

Joel Halpern, Slavko Kremenšek

# ETNOLOŠKO-ANTROPOLOŠKO DOPISOVANJE<sup>1</sup> ETHNOLOGICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE<sup>2</sup>

Joel Halpern

350 Market Hill Road  
Amherst, MA 01002 USA

Slavko Kremenšek

Trubarjeva 61  
61000 Ljubljana

May 30, 1994; December 12, 1994<sup>3</sup>

Dear Slavko,

I very much enjoyed my recent trip to Ljubljana and am very grateful to you and to your young colleague, Rajko Muršič, for your hospitality and for making the necessary arrangements about my lectures at your department dealing with themes connected with anthropology and ethnology. It is this topic which I would now like to explore with you. It was most enjoyable to begin our discussion while taking a walk in the woods near Lake Bohinj. You are really lucky in your small land to have such beautiful places. Slavko, you and others have brought to my attention that there is now a vigorous debate in Slovenia about the desired relationships between Social-Cultural (Sociocultural) Anthropology and Ethnology. I really was surprised to learn that these closely related disciplines are being taught in three different places at your university without coordination between the various faculties and departments. It is, of course, not my interest or role to concern myself with the internal organization of your university, rather I would like to focus on the intellectual aspects of the debate. Obviously I do have a disadvantage in that I have neither met nor am I acquainted with the viewpoints of your other university colleagues on these matters. But nevertheless I feel that we can explore some important ideas as they relate to the relationships between social-cultural anthropology and ethnology.

You explained to me that it was your strong desire to see that Slovene ethnology continue and that it be well supported. You mentioned the crucial matter of the lack of a proper museum of Slovene ethnography, where the arts and the traditions of the folk-peasant history could be properly displayed. I expressed to you the thought that I was surprised that now that Slovenia is for the first time an independent state, there is no such museum of rural and urban culture. It

would seem to me logical to suppose that there would now be extensive resources devoted to these aspects of Slovenian culture and history.

Such I suppose is in part the case, judging by the number of expensive books found in the stores on subjects as diverse as your famous bee hive slats, the specific Slovene hay drying racks, peasant costume, customs throughout the year etc. Expensive books to be sure, but all nicely illustrated and finely bound, suggesting that they may be symbolic collector's items. Also in America we receive weekly a half hour program in English from Ljubljana (through Scola) which focuses heavily on the arts, wines, folklore, historic buildings and other aspects of Slovenian life. I also noticed in passing the Slon Hotel that some of the display windows were given over to "folk" craft. Also, as I recall, one of the restaurants in the Slon has what might be called a folk motif which to a certain extent is reflected in the "Slovene" specialties on the menu. I guess that one could examine tourist brochures and Slovene public relations magazines published for distribution abroad for similar themes. "Folklorism" is also reflected in regional folk festivals, folk music on the radio and TV performances etc. Probably there are some published studies of this "folklorism" and they might be pertinent to cite in the context of our discussion. The institute of Ethnology and Folklore in Zagreb has done some studies of this type. Are there analogous studies in Slovenia to those of Dunja Rihtman and her associates in the Croatian Institute of Folklore?

The significance of the future (and past) role of Slovene ethnology is, of course, pertinent to the ways in which Slovene national culture has been constructed (Lofgren has several articles and a book on this topic for Swedish culture). Articles in *Ethnologia Europea* are perhaps of use here. Some of Robert Minnich's writings on the nature of identity in small peasant communities on the boundaries of Slovenia are also pertinent. This brings to mind the nature of Slovene identity in communities in neighboring Italy and Austria. Here I think considering the conflict over Trieste might be useful and consideration of the way this issue was finally resolved. I still recall Serbian demonstrations in Belgrade in 1953 when I first began my fieldwork, "Život damo, Trst ne damo," they shouted. But then when it was all over Trieste claims were, of course, abandoned. The Serbs were demonstrating in an organized way for a communist political purpose and not, I suppose, in favor of Slovene national identity. What was the

<sup>1</sup> Ker menimo, da je dopisovanje med Joelom Halpernom in Slavkom Kremenškom zanimivo tako za domačo kot za tujo strokovno javnost, objavljamo njuno dopisovanje o pogledih na razmerje med etnologijo in kulturno/socialno antropologijo v obeh jezikih, slovenskem in angleškem (op. ur.).

<sup>2</sup> Because we assume that the correspondence between Joel Halpern and Slavko Kremenšek may be interesting to Slovene and foreign scholars, we publish their correspondence concerning the relationship between (Slovene) ethnology and cultural/social anthropology in both, Slovene and English version (ed. note).

<sup>3</sup> The dating December 12, 1994 is referred to corrections and supplements by the author (ed. note).



attitude then in Ljubljana and Slovenia on this matter?

There is an interesting recent book by a young Englishman, Mark Thompson, who, according to the book jacket, is currently the London correspondent for Mladina Magazine. I have xeroxed the appropriate pages from his book and underlined them and it may be appropriate to cite certain passages. In any case, a major point that he makes is that the role of the peasant culture in defining national identity in Slovenia is less than, in the other case he cites, Serbia. I think that the same would also apply for Croatia. In any case enclosed are articles by Minnich and a recent article prepared by one of the graduate assistants and myself for publication in a magazine of Austrian social history (I can send you a copy). I would also think that my introduction to the Anthropology of East Europe Review, special issue on the war in Yugoslavia, may be referenced. What all of the above seems to argue, I suggest, is that the position of Slovene ethnology and the possibility of funds for a Slovene ethnographic museum need to be seen in a sociology of knowledge context. Also part of that problem is how the Slovenes present themselves to the world. An important point here is a consideration of the nature of Slovenian nationalism and its relationship to the diaspora communities in Austria and Italy. Here I feel that there is a strong contrast with the Serbs and also the Croats. Is it only a matter of numbers and territory, size alone?

But perhaps we can, for the moment, leave those political aspects and focus on the history and intellectual nature of ethnology as a discipline. In doing this I also wish to compare and to contrast it with social-cultural anthropology. In looking to the origins and functions of these disciplines it is clear that Slovene ethnology is tied to national history, art and literature and linked to the historical development of national identity (*Volkskunde*), while social-cultural anthropology is above all linked to maritime exploration, the age of imperialism and the study of the natural world (*Völkerkunde*). If one looks to the origin of American and British anthropology, or French and Dutch anthropology for that matter, one becomes aware that the earliest descriptions that we have of native peoples derive from expeditions in which the native peoples were described along with the natural world. Thus some of the early 20th century publications of Canadian ethnology were published by the Geological Survey of Canada. A similar situation happened in the western exploration of the US.

Thus in the American case, the Bureau of American Ethnology, concerned with the description of the native peoples of North America, was founded after the US Civil War (1861-65) and initially linked to US army explorations. Its initial director had been an officer in the Civil War. Captain Cook's voyages to the Northwest Coast and Hawaii were undertaken in his role as a naval officer for the British Royal Navy. Tamás Hofer, now director of the Ethnographic Museum in Budapest, wrote several very insightful articles comparing the approaches of ethnology and anthropology (published about 1969 in *Current Anthropology and Anthropologica*; I have the reprints at home and can send you copies if they are not in your library). He noted that in the huge Smithsonian complex of museums in Washington, D.C., the U. S. capital, anthropology is in the Museum of Natural History along with the stuffed elephants and polar bears while the history of white America was in the Museum of American History which is located next door and fits in along with the dresses worn by the wives of presidents of the U. S., these exhibits also include rural and working class culture as well. Also people (ethnics) are divided. Thus exhibits on such topics as Afro-American history in the rural

south and their migration to the cities of the North is in the American History Museum along with topics such as Asian-Americans, in this case, specifically the imprisonment of West Coast Japanese Americans in World War II is depicted. On the other hand, the Natural History Museum recently hosted exhibits of the Eskimo (Inuit) and related circumpolar peoples. This was also the case of a display of the peoples of Oceania, linked to an early 19th century U. S. Navy expedition. The American Indians are in the process of getting their own museum, but this is clearly an outgrowth of their changed identity in the American multicultural system. They have progressed from specimens of natural history to political actors.

In the summer the Smithsonian is host to ethnic folks fairs which deal with the entire variety of American ethnic groups - their crafts and folk culture. All this by way of documenting that historically anthropology has dealt with the remote and exotic, the non-European. On the other hand, European ethnology has dealt with the near and familiar, one's own folk. Involved here is as noted the *Volkskunde-Völkerkunde* distinction. But using the German distinctions really misses the point since the German traditions, despite Boas' origins, Bastian, Father Schmidt's cultural circles and the Vienna school are derivative traditions. That is, *Völkerkunde* was a distinctly secondary consideration for German society. For the main German historical role has been as a land based imperial power in East and Central Europe with only marginal involvements in the Americas, Oceania and Asia. The essential point here is that North American and West European anthropologists have historically done their primary investigations and based their theories essentially on the non-Western World. Boas's methodologies were based on describing hitherto unknown or little known cultures where all aspects of culture including, especially language, had to be described from an initial point of departure. By contrast, Slovene ethnology developed along with studies of national history, national art and literature and was based on a long, literate and documented tradition. Hofer describes at length how the European ethnologist is concerned with precise micro documentation of cultural data while the anthropologist is concerned with initially describing and defining hitherto "unknown" cultures. My professor Conrad Arensberg wrote in the preface to my *A Serbian Village*, first published in 1958, about the pioneering aspect of my research (for Americans) even though Serbs had been studying their own culture since the early 19th century (Vuk Karadžić, et. al.). A lot of these seeming differences have lost much of their validity, but this is the topic I think we need to consider subsequently. I would only mention here that the world is now one. The title of a recent book of mine, *The Far East Comes Near* (I had originally suggested, *The Far World Comes Near*, and that was the title of a photo exhibit of mine on Laos and Lao-Americans) deals with autobiographies of students from Indochina whom I taught at the University of Massachusetts. Originally the course had dealt with the peoples of Southeast Asia. The way you would teach a course in the U. S. on the Native Peoples of the Americas. But what if almost all the students were native peoples of the Americas and just learning English. In the U. S., as a direct consequence of the U. S. involvement in the Indochina War, since 1975 more than a million Indochinese (Vietnamese, Cambodians and Lao) have come to the US and many have become citizens and all are now permanently in the U. S. When I first went to Laos in 1956 I couldn't conceive that some of the peoples of Laos, including members of the tribal groups, would be coming to America to live by the tens



and hundreds of thousands. This has direct implications for American anthropology in that refugee studies are now an integral part of the discipline and need to be related to older ethnographic studies in Southeast Asia itself. By the way, in most of the maritime imperial nations of Western Europe there are now large populations from the former colonies which have had a permanent impact on those countries (Slovenia is now faced with the Bosnian refugee influx). The situation is not exactly parallel, but its implications for ethnology as mentioned below are, I would think, important in that part of anthropology becomes like modern European ethnology or, put another way, *Völkerkunde* becomes *Volkskunde* as in the Smithsonian case. In the U. S. today then (national) ethnology and anthropology merge - the exotic becomes domestic. Thus methodologies may, of necessity, be similar as between ethnology and cultural anthropology. But, as distinct from national ethnology, social-cultural anthropology is essentially a comparative discipline. One consequence is that now there is much concern with the process of description as affected by the relationship between the observer - participant and the culture he/she describes. By contrast problems in ethnology are defined within a much more precise context and since the observer-investigator is almost always among his own folk the methodological problems are different. National ethnologists seem primarily concerned with highly focused problems and not general descriptions. There is thus lessened the possible situation of the field investigator in ethnology encountering the perceptual problems which so frequently face the anthropologist. The goals remain fixed for the ethnologist as opposed to the anthropologist who has to adjust to altering political situations and unexpected social impacts in an area remote from the observer's home. These factors result in changing the nature of the investigation and can happen often. Such occurrences are widely recorded in anthropological literature.

For the European ethnologists the field site is almost always, and especially in Slovenia, a short car, bus or train ride away. Maybe the investigator spends overnight in a community, but more often the researcher is there and back in the same day as opposed to the six months to several years abroad so characteristic of anthropological investigations. One might also note that there aren't many cases of ethnologists who faced death as a direct consequence of their research. Death through accident or assault has unfortunately been the case for some anthropologists. I refer here not so much to unfriendly natives, although that too has been a problem, but rather to the real and continuing risk of accident and disease. It appears to me that from the perspective of the locally focused European ethnologist, the far ranging anthropologist, who has worked in a variety of cultures, can sometimes be viewed as a bit of a dilettante. Conversely, because they make many assumptions about the nature of their own culture, historically, ethnologists often tend not to focus on kinds of problems to which anthropologists have paid a great deal of attention, e.g. social structure as compared to material culture. This makes much of the local cultural background implicit in their investigations. Since so much ethnology is published in the national language it can be assumed that the reader shares much the same background as the investigator. Further, levels of linguistic competence are not an issue in localized ethnology, but they are constantly a serious consideration in the anthropological enterprise. Nevertheless, there is a direct connection between American anthropology and the classic studies of American communities going back to the 1920s.

The broad ethnographic approach is here a model. If one reads the preface to *Middletown*, the first real study of an American industrial town (in Indiana), by the Lynds, the introduction is written by Clark Wissler, an anthropologist who was a specialist on the Plains Indians. It was considered appropriate because an aspect of anthropological methodology was very pertinent here. This is the holistic approach, looking at all aspects of the culture. It was felt that this methodology which had been applied to a study of Plains Indians could also be used to study modern American white community. This city was restudied in the 1930s and again in the 1970s when film-documentaries were also made. The anthropological model was used not only for Middletown research, but also for the *Yankee City* series (studies of a New England coastal community) north of Boston. The organizer of that research, Lloyd Warner, had previous experience with the Australian aborigines. This became a significant publicized incident in American culture in the 1930s. There was a novel and a Broadway play based on this theme by the novelist John Marquand.

Understanding the causes of the war in ex-Yugoslavia seems to me to be a matter that requires reflection. This conflict acutely raises the significance of the lack of a comparative dimension. Clearly it was politically impossible to discuss national differences even if there had been a conceptual basis to do so. Before the breakup of Yugoslavia there was, and you are better acquainted than I am with the details, a "Yugoslav Ethnological Society" with its own journal. There were also annual meetings focusing on particular topics. Also the "Yugoslav Atlas," based in Zagreb, was a "national" project which cut across republic lines. But my impression was that this atlas received something less than enthusiastic cooperation from all sides, especially in Serbia, although I am not aware of the reaction in Slovenia. Also it was a technical project concerned only with charting the distribution of a variety of material cultural elements and it was in no way comparative or analytical. The point is that there were a variety of national ethnologies, each with their own separate agendas, their particular histories, leading researchers, and specific literatures. Thus Milenko Filipović, Milovan Gavazzi and Vilko Novak were colleagues, but they existed in their own separate worlds, the universes of their respective national ethnologies. In the Yugoslav context this is clearest for the Croats, Serbs and Slovenes. I may be wrong, but I don't recall that there were any significant long-term joint projects which would have involved cross publication in each other's journals. Therefore it was difficult, I believe, to analyze some of the key tools and concepts inherent in national ethnology to understand multi-cultural conflict. Here I think of the interests and methodologies of Jovan Cvijić as contrasted with the Radić brothers. Their work had obvious direct political connections. Each national entity was very much involved in their group's politics. Thus some of Cvijić's work was used specifically at the Versailles conference, and the Radić brothers were founders of the Croatian Peasant Party. I am also thinking of the use of some of the Slovene ethnological materials at the time of the Trieste dispute in the early 1950s. I would very much like to have your thoughts on this point. In my view ethnological data and anthropological concepts can help in understanding the present conflict. This is what I attempted to do in the special issues of the *Anthropology of East Europe Review* which is devoted to that subject and which I edited.

Thus I am curious as to how ethnology handles questions of cultural contact. I note, for example, in connection with my



visit and lectures in Ljubljana, that I met some students who were doing studies of Bosnians in Slovenia. How does this fit into the concept of a national ethnology and to what extent is it a valid part of such a picture? Can national ethnology deal with multiethnic problems? Another aspect has to do with ideas about conflict. The study of conflict is very much a central part of the anthropological tradition. It was inherent almost from the beginning as many initial imperial-colonial contacts were conflictful and involved fighting and destruction. In this specific situation one thinks of Evans-Pritchard's classic study of the Nuer in the Sudan. Reading the preface to this volume one can see how his investigations were tied in with the concerns of the British colonial service in controlling Nuer hostility. Conflict can, of course, also deal with social groups within the village community, as a result of migration to towns and between social classes. Thus, I would assume, although I don't remember, that your study of railroad workers dealt, at least in part, with class conflict. But it seems to me that the mode in national ethnologies has to do with historical process in relatively stable societies, especially when applied to peasant cultures. Marxism, of course, has emphasized class conflict and purposeful evaluation as opposed to a steady stable peasant society. But national ethnologies do not seem to have concerned themselves with socio-cultural processes of destruction or the extinction of cultures. Your colleague's studies of concentration camps inmates is an interesting case in point. I do not know the details, but wonder if any of his methods are also useful in ethnology. Understanding of the processes of destruction is certainly pertinent to the conflicts in Croatia and Bosnia.

At least three questions - first, ethnology and multicultural contexts; second, the questions of conflict, its consequences and resolution or lack of resolution; and, finally, ethnology not only as a discipline for understanding historical processes, but also conceptually and theoretically dealing with the end of a way of life. Could this be the case for aspects of peasant culture? What about the purposeful destruction of cultures as in the Holocaust and now in Bosnia ethnic cleansing?

A separate thought - I also wonder about the values inherent in national ethnology as a discipline. What does it have to say about values, about the validity of other cultural systems? How can national ethnology define its future? The former territory of Yugoslavia has now been transformed from a territory occupied by a multinational state to one occupied by a group of national states. Here I think of some of your own views, Marxist and otherwise, and your feeling about ethnology and nation states would be very important.

I could go on at great length but will pause here as this is to be a dialogue and I don't want to provide a complete framework, but hopefully a way in which we might interact.

Look forward to hearing from you.

*Best, Joel*

**Dragi Slavko, 30. 5. 1994, 12. 12. 1994<sup>4</sup>**

Zelo sem užival med mojim zadnjim obiskom v Ljubljani in zelo sem hvaležen tako vam kot vašemu mlajšemu kolegu Rajku Muršiču za vajino gostoljubje in za organizacijo mojih

predavanj na temo etnologije in antropologije na vašem oddelku. Prav te teme bi se sedaj rad lotil skupaj z vami. Zelo sem bil vesel, ko sva ta pogovor načela med sprehodom po gozdu blizu Bohinjskega jezera. Veliko srečo imate v vaši deželici, da imate toliko lepih krajev. Slavko, vi in drugi ste me opozorili na ognjevito debato v Sloveniji o odnosu med socialno-kulturno (socio-kulturno) antropologijo in etnologijo. Res me je zelo presenetilo, da ti tako sorodni si vedi na vaši univerzi poučujejo na treh različnih mestih, ne da bi bile fakultete oziroma oddelki med sabo usklajeni. Seveda pa ni moja stvar, da bi se ubadal z notranjo organizacijo vaše univerze, raje bi se osredotočil na intelektualne vidike te debate. Pri tem žal nisem srečal drugih vaših univerzitetnih kolegov oziroma ne poznam njihovih stališč. Vseeno pa se mi zdi, da lahko načneva nekatere pomembne ideje, ki zadevajo odnos med socialno-kulturno antropologijo in etnologijo.

Razložili ste mi, da si močno želite, da bi se slovenska etnologija nadaljevala in okrepila. Omenili ste pomembno dejstvo, da nimate ustreznega muzeja slovenske etnografije, v katerem bi bili na primeren način razstavljene umetnost in tradicije ljudske-kmečke zgodovine. Povedal sem vam, da sem presenečen, da Slovenija kot nova samostojna država nima takega muzeja kmečke in urbane kulture. Logična bi se mi zdela predvidevanja, da so sedaj na voljo znatna sredstva, posvečena tem vidikom slovenske kulture in zgodovine. Zdi se mi, da delno je tako, sodeč vsaj po številu dragih knjig v trgovinah, ki so posvečene tako različnim temam, kot so vaše slovite panjske končnice, specifično slovenski kozolci, kmečka noša, letne šege in tako naprej. To so drage knjige, a vse so lepo ilustrirane in natančno vezane, kar da misliti, da so mogoče simbolični predmeti za zbiralce. Pri nas v ZDA lahko vsak teden spremljamo polurno televizijsko oddajo v angleškem jeziku (s pomočjo Scole), ki govori pretežno o umetnosti, vinih, folklori, zgodovinskih zgradbah in drugih vidikih življenja v Sloveniji. Bežno sem tudi opazil, da je Hotel Slon namenil nekaj svojih izložbenih oken "ljudskim" obrtem. Prav tako se spominjam, da ima ena od Slonovih restavracij nekakšno ljudsko noto, ki se v določeni meri odraža v "slovenskih" kulinarčnih posebnostih v jedilniku. Ko človek prelistava turistične prospekte in revije, namenjene tujcem, verjetno najde v njih podobno tematiko. "Folklorizem" se prav tako kaže v pokrajinskih folklornih prireditvah, ljudski glasbi na radiu, televizijskih oddajah itd. Verjetno obstajajo kakšne objavljene študije o tovrstnem "folklorizmu" in mogoče bi jih bilo potrebno citirati v kontekstu tega najinega dvogovora. Zagrebški *Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku* je izvedel nekaj raziskav na to temo. Ali obstajajo v Sloveniji študije, sorodne tistim, ki so jih naredili Dunja Rihtman in njeni sodelavci v tem inštitutu?

Pomen vloge slovenske etnologije v prihodnosti (in v preteklosti) je seveda v skladu z načinom, kako je organizirana slovenska nacionalna kultura (Lofgren je napisal nekaj člankov in knjigo o tej problematiki v švedski kulturi). Morda bi bili v tej povezavi koristni članki iz *Ethnologie Europee*. Prav tako so pomembne nekatere razprave Roberta Minnichia o identiteti v majhnih kmečkih skupnostih na obrobju Slovenije. Ob tem se spomnim na značilnosti slovenske identitete v skupnostih v sosednji Italiji in v Avstriji. Zdi se mi, da bi ob tem veljalo upoštevati konflikt zaradi Trsta in način, kako so ga končno razrešili. Še vedno se spominjam srbskih

<sup>4</sup> Datiranje 12. 12. 1994 se nanaša na popravke in dopolnila, ki jih je avtor pisma naknadno vnesel v prvotni, 30. 5. 1994 napisani tekst.



demonstracij v Beogradu leta 1953, ko sem pričeval svoje raziskave, in vzkljkov "Život damo, Trsta ne damo!" Ko pa se je vse to končalo, so zahteve po Trstu seveda pojenjale. Srbi so organizirano demonstrirali za komunističen politični cilj, ne pa, tako se mi zdi, v podporo slovenski nacionalni identiteti. Kakšen je bil takratni odnos Ljubljane in Slovenije do tega vprašanja?

Nedavno je izšla zanimiva knjiga izpod peresa mladega Angleža Marka Thompsona, ki je, kakor piše na knjižnem ovitku, trenutno londonski dopisnik revije Mladina. Fotokopiral sem določene strani iz te knjige in podčrtal nekatere odstavke, ki bi jih bilo mogoče koristno citirati. Torej, ena od poglavitnih misli Marka Thompsona je, da je vloga kmečke kulture pri definiranju nacionalne identitete v Sloveniji manjša kot na primer v Srbiji. Zdi se mi, da bi podobno veljalo tudi za Hrvaško. Prilagam članke Minnichia in nedavno napisan članek nekega diplomiranega asistenta in mene, objavljen v reviji za avstrijsko socialno zgodovino (lahko vam pošljem kopijo). Zdi se mi, da bi lahko omenili tudi moj uvod v posebno izdajo revije Anthropology of East Europe Review, ki govori o vojni v Jugoslaviji. Zdi se mi, da vse omenjene zadeve kažejo na to, da je potrebno pozicijo slovenske etnologije in možna sredstva za Slovenski etnografski muzej gledati v kontekstu sociologije znanja. Del te problematike je tudi, kako se Slovenci predstavljajo v svetu. V tem kontekstu je pomembno pretehtati naravo slovenskega nacionalizma in njegov odnos do skupnosti v diaspori v Avstriji in Italiji. Zdi se mi, da obstaja v tem pogledu močan kontrast v primerjavi s Srbi in tudi Hrvati. Je to samo stvar številčnosti in ozemlja oziroma njunega obsega?

Morda lahko za nekaj časa pustiva pri miru politični vidik in se osredotočiva na zgodovino in naravo etnologije kot vede. Ob tem bi jo tudi želel primerjati in postaviti nasproti socialni in kulturni antropologiji. Ko premišljam o izvoru in funkciji teh dveh ved, je jasno, da je slovenska etnologija povezana z nacionalno zgodovino, umetnostjo in literaturo, in se navezuje na zgodovinski razvoj nacionalne identitete (*Volkskunde*), medtem ko sta socialna in kulturna antropologija predvsem povezani s pomorskimi raziskovanji, z dobo imperializma in s študijem naravnega sveta (*Völkerkunde*). Če gledamo izvor ameriške in britanske antropologije ali pa francoske ali nizozemske, se zavemo, da prihajajo najstarejši opisi naravnih ljudstev od ekspedicijskih, v katerih so naravna ljudstva opisana skupaj z naravnim svetom. Tako je nekatere od zapisov o kanadski etnologiji iz začetka tega stoletja objavila Kanadska geološka družba. Podobno se je zgodilo z raziskovanji ZDA, ki so jih opravili zahodnjaki.

V tem ameriškem primeru je bil tako po ameriški državljanski vojni (1861-65) ustanovljen Urad za ameriško etnologijo. V začetku je bil povezan z raziskavami ameriške vojske in se je ukvarjal z opisi naravnih ljudstev v Severni Ameriki. Njegov prvi direktor je bil častnik v državljanski vojni. Kapitan Cook je potoval na ameriško severozahodno obalo in na Havaje v vlogi pomorskega oficirja britanske Kraljeve mornarice. Tamas Hofer, sedanjí direktor budimpeštanskega Etnografskega muzeja, je napisal nekaj izredno zanimivih člankov (objavljenih okoli leta 1969 v revijah Current Anthropology in Anthropologica) in v njih primerjal etnološki in antropološki pristop (doma imam ponatise teh člankov in vam jih lahko pošljem, če jih še nimate v vaši oddelčni knjižnici). Hofer je opazil, da je v ogromnem muzejskem kompleksu ustanove Smithsonian v Washingtonu, glavnem mestu ZDA, antropologiji dodeljen prostor v Prirodoslovnem muzeju, skupaj z nagačenimi sloni in polarnimi medvedí, medtem ko je zgo-

dovina bele Amerike prikazana v Muzeju ameriške zgodovine v sosednji zgradbi in se lepo ujema z oblekami predsedniških žena. Sem pa je vključena tudi kmečka in delavska kultura. Prav tako so razdeljeni tudi narodi (etnične skupine). Tako so razstave npr. o afro-ameriški zgodovini na podeželskem jugu in o preseljevanju Afroameričanov v mesta na severu v Ameriškem zgodovinskem muzeju, poleg nje je razstava o azijskih Američanih oziroma v tem primeru o internaciji Japoncev ameriške Zahodne obale med drugo svetovno vojno. Po drugi strani pa je Prirodoslovni muzej nedavno priredil razstave o Eskimih (Inuitih) in njim sorodnih narodih polarnega kroga. Podobno je bilo v primeru razstave o narodih Oceanije, ki se je navezovala na ekspedicijo ameriške mornarice v začetku 19. stoletja. Pripravljajo poseben muzej ameriških Indijancev, ampak to je očitno posledica spremenjene identitete Indijancev v ameriškem multikulturnem sistemu. Iz prirodoslovnih primerkov so napredovali v politične akterje. Poleti prireja Smithsonian etnične ljudske festivale, ki razgrinjajo celotno paleto ameriških etničnih skupin in prikazujejo njihovo obrt in ljudsko kulturo. Vse to dokazuje, da se je, zgodovinsko vzeto, antropologija ukvarjala z oddaljenimi, eksotičnimi, zunajevropskimi temami. Po drugi strani pa je evropska etnologija preučevala bližnje, znane stvari, lastno ljudstvo. Tu gre, kot sem že omenil, za razliko med *Volkskunde* in *Völkerkunde*. Toda uporaba teh nemških izrazov v resnici zgreši svoj namen, saj je ta nemška tradicija kljub Boasovim izvorom, Bastianu, kulturnim krogom patra Schmidta in dunajski šoli izpeljanka. To pomeni, da je bila *Völkerkunde* izrazito drugotnega pomena za nemško družbo. Glavna vloga Nemčije v zgodovini je bila namreč vloga kontinentalne imperialne velesile v vzhodni in centralni Evropi, medtem ko je bila le obrobno prisotna v obeh Amerikah, Oceaniji in Aziji. Tu želim poudariti, da so severnoameriški in zahodnoevropski antropologi v toku zgodovine opravljali najobširnejše raziskave v glavnem zunaj zahodnega sveta in na tem tudi snovali svoje teorije. Boasova metodologija je slonela na opisovanju dotlej neznanih ali malo znanih kultur, v katerih je bilo potrebno vse vidike kulture, vključno z jezikom oziroma predvsem z njim, opisati od začetkov. V nasprotju s tem pa se je slovenska etnologija razvila ob raziskavah nacionalne zgodovine, umetnosti in literature, in se je naslanjala na dolgo pisno in dokumentirano tradicijo. Hofer podrobno opisuje, kako evropskega etnologa zanima točno določeno dokumentiranje podatkov o kulturi, medtem ko se antropolog ukvarja predvsem z opisom in definicijo do sedaj "neznanih" kultur. Moj profesor Conrad Arensberg je v uvodu moje knjige *Srbska vas*, ki je bila prvič natisnjena leta 1958, pisal o pionirskih vidikih moje raziskave (za Američane), čeprav so Srbi raziskovali svojo kulturo že od zgodnjega 19. stoletja naprej (Vuk Karadžić in drugi). Mnogo teh navideznih razlik je izgubilo precej svoje vrednosti, vendar pa je to problematika, za katero se mi zdi, da jo morava dodatno upoštevati. Tu bi želel samo omeniti, da je svet sedaj postal eno. Knjiga, ki sem jo nedavno izdal pod naslovom *Daljni Vzhod se bliža* (prvotno sem predlagal naslov *Daljni svet se približuje*, tako pa se je imenovala tudi moja fotografska razstava o Laosu in laoških Američanih), govori o avtobiografijah študentov iz Indokine, ki sem jih poučeval na massachusettski univerzi. Prvotno so ta predavanja govorila o narodih jugovzhodne Azije. Na ta način bi predavanja v ZDA govorila o naravnih ljudstvih v obeh Amerikah. A kaj, ko pa so bili skoraj vsi študentje domorodci iz obeh Amerik, ki so se šele učili angleščine. Po letu 1975 je več kot milijon Indokitajcev (Vietnamcev, Kambodžijcev in Laožanov) prišlo



v ZDA, kar je bila neposredna posledica ameriške vpletenosti v vojno v Indokini. Mnogi so postali ameriški državljani in so se sedaj za stalno naselili v ZDA. Ko sem leta 1956 prvič prišel v Laos, si nisem mogel niti predstavljati, da bodo desetisoči in stotisoči nekaterih laoških narodov, skupaj s pripadniki plemenskih skupin, prišli živeti v ZDA. To je neposredno vplivalo na ameriško antropologijo, saj so begunske študije sedaj integralni del stroke in jih je potrebno primerjati s starejšimi etnografskimi študijami o jugovzhodni Aziji. Mimogrede, med večino evropskih pomorskih imperialnih narodov živi sedaj veliko število prebivalcev iz nekdanjih kolonij, ki nenehno vplivajo na te narode (Slovenija se sedaj srečuje s prilivom beguncev iz Bosne). Ta situacija sicer ni čisto enaka, vendar menim, da imajo ti vidiki pomemben vpliv na etnologijo, tako da del antropologije postaja tak kot moderna evropska etnologija - ali, povedano drugače, *Völkerkunde* postaja *Volkskunde* tako kot v primeru muzeja Smithsonian. V ZDA se tako sedaj stapljata (nacionalna) etnologija in antropologija - ekotično postaja domače. Tako si morda metodologiji iz neke nujnosti postajata podobni prav tako kot etnologija in kulturna antropologija. Vendar pa je v nasprotju z nacionalno etnologijo socialna in kulturna antropologija predvsem komparativna disciplina. Ena izmed posledic je, da sedaj vlada veliko zanimanje za proces deskripcije, kot se kaže v odnosu med opazovalcem-udeležencem in med kulturo, ki jo opisuje. Nasprotno pa so problemi v etnologiji definirani znotraj veliko bolj natančnega konteksta. In ker je opazovalec-raziskovalec skoraj zmeraj med svojim lastnim ljudstvom, so metodološki problemi različni. Zdi se, da nacionalne etnologe zanimajo predvsem povsem določeni problemi, ne pa splošni opisi. Etnolog na terenu se tako redkeje srečuje s problemi percepcije, ki tako pogosto pestijo antropologa. Cilji ostajajo za etnologa trdno določeni, medtem ko se mora antropolog prilagoditi spreminjajočim se političnim situacijam in nepričakovanim družbenim navzkrižjem v deželah, ki so daleč od opazovalčevega doma. Zaradi teh stvari, ki se lahko pogosto dogajajo, se spreminja vidik raziskave. Antropološka literatura je polna takih dogodkov.

Za evropskega etnologa, še posebej pa za slovenskega, je teren skoraj zmeraj dosegljiv le po kratki vožnji z avtom, avtobusom ali vlakom. Mogoče bo prenočil v okolju, kjer poteka raziskava, še bolj pogosto pa se raziskovalec poda tja in se vrne domov še isti dan - v nasprotju s šestimi meseci ali nekaj leti v tujini, ki so tako značilni za antropološke raziskave. Mogoče bi tu še omenili, da se etnolog ne sooča tako pogosto s smrtjo kot direktno posledico svoje raziskave. Nekateri antropologi so žal umrli zaradi nesreče ali nasilja. Pri tem tu ne mislim toliko na neprijazne domorodce, čeprav je bila tudi to težava, temveč na zelo realno in nenehno tveganje zaradi nesreč ali bolezni. Zdi se mi, da iz perspektive evropskega etnologa, ki se osredotoča na svoje okolje, antropolog, ki posega v daljne kraje in je delal v različnih kulturah, izpade malce kot diletant. Seveda se zgodi, da se, zgodovinsko vzeto, etnologi, ki formulirajo številne domneve o podobi svoje lastne kulture, često ne osredotočajo na tiste probleme, ki jim antropologi posvečajo dobršno mero pozornosti, tako na primer primerjavi socialne strukture z materialno kulturo. Zaradi tega je veliko njihovega lokalnega kulturnega ozadja samoumevnega v njihovih raziskavah. Ker je tako veliko etnoloških raziskav objavljenih v nacionalnem jeziku raziskovalca, lahko predvidevamo, da je bralčevo kulturno ozadje zelo podobno raziskovalčevemu. Poleg tega stopnja jezikovne sposobnosti ne predstavlja problema v etnoloških raziskavah lokalnega značaja, je pa stalno prisotna v

antropoloških podvigih. Kljub temu obstaja neposredna povezava med ameriško antropologijo in klasičnimi študijami ameriških skupnosti iz 20. let tega stoletja. Model predstavlja tukaj širok etnografski pristop. V uvodu v *Middletown*, prvo resnično študijo ameriškega industrijskega mesta (v zvezni državi Indiani), ki sta jo napisala zakonca Lynd, je predgovor napisal antropolog Clark Wissler, strokovnjak za prerijske Indijance. Ta izbira avtorja se je zdela prikladna, ker je v tem delu zelo prisoten vidik antropološke metodologije. To je holističen pristop, ki zaobjema vse vidike kulture. Zdelo se je, da bi bila ta metodologija, ki je bila uporabljena v študiji o prerijskih Indijancih, lahko uporabna tudi za študijo o moderni ameriški belopoltni skupnosti. Raziskave tega mesta so ponovili v 30. in potem še v 70. letih, ko so posneli še dokumentarec. Tega antropološkega modela niso uporabili zgolj za raziskavo Middletowna, ampak tudi za serijo študij o *Yankee Citiju*, obalni skupnosti v Novi Angliji severno od Bostona. Organizator te raziskave Lloyd Warner je pred tem raziskoval avstralske domorodce. V 30. letih je ta zadeva zelo odmevala v tisku in ameriški kulturi. Romanopisec John Marquand je po tej temi napisal roman in gledališko igro, ki so jo predvajali na Broadwayu.

Zdi se mi, da razumevanje vzrokov za vojno v bivši Jugoslaviji zahteva premislek. Ta spopad očitno odseva pomembno pomanjkanje primerjalne razsežnosti. Očitno politično ni bilo mogoče razpravljati o nacionalnih razlikah, četudi bi obstajala konceptualna podlaga za to. Pred razpadom Jugoslavije je obstajalo, in vi ste s tem podrobneje seznanjeni kot jaz, "Etnološko društvo Jugoslavije" z lastnim glasilom. Prav tako so bili organizirani letni sestanki, ki so se ukvarjali z določenimi temami. Tudi delo na Etnološkem atlasu Jugoslavije, ki je imelo sedež v Zagrebu, je bilo "nacionalni" projekt, ki je segal prek republiških meja. Vendar pa sem imel občutek, da za ta projekt ni bilo posebnega navdušenja, še posebno kar zadeva Srbijo, čeprav odmeva nanj v Sloveniji ne poznam. Poleg tega je bil to tehničen projekt, katerega namen je bil le vnašanje razporeditve številnih elementov materialne kulture, in ni bil niti najmanj primerjalni ali analitičen. S tem želim povedati, da je v Jugoslaviji obstajala vrsta nacionalnih etnologij, od katerih je imela vsaka svoj obseg dela, svojo lastno zgodovino, vodilne raziskovalce in posebno literaturo. Tako so bili Milenko Filipović, Milovan Gavazzi in Vilko Novak kolegi, vendar so živeli vsak v svojem lastnem svetu, v vesolju svoje lastne nacionalne etnologije. V jugoslovanskem kontekstu je to najbolj jasno vidno v primeru Hrvatov, Srbov in Slovencev. Morda se motim, vendar se ne spominjam kakih dolgoročnih projektov, ki bi vsebovali objavljanje enih v publikacijah drugih. Zato se mi zdi, da je bilo težko analizirati nekatera ključna orodja in koncepte v lastni nacionalni etnologiji, da bi razumeli multikulturni konflikt. Pri tem imam v mislih interes in metodologijo Jovana Cvijića v nasprotju z bratoma Radić. Njihova dela so vsebovala očitne politične implikacije. Vsaka nacionalna enota je bila zelo vpletena v politiko svoje skupine. Del Cvijićevih raziskav so uporabili na versajski mirovni konferenci, brata Radić pa sta bila ustanovitelja hrvaške kmečke stranke. Prav tako imam v mislih uporabo dela slovenskih etnoloških podatkov v času tržaškega konflikta v začetku petdesetih let. Zelo si želim vašega odmeva na to moje razmišljanje. Menim, da etnološki podatki in antropološki koncepti lahko pripomorejo k razumevanju sedanjega spopada. To sem poskušal pojasniti v posebni izdaji publikacije *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, ki je posvečena tej tematiki in katere urednik sem.

Zato me zanima, kako se etnologija loteva vprašanj kul-



turnih stikov. Tako sem na primer med svojimi obiski in predavanji v Ljubljani srečal študente, ki so raziskovali življenje Bosancev v Sloveniji. Kako se to vklaplja v koncept nacionalne etnologije in v kolikšni meri je to pomemben del te podobe? Ali se lahko nacionalna etnologija ukvarja z multi-etničnimi problemi? Še drug vidik je povezan s preiščljanji o konfliktu. Raziskave konfliktov so osrednji del antropološke tradicije. Prisotne so bile skoraj od samega začetka, saj so bili mnogi začetni imperialno-kolonialni stiki polni konfliktov in so vsebovali boje in uničevanje. Ob tem se človek spomni na klasično študijo Evansa-Pritcharda o plemenu Nuer v Sudanu. Če preberemo uvod v to delo, lahko vidimo, kako se se njegove raziskave navezovale na skrb britanskih kolonialnih oblasti, ki so si prizadevale nadzorovati sovražnost Nuerov. Konflikt seveda lahko nastopi tudi v družbenih skupinah znotraj vaše skupnosti kot posledica preseljevanja v mesta, ali pa med družbenimi razredi. Tako predvidevam, čeprav se tega ne spominjam, da se vaša študija o delavcih pri železnici vsaj delno ukvarja z razrednim spopadom. Zdi se, da je ta metoda v nacionalnih etnologijah povezana z zgodovinskimi procesi v relativno stabilnih družbah, posebno glede kmečke kulture. Marksizem je seveda poudarjal razredni konflikt in koristno evolucijo v nasprotju s trdno kmečko družbo. Vendar pa se zdi, da se nacionalnim etnologijam ni potrebno ukvarjati s sociokulturnimi procesi uničevanja ali izumiranja kultur. Študija vašega kolega o taboriščnikih je zanimiva in potrjuje to misel. Ne poznam podrobnosti, zanima pa me, če bi bila katera od njegovih metod koristna tudi v etnologiji. Razumevanje procesa uničevanja je gotovo nujno za razumevanje konfliktov na Hrvaškem in v Bosni. Zastavlja se mi vsaj troje vprašanj - etnologija in multikulturni kontekst, vprašanje konflikta, njegove posledice in razrešitev ali odsotnost le-te, in končno vprašanje etnologije ne le kot vede, ki pomaga razumevati zgodovinske procese, ampak se tudi konceptualno in teoretično ukvarja s koncem nekega načina življenja. Bi to lahko bil primer za pojave kmečke kulture? Kaj pa namerno uničevanje kultur, kot na primer iztrebljanje Židov in etnično čiščenje sedaj v Bosni?

Poraja se mi še misel o vrednotah, ki jih vsebuje nacionalna etnologija kot veda. Kaj lahko pove o vrednotah, o veljavnosti drugih kulturnih sistemov? Kako lahko nacionalna etnologija definira svojo prihodnost? Ozemlje bivše Jugoslavije se je sedaj spremenilo iz ozemlja, na katerem je stala multinacionalna posvetna država, na ozemlje, ki ga zaseda skupina nacionalnih držav. Menim, da bi tu bili nekateri vaši nazori, tako marksistični kot tudi drugi, in vaši pogledi na etnologijo in nacionalne države zelo pomembni.

Še bi lahko nadaljeval, a bom na tem mestu prekinil svoje razmišljanje. Ker je to zamišljeno kot pogovor, ne želim sam postaviti celotnega ogrodja zanj, temveč le zarisati smernice za najin dvogovor. Veselim se vašega odgovora.

**Lep pozdrav, Joel**

*(Prevod v slovenščino: Nives Sulič.)*

**Slavko Kremenšek**

**Trubarjeva 61**

**Ljubljana**

**Prof. Joel Halpern**

**580 Market Hill Road**

**Amherst, MA 01002**

**Ljubljana, 3. avgust 1994**

**Dragi Joel!**

Toplo se Vam zahvaljujem za pismo, ki sem ga prejel pred časom. Vesel sem, da ste ostali pri najinem dogovoru glede izmenjave pogledov na nekatera strokovna vprašanja, ki so danes v Sloveniji aktualna. Gre predvsem za razmerje med etnologijo in antropologijo. Na najinem sprehodu v Bohinju letos spomladi pa sva načela tudi vprašanje prostorov Slovenskega etnografskega muzeja in vloge oziroma mesta etnološke vede v osamosvojeni Sloveniji. O obeh vprašanjih govorite v Vašem pismu. Spričo tega se mi dozdeva, da bo najina izmenjava mnenj najbolj plodna, če poskušam slediti toku Vaših misli.

O razmerju etnologija - antropologija bi najraje govoril na podlagi osebnih izkušenj, do katerih sem prišel predvsem v zadnjih letih. Kot veste, smo na Oddelku za etnologijo Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani na pobudo nekaterih mojih kolegov študiju etnologije dodali še študij kulturne antropologije. Tako smo spremenili tudi ime oddelka v Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo. Nisem bil pobudnik omenjenih sprememb, nisem pa bil tudi njihov načelni nasprotnik. Vendar so nekateri praktični postopki spreminjanja oziroma dopolnjevanja dela oddelka izzvali ugovore. Zato je verjetno težko izključiti nekatere subjektivne primesi mojega izvajanja. Sicer pa je treba reči, da je naša razprava o razmerju etnologija - antropologija za sedaj omejena povečini le na sodelavce našega oddelka in na študente. Ker pa, kot pišete, ne poznate razprave, o kateri teče beseda, pobljže, je prav, da se omejuje, kot predlagate, na nekatera pomembna načelna vprašanja.

Najprej bi rad poudaril, da nam vsebinska in metodološka vprašanja kulturne in socialne antropologije, ki bi mogla biti spodbudna za razvoj naše etnologije, tudi do uvajanja kulturne antropologije na naš oddelek, niso bila neznanca. Menim celo, da smo v šestdesetih in sedemdesetih letih, ko smo prenesli poudarek od reči in stvari na ljudi, izvedli določeno "antropologizacijo" naše etnološke vede. Tako se je kar precejšen del slovenskih etnologov, še zlasti mlajših, usmeril med drugim v preučevanje najrazličnejših oblik družbenih odnosov, v problematiko tako imenovane socialne kulture, ki je bila na poprejšnji, "folkloristični" stopnji razvoja slovenske etnologije nedvomno zanemarjena. Seveda pa je del raziskovalcev, celo precejšen del, ostal pri bolj ali manj "klasičnih" etnoloških temah. Ni pa mogoče trditi, da tudi pri njih niso bila zaznavna določena posodabljanja.

Glede na mojo genetično-strukturalno metodološko usmeritev mi je Vaše povezovanje vloge in pomena slovenske etnologije z družbenozgodovinskim dogajanjem in razvojem seveda blizu. Pozornost, ki jo posvečate razlikam v razvoju antropologije in etnologije, tudi nemškima *Völkerkunde* in *Volkskunde*, je ustrezna in zanimiva. Bi pa ob tem rad podčrtal, da je mimo antropologije (oziroma nemške *Völkerkunde*) doživela razvoj in spremembe tudi etnologija (v smislu nemške *Volkskunde*). Res je, da antropologija ni ostala



le pri preučevanju t. i. "primitivnih" ali "naravnih" ljudstev, ampak je po zakoncih Lynd in W. L. Warnerju posegla tudi v mesto in na področje tako imenovane industrijske kulture. Seveda pa se tudi evropski etnologi že desetletja ne ukvarjajo več le s kmečkimi kulturami in podeželani, ampak preučujejo tudi način življenja in kulturne pojave prebivalstva industrijskih naselij in mest. To tako za sedajnost kot za preteklost.

Povsem se strinjam z Vašim razločevanjem, tako v razvojnem kot v funkcionalnem smislu, med socio-kulturno antropologijo (poimenovanje je Vaše!) in etnologijo. Zdi se, da temu ni kaj bistvenega dodati. Opozorili ste na to, da se je etnologija (v smislu nemške *Volkskunde*) razvijala ob študiju narodne zgodovine, umetnosti, literature. Vse to drži. Razvoj etnologije v smislu nemške *Völkerkunde* ali angloameriške socio-kulturne antropologije je bil drugačen. Obe vedi sta izpolnjevali v bistvu ločene naloge. V tem smislu smo na Slovenskem vse do sredine petdesetih let ločevali med etnografijo (na Nemškem naj bi bila to *Volkskunde*) in etnologijo (ime za nemško *Völkerkunde*). Iz več razlogov, med njimi tudi idejnopoličnih, smo tedaj etnografijo in etnologijo združili v enotno vedo - etnologijo. Velja ugotoviti, da nam omenjena spojitev tri desetletja ni delala nikakršnih težav. Prej nasprotno. Pridobljena širina je dajala več možnosti in več poleta. Ko pa so na našem oddelku, kot rečeno, nekateri kolegi začeli z uvajanjem kulturne antropologije, so se začele stvari postopoma zapletati. Pokazalo se je, da se omenjena novost uveljavlja na škodo tega, kar smo pred desetletji označevali z imenom etnografija (nemško *Volkskunde*). Da pa je šlo pri etnografiji za specifično problematiko, ki jo povezuje sklop tako imenovanih nacionalnih ved, je bilo povedano. Ob morebitnem nadaljnjem uveljavljanju kulturne antropologije na škodo etnologije kot nacionalne vede par excellence bi bilo seveda treba sprejeti nekatere zaščitne ukrepe. Dozdeva se mi, da bi bilo glede na Vaše razumevanje razlik med etnologijo in socio-kulturno antropologijo kaj takega tudi za Vas sprejemljivo. Dejstvo je pač, da problematika, ki smo jo pri nas nekoč uokvirjali v etnologijo, na Nemškem v *Völkerkunde*, postaja vse bolj predmet socio-kulturne antropologije. Ljudi, ki so se pri nas pred drugo svetovno vojno sami opredeljevali za etnologe, uvrščajo danes med antropologe. Zdi se, da je ta proces, ki ima svoj izvor v angloameriškem kulturnem območju, v zadnjem obdobju nezadržen. To pa ne pomeni, da je treba temu toku prepustiti tudi tisti del našega dosedanjega etnološkega zanimanja, ki smo ga v preteklosti označevali z besedo etnografija (v pomenu nemške *Volkskunde*). Glede na drugačne družbene pobude tako pri nastanku kot pri nadaljnjem razvoju preučevanja te tematike je treba še nadalje ohraniti zanj posebne strokovne okvire. Pri tem gre, kot je to razvidno tudi iz Vašega pisma, prvenstveno za obravnavo lastnega ljudstva, naroda, nacije. Zanimanje za druge etične skupine, v poglavitem za sorodne in sosednje, je potemtakem v funkciji samospoznavanja. Takšna usmeritev je usklajena tudi z imenom vede: etnologija ali etnografija (v nemščini v edninski obliki: *Volkskunde*). Antropologija že po imenu bistveno presega etnološke ambicije. Je, kot pravite, "essentially a comparative discipline". Delitev dela med etnologijo (s poudarkom na "ethnosu") in antropologijo (s poudarkom na "anthroposu") je na tak način v tematskem pogledu dovolj opredeljena. To velja tudi za njune cilje. Medtem ko je meto-

dologija stvar naše svobodne izbire, se metodični postopki ravnajo po metodologiji, ciljih in še zlasti po predmetu obravnave. Sicer pa pišete o metodiki v antropologiji (tudi v primerjavi z etnologijo) boljše v svojem pismu.

Razumevanje etnologije kot izrazito nacionalne discipline ste povezali z razmerami v bivši Jugoslaviji. Strinjam se z Vašo ugotovitvijo, da so bila skupna prizadevanja etnologov iz bivših jugoslovanskih republik razmeroma skromna. Res pa je tudi, da določenih poskusov intenzivnega medsebojnega povezovanja in sodelovanja ni manjkalo. Toda posebnosti posameznih nacionalnih etnologij in njihovih okolij, temelječe na različnih tradicijah, so bile očitne. Tovrstne disparatnosti so lahko eden od mnogih pokazateljev, zakaj je Jugoslavija razpadla. Prepričan sem tudi, da bi bile etnološke in antropološke primerjalne študije, ki bi se nanašale na različna območja bivše Jugoslavije, zelo koristna, čeprav bi seveda ne mogle zavreti razpadanje nečesa, kar je sililo narazen. Tako smo se slovenski in hrvaški etnologi pred poldrugim desetletjem dogovorili za redne vsakoletne strokovne sestanke, na katerih smo razkrivali vzporednice, podobnosti in razlike med slovensko in hrvaško etnološko problematiko. Ti sestanki so bili, tako menim, zelo koristni. Če bi jih kdaj obnovili, bi jih nedvomno kazalo podpreti. Podobno je bilo pred leti z *Alpes Orientales*, svobodno delovno skupnostjo etnologov vzhodnoalpskih dežel (Slovenija, Avstrija, Furlanija, Retija v Švici), ki je izhajala iz spoznanja o enovitosti ljudske kulture vzhodnoalpskih pokrajin ne glede na jezik in politične meje. Seveda pa so slovenski etnologi še v drugih zvezah pritegovali primerjalno gradivo, ki se je nanašalo na tuje etične skupine. Kajpak v poglavitem s ciljem, da bi boljše osvetlili vprašanja, na katera so naleteli doma. Pri tem so upoštevali ali bi vsaj ne smeli zanemarjati krajevnih in časovnih opredelitev, se pravi zgodovinskih določil. Da so bili pri ugotavljanju socialnih razlik šibki, je bilo posredno povedano. Tako so jih res manj zanimali npr. kulturni kontakti ("cultural contacts") nasploh ali zamisli o spopadih ("general ideas of conflicts") nasploh. So pa bili bolj zainteresirani za konkretne, zgodovinsko opredeljene pojave. Ne bi mogli nadalje trditi, da etnologue zanimajo le relativno stabilne družbe ("relative stable societies"). V strukturi etnološke topografije raziskave slovenskega etničnega ozemlja, ki jo prav gotovo poznate, sta enakopravna razdelka, ki se nanašata na uvajanje novosti in na razkroj tradicionalne kulturne podobe, kar se verjetno razlikuje v temeljih od antropološkega zanimanja za procese rušenja ("processes of destruction"). Seveda pa gre pri topografskem projektu v vsakem primeru za konkretne, zgodovinsko določene procese. Toliko o mojem umevanju razlik med etnologijo in socio-kulturno antropologijo. Kar zadeva Slovenski etnografski muzej, o katerem sva na najinem spomladanskem sprehodu prav tako govorila, gre za praktično in načelno vprašanje, ki že precej časa razgibava kulturno in v določanem pogledu celo politično ozračje na Slovenskem. Po osamosvojitvi Slovenije oziroma odhodu jugoslovanske vojske je namreč nasproti stavbe Narodnega muzeja ostalo prazno poslopje, ki bi bilo v obstoječih razmerah po mnenju mnogih iz več razlogov najbolj primerno za Slovenski etnografski muzej.<sup>5</sup> Slovenci sicer imamo svoj etnografski muzej že sedemdeset let, vendar brez ustreznih prostorov, v katerih bi bilo mogoče urediti prepotrebno stalno razstavo.

5 Po zadnjih načrtih se bo SEM preselil v kompleks izpraznjene vojašnice na Metelkovi v bližini železniške postaje. To naj bi bila dokončna rešitev (op. ur.).



**Slavko Kremenšek**

*Trubarjeva 61 61000 Ljubljana*

**Prof. Joel Halpern**

*580 Market Hill Road*

*Amherst, MA 01002*

*Ljubljana, August 3, 1994*

**Dear Joel**

Thank you so much for your letter which I received a while ago. I am glad you decided to follow our arrangement concerning an exchange of views on some of the professional problems which are of considerable importance in Slovenia today. These concern the relationship between ethnology and anthropology. This spring, while walking around Bohinj, we started to talk about the future location of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum and the role of ethnology in independent Slovenia. You deal with both of these topics in your letter; therefore I feel it best if I try to follow your line of thought.

I would prefer to speak about the relationship between ethnology and anthropology on the basis of my personal experience during these last few years. As you know, some of my colleagues at the Department of Ethnology in Ljubljana have initiated the study of cultural anthropology. Due to this fact, the name of the department was changed to the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. I was not among the initiators of these changes, but I was also not, in principle, against them. Some aspects of these changes or, better put, supplementing the work of the department did provoke certain complaints. This is why it may be difficult to avoid a certain degree of subjectivity here. It has to be stated that our discussions concerning the relationship between ethnology and anthropology have been, for now at least, limited mostly to department staff, and to our students. Since you have stated that you were not familiar with these discussions in detail, it seems only right to limit our debate to, as you had put it, some important ideas.

First, I wish to assert that contextual and methodological questions concerning cultural and social anthropology, which could be stimulating for the development of our ethnology, were not unknown to our department prior to these changes. It is even my opinion that in the sixties and the seventies, when our emphasis shifted from things to people, there was a certain "anthropologization" of our ethnology. Quite a large percentage of our ethnologists, especially younger ones, directed their attention to researching different kinds of social relations. Their attention shifted to problems of the so-called social culture. This aspect had undoubtedly been neglected previously. This was during the period of the "folkloristic" focus in the development of Slovene ethnology. A large group of Slovene researchers continued working on "classical" ethnological themes. But it would not be correct to say that certain elements of modern scholarship were not present in their work as well.

According to my genetic/structural methodological orientation it is understandable that I feel close to your linking the role and importance of Slovene ethnology with the evolution of current socio-historical events. The degree of attention which you devote to differences in the development of anthropology and ethnology, also to *Völkerkunde* and *Volkskunde* in Germany, is interesting and appropriate. I would like to stress, however, that aside from anthropology (namely

Kljub temu so strukturne oblasti omenjeno poslopje, kot vse kaže, namenile za upravne pisarne nekaterih ministerstev. Se pravi, da ima birokracija prednost pred ustanovami take vrste, kot je Slovenski etnografski muzej tudi v osamosvojeni Sloveniji. Nad tem sem se z ogorčenjem pritoževal na najinem sprehodu, pomirjen pa seveda nisem glede tega vprašanja niti danes. Povedati moram, da se spričo omenjenih dejstev počutim nelagodno, ker se Vaše besede, izzvale ob vprašanju Slovenskega etnografskega muzeja, sučejo v osnovi okrog tako imenovanega "folklorizma". To zato, ker vem, da že dobrih štirideset let spremljate prizadevanja v slovenski etnologiji, čeprav v primerjavi z nekaterimi drugimi območji bivše Jugoslavije morda res nekoliko sporadično in na daleč. Pa vendar: upal bi si trditi, da ste bili med najbolj obveščeni tujimi strokovnjaki glede jugoslovanskih etnologij. To izpričuje konec koncev tudi Vaše pismo. Zato veste, da smo v zadnjih tridesetih letih močno razširili vprašanja naših raziskav in se vsaj nekateri med nami s problemi, ki bi jih mogli označiti kot folkloristične, sploh nismo nikoli ukvarjali. Tako npr. moje razprave o Mostah prav gotovo niste dali prevesti na svoje stroške in nato razmnožili v seriji, ki ste jo zasnovali pred leti, zaradi njenih folkloristih sestavin. Teh v tem delu ni, kot jih ni npr. v študiji o Zeleni jami, ki ste si jo prav tako dali prevesti in ste mislili tudi na njeno objavo. Se pravi, da nas že desetletja ne zanima več le ljudska kultura, v našem primeru pač v prvi vrsti slovenska, ampak tudi način življenja družbenih slojev, ki z ljudsko kulturo niso imeli neposredne zveze. Le zavoljo ponazoritve položaja naj omenim, da je trenutno v tisku diplomska naloga ene naših študentk, ki obravnava način življenja na enem od gradov na Slovenskem med svetovnimi vojnami. Tema torej, ki bi morala prav tako dobiti prostor na stalni razstavi Slovenskega etnografskega muzeja. Sicer pa se je naša etnologija v marsičem spremenila tudi pri obravnavi ljudske tradicije, se pravi klasičnih etnoloških tem, recimo folklore. Ko ste bili lansko leto v Ljubljani, ste si, če se prav spominjam, kupili knjigo Janeza Bogataja *Sto srečanj z dediščino*. Delo je v celoti namenjeno vprašanju, kako kaže pojmovati dediščino v našem času, se pravi na nov, posodobljen način. In tako naprej. Spričo nakazanih sprememb v pojmovanju predmeta etnološkega preučevanja lahko predpostavljamo, da bi bila podoba stalne razstave v Slovenskem etnografskem muzeju, če bi jo imeli kam postaviti, močno drugačna kot pred, recimo, tridesetimi leti. Folklorizem in etnologija sta danes na Slovenskem dve bistveno različni stvari. V procesu oddaljevanja od folkloristične stopnje v razvoju naše etnologije smo se v tem in onem zgedovali tudi pri socio-kulturni antropologiji. Seveda pa zavoljo tega nismo postali antropologi. In sva spet pri vprašanju, o katerem je bil govor na začetku. Naj sklenem. Mislim, da sva si edina v prepričanju, da gre pri antropologiji in etnologiji v pogledu izvira, razvoja in njunega današnjega mesta v vrsti družboslovnih in humanističnih disciplin za dve stvari. Poigravanje s pomensko zvezo "etnologija in/ali antropologija", ki jo dandanes srečujemo pri nekaterih naših kolegih, je spričo tega vsekakor vprašljivo. Razumljivo pa je, da imate antropologi o etnologiji in imamo etnologi o antropologiji v tem in onem različne predstave, ki ne ustrezajo docela predstavam, izoblikovanim v lastni disciplini. Ker utegne biti ta podoba tako na eni kot na drugi strani tudi do določene mere zgrešena, je prav, da si svoje predstave večkrat izmenjamo. V upanju, da imata najini pismi značaj in pomen takšne izmenjave, ju pošiljam uredništvu Glasnika SED, ki nama bo prav gotovo pokazalo svojo naklonjenost.

**Prejmite moje iskrene in tople pozdrave, Slavko**



*Völkerkunde* in Germany), there were certain changes and further developments in ethnology (in the sense of *Volk-skunde* in Germany) as well. It is true that anthropology had not persisted only in research on the so-called "primitive" or "natural" peoples, but reached also into the sphere of the so-called industrial culture with W. L. Warner and the Lynds. But it is equally true that European ethnologists have ceased to limit their research solely to the farming culture and farmers, but are also interested in the way of life and in cultural elements among the inhabitants of industrial settlements and cities, in the past as well as today.

I could not agree more with your distinction - developmental as well as functional - between social-cultural anthropology (this is your term!) and ethnology. There is nothing I could add to it. You have stressed the fact that ethnology (in the sense of *Volk-skunde* in Germany) has developed alongside the study of natural history, art, and literature. All of this is correct. The development of ethnology in the sense of the German *Völkerkunde*, or Anglo-American social-cultural anthropology, has been different. Both disciplines have had essentially different goals. It was in this sense that all to mid-fifties there was the distinction between ethnography (*Volk-skunde* in Germany) and ethnology (*Völkerkunde* in Germany). Due to several reasons, including ideological ones, ethnography and ethnology then emerged into a uniform discipline - ethnology. It has to be asserted that for three decades, this merger has not presented any problems whatsoever. If anything, the exact opposite was true. The breadth thus attained offered more possibilities and more impetus. But since some of my colleagues at our department started to bring in cultural anthropology, as has already been mentioned, things slowly started to become complicated. It has turned out that this innovation of anthropology has asserted itself much to the detriment of what had been termed ethnography (*Volk-skunde* in Germany) decades ago. It has already been mentioned that ethnography dealt with specific problems linked together by the complex of the so-called national sciences ("national" in the more limited sense of this term).

It would of course be necessary to undertake some protective measures if cultural anthropology is going to further develop to the detriment of ethnology as the national science par excellence. It seems to me that, since you understand the differences between ethnology and social-cultural anthropology, this would be acceptable for you as well. The fact is that themes which had once been the scope of ethnology and of *Völkerkunde* are becoming more and more the subject of social-cultural anthropology. People who thought of themselves as ethnologists are nowadays labelled anthropologists. It seems that this process, the source of which is in the Anglo-American cultural area, lately became irrevocable. This does not denote, however, that the part of our ethnological research which was termed ethnography (in the sense of German *Volk-skunde*) in the past should be yielded to this current. This concerns, as is clearly evident from your letter as well, above all the research of one's own people, one's own nation. Interest in other ethnic groups, mainly in those similar to ours, or in our neighbours, is thus a developing of "self-knowledge." Such orientation is also in accordance with the name of the discipline: ethnology or ethnography (it is singular in German: *Volk-skunde*). Even in its name, anthropology fundamentally exceeds the ambitions of ethnology. It is, as you say, essentially a comparative discipline. Division between ethnology (with the stress on "ethnos") and anthropology (with the stress on "anthropos") is thus thematically clearly

defined. The same holds true for their goals as well. While methodology is a matter of our own free choice, methodical processes depend upon methodology, goals and, above all, on the subject of research. Moreover, you write about methods in anthropology (compared to ethnology) in detail in your letter.

You have linked your understanding of ethnology as a distinctive national discipline with the circumstances in ex-Yugoslavia. I agree with your statement that joint endeavours of ethnologists from ex-Yugoslav republics were somewhat modest. But it is also true that there were certain attempts at intensive mutual association and cooperation. Peculiarities of individual national ethnologies and their surroundings, based on different traditions, were, however, obvious. Such discrepancies can be one of many indicators explaining the disintegration of Yugoslavia. I am also of the opinion that comparative ethnological and anthropological studies of different areas of ex-Yugoslavia would have been extremely useful; but they could not, of course, prevent the disintegration of what had already come apart. A decade and a half ago Slovene and Croatian colleagues arranged for regular professional meetings the topics of which were parallels, similarities and differences between Slovene and Croatian ethnologies. I feel that these meetings were extremely useful. Should they be organized again, we should support such an initiative. A similar situation occurred some years ago with *Alpes Orientales*, an independent, noninstitutionalized organization of ethnologists from East Alpine countries (Slovenia, Austria, Friuli and Raetia in Switzerland) which was based on the recognition of the uniformity of folk culture in East Alpine regions, regardless of language and political borders. Slovene ethnologists have, of course, made use of comparative data on foreign ethnic groups elsewhere as well. The main goal of this was, to be sure, to analyze in detail those problems which occurred at home. In doing this they have considered, or at least they should have, local and temporal definitions or, to put it differently, historical definitions. It has already, although indirectly, been stated that social differentiation was not exactly their strong point. They were also not very interested in cultural contacts, as you have stated, in general, for example, or in, according to your own terms, general ideas of conflict. They were just more interested in concrete, historically defined phenomena. It would also not be possible to maintain that ethnologists are interested solely in, as you suggest, relatively stable societies. Within the structure of ethnological topographic research of Slovene ethnic territory, with which you are undoubtedly familiar, there are two equal sections dealing with the introduction of innovations and with the destruction of traditional culture. This is probably not basically dissimilar from anthropological interest in what you term the processes of cultural destruction. This topographic research project has, of course, consistently dealt with concrete, historically defined processes.

This concludes my comments about my understanding of differences between ethnology and social-cultural anthropology. As far as the Slovene Ethnographic Museum is concerned, which we discussed during our spring walk, this is a practical as well as a fundamental question. This matter has stirred up the cultural and, to some extent, the political climate in Slovenia for quite some time. After Slovenia gained its independence and following the departure of Yugoslav soldiers, there remained an empty building across from the National Museum in downtown Ljubljana; in these circumstances, and for several reasons, this would be the most suit-



able location for the Slovene Ethnographic Museum.<sup>6</sup> It is true that we Slovenes have had our own ethnographic museum for the last seventy years, but without a suitable building which would house a much-needed permanent exhibit. Despite this, it seems that our authorities have allocated this building for the offices of several ministries. This means that the bureaucracy has an advantage over such institutions as the Slovene Ethnographic Museum - even in independent Slovenia. I have already complained bitterly over this fact during our walk, and am still not at ease today.

I do have to say that due to these facts I feel some unease because your references to the problems of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum are basically centered on the influence of the so-called "folklorism." This is because I know that for about four decades you have been following Slovene ethnology, although maybe a bit sporadically and from a distance compared to some other areas of ex-Yugoslavia. And yet: I would dare to state that you were one of the best informed foreign professionals with regard to Yugoslav ethnologies. The proof of this is in your letter. You are therefore aware that we expanded considerably the scope of our research in the last thirty years, and at least some of us have never even dealt with problems which could be termed folkloristic. For example, I am sure that you did not have my treatise on *Moste* translated and published in your University's East European series because of its folkloristic elements. This monograph does not contain any such elements. The same is true for my publication on *Zelena jama* which you also had translated and intended to publish. This means that for some decades we have not been interested solely in folk culture in Slovenia, but also in the way of life of social strata which were not directly connected with folk culture. Let me just mention an illustration. At present we are printing a diploma thesis of one of our students on the way of life in one of the Slovene castles between the two World Wars. This is a theme which should find some space in the permanent exhibit of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum. Furthermore, our ethnology has also experienced many changes in dealing with folk tradition, as

with classical ethnological themes such as folklore. If I recall rightly you bought a book by Janez Bogataj entitled *Sto srečanj z dediščino* (*One Hundred Encounters with Our Heritage*) when you were in Slovenia last year. This entire book is dedicated to questions of comprehending our heritage at the present moment, meaning in a new, modern way. Due to these changes in our view of ethnology we envisage that a permanent exhibit in the Slovene Ethnographic Museum, were there any space for it, would be very different from one of, say, thirty years ago. Folklorism and ethnology in Slovenia are today two essentially different things. In the process of distancing ourselves from the folkloristic stage in the development of our ethnology we have occasionally taken an example from social-cultural anthropology. Of course this did not make us anthropologists. Thus we have come back to the question raised at the beginning of this letter.

Let me conclude. I feel that we agree that regarding their origins, development and present status among other humanities and the social sciences, ethnology and anthropology are two different fields. Playing with the syntagma "ethnology and/or anthropology" which is in use by some of our colleagues at present, is thus highly doubtful. It is understandable however, that anthropologists as well as ethnologists sometimes have different notions regarding ethnology and anthropology respectively, which do not wholly correspond to those formed within one's own discipline. Since these notions might be distorted to a certain degree, it is only right to clarify them among ourselves. In the hope that our letters do possess the character and meaning of such an exchange, I will send them to the editors of *Glasnik SED* (Bulletin of the Slovene Ethnological Society) who will, hopefully, demonstrate their benevolence.

**With warmest regards, Slavko**

(Translated from Slovene by Nives Sulič.)

<sup>6</sup> The latest plans for Slovene Ethnographic Museum are to move it into the complex of empty barrack near the railway station on Metelkova Street. It should be the final solution (ed. note).