

Dear Members of HOAN,

This is HOAN's 17th circular to inform you and over 210 other members of HOAN about the activities of EASA's History of Anthropology Network and other developments in this subdisciplinary field. We report on 1. **Past events**, in particular eight **HoA-related panels during EASA's 16th biennial conference in (virtual) Lisbon, 21-24 July 2020**; 2. **Network meeting of HOAN** on 20 July 2020 and **the new Network Convenors of HOAN**; 3. **Recent publications**; 5. the **Renaming Kroeber Hall at the University of California, Berkeley**.

1. **Past events**

EASA's 16th biennial conference in (virtual) Lisbon was conducted online from 21-24 July 2020 on the general theme [New anthropological horizons in and beyond Europe](#). By using the [Shindig platform](#), EASA2020 offered [199 panels with 1200 papers over four days](#); 1790 delegates attended. As to statistics, the opening session and keynote address by Marilyn Strathern had 761 attendees; Plenary A: 392, Plenary B: 288, Plenary C: 238, the Annual General Meeting: 202; the Journal session 182, and the party 216 attendees (all online).

Members of HOAN initiated seven panels and one roundtable related to the history of anthropology at EASA2020 in Lisbon.

[See Resources \(Newsletter No. 17\):](#)

[HOAN_Newsletter_17b_Timetable_HoA-Panels_EASA_202007](#)

In order of appearance, here are their reports:

P001: [Ethnographers before Malinowski \[History of Anthropology Network\]](#). Convenors: Christine Laurière (CNRS) and Frederico Delgado Rosa (Universidade Nova de Lisboa-CRIA/FCSH); discussant: Han F. Vermeulen (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology). **Tuesday 21 July, 11:00-12:45 and 14:00-15:45 (BST: Lisbon/London time)**

This panel invited case studies reassessing ethnographic works produced by observers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Welcoming diversity within a history of anthropology framework, it stressed the possibility of pre-Malinowskian texts regaining importance in the eclectic futures of the discipline. The first session was introduced by the convenors. Christine Laurière recalled that disciplinary past may be subject to various forms of exclusion, while historians of anthropology are themselves confronted with the drama of drastic selections. Frederico Delgado Rosa added that the vast literature by ethnographers before Malinowski is sufficiently varied, rich and complex to deserve a case-by-case analysis of form and content, avoiding the hasty judgment that most of them were but miscellaneous, dry compilations of odds and ends.

The first paper, "Other Argonauts: Lost Chapters in the History of Anthropology," by Frederico Delgado Rosa, addressed risks in the search for ethnographic forerunners, such as the risk of Anglocentrism, viewing the history of the discipline mostly from a British perspective. Rosa stressed the fact that the nineteenth-century label of data collectors was itself a conceptual construct that hid a myriad of different occurrences. In the second paper, "Westermarck and his Ethnography: A Reconsideration," David Shankland (University College London; Royal Anthropological Institute, UK), underlined the fact that disciplinary amnesia also affects leading transitional figures in the history of British anthropology. According to Shankland, the lack of appreciation of Edward Westermarck's work, including his Moroccan ethnography, goes back to the time when social anthropologists came to codify

the discipline and regard themselves as being part of a revolution not only in the temporal but also in an intellectual sense. In a paper entitled “Out Amongst the Natives: Daisy Bates’ Ethnography and the Invention of Ethnographic Fieldwork,” Edward M. McDonald (Ethnoscience, Australia) and Bryn Coldrick (Ancestral Voices, Ireland) argued that much criticism of Daisy Bates and her work is and has been ‘presentist’ and that the failure to acknowledge her as an important figure in the history of Australian anthropology ignores its multi-stranded origins, its complex interconnections, and the fact that her work in various parts of Western and South Australia underpinned ethnographic orthodoxies. In “A Book of Good Faith? The Contradictory Nature of the Present in Henri-Alexandre Junod’s Novel *Zidji* (1911),” João de Pina-Cabral (University of Kent, UK) demonstrated the complexity of early 20th century fictional ethnographic genres, namely of Junod’s less-known novel which, on the one hand, bears as much empirical validity as his remaining work, and, on the other, resorts to the fictional format to better deal with the cultural and historical ambiguity of the colonial “present.” In the last paper of session 1, “Turn-of-the-century Ethnographies of South-East Europe between Political Engagement, Textual Experimentation and Humanitarian Activism,” Anne Müller-Delouis (Université d’Orléans, France) compared the Balkanese ethnographies of Guillaume Lejean, Eugène Pittard and Edith Durham to exemplify the merits and limits of earlier ethnographic practices. If earlier texts may seem superficial, biased or based on false premises, other elements remain of interest, such as giving visibility to local interlocutors and paying careful attention to populations in humanitarian crisis or without recognition in the global political arena.

In the first paper in session 2, “Old Tropes, New Histories: An “Irish” Reading of Haddon’s Ethnographies,” Ciarán Walsh (Maynooth University, Ireland) unveiled anti-colonial dimensions in Alfred Haddon’s life and work. Resorting to visual and other archival materials, Walsh interpreted Haddon’s photo-ethnographic method as a platform for anti-racism activism, one that has its analogue in current projects of Indigenous activists to campaign against land grab, racial violence and genocide. In “Turning Fieldwork and Museum Research into Comparative Ethnographical Studies: Erland Nordenskiöld and the Gothenburg School,” Christer Lindberg (Lund University, Sweden) focused on Erland Nordenskiöld’s fieldwork and the use he made of ethnographical and archaeological collections. Lindberg called attention to a clear shift in Nordenskiöld’s fieldwork style as he moved from a large-scale expedition to making field studies on his own or with a single collaborator, and stressed the imaginative ways he used the ethnographic materials at home.

In a paper entitled “Moisei Krol’s Return to the Jewish People via Ethnographic Research among the Buryats,” Sergei Kan (Dartmouth College, USA) focused on the transformative ethnographic experience of Moisei Krol while exiled in southern Siberia in the 1890s. Following his admiration for the Buryats and their values, Krol reconciled with his Jewish background and devoted himself to various Jewish causes. In the last paper of session 2, “Franz Boas as Ethnographer in the Field,” Herbert S. Lewis (University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA) focused on Boas’s ethnographic experience among the Inuit and the resulting monograph, *The Central Eskimo* (1888), as a way of counter weighting the critique of his work in the Northwest Coast of British Columbia. He recalled that Boas’s experience among the Inuit was constitutive of his position in methodological terms, as he “was never able to carry out a full year’s worth of fieldwork again and would never have the intense intimacy or involvement in hardships, movements, and daily life.” Lewis also put into question the claims that Boas did not focus on living cultures.

All presentations were followed by questions and answers giving way to lively and informed discussions. Discussant Han F. Vermeulen identified intersections between the various papers, namely the fact that the historiographic reassessment of pre-Malinowskian ethnographers and ethnographies has to deal with still prevailing canons in anthropology and also with their genealogies. These do not go back necessarily to the Malinowskian “Revolution in

Anthropology” from 1922, he added, but to later forms of theoretical consolidation and professionalization of British social anthropology. Vermeulen also called attention to the risks of compartmentalizing the period c. 1870-1922, as earlier ethnographies, namely of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth-century, should also be taken into account. The problems and case studies of P001 may rejoin other histories of anthropology written for more distant periods. One of the panel’s conclusions was that historians of anthropology avoid, as an open and complex subject, pinpointing the emergence locus of the ethnographic monograph.

The papers contributed to reassess positive human dimensions underlying the ethnographic experiences and outputs of the age of empire, somehow avoiding the predicaments of radical post-colonial critique. The panelists, in dialog with the convenors, the discussant and the attendees who joined the stage, were fundamentally in agreement that the materials pre-Malinowskian ethnographers gathered and published, namely under the form of ethnographic monographs, deserve special attention as historical documents, but also for additional reasons that were brought forward by the case studies in the panel. About 50 people were in attendance.

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17):

[HOAN_Newsletter_17c_P001-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P179: [Curating the \(Post\)Colonial in Europe and Beyond](#). Convenors: Chiara De Cesari (University van Amsterdam) and Wayne Modest (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/National Museum of World Cultures). **Wednesday 22 July, 08:30-10:15 and 11:00-12:45 (BST)**

This panel explored how museums in different contexts respond to the (post)colonial condition. Its main question was: In what ways are museums colonial institutions, how do they represent colonialism, and what does it mean, practically, theoretically, to decolonize them? Nuno Porto (University of British Columbia, UBC) talked about the Museum of Anthropology in Vancouver at UBC and the project to decolonize its African collections in the context of a university located on unceded land of the Musqueam first nation, emphasizing the socially situated nature of decolonization. Damiana Otoi (Bucharest University) examined how questions of ownership and representation have been approached by French and South African (post)colonial museums with regard to collections of physical anthropology and human remains; and how claims to the dead help constitute Indigenous communities in the present. Ana-Rita Amaral (University of the Free State) interrogated limitations and potential of research on missionary collections, especially from colonial Angola, for the mission to decolonize. Vittoria Caradonna (University of Amsterdam) focused on the relations between Amsterdam’s Tropenmuseum and the Black Archives, a local grassroots archive focusing on colonial legacies, to investigate whether such connections may engender a space for true recognition beyond neoliberal multiculturalism and policy constraints. Aleema Gray (Museum of London) discussed “radical curating” using the London Sugar & Slavery gallery as a case study to probe the meanings of “representation” and “knowledge” in museum displays and their potential to represent the multiplicity of Blackness. Margareta von Oswald (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin) asked how we can theorize the convergences across activism, politics, and curatorial practice with a view to trans-European postcolonial reckoning departing from a long-term research and publication project entitled “Across Anthropology” carried out together with Jonas Tinius. Lukasz Bukowiecki (University of Warsaw) explored how current European debates concerning ethnographic museums and colonial collections affect the narratives and practices of Polish museums, discussing some recent exhibitions as examples. Merve Kayikci (KU Leuven) analyzed how Islam is represented in contemporary museums and especially how a narrative focusing on the splendor of “Islamic civilization” to counter negative public representations

itself erases key dimensions and unwittingly reproduces highly racialized discourses. Banu Karaca (Forum Transregionale Studien) examined possibilities and limitations of attempts to decolonize museum collections at times of war, looking at Syrian heritage today and art stolen in the late Ottoman period in the context of the Armenian genocide, probing contemporary entanglements of historical artifacts and art with war and political violence, past and present. Ferdinand de Jong (University of East Anglia) explored the potential of restitution to address the effects of colonialism, and particularly restitution as an act of repair taking place in a complex neo-colonial context while focusing on the Museum of Black Civilisations in Dakar, Senegal. The final discussion touched upon issues of racializing assemblages, forms of racialization, the agency of museums and objects, the value of comparison, the problem of legal frameworks, the politics of emotions, social forces and processes driving museological shifts, the relations with communities and with policy making and diversity frameworks.

[See Resources \(Newsletter No. 17\):](#)

[HOAN_Newsletter_17d_P179-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P049: [Uncomfortable Ancestors: Anthropology \(not\) Dealing with Totalitarian Regimes.](#)

Convenors: Fabiana Dimpflmeier (University of Pisa) and Reinhard Johler (University of Tübingen). **Wednesday 22 July, 08:30-10:15 and 11:00-12:45 (Lisbon/London time)**

Panel 049 invited “papers that explore the involvement of anthropology and folklore studies in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes in Europe (and beyond)” in order to “better understand the ‘shadows’ of anthropology and include in its history the less explored phases and harsher personalities of our discipline (its ‘uncomfortable ancestors’)” and “to stimulate their acknowledgment and re-elaboration.” The panel hosted 10 papers reflecting on the involvement of anthropology and folklore studies in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes in Italy, Germany and Austria, Lithuania, Russia, Romania, Albania, and Turkey and showing how – and how deeply – anthropology was involved not only with ideology, propaganda and consensus policies, but also with everyday practices, representations, material culture and folklore. The panel was divided in two slots, grouped by time and focus, briefly introduced by the two convenors: the first dealing with the 1920s-1940s, Italian Fascism and German Nazism; the second referring to post WW2 regimes, with a special focus on Communism, ending with the more contemporary case of Turkey.

The first session was opened by three Italian scholars, Paola Sacchi, Sofia Venturoli and Barbara Sorgoni (University of Torino) who presented “Unexpected Routes. Corrado Gini’s Ethnographic Expeditions: Theoretical Assumptions and Political Consequences.” Focusing on the statistician Gini, the paper showed his little known approach to miscegenation divergent from official anthropological theories during Fascism. “The Totalitarian Turn of Folklore Studies in Italy” of Maurizio Coppola (EHESS) meticulously reconstructed and summarized the relationship between folklore studies and Fascism in the 1920s and 30s, showing how innovation and tradition were constantly used by the regime in non-contradictory terms. Paolo De Simonis and Dario Nardinis’s (University of Florence) paper, “Fascism and Anthropology in Florence between Writings and Social Practices” offered a vibrant and original exploration of the social practices used by the Fascist regime to build consensus in Florence, lingering on the various forms of cultural and traditional re-enactment promoted by Alessandro Pavolini, Florentine Minister of Popular Culture.

The following two papers dealt with anthropology and Nazism from an Austrian perspective. In her dense presentation of a specific case study, “Ethnic Fragmentation: Viennese Racial and Folklore Research in Occupied Poland (1940-1944),” Lisa Gottschall (University of Vienna) focused on the Góral population of Poland and the way Anton A. Plügel’s anthropological researches impacted on its identity and survival during and after Nazism. Peter Rohrbacher (Austrian Academy of Sciences) dedicated his paper to “Folklore Studies

for the Waffen-SS: Caucasus and Turkestan Research from Vienna at the End of the Second World War.” Introducing his on-going research on voice recordings from the Phonogrammarchiv of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Rohrbacher thoroughly underlined the little known regional connections of the “Eastern Turkic SS Corps” with the Viennese Turkologist Herbert Jansky.

The second session was mainly dedicated to Communist countries. Vida Savoniakaitė (Lithuanian Institute of History) talked of “Anthropology and Totalitarian Regimes: Eduard Volter as ‘Uncomfortable Ancestor’ (1884-1941),” richly reconstructing his life and oeuvre and highlighting his importance in Lithuanian anthropology. Sergei Alymov (Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences) described the ambivalent effects of the Stalinist regime on Russian anthropology. In his paper, “Soviet Ethnography on the World Stage: from World War II to Détente,” he emphasized the dynamics of relations between Soviet ethnographers and their foreign colleagues in the 1940-60s, showing how the discipline acquired a global outlook and developed tactics aimed at attracting the minds of scholars from the Cold War geography. Two insightful examples from Romania were presented in the following two papers. Alina Ioana Branda (Babes-Bolyai University) gave a paper on “Totalitarianism and Ethnology/Anthropology in Romania. A case study.” Taking into consideration the Cluj Archive of Folklore and the Ethnographic Museum of Transylvania, Branda focused not only on the strategies developed by the Romanian regime to control the ethnological production and research, but also on the local levels of compromise and resistance. In “Ethnography in Dictatorial Situation: The State and/of Knowledge in Communist Albania” Olsi Lelaj (Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Arts Studies, Tirana, Albania) presented an insightful critical understanding of the relation between Albanian ethnographic knowledge and the dictatorial state, underlining how anthropology participated in sustaining a state-led holocaustic culture while the totalitarian state implemented an ideologically motivated vision on society.

Erdogan Gedik (Goethe Universität), Abdurrahim Özmen (Dicle University), and Hande Birkalan-Gedik (Goethe Universität) presented the final paper “The Haunting Phantoms of the Ancestors: Coming to Terms with Anthropology and Folklore in Turkey,” in which they explored the development of anthropology and folklore in relation to the state ideology in Turkey from the 1930s-1940s until the 2000s under the current regime. The informed paper switched the focus of the panel from past regimes to present dictatorial states, stimulating the emergence of a series of delicate questions. The challenges of how to face the future of Turkish anthropology in the aftermath of the actual intellectual brain-drain, loss of funding, economic deprivation, compromised scientific publishing, and a general lack of social trust, encouraged a general and lively discussion on what we can learn from and how we should come to terms with our past. To this end, supported and appreciated by all scholars, was the idea of conducting broad comparative research involving different totalitarian regimes in time and space. The debate lasted until 2pm (Lisbon/London time) and included several positive feedbacks and invitations to further develop the ideas expressed during the panel. The panel hosted up to 30 attendees. The recording is available on the EASA website.

[See Resources \(Newsletter No. 17\):](#)

[HOAN_Newsletter_17e_P049-Report_EASA_202007](#)

R001 [P028]: [Anthropological Perspectives: Past, Present and Future \[Roundtable\]](#).

Convenors: Aleksandar Bošković (University of Belgrade) and Virginia Dominguez (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign); discussant: Thomas Hylland Eriksen (University of Oslo). **Wednesday 22 July, 14:00-15:45 (Lisbon/London time)**

The main idea of convening the roundtable was the questioning of the shifting role of ethnography in the changing world. The invited participants, Adam Kuper, Maja Petrović-

Šteger and João Pina-Cabral, were asked to include their own experiences in the discussion of the topic, which provided for diversity of perspectives and opinions. In his introductory remarks, Aleksandar Bošković noted the importance of anthropological perspectives in understanding human behaviour and its consequences. In doing so, he is in favour of a specific approach (methodological individualism), in order to answer to specific questions relevant to contemporary world (and formulated by Ladislav Holy and Milan Stuchlik in their seminal work, *Actions, Norms and Representations*, 1983). Just as perspective in art means reproducing three-dimensional objects on a two-dimensional plane (i.e., in a drawing), perspective in anthropology means presenting others (in texts, visual media, and other types of narratives) in a way that is also acceptable for them. However, this is not easy when specific issues of identity and identity construction obscure reasoning on a collective level. In his presentation, Adam Kuper (London School of Economics) began with the paradox of the current situation of social anthropology. At the time that EASA was founded, thirty years ago, we were engaged in large and resonant debates about theory – about structuralism, and sociobiology, and postmodernism; about gender and identity; and about post-colonial development policy. But we felt that not enough attention was paid to us by other social scientists, by policy makers, and by the general public. Our current situation is very different. Out there in the world there is a real if rather puzzled interest in the great issues of anthropology. These are discussed in blockbuster best-sellers. (He noted the examples of Harari, Diamond, and others.) Unfortunately they are not written by anthropologists. And yet today a number of anthropologists are engaged in huge issues that are of cross-disciplinary interest, and which are policy-relevant: contagious diseases, and now COVID-19; Climate Change; Migration; Family, Sex and Gender; Identity and Nationalism. And the coming generation of researchers has adopted new research methods, and new modes of communicating their ideas and their results in online journals and forums, and video sites. Is a new intellectual community taking form?

Maja Petrović-Šteger (Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts), focusing on her field research experience and specific narratives of her interlocutors, noted the awkward situation in which we find ourselves. The state of our politics, our economies, the planet, COVID-19 – all these prompt disquiet and have exacerbated cultural and ideological differences around the world. Anthropology, it is often claimed, is meant to have a public face. There is something like the expectation that we should act as public intellectuals who, on the basis of what they already know, offer predictions concerning the new world order and the future of our discipline (as per the call of this roundtable). This paper suggests that although our procedures of data-collection privilege the present, they overemphasize the expert's authority and future's predictability. In that way, they assume continuous time, not rupture.

Finally, João de Pina-Cabral (University of Kent) started from the premise that anthropology and ethnography will never disappear because the person (*anthropos*) is a condition for the world to exist and, from within our collective condition (*ethnos*), there will always be someone seeking to achieve the broader view. Writing in 1963, Ernesto de Martino argued that, to move out of the imperial condition, anthropology had to adopt what he called ecumenical ethnocentrism. By ethnocentrism he meant that, since persons are irrevocably within life, and life is foundationally social, there is no veranda beyond life from which to look at the world. We have to stop fooling ourselves with the vacuous hope that logic can lift us above history, like God had done of old. Today, in order to seek the broader view, we need to unmake the two principal pillars of the modernist paradigm: on the one hand, the notion that the Greater Divide in the human condition lays between modernity and ancientness; on the other, the neo-Kantian conception of Reason as the external measuring rod that sets up the Great Divide. When one takes these aspects into account, a picture emerges of the kind of anthropology we would want to bring about in our coming postimperial condition.

In his discussion, Thomas Hylland Eriksen reiterated his call for a more public engagement of anthropologists, and for anthropology to enter more vigorously into the public sphere. The presentations were followed by an interesting exchange of views and perspectives. Perhaps this opens the space for future debates, and even an edited volume on the topic. The roundtable was recorded, see here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6YDZsjyUp7c>

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17):

[HOAN_Newsletter_17f_R001-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P003: [World Fairs, Exhibitions, and Anthropology: Revisiting Contexts of Post/Colonialism \[Europeanist Network\]](#). Convenors: Hande A. Birkalan-Gedik (Goethe Universität), Patrícia Ferraz de Matos (Universidade de Lisboa) and Andrés Barrera-González (Universidad Complutense de Madrid); discussant: Benoît de L'Estoile (CNRS, Ecole normale supérieure). **Thursday 23 July, 08:30-10:15 and 11:00-12:45 (BST)**

The panel aimed at illuminating “world fairs and other great exhibitions in the past and the repercussions they may still have on ‘contemporary exhibitions,’ particularly considering the role of anthropology and the contexts of post/coloniality.” Geographically, the papers related to various parts of the globe: Portugal, France, Brazil, Argentina, Spain, Turkey, and Russia. The panel was introduced by two of the convenors, Patrícia Ferraz de Matos and Hande Birkalan-Gedik. Patrícia Ferraz de Matos chaired the first session. Based on the work of German anthropologist Robert Lehmann-Nitsche on exhibited Argentinean indigenous groups, Diego Ballesterio (Universität Bonn) analysed the use of fairs and exhibitions as a privileged space for “field work” for the scholars of the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Argentina (1898-1904). Nicolas Freeman (Goldsmiths, University of London) introduced “A Critical Historiography of Argentina” from the “International Centennial Exposition to 2001” and proposed that the Buenos Aires’ International Centennial Exposition (1910) laid the foundational moment not only of the nationalist state and a capitalist economy but also of the systematic use of genocide as a political tool. Hande Birkalan-Gedik presented a paper on a non-canonical, nineteenth century Ottoman travel report, titled “La rue du Caire at the Exposition Universelle (1889): Ahmet Midhat’s Orientalist Twist on Muslim Morality and Gender.” Mariam Kerimova (Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences) talked about “The Ideas of Slavic Reciprocity and Unity of the Peoples of Imperial Russia at the First Ethnographic Exhibition of 1867 in Moscow,” which presented a different context of the history of anthropology, and of other exhibitions in Europe and USA, and highlighted the frequent relations between exhibitions and the creation of museums after them.

The second session was chaired by Hande Birkalan-Gedik. In this session, Pegi Vail (New York University) analysed the trajectory of cultural display, from early public exhibitions of humans in world fairs and museums to the cinematic representations of world cultures, popular travelogues and expedition films of the 20th century and their enduring influence in contemporary tourism. Patrícia Ferraz de Matos reflected on the presence of women in photographs and other representations such as drawings, posters, postcards, exhibition catalogues, newspapers and magazines, which were disseminated in the context of the Portuguese colonial expositions. Juliana Ladeira Coelho (University of São Paulo) analysed press reports about Balinese performances as an entertainment for the public, as well as a device used to display an “effect of authenticity” to the Paris Colonial Exhibition of 1931. Marina Cavalcante Vieira (Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro) discussed the journey of a group of Botocudos, presented in the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro in 1882 and later in England and the USA, examining the transformation of narratives and representations between the Museum’s official exhibition and its London and American versions.

At the end of each presentation questions or comments followed. After all presentations, specialist in the subject Benoît de L'Estoile, the panel's discussant, articulated all presentations and made an in-depth analysis of some aspects that were later taken as the basis for the open discussion. The final debate was animated, and it was concluded that the tensions presented in the colonial contexts continue to raise questions and generate fruitful arguments. Between 25 and 35 people were in attendance.

[See Resources \(Newsletter No. 17\):](#)

[HOAN_Newsletter_17g_P003-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P120: [The Futures of Visual Restitution](#). Convenors: Rodrigo Lacerda (CRIA/NOVA FCSH, Lisbon) and Renato Athias (Federal University of Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil). **Thursday 23 July, 08:30-10:15 and 11:00-12:45 (Lisbon/London time)**

This panel reflected on the intersection between the restitution and repatriation debates and the use of visual images, specifically since photos and film footage represent special artefacts due to their indexical quality as signs, which makes them both illusorily transparent and full of details that resist signification and provide new ways of thinking about and accessing the past. The session was successful in demonstrating the diverse uses of visual images and methodologies in restitution and repatriation processes, and their potential for anthropology, visual anthropology, history and decolonization.

The first paper by Katja Müller (Halle University), entitled "Digital Archives: Postcolonial takes on circulating Indian photographs," analysed how online archives have become a means of visual restitution and presented a comparative study based on three examples. The author concluded that community-based archives are the most successful in generating online interactions, encounters and emotional involvement. However, this is not easily achieved, since archiving software is available, but there is no manual for creating an engaged audience. The paper "Dislocation and performance in the Makonde's response to visual archives," by Catarina Alves Costa (CRIA NOVA FCSH, Lisbon), assessed the process of making her film *A Journey to the Makonde* (2019), which is based on the reaction of contemporary Makonde living in Maputo (Mozambique) to photographs and film footage of this ethnic group shot by Margot Dias, wife of the ethnologist Jorge Dias, in the north of the country between 1958 and 1961. She reflected on how the camera, both for her and Dias, instigates dislocation that produces changes in visual and social perspectives and new kinds of knowledge. Renato Athias' paper presented yet another way of using images in restitution processes. In "Virtual restitution of photographic archives and ethnographic objects of the Upper Rio Negro Indigenous Peoples: issues and problems," the anthropologist, who has considerable experience in this ethnographic region, reflected on the experience of showing present-day communities photographs of objects collected by missionaries and travellers since the 19th century and stored in European and North American museums. This process was a way of informing the communities of the whereabouts of their heritage and initiated reflection and discussion that may (or may not, depending on ritualistic and shamanic issues) lead to requests for restitution and demands for how museums display the objects and who is allowed to see them. The paper "Film screening of mythical times: Clashes of temporalities and nostalgia in a Papuan Village," by Roberto Costa (Macquarie University, Sydney), examined the experience of a public screening of historical footage in an Asmat village. This event produced feelings of nostalgia, both by recalling memories in an attempt to find visual evidence of mytho-historical pasts in which ancestors were stronger, bigger, healthier, and braver, and also in the emerging moral critique of the modern state, leading to reflections on the future. Finally, Kaylee Good (Damsko International Theatre Academy, Amsterdam) presented her paper "Performing Arts as Visual Restitution of Missing Cultural Artifacts" as a pre-recorded video. Exploring the use of film and photos as a "replacement" for cultural

artefacts and, based on her research on Emma Hamilton's work, she examined whether performing art, as a form of visual representation, may be a way of replacing the spirit of a missing object.

The panel showed that visual restitution is an emerging and diverse arena which, for better or worse, has not yet been fully embraced by states, museums and other institutions but is eagerly pursued by the source communities and their allies, such as anthropologists, filmmakers and artists. Visual restitution is a process that challenges the old structures of oppression and is a source of knowledge, power and healing for the heritage stakeholders as well as a catalyst for new relationships, both within communities and between communities, institutions and states. By reassessing memory, it provides these various actors with new ways to think about the future.

[See Resources \(Newsletter No. 17\):](#)

[HOAN_Newsletter_17h_P120-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P176: [Engaged Anthropology at Times of Nationalistic Enhancement in the XX Century.](#)

Convenors: Grazyna Kubica-Heller (Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University, Kraków) and Anna Engelking (Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw).

Thursday 23 July, 08:30-10:15 and 11:00-12:45 (Lisbon/London time)

The panel's aim was "to discuss the engagement of anthropologists in fighting with or supporting twentieth-century nationalisms. Why were some anthropologists using anthropological knowledge to deconstruct nationalisms, while others were doing just the opposite: they were engaged in strengthening them?" The first session was introduced by the convenors with a short statement, concluded by the remark: "We hope that this historical panel will help us understand the contemporary situation. How to defend the ideas of multiculturalism and pluralism, the importance of citizenship and openness, when the nationalistic enhancement is again so powerful?" Adam Pisarek (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) presented a paper on "Race and the island. The role of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait in the formation of selected concepts of the nation state." He was followed by Erik Petscheries (University of São Paulo, Brazil) who spoke about "Hermann von Ihering (1850-1930) and the indigenous question." Then Laura Cristina Pop (Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania) presented a paper on "Treasures from Transylvania: ethnographers, archives and the fascinating universe of traditional society – tools of constructing the 20th century Transylvanian national identity" and Grażyna Kubica-Heller (Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland) talked about "Interwar Polish engaged anthropology and nationalism – two exemplary cases" and presented some theoretical background on engaged anthropology (following the sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Burawoy). The topic was continued in the second session by a paper of Anna Engelking (Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland) entitled "Dworakowski, Chajes, Obrębski. Three models of the anthropologist-state nationalism relation in prewar Poland." Götz Bachmann (Leuphana University, Lüneburg, Germany) talked about "The Oyneg Shabes Action Research Group, 1940-1943" in the Warsaw Ghetto. Later Ricardo Gomes Moreira (Institute for Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Portugal) spoke about "Genetic Temporalities: history and narrative in the production of imaginaries of belonging and biological diversity." The final paper was given by Katarzyna Warmińska (Cracow University of Economics, Poland) and Ewa Michna (Jagiellonian University, Poland) on the subject "Unveiling the difference? The Polish anthropologist in the face of social transformation" based on their own experiences in the 1990s. The panel was concluded by a prolonged discussion on various kinds of anthropological engagement, quite often strengthening state nationalism, which was taken for granted by contemporary anthropologists. The panel was conducted online quite smoothly and was recorded.

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17):
[HOAN_Newsletter_17i_P176-Report_EASA_202007](#)

P030: **[Making and Remaking Anthropology Museums: Provenance and Restitution.](#)**

Convenors: Adam Kuper (London School of Economics) and Han F. Vermeulen (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology). **Friday 24 July, 11:00-12:45 and 14:00-15:45 (BST)**

This panel invited “discussions and reviews of current debates concerning ethnographic museums in Europe and beyond ... [that] address questions about the origins and purpose of these museums, their role in imperial or national projects and, more recently, the restitution of cultural treasures.”

The first session was introduced by the two convenors. Han Vermeulen reviewed the historical trajectory of anthropology museums, “From Kunstkammern to Ethnographic Museums and World Museums.” Adam Kuper’s contribution, “Imagining Ethnographic Museums,” reflected on the first experiments in museums of ethnography in the 1830s and 40s. In her presentation, “The waltz of the Parisian anthropology museums (1878-2020),” Christine Laurière (CNRS, Paris) described the paradigm changes that regularly transformed the museum landscape of Paris in a sixty-year cycle. In particular, she reflected on the tension between natural history and ethnographic perspectives, and the problematic highlighting of works of “art” in the Quai Branly Museum.

The following papers all dealt with the current hot topics of provenance, “restitution,” and “representation.” In his probing theoretical presentation, “Restituting, reclaiming, sharing: challenges for ethnographic museums,” Benoît de l’Estoile (CNRS, Paris) invoked Marcel Mauss and explored the meaning of ownership in different legal traditions, and the variety of ways in which exchanges and reparations might be envisaged. Vibha Joshi (University of Oxford) described “Historical trajectories and global flows of Naga museum collections.” Her paper reviewed the origins of the major Naga collections, discussed the variety of ways in which they have been exhibited (or neglected) in some of the great ethnographic museums, and sketched recent contributions by Naga artists to new forms of display. João de Castro Maia Figueiredo (CEDIS – Nova University of Lisbon) presented a remarkable case study, under the title “Restitution as imperial propaganda: the strange case of the Benin bronzes ‘restituted’ to Angola (1952).” This historical episode – in which Benin bronzes were transferred from Portugal to Angola, symbolising a myth of a Portuguese African identity – has troubling and unexpected resonances with current post-colonial debates.

The second session was dedicated to German ethnographic collections and in particular to the current project, the Humboldt Forum in Berlin. In his paper, “Failed ambitions: The Humboldt Forum in Berlin, the postcolonial debate and the symbolic politics of restitution,” Karl-Heinz Kohl (J. W. Goethe University Frankfurt) provided a clear, insightful picture of the ambitious, tragicomical and hugely expensive project of the Federal Government, inspired by Chirac’s Quai Branly Museum in Paris, to renew the landscape of German ethnographic museums. Jonas Bens (Free University Berlin) and Paola Ivanov (Ethnologisches Museum Berlin) took up one particular, very telling episode in the evolution of this museum. Their paper, “Colonial Alexithymia: Affect and Colonialism in the German Humboldt Forum Debate,” told the story of the relationship between the Humboldt Forum and Tanzanian authorities and the National Museum of Tanzania. Julia Binter (Ethnologisches Museum Berlin) followed another trail, describing her collaboration with colleagues from Namibia, another former German colony. Her paper “The chronotopes of provenance and restitution – What subjectivities does the ‘New Relational Ethics’ afford?” presented vivid examples of the general considerations raised earlier by De l’Estoile. Margarita Valdovinos Alba (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) presented another fascinating case study of a historical German ethnographic collection, this time from Central America: “On the ‘history of

ethnographic collections' in a repatriation process: an anthropological approach to the Náayeri collection." It gave further examples of the complexities that may arise in well-meaning but sometimes naïve attempts at collaboration with local experts. Andreas Schlothauer (Research Centre for Material Culture Berlin) presented the final paper, "The Restitution Debate in Germany 2018-2020." He summarized four cases of the "restitution" of ethnographic objects from museums in Germany and Austria, all of which were driven by European politicians and activists, with little or no input from African stake-holders, and with no reference to anthropological specialists.

To a remarkable degree the papers all contributed to central current debates on museums of anthropology or ethnography. The discussions were lively, informed, and collegial.

Participants agreed that it was a stimulating event, which will feed back into their research.

Between 30 and 50 people were in attendance. The recording was hosted on NomadIT's

YouTube channel and embedded on EASA's website on 18 August. It can be accessed here:

<https://easaonline.org/conferences/easa2020/panels#8544>. And here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=42&v=FGCa3eUvQkc&feature=emb_logo

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17):

[HOAN_Newsletter_17j_P030-Report_EASA_202007](#)

2. **Network meeting of HOAN – HOAN's business meeting at the EASA2020 conference**

Report on the History of Anthropology Network (HOAN) business meeting

The online business meeting of HOAN took place on Monday 20 July 2020, 14:00-16:00 (Lisbon/London time). Chaired by the network's convenors, the meeting was attended by over 70 network members. After the welcome, a short report on the network's activities in 2018-2020 and an overview of seven history of anthropology related panels and one roundtable convened by members of the network were presented (for reports on these sessions, see above). Since December 2016, sixteen HOAN Newsletters with almost 70 attached resources have been shared with members of HOAN by e-mail. These are also online on [HOAN's subpage](#) and, thanks to EASA's IT department, are uploaded as soon as they have been distributed. As part of our efforts to strengthen communication between HOAN and similar initiatives in Europe and the USA four sister organizations were invited to present themselves: [BEROSE: International Encyclopaedia or the Histories of Anthropology](#); the [History of Anthropology Review](#) (HAR); the "History of Anthropology Interest Group" (HoAIG) of the AAA's largest section, the [General Anthropology Division](#); and the Working Group "Historical Approaches in Cultural Analysis" (HACA) of the International Society for Ethnology and Folklore (SIEF). For full reports, see the PDFs attached.

The proposal to appoint Hande Birkalan-Gedik as liaison between EASA's HOAN and SIEF's HACA was unanimously accepted. She thanked both HOAN convenors and members for the opportunity and informed them that the 2021 SIEF meeting will take place in Helsinki on the theme "[Breaking the Rules? Power, Participation, Transgression](#)." (The call for panels is open until 21 September 2020; see below.)

The final topic on the agenda was the election of new network convenors. Under the rules of EASA, network convenors can only function two terms. Therefore, having served from 2018-2020 and 2016-2020, respectively, both convenors made their position available. Fabiana Dimpflmeier (Università degli Studi della Tuscia, Viterbo, VT) and Frederico Delgado Rosa (Universidade Nova de Lisboa-CRIA/FCSH, Lisbon) volunteered to accept these positions and were invited to the virtual stage to introduce their views on the history of anthropology. The candidates were elected unanimously, by acclaim. More details in the report attached.

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17):

HOAN_Newsletter_17k_Network-Meeting-Report_EASA_202007
HOAN_Newsletter_17l_Network-Meeting-PowerPoint_EASA_202007
HOAN_Newsletter_17m_BEROSE-PowerPoint_EASA_202007
HOAN_Newsletter_17n_HAR-PowerPoint_EASA_202007
HOAN_Newsletter_17o_SIEF-PowerPoint_EASA_202007

3. Call for panels: SIEF2021 15th Congress

The Call for Panels, Roundtables, Workshops and Combined Formats is now open for SIEF2021 “Breaking the Rules? Power, Participation, Transgression” taking place in Helsinki, Finland, 21-24 June 2021. Please [read the theme](#), go to the [Call for Panels page](#) to read the formats, rules and instructions, and find the link for proposing a contribution. **The call for panels is open until 21 September 2020.**

4. Recent publications

Barron, Nicholas (2020) “Renegades or Liberals? Recent Reflections on the Boasian Legacies in American Anthropology.” *History of the Human Sciences* 33(4): 1-12 (August 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695120941195>

Bashkow, Ira 2020 “The Cultural and Historical Openness of Bernard Narokobi’s ‘Melanesian Way.’” *Journal of Pacific History* 55(2): 187-219. Available in open access for a limited time at [this link](#)

Blanchard, Pascal et al. 2020 “[‘Die Wilden’ in den Mensenzoos.](#)” *Arte TV*, 5 September, 92 min. German version of “Sauvages au coeur des zoos humains” (2017), taking up themes from Pascal Blanchard, Nicolas Bancel, Gilles Boetsch, Eric Deroo and Sandrine Lemaire (dir.) *Zoos humains. De la Vénus hottentotte aux Reality Shows*. Paris, 2002; and Nicolas Bancel, Thomas David and Dominic Thomas (eds.) *The Invention of Race: Scientific and Popular Representations*. New York/London: Routledge, 2014, including 21 papers by Miriam Claude Meijer, Britta Rupp-Eisenreich, Maarten Couttenier, Patrick Harries, etc.

Décultot, Elisabeth, Jana Kittelmann, Andrea Thiele, and Ingo Uhlig (eds.) 2020 [Weltensammeln. Johann Reinhold Forster und Georg Forster](#). Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag (Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert, Supplementa, Band 27). 280 pp. 58 ill. Proceedings of a conference held in Wörlitz, Saxony-Anhalt, from 6 to 8 September 2018 organised by the Dessau-Wörlitz-Kommission with the Alexander von Humboldt-Professur für Neuzeitliche Schriftkultur und europäischen Wissenstransfer and the Kulturstiftung Dessau-Wörlitz.

Deliss, Clémentine 2020 *The Metabolic Museum*. Stuttgart/Berlin: Hatje Cantz Verlag. 128 pp. Released in August. <https://www.hatjecantz.de/clmentine-deliss-7776-0.html>

Fabre, Daniel and Christine Laurière (eds.) 2018 *Arnold Van Gennep, du folklore à l’ethnographie*. Paris: Éditions du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (CTHS).

Geisenhainer, Katja 2020 “‘aus innerer Zustimmung zu den Programmpunkten der NSDAP’ – Der Völkerkundler Hans Plischke (1890-1972) und sein Wirken in Göttingen.” In: Dirk Schumann and Désirée Schauz (eds.) *Forschen im ‘Zeitalter der Extreme’. Akademien und andere Forschungseinrichtungen im Nationalsozialismus und nach 1945*. Göttingen: Wallstein-Verlag, pp. 263-296.

Hempenstall, Peter 2017 [*Truth's Fool: Derek Freeman and the War over Cultural Anthropology*](#). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. xiv +321 pp., ill., maps.

Joseph, Camille and Isabelle Kalinowski 2020 "Franz Boas, une anthropologie de la variation." *La Vie des idées*, 4 September 2020. ISSN: 2105-3030.

URL: <https://laviedesidees.fr/Franz-Boas-une-anthropologie-de-la-variation.html>

Kaufmann, Doris 2020 [*Ornamentwelten. Ethnologische Expeditionen und die Kunst der "Anderen" \(1890-1930\)*](#). Köln: Böhlau Verlag. 174 pages. ill. Not European avant-garde discovered "primitive art" in ethnological museums of the early 20th century but ethnologists encountered cultural objects on their expeditions and assessed them as works of art much earlier. Illuminating the implications of this conclusion, which did not fit contemporary colonial apologetic and racial hierarchical discourse, Kaufmann examines the appropriations and transformations that the collected artifacts underwent in global cultural and political contexts. Including chapters on discussions about art and ornaments by Franz Boas, Berthold Laufer and Karl von den Steinen. Flyer with table of contents and extract attached.

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17): [HOAN_Newsletter_17p_Kaufmann_Book_2020](#)

King, Charles 2020 [*Schule der Rebellen. Wie ein Kreis verwegener Anthropologen Race, Sex und Gender erfand*](#). München: Carl Hanser Verlag. 479 pp. German translation of *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex and Gender* (2019). From the backcover: "Charles King tells the story of an extraordinary scholarly pioneer and his students, with whom the battle against all forms of discrimination began."

Müller-Delouis, Anne Friederike (ed.) 2020 *Voyages au Centre de la France. L'identité d'une région au regard de ses visiteurs (XVIe-XXe siècles)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes. ISBN 978-2-7535-8028-2.

Pellerin, Pascale (ed.) 2020 [*Les Lumières, l'esclavage et l'idéologie coloniale XVIII^e-XX^e siècles*](#) [Enlightenment, Slavery and Colonial Ideology, 18th-20th centuries] Paris: Classiques Garnier (Rencontres no. 432). 560 pp. Abstract: How does one articulate the problems of slavery and colonization? How did the anthropology of the Enlightenment develop after the Egyptian expedition and then the conquest of Algeria? What role did it play in the construction of the image of the native in the nineteenth century?

Pina-Cabral, João and Glenn Bowman 2020 [*After Society - Anthropological Trajectories out of Oxford*](#). New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books (Methodology & History in Anthropology series, edited by David Parkin, David Gellner and Nayanika Mathur). 232 pp. ill.

Richards, Jake Subryan 2020 "Colonial Mentalities: A culture war on race and empire divided the intellectual classes of Victorian Britain." [*History Today*](#) 70(9), September.

Sirina, Anna Anatol'evna. Vladimir Nikolaevich Davydov, Olga Alekseevna Povoroznyuk and Veronika Vital'evna Simonova 2015. "[S. M. Shirokogoroff's book Social Organization of the Northern Tungus and its Russian translation: History, Structure, and Interpretations.](#)" *Asian Ethnicity*, DOI: 10.1080/14631369.2015.1086088.

Taube, Erika 2020 [*Briefe aus der Mongolei \(1966-1987\)*](#). [Letters from Mongolia, 1966-1987] Ed. by Manfred Taube and Jakob Taube. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag. 256 pp. ill. A folklorist and ethnographer from Leipzig (GDR), [Erika Taube](#) (1933-2020) pioneered research on the nomadic Tyvans of the Mongolian Altai during eight field trips. She published

eight books and numerous articles on their oral traditions. The letters to her family bring out both challenges and rewards during her fieldwork among non-literate Tyvans in Mongolia.

Werbner, Richard 2020 [*Anthropology after Gluckman: The Manchester School, Colonial and Postcolonial Transformations*](#). Manchester: Manchester University Press. 376 pp. June 2020. Flyer attached.

See Resources (Newsletter No. 17): [HOAN_Newsletter_17q_Werbner_Book_2020](#)

See also: [Latest Additions to the Bibliography of the History of Anthropology Review](#) (HAR) by Nicholas Barron and Janet Steins, August 16, 2020.

5. **Renaming Kroeber Hall at the University of California, Berkeley**

A very helpful notice about the Kroeber Hall renaming has been published in *HAR* with links to the relevant sources: <http://histanthro.org/news/proposal-to-un-name-kroeber-hall/>

All good wishes for carrying on,

HOAN convenors 2018-2020:

Frederico Delgado Rosa (Universidade Nova de Lisboa-CRIA/FCSH, Lisbon)
fdelgadora@fcs.unl.pt

Han F. Vermeulen (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale)
vermeulen@eth.mpg.de

HOAN convenors 2020-2022:

Fabiana Dimpflmeier (Università degli Studi della Tuscia, Viterbo, VT)
f.dimpflmeier@unitus.it

Frederico Delgado Rosa (Universidade Nova de Lisboa-CRIA/FCSH, Lisbon)
fdelgadora@fcs.unl.pt

History of Anthropology Network: <https://www.easaonline.org/networks/hoan/>

PS This newsletter is also attached herewith as a Word file and has 16 attachments.

All previous HOAN Newsletters are online: <https://easaonline.org/networks/hoan/newsletters>



European Association of Social Anthropologists
Association Européenne des Anthropologues Sociaux