spaces— discursive, material, ideological— in which anthropologists worked. Johler laid out the questions that framed the conference's deliberations. What were the connections between war and anthropology in the nineteenth

and twentieth centuries? How did wartime contexts affect the discipline and its institutional development? Did colonial practices and discourses in anthropology continue during wartime, or cease? How did work in the new spaces and places created by war, such as prisoner-of-war camps, occupied territories, and battle zones, influence anthropology after the conflict?

Questions of continuity and discontinuity quickly came to the fore in a series of papers that examined anthropological traditions in different countries during World War I. Henrika Kuklick (University of Pennsylvania) argued that the Great War sustained prewar trends in British anthropology. British anthropologists generally denied a racial basis for the conflict and saw POW camps as flawed venues for anthropometric studies. W.H.R. Rivers's analyses of the war's shell shock victims had elements that were compatible with the emerging school of functionalist social anthropology, but the general trajectory of British anthropology was not altered by the conflict. Marina Mogilner (*Ab Imperio*/Kazan State University) also provided a narrative of continuity in her paper on Russian military anthropology during World War I. Both before and during the war, the Russian War Ministry encouraged graduates of its St. Petersburg Military-Medical Academy to produce dissertations in physical anthropology that served imperial purposes, particularly by addressing the question of nationality within the Russian army. The turning point came not in 1914 but with the Russian civil war and early Soviet state-building, which reoriented anthropologists toward both traditional ethnography and eugenicist projects. For the German case, however, Andrew Evans (SUNY New Paltz) argued for discontinuity, maintaining that World War I facilitated a final break with the liberal and anti-racist anthropology that had dominated the late nineteenth century. In the atmosphere of total war, German physical anthropologists sought to make their science relevant to the nation and state by applying their disciplinary tools—including concepts of race—to the war effort. The wartime experience and the dislocation of defeat resulted in a more politically instrumentalized and narrowly nationalistic anthropology that paved the way for postwar forays into the *völkisch* racial science of the 1920s. Gottfried Korf (Tübingen) argued that the war also played a central role in the institutionalization of *Volkskunde* as an independent discipline in Germany after 1918. During the war, the discipline not only presented itself as a critical tool in the formation of a national community but also aimed to establish itself as a practical science, focusing on soldiers' languages, customs, and superstitions.

Another series of papers revealed a common pattern of anthropological work in various war zones. Anthropologists in vastly different national contexts and periods sought to make their science politically and practically relevant to diverse conflicts. Christian Promitzer (University of Graz) demonstrated that from the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, Serbian and Bulgarian physical anthropologists used studies of POWs and recruits to present biological evidence for competing political claims. Serbian anthropologists in particular argued for a South Slav racial type in order to support a Serbian and Pan-Slavic brand of nation-building. Irma Kreiten (Tübingen) showed a similar political process at work in the Caucasus during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century; Russian military officers produced ethnographic knowledge designed to facilitate the subjugation of the area's peoples. Harold Salomon (Humboldt University, Berlin) explored the efforts of American anthropologists—and Ruth Benedict in particular—to contribute to the war effort in the United States during World War II. Constrained by wartime circumstances, Benedict argued that Japanese culture could be studied “at a distance,” especially through film, in order to answer questions about Japanese behavior. In each of these cases, wartime contexts shaped both methodologies and conclusions, and the activities

of anthropologists could not be divorced from the political, military, and administrative circumstances in which they took place.

Another series of papers established that the development of colonial practices and rhetoric accelerated in wartime anthropology. Ethnographic projects centered on the Balkans, in particular, functioned to create an orientalized, colonial space in the Central European imagination. Diana Reynolds (Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego) explained how this dynamic operated in the case of Bosnia, where the Austro-Hungarian empire functioned as a colonial power after the annexation of the region in 1878. Focusing on the reception of Bosnian weaponry in Austria, Reynolds argued that imperial authorities sought to tame the image of the Bosnian warrior by transforming previously threatening Bosnian weapons into souvenirs and decorative objects through the establishment of craft schools and ateliers. Christian Marchetti (Tübingen) argued that from the 1880s to the First World War, Austrian ethnographers working in the Balkans consistently conceived of the region as a violent frontier area where the inhabitants respected only military strength. In the case of Montenegro, Ursula Reber (University of Vienna) described how Austrian military officers produced ethnographies that emphasized an image of the Montenegrins as warlords, and later, during World War I, as less civilized and strategically inexperienced tribes. In his closing comments, Andre Gingrich classified these ethnographic efforts in the Balkans as forms of “frontier orientalism”—colonial discourses about the margins of Europe. Michael Pesek’s (Humboldt University, Berlin) paper on military ethnographies in East Africa showed similarities to the Balkan studies. Colonial travelers and administrators produced ethnographies that were primarily designed to aid would-be conquerors, with a clear emphasis on military applications.

A final group of papers addressed the major anthropological project in Germany and Austria during the First World War: the study of foreign soldiers in POW camps. Physical anthropologists and ethnologists alike were thrilled with the potential of the POW population for anthropological study and viewed their work in the camps as equivalent to work in a laboratory. Several papers examined how the POW camps affected the ways in which scientists gathered data. In her comparative analysis of the Austrian and German ethnographic projects to record the languages and songs of the POWs, Monique Scheer (Tübingen) argued that the camp studies were a decisive moment in the shift toward the gramophone in musical ethnography, since the “laboratory-like” conditions of the camps made the technology easier to use than it was in the field. For the specialty of physical anthropology, Margit Berner (Museum of Natural History, Vienna) located the methodological roots of the POW studies in late-nineteenth-century racial surveys conducted in Germany. A number of the papers pointed out, however, that the camps presented unforeseen difficulties. Britta Lange (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin) showed that the physical anthropologist Egon von Eickstedt struggled to obtain accurate background information from captive soldiers and to collect representative samples of data, leading him to question the very methods of anthropometry.

The camps also produced a vast visual archive of photographs, paintings, drawings, and films. Two papers explored the ways in which such images remained embedded in non-scientific discourses. In his analysis of the ethnographic films made in the camps by the Austrian anthropologist Rudolf Pöch, Wolfgang Fuhrman (University of Kassel) argued that these films were heavily influenced by the techniques of the colonial travelogue, which emphasized the picturesque in an effort to contain the exotic. Margaret Olin (Art Institute of Chicago) found parallels between anthropology and art history in the visual archive from the camps and analyzed the participation of Jews in the production of images of POWs. Jewish

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

information from HAN, as we do from them. We welcome and encourage bibliographic suggestions from our readers.]

Ames, Eric, Marcia Klotz and Lora Wildenthal, eds. 2005. Germany's Colonial Pasts. Preface by Sander L. Gilman. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press.

Anderson, Warwick. 2006. Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines. Durham: Duke University Press.

Arnold, David. 2006. The Tropics and the Traveling Gaze: India, Landscape, and Science, 1800-1856. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Banner, Stuart. 2005. How the Indians Lost Their Lands: Law and Power on the Frontier. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.

Barnes, Robert H. 2006. Maurice Godelier and the Metamorphosis of Kinship. Comparative Studies in Society and History 48: 326-358.

Bickham, Troy. 2006. Savages Within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in Eighteenth-Century Britain. London: Oxford University Press.

Cherki, Alice. 2006. Frantz Fanon: A Portrait. Trans. Nadia Benabid. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

De L'Estoile, Benoit, Federico Neiburg, and Lygia Sigaud, eds. 2005. Empires, Nations, and Natives: Anthropology and State-Making. Durham: Duke University Press.

Den Ouden, Amy E. 2005. Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England. Fourth World Rising. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press.

Dirks, Nicholas B. 2006. The Scandal of Empire: India and the Creation of Imperial Britain. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.

Dougherty, Frank William Peter (ed.) 2006. The Correspondence of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach. Vol. 1: 1773-1782, Letters 1-230. Revised, augmented and edited by Norbert Klatt. Göttingen: Norbert Klatt Verlag (Brosamen zur Blumenbach-Forschung 2).

Driver, Felix and Luciana Martins, eds. 2005. Tropical Visions in an Age of Empire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dubois, Thomas David. 2006. Local Religion and the Imperial Imaginary: The Development of Japanese Ethnography in Occupied Manchuria. American Historical Review 111(1): 52-74.

Dyer, Colin. 2005. The French Explorers and the Aboriginal Australians, 1772-1839. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

- Earle, T. F. and K. J. P. Lowe, eds. 2005. Black Africans in Renaissance Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuhrmann, Wolfgang. 2004. [The moving colonial gaze: "Views" on early German films from the colonies], *Der bewegt koloniale Blick „Ansichten“ über frühe deutsche Film aus den Kolonien*. Iz3w (Informationcenter 3. World), no. 280, p. 36-39.
- Fuhrmann, Wolfgang. 2002. [The Kinema in Africa], *Der Kinema in Afrika*, in: Grüße aus Viktoria. Ansichten aus der Ferne. KINtop Schriften, no.7 (Basel, Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld/Roter Stern), pp. 117-138.
- Fuhrmann, Wolfgang. 2002. [Rhino hunt in German East-Africa: The early colonial film industry], *Nashornjagd in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Die frühe Kolonialfilmindustrie*, in: Ulrich van der Heyden and Joachim Zeller (eds.) Kolonialmetropole Berlin. Eine Spurensuche (Berlin: Quintessenz Verlag), pp. 184-187.
- Gade, Daniel. 2006. *Converging Ethnobiology and Ethnobiography: Cultivated Plants, Heinz Brücher, and Nazi Ideology*. Journal of Ethnobiology 26 (1): 82-106.
- Grant, Kevin. 2005. A Civilised Savagery: Britain and the New Slaveries in Africa, 1844-1926. New York: Routledge.
- Haefeli, Evan and Kevin Sweeney eds. 2006. Captive Histories: English, French, and Native Narratives of the 1704 Deerfield Raid. Native Americans of the Northeast: History, Culture, and the Contemporary. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hargreaves, Alec, ed. 2005. Memory, Empire, and Postcolonialism: Legacies of French Colonialism. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Harrison, Julia and Regna Darnell, eds. 2006. Historicizing Canadian Anthropology. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Henare, Amiria. 2005. Museums, Anthropology, and Imperial Exchange. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hubble, Nick. 2005. Mass Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Katzew, Ilona. 2004. Casta Painting: Images of Race in Eighteenth Century Mexico. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kleijwegt, Marc, ed. 2006. The Faces of Freedom: The Manumission and Emancipation of Slaves in Old World and New World Slavery. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Kuklick, Henrika. 2005. *Interpreting Aboriginal Religion: From Nineteenth-Century Evolutionism to Durkheimian Sociology*. Humanities Research 12: 13-25.

- Kuklick, Henrika. 2006. 'Humanity in the Chrysalis Stage': Indigenous Australians in the Anthropological Imagination, 1899-1926. British Journal for the History of Science 39: 535-568.
- Liebersohn, Harry. 2006. The Traveler's World: Europe to the Pacific. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lynn-Sherow, Bonnie. 2006. Red Earth: Race and Agriculture in Oklahoma Territory. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Metcalf, Alida C. 2005. Go-Betweens and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500-1600. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Moses, Dirk, ed. 2005. Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History. War and Genocide 6. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Oakley, Christopher Arris. 2005. Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- O'Quinn, Daniel. 2005. Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1700-1800. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pratt, Stephanie. 2005. American Indians in British Art, 1700-1840. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Pulsipher, Jenny Hale. 2005. Subjects unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England. Early American Studies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Reid, Andrew M. and Paul J. Lane, eds. 2004. African Historical Archaeologies. Contributions to Global Historical Archaeology Series. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum
- Sartori, Andrew. 2005. The Resonance of 'Culture': Framing a Problem in Global Concept-History. Comparative Studies in Society and History 47: 676-699.
- Sayre, Gordon M. 2005. The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America, from Moctezuma to Tecumseh. University of North Carolina Press.
- Sikka, Sonia. 2005. Enlightened Relativism: The Case of Herder. Philosophy and Social Criticism 31(3):309-341.
- Sillitoe, Paul. 2006. The Search for Relevance: A Brief History of Applied Anthropology 1. History and Anthropology 17: 1-19.

Sommer, Marianne. 2006. Mirror, Mirror on the Wall: Neanderthal as Image and 'Distortion' in Early 20th-Century French Science and Press. Social Studies of Science 36: 207-240.

Steinweis, Alan. 2006. Studying the Jew. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Stuchtey, Benedikt, ed. 2005. Science Across the European Empires, 1800-1950. London: Oxford University Press/German Historical Institute.

Taylor, Alan. 2006. The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Viljoen, Russel. 2006. Jan Paerl: A Khoikhoi in Cape Colonial Society, 1761-1851. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Williamson, Ronald and Michael Bisson, eds. 2007. The Archaeology of Bruce Trigger: Theoretical Empiricism. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wood, Stephanie. 2003. Transcending Conquest: Nahua Views of Spanish Colonial Mexico. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Bruce Trigger, 1937-2006. Archaeologist and historian of archaeology Bruce Trigger passed away December 1, 2006. For an in-depth interview with Trigger about his life and his work, see Eldon Yellowhorn, 2007, "Understanding Antiquity," Journal of Social Archaeology 6: 307-327.

'Breaking the Chains': A New Exhibition of the British Empire & Commonwealth Museum. 'Breaking the Chains,' a new exhibition about Britain and the slave trade, opens Spring 2007 in Bristol, South West England. Planned to coincide with the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade, the exhibition will act as the centerpiece of the former major slave-trading port's commemoration program. For more information, see www.empiremuseum.co.uk

After Culture: Emergent Anthropologies. The new journal After Culture seeks manuscript submissions for upcoming issues. This peer-reviewed journal is published semiannually (in January and July) and made available free through the internet. Manuscripts should range between 8,000 and 10,000 words, use American Anthropologist citation style, and bear the title and author's name and affiliation on a cover page. They should also include a 200-250 word abstract, a list of key words, and a word count on the first page of the manuscript. All submissions may be sent to after.culture@gmail.com. Send all inquiries to Matthew Wolf-Meyer, Managing Editor, at after.culture@gmail.com.

Global Indigenous Politics, SAR Press. SAR Press has launched a new book series, Global Indigenous Politics. This series opens a forum for the best and most challenging work on the politics of indigenous peoples around the world, past and present. The press welcomes proposals for books that shed new light on the political struggles of indigenous peoples and

compel us to rethink the implications of tribal autonomy or sovereignty for nation-states and transnational organizing, notions of cultural and biological property, and the very nature of politics and indigeneity. Scholarship in interdisciplinary fields centered on indigenous peoples, anthropology, history, sociology, law, art history, and related fields will be considered. The series will include both monographs and edited volumes. The press will accept proposals in English or Spanish; the language of the series is English. Book proposals should include: a brief prospectus describing the work, the expected length of the manuscript, the number of illustrations desired, and the projected schedule for completion; a table of contents; the introduction or a sample chapter; and the author's or editor's curriculum vitae. Do not send complete manuscripts unless invited to do so. Send proposals to: Catherine Cocks, Ph.D., Co-Editor and Executive Director, SAR Press, PO Box 2188, Sante Fe, NM 87504-2188. Tel. 505-954-7261. Fax 505-954-7241. Contact Dr. Cocks at: catherinec@sarsf.org.

Histories of Anthropology Annual. Volume 2 of Histories of Anthropology Annual will be available in 2007, and Volume 3 will be available shortly thereafter. Co-editors Regna Darnell and Frederic Gleach continue to seek submissions for future volumes. Papers may deal with any aspect of the discipline's histories, from any part of the world; particular perspectives are not mandated. General length for papers is approximately 40 pages, formatted according to American Anthropologist style. Short research notes focusing on a particular finding are also welcome, as are reviews and review essays covering books, exhibits, or other media pertaining to the histories of anthropology. Electronic submissions are encouraged. The editors may be reached at fwg1@cornell.edu and rdarnell@uwo.ca.

International Thesaurus for the Registration of African Ethnographic Objects— Call for Ideas and Collaboration. Prof. Annemieke Van Damme, Visiting Professor at the State University of Ghent, is seeking professionals working at ethnographic museums and universities to share ideas about and cooperate toward an international thesaurus for the digital registration of African Ethnographic objects. Contact her at Annemieke Van Damme, University of Ghent, Dept. Art Sciences – Ethnic Art, Blandijn 2 – 9000 Gent, Belgium. Email: annemieke.vandamme@ugent.be.

University of Chicago Library Special Collections Research Fellowships. The University of Chicago library is awarding short-term research fellowships for 2007-2008. Any researcher residing more than 100 miles from Chicago whose project requires on-site consultation of materials in the Special Collections Research Center is eligible. Up to \$3,000 will be awarded to help cover projected expenses. The deadline for applications is February 15, 2007. Applicants must submit: a cover letter; a 1-3 page research proposal; the projected beginning and ending dates of on-site research; a budget for travel, living and research expenses; a CV (maximum 2 pages); 1-3 letters of support from scholars. Submit application to Alice Schreyer, Schreyer@uchicago.edu, or to Special Collections Research Fellowships, University of Chicago Library, 1100 E. 57th St, Chicago, IL 60637.

American Philosophical Society Library Fellowships. The American Philosophical Society Library offers short-term residential fellowships for conducting research in its collections. The Society's Library, located in Philadelphia, is a leading international center for research in the history of science. Holdings of interest to historians of anthropology include the papers of Western scientific expeditions in the 18th and 19th centuries, the papers of Franz Boas,

holdings on American Indian languages, and materials on the history of eugenics. The fellowships are open to U.S. citizens and foreign nationals who are holders of the Ph.D., Ph.D. candidates who have passed their preliminary examinations, and independent scholars. Applicants in any relevant field of scholarship may apply. Candidates who live 75 or more miles from Philadelphia will receive some preference. The stipend is \$2000 a month, and the term of the fellowship is a minimum of one month and a maximum of three, taken between June 1, 2007 and May 31, 2008. Fellows are expected to be in residence at the Library for four to twelve consecutive weeks, depending on the length of their award. Applications are due by March 1, 2007. For additional information, call 215-440-3443, or send an email inquiry to jjahern@amphilsoc.org. For application materials, visit <http://amphilsoc.org>.

Discourses of Race, Sex, and African American Citizenship. The *Journal of African American History* is planning a Special Issue examining the role of sex and sexuality in American discourses on race and citizenship historically. As W.E.B. Du Bois observed in 1922, "The race question is at bottom simply a matter of the ownership of women." Contentions over who would control black bodies— female and male— and African American sexuality have been a central theme in U.S. and African American history. This special issue seeks scholarly essays that consider the ways that African Americans historically have sought sexual self-determination. Essays that center on the African Americans' efforts to validate consensual modes of sexual expression in the context of citizenship, as well as public policy debates, are especially welcome. Among the essay topics to be considered for this Special Issue of the JAAH are: 1) gender identity and gender "respectability" and modes of sexual expression within African American communities historically; 2) biographical essays examining the lives of individual African Americans and their views on sexual expression; 3) African American sexual entrepreneurs and other black workers in the commercial sex industry historically; 4) non-"heterosexual" modes of sexual expression, including the construction of gendered sexual selves; 5) sexual health and campaigns for reproductive self-determination; 6) the impact of STDs or HIV/AIDS on notions of African American sexuality and sexual behavior; 7) analyses of sexuality within black political discourses (nationalism, integrationism, Black Power, black feminism, etc.). The deadline for submissions is March 1, 2007. For more information, visit <http://www.jaah.org/>.

UPCOMING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

The Business of Race and Science. Recent advances in genetics have renewed interest in sciences and technologies of race. This has fueled rapidly growing interest in a range of products that claim to take advantage of differences between human populations. Companies now market race-specific medications and vitamins, and other racial therapeutics are in development. Competing laboratories offer genetic analyses of race and ancestry. Increasing funding for racial analyses from governments, corporations, and consumers will only accelerate the infiltration of racial science into a wide range of areas. Are these ventures appropriate uses of new understandings of race? Will this commodification of racial science help or harm the targeted populations and society at large? How will attending to the business of racial science help understand the science itself and clarify its role in our world? The Center for the Study of Diversity in Science, Technology, and Medicine at MIT will explore these issues from the perspectives of many disciplines, including history and anthropology, at a conference March 30-31, 2007.

Cultural Studies Association. The Cultural Studies Association will hold its fifth annual meeting at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, April 19-21, 2007. The conference includes a wide range of topics of relevance to cultural studies, including cultural theory, critical race studies, and postcolonial studies. It will feature plenary sessions on Ethics and Environment; Asia, the Pacific Rim, and Capitalism; and Post-9/11 America and the World. Plenarists will include: Jill Casid, Art History, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Eric Cazdyn, East Asian Studies, University of Toronto; Katharyne Mitchell, Geography, University of Washington; David Palumbo-Liu, Comparative Literature, Stanford University; Paul Smith, Cultural Studies, George Mason University; and Andrew Ross, Social and Cultural Analysis, New York University. For information on registration, visit <http://www.csaus.pitt.edu/conf/index.php?cf=4>.

Cheiron and European Society for the History of the Human Sciences First Joint Meeting. Cheiron and ESHHS will hold their first joint meeting June 25 to 29, 2007, at University College, Dublin, Ireland. For up-to-date information on the meeting, visit the ESHHS website at <http://psychology.dur.ac.uk/eshhs/> or the Cheiron website at <http://people.stu.ca/~cheiron/>.

HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY ON THE WEB

Professional Associations and Institutions

Cheiron: The International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences
<http://people.stu.ca/~cheiron>.

Forum for the History of Human Science
www.fhhs.org

Images of Empire, from the British Empire and Commonwealth Museum
www.imagesofempire.com

National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution
<http://www.nmnh.si.edu/naa/>

Blogs and Discussions

Museum Madness

<http://museum-madness.blogspot.com/>

Savage Minds: Notes and Queries in Anthropology

<http://savageminds.org>

HAN
c/o Henrika Kuklick
Logan Hall 303
249 S. 36th St
Philadelphia PA
19104