

Introduction: Whither race? Physical anthropology in post-1945 Central and Southeastern Europe

Marius Turda

Abstract: Although research on the history of physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe has increased significantly since the 1990s the impact race had on the discipline's conceptual maturity has yet to be fully addressed. Once physical anthropology is recognized as having preserved inter-war racial tropes within scientific discourses about national communities, new insights on how nationalism developed during the 1970s and 1980s will emerge, both in countries belonging to the communist East—Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania, and in those belonging to the West—Austria and Greece. By looking at the relationship between race and physical anthropology in these countries after 1945 it becomes clear what enabled the recurrent themes of ethnic primordiality, racial continuity, and de-nationalizing of ethnic minorities not only to flourish during the 1980s but also to re-emerge overtly during political changes characterizing the last two decades.

Keywords: communism, nationalism, ethnic identity, physical anthropology, race

That the relationship between race and physical anthropology has been fashioned differently by various cultural and political traditions has long been discussed (e.g., Calcagno 2003). One must, however, be constantly alert to the frequency with which race has been effecting anthropological discourses, past and present (Glasgow 2009; Gould 1981). As Rachel Caspari pertinently noted “[t]he race *concept* may be rejected by anthropology but its underlying racial *thinking* persists” (2003: 74).

During the first half of the twentieth century most anthropological research projects and dis-

courses were dominated by an interest in race. As national politics—predominantly in Europe—increasingly came to rely on racial theories about the national community, its dominant physical type, and the preservation of its specific racial characteristics, physical anthropology attempted to furnish the necessary evidence for the notion that nations too were racially and hierarchically organized. In doing so, physical anthropology developed both scientifically and politically. This process of appropriation also caused, on occasions, physical anthropologists to convey an overtly nationalist or even racist message, with

German anthropologists during the Third Reich offering many an infamous example (Hutton 2005; Tucker 1994).

There is now a substantial body of work concentrating on both pre- and post-1945 periods, with German, British, and French anthropology occupying a central place (Barth et al. 2005; Schaffer 2008). Recently, these debates have also extended to other national contexts, illustrating a more pervasive and generalized acceptance of racial thinking among interwar anthropologists than previously assumed (Kuklick 2008). In Central and Southeastern Europe, for instance, these conceptual mutations were commonly adaptations of dominant Western methodologies, but local anthropologists did not lack originality altogether. They may have followed Western cultural models in terms of scientific theories, but when it came to a racial prognosis they acted according to the expectations of their own societies. This cultural dialogue between East and West had important implications, not only for the internal dynamic of anthropology as scientific discipline, but also for the general usage of race within society and the biological determinism it substantiated (Herzfeld 1986; Peckham 2001; Todorova 1997). Like in Western Europe, race became a contested ideological object, dividing Central and Southeastern European physical anthropologists over its meaning and practical application. But the historic role that race has played in the consolidation of physical anthropological research in Central and Southeastern Europe must ultimately be recognized.¹

The early twentieth century's shift from culture to biology, and from nation to race, was geographically widespread, representing both a form of power and of authority, as described by Michel Foucault, as well as the result of nationalist fictions of identity, as social and cultural anthropologists have cogently argued (Bošković 2008; Kalb and Tak 2005; Stoler 2010). Race was, in this context, employed to legitimize and rationalize the political geometry of the emerging nation-states, particularly in Central and Southeastern Europe. With physical anthropology endorsing the idea of racial differences between human groups it came as no surprise that

many nationalists invoked the pernicious power of racial categories to reassert ideas of historical superiority in moments of international and domestic crises and instability.

But to highlight only these features of anthropological thinking would be misleading as it ignores the critical importance of the concept of race within anthropological traditions in Central and Southeastern Europe. It would be mistaken to underestimate the reservoir of race ideas to which physical anthropologists in these countries referred to in their writings during the post-1945 period, and how these writings, in turn, rationalized the political use of theories about the biological framework of national communities, both in the democratic West and the communist East.

Geographical proximity notwithstanding, there are notable historical differences between the countries surveyed here, particularly in their political and economic development. Prior to 1918 Austria and Hungary, for example, were united within the Habsburg imperial framework while Greece, Bulgaria, and Romania were all carved out of territories that had been under the Ottoman empire's jurisdiction and control until the mid-nineteenth century. Furthermore, countries like Romania and Greece enjoyed significant territorial expansions between 1878 and 1920 while, at the end of the Great War, Austria and Hungary became independent states, if substantially reduced territorially. Furthermore, between 1938 and 1945, Austria became part of Nazi Germany, only to be reconfigured once again at the end of World War II as a republic, becoming, like Greece, part of the West. Meanwhile, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria succumbed to communism. Finally, during the past two decades, a process of political and economic reintegration gradually began in the post-communist countries, a process culminating with the acceptance of Hungary (2004), Romania and Bulgaria (2007) into the European Union.²

But different political systems aside, what emerges from an overview of the physical anthropological research in these countries after 1945 is a remarkable similarity in terms of narratives and themes.³ What united these anthro-

political narratives was not only a shared interest in racial typologies and biological determinism, but also formal and informal scientific networking. Furthermore, the prevailing assumption that scientists in Eastern Europe developed a distorted scholarship due to their isolation and lack of exposure to Western scientific literature during communism must—at least in the case of physical anthropology—be revised. In what follows I shall endeavor to unwrap some of the conceptual and academic trajectories experienced by physical anthropologists in Austria, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Greece, and their respective cultural and political milieus, after 1945. It is against this background that the relationship between race and physical anthropology, and the intimate link connecting science and politics, is ultimately revealed.

Between camps: Local contexts and international itineraries

Little is known about the post-1945 history of physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe (Bubociu 1966; Fuchs 2003; Hann et al. 2005; Mihăilescu et al. 2008; Sozan 1977). Marked by the civil war in Greece and the communist takeovers in Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary, the immediate post-war years were hardly suitable for anthropological research (Foltiny and Ivaniček 1955). Yet new professional associations were formed, such as the Anthropological Division of the Museum of Natural History created in 1945 in Budapest, and the Commission of Psychometrics and Anthropology established in 1946 by the Romanian Academy in Bucharest (Alivizatos and Sklepa 1948; Kuti 2005; Lahovary 1946; Malán 1947, [1948] 1960; Preda 1947; Sárkány 2005).

The increased Soviet presence in Eastern Europe had a profound impact both on the political and cultural spheres. In biology, for instance, Mendelian genetics was replaced by Lysenkoism, namely the theory that acquired characteristics can be inherited. Between 1945 and 1950, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria underwent the troubled transition from an independent coun-

try to Soviet occupation to transformation into a communist satellite state (Eretescu 2008; Iliev 2008; Sárkány 2005). The majority of physical anthropologists, especially in Romania, were gradually imprisoned; university chairs and departments were dissolved, and the “bourgeois” racial anthropology was deemed “incompatible” with the new scientific ideologies imported from the Soviet Union. By the 1950s, with the proclamation of the communist republics in Eastern Europe, physical anthropology had entered a new period, one in which Mendelian genetics and eugenics were dubbed “capitalist sciences,” and proscribed as a consequence.⁴ Not surprising, at the Fourth International Congress of Anthropology and Ethnology held in Vienna in 1952 there were no participants from Hungary, Romania, or Bulgaria (Heine-Geldern et al. 1954–1956).⁵

Adopting Soviet models was, crucially, less detrimental to physical anthropology than it was to biology (Hann et al. 2005; Matalová and Sekerák 2004; Müller 2009). What Francine Hirsh aptly termed “state-sponsored evolutionism”—namely the “Soviet version of the civilizing mission that was grounded in the Marxist conception of development through historical stages and also drew on European anthropological theories about cultural evolutionism” (2005: 7)—also fittingly describes the conceptual reorientation of physical anthropologists in Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria during the 1950s. Equally important, this cultural transformation was commensurate with a broader academic movement to make salient the idea of racial unity of mankind (Lévi-Strauss 1958; Stocking [1968] 1982).

Interestingly, in a period when a concerted campaign was launched in Western Europe and the US against the concept of race (Brattain 2007), the evolutionary framework and the idea of typological races professed by Soviet anthropology (Alekseyeva 1974; Black 1977) provided the perfect conditions for interwar anthropological methodologies to survive the ideological *Gleichhaltung* of the new political regimes in the East. According to one scholar, “there was no social expectation that would be fulfilled by the

notion of the ‘nonexistence of human race’ in communist Europe. Eastern European countries were not burdened by past colonialism, and, moreover, the philosophy of ‘brotherhood and unity’ was officially imposed on citizens and implemented. Both the existence of races and their equality were therefore strongly affirmed in politics and science” (Kaszycka et al. 2009: 50). As an example, among many, I turn to the Hungarian anthropologist János Nemeskéri (1914–1989) who, as early as 1955 distinguished three main areas of research in Hungarian anthropology: “1) the problems of ethnic anthropology (Raciology); 2) the investigation of certain morphological and physiological traits; and 3) anthropogenesis (paleo-anthropology)” (in Foltiny and Ivaniček 1955: 678). Equally important, Nemeskéri’s academic typology pointed in another direction, namely the investigation of ethnic identities, a theme that was not only encouraged by Soviet ideologues (Hirsch 2005) but would become one of the hallmarks of physical anthropology’s contribution to the re-canonization of national identity after the 1960s (Nemeskéri 1960).

Expressing the reality of biological races was not limited to the communist East (Bielicki 1961; Dokládál and Brožek 1961). In Greece, Ioannis Koumaris continued to argue for the existence of the Greek race. “Races exist and will continue to exist,” Koumaris claimed (1948: 127). He opposed the 1950 UNESCO (1952) statement declaring race a “social myth” devoid of any biological foundations.⁶ Further endorsement of this anthropological approach is found in the report Koumaris wrote for the *Yearbook of Anthropology* in 1955, in which the connection between his approach to race and that of his younger colleagues is clearly established.

As in Greece, physical anthropological research in Austria changed little after 1945. Anthropologists such as Josef Wastl, Josef and Margaret Weninger, and Robert Routil remained centrally placed within the discipline (Heine-Geldern 1955). Dermatoglyphic patterns, blood-group analysis, paleoanthropology, and investigation of twins were some of the research trajectories popularized by Austrian anthropol-

ogists. The pre-war interest in the ethnic groups of Central and Southeastern Europe did not fade away (Pacher 1952; Weninger 1952). But the racial typologies formulated, and anthropological measures adopted, by Greek and Austrian anthropologists should not be considered solely within the interpretative framework of their own traditions. They should also be discussed within the more general European trend, especially in relation to German anthropological developments after 1945.

Though scandalous—considering German and Austrian anthropologists’ involvement in Nazi racial research—the concept of race remained a fundamental template for anthropological research after World War II in West Germany. To some extent, the reluctance to question the scientific validity of race was due to the successful social and academic reintegration of physical anthropologists. Two of them played particularly important roles in shaping the post-war evolution of physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe, particularly in Romania and Bulgaria, namely Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt (1892–1965) and his assistant Ilse Schwidetzky (1907–1997). Both authors were prolific writers of popular books on anthropology and genetics. During the 1950s, they rephrased their racial theories under a new concept, national biology (*Völkerbiologie*), which Schwidetzky (1950) described as the most recent development in comparative human biology. The allegedly untarnished anthropological methodology was later incorporated in what Schwidetzky (1962) rather audaciously called the “new racial science” (*Die neue Rassenkunde*).

These ideas about national biology involving notions of racial differentiation, cycles of growth and decay, genetic genealogies, the interconnectedness of nurture and nature, were abundantly present in the first collective anthropological investigations published in communist Romania, two comprehensive anthropological assessments of the populations of Hațeg and Pădurenilor Counties in Transylvania (Milcu and Dumitrescu 1958, 1961). The fact that Traian Herseni (1907–1980), an important Legionary

sociologist of the interwar period, contributed to both volumes is illustrative. Like Eickstedt and Schwidetzky, Herseni provides an exemplary case of post-war re-adaptation, professionally and theoretically. Although the general topic Herseni (1958, 1961) reflected on was genetic genealogies, his main argument focused on the importance of ethnic anthropology in connecting forms of the nation's micro and macro physical development over time.

This was the very period in which a new narrative on national identity, ethnogenesis, was elaborated in Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary, allowing anthropologists to reposition autochthonous ideas within their discipline.⁷ The biological codes of the interwar period were brought back in a nuanced form. The 1960s and 1970s were characterized, as Mark Bassin has argued, by attempts to “develop new perspectives on the nature of ethnos and ethnicity in the decades following Stalin's death” (2009: 875). Permeated with ethnogenesis themes, they have been made to accord with the technical examination of Bulgarian, Romanian, and Hungarian physical “anthropological types” (Kuti 2005; Râmneanțu 1975; Sárkány 2005). Illustratively, the physical anthropological methods used in these examinations were based on those developed by German and Austrian anthropologists Egon von Eickstedt, Viktor Lebzelter, Robert Rutil, and Josef Weninger; with not a single Soviet anthropologist mentioned (Dumitrescu and Dumitrescu 1961; Malán 1961; Necrasov 1970/1971; Pop and Enăchescu 1958).

But these collective anthropological endeavors are more than just documentary illustrations of a vibrant national scientific activity (for Hungary, see Acsádi et al. 1953; for Romania see A. Manuila 1957). They are also part of an intricate international exchange of ideas and academic mobility (Bartucz 1961). The sixth and the ninth International Congresses of Anthropology and Ethnology held in Paris in 1960 and in Chicago in 1973 provide eloquent examples of how Central and Southeastern European anthropologists attempted and succeeded to insert their ideas and research within the international community (as many as twenty-six Romanian an-

thropologists and ethnologists delivered papers to the Paris congress, for instance). In such efforts, Schwidetzky again played a decisive role (Schwidetzky et al. 1980).

Race and biology were the central elements of this transnational physical anthropology, a relationship reaffirmed in what is, undoubtedly, the perfect model of international collaboration as well as the official portrait of the nation as an integral biological unit surviving centuries of ethnic mixing and territorial displacement: *The racial history of mankind* (14 volumes between 1968 and 1993).⁸ Volume 6 of the collection included contributions on Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Greece⁹ (Boev and Schwidetzky 1979; Kiszely 1979; Necrasov 1979; Xirotiris 1979). This volume's importance to understanding the relationship between race and physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe is twofold. On the one hand, it codified the general acceptance of racial classification among anthropologists in these countries; on the other hand, it identified sites of anthropological knowledge in which particular narratives of ethnic homogeneity and historical continuity, similar to those devised during the 1930s and 1940s, were reinvented and proposed to the general public. Once again, the anthropological language of race and ethnicity, initially the privileged property of experts, was increasingly adopted by various authorities of cultural and political life as well as by nationalist propagandists. Identifying the connection between these different intellectual fields is necessary to understand the radicalization of nationalist languages and practices during the 1980s.

Physical anthropology and nationalism

Most of the existing historical scholarship on the intellectual traditions of Central and Southeastern Europe emphasizes literary, social, and religious constructions of national identity. According to this interpretation, participants in the debates about how to define the nation appropriated themes that were created by successive generations of poets, linguists, and historians.

In most cases, scholars suggest that there was no clear terminological distinction between the concept of race and the idea of the nation in the twentieth century, and that nationalists used the two concepts interchangeably. Regrettably, this scholarship resulted in the failure to analyze the history of race and how physical anthropology shaped nationalist thought (one salutary exception is Tzanelli 2008).

A recent case in point is Hercules Millas's meticulous historiographic review of historical narratives dealing with the oppositional history between Greeks and Turks in modern history. When discussing the development of the nationalist vocabulary in Greece Millas asserts that "[d]uring the years of nation-building the word *genos* was gradually replaced by *ethnos*, and the latter was and is still used in Greek in the sense of 'nation.' There is no other word for 'nation,' and the ethnic/national distinction does not exist among the Greeks" (2008: 492). This argument certainly elicits conceptual problems when applied to nationalist discourses developed after 1945. To be sure, the concept of race frequently accompanied the idea of the nation in nationalist discourses, but in most cases the terms were used jointly rather than fused (Karnouh 1990). What Millas and others fail to appreciate is that race existed simultaneously with the idea of the nation, both originating from the same Western intellectual traditions forming national political cultures in Central and South-eastern Europe.

One well-documented example of how anthropological theories of race were instrumentalized by nationalism is the case of ethnic minorities (Neuburger 1997; Turda 2007). Since their emergence as modern states, Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, or Croatia have been defined in opposition to either something external (Europe, the Balkans, the Slavic world) or internal (the Hungarians, the Jews, the Greeks, the Serbs). Already in the nineteenth century, as Maria Todo-rova (1992) has suggested, the emerging Bulgarian anthropology and *Völkerpsychologie* provided Bulgarian nationalism with sufficient arguments to lay nationalist claims on Macedonia. During the interwar period, Bulgarian nationalists there-

fore argued that all Slavic-speakers in Macedonia were "Bulgarians" (Dragostinova 2008). Such processes of racial appropriation continued after the 1950s, and intensified during the 1970s, as politicians and anthropologists alike aimed to homogenize the nationalized space, proposing a new vision of the national community, one biologically and culturally purged of all symptoms of otherness (Märtinaş 1985; Xirotiris 1980).

Since the late nineteenth century, modern nationalism centered on the prowess of a particular ethnic group to survive centuries of ethnic mixing and migrations. To be sure, the regional crisis that had started in 1912 with the Balkan Wars, and continued after the start of World War I, did not end with the armistice of November 1918, but extended well into the interwar period. Greece and Turkey, for instance, were not to settle their differences until 1922, while Romania and Hungary continued to struggle over Transylvania until 1945. The major results of this international crisis were the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman empires, the formation of a south Slav state, the establishment of a Greater Romania, the expulsion of Greeks from Asia Minor, and the creation of a secular Turkish state. In the final agreements of the peace treaties, the future Yugoslavia and Romania emerged as winners; Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey were losers, as was Greece ultimately.

Under these political circumstances, physical anthropology proved critical in defining national territories and guiding linguists, geographers, and ethnographers in the region toward asserting nationalist claims. In a broader context, Chris Hann has identified a distinction between the "*Volkskunde*, nation-centred anthropology, in Eastern Europe, and *Völkerkunde*, comparative enquiries carried out by anthropologists from those Western European states that established overseas empires" (2007: 9). To be sure, the anthropologists' ambition to engage with debates on national identity echoed precisely what scientists in all disciplines aimed at achieving, namely the advancement of scientific knowledge in the nation's service. Like elsewhere

in Europe at the time, physical anthropologists in Central and Southeastern Europe “proclaimed an ethos of objective, impartial scholarship, although in fact their scholarship was highly ideological, nationalistic and socially conservative” (Iggers 2005: ix). That this was the case is illustrated by the importance given to racial models of identity by the generations of anthropologists and nationalists during the twentieth century.

With the establishment of communist regimes in Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria this anthropological tradition was officially terminated but not forgotten (Ivanova 1998). Anthropologists, like professionals in other disciplines, were not deterred in their attempts to synchronize interwar racial narratives with communist nationalist principles. In Romania, for example, a further change occurred with the ascension of Nicolae Ceaușescu (1918–1989) to power in 1965. After Ceaușescu delivered his “July theses” in 1971, the “cultural revolution” commenced and autochthonism became the norm. Some topics, like the Dacian-Roman continuity, became ubiquitous in the official discourse, generating a veritable “Dacomania” among intellectuals and party officials alike (Verdery 1991). Bulgaria experienced a similar form of historical megalomania, which connected the modern Bulgarians to the ancient Thracians (Boev 1975, 1985), while some Hungarian anthropologists labored intensely to establish the contribution of the “steppe peoples,” like the Avars, to Hungarian ethnogenesis (Lipták 1980, 1983). This anthropological maneuvering of traditional strategies of national identification based on language and archaeological findings constantly and actively reinvented the national past.

This excessive politicization of physical anthropology was, however, not uniform. Although the fusion between official dogmatism and physical anthropology continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s in Romania and Bulgaria, Hungary witnessed the emergence of an ethnographic tradition that attempted to counteract excessive nationalist discourses. To be sure, new developments in ethnography, social, cultural, and linguistic anthropology vied with national narratives maintained by physical anthropology

(Caramelea 1979), but these disagreements rarely degenerated into straightforward ideological and methodological conflicts, as the case of Austria and Greece clearly indicates (Dow and Bockhorn 2004; Green 2005; Karakasidou 1997; Kaser et al. 2005).

The way forward

In an article published posthumously, the Hungarian anthropologist Ottó G. Eiben (1931–2004) advocated a return to the “original *biological* definition of anthropology.” As this suggests, the fundamental structure of this “*biological anthropology* or *human biology*” was racial (Eiben 2006: 6.). Eiben’s main area of expertise was physical growth, or auxology. “Growth and maturation,” Eiben further explained, “is a complex biological process, influenced by internal (genetic) and external (environmental) factors.” Race, like gender, was considered to be one of the “genetic factors” (ibid.). To some this may seem anachronistic, to say the least, but much of the same conceptual language and imagery can be detected across other anthropological traditions in Europe and elsewhere (Radu et al. 2004). One recent survey, for instance, indicates that in the United States almost 80 percent of anthropologists reject the concept of biological races, but only 25 percent do so in Poland (Kaszycka et al. 2009).

Illustrating some of the assumptions made in this introduction and the contributions included in this volume of *Focaal*, the relationship between race and physical anthropology also illustrates something that few would have imagined before 1989. Despite successive programs of social homogenization engineered by communism in the East and capitalist democracy in the West, Austrians, Hungarians, Romanians, Bulgarians, and Greeks continue to be polarized and divided by the issue of ethnic identity, ethnic minorities, and racial phantasms of historical primacy.¹⁰ Several factors contributed to this situation. First, interpretations of national history were based on theories of historical rights and historical continuities that favored one eth-

nic group over others, and did not allow for complementary visions of peaceful coexistence to completely materialize. Second, the countries in Central and Southeastern Europe were subjected to numerous social and political changes throughout the twentieth century that displaced populations and moved ethnic boundaries. It is this unbroken, reciprocal influence of politics, nationalism and history that continues to characterize physical anthropology in Austria, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Greece.

Questions concerning the content of national identity constitute some of the most crucial problems confronting physical anthropology in the countries under investigation here. They also highlight, as the contributions to this special issue reveal, the need for a comparative perspective and a common theoretical denominator in studying the relationship between race and anthropology both historically and conceptually. One cannot fully understand these countries' anthropological traditions without considering the rich history of race behind it.

An in-depth assessment of physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe is essential to formulating a more balanced understanding of the nature and impact of race on social, cultural, and political discourses throughout twentieth-century European history. One can only hope that this special issue on race and physical anthropology in Central and Southeastern Europe convincingly demonstrates the need for a new conceptual framework and system of reference. One that will encourage a more encompassing and thought-provoking scholarship, on what undoubtedly is one of twentieth-century Europe's most compelling scientific stories, to finally emerge.

Acknowledgments

Research for this special issue was made possible by a generous grant from the Wellcome Trust, London (Grant no. 088975/Z/09/Z). I also want to thank the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and critical comments.

Marius Turda (the Centre for Health, Medicine and Society, Oxford Brookes University, UK) is the author of *The Idea of National Superiority in Central Europe, 1880–1918*, *Eugenism și antropologia rasială în România, 1874–1944* and *Modernism and Eugenics*. His main areas of interest include the history of eugenics, racism, anthropology and nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe, with a particular focus on Hungary and Romania.

Email: mturda@brookes.ac.uk.

Notes

1. During the 1950s and 1960s, “anthropology” was understood in Central and Southeastern Europe to refer to “physical anthropology.” As Milan Dokládál and Josef Brožek explained: “As taught and studied in Czechoslovakia, anthropology does not include the various branches of science (such as prehistoric archaeology, ethnography, linguistic, or comparative studies of religion) which constitute cultural anthropology. In Czechoslovakia, then, anthropology refers to the Science of Man in the narrower sense. It may be defined as the science of human physique, man's phylogenetic evolution and ontogenetic development, and the varieties (‘races’) of man” (1961: 455). Ironically, the term anthropology is currently often used synonymously with cultural and social anthropology as well as ethnography (Hann et al. 2005; Mihăilescu et al. 2008).
2. For an overview of how cultural and social anthropology developed in the wake of the political changes in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as the Soviet Union see Hann 1994; Wolfe 2000; and Skalnik 2002.
3. Contrary to physical anthropology, the local ethnographic tradition in Central and Southeastern Europe has benefited from consistent attention (Filipović 1982; Hofer and Fel 1969; Mouzelis 1973; Ortutay 1937, 1972; Stahl 1980; Winner 1971), contributing significantly to the emergence of the first sustained Western social and cultural anthropological research on Eastern Europe (Byrnes 1976; Cole 1977; Halpern and Kideckel 1983; Hann 1980; Kligman 1981;

- Verdery 1983). Greece has, moreover—since Ernestine Friedl's 1962 and John Campbell's 1964 pioneering studies—become one of the most researched countries in the region. For a recent work on Albania, see Bringa 1995.
4. See, for example, the Hungarian journal *Ethnographia* vol. 60, nos. 1–4 (1949). Yet the submission to the new ideological norms imposed by Soviet occupation was by no means a straightforward process. Again Hungary provides a good example. In parallel to *Ethnographia* (which was the journal of the Hungarian Ethnographical Society), the Ethnographic Institute of the Pázmány Péter University in Budapest published its own *Folia Ethnographica* in 1949, in an attempt to stay clear of ideological commitments.
 5. In the permanent council of the congress, Greece, Romania, and Hungary were still represented by the interwar anthropologists, including Koumaris, Bartucz, and Făcăoaru. With one exception—Koumaris was not part of the Greek national committee—this arrangement survived until the Sixth International Congress of Anthropology and Ethnology held in Paris in 1960.
 6. Koumaris was not the only anthropologist to contest the validity of the UNESCO statement on race. The British Royal Anthropological Institute reacted critically, and so did anthropologists in France, South Africa, and the Netherlands (see Brattain 2007; Schaffer 2008).
 7. During the first years of the Soviet occupation of Romania (1944–1948) efforts were made to stress the role played by the Slavs in the formation of the Romanian nation (Turda 2008).
 8. Apart from volume 1, which was edited by Karl Saller, all others were edited by Ilse Schwidetzky.
 9. Austria was discussed in volume 5.
 10. Examples include the anti-Turkish demonstrations in Bulgaria in early 1990, the ethnic conflicts between Hungarians and Romanians in Târgu-Mureș, also in 1990, and last year wave of anti-Roma attitudes in Hungary.
- Alekseyeva, T. I. 1974. Human race studies in Soviet anthropology. *Rasy i narody* 5 (4): 67–93.
- Alivizatos, G., and P. Sklepa. 1948. The homogeneity of the Greek race based on the blood group distribution. *Helleniki Iatriki* 17: 873–908.
- Barth, Frederik et al. 2005. *One discipline, four ways: British, German, French and American anthropology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bartucz, Lajos. 1961. *Die internationale Bedeutung der ungarischen anthropologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Bassin, Mark. 2009. Nurture is nature: Lev Gumilev and the ecology of ethnicity. *Slavic Review* 68 (4): 872–897.
- Bielicki, Tadeusz. 1961. *Typological and populational conception of race in anthropology*. Wrocław: Polska Akademia.
- Black, Lydia T. 1977. The concept of race in Soviet anthropology. *Studies in Soviet Thought* 17 (1): 1–27.
- Boev, P. 1975. Anthropological data on the ethnogenesis of the Ancient Thracians. *Mankind Quarterly* 16: 68–73.
- . 1985. The importance of anthropology for ethnogenesis. *Ethnologia Bulgaria* 1: 15–21.
- Boev, P., and I. Schwidetzky. 1979. Rassengeschichte von Bulgarien. In *Rassengeschichte der Menschheit*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky, 97–118. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.
- Bošković, Aleksandar, ed. 2008. *Other people's anthropologies: Ethnographic practice on the Margins*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Brattain, Michelle. 2007. Race, racism and anti-racism: UNESCO and the politics of presenting science to the postwar public. *American Historical Review* 12 (5): 1386–1413.
- Bringa, Tone. 1995. *Being Muslim the Bosnian way: Identity and community in a central Bosnian village*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bubociu, Octavian. 1966. Folklore and Ethnography in Rumania. *Current Anthropology* 7 (30): 295–314.
- Byrnes, Robert F., ed. 1976. *Communal Families in the Balkans: The Zadruga*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Calcagno, James M., ed. 2003. Biological anthropology: Historical perspectives on current issues, disciplinary connections, and future directions. Special issue, *American Anthropologist* 15 (1).
- Campbell, John K. 1964. *Honour, family and patronage: A study of institutions and moral values in a*

References

Acsádi, Gy et al. 1953. Az ivádi embertani kutatások. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Biológiai Osztályának Közleményei* 2 (2/3): 137–243.

- Greek mountain community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Caramelea, Vasile V. 1979. Philosophy and the Romanian social and cultural anthropology. The first axiological atlas of the national culture. *Revue Roumaine des Sciences Sociales. Série de Philosophie et Logique* 23: 273–288.
- Caspari, Rachel. 2003. From types to populations: a century of race, physical anthropology, and the American Anthropological Association. *American Anthropologist* 105: 65–76.
- Cole, John. 1977. Anthropology comes part-way home: Community studies in Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6: 349–378.
- Dokládál, Milan, and Josef Brožek. 1961. Physical anthropology in Czechoslovakia: Recent developments. *Current Anthropology* 2: 455–477.
- Dow, James R., and Olaf Bockhorn. 2004. *The Study of European Ethnology in Austria*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Dragostinova, Theodora. 2008. Speaking national: Nationalizing the Greeks of Bulgaria, 1900–1939. *Slavic Review* 67: 154–181.
- Dumitrescu, Marta, and Horia Dumitrescu. 1961. Tipul antropologic. In *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Pădurenilor. Satul Bătrîna*, ed. Șt. M. Milcu and H. Dumitrescu, 73–121. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- Eiben, Ottó G. 2006. Growth pattern: Heritability and changes in manifestations at the turn of the millennium. *International Journal of Anthropology* 21: 5–23.
- Eretescu, Constantin. 2008. De Gustibus non disputandum ... Romanian Folk Studies in the Fifties. In *Studying peoples in the people's democracies, Vol. 2, Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*, ed. Vintilă Mihăilescu et al. 41–53. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Filipović, Milenko S. 1982. *Among the people: Selected writings*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Foltiny, S., and F. Ivaniček. 1955. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Roumania. An anthropological review for 1952–1954. *Yearbook of Anthropology* 1: 671–692.
- Friedl, Ernestine. 1982. *Vasilika: A village in modern Greece*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Fuchs, Brigitte. 2003. "Rasse," "Volk," "Geschlecht: Anthropologische diskurse in Österreich, 1850–1960. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
- Glasgow, Joshua. 2009. *A theory of race*. New York: Routledge.
- Gould, Stephen J. 1981. *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Green, Sarah. F. 2005. *Notes from the Balkans: Locating marginality and ambiguity on the Greek-Albanian border*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Halpern, Joel, and David A. Kideckel. 1983. Anthropology of Eastern Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12: 377–402.
- Hann, Chris. 1980. *Tázlár: A village in Hungary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1994. After communism: Reflections on East European anthropology and the "transition." *Social Anthropology* 2: 229–249.
- . 2007. *Anthropology's multiple temporalities and its future in Central and Eastern Europe: A debate*. Halle: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Hann, Chris et al. 2005. Introduction: Continuities and contrasts in an essentially contested field. In *Studying peoples in the people's democracies: Socialist era anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris Hann et al., 1–20. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Heine-Geldern, Robert. 1955. Austria: A review of anthropology, ethnology, and prehistoric archaeology for 1952–1954. *Yearbook of Anthropology* 1: 619–638.
- Heine-Geldern, Robert et al. 1954–1956. *Actes du 4e Congrès international des sciences anthropologiques et ethnologiques*, vols. 1–3. Vienna: Holzhausen.
- Herseni, Traian. 1958. Studiul genealogic al populației. In *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Hațegului. Clopotiva*, ed. Șt. M. Milcu and H. Dumitrescu, 47–65. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- . 1961. Familia și grupurile genealogice. In *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Pădurenilor. Satul Bătrîna*, ed. Șt. M. Milcu and H. Dumitrescu, 57–71. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1986. *Ours once more: Folklore, ideology, and the making of modern Greece*. New York: Pella.
- Hirsch, Francine. 2005. *Empires of nations: Ethnographic knowledge and the making of the Soviet Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hofer, Tamás, and Edit Fel. 1969. *Proper peasants: Social relations in a Hungarian village*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hutton, Christopher. 2005. *Race and the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Iggers, Georg G. 2005. Foreword. In *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing, 1919–1945*. ed. Ingo

- Haar and Michael Fahlbusch, vii–xviii. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Iliev, Iliia. 2008. Local uses of three Soviet ethnographic concepts. In *Studying peoples in the people's democracies, vol. 2, Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. ed. Vintilă Mihăilescu et al. 137–56. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Ivanova, Radost. 1998. New orientations in Bulgarian ethnology and folkloristics. *Ethnologia Balkanica* 2: 225–231.
- Kalb, Don, and Herman Tak, eds. 2005. *Critical Junctions: Anthropology and History beyond the Cultural Turn*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Karakasidou, Anastasia. *Fields of wheat, hills of blood: Passages to nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870–1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Karnoouh, Claude. 1990. *L'invention du peuple. Chroniques de Roumanie*. Paris: Arcantère.
- Kaser, Karl et al., eds. 2005. *Between the archives and the field: A dialogue on historical anthropology in the Balkans*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Kaszycka, Katarzyna et al. 2009. Current views of European anthropologists on race: Influence of Educational and Ideological Background. *American Anthropologist* 111 (1): 43–56.
- Kiszely, I. 1979. Rassengeschichte von Ungarn. In *Rassengeschichte der menschheit*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky, 9–49. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.
- Kligman, Gail. 1981. *Calus: Symbolic transformation in Romanian ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Koumaris, John. 1948. On the Morphological Variety of Modern Greeks. *Man* 48: 126–127.
- . 1955. Greece: An anthropological review for 1952–1954. *Yearbook of Anthropology* 1: 471–480.
- Kuklick, Henrika, ed. 2008. *A new history of anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kuti, Klára. 2005. Historicity in Hungarian anthropology. In *Studying peoples in the people's democracies: Socialist era anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris Hann et al. 273–284. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Lahovary, Nicolas. 1946. *Les peuples Européens: Leur passé ethnologiques et leurs parentés réciproques d'après les dernières recherches sanguines et anthropologiques*. Neuchatel: Éditions de la Baconnière.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1958. *Race and history*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Lipták, Pál. 1980. Physical anthropology of the Finno-Ugric peoples. In *Physical anthropology of European populations*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky et al., 365–368. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1983. *Avars and ancient Hungarians*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Malán, Mihály. 1947. *Az élő magyarság embertani kutatása*. Budapest. Teleki Pál Tudományos Intézet.
- . [1948] 1960. Die Blutgruppen in Siebenburgen. In *Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques. Compte-rendu de la Troisième Session, Bruxelles, 1948*, 143–147. Bruxelles: Tervuren.
- . 1961. *Ergebnisse der ethnisch-anthropologischen Forschungen des Ungarturns*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Manuila, Alexandre. 1957. Recherches sérologiques et anthropologiques chez les populations de la Roumanie et des régions voisines. Contribution à l'étude du problème dinarique. *Archiv der Julius Klaus-Stiftung für Vererbungsforschung, Sozialanthropologie und Rassenhygiene* 23 (3/4): 219–357.
- Mărtinaș, Dumitru. 1985. *Originea ceangăilor din Moldova*. Bucharest: Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Matalová, Anna, and Jiří Sekerák, 2004. *Genetics behind the iron curtain: its repudiation and reinstitutionalisation in Czechoslovakia*. Brno: Moravian Museum.
- Mihăilescu, Vintilă et al., eds. 2008. *Studying peoples in the people's democracies, vol. 2, Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Millas, Hercules. 2008. History writing among the Greeks and Turks: Imagining the self and the other. In *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, ed. Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, 490–510. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Milcu, Șt. M., and H. Dumitrescu, ed. 1958 *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Hațegului. Clopotiva*. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- . 1961. *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Pădurenilor. Satul Bătrâna*. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- Mouzelis, N. 1973. Greek and Bulgarian peasants: Aspects of their sociopolitical situation during the interwar period. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 18: 85–103.
- Müller, Miklós. 2009. Lysenkoism in Hungary. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Lysenkoism at CUNY Graduate Center Harriman Institute, Columbia University, 4–5 December.

- Necrasov, Olga. 1970/1971. Les caractéristiques morphologiques et sérologiques de la population roumaine. *Rivista di antropologia* 57: 5–26.
- . 1979. Structure anthropologique des populations anciennes et récentes de la R. S. Roumanie. In *Rassengeschichte der Menschheit*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky, 51–96. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.
- Nemeskéri, János. 1960. Problèmes de la reconstruction biologique en anthropologie historique. In *VIe Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, Vol 1, Rapport général et anthropologie*, 669–674. Paris: Musée de l'Homme.
- Neuburger, Mary. 1997. Bulgaro-Turkish encounters and the re-imagining of the Bulgarian nation (1878–1995). *East European Quarterly* 31: 1–18.
- Ortutay, Gyula. 1937. *Magyar népismeret*. Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság.
- . 1972. *Hungarian folklore. Essays*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Pacher, Helga-Maria. 1952. *Anthropometrischer Vergleich zweier mitteleuropäischer Bevölkerungsgruppen (St. Jakob im Rosental, Kärnten und Marienfeld, rumänisches Banat)*. Vienna: Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Peckham, Robert. 2001. *National histories, natural states: Nationalism and the politics of place in Greece*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Pop, Suzana, and Teodor Enăchescu. 1958. Tipul antropologic. In *Cercetări antropologice în Țara Hațegului. Clopotiva*, ed. Șt. M. Milcu and H. Dumitrescu, 67–127. Bucharest: Ed. R. P. R.
- Preda, Victor. 1947. *Tratat elementar de antropologie*. Sibiu: Ed. "Dacia Traiana."
- Radu, Elena et al. 2004. *Atlasul antropologic al Banatului de sud-est*. Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Române.
- Râmneanțu, P. 1975. Biometrical variations of some anthropological parameters of Romanians in the last century. *Annuaire roumain d'anthropologie* 12: 25–30.
- Sárkány, Mihály. 2005. Hungarian anthropology in the socialist era: Theories, methodologies, and undercurrents. *Studying peoples in the people's democracies: Socialist era anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris Hann et al., 87–108. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Schaffer, Gavin. 2008. *Racial science and British society, 1930–1962*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schwidetzky, Ilse. 1950. *Grundzüge der Völkerbiologie*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag.
- . ed. 1962. *Die neue Rassenkunde*. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
- . ed. 1979. *Rassengeschichte der Menschheit, Vol. 6*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.
- Schwidetzky, Ilse et al., eds. 1980. *Physical anthropology of European populations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Skalnik, Peter. ed. 2002. *A post-communist millennium: The struggles for sociocultural anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Set Out.
- Stahl, Henri H. 1980. *Traditional Romanian village communities: The transition from the communal to the capitalist mode of production in the Danube Region*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stocking, George W. [1968] 1982. *Race, culture, and evolution: Essays in the history of anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. [2002] 2010. *Carnal knowledge and imperial power. Race and the intimate in colonial rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Todorova, Maria. 1992. Self-Image and ethnic stereotypes in Bulgaria. *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 8: 139–163.
- . 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tucker, William H. 1994. *The science and politics of racial research*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Turda, Marius. 2007. The nation as object: Race, blood and biopolitics in interwar Romania. *Slavic Review* 66: 413–441.
- . 2008. National Historiographies in the Balkans, 1830–1989. In *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, ed. Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, 463–489. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Tzanelli, Rodanthi. 2008. *Nation-building and identity in Europe: The dialogics of reciprocity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- UNESCO. 1952. *The race concept: Results of an inquiry*. Paris.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1983. *Transylvanian villagers: Three centuries of political, economic, and ethnic change*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1991. *National ideology under socialism. Identity and cultural politics in Ceaușescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weninger, Josef. 1952. Über die brachykephalie bei Kaukasus—und Balkanvölkern. *Zeitschrift für*

- Morphologie und Anthropologie* 44 (1/2): 260–273.
- Winner, Irene. 1971. *A Slovenian Village: Žerovnica*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press.
- Wolfe, Thomas C. 2000. Cultures and communities in the anthropology of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 195–216.
- Xirotiris, N. 1979. Rassengeschichte von Griechenland. In *Rassengeschichte der menschheit*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky, 157–192. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.
- . 1980. Serological studies of the Pomacs. In *Physical anthropology of European populations*, ed. Ilse Schwidetzky et al. 239–241. The Hague: Mouton.