

Inhalt

Finke, Peter: Introduction: Anthropological Pasts, Presents and Futures	5
Schindlbeck, Markus: 150 Jahre Zeitschrift für Ethnologie: ein Rückblick	13
Shankland, David: Social Anthropology and its History	51
Schaik, Carel P. van: Cultural Anthropology's Love-Hate Relationship with Evolution: What Will the Future Bring?	77
Neveling, Patrick: Die Lage der marxistischen Ethnologie im Jahr 2020	93
Eidson, John R. : Anti-Relativism since the Eighties	133
Flitsch, Mareile und Karoline Noack: Museum, materielle Kultur und Universität. Überlegungen zur Parallelität und Zeitgenossenschaft der DDR/BRD-Ethnologien im Hinblick auf eine Standortbestimmung mit Zukunftsaussichten	163
Eriksen, Thomas Hylland: Afterword: Genealogies of Social Anthropology	199

Nachruf

Lang, Hartmut: Hans Fischer (1932–2019) †	211
---	---------------------

Introduction: Anthropological Pasts, Presents and Futures

Peter Finke

Department of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies, University of Zurich, Switzerland
peter.finke@uzh.ch

The year 1869 may not have been the most prominent in terms of historical watersheds. Yet some events paved the way to some major shifts that were to take place in the decades to come. In November, the opening of the Suez Canal was celebrated, marking the beginning of a new era of transcontinental connections for the global expansion of trade. That same year, August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht founded the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Germany, later to become the nucleus of both the Social Democrats and the Communist Party. And, amongst many others, this was also the year of the birth of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, André Gide, Grigori Rasputin as well as Nadezhda Krupskaya, each epitomising in their own ways a world that was about to change.

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

150 Jahre Zeitschrift für Ethnologie: ein Rückblick

Markus Schindlbeck

Kästlesweg 1, 89275 Elchingen, Germany

Abstract. The „Zeitschrift für Ethnologie“ is one of the oldest scientific journals in Germany. For the first 75 years it was published by the „Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte“ (Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory), later it was also edited by the „Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde“ (German Society of Anthropology). The journal is therefore closely linked to the establishment of the discipline of anthropology and well-known representatives of this science have published articles in it. In a way, it reflects the development and history of the discipline, from the period of colonialism to National Socialism and postmodernism. The essay deals above all with the period of the foundation in the 19th century and the then journalistic scientific environment, the expansion of the journal up to the First World War and its more recent time, which the author himself experienced and designed as co-editor. It can be shown how the discipline developed from an initial strongly emphasized interdisciplinary approach to an increasingly diversified science. The journal's attachment to scientific societies gave it a long tradition.

[Anthropology, Scientific Journals, History of Science, Colonialism, Material Culture]

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Social Anthropology and its History

David Shankland

Director, Royal Anthropological Institute

David.Shankland@therai.org.uk

Abstract. The history of social anthropology is widely assumed, both in texts and in teaching, to have gone through a series of stages, the one giving way to the next. Social anthropology as a discipline is also assumed to have been sparked off by Malinowski's tenure at the LSE. In this article, I suggest that this conception is not accurate, even though it remains very important in facilitating *esprit de corps*, both in Britain and in Europe more widely. Malinowski did not, in any straightforward way found social anthropology. It is also doubtful whether dividing anthropology into a series of stages is useful from the point of view of appreciating any intellectual progress that the discipline may have made. Social Anthropology should, instead, be regarded as having multiple sources, and as possessing a series of theoretical impulses many of which may remain valid, albeit rejected, even after they are supposed to have been surpassed.

[social anthropology, history of anthropology, Evans-Pritchard, Malinowski, Marett, Radcliffe-Brown, LSE, Oxford, EASA]

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Cultural Anthropology's Love-Hate Relationship with Evolution: What Will the Future Bring?

Carel P. van Schaik

Department of Anthropology, University of Zurich, Switzerland

vschaik@aim.uzh.ch

Abstract. Cultural anthropology and evolutionary biology arose around the same time, and both adopted the same evolutionist framework. Their paths soon diverged, however, largely because anthropology rejected the notion of evolutionary progress—and thus the notion of the existence of primitive versus advanced races—before evolutionary biology did. Most anthropologists subsequently rejected all evolutionary interpretations of ethnographic patterns and thus all biological influences on human behavior. Most evolutionary biologists until recently ignored the massive role of culture in guiding human behavior. Promising recent work suggests that important new insights emerge when evolutionary and cultural influences on behavior and society are integrated. The success of these new approaches indicates that the presence of a similar mental substrate everywhere produces a non-trivial level of predictability and thus convergence in cultural evolution. Future work along these lines should therefore yield novel insights in how humans respond to changing subsistence or institutional arrangements.

[evolutionism, unilinealism, cultural evolution, human nature, sociobiology]

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Die Lage der marxistischen Ethnologie im Jahr 2020

Patrick Neveling

Department for Social Anthropology, University of Bergen
patrick.neveling@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract. The upheaval of the 2007/8 financial crisis and its aftermath have had significant impact on the social sciences and humanities. In social anthropology this amplified empirical attention for escalating global inequalities. Critical political economy paradigms and historical materialist theories are now prominent in the discipline. These developments inform this article's review of the historical and present-day relationship between mainstream anthropology and Marxian anthropology. The first section establishes some paradigms of Marxian anthropology with reference to Marx and Engels' analysis of the so-called original accumulation of capital. Their critique of mainstream political economy's essentialist conceptions of human nature is applied to Max Weber's understanding of capitalism's historical emergence. Based on these findings, two sections juxtapose the development of Marxian anthropology and mainstream anthropology before and after the Second World War. Whereas Marxian anthropologists were excluded from university employment prior to 1945, their entry into US, British, French and other university settings in capitalist nations was shaped by anti-communist prosecutions during the Cold War. Despite those pressures, Marxian anthropologists pioneered an internationalist, anti-racist, anti-capitalist and decolonial anthropology. Not in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), however, which was shaped by unfinished denazification until the 1970s, only to undergo a belated modernisation that imported exoticist mainstream anthropology from Britain and the US. The articulation approach developed at Bielefeld University is a notable exception in an FRG-setting that otherwise opened up to historical materialist approaches in the 2000s only. The concluding section highlights the recent importance of Marxian anthropology for an anti-capitalist, anti-fascist and decolonial turn of the discipline.

[History of Anthropology, Marxism, Decoloniality, Anti-capitalism, Economic anthropology, Political anthropology, Anti-racism]

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Anti-Relativism since the Eighties

John R. Eidson

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale, Germany
eidson@eth.mpg.de

Abstract. Following the publication of Geertz's lecture "Anti Anti-Relativism" in 1984, anti-relativism has developed along straight and twisting paths. This contribution starts with a critical review of three varieties of anti-relativism since the 1980s: cultural relativism as (1) ideology, as (2) anti-science, and as (3) Western ontology. It concludes with a critique of the assumptions about cultural relativism that are current in contemporary anthropological discourse and that serve as the common basis for all varieties of anti-relativism. *[cultural relativism, political economy, evolutionary psychology, ontological turn, textbook legends]*

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Museum, materielle Kultur und Universität

Überlegungen zur Parallelität und Zeitgenossenschaft der DDR/BRD-Ethnologien im Hinblick auf eine Standortbestimmung mit Zukunftsaussichten

Mareile Flitsch

Ethnographic Museum, Department of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies, University of Zurich, Switzerland
flitsch@vmz.uzh.ch

Karoline Noack

Department for the Anthropology of the Americas, University of Bonn, Germany
knoack@uni-bonn.de

Abstract. More than 30 years after the “Wende” [the “Turn”], a review of the social anthropology and ethnographic museums of the GRD and FRG as parallel, contemporaneous, closely entangled and yet equally “system competing” disciplines and research groups is long overdue. For, after the “post-Wende-era” – as a still rather blurred transition period of relative curiosity about each other and emerging opportunities – the current acute ignorance about the GDR is all too obvious. It has resulted in a new sovereignty of interpretation about the discipline having become commonplace, one which knows very little about the institutions, publications and achievements, and which ignores witnesses from the time. Cold War figures of speech of times about “the east” are reproduced without thought, whereas archival research, knowledge about the GDR and FRG’s scientific landscapes, of the science policies and the actors and actresses at institutes and museums, and therewith competences of understanding publications and exhibitions and the remaining academic potentials, would shed new light on social anthropology’s theory and research lines. The authors aim – along the counterfactual question of which social anthropologies could have encountered each other in 1989 – to undertake a positioning of the ethnographic institutes and museums in their contemporaneous parallelisms, which acknowledges today’s simultaneity of disciplinary and museum competences, and which keeps it visible for future researchers, as well as for projects and debates today.

[History of knowledge, GDR Social and Cultural Anthropology, FRG Social and Cultural Anthropology, ethnographic museums, social and cultural anthropology in the “Wende” era, parallelism in scientific landscapes, contemporaneity]

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Afterword: Genealogies of Social Anthropology

Thomas Hylland Eriksen

Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo, Norway
t.h.eriksen@sai.uio.no

‘Who controls the past controls the future,’ reads one of the most famous slogans of the Ingsoc party in Orwell’s *1984*. In a surprisingly candid afterthought, the slogan ends: ‘Who controls the present controls the past.’

Speaking of the past, in other words, is not an innocent exercise, as is well known to anthropologists, who have long been engaged in showing how perceptions of the past inevitably are shaped by ideology and power relations, nostalgia and wishful thinking, the need for a rooted identity and the need to leave it behind. This is no less the case with anthropology than with national or ethnic histories. Accordingly, the history or genealogy of anthropology changes to accommodate current thinking. All the contributions to this special issue trace genealogies of anthropology, but not the same ones. Temporalities and foci vary, as do the questions asked of the past. Seen as a whole, they reveal both unity and diversity. Towards the end of these musings, I will ask whether it is time to strengthen the sense of unity *in* diversity which, when the dust has settled, continues to define the shared identity of anthropologists.

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)

Nachruf für Hans Fischer (1932–2019)

Hartmut Lang

Hamburg

Hartmut.Lang@uni-hamburg.de

Hans Fischer wurde am 14.12.1932 in Grottkau (heute Grodkow) südöstlich von Breslau (Wroclaw) geboren. Das Abitur hat er 1951 auf Spiekeroog abgelegt. Der Lebensabschnitt in der Zeit des Dritten Reichs und direkt danach muss streckenweise sehr unerfreulich gewesen sein, liegt aber für mich zu sehr im Dunkeln.

An Fischers akademischem Werdegang fällt vor allem dies auf: Es hat nur wenige Etappen gegeben, die zudem wie am Schnürchen aufeinander gefolgt sind, was mich dazu angeregt hat, dieses Thema im Telegrammstil abzuhandeln.

[\[Zurück zum Inhalt / Back to Content\]](#)