

Anthropology on the Periphery: The Early Schools of Nordic Anthropology

Christer Lindberg

Introduction: From the periphery

The contributions of figures in the Nordic states are occasionally noted in historical accounts of the formative years of anthropology. The Danish museum curator Christian J. Thomsen is recognized for his influence on museology, and especially for his stone-, bronze- and iron-age typology. The Norwegian Carl Lumholtz's travels in Mexico and Australia are noted, and the Swedish Hjalmar Stolpe is acclaimed for his archaeological work and his studies of primitive art. Lately, thanks to the research of curators Staffan Brunius at the Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm and David R. Watters and Oscar Fonseca Zamora of the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, credit has also been given to Carl V. Hartman for his archaeological excavations in Costa Rica, as well as for his role as the quintessential museum anthropologist of the Carnegie in the 1900s (Brunius 1984; Watters & Zamora 2002).

Nevertheless, there has never been proper recognition of two, important anthropological schools based in the Nordic periphery: the Westermarck school of Finland and the Nordenskiöld school of Sweden. Historians of American, British or French anthropology may make occasional, casual references to the two schools, but historians rarely suggest that Nordic anthropologists had any major impact on their American, British or French counterparts. Indeed, over time, knowledge of Nordic anthropologists'

contributions to their discipline in its formative years has diminished. In part, historians' neglect of the Westermarck and Nordenskiöld schools is a product of the fact that American and British authors dominate the field of historical writing. In addition, recent Swedish and Finish anthropologists have tended to identify British social anthropologists as their intellectual ancestors, rather than Nordenskiöld or Westermarck. Historical memory is now being recovered in Finland; following the decline in influence there of Parsonian sociology and Geertzian interpretative anthropology, Westermarck has resurfaced in anthropologists' discussions (Suolinna 1993:43). In Sweden, however, where a fundamental split between ethnographic museums and universities was effected in the 1960s, social anthropologists routinely dismiss the Nordenskiöld school as "old museum stuff."

The Westermarck School

In the *International Dictionary of Anthropologists*, Timothy Stroup gives the impression that there never was a Westermarck school, indicating that Edward Westermarck (1862-1939) had no recognized group of followers (Stroup 1991:749-750). Yet, Westermarck was well placed to gather followers. He was appointed professor of moral philosophy in Helsinki in 1906, and in the following year became professor of sociology at the London School of Economics. His international reputation encouraged both Helsinki and Turku to create departments of sociology in 1926-27. A number of scholars have recognized the influence of his biologically-based conception of social behaviour

on Malinowski's version of functionalism, but historians have not paid much attention to Westermarck's pioneering work as a fieldworker, who did field-based studies in Morocco. Moreover, in Finland Westermarck trained a group of young students whose research was field-based, a contribution that is rarely acknowledged outside Finland and Sweden. In addition to Westermarck himself, three of his students--Gunnar Landtman, Rafael Karsten and Hilma Granqvist--were prominent anthropologists. Together, members of the Westermarck school made some important international contributions to the fields of anthropology, sociology, comparative religion, and philosophy, especially in the 1910s and 1920s.

As is well known, Westermarck and C. G. Seligman were Malinowski's mentors at London School of Economics. Perhaps Numelin (1947:89, 138) was being somewhat Finnocentric when he identified Malinowski as more Westermarck's student than Seligman's. In any case, Malinowski repeatedly expressed his gratitude to Westermarck. In one letter to Westermarck, he wrote "how deeply grateful I am for all you have done in the past; for your initial help when I was quite alone and unbefriended in London; for your advice and assistance in bringing out my book and most of all for your personal friendship in which you have honoured me. I am very conservative in my friendship and I value yours very highly for many reasons, not the least because our scientific and general ideas and aims are very much in harmony." (ÅAB: 07/18/1921) Furthermore, Malinowski had reason to thank

Westermarck for helping to secure him a position at the London School of Economics (ÅAB: 11/28/1921).

Edward Westermarck was a man of sparkling intellect and critical mind, well read in English, French and German literature, politically outspoken, with strong anti-Czarist views—and a man who had the courage to stand up for his ideas. He was a great humanist, whose consistently strong evolutionist perspective must not be confounded with social Darwinism. Throughout his scholarly career, Westermarck stressed the close relationship between nature and culture. This was the central idea in his studies of marriage and family life, in his works on religion, and in his philosophy of morality and emotions. In his *magnum opus*, a revised version of his doctoral thesis, *The History of Human Marriage* (1891), he rejected earlier anthropologists' models of the evolution of family structure, opposing the arguments of such persons as Bachofen, McLennan and Morgan, who had hypothesized that early humans were promiscuous. To the contrary, Westermarck argued, the family consisting of mother, father and child must have existed in the very earliest times of humankind. Classifying empirical data to formulate types of marital forms such as monogamy, polygamy, group marriage, marriage by capture, and so on, he showed that similar social forms of marriage existed in very different social and cultural environments, concluding that similarities were to be explained in biological terms (Allardt 2000:300). Because of human biological character, marriage was a universal social institution: it was required by the growing child's need for prolonged

protection by its mother and father. The conclusion of *The History of Human Marriage* was an analysis of early humans' various means for regulating sexuality, which involved an extensive discussion of the incest taboo.

Westermarck's explanation of the basis of this taboo, which became known as the "Westermarck effect," suggested that exogamic rules in many societies were not based on kinship per se, but were related to the degree of proximity in which children had grown up together—an argument that he was to repeat in subsequent works.

Another of Westermarck's controversial assertions was his claim that moral judgements are based on emotions, not intellectual rationality, an argument that received its fullest treatment in his provocative *Ethical Relativity* (1932). He found the origin of morality in language, and tried to show that morality moved towards a central position in human culture through biological evolution. He argued that it was foolish for the social scientist to attempt to determine whether a moral judgement was true or not true. Research in sociology and social anthropology (the latter of which he defined as a branch of the former [e.g., 1936]), was undertaken to reveal the causes and purposes of social phenomena.

In a letter A. C. Haddon wrote to Westermarck (ÅAB 07/20/1908), Haddon insisted on the need for "the intensive study of limited areas" in order to learn "...the conditions of existences of a given people – how the environment affects them, how they react on it. But above all we need an accurate and exhaustive study of the psychology, sociology and religion of the people

studied.” Westermarck was indeed an empiricist, following the Finnish history tradition, and he was certainly a pioneer in the “intensive study of limited areas”. In 1898, Westermarck travelled via Spain to Morocco, from which he intended to travel further toward more remote fields. Instead, he decided that Morocco was an ideal fieldwork site; not only was it within easy reach of Europe but it also was virtually unexplored by anthropologists, and had been untouched by modern civilisation (1936). Over the years, Westermarck was to return to Morocco repeatedly. He came to study wedding ceremonies, as well as conceptions of holiness (*baraka*), the evil eye, and evil spirits among the Berber tribes of central and northern Morocco. In 1900, he returned for a period of protracted fieldwork, spending two years and two months in Morocco, and subsequently returned at regular intervals until the outbreak of World War I. In 1923, he was back for a period of intensive work that resulted in the completion of *Ritual and Belief in Morocco* (1926) and *Wit and Wisdom in Morocco* (1930). During his later visits to Morocco, he was stationed in his villa Tusculum on the outskirts of Tangier, working with his key informant, Abdessalam El-Baqqali (Suolinna 1997:264-265).

Indeed, Westermarck has not been appropriately credited for his articulation and application of the standards of field methodology that have often been assumed to have been pioneered by Malinowski. “Prior to Malinowski doing his fieldwork, Westermarck emphasized the importance of learning the local languages and of getting thoroughly acquainted with the environment, in which one did research” (Suolinna 1997:276). Judging from

Malinowski's *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term* (1967), one can surely say that Westermarck enjoyed his fieldwork more than Malinowski did.

Westermarck's student Rafael Karsten was also a pioneering fieldworker. Under severe hardships, Karsten did long periods of field research in South America, making his first field trip to the Gran Chaco area in the Bolivian-Argentine borderland in 1911. He spent over two and a half years in the Amazonian region of eastern Ecuador during the war years of 1916 to 1919, returning to the Shuar Indians (or Jibaro as they were called then) in 1928-29, 1937, 1946, and 1951. Among his best-known publications are *Blood Revenge, War, and Victory Feast among the Jibaro Indians of Eastern Ecuador* (1923), published by the Bureau of American Ethnology, and *The Head-Hunters of Western Amazonas* (1935).

The fact that Karsten's first major fieldwork in Ecuador coincided with Malinowski's fieldwork in New Guinea 1914-15 and the Trobriand Islands in 1915-16 and 1917-18 led me compare their approaches to fieldwork (1995a). I concluded that the shift in the conception of the ethnographer's role, from that of inquirer to that of participant, did not begin with Malinowski; although other persons in the young Malinowski's professional world described and approximated the participant observer method, Westermarck led directly by example as well as by precept, and Karsten's field research was at least as intensive as Malinowski's. Although covering most aspects of the everyday life of the Shuar, including social and political organisation, hunting, trade, agriculture, material culture, and language, Karsten's writings focus on their

head-hunting practices. He evidently found this form of ritual warfare so central in their universe that it affected every aspect of their way of life.

Hilma Granqvist studied the lives of women and children in the Palestinian village of Artas for a total of three years in the field between 1925 and 1931. She participated in Westermarck's seminar in London in 1929, and returned to the London School of Economics in 1938 in order to attend a seminar organised by Malinowski. Similarly to Karsten, she was critical of the comparative method of Westermarck and that of her local tutor, Landtman. While Karsten remained descriptive in his ethnography, Hilma Granqvist embraced the ideas of British functionalism, as well as some of British anthropology's methodologies, such as W. H. R. Rivers's genealogical method. Granqvist collected demographic data about the families in Artas. She collected information on all marriages during a hundred-year period from 1830 to 1930. She kept a field diary and carefully noted comments of key figures on the various phenomena in the village (Suolinna 1997:264-265).

The Nordenskiöld School

Baron Erland Nordenskiöld (1877-1932) was the son of the world famous Arctic explorer Adolf E. Nordenskiöld, who discovered the Northeast passage. The younger Nordenskiöld began as a naturalist, making his first expedition to South America in 1899. By the time he made his second South American trip, in 1901-2, his interest had shifted from zoology to ethnology and archaeology. He began his extensive travels in the Gran Chaco area of Argentina, Bolivia and

Paraguay, which included additional periods of fieldwork in 1904-05, 1908-09 and 1913-14. He lived among and travelled with the Ashluslay, Choroti, Chané and Chiriguano tribes, making archaeological and ethnographic collections for the Swedish ethnographic museums of Stockholm and Gothenburg. He got his professional training from Hjalmar Stolpe, and might have seemed his logical successor. When Stolpe died, however, his position was filled by Carl Hartman. Just before the outbreak of World War I, Nordenskiöld was offered a job at a small county museum in Gothenburg housing stuffed birds, minerals, and a minor ethnographical collection demonstrating the local peasant life. He undertook an ambitious program of collecting, trading and purchasing, and within ten years had transformed a once-insignificant museum into an internationally important one that specialized in the Indian cultures of South America (Lindberg 1995b, 1997). Moreover, with the aid of a private patron, he secured a position as Professor in “general and comparative ethnography” at Gothenburg University. Thus, he was able to tutor a first generation of anthropologists and archaeologists in Sweden, notably Karl Gustaf Izikowitz, Sigvald Linné, Stig Rydén and Henry Wassén. Indeed, the Nordenskiöld school” counted Alfred Métraux of Paris among its members.

Anthropogeography, the combination of geography and anthropology, the leading progenitor of which was Friedrich Ratzel, was a significant influence on Nordenskiöld’s thinking. Ratzel had stressed the interaction between man and nature, emphasizing the topographic and climatic influences upon peoples and cultural forms. In his groundbreaking works *Die*

Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika (1880, “The United States of North America”) and *Anthropo-Geographie_oder Grundzüge der Anwendung der Erdkunde auf die Geschichte* (1882, 1891, “Anthropo-Geography or Basic Traits of the Use of Geology on History”), Ratzel explained similarities in human societies as a result of historical contact and cultural borrowing. He justified his position by stressing that humankind had limited capacities for invention and was inclined to attachment to traditions. Nordenskiöld elaborated Ratzel’s ideas, but objected to the uses to which they were put by diffusionist anthropologists. He became particularly hostile to the *Kulturkreise* studies of the “Vienna school,” represented by Wilhelm Schmidt and Wilhelm Koppers. Although he was impressed by Schmidt’s extensive literary knowledge of all areas of ethnography, Nordenskiöld objected to Schmidt’s schematic presentations and dogmatic speculations. Nordenskiöld was an empiricist, just as Westermarck was, and by the 1910s he had distanced himself from the philosophical and speculative styles of German ethnography. Instead, he had begun to develop his own version of the empirical cultural history tradition, a middle way between evolutionism and diffusion (Lindberg 1995b). Most of his earlier field reports and investigations were written in German, but from the 1920s and onward he favoured French journals. However, the bulk of Nordenskiöld’s multi-disciplinary investigations were published in the ten volumes of his serial publication, *Comparative Ethnographical Studies* (1916-33), including (but not limited to) treatises on the “copper and bronze age in South America” and Amerindian inventions. The decision to write in English

was probable a direct result of his increasing interaction with American scholars. The first volume of the series was originally written and published in German, but Nordenskiöld translated it and wrote the rest of the volumes in English. *Comparative Ethnographical Studies* was also to be published in Paris with the assistance of Paul Rivet. For unknown reasons the project became postponed and the French translations still remain unpublished (Lindberg 1995b).

For Nordenskiöld and his students, the framework of historically-oriented anthropology suggested two fundamental questions about the New World's Indian cultures. One, were similar material cultural elements found among various Indian tribes the products of independent invention or diffusion? Two, had cultural elements spread between the Old and New World in pre-Columbian times—a particularly controversial matter? Combining the methods of archaeology, geography and ethnography, Nordenskiöld was able to develop an analytical approach that utilized collections of material artifacts, cartographic reconstructions, and meticulous research in older literature. In his synthetic method, historical research reconstructed the prehistoric epoch as a sequence of events, and anthropological and archaeological techniques permitted this sequence of events to be traced, based upon its consequences. Nordenskiöld was also convinced that natural factors drove series of changes on culture, which could be plotted by tracing specific historic sequences of adaptation. Regarding the environment primarily as a limiting factor did not preclude the possibility that nature could also function as a cultural stimulant,

as was proven by the development of certain human innovations. Thus, it was very important for the Nordenskiöld School to make maps of migrations. Furthermore, Nordenskiöld also paid considerable attention to the causes of migration. War, employment opportunities, water shortages, and religious beliefs were some of the factors he analyzed in his mapping of migratory waves, seasonal migrations and relocations (Lindberg 1995b).

Considering the spatial dispersal of ethnographic artefacts, Nordenskiöld could provide analysis documented by material culture. When he attempted to determine temporal sequences in Indian cultural development, however, he had to use indirect evidence. His primary database consisted of archaeological discoveries, which relied upon relative dating methods in the days before the development of radiocarbon dating. Linguistic data were also of some utility, as were historical reconstructions based upon the later spread of material cultural elements. But his assertion that there had been high cultural forms in the Amazon area that influenced Meso-American high cultures via early migrations was controversial in his day. His reconstruction of chronological sequences in South America was generally ignored until archaeologist Donald W. Lathrap published his work *The Upper Amazon* in 1970. New archaeological discoveries, technological improvements in dating methods, and ethno-botanical research substantiated Nordenskiöld's depiction of pre-Columbian migrations.

In the international spotlight

To promote *l'étude historique et scientifique de deux Amériques et de leur habitants* and gather scholars working in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, religion, history, ethnology, geography, and linguistics, the first international congress of Americanists was held in Nancy, France in 1875. It was followed by meetings in Paris, Berlin, London, Stockholm, Mexico City, and New York. In the early days of his career, Nordenskiöld had been sceptical about the value of such congresses. But his international contacts expanded when he moved from Stockholm to Gothenburg in 1913, and also when he embarked on his fifth expedition to South America (1913-14). Moreover, when he found that his intellectual exchanges with overseas colleagues were disrupted while World War I raged, he may have realized just how important these exchanges were to him. In 1915, he began contemplating staging an Americanist Congress in Sweden (Nordenskiöld to Rafael Karsten, GUB: 8/20/1915).

Shortly after the end of the war, Nordenskiöld moved to realize this project, seeking the support of his closest friends, the Danish ethnographer Kaj Birket-Smith and Paul Rivet of the Trocadero Museum in Paris. In July 1920, Birket-Smith, wrote to him, "I find the idea of an Americanist Congress in Gothenburg absolutely splendid." (GUB: 7/16/1920). A month later, Nordenskiöld contacted Franz Boas in New York. Both men were distressed by the rejection by many British, French and American scholars of the possibility that they might have any contact with colleagues in Germany and Austria.

Indeed, some French publishers even refused to mail books to German-speaking countries (GEM: 8/19/1920; 10/31/1921).

The suggestion that an international congress of this magnitude should be held in Sweden led to divided opinions both in France and in the United States. Boas sided with Nordenskiöld and Rivet in promoting a Congress in Sweden, while Ales Hrdlicka and William Henry Holmes supported Arnold van Gennep's proposal that there should be yet another meeting in Paris. But Nordenskiöld was determined, knowing that he had the support of German, Austrian and Dutch scholars. "It must be held in a country that has been neutral during the war," he argued, adding that "members of the congress should be, first and foremost, specialists." (GEM: Nordenskiöld to Boas, 1/23/1922).

Finally, it was decided that proceedings of the Congress would be split between the Netherlands and Sweden. Originally scheduled for 1922, the 21st Congress of Americanists was not convened until August 1924. Papers pertaining to North and Central America were presented in the Hague, and lectures and discussions about the Inuit and South American peoples took place in Gothenburg. This division made sense because Nordenskiöld was an authority on South American Indians, while a number of Danish scholars were specialists in Eskimo studies. A post-seminar was planned for Copenhagen, and yet another international meeting in Prague was put on the agenda (GEM 12/7/1921; 2/22/1924).

World wide problems impeded the staging of the Congress. The world economy was very unstable, and while post-war Europe suffered from economic depression, unemployment, epidemics, and starvation, it was difficult to raise the funds necessary to assemble an international group of scholars. In a local newspaper, a frustrated Nordenskiöld complained: “How will it be possible for an Austrian scholar to go to Sweden under the present economic situation?” To a few scholars, including Waldemar Bogoras of Leningrad, he managed to offer modest travel grants (GEM 5/20/1924). A special invitation was extended to John Cooper of the Catholic University in Washington, who was, according to Nordenskiöld, “one of the few scholars who really have a great knowledge of the old Spanish sources” and the compiler of some excellent biographical works on Tierra del Fuego. Boas suggested that Edward Sapir was equally deserving of treatment that would place him in a prominent role at the Congress (GEM 12/27/1923; 5/24/1924; 7/4/1924; 7/19/1924); in the end, however, only Cooper was able to come to Sweden.

Nevertheless, the Congress became a multi-disciplinary event, with representatives from social and cultural anthropology, ethnography, archaeology, linguistics, geography, history and physical anthropology. Franz Boas was “the Great Man” and Karl von den Steinen the “Grand Old Man” of the Congress. Swedish newspaper coverage was extensive, with articles on Rafael Karsten as “a profound researcher” and Max Uhle as “the foremost expert on American antiquities.” Presenting reports from the Fifth Thule Expedition led by Knud Rasmussen to the Hudson Bay area in 1921, the

Danish scholars Kaj Birket-Smith and Therkel Mathiassen gained considerable attention both in the media and at their Congress workshops. Other prominent participants were Stewart Culin of the Brooklyn Museum, Theodore Koch-Grünberg of the Linden Museum of Stuttgart, and Nordenskiöld's close friend Paul Rivet.

During the week of the Congress, more than eighty presentations were given, notable among them Karsten's "The Preanimistic Theory in the Lights of South American Beliefs", Métraux' "Sur un mode Américain du rite du Balancement" (Concerning an American Rite of Balance), and Max Uhle's "Der mittelamerikanische Ursprung der Moundbuilder und Pueblcivilisationen" ("The Middle American Origin of the Moundbuilder and Pueblo Civilization"). Matters covered included patterns of migration, social and political organization, religion and witchcraft, as well as astronomy and mathematics. Intensively debated were historical questions about the relationship between the Old and New World: about migration from Asia to America (the origin of the "Indian race"); about the discovery of America; and about the possibilities for cultural exchanges in pre-Columbian times. Congress participants' theoretical discussions were dominated by concepts of evolution, diffusion, cultural areas, and cultural elements. A split between a European view of diffusion (the *Kulturkreis* theory) and an American cultural history based upon historical connections and diffusion within the American continents was obvious. The German/Austrian position was held by Schmidt and Koppers, while the American version was represented by Boas, Clark Wissler, and Robert

Lowie. Within the framework of a *New History of Anthropology*, it is quite interesting to note that at this major international conference in 1924 there was yet no trace of what Adam Kuper (1983:1) has referred to as the “functionalist revolution,” which has for him been denoted by Malinowski’s appointment as a Reader at London School of Economics in that year. Obviously, the Anglo-American variants of diffusionism were consistent with the ideas that were shared by most Continental European anthropologists at the time, despite the differences that obtained among different groups of diffusionists. It is of some interest that Robert Lowie would later say of Nordenskiöld that he was able to steer “a middle course between an outdated evolutionism and an extravagant diffusionism,” coming “closer” than most scholars elsewhere “to the attitude commonly assumed in this country.” (1933, 160).

At the Conference, Nordenskiöld seemed to be everywhere at once, and “displayed solicitude for the individual comfort of the foreign guests that will be gratefully remembered” (Lowie 1933:159). Between sessions, he guided groups around the museum, proudly presenting a new archaeological collection made in the Amazon area of Rio Tapajus by Curt Unkel, whom Nordenskiöld characterized as “one of the best in the field,” and reporting “that he has been adopted among the Guarani tribe under the name of Nimuendajú” (Göteborgs Handelstidning 11/8/1924).

The 21st International Congress of Americanists was a tremendous personal success for Nordenskiöld. The curator of the American Museum of

Natural History wrote him a letter stating: “from everyone who visited Gothenburg I hear the most enthusiastic reports, not only of the success of the congress, but of your museum, which is uniformly admired as the best in Europe if not in the world.” (GEM: Mason to Nordenskiöld 12/31/1924)

Melville Herskovits of Columbia University praised Nordenskiöld’s serial publication, *Comparative Ethnographical Studies*, saying “I only wish that I may be able to write such a work regarding Africa.” (GEM 1/7/1925)

The decline of the Westermarck and Nordenskiöld Schools

Nordenskiöld was at the peak of his career, making full use of his international contacts, his American colleagues in particular. He and Robert Lowie made an agreement to edit and compile a *Handbook of South American Indians* in two volumes. The contributors were to be mainly European scholars, including Rivet, Métraux, Karsten, and Nordenskiöld himself. Alfred Kroeber invited him to be a visiting professor at Berkeley, and Nordenskiöld took advantage of the opportunity to make a sixth expedition to South America that this overseas visit provided; on this occasion, he went to Panama and Colombia. Doing research among the Cuna Indians, he was breaking new ground, most notably in his collaboration with his informant, Ruben Pérez Kantule. Unfortunately, however, his health was failing, and he died in 1932 at the age of fifty-five. Although several of his students made distinguished careers as museum curators and archaeologists, his death marked the end of an era. Lowie managed to take over the sponsorship of Nimuendajú research in the Amazon,

but publication of the *Handbook* took far longer than had been anticipated. Eventually edited by Julian H. Steward and published by the Bureau of American Ethnology in seven volumes, it became an American enterprise, not a European one (although it did include contributions by Métraux and Claude Lévi-Strauss).

Becoming a prophet at home is indeed difficult according to Swedish folk-wisdom. After Nordenskiöld's death, his professorship in "general and comparative ethnography" was eliminated, and it took more than twenty-five years before anthropology re-entered the curriculum at the University of Gothenburg. With the exception of Izikowitz, his students pursued their careers in the ethnographic museums of Gothenburg and Stockholm. Thus, they were all marginalized when the "modern Swedish anthropology", inspired by the works of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, disassociated itself from the ethnographic museums in the 1960s (Lindberg 1995b). Replacing the old Ethnographical Museum in Gothenburg, a Museum of World Culture was opened in December of 2004. Obviously trying to disassociate itself from its historical legacy, the new museum pays no homage whatsoever to Nordenskiöld, or to any of his students. From a single small display, almost hidden in a corner of a stairway, the visitor may sense that the museum has a history by looking at a desk with an old typewriter, a few books, and some museum catalogue cards scattered about. There is also an installation by an American artist who was commissioned to select a collection of old photographs from the archives. Knowing nothing about the actual collaboration between

Nordenskiöld and Kantule, or the strong friendship between the Gothenburg scholars and the Cuna Indians, the artist created a representation of colonial relationships. This installation is an insult to Nordenskiöld as well as to the Cuna people.

Even if Nordenskiöld's enduring legacy to general anthropology was limited, his teaching and fieldwork experience made him a decisive influence in various quarters. His work is still held in high esteem by scholars specializing in South American archaeology and ethnography. His innovative museum exhibits, which combined the use of artefacts, regional descriptions, maps, and photographs were highly influential. Rivet patterned the collections of Trocadero (later Musée de l'Homme) after his example, and so did Birket-Smith in the ethnographic collections in the National Museum of Denmark (Lindberg 1997, Vildé 1938–39, Wassén 1932). As a fieldworker, Nordenskiöld influenced both his students and later generations of Swedish Americanists. The highest homage to him was paid by Alfred Métraux, who always spoke of Nordenskiöld as his great teacher, best friend and inspiration (not Marcel Mauss, who might seem a more probable influence).

At the time of Nordenskiöld's death, the Finnish school was also in decline. Regarding Westermarck as one of the leading theorists of the evolutionary school, Émile Durkheim was one of the first to question his writings on marriage and morals. (Westermarck wrote his books in English and Swedish and it was Arnold van Gennep, alienated from Durkheim's circle, who translated and promoted Westermarck's works in France.) But the most

decisive rejection of his approach was in Britain, where Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown's functionalist social anthropology rejected any attempts to reconstruct the unknown past, proscribing all considerations of hypothetical historical origins (see. e.g., Radcliffe-Brown, 1931). Westermarck replied in his Huxley Memorial Lecture that he and the functionalists were arguing at cross-purposes: for them, consideration of the origin of an institution meant determining its causes, whereas he was concerned to understand its historical development (1936). His friend R. R. Marett congratulated Westermarck on his lecture, remarking , "Well, we are all getting old, but are not 'done' yet, and have something to say to the younger generation." (ÅAB: Marett to Westermarck, 10/30/1936)

Although not a dogmatic evolutionist, Westermarck was never able to abandon his comparative approach, and was not able to provide insight into economic and political conditions, and how these influenced the development of customs and ceremonies (Suolinna 1997:268). Westermarck died in 1939, but it was his students who had to confront a changing intellectual climate in Finland and abroad. Under the banner of "a new sociology," the empirical and comparative approaches of Westermarckian ethnology were abandoned in favour of more philosophical and theoretical positions. None of Westermarck's students managed to pursue a successful international career. Wars and troublesome relations with the Soviet Union contributed to the relative isolation of Finnish academe. Nevertheless, Westermarck's students failed not only by virtue of their limited international contacts but also because of conditions at

home. Landtman secured a professorship in sociology, but did no more fieldwork. Karsten ruined his reputation as an able scholar and fieldworker in numerous polemical debates with Nordenskiöld, Rivet, Stirling and others. Granqvist's thesis, *Marriage Conditions in a Palestinian Village* (1931-35), aroused only marginal interest in her home country, notwithstanding the good reviews it received in international sociological journals. In fact, even with Westermarck's strong support, she was deliberately made a marginal figure in the university by her colleagues, not least by Landtman. Every chance for an academic career was effectively foreclosed when her application for an associate professorship was unsuccessful. Still she managed to publish three important scholarly works after the Second World War – *Birth and Childhood among the Arabs* (1947), *Child Problems among the Arabs* (1950) and *Muslim Death and Burial* (1965). Lately, her works have received renewed attention, evaluated in international forums by Zilberman (1991) and Suolinna (1997).

Suolinna (1998) concludes that the stagnation of the Westermarck school was the result of Westermarck's failure to encourage his students to explore new perspectives; he had become an overbearing and therefore constraining force in scholarly discussions. Westermarck's behaviour as an elder statesman may have been an important reason for the decline of the Westermarck school, but I would like to stress institutional factors—which figured in the decline of the Nordenskiöld school as well as that of the Westermarck school. Simply by virtue of their geography, Finnish and Swedish scholars are easily marginalized. Scholars in small countries have difficulties

getting research grants, assuming prominence in anthropological associations, and placing their articles in international journals. Both Westermarck and Nordenskiöld faced the difficulty of establishing ethnography as a significant scientific field. Westermarck's strategy, as noted above, was to regard it as a branch of sociology, sometimes called ethno-sociology. The anthropology of the Westermarck school moved across the borders of philosophy, sociology and history of religion, but did not secure an independent status until much later. Nordenskiöld was confronted by the same difficulty. It was impossible to do ethnography within the Swedish university curriculum in the early twentieth century; thus, his institutional base was of necessity in the museum. The Swedish university discipline of social and cultural anthropology was not established until the 1960s, and the new generation of scholars felt compelled to distance their discipline from any "stone-age" museum tradition.

Suggestions for further reading

Lowie, R. H. 1937. *The History of Ethnological Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Voget, F. W. 1975. *A History of Ethnology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

References

Manuscript sources

Etnografiska Museet, Stockholm (EMS)

–MS. Erland Nordenskiöld, correspondence.

Göteborgs Etnografiska Museum/Museum of World Culture (GEM)

–MS. Correspondence 1933-1941.

Göteborgs Universitetsbibliotek, Göteborg (GUB).

–MS. Erland Nordenskiöld, private correspondence K1-K10.

–MS. Erland Nordenskiöld, foreign correspondence.

–MS. Erland Nordenskiöld, letters to Kaj Birket-Smith. Provis kat. 168.

Åbo Akademi Bibliotek, Handskriftssamlingen, Åbo/Turko (ÅAB)

–MS. Edward Westermarck's letters and manuscripts.

Published works

Allardt, E. 1997. *The History of the Social Sciences in Finland 1828–1918*.

Ekenäs: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

_____ 2000. "Edward Westermarck: A Sociologist Relating Nature and Culture." *Acta Sociologica*, 43:299-306.

Brunius, S.

1984. "Carl V. Hartman: Svensk arkeolog - etnograf i Centralamerika" (Carl V. Harman: Swedish Archaeologist - Ethnographer in Central America").

Stockholm: *Institute of Latin American Studies*, Occasional Papers.

Congrès International des Américanistes. 1925. *Compte-rendu de la XXIE Session, Deuxième Partie, Tenue à Göteborg en 1924*. Göteborg: Göteborgs Museum.

Karsten, R. 1954. "Some critical remarks on Ethnological Field-research in South America." *Societas Scientiarum Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, Vol XIX, No 5.

Kuper, A. 1983. *Anthropology and anthropologists: The Modern British school*. Revised edition. London/New York: Routledge.

Lindberg, C. 1995a. "It Takes More than Fieldwork to Become a Culture Hero of Anthropology." *Anthropos* 90: 525-531.

_____ 1995b. *Erland Nordenskiöld: en antropologisk biografi* ("Erland Nordenskiöld: An Anthropological Biography"). Lund: Lund Studies in Social Anthropology No. 5.

_____ 1997. "El museo – como libro y situación de campo: El visionario Erland Nordenskiöld" (The Museum as a Field of Knowledge: The Vision of Erland Nordenskiöld). *Erland Nordenskiöld: investigador y amigo del indígena*, edited by Jan-Åke Alvarsson. Quito: Abya Yala.

Lowie, Robert H. 1933. "Erland Nordenskiöld." *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 35: 158-164.

Numelin, R. 1947. *Fältforskare och kammarlärde: Drag ur socialantropologiens idéhistoria* ("Fieldworkers and Bookish Persons: Notes on the History of Social Anthropology"). Helsingfors: Söderström & Co. Förlagsaktiebolag.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1958 (1931). "The Present Position of Anthropological Studies," in M. N. Srinivas, ed., *Method in Social Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Salomaa, I. 2002. *Rafael Karsten (1879-1956) as a Finnish Scholar of Religion: The Life and Career of a Man of Science*. Helsinki: The University Press.

Stroup, T. 1991. "Westermarck, Edward Alexander". *International Dictionary of Anthropologists*, edited by Christopher Winters. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Suolinna, K. 1993. "Rituals of Passage in Islamic Folkculture – A Comparison Between Studies by Edward Westermarck and Hilma Granqvist." *Westermarck et la société marocaine*. Rabat: Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.

_____ 1997. "Focusing on fieldwork: Edward Westermarck and Hilma Granqvist before and after Bronislaw Malinowski". *Approaching religion based on papers read at the Symposium on Methodology in the Study of Religion held at Turku, Finland, on the 4th–th August*. Åbo: Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History.

_____ 1998. "Edward Westermarck in the Light of Correspondence Exchanged with His Students and Colleagues". Paper presented at Marriage, Morality and Emotions: An International Symposium in Helsinki, Finland, November 19–22.

Vildé, B. 1938–39. "L'ethnologie française et le Musée de l'Homme" ("The French Ethnology at Musée de l'Homme"). *Aikakauskirja: Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne*, Vol. L.

Wassén, S. H. 1932. "Le Musée Ethnographique de Göteborg et l'oeuvre d'Erland Nordenskiöld" ("The Gothenburg Ethnographical Museum and the

Legacy of Erland Nordenskiöld“). Tucuman: *Universidad Nacional, Instituto de etnología, Revista*.

Watters, D. R. & Zamora, O. F. 2002. “Expeditions, Expositions, Associations, and Museums in the Anthropological Career of C. V. Hartman”. *Annals of Carnegie Museum*, Vol. 71, No. 4: 261-299.

Westermarck, E. 1891. *The History of Human Marriage*. London: Macmillan.

_____ 1908a. *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*. London: Macmillan.

_____ 1908b. “Sociology as a University Study.” *Inauguration of the Martin White Professorships of Sociology*. London: University of London.

_____ 1926. *Ritual and belief in Morocco*. London: Macmillan.

_____ 1930. *Wit and Wisdom in Morocco*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

_____ 1932. *Ethical Relativity*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.,.

_____ 1936. “Methods in Social Anthropology.” Huxley Memorial Lecture. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 66: 223-248.

Zilberman, Y. 1991. "Ethnographic notebook: 'Hilma Granquist and Artas: A Finnish anthropologist in Israel'." *Cambridge Anthropology*, Vol 15, No 1: 56-69.