For export only? Cosmopolitan anthropology from and in Central Europe

Chris Hann ***(for ASA Conference, University of Keele, April 2006)***

Abstract

In an elaborate discussion, Ernest Gellner saw cosmopolitanism as a key ingredient in Malinowski's functionalist 'cocktail', explicable both in terms of his personal history and his general political stance. Gellner proceeded to draw out a basic tension:

> 'But this internationalist, individualist, 'cosmopolitan' option, the cult of the Open Society, is perhaps less likely to constitute the whole answer for a man who knows full well, professionally, that the human condition in general is not like that – who knows … that a greater part of mankind lives or lived in absorbing, relatively self-contained communities. In other words, can an anthropologist whole-heartedly adopt the 'cosmopolitan' model of man? He may well be cosmopolitan himself, but can he conceivably see the human condition in general in such terms? And if indeed he cannot, is he therefore condemned to embrace its best known and most favoured alternative, and indulge in the 'organic' sense of historic communities and of continuity? … Must he choose between cosmopolitanism and Hegelianism?' (1988: 168)

I propose to examine how this tension was played out in anthropology under socialism and how it continues to affect the discipline in those countries where socialist rule has collapsed. Western anthropology was condemned by Soviet scholars as a handmaiden of imperialism, long before similar critiques began to be put forward by Western scholars themselves. Malinowski himself was repeatedly denounced as "a cosmopolitan of Polish origin" (in other cases of course the stigma was directly associated with Jewish identity). This history has usually been an embarrassment to socialists, with their principled commitment to internationalism, but such propaganda accusations become less surprising if, as one sees clearly in Gellner's formulation, the cosmopolitanism pilloried by socialists is linked not only to internationalism but also to liberal individualism. Similarly, the fact that the term cosmopolitan still raises hackles even today in Russia and elsewhere can be partly explained in relation to the impact of neo-liberalism and its apparent disregard of all 'organic' communities in favour of subjects postulated as mobile and entrepreneurial individuals.

The paper will outline the dilemma identified by Gellner in the context of his own work, bearing in mind the affinity between his personal trajectory and that of Malinowski, and also in the

context of postsocialist social conditions. It will also explore a possible solution: can the link to liberal individualism be broken and cosmopolitanism defined in such a way that it is not the antithesis of 'rooted' communities but builds directly upon collective identities? If so, are identities based on work, education and class or citizenship necessarily less significant than those based on descent, language and religion? In the light of this discussion, the paper will assess the prospects for a genuinely cosmopolitan anthropology across the land mass of Eurasia.

(Alas the above Abstract proved over-ambitious - the draft which follows is altogether more modest and incomplete. CH, March 30th 2006)

Introduction

The 1985 Keele conference on *Anthropology at Home* was my very first ASA meeting. On that occasion I was driven across from Cambridge by Ray Abrahams. This time I plan to drive myself from Germany, where I've been based since 1997. So for me personally the topic of this year's meeting is highly appropriate and I want to concentrate on questions of cosmopolitanism in our discipline. Let me begin by noting that the German media are already in the "hot phase" of preparing for the World Cup, which begins in just two months. The motto, which you see everywhere on posters, is "at home among friends". The social significance of major sporting events, followed intensively on television all over the world, is not disputed. For the host country the significance is also very material: the World Cup is expected to give a significant boost to the German economy, including the job market, in the coming months. But it is also widely recognized that such events are still framed around nations and states: they are occasions for illiberal patriotism as well as cosmopolitanism. There is a very intense concern in Germany that the national team will this year not live up to the standards of illustrious predecessors. The pressure upon the coach (manager) Jürgen Klinsmann is immense. Klinsmann seems to me an attractive cosmopolitan character; he played some of his finest football in Italy and in London for Tottenham Hotspurs. But he has made his family home in Huntington Beach, California. This poses some problems when your job is to monitor the performances of German players in order to select the best possible national squad. Some elements of the popular press have led strident campaigns against the national coach whose *Wahlheimat* (adopted homeland) is not Germany.

My best excuse for sharing this information with you is that Ernest Gellner, one of the two major figures I discuss in the first part of this paper, was a great fan of soccer – by no means a majority interest in the Cambridge Department of Social Anthropology in the 1980s. I doubt that Malinowski, the other figure I address, ever shared this interest. But I am going to emphasize what these two scholars shared as well as certain differences. Most obviously they shared social anthropology as their chosen discipline, albeit practised in quite different ways, after initial specialization in philosophy. They also shared a background in Central Europe and England as their *Wahlheimat*, albeit chosen in quite different circumstances. Following Gellner's death in November 1995, Adam Kuper hailed him in *Anthropology Today* as "the last of the Central Europeans", "our emissary to the intellectuals, our link to the great traditions of modern European thought, our precious Voltaire". Kuper drew attention (as had others before him) to the affinity to Malinowski, who presumably goes unchallenged as the first of the Central Europeans, at least as far as the ASA is concerned; together with Karl Popper, they were "all the progeny of Franz-Josef's Vienna, that extraordinary school of all our modernities" (*ibid*).

If Malinowski and Gellner are the first and last, how many do we find in between? Perhaps only Franz Steiner really qualifies, for Prague, like Malinowski's Cracow, was still living off Habsburg credit long after the Empire's formal demise in 1918. The later contributions of Ladislav Holý and Milan Stuchlik belonged clearly to another era. Overall the influence from Central Europe has been modest: in comparison, say, to the influence from South Africa. I shall argue that it has been a cosmopolitan influence, reflecting the personal trajectories of these scholars. But it would be misleading to characterize Central Europe as a cosmopolitan place. The late Habsburg era was also the apogee of national movements in *Mitteleuropa* and I shall suggest that both Malinowski and Gellner were deeply marked by this background. After probing some ambiguities in their reception in Britain, in the second section of the paper I return to Central Europe to explore the current state of anthropology in the scholars' original *Heimat*. The postsocialist era has brought new tensions between an establishment associated primarily with the folk culture of the nation and a rival current with quite different concerns that is more attractive to some scholars, especially the young. I shall argue that a healthy cosmopolitan anthropology needs to combine both of these streams.

I

According to Gellner's analysis (1988), Malinowski was a Polish „cultural nationalist", whose genius lay in his ability to combine a Hegelian (I think Herderian might have been even more appropriate) 'organic' vision of human societies with the individualist empiricism of Ernst Mach, on whom he based his doctorate. Certainly he was deeply influenced by his education in Cracow, the conservative intellectual centre of Poland's national movement. It can be readily demonstrated that he never lost interest in the affairs of his native country during all his years in Britain, and that he was engaging himself actively on behalf of Poland when he died in New Haven in the dark hour of 1942.

At the same time Malinowski was clearly a cosmopolitan intellectual, at home from his childhood in several European languages. He was ready to give up his Polish passport for a British one, but he never became so British that he lost his ability to maintain a critical distance, e.g. towards the snobbery of colonial society, including that of the family into which he married (Young 2004). He made no effort to teach his daughters Polish, or to inculcate any knowledge of Polish culture and history. For their holidays the family went not to the Polish Tatras but to the Italian Alps.

As everyone in anthropology knows, the Department he built up in the inter-war decades at the London School of Economics was highly international in both its staff and its students. The political tenor of Malinowski's cosmopolitanism comes through most clearly in his posthumous works (especially 1944b). His values were those of a "conservative-liberal" European intellectual (Mucha 1988). He thought anthropology could be put to use to improve the running of the Empire, and certainly not to subvert it.

As a Jew forced to leave his homeland as a schoolboy, Ernest Gellner's route from Prague to Britain was utterly different from Malinowski's journey from Cracow a generation earlier. Gellner picked up his philosophy in Oxford, not a "suburb of Vienna". Though multilingual, fieldwork in the vernacular was not one of his strengths. In his ethnographic work in Morocco and voluminous other writings he is generally more concerned more with structure in a Radcliffe-Brownian sense than with the details of culture ("wallpaper"). His strong interest in long-term historical change stood in sharp antithesis to Malinowski's synchronicism.

Yet Malinowski and Gellner had more in common than is widely recognized. Gellner too was respectful of the traditions of his adopted country, but he too was an acute observer of its quirks and absurdities. I think both would have agreed with the football philosophy of Arsène Wenger, the Frenchman who manages Arsenal, and rejected those who criticise him because Britain's most successful club this season no longer has many British players.

As far as their anthropology is concerned, Malinowski's prioritizing of the "native point of view" and his attachment to the culture concept conceal a tendency to generalize European individualism to the whole of humanity. By contrast, Gellner is conventionally perceived as the most explicit of Popperians, as indeed he is when proclaiming the West's "cognitive superiority". Yet like Malinowski he was also deeply imbued with a Herderian notion of organic cultures. I think this derives from their origins in Mitteleuropa. Both were nostalgic admirers of Franz Joseph's *Vielvölkerstaat* (this had of course ceased to exist before Gellner was born in 1925, but this did not prevent him from constant evocations, notably in his work on nationalism with the ideal-type of "Ruritania").

It is interesting to compare the reception of these two cosmopolitans in British social anthropology. After patient years of apprenticeship with Seligman, Malinowski emerged in the 1920s as the unchallenged leader of a school. But I suspect that Volume II of Michael Young's biography will provide more details to document the reservations harboured by some sections of the British establishment. As for his anthropology, even before his death his theories were largely dismissed or ignored. Without the loyal efforts of Raymond Firth it is doubtful he would have anything like his present stature. Evans-Pritchard, one of his first students at the LSE and surely the most quintessentially English of anthropologists, was later devastating:

'… he was unscrupulous in his use of theoretical writers as strawmen and quite unconstructive theoretically … What Malinowski calls a theory is not really a theory at all … It never rises above the descriptive and operational level of analysis; and it is for the most part a verbose elaboration of the obvious and the erection of commonplaces into scientific concepts.' (1981: 199)

At the end of his admiring Introduction to this posthumously published volume, Gellner tries to salvage the few positive positive things E-P had to say about Malinowski. I wonder if he detected any similarity to the invective regularly directed at his own work. True, he was appointed to a most prestigious position in Cambridge; but (so I was informed at the time) only after overcoming dogged opposition from one of Evans-Pritchard's successors at Oxford. What was the problem? Was it simply that he had published polemical criticism of the idealism of Oxford linguistic philosophy? Surely there was more to it than that. For some of his anthropological critics, Gellner's Enlightenment universalism was an affront, a contradiction of the prime job of the anthropologist, namely the appreciation of diversity. Somehow his style of combative cosmopolitanism did not endear the outsider from Central Europe to the mainstream "native anthropologists". Gellner served for a few years as the President of Royal Anthropological Institute: but it is hard to imagine him being nominated as Chair of the ASA.

Explanations can be pursued at various levels, including the personal and the local politics of the departments and institutions in which Malinowski and Gellner worked. I shall not pursue these factors but point to two key factors to explain similarity and difference in turn.

In terms of intellectual ambition, I see a basic similarity. Both Malinowski and Gellner were trained in Western philosophy and they aimed in their anthropology to reach levels of scientific generalization at which the details of local cultures were of no relevance. As noted, they divided the world up into cultures, which they tended to see as "harder", less flexible entities than Boas, but they never doubted that some forms of our knowledge of the empirical world were culture free. Malinowski found an ultimate basis for his functionalism in the "biological needs" of the individual. Gellner's universalism is grounded in Popper's epistemology and his vision of the "open society". Our modern forms of knowledge are necessarily provisional and unstable, but the criteria of modern Western science have given us an incredibly powerful toolkit for acting upon the world. Gellner was frequently impatient with the sort of relativist who argued that such understanding was no more than one cosmology among others, and not inherently different from the world-view of a "primitive society". He was a thoroughgoing "great

divide" theorist, for whom the political breakthrough to "civil society" coincided not only with the economic breakthrough from *Agraria* to *Industria* but also with the cognitive breakthrough that has produced modern science.[1]

Malinowski never offered anything remotely comparable. But for all his synchronicism and dismissal of "conjectural history" I suggest that his world view (e.g. as summarised in 1944a) is not very different.

It is hardly surprising that an emphasis upon a radical discontinuity in human history which all revolves around a "miracle" in Europe arouses suspicion among anthropologists. Gellner was a good match for Malinowski in composing provocative hyperbole. In many passages in works such as *Conditions of Liberty* (1994) he wrote of a collective "we" in the post-Enlightenment West, fortunately acquainted with liberal individualism, the only possible basis for a free civil society, while most of the world has had to struggle against "totalitarianism" or the "tyranny of cousins". Just like the late Malinowski, Gellner leaves you in no doubt about his values and political sympathies. But at least they do so transparently. I don't actually see much difference to the values to which Clifford Geertz owns up more obliquely in some of his later writings (2000). In particular, I don't think Gellner ever pleads for a *moral* universalism. Other cultures have different systems of knowledge and different values. We can say that *our* science is much more powerful and the basis for universal knowledge; we can also state a preference to live in a society based on Popperian values; but I think both Gellner's cosmopolitan universalism and Malinowski's earlier variant step short of claiming that these values are *better*.

Both of these Central Europeans have to pay a price for their ambition to theorise outside the constraints of culture. As the biographical and exegetical studies multiply, we are obtaining more and more insight into the links between the *œuvre* and the particular conditions of its creation. Although they remain forever Central Europeans from the perspective of the mainstream ASA membership, from other perspectives each looks comes to look more and more British. Malinowski's sympathetic stance to the Empire

[1] He did not deny that the mechanisms through which this knowledge is produced have specific cultural dimensions. But I don't think he would have been very excited by the work that has been carried out in "science studies" in recent years, since for him this has no bearing his fundamental insistence on the "effective knowledge" of the modern West.

replicated his sympathies for the Habsburg Empire into which he was born. As for Gellner, the historian William McNeill sees him as the "diminished, battered heir" (1996: 572 to the *philosophes*. *Plough, Sword and Book* (Gellner 1988) is, for McNeill, "a swan song for British liberalism". Ironically, in view of Gellner's lifelong anti-idealist polemics, McNeill concludes that the attention he pays to an alleged revolution in cognition leads him into the same intellectualist traps as those he criticised.

"A swan song": wouldn't this phrase be better applied to Malinowski? In any case timing is surely one key to explaining the very different standing of the two figures in the history of the discipline. Malinowski's theoretical premises and aspirations could be overlooked in the last days of Empire; the inspiration of his fieldwork was sufficient to justify his self-promotion as the founder of a school and confer the status that is confirmed with each new edition of Adam Kuper's textbook. But Gellner's defiant "Enlightenment fundamentalism" came in the aftermath of Empire, when all the old certainties had to be questioned and anything that smacked of Eurocentrism was inherently suspect; and nowhere more so than in anthropology, a discipline that in countries such as Britain was very largely a product of the Empire. Temperamentally I think Gellner sometimes revelled in his minority position in these debates. Though he supervised many students, both in London and in Cambridge, there is no Gellnerian school. In terms of intellect and charisma our last Central European was at least an equal to our first: if Gellner has only a handful of loyal followers, few of them anthropologists, this is largely due to the embarrassment that a militant pro-Enlightenment stance is considered to create for our discipline in a postcolonial world.

II

So far I have discussed the contributions of two Central Europeans to social anthropology in Britain. I take it for granted that our subject has always been promiscuous and comparative, but it became much more diverse and international in the age of Malinowski. Different views concerning universalism and relativism, or synchronicity versus history, or structure versus process, etc. etc, have all taken place within an inherently cosmopolitan intellectual community. Much more might be ventured here about how the community of the ASA has been shaped over the years by changing patterns of

international recruitment (my impression is that the academic job market remains much more open in Britain than it is elsewhere in Europe; but the decisive factor is the English language, rather than any greater propensity to cosmopolitanism on the part of our politicians and educational managers).

Instead I turn now to the prospects for a new cosmopolitanism elsewhere in Europe, namely in countries in which quite different styles of anthropology developed in the nineteenth century and continued with surprisingly few modifications down to the end of the socialist era and beyond. Both Malinowski and Gellner grew up in such places. The former cultivated close ties to ethnographers in Poland for many years after leaving Cracow; up to his work in the Trobriands he published mainly in Polish. It seems to me likely that, at least up to the time of his marriage, following completion of the Trobriand fieldwork, he was intending to return to an academic career in Poland. But after rejecting the offer of a position as assistant professor of *Etnologia* in Cracow in 1922, it seems that Malinowski gave up all thought of returning to Poland.[2]

As for Gellner, though he forged close contacts to numerous anthropologists in Moscow, his links to his home city of Prague became strong only in the postsocialist years. In 1992, having retired from Cambridge, he accepted an invitation to build up a new Centre for the Study of Nationalism, as part of the Prague component of the Central European University (financed by George Soros and intended to reinvigorate the spirit of the "open society" among the region's intellectuals). Gellner inspired several cohorts of students here, until his death in November 1995. However, I am not aware of any close contacts to local ethnographers. Indeed, the Prague College of the CEU was never well integrated in the city and it was closed soon after Gellner's death. Despite the valiant efforts of (ASA member) Peter Skalník, social anthropology has not been established at the Charles University, where the previous programmes in ethnography and folklore continue to flourish. What is going on here?

[2] See his letter to the Dean, translated in Ellen et al 1988: 206-7, in which he explains that he is not ready to accept a permanent teaching position anywhere because of the overriding need to write up his fieldwork materials and undertake more urgent expeditions. In fact he accepted a post at the LSE that same year and undertook no further expeditions.
During the inter-war decades Polish ethnographers were generally expected to fulfill „nation-building" functions; research in other parts of the world declined.

These are controversial matters. The position in Cracow is quite different from that in Prague (due largely to astute instrumentalisation of Malinowski as an ancestor), Budapest is different again, and there are major differences within each of these countries. I shall abstract from local details to outline the general contours. At the heart of the matter is whether one considers subjects called *etnologia* or *narodopis* or *folklor* to be the Central European equivalents of social or cultural anthropology, or whether one considers them to form a separate discipline (or even disciplines). In my view this is and should remain one unified field; I shall try to explain why some of my good friends in the region see matters differently.

It is easiest to begin with the German terms, since the two main strands have long been separately institutionalized in the German-speaking countries. Scholars such as Tamás Hofer (1968) and George Stocking (1982) have laid out the contrast between nation-centred *Volkskunde,* devoted above all to the 'folk culture' of the peasantry, which was assumed to reveal the essence of the *Volk,* and *Völkerkunde,* the comparative enquiries which developed mainly in those Western European states that established overseas empires in the nineteenth century. Relatively little attention has been paid to the remarkable persistence of the nation-centred tradition in the era of Marxist-Leninist socialism, in which one might have expected that the ostensible ideology would have prescribed quite different approaches in Central Europe (Hann, Sárkány and Skalnik 2005). The socialist era did bring some changes and innovations in *Volkskunde*. For example, some ethnographers began to analyze the rural population as stratified along class lines rather than as a harmonious essence. However, many preferred to shy away from the study of contemporary changes (even after it became possible politically to conduct research in the socialist countryside) and to continue working with the dominant temporality of their pre-socialist predecessors (Kuti 2005). The discipline therefore became increasingly oriented towards the salvaging of cultural elements from a preindustrial past. It was typically located in a Faculty of History. Some ethnographers made serious use of archival sources, though engagement with concrete processes of social change was usually limited.

Those dissatisfied with the antiquarian or ahistorical nation-centered paradigm and attracted by western currents in cultural or social anthropology have attempted to

exploit the opportunities of postsocialist reconstruction to establish a new discipline on the local intellectual landscape. Some were keen to make local connections and devote time and resources to making the works of scholars such as Malinowski and Gellner available in Polish and Czech respectively. Others are more adventurous and prefer to expose students to the latest North American products. James Clifford and Arjun Appadurai appear to be especially popular.[3] It is easy to understand how the end of the Cold War and sudden opening up of these countries to Western influences created a market for such authors. It is also easy to imagine what Gellner would have said about the new cosmopolitanism: students who had never read a page of Malinowski were being introduced as novices to George Marcus on 'multi-sited ethnography', or encouraged to do 'fieldwork' in the internet, and assured that this was the cutting edge of anthropology.

Of course the old ethnographers were not ready simply to vacate the stage; and besides their national mission was now once again highly relevant, so that there was no danger of their funding being cut by the new postsocialist governments. The Young Turks of Western-oriented anthropology have frequently been obliged to forge new alliances, e.g. with sociology, cultural studies and media studies in their "struggle" (Skalnik 2002) to introduce their subject into the curriculum. The institutional outcomes have been extremely diverse and there is still little sign of long-term stability. In some places new departments of cultural anthropology have been established within a Faculty of Social Sciences, while the older departments of ethnography compete to recruit students to a Faculty of History.

I think this rivalry and duplication are regrettable. I am aware that a dual model exists in Scandinavia as well as in Germany. In the latter the contacts between the two are minimal. It is still difficult if not impossible for a project based 'at home' to be recognized for a degree in *Völkerkunde*; and 'at home' may mean anywhere in Europe, not just Germany. In the small countries of Central Europe it seems to me that the fragmentation of an already small discipline and the multiplication of organizations are

[3] A great deal depends on which works are available in translation: although English language skills are improving everywhere, few university students are comfortable reading even article-length texts let alone monographs. Obtaining state support for translation is a fine art throughout the region. Student demand seems to be potentially strong everywhere and this has been reflected in the launching of numerous new periodicals; but, despite the survival of relatively well-endowed research institutes within the framework of Academies of Sciences, graduates find it increasingly difficult to obtain academic positions.

unlikely to be a good thing in purely practical terms.[4] I also think there are good intellectual reasons for unity.

A closer look at the disciplinary history indicates that comparative work in other lands seldom disappeared entirely. Let me point briefly to the example of Hungary, the one I know best. Hungarian *néprajzosok* have been deeply involved in nation-building and a focus on the nation has dominated down to the present day. Their penchant for investigating presumed ancestors of the Magyars in Siberia, which has produced many fine comparative studies, can also be understood as part of the nation-centred framework. But Hungarian anthropologists also found their way to many other corners of the world in the late Habsburg period when Budapest was a second imperial capital. Long after this status was lost and throughout the socialist period, a minority of the *néprajzosok* continued to specialise in other parts of the world. Moreover by the 1970s some were beginning to work in a more anthropological way in their own countries, e.g. in studying contemporary social changes. Mihály Sárkány was one of the key figures in this trend. He has recently headed a major restudy of a village in Northern Hungary in order to assess the impact of postsocialist changes and we have compared our data from different parts of the countryside (Hann and Sárkány 2005). At the same time, Sárkány teaches courses on theory and method in social anthropology, with special reference to economic anthropology, and on Africa, where he also has fieldwork experience.

Sárkány is, admittedly, an exceptional figure among Hungarian *néprajzosok*. My point is that he has been able to spend his entire career promoting wider social anthropological agendas *within* the framework of national *néprajz*. So long as this is possible, in other words so long as multiple spatial and temporal frameworks can be adopted *within* the established institutional framework, I can see no justification for importing a "new" subject from the West. As far as I can judge, certainly in the work I see concerning contemporary "transition", there is increasing convergence between

[4] It is worth remembering that the staff of these older departments have national associations that are much older than the ASA (though not the RAI). They were organized at the European level long before the foundation of the *European Association of Social Anthropologists*, an organization in which they have from the start felt marginalized.

cultural anthropologists and the *narodopisci* or *néprajzosok*, in terms of the subjects they address and the methods they employ. More intensive cooperation would, it seems to me, be mutually beneficial. Some local scholars have expressed fears to me that national ethnography will simply disappear if they do not resist what they perceive to be the cosmopolitan juggernaut of cultural anthropology. But I see no reason why, within unified departments, sub-groups with a *Volkskunde* orientation should not continue to flourish. In a number of places, especially in Poland, the older departments have changed their names by adding 'and cultural anthropology'. This seems to be working well.

Let me conclude by going one step further. The expertise of the "native ethnographer" on his/her home society need not be seen as inhibiting the generalizing comparative perspective of more "cosmopolitan" styles. The home variant can also be viewed as providing roots or a bedrock for scholars with those further objectives. From this point of view it is the British student of social anthropology who is in the less fortunate position, when compared with students in today's Central Europe. For example, the study of folklore hardly exists as an established academic field in Britain, where the only way to study the preindustrial rural population is to enroll for courses in social and economic history. But surely British anthropology students might benefit from more engagement with the mainstream traditions of their own country; this would help to overcome the dominant bias of our version of the discipline, which grew out of the study of the 'savage' and the 'primitive', and even when practised at home tends to focus on the marginal and exotic, and to neglect history.

Conclusion

In Part I I explored the cosmopolitan anthropology of Bronislaw Malinowski and Ernest Gellner and their incorporation into the history of British social anthropology. I judged this to be overwhelming successful, but in neither case entirely frictionless. I drew attention to similarities in their general values and also to their habit of conceptualizing humanity as a mosaic of organic cultures. This is the less frequently noted complement to their basic modernist individualism. I suggested that this holism derives from their upbringing in *Mitteleuropa* in the heyday of nationalism. In this respect I place both

Gellner and Malinowski on the same side of a significant boundary *within* anthropology's cosmopolitans; on the other side is the tradition from Radcliffe-Brown to Kuper, scholars profoundly suspicious of the concept of culture. Malinowski and Gellner reacted against this Herderianism in their political and epistemological liberal individualism; but for later critics, both remained imprisoned with the confines of a dichotomy specific to the modern West, a fact which undermines their larger theoretical aspirations.

I think it would be an interesting exercise in the history of anthropology to link these two giants of the British tradition to other anthropological exports from Central Europe. Thanks above all to George Stocking, the significance of the German connection for North American anthropology is fairly well understood (Boas, Kroeber, Lowie etc) but it does not stop there. Karl Polanyi's formative years were spent in Budapest and Vienna. The contributions of Géza Róheim, Mircea Eliade and many more were decisively shaped by their socialization and training in these parts of Europe. All were cosmopolitans, in comparison with the non-émigrés who dominated in the discipline of national ethnography.

Instead of pursuing such cases (possibly a future book project) I turned in Part II to consider the situation of our subject in Central Europe in the fluid period following the collapse of socialism. I argued from the premise that the 'nation-centred' variant is a part of anthropology, not a separate discipline. Despite socialism's internationalist ideology, scholars in this field had little opportunity to develop cosmopolitan approaches in the recent past. In the postsocialist era they have been fearful of losing their professional identity in the face of what they perceive as an aggressive English-language anthropology. I suggested that these strands belong together, rather than in separate departments in separate faculties, since they have much to learn from each other. It is good that the works of Malinowski and Gellner are being translated into their native languages, so that they can be read more widely, also by students whose prime interest is in their own country. Similarly, I think it would make for a healthy balance if works by the likes of E.P. Thompson, Hans Medick and Peter Burke would find their way into the basic curricula of anthropology departments in Britain. A mature cosmopolitan anthropology should be a synthesis of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde*, neither the celebration of our own people nor a preoccupation with "the other".

References

Ellen, R.E. et al (eds), *Malinowski between Two Worlds: the Polish roots of an anthropological tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1981 *A History of Anthropological Thought*. Faber and Faber.

Geertz, C. 2000 *Available Light; anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*. Princeton University Press.

Gellner, E. 1988 ‘’Zeno of Cracow’ or ‘Revolution at Nemi’ or ‘The Polish revenge: a drama in three acts’ in R. Ellen *et al* (eds), *Malinowski Between Two Worlds: the Polish roots of an anthropological tradition*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 164-94.

- 1988 *Plough, Sword and Book; the structure of human history*. Collins Harvill

- 1994 *Conditions of Liberty; civil society and its rivals*. Hamish Hamilton

Hann, C. and M. Sárkány 2003 ‘The Great Transformation in Rural Hungary; property, life strategies and living standards’ in Chris Hann and the ‘Property Relations’ group, *The Postsocialist Agrarian Question; property relations and the rural condition*, Lit. pp. 117-42.

- and M. Sárkány and P. Skalník (eds) 2005 *Studying Peoples in the People’s Democracies. Socialist era anthropology in East-Central Europe*. Lit.

Hofer, T. 1968 ‘Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: comparative notes on the professional personality of two disciplines’, Current Anthropology, 9 (4): 311–315.

Kuper, A. 1996 Obituary of Ernest Gellner, *Anthropology Today* 12 (1): 19-20.

Malinowski, B. 1944a *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. The University of North Carolina Press.

- 1944b *Freedom and Civilization*. Roy.

McNeill, W. H. 1996 ‘A swan song for British liberalism?’ in J. Hall and I. Jarvie (eds), *The Social Philosophy of Ernest Gellner*. Rodopi. pp. 565-72.

Mucha, J. 1988 ‘Malinowski and the problems of contemporary civilisation’ in R. Ellen et al (eds), *Malinowski between Two Worlds: the Polish roots of an anthropological tradition*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 164-94.

Skalník, P. (ed.), 2002 *A Post-Communist Millennium: the struggles for sociocultural*

anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe. Set Out.

Stocking, G. 1982. 'Afterword: A view from the center,' *Ethnos* 47 (1-2): 172-186.

Young, M. W. 2004 *Malinowski; Odyssey of an anthropologist, 1884-1920*. Yale University Press.