

# 17.

Inclusions  
and exclusions  
in the production  
and circulation  
of scientific  
knowledge:  
the case of the Royal  
Anthropological  
Institute (RAI) and of  
the Portuguese Society  
of Anthropology  
and Ethnology (SPAÉ)

Patrícia Ferraz de Matos

## INTRODUCTION

This text examines and demonstrates why the activity of two European scientific societies carried out approximately from 1918 to 1960 (although both are still active today) enables us to study inclusion and exclusion dynamics.<sup>1</sup> These dynamics will be analysed based on the study of the relationship between the Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) – created in 1871 and still recognised and renowned internationally today – and the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology (SPAЕ, *Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia*) – founded in 1918 and whose activity is nowadays considered peripheral. Nevertheless, during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, these societies shared some of their members, exchanged ideas, research and publications, and cooperated in the organisation of several international events.

The research presented in this text is related to two wider research projects: one entitled “The weavings of science: an anthropological view on the networks underlying the forging of scientific knowledge”, which I am working on at the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon; and another on the history of the RAI, sponsored by this same institution. My project at ICS aims to contribute towards the study of the institutionalisation of anthropology in Portugal, based on an analysis of the people and knowledge networks connected to SPAЕ and the University of Porto, up to the 1970s. On the other hand, the RAI project, encompassing the history of the institution itself, is a long-term study on which specialists from several countries are currently working. The analysis presented here is therefore set out as work in progress and not as an account of final results, since both projects are still running. This is, as yet, an under-explored subject, mainly from the perspective of the social studies of science, and some of the materials used, and which I intend to leverage, are widely unknown, or have been scarcely studied. This can also be due to the difficulty in accessing and working on a significant part of those primary sources.

The reason why I decided to widen my research to the RAI archive is the fact that this institution has played a central role in the history of anthropology, gathering around it a set of people who have organised several activities related to this field. It has also been a starting point for several initiatives, both

1 My sincere thanks to Sarah Walpole (archivist at the RAI) for the support given to me during my research. I also thank SPAЕ’s board, particularly its chairman, Vítor Oliveira Jorge, for allowing me to access the archive.

at a national and international level. Its archive has a considerable volume of correspondence sent by people and institutions from all continents, which could be the possible basis for mapping a relationship.

Although this analysis is focused on the relationship between these two institutions, in some instances it can be widened, considering other Portuguese institutions with which the RAI has had connections, namely the Universities of Coimbra and Lisbon, as well as institutions in other territories once administrated by the Portuguese, such as Goa (in the then Portuguese India and under Portuguese dominion until 1961). The material held by SPAE and the RAI may offer us much useful information for the study of the institutionalisation of anthropology, as a discipline, both in Portugal and in England, but also at a global level.

My methodology is inspired, among others, by the work of Bruno Latour (1987), but it is not strictly guided by it, as in other studies (Bastos and Barreto 2013), and considers its limitations. Concerning the analysis of a network of people, it is important to keep in mind the boundaries of the actor-network theory and of the social studies of science and technology<sup>2</sup> (Mendes 2010). On the other hand, we cannot forget that there are individuals and events forced into silence and invisibility. Any critical analysis must bear in mind the limitations of the scientist's scope and the circumstantial character of its conclusions, when studying the way scientific knowledge has been built and disseminated.

The matter of invisibility may also be related to processes of appreciation, selection and sponsoring. Some authors have classified the Portuguese scientific system as peripheral. For example, João Arriscado Nunes and Maria Eduarda Gonçalves (2001, 19) consider that "from the point of view of the capitalist economy/world and of the interstate system, Portugal is a peripheral country" and that this condition is one of the "keys to understanding the specific features of the history of science in Portugal". As regards anthropology, we realise that some examples have been shown to play a more central role in the history of this area. This is the case of British social anthropology, of American cultural anthropology and also of anthropology in France, which, during the 1960s and 1970s, gained important status, mainly due to authors such as Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009). On the other hand, with respect to the institutionalisation of anthropology, not all contributors to this process are

2 On the challenges brought to these theories by the new technologies, see Matos (2017).

considered as such, and surely not as precursors, or as having presented work that deserves to be remembered. These are the ones Richard Handler (2000) designated as “excluded ancestors”, that is, those authors who, despite having played a role that was considered important during their lifetime, were fated to oblivion or to the denial of their contribution.<sup>3</sup>

For the reasons presented above, to study the way the two scientific societies (SPAÉ and RAI) were related at some time is a contribution to confirming Portugal’s peripheral status, although, in some circumstances, it has played a prominent role in comparison to other countries.<sup>4</sup> I will start by characterising the particularities I found in both archives, RAI’s and SPAÉ’s. I will then describe the context in which these societies were born and the activities they carried out, as well as their publications. In a later section, I will analyse the relationship between these societies, based on institutional and personal correspondence, on the exchange of research and publications, on the invitation of foreign scientists to become honorary or correspondent members, and also on the organisation of scientific meetings.

This analysis was based, not only on the archival documentation of these societies (in London and Porto, respectively), but also on their periodical publications, that is, the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (formerly *Man*) and *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia* (TAE). Within the scope of the work exchange and of the cooperation in the journals published by both societies, I will approach some of the subjects incorporated in these publications that are directly related to the historical context where they were brought to life. Furthermore, I will analyse the correspondence exchanged between the RAI and other Portuguese institutions besides SPAÉ, as well as the joint efforts at organising events, such as international congresses, or the formation of scientific committees devoted to specific matters. We will see, in the period under analysis, that both societies have contributed to the specialisation of a greater number of people in a specific scientific domain – anthropology –, as distinguished from other areas, as well as to spreading the knowledge produced by this new study field.

3 An example of these authors in the Portuguese scientific world, and particularly in the history of anthropology, is Mendes Correia (1888-1960), whose life and work I analysed in my doctoral dissertation (Matos 2012).

4 On the relationship between Portugal and Brazil, for example, from some of the most renowned scientists of this period (1910s – 1960s), see Matos (2013a).

The analysis of the RAI and SPAE's relationship will allow us to determine the inclusion and exclusion dynamics regarding the production and circulation of scientific knowledge. This relationship, which involved the selection of actors and areas, or the promotion of initiatives, shows us that some structures have revealed greater strength (by being associated with countries like the United Kingdom or France) and eventually determined the standards based on which attitudes were stated, positions held and power strategies consolidated, and which were later on reproduced. Even today we still find some remnants of those phenomena.

## THE FIELD AND THE CONTEXT

The challenges an archive research presents to us are huge, but according to Tristan Platt, it can be as focused as fieldwork. Documents refer to the same people and the same places we find in the chaotic fieldwork notes, relating them to others, as unknown places (Platt 2012, 31). Therefore, similarly to the life of individuals, the archive sources are open. They answer certain questions but raise further ones that remain unanswered (Platt 2012, 32).

The RAI archive is comprised of a great variety of materials (documents, photographs, films and objects). It is in a multi-storey building, is well organised and accessible to researchers; and my research there was an interesting and productive experience (Figure 17.1).

When I went to SPAE, however, I did not find an organised archive (Figure 17.2). My study forced me to create the necessary conditions for an archive or, in this case, for my own field. This material included monographs, periodicals, multimedia documents, the archive section itself, and a set of publications by the society. Given its importance, I stressed its value to the members of this society and the need for its due preservation, inventory and accessibility for other researchers. Following several measures taken since 2013, the material was inventoried for the first time in 2015<sup>5</sup>, in a procedure that involved the President of SPAE, the Rector of the University of Porto, the Director of the Faculty of Humanities of this university, as well as the support of two assistants with archive training.

5 Once the inventory was completed, in October 2015, with minimal information (author, date, and edition), we realised that it contained 36,403 records, divided into 27,921 periodicals, 8,470 monographs and 12 multimedia units. Additionally there are 12,048 volumes of publications by SPAE, gathered in 902 boxes.

**Figure 17.1** *RAI Archive, London, 2016.*



**Figure 17.2** *SPAÉ Archive, Porto, 2015.*



The part pertaining to archive material has not yet been inventoried, but I have already started consulting it (Figure 17.2). From the monograph and periodical inventory, we can conclude that the number of exchanges, as well as the number of individuals and places that have had contact with SPAE are higher than predicted. This will allow me to make a wider and more complete mapping than initially planned.

The appearance of RAI and SPAE, as well as the activities these institutions have fostered and developed, must be seen in the context of the historic period in which they occurred. On the other hand, both the local and global focus are important, as well as considering the dynamics at a formal and informal level. Besides this, it is important to understand what was decided to be included and excluded within this context. As mentioned by Adam Kuper:

Earnest science stories, such as good ethnographies, must encompass the practices of its actors, institutional structures, social networks, intellectual and material resources, as well as the relationships to other disciplines and foreign schools or with official bodies. (...) We must not reflect only upon what anthropologists speak of, but also upon who they speak to and who they exclude from that interaction.

The period analysed in this text runs from the end of the First to that of the Second World War. This period also witnesses the foundation and affirmation of SPAE as a scientific society, which stimulated the development of anthropology and sought its recognition in the university environment as an independent study domain. In England, the period from 1918 to 1945 was marked by the emergence of functionalist ethnography, the division of anthropology into sub-disciplines and the definitive institutionalisation of anthropology in universities. The RAI was connected to these processes and followed their evolution by organising conferences and publications. At the same time, it expanded its library, created the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, and made several attempts to allow anthropology to also play a role as an applied science. During that period, the RAI was a confluence point for individuals connected to several institutions and sub-areas in anthropology.

The RAI, created in 1871, and SPAE, created in 1918, were preceded by other scientific societies, but sought to benefit from those previous experiences, both in their own, as well as in other European countries and in the USA. In Europe,

the most significant learned society, the Ethnological Society of London, was founded in 1843; and, in 1871, it was merged with the Anthropological Society of London (created in 1862) to form the RAI. Its first members were amateurs and, later on, colonial officers and missionaries followed suit. These members were gradually replaced by professional anthropologists and, in 1992, its membership already reached 2,408 (Urry 2006, 44). To receive full RAI fellowship, potential members must be proposed by Fellows who are personally acquainted with them. RAI Membership is aimed mainly at scholars who have distinguished themselves professionally or academically within the scope of humanities or social sciences. Fellows are elected by the RAI Council and can use the honorific post-nominal letters FRAI. However, the RAI does not include only academic anthropologists, but also individuals interested in anthropology, or qualified in anthropology, who are currently working in other areas.

The RAI publishes three journals: *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*<sup>6</sup> (formerly *Man*); *Anthropology Today*; *Anthropological Index Online* (launched in 1997). Besides these, with the authorisation of the RAI Council, the title *Indian Antiquary* was published, between 1925 and 1932. The RAI's collection is composed of films, photographs, archive material and manuscripts. Both the archive and the manuscripts correspond to a period of over 150 years. The RAI still maintains a close relationship with the British Museum's Anthropology Library, which incorporates the former RAI Library donated to the Museum in 1976.

The RAI encompasses all fields in anthropology (at a biological, evolutionary, social, cultural, visual and medical level) and shares interests with other areas, such as archaeology, linguistics and human genetics. Its field of action is diversified by seeking to combine academic tradition with the services offered to the anthropological community. The activities promoted by the RAI seek to reach a wide audience and inform on the benefits anthropology may offer in the resolution of current, concrete issues. Among these activities are conferences, workshops or events on specific topics. One of the most appreciated is the International Film Festival, taking place every two years in partnership with United Kingdom universities.

6 The title used between 1907 and 1965 was *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. From 1995 onwards, it bore the title *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.



Such RAI activities, individually and partnered by other institutions, have contributed to the diffusion of this society and its consolidation internationally. The publishing of several journals has allowed it to take in new authors and trends, and to reach more diversified audiences. The same applies to the organisation of events directed at a specialised audience, but also at the public in general.

In the Portuguese case, the institutionalisation of anthropology was parallel to the affirmation and institutionalisation of other areas. This occurred in a similar manner to other European and North American countries, but did bear its own specificities both at a local and regional level (Matos 2016). On the other hand, this process was influenced by the political and ideological context towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Matos 2012).

SPAЕ was founded in Porto in 1918. Considering the dates of other anthropological societies created in Europe – in Paris (1858), Berlin (1869), Vienna (1870), London and Italy (1871), and Sweden (1872) – SPAЕ (1918) was rather late in appearing. It is, however, important to note that SPAЕ had important predecessors in Portugal, namely the Carlos Ribeiro Society, created in Porto in 1888 (which included four departments: Geology and Palaeontology; Zoology and Botany; Anthropology; Ethnography), and the Society of Anthropology, created in Coimbra in 1896. SPAЕ was founded on the initiative of Mendes Correia (1888-1960), who graduated in Medicine from the Porto Medical and Surgical School in 1911 and would become the primary mentor of the Porto School of Anthropology, which existed as such in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the process of creating SPAЕ, Mendes Correia counted on the support of more experienced personalities, connected to the Faculty of Medicine and to the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Porto, and to the Polytechnic Academy in Porto. However, despite the predominance of academics in its directive bodies, SPAЕ has always counted on the presence of individuals from outside academia, that is, from the military, religious and business domains (Matos 2016).

The name of the society illustrates the initial division between anthropology (the study of the human being in terms of their physical and biological dimension) and ethnology (the study of the human being in terms of their social and cultural dimension). SPAЕ operated at the Institute of Anthropology of the University of Porto (IAUP), organised several scientific meetings and regularly published the journal *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia* (TAE).

Similarly to some of its counterparts in Europe and in the USA, SPAE gathered a small group of specialists with common academic and social interests. Besides, it grew to be an institutional space with a considerable scientific dynamic, as well as a place for debate and the exchange of ideas. SPAE is still active, promoting monthly conferences and debates, not only on historical issues, mainly related to anthropology and archaeology, but also on current matters. And it still publishes its journal, nowadays on an annual basis.

Therefore, both the RAI and SPAE have contributed to the institutionalisation process of anthropology as a science. Both have stimulated and been participative bodies in study missions in the countries where they were based and also in their respective colonies.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, they have contributed, each in its own way, to the spread of knowledge connected to anthropology, including several sub-domains.

#### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPAE AND THE RAI

In the period under study, Portugal still occupied a marginal spot as regards scientific production. However, in the case of SPAE, a considerable effort was made towards internationalisation. SPAE sought to widen its relationship with older and already prestigious institutions, by means of an institutional and personal correspondence, through the exchange of research and publications (books and articles), and by inviting foreign personalities to become honorary or correspondent members. This wider scope was also materialised with SPAE's participation in the creation of the International Institute of Anthropology (IIA), founded in Paris in 1920, and in organising several international events.

The RAI was among the institutions to which SPAE was connected. There are several examples of the exchange of correspondence between the RAI and SPAE, as well as between the RAI and the University of Porto, since some of SPAE's members were connected to the university's faculties of humanities, science and medicine. SPAE invited some RAI members to participate in the society. For example, Arthur Keith, member of the RAI, was proposed as SPAE's correspondent member on December 26<sup>th</sup>, 1918.<sup>8</sup> Later on, some of SPAE's

7 On the production of scientific knowledge on the Portuguese colonies, see Matos (2013b, 2018).

8 *Livro de Actas da Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia I*, 1918-1924.

members, connected to the University of Porto, also became members of the RAI. This is the case of Mendes Correia, elected an honorary member of the RAI in 1956. This fact was considered of great importance in Portugal, since the RAI was referred to as “one of the most highly-ranked aeropaguses in the world” (AAVV 1957, 125), which became the reason for organising an event honouring Mendes Correia, at Lisbon’s Geographic Society on April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1957 (Matos 2012, 31-32).

The cooperation between SPAE and the RAI included the exchange of publications and cooperation in the journals published by both societies – the *JRAI/Man* and the *TAE*. The promise by SPAE’s directive council to set up links and exchanges with the RAI was kept as early as in 1919 (report dated January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1920). Among SPAE’s material, we can find several copies of periodicals originating from the RAI and also copies that were exchanged. One of the articles included in those exchanges and that appears isolated (that is, it is not simply integrated in a journal volume, but is there also as an offprint sent by the author himself) is by Arthur Keith, and is entitled “On certain factors concerned in the evolution of human races”, having been published in volume 46 of the *JRAI*, in 1916, pp. 10-34.

The oldest of RAI’s editions we can find at SPAE is number 3, from volume 20, of *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* dated 1891. And the most recent seems to be volume 35, numbers 198 to 217, dated 1935. I cannot fathom the motive for this interruption in sending the volumes to SPAE. It was the middle of the 1930s, four years away from the beginning of the Second World War and, back then, there were several subjects of interest for both societies. In any case, this exchange reflects the importance that SPAE, and its members, had attributed to RAI’s publications since its inception.

Bearing this in mind, the analysis of the subjects published by the RAI that caught the attention of Portuguese authors is one of my ongoing lines of research towards a full assessment of the impact of RAI’s publications, expressed as quotes and references in articles, books and papers presented at conferences. In other words, I intend to determine which subjects attracted Portuguese authors, at the expense of others, which ones were excluded or ignored, despite the relevance they might have once had in other contexts.

One predominant area, for both the RAI and SPAE, was physical anthropology. In the case of the RAI, the presence of the racial issue, the efforts by Miriam L. Tildesley (from the late 1920s) to encourage the creation of a standardisation

technique (in the area of anthropometric measurements), and the creation of projects on blood groups, stand out.<sup>9</sup> A further important topic was eugenics. In fact, in the late 1920s and during the 1930s, ideas on “race” and eugenics reached their peak in the whole of Europe.<sup>10</sup> For example, Miriam L. Tildesley (1883-1979)<sup>11</sup> wrote, on June 26<sup>th</sup>, 1930, to foreign anthropologists to invite them to the meeting of the International Federation of Eugenic Organisations and proposed international cooperation between anthropologists. Tildesley took the occasion to convey one of her greatest interests: the establishment of standardisation at the level of anthropometric techniques:

You will have received (...) an invitation from the Secretary of the International Federation of Eugenic Organisations to take part in a conference which is being held in England from September 10<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup>. The Eugenists are anxious to systematise and develop the anthropometric side of their work, and are making this matter one of the special subjects to be dealt with at their conference. They are therefore inviting leading anthropometrists from various countries to take part in the discussion of this matter.

The standardisation of anthropometric technique is a subject in which I myself am greatly interested, to the extent of having formulated a plan by which we might achieve agreement upon a standard minimum list of characters and a standard technique, in measuring the living.<sup>12</sup>

The RAI published articles on physical anthropology by authors connected to several institutions, as was the case of F. Rozprým of the Anthropological Institute of the Masaryk University (created in 1919, in Brno, the Czech Republic). F. Rozprým published “Eyebrows and Eyelashes in Man: Their different forms, pigmentation and heredity”, in volume 64 of the *JRAI* dated 1934 (pp. 353-395), and this was one of the texts exchanged with SPAE.

9 See on this topic: “Report to the Council of the Royal Anthropological Institute by M. L. Tildesley” (RAI Archive: Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, 1912-34; 1937-9 (A62, 3 of 6, 151/1).

10 On the subject of eugenics in Portugal, see Pereira (2001), Matos (2010), and Cleminson (2014).

11 Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, and member of the RAI Council 1933-59. She was strongly influenced by mathematician and biostatistician Karl Pearson (1857-1936), author of the biography of Francis Galton (1822-1911).

12 RAI Archive: Congrès International..., 1912-34; 1937-9 (A62, 3 of 6, 151/8).

I do not intend to carry out a survey of all countries connected to the authors who published through the RAI, but I'm interested in the activity of the authors who had a relationship with Portugal. And actually, so far, among RAI's publications, I have not found articles by Mendes Correia nor by other authors related to SPAE, the University of Porto or other Portuguese institutions. Even if they exist, I believe that there will be only a few examples. It therefore appears that these authors, and authors generally connected to Portugal, were not exactly included in the RAI's publishing activities.<sup>13</sup> The analysis thus far leads me to conclude that this relationship was unequal, since it seems to have been more proactive on the Portuguese side, and several examples show an apparent protagonism from their British counterparts.

#### ORGANISATION OF CONGRESSES AND EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE

The cooperation between members of these societies has been recorded mostly in the regular correspondence and within the scope of the organisation of events, such as international congresses. There are also letters received by the RAI from individuals connected to Portugal (at the then metropolis or in the colonial territories), which were sent primarily from Porto and Coimbra, although there are also several examples from Lisbon. The Portuguese António Aurélio da Costa Ferreira (1879-1922), for example, graduated in Medicine at the University of Coimbra, subsequently connected to Lisbon, was a local correspondent of the RAI from 1910.

The question of being, or not being included as a member of these societies, institutions or scientific committees of events should not be underestimated, since this membership is precisely what allowed them to attend congresses, publish in journals or take part in decisions on future initiatives. Perhaps for this reason, some Portuguese scientists endeavoured to obtain that membership. For example, concerning the standardisation of anthropometric techniques, there were two competing committees that organised activities separately.

13 However, concerning the JRAI, I found a document in the RAI's archives (A25 - 4 of 4) related to an article entitled "Les indices Robustesse chez les Mahrattes de l'Inde portugaise", by Alberto Carlos Germano da Silva Correia (Panjim [Goa], 1888 - Lisbon, 1967), director of the Goa Surgery and Medical School (located in the then Portuguese India). This article was probably sent to Herbert John Fleure, from the RAI, on November 23rd, 1934, but was not even registered.

According to the documentation kept in the archive by Aleš Hrdlička<sup>14</sup>, at the Smithsonian Institution, in Washington DC, Mendes Correia belonged to these two committees, simultaneously, which is rather surprising.<sup>15</sup> This Portuguese author was in fact connected to several networks, in various countries, that could be dedicated to different domains and even be rivals.

Regarding the organisation of events in the studied period, I found materials related to the International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (Congrès International de Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques), and to the Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques.

These congresses are related to the story of the International Union of the Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences. It began in 1865 when the Congrès paléoethnologique international (CPI) was created, during a meeting of the Italian Society of Natural Sciences. In 1867, the CPI took the name of Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques (CIAAP). Between 1866 and 1912, fourteen congresses were organised. At the session of the CIAAP in Lisbon, in 1880, a Permanent Council was created. The last pre-war meeting of the CIAAP took place in Geneva in 1912.

In its turn, the International Institute of Anthropology (IIA), founded in 1920, and which tried to reunite anthropologists and archaeologists after the First World War, was mainly French-inspired. The IIA, however, differed from the CIAAP: its focus was anthropology, in a wider sense (the study of communities, comparative religion, folklore, among other subjects); prehistoric archaeology comprised a smaller section and, moreover, the researchers from the war's defeated nations were excluded from the IIA's activities (Nenquin and Bourgeois, n.d.). Several anthropologists and prehistoric historians chose, therefore, not to join the IIA. Some of them, such as Marcellin Boule (palaeontologist) and René Verneau (anthropologist), both from the Paris Museum of Natural History and correspondent members of SPAE, Hugo Obermaier (German palaeontologist, correspondent member of SPAE) and Pedro Bosch-Gimpera (Catalan archaeologist who published in *TAE*), tried to continue CIAAP's international path.<sup>16</sup>

14 Aleš Hrdlička founded and became the first curator of physical anthropology of the USA National Museum (now the Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History) in 1903. He was also the founder of the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*.

15 Archive of Aleš Hrdlička at the Smithsonian Institution Archives Collections (Accession 05-123, Personal Records, 1892-1952, Box 11 of 22).

16 On these authors and their influence in Portugal, see Matos (2012).

The cooperation between the members of the CIAAP Permanent Council and the IIA Executive Committee led to the decision (in October 1928) to host the 15<sup>th</sup> session of the CIAAP and the 4<sup>th</sup> session of the IIA in Portugal, during September 1930, under the denomination Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistorique. However, on the IIA's initiative, only the members of the Congrès that were simultaneously members of the IIA would be allowed to vote at that meeting. As a consequence, the 15<sup>th</sup> Congrès was suspended. A small committee was then formed in Porto (September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1930), composed of the members who still belonged to the Permanent Committee, the Presidents of the IIA and of the RAI, and other members, with the aim of assessing the relationship between the IIA and the Congrès. At that committee's meeting in Paris, on December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1930, John Myres (1869-1954), President of the RAI, argued that a separate management of the two organisations was fundamental, and the majority of the attendees agreed that the 1928 agreement had been a mistake.<sup>17</sup>

In 1929, during the International Congress of Archaeology, in Barcelona, a separate development took place that led Bosch-Gimpera to summon a conference in Bern, on May 28<sup>th</sup> 1931, to discuss the future organisation of international congresses, exclusively on prehistoric archaeology, with a truly international character and with no exclusions. The following was decided in Bern: (i) to separate prehistoric studies from general anthropology; (ii) to not reinstate the former pre-war Congrès, but rather create a new one called Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques (CISPP). On the initiative of the Society of Antiquaries and of the RAI, the first meeting of the recently created congress took place in London in 1932. The new Permanent Council was then formed by archaeologists from 35 different nations. Therefore, it is also from the organisation of scientific meetings that anthropology began to have some autonomy from areas such as archaeology and pre-history.

The demise of the old Congrès also resulted in the establishment of the new Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques e Ethnologiques. The first meeting of this congress took place in London and Oxford, in 1934; and, at the time, it was to be held every four years. The second one took place in Copenhagen in 1938; the third one could not be held in 1942 (due to the Second World War), and was rescheduled to 1947, in Prague, but was only held

17 RAI Archive: Congrès International..., 1912-34, 1937-9 (A 62 - 01 of 06, 11).

in 1948, in Brussels and Tervuren. Subsequently, it was organised every four years, as initially planned. Therefore, the fourth meeting happened in 1952, in Vienna, the fifth in 1956, in Philadelphia, and the sixth in 1960, in Paris.

This congress had a Permanent Council that coordinated the event. It included four members of each country, assisted by one or two National Secretaries.<sup>18</sup> The members of this Permanent Council were elected, and it also included authors connected to Portugal. For example, at the congress' London Session, in 1934, the following Portuguese representatives were present: Mendes Correia, Eusébio Tamagnini (professor at the University of Coimbra), and the National Secretaries, Vítor Fontes (President of the Anthropology Committee of the Lisbon Geographic Society), and J.R. dos Santos Júnior (professor at the University of Porto). Of these four, only Mendes Correia and Vítor Fontes took part in the event. The consulted document<sup>19</sup> states that "Fontes is a physical anthropologist and read a paper on 'Sur la morphologie du cou'". According to the previous document, the RAI has no record of who were the representatives of Portugal and the USA in the Permanent Council of the Copenhagen Meeting in 1938. The analysis of these documents suggests that Portugal exhibited a certain neutrality, while other countries, such as the United Kingdom or France, fought among themselves for protagonism. This attitude may nevertheless be related to the goal of the scientific community in Portugal, at least partly, to be recognised internationally, without leveraging national rivalries.

Portugal, and the individuals connected to this country, may also be included in the topics dealt with in documents they were not directly involved in. This happened, for example, in a letter<sup>20</sup> written by E. J. Lindgren (Liaison Officer, from the British Council) to David Shillan (British Council), on April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1944, where he mentions that he intends to deal with "Portuguese affairs":

18 The Permanent Research Committees are: "Standardisation of anthropological technique"; "International research on Arctic peoples and culture"; "Organisation and employment of films in anthropology and ethnography"; "Compilation of a comparative vocabulary of anthropological and ethnological terms", later called "The study and definition of anthropological and ethnological terms". The subsequent Committees included: "The conditions of anthropological and ethnological teaching in the countries represented at the Congress", and "the obstacles to the admission of these studies in public education and Conservation of Aboriginal peoples whose modes of life are scientific interest".

19 RAI Archive: Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques. Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/7).

20 RAI Archive: Congrès International... Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/1).



I am taking the liberty to enclose, for your personal use, a copy of a confidential account by Sir John Myres of the present position regarding the international congresses of prehistory and anthropology which he did so much to establish between the two wars. His references to the mauvais congrès<sup>21</sup> may be explained by saying, briefly, that (as I have been told) after the last war the French insisted on substituting for a previous, 'truly international', series one dominated by the French and their Eastern European allies, and excluding ex-enemy scientists. The British delegates fought this in meeting after meeting, of the executive but, on being finally defeated towards the end of the twenties, decided to sponsor another series, of this old type. The Prehistoric ones met in 1932 and 1936 and the one for 'Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences' in 1934 (London) and 1938 (Copenhagen). The latter two I attended and they were a conspicuous success; their influence indeed spread far beyond their particular sector of the social sciences.

You will see from Sir John's remarks that, very wisely, he wishes us to avoid the mistake the French made before, and that is why he favours our accepting the earlier Portuguese invitation (if renewed) rather than suggesting that we start afresh once more, and once more in London. In any case I shall, as you see, be sounding out the Congress officials in USA, and, if I do return via Lisbon (which is probably), also the Portuguese anthropologists who were in Copenhagen in 1938.

According to this letter, the organisation of congresses dedicated mainly to a scientific domain, in this case anthropology (separately from archaeology and prehistory), could actually be a success. In a conflictive atmosphere between the United Kingdom and France, it is the president of the RAI himself, John Myres, who favours the acceptance of Portugal's offer to host the following International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, and not London; so that other countries might be given an opportunity and to display a truly international attitude. This example was yet another result of the Portuguese scientific community's efforts towards being included in the international meanders concerning the organisation of large events.

These letters sometimes unveil comments and confidences related to the context in which they were written and include matters related to politics and war. Among them, I sought to determine if these matters altered or disrupted the relationship between Portugal and the United Kingdom. During the Second World War, some reminders arise reinforcing the idea that science should be above political interests. This happens, for example, in a letter by

21 Underlined in the original.

John L. Myers (RAI Hon. Secretary), dated April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1944, to E. J. Lindgren (British Council), on reconstructing the international congresses, where he mentions that he hopes “to get scientific problems and organisations free from political considerations”.<sup>22</sup> Also in a letter from Stallman (RAI Assistant Secretary, 1941-52), dated July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1944, to John L. Myers, it is stated that “care must be taken over ‘political’ aspects”.<sup>23</sup>

On the other hand, the research produced during that period, and the changes and limitations it brought, were among the subjects dealt with. The topic of war was also the main theme of the article, “Anthropology on the continent of Europe in war-time” by William Buller Fagg (Hon. Secretary of RAI). Published in *Nature* in 1946 (London, vol. 158, July 6<sup>th</sup>), it talks of the meeting of the Permanent Council that took place in England that same year, and begins by saying:

As has already been reported in *Nature* of May 18, p. 665, the Permanent Council of the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences visited England during April at the invitation of the Royal Anthropological Institute, and a most successful meeting was organised at Oxford by Sir John Myres, one of the joint secretaries of the Congress, to make arrangements for next full meeting and to advance the work of the standing committees. The Royal Anthropological Institute took advantage of this gathering to invite the delegates to read short papers at informal meetings of the Institute in London, on the days immediately preceding and following the Oxford meetings, as a means of making better known in Britain and among the delegates themselves the progress made in anthropological science in their several countries since the outbreak of war brought international contacts to a stop. (Fagg 1946, 1)

The article by Fagg highlights the meeting of the congress’ Permanent Council and stresses the fact that this opportunity allowed some of the international delegates to read their papers at informal meetings. Among them was the Portuguese Eusébio Tamagnini, who presented the paper entitled, “Progress in Portugal in anthropological and ethnological studies”.<sup>24</sup> Fagg is very positive about Tamagnini’s text and the work of other Portuguese in the domains of physical anthropology and archaeology:

22 RAI Archive: Congrès International... Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/2).

23 RAI Archive: Congrès International... Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/9).

24 RAI Archive: Congrès International... Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/4/8).

In physical anthropology, as in domestic ethnography, Great Britain lags at present far behind, and Prof. Tamagnini's talk on April 18, outlining remarkable progress made in Portugal, was fresh salutary proof of this. After a short sketch of the history of anthropological studies in Portugal (with their emphasis from the beginning on the physical side), he summarised current research activities at Lisbon (under Heleno, de Vilhena and Barbosa Sueiro), Porto (Mendes Corrêa and Pires de Lima) and Coimbra (the speaker himself and Serra). Finally, he described his own Institute's very large and important statistical undertaking, in which the genealogical method is being applied in the study of blood groups and other characters among great numbers of families in the Department of Coimbra. (Fagg 1946, 7)

Therefore, the circumstance of war does not seem to have influenced, at least apparently, the relationship between Portugal and the United Kingdom, nor cooperation in scientific production. The correspondence with authors connected to Portugal, or with references to this country, also appears in some folders of the RAI's manuscript collection concerning the following authors: William Croke (1848-1923), ethnologist and folklorist; Arthur Keith (1866-1965), anatomist and anthropologist; and Herbert John Fleure (1877-1969), zoologist and geographer. The names of these scientists and the areas they were focused on reinforce the idea that, despite the endeavour on behalf of anthropology's autonomy, the input received from specialists in other areas also contributed to further deepening some of its subdomains.

## CONCLUSION

From the study of the relationship between the RAI and SPAE, with a focus on the production, legitimation and knowledge circulation processes, we are able to study inclusion and exclusion dynamics. The RAI has allowed several individuals to internationalise their work and has consolidated its position in the international context. During the period under study, Portugal was a peripheral country in terms of scientific production. Nevertheless, examples such as SPAE reveal the effort of the Portuguese scientific community towards internationalisation. SPAE's internationalisation strategy included contacts with the RAI. It invited members of the RAI to be its own members and collaborators. Later on, some of SPAE's members and/or people connected to the University of Porto became members of the RAI. There was also

mutual collaboration in the organisation of events, such as international congresses.

Both the RAI and SPAE have fostered scientific studies, not only in the countries where they were created (Portugal and England), but also in the countries under their colonial administration. The activities developed by the RAI and SPAE demonstrate the role of scientific societies in contributing to the development of anthropological studies and to the consolidation of anthropology as a university subject, in the period from 1918 to 1960. Both societies have risen as spaces of reflection on issues regarded as pertinent and have allowed an ever greater number of people to specialise in a new scientific area. Furthermore, both the conferences these societies have organised, and the editions they have published have contributed to the diffusion of the knowledge produced within the scope of anthropology.

In this process, however, over time we observed strategies of inclusion and exclusion (of individuals, institutions, scientific domains and subjects). Within anthropology, I concluded that one of the most frequent areas in correspondence and publications was physical anthropology. Among this area's main topics we found "race", the standardisation technique, blood groups and eugenics. However, despite the interest several Portuguese authors showed in these topics, these authors' presence does not stand out and seems almost inexistent in RAI's publications.

The study of the relationship between the RAI and SPAE allows us to understand other dynamics. Over the years, for example, the designation of large international congresses kept changing, sometimes emphasising anthropology, sometimes archaeology and pre-history, or else including them all. My research has revealed how some researchers have refused to cooperate with the IIA, due to the latter's imposed rules (exclusion of researchers from the First World War's defeated nations and the disdain towards archaeology), and favoured their relationship with the CIAAP, more inclusive at an international level. However, the rivalries between the IIA and the CIAAP, which led to disputes sometimes between authors and institutions, sometimes between the United Kingdom and France, paved the way for Portugal, as a peripheral country, to be able to leverage these circumstances and reach some prominence. This was also a consequence of the Portuguese scientific community's attempts at internationalisation. Furthermore, and despite national disputes, the organisation of large congresses led to autonomy for anthropology, through a differentiation from subjects such as archaeology and pre-history.

Finally, the matters related to politics or the Second World War have apparently not influenced the relationship between Portugal and the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, it appears that several dynamics existed (internal and external) that promoted certain scientific domains and subdomains, as well as their sponsors, but neglecting others. This is due to factors that involve sometimes associations, sometimes rivalries (personal, institutional, national), but also motives influenced by the international context, namely the two world wars. The situation also meant some studies, such as those related to “race”, to anthropometric standardisation techniques and to eugenics, until the end of the Second World War (1945). At a later stage, there was also the major promotion of studies related to “culture” and biological studies that turned away from racial (and racist) analyses. The study of these subjects allows us therefore to reflect on the way the historical, social, economic and geopolitical context influences, not only the formation of networks in the academic and scientific environment, but also the construction of knowledge, its diffusion and its recognition at a national and international level.

## » ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by FCT under Grant SFRH/BPD 91349/2012, and by the Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa, under Grant UID/SOC/50012/2013.

---

PATRÍCIA FERRAZ DE MATOS  
 Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa  
 Av. Prof. Aníbal Bettencourt 9 — 1600-036 Lisboa, Portugal  
 patricia\_matos@ics.ulisboa.pt  
 orcid.org/0000-0001-7322-3756

---

## § REFERENCES

- AAVV. 1957. “Professor Mendes Correia. Homenagem dos seus amigos e admiradores”. *Boletim da Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa*, 4-6: 119-152.
- BASTOS, C., R. Barreto, orgs. 2013. *A Circulação do Conhecimento: Medicina, Redes e Impérios*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- CLEMINSON, R. 2014. *Catholicism, Race and Empire: Eugenics in Portugal, 1900-1950*. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press.

- FAGG, W. B. 1946. "Anthropology on the continent of Europe in war-time". *Nature*, 158: 14-16. (reprinted from *Nature*, pp. 1-7).
- HANDLER, R., org. 2000. *Excluded Ancestors, Inventible Traditions: Essays Toward a More Inclusive History of Anthropology*, vol. IX of *History of Anthropology*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- KUPER, A. 2005. "Histórias alternativas da antropologia social britânica". *Etnográfica*, IX (2): 209-230.
- LATOUR, B. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2010. "Aperfeiçoar a 'raça', salvar a nação: Eugenia, teorias nacionalistas e situação colonial em Portugal". *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia*, 50: 89-111.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2012. *Mendes Correia e a Escola de Antropologia do Porto: Contribuição para o Estudo das Relações entre Antropologia, Nacionalismo e Colonialismo*. PhD Thesis, Lisbon: Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2013a. "Um olhar sobre as relações entre Portugal e o Brasil a partir da obra de Mendes Correia: desafios, pontes e interacções". *População e Sociedade*, 21: 53-69.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2013b. *The Colours of the Empire: Racialized Representations during Portuguese Colonialism*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2016. "Anthropology in Portugal: the case of the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology (SPA), 1918". In *Local Knowledge: Global Stage*, vol. 10 of *Histories of Anthropology Annual*, org. R. Darnell and F. W. Gleach. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 53-97.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2017. "Redes emaranhadas no ciberespaço: indivíduos, objectos virtuais e ideias em circulação". In *Cibercultura: Circum-Navegações em Redes Transculturais de Conhecimento, Arquivos e Pensamento*, org. H. Pires, et al. Braga and Vila Nova de Famalicão: Centro de Estudos Comunicação e Sociedade and Edições Húmus, 167-182.
- MATOS, P. F. de. 2018. "Conhecimento científico como promotor de potência colonial: O caso das missões científicas de foro antropológico". In *Repensar el Colonialismo: Iberia, de Colonia a Potencia Colonial*, org. B. Marín-Aguilera. Madrid: JAS Arqueología, 371-400.
- MENDES, J. M. de O. 2010. "Pessoas sem voz, redes indizíveis: os limites da teoria do actor-rede". *Análise Social*, XLV, 196: 447-465.
- NENQUIN, J., J. Bourgeois, (s/d). "Une breve histoire de l'union internationale des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques"(updated by L. Oosterbeek). Available at: <http://www.uispp.org/about/history> (consulted in 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018).
- NUNES, J. A., M. E. Gonçalves. 2001. "Introdução". In *Enteados de Galileu? A Semiperiferia no Sistema Mundial da Ciência*, org. J. A. Nunes and M. E. Gonçalves. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 13-31.
- PEREIRA, A. L. 2001. *Darwin em Portugal (1865-1914): Filosofia, História, Engenharia Social*. Coimbra: Almedina.
- PLATT, T. 2012. "Between routine and rupture: the archive as field event". In *The Sage Handbook of Social Anthropology*, 2: 21-37.
- URRY, J. 2006 [1996]. "Anthropological societies". In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, org. A. Barnard and J. Spencer. London and New York: Routledge, 44-45.

## ARCHIVES

ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, London.

CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DES SCIENCES ANTHROPOLOGIQUES ET ETHNOLOGIQUES, 1912-34; 1937-9 (A62, 01 of 06, 11), (A62, 3 of 6, 151/1; 151/8).

CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DES SCIENCES ANTHROPOLOGIQUES ET ETHNOLOGIQUES, Conseil Permanent (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/1), (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/2), (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/3/7), (A93, papers 1934-54, 93/4/8), (A93, papers 1934--54, 93/3/9).

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, Washington DC, Accession 05-123, Personal Records, 1892-1952. Hrdlička, Aleš, Box 11 of 22.

SOCIEDADE PORTUGUESA DE ANTROPOLOGIA E ETNOLOGIA, Porto.

LIVRO DE ACTAS DA SOCIEDADE PORTUGUESA DE ANTROPOLOGIA E ETNOLOGIA I, 1918-1924, Porto: Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia.

LIVRO DE ACTAS DA SOCIEDADE PORTUGUESA DE ANTROPOLOGIA E ETNOLOGIA II, 1925-1944, Porto: Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia.

SEVERAL DOCUMENTS NOT YET INVENTORIED OR CATALOGUED.

## CITE THIS CHAPTER AS:

MATOS, P. F. 2018. "Inclusions and exclusions in the production and circulation of scientific knowledge: the case of the Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) and the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology (SPAÉ)". In *Changing Societies: Legacies and Challenges*. Vol. I. *Ambiguous Inclusions: Inside Out, Inside In*, eds. S. Aboim, P. Granjo, A. Ramos. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 407-429. <https://doi.org/10.31447/ics9789726715030.17>