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posed against expertise and shared decision-making threaten to undermine the
legitimacy of the World Heritage Committee and its ability to act.

“The Study of Jewish Biological Difference After 1945,” October 15-16, hosted by
The Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (MPIWG), report submitted by
Jonathan Marks, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, jmarks@uncc.edu

The conference was organized by Veronika Lipphardt (MPIWG) and Amos Morris-Reich
(Haifa), and sponsored by Minerva-Gentner, which aims to increase the contact
between Israeli scholars and those of other nations (and which had not previously
supported history of science). The organizers intended the conference to focus “on the
history of scientific accounts of Jews in the life sciences after the end of World War
Two,” and was especially timely, given the appearance of recent full length works by
two geneticists (David Goldstein, Jacob’s Legacy; and Harry Ostrer, Legacy) and an
anthropologist (Nadia Abu el-Haj, The Genealogical Science). Three themes emerged
during the presentations: (1) trans-World War II narratives of Jews and genetics
(Veronika Lipphardt, Anne Cottebrune, Alexander von Schwerin, Amir Teicher, Felix
Weidemann), (2) the development of the field of human genetics in Israel (Raphael
Falk, Nurit Kirsh, Snait Gissis, Amos Morris-Reich); and (3) contemporary issues of
genomics and Jewish identity (Petter Hellström, Yulia Egorova). The discussants were
Hans-Jörg Rheinberger, Paul Weindling and Jonathan Marks. Discussions about
publication are underway.

“Colonial Governmentalities Workshop,” held at the Institute of Culture and Society,
University of Western Sydney, October 31st to November 1st, report submitted by Ben
Dibley, University of Western Sydney, B.Dibley@uws.edu.au

The literature on governmentality in colonial contexts is well developed. Less attention
has been paid to the materialities through which particular forms of colonial rule are
exercised—the focus of this workshop, which emphasized how collecting cultures were
implicated in the rationalities of government in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth
century colonial situations. Participants examined the different kinds of knowledges—
such as anthropology, archaeology, and folklore studies—associated with practices of
collecting, and the roles these played in shaping forms of colonial rule, such as those of
settler, conquest, or neo-conquest colonialism. Organized around paired papers, the
workshop was led by Tony Bennett, Institute of Culture and Society (ICS), University of
Western Sydney (UWS). It was part of an Australian Research Council Discovery
Project, “Museum, Field, Metropolis, Colony: Practices of Social Governance.” (For an
overview of this project, see http://www.uws.edu.au/ics/research/projects/
museum_field_metropolis_colony.)

Henrika Kuklick (University of Pennsylvania) and Tony Bennett presented the first
paired papers. Both focused on the practice of anthropology and its relations with
colonial governance. Each offered distinctive accounts on the materialities of
ethnographic fieldwork, advancing contrasting conceptualizations of anthropological
practices and their folding into relations of government. Kuklick argued that, in
contradistinction to laboratory science, anthropology was a form of work that shared in
the methods of field sciences, which she characterized as more historical than
experimental, with knowledge witnessed, rather than manufactured. Like other field
scientists, anthropologists had to negotiate with administrative regimes, but their
negotiations were arguably more problematic given their subject matter. Because anthropology emerged in a period of secure colonial rule, its subjects were also colonial subjects; doing anthropology thus "meant dealing (somehow) with colonial authorities"; Kuklick reflected on these relations in canonical instances of fieldwork: A C Haddon in the Torres Straits; Franz Boas in Baffin Island; and Bronislaw Malinowski in the Trobriand Islands. Bennett was also concerned with the materialities of anthropological practices; he analyzed these as collecting practices with changing affiliations with the apparatuses of the field, the museum and the university, and examined anthropology's place in relation to liberal governmentality. He advanced two concepts, governmental rationality and anthropological assemblage, to explore the work of Franz Boas, Baldwin Spencer, Paul Rivet and that of Mass Observation. The first term provided an optic on the different logics of colonial rule in which the practices of these anthropologists were located. The second concerned the particular materialities, from colonial infrastructure to ethnographic tools, in which such anthropological practices were enmeshed and through which the ethnographic data generated came to circulate. With these formulations Bennett traced the ways in which anthropology was implicated in liberal rule, particularly through its role in differentiating populations with respect to their varying capacities for freedom.

The subsequent sessions were largely case studies, with particular papers paired around an empirical or conceptual affinity. Ira Jacknis (University of California, Berkley) and Julie Thorp (ICS, WWS) shared a concern with how collecting and display practices were implicated in Imperial imaginaries and processes of governing subjugated populations and territories. Jacknis argued that during the first half of the 20th century natural history museums in the United States adopted Enlightenment schemes of universal survey in ways parallel to art museums. He explored the emergence of anthropological regionalism at the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) under the directorship of Boas and, subsequently, Clark Wissler, examined the processes by which the museum's regional interests and emphases in anthropological collection, research, and display expanded beyond the Americas, including the Philippines as a colonial possession of the United States. Thorp also considered an imperial museological gaze, but one with a different political logic. Focusing on the Austrian Museum for Folk Culture (Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde), she examined a series of ethnographic exhibitions held in the last decades of the Austro-Hungarian empire, describing how the monarchy, museums and national elites sought to foster the empire's supranational identity of "unity-in-diversity"; this identity was displayed with through images of ethnic diversity in both metropolitan and local public spaces.

Tim Rowse and Ben Dibley (both ICS, IWS) analyzed practices of collecting data on colonial populations. Rowse considered the "dying Native story" as it was variously articulated in Canada, the USA, New Zealand, and Australia from the late nineteenth to the mid twentieth century, showing how putative trends were evaluated with census data on indigenous populations—represented either as people with particular cultural attributes or populations with distinct demographic profiles. Rowse identified three ways in which indigenous peoples might be said to be dying out: through catastrophic mortality, miscegenation, or rapid dissolution of native social order. Dibley explored the development of government anthropology in the Australian-administered territory of Papua during the interwar period, focusing on the collaborations and contestations of the government anthropologist, F E Williams, and the Lieutenant-Governor, Hubert
Murray. He argued for the emergence of a new kind of anthropological actor, framed in relation to new articulations of administrative, museum and academic networks associated with the emergence of functionalist anthropology, as well as implicated in the new forms of rule associated with the doctrine of humanitarian colonialism that was formally sanctioned by the League of Nations.

Paul Turnbull (University of Queensland) and Conal McCarthy (Victoria University of Wellington) considered indigenous agency and the shaping of conduct in two antipodean settler societies. Turnbull examined how Aboriginal bodily remains were collected, analyzed and interpreted in colonial Australia. He was concerned to consider the affective engagements of these activities, which, in their focus “on recovering a deep past shared by Indigenous people and settlers,” complicated recent historiographies and their assumption that once in the scientific domain these remains were voided of human qualities. Turnbull’s interest was with how the work of recovering the deep past might have come to shape the conduct of settler subjects. McCarthy traced the circulation of objects, people and ideas through a series of institutions central to the administration of New Zealand’s indigenous populations during the opening decades of the twentieth century. He was concerned with the Department of Native Affairs, the Dominion Museum, the Board of Māori Ethnological Research, and the Polynesian Society. Focusing particularly on the role of prominent Māori intellectuals and politicians, key among them Te Rangihiroa and Āpirana Ngata, McCarthy charted a simultaneous and paradoxical process of resistance and accommodation, collaboration and contestation between Māori leadership and the settler state.

Elizabeth Edwards (De Montfort University) and Nelia Dias (ISCTE—Instituto Universitário de Lisboa) addressed the complex ways that particular ethnographic technologies were folded into apparatuses of colonial rule. Edwards examined the photographic collecting practices of the Colonial Office over the 1860-70s, qualifying other scholars’ assumptions that there had been a ready fit between colonial photography and colonial rule. Edwards provided an account of a more fragile colonial project: photographs’ purpose, use, and evidential quality was uncertain, and their acquisition was far from systematic. Edwards argued that the photographic archive of the Colonial Office did not constitute information to be mobilized in colonial action, but rather served as a “form of reassurance” in the face of the radical contingencies of colonial rule. In the second presentation, Nelia Dias analyzed a research trip by Paul Rivet, director of the Musée d’Ethnographie du Trocadéro (MET), to former French Indochina in the early 1930s, which was conducted under the auspices of the Ecole Française d’Extême Orient (EFEO). Dias was concerned to investigate the affinities between administrative ethnographic practices and ethnographic research. This she advanced by examining the ethnographic surveys conducted by the EFEO and the relationships between local collectors in the field and the MET. In drawing out the geographical dimension of Rivet’s Indochina research and the role of colonial infrastructure in the submission of indigenous populations, Dias argued that administrative ethnographic practices were oriented towards the management of territory, while ethnographic research focused on listing and registering ways of controlling the territory.

The sixth session’s papers discussed the economies in which indigenous cultural objects circulated in the settler colony of New Zealand. One took as its example an
enduring set of relations into which tribal Māori and representatives of the state entered through the intermediary of the gift. The other turned to a formative moment in the history of anthropology in New Zealand as it was institutionalized as both disciplinary and administrative knowledge directed at the materialities of indigenous life. Paul Tapsell (University of Otago) and Ngati Whakauerre Te Arawa, offered a tribal perspective on the colonial agent Captain Gilbert Mair (Tawa) and the relations of reciprocity into which he entered on receipt of taonga. Tapsell outlined the ontology in which taonga are inscribed, describing them as 'art-like memorials' enmeshed in the genealogical folding of descent, knowledge and belief or whakapapa. He narrated the history of the taonga, Pukaki, a carved gateway, which, as the result of Mair's diplomacy, was moved from Ohinemutu to the Auckland Museum in 1877, and, through negotiations, in which Tapsell was intimately involved, between the state, iwi and the museum, was returned in 1997. Tapsell closed with a discussion of how museums might more actively engage descendant communities to present 'the whakapapa of taonga from an ethical space of reciprocity.' In the second presentation Fiona Cameron (ICS, UWS) considered the anthropological apparatuses emerging under the auspices of the New Zealand state during the opening decades of the 20th century. She focused on H. Devenish Skinner and his work on Māori and Pacific artifacts at both the Otago Museum and the Otago University. Skinner was appointed ethnologist at the Museum in 1918 and established anthropology as a discipline and as a degree course at the University in 1920, the first such anthropological program outside the UK. Cameron traced the networks in which Skinner's collecting, teaching and research practices were located. She emphasised the importance of Wissler's 'culture areas' concept for these. Cameron also considered how Skinner's research was linked with particular centres of calculation, especially through his association with the Board of Māori Ethnological Research.

Rodney Harrison (University College London) and Ben Dibley and Michelle Kelly (both ICS, UWS) focused on the work of Mass Observation. These papers were concerned to investigate that project's knowledge practices and the ends to which they were put as they came to be aligned with various aesthetic and administrative practices. Harrison reviewed the project of Mass Observation by investigating its epistemic procedures, collecting practices and its connection with surrealism. He contended that Mass Observation was a "museological" project, arguing that not only from its conception was Mass Observation an institution committed to the museal tasks of collecting, ordering, archiving and exhibiting; but that it also "conceptualized itself in museological terms." Harrison traced these formulations by which, in the words of one of the project instigators, Charles Madge, Mass Observation aimed to create a "collaborative museum." Dibley and Kelly focused in on Mass Observation's morale work commissioned by the British Government over the period 1939–41. They investigated how, through its research for the Ministry of Information, Mass Observation established civilian morale simultaneously, as an autonomous object of knowledge—that is, as a dynamic affective atmosphere associated with collective everyday life that could be calibrated through social scientific methods—and, as a particular field of intervention, which could be regulated through various policy instruments, from programs of propaganda to policies of compulsion. In this Dibley and Kelly were concerned to trace how the data generated by Mass Observation came to be put to administrative ends targeting the conduct of civilian subjects.
In the final session, Philip Batty, Melbourne Museum, gave two presentations. First, he discussed how an Aboriginal object, the secret/sacred churinga, figured in colonial and post-colonial programs. For early missionaries, churingas were impediments to Indigenous "salvation." For evolutionist anthropologists like Baldwin Spencer, they represented a stage in a standard narrative of the replacement of "primitive" beliefs by science. Recently, possession and knowledge of a churinga have served to establish legal rights to traditional land. Then, Batty described an Australian Research Council project in which he is participating, "Reconstructing the Spencer and Gillen Collection," which is digitizing everything that Spencer and Gillen collected, photographed, wrote about, recorded, and filmed. Material comes from over thirty institutions world-wide, including: Museum Victoria, Melbourne; American Museum of Natural History, New York; South Australian Museum, Adelaide; Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford; Manchester Museum, Manchester; Pigorini Museum of Ethnography, Rome; Mikluho-Maklay Institute of Ethnography, St Petersburg; and the British Museum, London. A website will be available shortly.

History of Anthropology Panels 2012 AAA Meetings

History of Berkeley's Anthropology: New Subjects, New Questions, New Perspectives (Organizer: Sergei Kan). Presenters: Sergei Kan (Dartmouth); Ira Jacknis (Hearst Museum, Berkeley); Priscilla Faulhaber-Barbosa (Museum of Astronomy and Related Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, Brazil); Robert V. Kemper (Southern Methodist University); Carolyn Smith (Berkeley); Samuel J. Redman (Berkeley). Discussant: Harold C Conklin (Yale)

Ancestor Worship or Parricide? Anthropological Genealogies (Organizer: Joshua Smith). Presenters: Robert G. Launay (Northwestern); Andrew Lass (Mount Holyoke); Margaret B. Bodemer (Cal Poly San Luis Obispo); Herbert Lewis (Wisconsin); Paul Shankman (Colorado); Joshua James Smith (Western Ontario). Discussant: Regna Darnell (Western Ontario).

Crossings Past to Present: Stocking Symposium in the History of Anthropology in Anthropological Practice (Organizer, David W. Dinwoodie) Presenters: Char Peery (New Mexico); Suzanne Oakdale (New Mexico); Kirk Dombrowksi (CUNY John Jay College); Kristen Adler (Antioch College); David W. Dinwoodie (New Mexico); Michelle Lelièvre (William and Mary); Olga Glinskii (New Mexico); Sebastian Braun (North Dakota); Susan Trencher (George Mason University). Discussant: Robert Brightman (Reed College).

Those with ideas for sessions for the 2013 AAA meeting should contact David Dinwoodie, Convener of the History of Anthropology interest group, ddinwood@unm.edu. The theme for the meeting is "Future Publics, Current Engagements."
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