The devastating fire in the 200-year-old Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 2018, demonstrates the vital importance of the historiography of sciences and the arts. As most collections have vanished, it is left to the history of science to pick up the pieces and present past developments in their complexity and global entanglements.

In this special issue we aim to do this for the work of German and German-speaking anthropologists in Latin America, with a special focus on Brazil, carried out between the 1880s and 1945. This period was important in the history of anthropology as ethnography, its most enduring incarnation, led to a strong and varied research tradition in the German-speaking countries, including Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. This tradition has a long and chequered history, going back to the early eighteenth century (Vermeulen, 2015), but it came to fruition in the work of Adolf Bastian (1826-1905), director of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, and his associates Karl von den Steinen (1855-1929) and Franz Boas (1858-1942) (Figures 1-3).

The articles assembled here discuss various forms of ethnographic research and writing, the institutionalization of anthropology in Latin America, and the impact of German or German-speaking anthropologists on the trajectory the discipline took in Europe and elsewhere. They emphasize how these scholars con-
ducted research by means of peer-working with colleagues from museums and institutes based in German-language countries as well as with scholars and intellectuals in Latin America. Our focus on transnational networks demonstrates the strong and longstanding relations between scientific communities in Western and Central Europe with scientific communities in the Americas. Many of these scholars became “brokers” – *passeurs culturels* (Sanjad, 2015: 77) – between these communities.

The present issue is opened by Renate Brigitte Viertler, who presents von den Steinen’s ethnographic research in Brazil conducted during expeditions to the Xingu River in 1884 and 1887-88. Diego Ballestero analyzes the anthropological and ethnological studies carried out by Robert Lehmann-Nitsche in Patagonia, Argentina, 1898-1919. Peter Rohrbacher discusses astronomy, mythology, and Ancient Mexican Studies in Austria between 1910 and 1945, i.e., until the end of World War II. Michael Kraus places Max Schmidt’s ethnographic research pertaining to his doctoral thesis, *Die Aruaken* (The Arawak, 1917), in the context of contemporary German ethnology. Erik Petschelies focuses on Theodor Koch-Grünberg, a “field ethnologist” who stood in close contact with Brazilian intellectuals. Finally, Peter Schröder’s article about Curt Nimuendajú as a collector and researcher for ethnological museums in Germany discusses an episode in the history of German and Brazilian anthropology during the Weimar Republic, 1928-1930.

These articles result from meetings of the History of Anthropology Network (HOAN) as part of a larger effort to provide more visibility to anthropological traditions that influenced the development of anthropology and ethnography beyond the hegemonic tradition of the English-speaking parts of the world (Ribeiro, 2006, 2014), in this case in Latin America. Five of the articles were originally presented during panels at the EASA conference in Milan (2016), the GGA conference in Berlin (2017), and the IUAES World Congress in Florianópolis (2018). They have been extensively rewritten and edited for the present purpose. The sixth article, by Michael Kraus, is the slightly expanded English version of an article that will soon also appear in Portuguese; it is published here for the first time.

Anthropology is understood here as a generic term for a group of studies including ethnology, ethnography, social anthropology, cultural anthropology, folklore studies, prehistoric archaeology, linguistics, biological anthropology, etc.
A selection hereof is included in anthropology as defined in the US American "four-field approach": cultural anthropology (previously referred to as ethnology), linguistics, archaeology, and biological anthropology. While the boundaries between these fields vary between national traditions in Europe, the UK, the USA, Latin America, or Asia, "anthropology" serves best to classify these specialties under a general label. For historical purposes, however, it is vital to study these traditions from a historicist perspective and use the terms practitioners applied to the fields they worked on. In the articles presented here, these comprised ethnology, linguistics, archaeology, and anthropology, i.e., biological anthropology. Whereas the four-field approach was first formulated in the Anthropological Society of Washington’s statutes of 1879 to include “Archaeology, Somatology, Ethnology, and Philology” (Vermeulen, 2015: 8, 422), the three-field Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Archaeology was founded in 1869.

TRAVELERS AND EXPLORERS

Travelers, explorers, missionaries, and scholars from present-day Austria, Germany, and Switzerland have visited parts of South and Central America and the Caribbean either on voyages of exploration or individually for at least 300 years. They have produced a significant body of knowledge concerning nature and indigenous groups of the southern and central parts of the Americas, including Brazil. Learning about nature often depended on the knowledge accumulated by native groups, translated through European expressions of curiosity.

German-speaking travelers were not the only ones. The first reports describing Brazil and its inhabitants were written by the Portuguese chroniclers Pero Vaz de Caminha (c.1450-1500) and Pero Gândavo (c.1540-1580), the Spanish Jesuits José de Anchieta (1534-1597) and Christóbal de Acuña (1597-c.1676), the Portuguese Jesuit Manuel da Nóbrega (1517-1570), the Portuguese explorer Gabriel Soares de Souza (c.1540-1591), the French Franciscan priest André Thevet (1502-1590), and the French Reformed pastor Jean de Léry (1536-1613).

The earliest German “reporter” was Hans Staden (c.1525-c.1576), a soldier and mariner who made two journeys to South America in Portuguese ships. On his second voyage, Tupinambá warriors captured Staden in 1552, assuming him to be Portuguese. Knowing Tupi after a 3-year sojourn in Brazil, Staden managed to sur-

Figure 3
Franz Boas posing for a figure in the diorama titled “Hamats’a coming out of secret room” at the United States National Museum, c. 1895. (Credit: National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, USA, Negative No. MNH 8302)
vive for months among his captors before finally escaping. During his captivity he observed many aspects of their culture, which he recorded in a two-part narrative: *Warhaftige Historia* (printed at Marburg, 1557). A recent translation into English is titled *Hans Staden’s True History* (2008).

During the seventeenth century, information on Brazilian Indians was acquired by the French Franciscan Claude d’Abbeville (c.1590-1632) and Capuchin Yves d’Evreux (1570-1630); the Dutch merchant Joannes de Laet (1581-1649); the Dutch theologian and historian Caspar Barlaeus (1584-1648); the Flemish interpreter and ambassador of the West Indian Company Roulox Baro (see Albuquerque, 2006); the Spanish Jesuit Antonio Ruiz de Montoya (1585-1652); and the Portuguese auditor Maurício de Heriarte.

During the Dutch interlude (1637-1644), the German naturalist and astronomer, Georg Marcgraf (1610-1644), served as a member of Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen’s mission to Recife in northeastern Brazil (Disney, 2009: 225). The published work of Marcgraf and Willem Piso (1611-1678), the Dutch physician and naturalist on this mission, included zoological, botanical, and ethnographic accounts as well as notes on medical plants, the first astronomical observations, and a lexicon including notes on Tupi and other languages: *Historia naturalis Brasiliae* (1648); the book was richly illustrated with woodcuts by the Dutch artist Albert Eckhout (c.1610-1665).

Another German naturalist active in Latin America was Maria Sibylla Merian (1647-1717). This illustrator traveled to Surinam in 1699-1701 on presumably “the first European voyage exclusively for scientific fieldwork” (Valiant, 1993: 470). Merian pioneered the metamorphosis of natural species, especially insects, as well as the classification of tropical fauna and flora. Her work influenced biologists such as Linnaeus and Darwin, but somehow fell out of the canon (Valiant, 1993: 475). Recently “re-covered,” she stands out as a major figure in the fields of biology and anthropology, and is especially noted for her ethnographic manner of interviewing Native Americans and Africans about their uses of plants for healing purposes, thereby anticipating future ethnobotanical research (Valiant, 1993; Todd, 2007).

Two Austrian missionaries from Bohemia, Martin Dobrizhoffer (1717-1791) and Florian Paucke (1719-1779), worked in Paraguay from 1748 to 1768 and contributed to the ethnography of the Gran Chaco (Kitzmantel, 2004).

During the eighteenth century (systematic) ethnography and ethnology were developed in the Russian Empire, the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, the universities of Halle and Göttingen, and in Vienna. German explorers such as the naturalist Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt (1685-1735), the historian Gerhard Friedrich Müller (1705-1783), and the naturalist Johann Georg Gmelin (1709-1755) described indigenous groups in Siberia. Müller developed an ethnographic program for the description of all Siberian peoples and their comparison among each other and with peoples of other continents. His influence extended to all later explorers.
of the Russian Empire as well as to historians such as August Ludwig Schlözer (1735-1809) in Göttingen and Adam František Kollár (1718-1783) in Vienna, who coined the terms Völkerkunde (1771) and ethnologia (1783), respectively (Vermeulen, 2015, 2019).

One of Schlözer’s students, Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), set off on an epoch-making expedition through South America between 1799 and 1804. Together with the botanist Aimé Bonpland and Carlos de Montúfar, von Humboldt carried out a 5-year investigation of the interrelations between nature and the populations of Mexico, Colombia, and of districts bordering on the Orinoco and Amazon Rivers, i.e., not in Brazil.

Subsequent expeditions included the journey of Prince Maximilian zu Wied-Neuwied (1782-1867), a zoologist and disciple of the anatomist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach in Göttingen, who arrived in Brazil in 1815 and acquired ethnographic and anthropological material among the Botocudo Indians residing in the provinces of Bahia and Rio de Janeiro; his monograph avoided the prejudices of his time (Baldus, 1954-68, 1: 12).

In 1817, the zoologist Johann Baptist von Spix (1781-1826) and the botanist Carl Friedrich Phillip von Martius (1794-1868) arrived in Brazil as members of a group of Austrian naturalists to accompany Maria Leopoldina of Austria. Departing from São Paulo in 1820, both men reached Maranhão to then travel up the Amazon River coming across Indians who were culturally influenced by colonization. Although Martius held views on “degenerated Indians” that are now unacceptable, he proposed a linguistic classification that proved useful to Karl von den Steinen’s and Paul Ehrenreich’s work on languages almost a century later (Baldus, 1954-68, 1: 12-13). Martius’s essay titled “How the history of Brazil should be written” (1845), awarded by the recently inaugurated Institute for Brazilian History and Geography in 1843, influenced the historiography of Brazil as developed by Francisco Varnhagen as well as the sociological program carried out by Gilberto Freyre and others.

Another naturalist accompanying the Archduchess Leopoldina, Johann Natterer (1787-1843), acquired ethnographic objects in Southern, Central, and Northern Brazil between 1817 and 1835, which are now kept at the Vienna Museum of Ethnology (Augustat, 2012).

Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff (1774-1852), a German-Russian physician who served as the Russian consul in Rio de Janeiro from 1813 on, carried out an expedition between 1824 and 1829. Organized by Tsar Alexander I, Dom Pedro I, and José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva this expedition aimed at promoting commercial relations between the Brazilian and Russian empires. At that time, Bonifácio, who was also a mineralogist, invited his friend Alexander von Humboldt to come to Brazil in order to assist in increasing the yield of gold mines. Declining this invitation, von Humboldt travelled to Russia in 1827, at the invitation of Tsar Nicholas I, to study the gold and silver mines of Central Asia.

---


8 See Martius (1845), Salgado Guimarães (1988), Contijo (2010).
EXPLORERS AND FIELDWORKERS

The articles in this issue take up the discussion with two research expeditions led by Karl von den Steinen to Brazil during the 1880s (Figure 4). Inspired by the ethnologist Adolf Bastian,\(^9\) von den Steinen conducted the first systematic ethnographic research in Brazil, following rigorous methodological steps German ethnographers had established during the preceding century. In analyzing von den Steinen’s work, as well as that of his contemporaries and successors, it is not so much the countries (Germany, Austria, Switzerland), but the language area (German) that interests us. Some of the topics discussed in the articles are: (1) How did their anthropology reflect the authors’ own experiences or wider representations of Latin America? (2) Which political, religious, social, and cultural factors influenced their research and reports? (3) What is the legacy of German-language anthropology in Latin America?

At the time of von den Steinen’s sojourn in Brazil, the economic frontier to the hinterland was rapidly expanding. The colonizing Brazilian and non-Brazilian population deemed the Indians as having occupied too much land (a view again cherished by the current administration), that they were “lazy” and “good to be killed.” In 1884, Dom Pedro II, Emperor of Brazil, assisted von den Steinen in exploring the possibilities of navigating along the Xingu River from Mato Grosso to Pará and then search for a fluvial connection that could benefit the regional economy.\(^10\) Although the latter plan failed, the Upper Xingu region was opened up to ethnographic research. Accompanied by two other scientists, two Brazilian assistants and a group of Brazilian soldiers, von den Steinen set off on his first Brazilian expedition to this isolated and relatively unknown region, where he met Bakairí, Kustenau, Trumai, Suyá, Manitsauá, Juruna, Nahukuá, Mehinako,

---

\(^9\) On Bastian, see e.g., Steinen (1905), Baldus (1968), Koepping (2001), Fischer et al. (2007), Kraus (2007).

\(^10\) Petschelies (2018) argues that Dom Pedro II was interested in the scientific results but also in maintaining his status as an intellectual. A fluvial connection to northern Brazil was especially in the interest of regional elites.
Yawalapiti, Aweti and Kamaiurá Indians. He revisited some of them during a second expedition (1887-88) when he also encountered Paresí Indians in Cuiabá and stayed among the Bororo residing in the Teresa Cristina colony along the São Lourenço River. These indigenous groups were already engaged in direct contact with the non-indigenous population of the Mato Grosso region. The extermination of the Indian population intensified in such a way that an Indian Protection Service was founded in 1910, aimed at transforming Brazilian Indians into good, hard-working citizens.

The period between 1880 and the end of World War I can be considered a Great Age of German-language anthropology in Latin America. A series of expeditions, field research, and ethnographic monographs from this period have become classics in Americanist ethnology. Well-known representatives, in addition to von den Steinen, are Paul Ehrenreich (1855-1914), Konrad Theodor Preuss (1869-1938), Theodor Koch-Grünberg (1872-1924), Max Schmidt (1874-1950), Felix Speiser (1880-1949), Fritz Krause (1881-1963), and several other anthropologists (see Kraus, 2004). The Brazilian anthropologist of German descent Curt Nimuendajú (1883-1945) worked in the same tradition, although he in later years of his career was influenced by North American anthropologists of the Boas school such as Robert H. Lowie (1883-1957) (Figures 5-9).

Other scholars of this era were the zoologist Hermann von Ihering (1850-1930), the botanist Ernst Heinrich Georg Ule (1854-1915), the archaeologist Friedrich Max Uhle (1856-1944), the Swiss naturalists Emil August Goeldi (1859-1917) and Jacques Huber (1867-1914), as well as the anthropologists Robert Lehmann-Nitsche (1872-1938), Wilhelm Kissenberth (1878-1944), Paul Kirchhoff (1900-1972), and Hermann Trimborn (1901-1986). Female scholars included the Austrian ethnologists Wanda Hanke (1893-1958), who studied indigenous groups in Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, and Paraguay to acquire important collections of artifacts she presented to museums in Europe, and Violetta Becker-Donner (1911-1975), who worked for the Ethnological Museum of Vienna and conducted fieldwork in Africa as well as in Central and Northern Brazil (Sombrio and Lopez, 2011; Sombrio, 2014). The latter’s husband, Hans Becker (1895-1948), worked on Indian studies in the Chaco Boreal (Becker, 1941).

In 1884, Goeldi disembarked in Rio de Janeiro, after being invited to work at the
Museu Imperial e Nacional, now the Museu Nacional (sadly consumed by fire in 2018). During his formative years, Goeldi travelled between Switzerland and Germany (Leipzig and Jena) and carried out research near Lake Biel and the Gulf of Naples (Sanjad and Güntert, 2015: 27-28). Having spent five years at the museum in Rio he was dismissed in 1890; three years later, the governor of Pará requested him to reorganize and chair the Pará Museum of Natural History and Ethnography, founded at Belém in 1866. Upon his arrival, Goeldi employed a team of Austrian, German, and Swiss zoologists and botanists to study human interactions with nature, which led to innovations in the fields of botanical geography, plant sociology, and ethnobotany (Sanjad, 2015). In his honor, the museum was renamed the “Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi” in 1902.

Two ornithologists were of significance to the ethnography of Brazil. Emílie Snethlage (1868-1929) made several research trips to the Xingu River, lived among the Xipaya and Kuruaya, and acquired artifacts for the Museum of Ethnology in Berlin. She later directed the Museu Goeldi in Belém and supported Nimuendajú’s research. Emile-Heinrich Snethlage (1897-1939) followed his aunt to Belém and undertook two expeditions in Brazil, the first of which for the Field Museum in Chicago; he later worked at the Berlin Museum. 13

THE GERMAN TRADITION

Anthropologists such as von den Steinen, Ehrenreich, Preuss, Koch-Grünberg, Schmidt, Kirchoff, Trimborn, and the archaeologist Uhle conducted research in all regions of the subcontinent: Mexico (Preuss, Kirchoff), Colombia (Preuss), the Andean region (Uhle, Trimborn), Patagonia (Lehmann-Nitsche), Chaco and Pantanal (Schmidt), and Amazonia (von den Steinen, Ehrenreich, Koch-Grünberg, Schmidt, Nimuendajú). German and Austrian museums supported their expeditions with clear objectives: to collect information on lesser-known regions and peoples, organize new ethnographic collections or complete existing ones and, in so doing, salvage testimonies of cultural diversity. In Imperial Germany, this financial support was nourished by a rivalry between ethnological museums, which were frequently maintained by donations from the local bourgeoisie (Penny, 2002). Thus, the opportunity to exhibit major ethnographic collections...
was part of a competition aimed at obtaining prestige.

These anthropologists shared thematic focuses: an interest in material culture, art, religion, mythology, and indigenous languages. These subjects were not studied in isolation, but understood as interconnected. At that time, the interest in material culture was related to the museum background of the majority of German and Austrian anthropologists, whereas the study of indigenous languages can be attributed both to linguistic instruction and to the idea that language could be the key to understanding the spiritual worlds of other people. As Vermeulen (2015) has demonstrated, the German-speaking ethnographers shared a strong linguistic tradition which, in principle, was not judgmental. In this connection, one may recall that two of Boas’ students, Alfred L. Kroeber (1876-1960) and Robert H. Lowie, who were of German and Austrian descent, respectively, also received extensive linguistic training.

The primary interest of German-speaking ethnographers was in so-called Naturvölker (natural peoples), i.e., peoples closely depending on nature. Until 1945, German-language anthropology in Latin America was almost a synonym of studying indigenous peoples, then called “Indians,” from an Americanist point of view. This implied that above all indigenous cultural “traits,” regarded as “original” or less influenced by non-indigenous societies, should be investigated in order to reconstruct cultural histories and illuminate the development of “people without history” (Wolf, 1982). This approach survived in the Boasian tradition of North American historical anthropology during the first half of the twentieth century.

Both traditions placed a strong emphasis on empirical work in the field, combined with efforts to catalogue as many details as possible. Whereas the research undertaken by von den Steinen, Ehrenreich or Krause consisted of research expeditions comprising sojourns of a few days in most indigenous villages, Schmidt, Koch-Grünenberg, Preuss, and Nimuendajú were forerunners of modern anthropological fieldwork with its stationary character (Kraus, 2004: 254-56, 288-90)—even if Malinowski (1922) was more successful in propagating the principles of anthropological fieldwork. It is important to underline that ethnologists such as Koch-Grünenberg actively reflected on fieldwork conditions and their implied subjectivities, contrary to current suppositions.
about that generation. However, they did this primarily in private correspondence, not in scientific publications, as Kraus (2004) has shown.

In addition to scholars, an educated middle-class (Bildungsbürgertum) in the German-speaking countries took an interest in exhibitions of ethnographic objects in museums and in reading ethnological literature written for a wider public. Therefore, von den Steinen, Koch-Grünberg, and Schmidt not only published articles and monographs according to the scholarly standards of their time, but also popular editions about their research, often full of lively descriptions of their expeditions and the people they had encountered.14

Regarding their theoretical assumptions, the majority of German-speaking ethnologists of the period under discussion were influenced by Adolf Bastian’s ideas about a comprehensive ethnology conceived as a “Universal Archive of Humankind” (Fischer et al., 2007). Whereas Alexander von Humboldt had emphasized the unity of nature, Bastian stressed the “psychic unity of mankind.” In the early twentieth century, ideas from the Vienna “culture circle” school led by Father Wilhelm Schmidt (1868-1954) were added to the “cultural history” program developed in Leipzig by Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904) and in Berlin by Fritz Graebner (1877-1934) and Bernhard Ankermann (1859-1943). The concept of Kulturkreise was inspired by Ratzel, named by Leo Frobenius (1873-1938) in 1897-98, formalized for Africa and Oceania by Ankermann and Graebner in 1905 and 1911, and further developed by Wilhelm Schmidt and his associates in the 1920s and 1930s (Eidson, 2017: 55); collectively these approaches are known as diffusjonism. By contrast, many ethnologists conducting research in the South American lowlands, above all Max Schmidt, criticized the “culture circle” theory in their publications. A common trait of German-language anthropology was the idea to map various cultures and even...
the cultures of humanity in a kind of synthesis of Bastian’s ethnology and Ratzel’s anthropogeography (Santini, 2018).

Distinctive for the German tradition in Latin American anthropologies was the practice of systematic empirical data collection. The aim of carrying out systematic, comprehensive ethnography by focusing on material and spiritual culture, on art, languages, myths, songs, folklore, etc., was a common denominator of this research tradition. The call for empirical work, and the ethnographic practice of German-language anthropology in both the eighteenth and the nineteenth century, offered a stance against speculative, evolutionist tendencies predominant in other national contexts, especially during the nineteenth century. Empiricism as an epistemology and a scientific practice was so relevant to German ethnology that Boas succeeded in transferring it to the American academic environment.

To illustrate the importance of this kind of research: Martin Gusinde SVD (1886-1969) undertook four research trips to Tierra del Fuego between 1918 and 1924, accompanied by Wilhelm Koppers SVD (1886-1961) on the third. Gusinde worked as a teacher in Santiago de Chile from 1912 to 1922, and as a volunteer at the Museo de Etnología y Antropología de Chile (at first as an associate of Max Uhle). Concluding his research in 1922-24 (Bornemann, 1970), Gusinde’s ethnography of three “tribes” of “Feurland-Indianer” is highly valued as these groups are now extinct or nearly extinct and because he, in documenting their cultural richness, refuted the idea of “uncivilized savages” common in Chile and Argentina at the time (Rabinovich, 1985: 397-398).

As von den Steinen cited Bastian in his obituary: it was vital to “salvage” items of material and spiritual culture “before it will be too late” (*Rettet! rettet! ehe es zu spät ist*. Steinen, 1905: 248). German-speaking ethnologists formed a small community in which almost everyone knew everybody else; depended on local assistants, interpreters, governors, missionaries, and state authorities; and cooperated with Latin American intellectuals. To cite only a few examples of such transnational interactions: Antonio Bakairí supported von den Steinen (Viertler, this issue); Juan Salva Marinau was a Mapuche informant who helped Lehmann-Nitsche (Ballestero, this issue); Max Schmidt’s Brazilian travel partner André is often cited in his accounts of the expedition in the Upper Xingu region (Kraus, this issue);
João Capistrano de Abreu, Teodoro Fernandes Sampaio, and Affonso d’Escragnolle Taunay were important academic interlocutors for Koch-Grünberg (Petschelies, this issue); and Carlos Estevão de Oliveira was not only one of Nimuendajú’s best friends, but also one of his most important financial supporters and political allies (Schröder, this issue) (Figure 10).

Thus, identifying scholars exclusively on the basis of national origins would be misleading. A focus on transnational networks is more useful for studying the connections between intellectual agendas, especially regarding the role of Brazilian academic institutions and individuals in joining scholars from different academic backgrounds.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL TRADITIONS IN BRAZIL

Herbert Baldus (1899-1970) and Emilio Willems (1905-1997) continued the tradition in São Paulo (Figures 11-12). Key players in the institutionalization of anthropology in Brazil, Willems and Baldus trained the next generation. From 1936 on, Willems held the chair of sociology at the Free School of Sociology and Politics (ELSP), founded in 1933, and at the University of São Paulo (USP), founded in 1934. Baldus accepted the chair of Brazilian ethnology at the Free School in 1939. That same year, Willems launched the Revista de Sociologia, the most important sociological and anthropological journal in Brazil for years. In 1941, Willems helped consolidate the teaching of anthropology by accepting a chair in anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences, and Literature of the USP. In 1947, antropologia was finally made a specialization in the diploma of the social sciences and one year later became a compulsory subject in courses on social sciences, geography, and history (Borges Pereira, 1994). Baldus coordinated the ethnological section of the Revista de Sociologia, through which new studies and translations of foreign authors circulated. This section included “suggestions for ethnographic investigations,” which helped define trends in anthropology and inspired younger scholars to find...
topics for their graduate studies (Borges Pereira, 1994).

Willems and Baldus influenced the next generation of Brazilian-born or immigrant social scientists, who would follow their professional agenda. Most of them were graduate candidates, research assistants, or students who had attended their courses. This generation included Oraça Nogueira (1917-1996), Gioconda Mussolini (1913-1969) and Virgínia Leone Bicudo (1915-2003), who earned their master's degrees in 1945; Lucila Hermann in 1946, Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995) in 1947, Fernando Altenfelder Silva (1916-1993) in 1949; Levy Cruz in 1951; Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1902-1982) in 1958. Other students of future relevance to Brazilian anthropology were Darcy Ribeiro (1922-1997), Juarez Brandão Lopes (1925-2011), Cândido Procópio Ferreira de Camargo (1922-1987), Alfonso Trujillo Ferrari, Egon Schaden (1913-1991), João Baptista Borges Pereira (b. 1930), David Maybury-Lewis (1929-2007), Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (1928-2006), Harald Schultz (1909-1966), and Thekla Hartmann (b. 1933) among others. Thus, Schaden, Hartmann, and Fernandes – some of the biggest names of the first generation of social scientists in Brazil – were former students of Willems and Baldus. When Willems left for Vanderbilt University in Nashville (USA) in 1949, his assistant Egon Schaden, born in Brazil, succeeded him as professor catedrático de Antropologia (full professor of anthropology) in 1952. Schaden founded the Revista de Antropologia at São Paulo in June 1953.

Up to the 1930s, the German-language tradition of ethnography and ethnology was central to structuring the development of Latin American anthropology. From the 1930s until the 1950s, however, when most Brazilian and Latin American research and teaching institutions were established, German-speaking anthropologists in Brazil had to compete with French and North American colleagues. Fernanda Peixoto (2001: 478) drew a sharp distinction between these disciplinary traditions: “Brazil chooses French scholars as masters. The North Americans select Brazil as their ‘object.’” The growing influence of French and North American scholars and academic institutions on the formation of the social sciences in Latin America coincided with the rise of National Socialism in Germany (1933-45). French cultural missions staffed institutions with scholars, especially teaching the humanities. Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009) held a visiting professorship in sociology at the University of São Paulo between 1935 and 1939. His first wife, Dina Dreyfus (1911-1999), worked as a visiting professor of ethnology at the same university. Together, they undertook an expedition to the Mato Grosso, studying the Kadiwéu and Bororó. The acquired artifacts were exhibited at the Musée de l’Homme in Paris: “Indiens du Mato-Grosso (Mission Claude et Dina Lévi-Strauss)” in 1937. The following year, they carried out a second expedition to the Nambikwara and Tupi-Kawahib, which lasted more than 6 months. During

---


17 For the impact of National Socialism on ancient Mexican studies in Austria, see Rohrbacher, this issue.

these expeditions Lévi-Strauss turned into an ethnologist and collected material for his first dissertation (1948b); his photographs were later published in Saudades do Brasil (1994). (Figure 13)

North American funding organizations, such as the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations, exerted a growing influence on the social sciences that were established in Latin America from the 1930s on (Miceli, 1993). Brazil and other parts of Latin America became a site for developing research, particularly concerning topics associated with racial relations and community studies. Of key significance was Donald Pierson (1900-1995), Robert E. Park’s Ph.D. student at the University of Chicago. Pierson conducted fieldwork in Bahia (1935-37) as part of the “Race and Cultural Contact” program supervised by Robert Redfield, Louis Wirth, Herbert Blumer, and Park. Park’s project of a comparative sociology pertaining to the integration of blacks and migrants in communities in the United States as well as globally, led members of the Chicago school to select Bahia as a research site, hereby resonating Rudiger Bilden’s 1929 characterization of Brazil as a “laboratory of civilization” (cited in Chor Maio, 1999: 142). After defending his thesis titled Cruz das Almas: A Brazilian Village at Chicago in 1939, Pierson returned to São Paulo to later officiate as professor at the Free School of Sociology and Politics as well as at the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences, and Literature of the USP, where he served until 1959. Working alongside Willems and Baldus, Pierson played an important role in training Brazilian social scientists through courses, fieldwork, and by co-supervising graduate researchers (Silva, 2012; Chor Maio and Costa Lopes, 2017).

After 1945, Bahia continued to be a major research site. Due to the atroci-
ties committed during World War II, the problem of “race” and race relations became a serious subject within the social sciences. From 1950 on, UNESCO commissioned a series of researches in Bahia concerning race relations and the integration of minorities. The Brazilian social scientist Arthur Ramos (1903-1949) delineated the guidelines of this UNESCO Project, which included research in several cities and regions in Brazil. The initial purpose, as summarized by Charles Wagley (1952: 1), was “to determine the economic, political, and psychological factors which influence such relations.” After the demise of Ramos, Alfred Métraux (1902-1963), having studied in Paris and Gothenburg and carrying out fieldwork among the Argentine Chaco, continued the coordination of the division “Racial Relations” in UNESCO’s Department of Social Sciences. In the following years, Brazilian and North American researchers published monographs in Portuguese, French or English dealing with case studies that continued this project, committed to display a country that remained “a lesson in racial democracy for the rest of the world.”  

In 1967, Egon Schaden “prematurely and hastily” resigned from his post at USP in order to occupy a chair in ethnology at the University of Bonn, where he had been a visiting professor several times (Figure 14). “Personal and family matters prevented him from accepting this position” (Borges Pereira, 1994: 253). At the same time, Lévi-Straussian structuralism was attracting most scholarly attention. “By the late 1960s, social anthropology had become the dominant, hegemonic orientation within anthropology” in Brazil (Peirano, 2018).
DECLINE OF THE GERMAN TRADITION

From the 1960s on, German-language anthropology suffered from a lack of interest to such an extent that references to German or German-speaking anthropologists have almost vanished from the canon of social sciences in Latin America. The Brazilian anthropologist of German descent, Renate Brigitte Viertler, who spent her career studying the Bororo and relating her fieldwork data to German, French, Italian, and English references, recently published a book on the foundations of German anthropology, which she opens with the statement that ethnological treatises written in German are no longer acknowledged in the majority of works on the history of anthropology written in English or French (Viertler, 2018: 15). Egon Schaden still discussed German-speaking ethnographers during Viertler’s first year of studies at the University of São Paulo in 1960-61, but these references gradually came to a halt. Today, in Brazil, German-language contributions to anthropology and ethnology are infrequently discussed in scholarly works or in lectures on anthropology.

Evidence of this amnesia can be found in the syllabi programs for anthropology courses in Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, etc. A study of syllabi for the Graduate Program for Social Anthropology at the Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro, one of the first and most prestigious graduate schools in anthropology in Latin America, inaugurated in 1968, indicates that the number of references to works by German-speaking ethnologists is extremely low. The only exceptions are a few works by Willems and some of his students, such as Schaden or Gioconda Musso-lini, offered in courses on “migration and community studies” and “ethnology of inter-ethnic contact.” Without being exhaustive, two observations can be made. First, works by von den Steinen, Nimuendajú, Max Schmidt, and Koch-Grünberg, or by Baldus and other ethnologists are notably absent, although they carried out important field research and contributed to the institutionalization of anthropology in Brazil. Second, German-speaking ethnologists such as Bastian and those who pursued fieldwork in Latin America are never referred to in courses on “Anthropological Theory” or “Ethnology.”

These findings are remarkable, considering that ethnography, one of anthropology’s most enduring roots, has been a strong research tradition, as the case of German-speaking ethnographers and ethnologists in Latin America presented in this issue demonstrates.

Yet another Brazilian anthropologist, Mariza Peirano, commented on this amnesia in 2004 and raised critical questions about the legacy of the German tradition in Brazil. In a paper presented at the “Anthropology of Anthropology Seminar” in São Paulo, she looked back on her study days in Cambridge, MA, and contrasted the loss of visibility of German ethnographers in Brazil with the high regard for their compatriots in North America:

20 These findings are even more striking when compared to the positive reception of German-language sociology in Brazil (Villas Bôas, 1997). In general, graduate students in the social sciences and philosophy in Latin America are well aware of the names of sociologists and philosophers such as M. Weber, G. Simmel, F. Tönnies, J. Habermas, N. Luhmann, N. Elias, K. Marx, R. Luxemburg, P. Lazarsfeld, etc., and less able to recognize the names of German-speaking anthropologists.
It was then [in 1977] that George Stocking Jr. spent a semester at Harvard. [...] It was during his classes that I raised the fateful question that would lead me to the thesis I finally wrote [Peirano, 1981]: If the German ethnographers who went to North America left behind a Franz Boas, why had we not gained an equivalent legacy from the ethnologists who came to Brazil as part of the same project? Why do our intellectual lineages so rarely go back to the German ethnographers from the late 19th century (except for Baldus, and Schaden, for example)? Why, after all, did the long-term ethnographic style never “catch on” in Brazil as it did in the United States? (A contemporary version of the same question might lead us to query why some currents never make it here [in Brazil], while others catch and stick, as obligatory “musts”.) (Peirano, 2004: 4 – our emphasis)

Peirano’s questions disclose a striking paradox: If we accept the fact that Brazil has been a major fieldwork destination for German-speaking scholars and a space in which writings that impacted mainstream anthropological theory have been developed, why does the German anthropological tradition experience such restricted visibility in Brazilian academia? The same can be said when referring to other Latin American academic contexts in which mainstream narratives tend to reinforce the relevance of British, North American or French anthropologies to the detriment of German-language anthropological contributions. Following Peirano’s suggestion, further interrogations could be added: why did the German-language anthropological tradition fall into oblivion in Latin America and how did that happen?

Of course, the amnesia and exclusion are not only due to the language barrier and the limited availability of the original publications in libraries around the world. Cultural and political factors play a role here, too. After both world wars (1914-18, 1939-45), German-speaking scholars suffered from a loss of academic prestige, the German language lost its position as an international language of science, and the number of scholars familiar with publications in German has dwindled in the century since 1918 (Eidson, 2017: 49).

The decline of this research tradition began with the defeat of the German and the Austro-Hungarian Empires in the course of World War I. After the Great War both empires suffered from economic crises and their academic institutions were downsized. The ensuing hyperinflation of the Weimar Republic (1918-33) affected the funding of anthropological research in Latin America, rendering it almost impossible for many years and even influenced anthropological periodicals. After World War I, only *Anthropos* continued to be regularly published. Curt Nimuendajú was forced to find financial support outside his usual networks and received assistance from Lowie in Berkeley, who sponsored his research from 1935 on (Schröder, this issue; Welper, 2018).
In addition to financial and institutional challenges, German and Austrian anthropology witnessed unfortunate theoretical orientations. The majority option, which favored diffusionist approaches, resulted in a theoretical dead end. Although some German-speaking anthropologists maintained their international contacts and applied various approaches to their research, the majority of German and Austrian anthropologists became isolated, lost contact with their colleagues abroad, and failed to acknowledge the importance of British and French innovations. British functionalism, for example, which had developed from the 1920s on, was introduced into the German ethnological curriculum only after 1945.

Internal factors, intrinsic to ethnology in the German language area, contributed to what Andre Gingrich (1997: 84) called the “decline of the German language ... seen in the comparatively weak resonance” in the international literature. Gingrich cited a 1995 conference report by the Austrian ethnologist Walter Dostal (1928-2011), who had argued that this decline was not only “caused by the events of the Second World War” but also “a result of developments in the post-war era in which German-language anthropology lost its importance due to exhausting directional quarrels, an increasing deficit of theories, and the ‘crisis of meaning’ which resulted from it” (cited in Gingrich, 1997: 84). Accordingly, Michael Kraus (2004: 488-89) concluded that German-language Amazonia studies remained strong until 1929; this tradition could only be continued in the late 1960s.

In an irony of history, non-mainstream German ethnologists such as Fritz W. Kramer (b. 1941) and Hans-Peter Duerr (b. 1943) anticipated the reflexive turn of Anglo-American anthropology during the 1970s and 1980s. Needless to say, their publications were not received in international academia as they were written and published in German.

CONCLUSION

From the 1960s on, German and German-speaking anthropologists again carried out research in almost all Latin American countries, although regional focuses on Mexico and the Andean countries became apparent. Their publications escaped international attention if written in German. Thus, the works of Mark Münzel (b. 1943), Udo Oberem (1923-1986), Hanns J. Prem (1941-2014) or Gerhard Baer (1934-2017) were perceived in Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, and Mexico only when published in English, Spanish or Portuguese. 21

Brazilian scholars such as Edgar Roquette-Pinto (1884-1954) and Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1902-1982) continued to refer to German ethnographers and ethnologists. Their work was important for Buarque de Holanda in his renowned Caminhos e Fronteiras (1957). Lévi-Strauss, for one, was well aware of the importance of German ethnographers and cited their work in his early

---

22 On Buarque de Holanda, see Françozo (2004, 2007).
publications (e.g. 1948a). Currently, however, for most Brazilian anthropologists this research tradition remains a terra incognita, even though many German-language books have been translated into Portuguese.23

Yet these later developments spring the timeframe of the present issue. Our overview of a rich but fragmented research tradition closes in 1945 with the demise of Nimuendajú, the most dedicated fieldworker of them all. In an obituary published in Boletim Bibliográfico and American Anthropologist, Herbert Baldus stated:

On December 10, 1945 occurred the death of the great ethnologist Curt Nimuendajú. Like Theodor Koch-Grünberg, he died among the Indians to whom he was so greatly attached. No one perhaps has contributed more to the study of Brazilian aborigines than these two men of German origin. (Baldus, 1946: 238, 1945: 91)

Baldus listed 35 “explorations” Nimuendajú had undertaken between 1905 and 1945, many of which at his own expense, as well as 33 publications resulting from these journeys, five of which written either in cooperation with or translated by Robert Lowie in 1937-45. Baldus hailed Nimuendajú’s ethnographic and archaeological collections that “enriched museums in Germany, Sweden, and Brazil,” praised his efforts to protect the Indian tribes against violence, and called him “perhaps the greatest Indianista of all time” (Baldus, 1946: 241).

It is hardly an exaggeration to conclude that the German-language empirical tradition, focused on ethnography, has been constitutive and exerted an important influence on Latin American academia, at least until the 1930s. From the 1960s on, the influence of Austrian, German or Swiss scholars on scholarly research in Latin America faded away and today is hardly acknowledged in the master narrative of disciplines such as anthropology.

To help remedy this situation, the present special issue offers fresh contributions based on extensive archival research, accumulated discussions, and primary publications. It aims to introduce hypotheses, on-going research questions, and recent research findings that address the relevance of ethnographic research to both world anthropology and indigenous peoples. In a recent study of German Ethnography in Australia, the editors, Nicolas Peterson and Anna Kenny (2017), emphasize the relevance of “early ethnographic accounts of Aboriginal life” to native title and statutory land claims in Australia—a vital issue also acute in Brazil today.
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