Who’s afraid of ‘Teutonic professors’?

The hermeneutic tradition in German ethnology
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In his well-known essay ‘Blurred Genres’, Clifford Geertz points out that the word ‘hermeneutics’ frightens people, because it conjoins up ‘images of biblical zo- lots, literary humbugs, and Teutonic professors’ (Geertz 1980–1983: 21). To exorcize the menace represented by the ‘Teutonic professors’, one may want to call them by their names: Herder, Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Hei- degger, Gadamer, Habermas for example. As a matter of fact ethnology in Germany decided to exorcize the menace by ignoring it, so that hermeneutics had no direct influence on theory building in our discipline.

The traditional domain of hermeneutics is philology, the interpretation of classical and biblical texts. But from the beginning of this century hermeneutics also gained ground in the historical sciences and in sociology, most prominently represented in Max Weber’s ‘Verstehende Soziologie’ (Weber 1921). In contrast to the historical sciences and to sociology there was no her- meneutical approach in German ethnology: a term such as ‘Verstehende Ethnologie’ for example was never coined. There were initial impulses towards such an approach, but the very few representatives of our discipline who tried to free ethnology from the dominant naturalistic and scientific paradigm stand outside of mainstream ethnology: others emigrated, such as Franz Boas, who, being a young Jewish intellectual, saw no chance for a career under Adolf Bastian at the ‘Völker- kunde Museum’ in Berlin.

German-speaking ethnology during that period of time had a strong historical orientation.1 Its leading representatives in Berlin, Vienna and Frankfurt am Main held the position that hermeneutics, being applied to the interpretation of texts, would have no relevance for the reconstruction of the history of illiterate people. They relied heavily on a ‘salvage paradigm’ (Clifford 1987), which was to characterize German ethnology from Bastian to Frobenius to Haberland.

Eike Haberland, one of the most influential ethnolo- gists in post-war Germany, used a telling metaphor in his inaugural lecture 1967 at the Goethe University in Frankfurt/M. Attempting to describe the situation in Af- rica at the end of the sixties, he compared the continent to a burning house, saying that we might not be able to extinguish the fire, but should try to rescue as much as we can (cf. Uni-Report 1991). Haberland belonged to the last generation of German ethnologists to be edu- cated before or during the Second World War. Scholars from this generation were convinced that, for a rescue operation in Africa and elsewhere, an attempt to come to terms with epistemological or ethical issues would be an irresponsible waste of time.

The generation of German ethnologists to which I belong was educated in an ‘atheoretical idyll’ (Stagl 1981), since up to the seventies and early eighties the discipline maintained a strong empirical orientation without any epistemological interest.2 In any case, the hermeneutic philosophers of the ‘Teutonic’ tradition mentioned at the beginning were – perhaps with the ex- ception of Johann Gottfried Herder – not on the cur- riculum.

Against this background it was a surprise for us to encounter some of these ‘Teutonic professors’ in anthro- pological textbooks edited by North American or British colleagues; these textbooks were about rational- ity, fieldwork methods, understanding foreign cultures or the textual representation of the other; and they had titles like ‘Symbolic Anthropology’, ‘Interpretive Social Science’, ‘The Anthropology of Experience’, or ‘Writing Culture’.

In these textbooks we discovered as ethnologists in Germany that German philosophers of the above-mentioned hermeneutic tradition have something relevant to say to us. So we had the paradoxical situation, that we first read for example about Dilthey or Gadamer in English before we came to the idea of reaching for the original text.

Even when the situation in German ethnology began to change, an interest in theoretical issues developed very slowly. This was pointed out in an M.A. thesis by a student in Tübingen, who examined the response which a theoretical approach such as interpretive anthro- pology has received in Germany; one of the find- ings of this thesis was that up to the year 1992 not a single article was published in German ethnological journals and magazines which deals with the work of Clifford Geertz (Gratz-Meskini 1992).

Why was the most influential representative of an inter- pretive or cultural hermeneutic approach largely ig- nored by German speaking ethnologists, at least until recently? Here I want to stress only three points which are able to cast light on the present situation of ethno- logy in Germany.

First, Geertz’s work is difficult to classify in terms of location or geography. His perspective is comparative insofar as he is trying to find global structures in local details. Geertz brings his interpretive approach right to the point, when he says that the place of investigation is not the object of investigation (Geertz 1973). Such a comparative perspective, which analyses the same phenomena in Southeast Asia and in the Maghreb, hinders his reception in Germany, where a strong geographical division and subdivision characterizes the discipline.

Second, Geertz’s style is, in a good sense of the word, essayistic; but the essay as genre is not widely accepted as an appropriate scientific form in German academia. Despite the influential articles of Lukacs (1911) and Adorno (1958) about the essay as genre, there is still a ‘petit bourgeois resentment’ (Bude 1989: 535) against an unorthodox writing style which ignores bibliographical references and the beauty of footnotes. Because Geertz constantly borrows ideas and notions from other social scientists, linguists and philosophers, a widespread objection against his interpretive approach in German ethnology runs as follows: too much theory – too little data.
Third, the process of translation and publication of Geertz’s work in Germany is generally unsatisfactory. Many of his influential essays are not translated at all. In this case his pretentious English writing style hinders the reception of his work in the original in Germany. The translation of other essays is often inconsistent and partly unfortunate; in the first German collection of his essays, the central term ‘interpretive anthropology’ was not translated as interpretative Anthropologie which would have been obvious – but as deutende Ethnologie, which only contributes to the general confusion about semiotic, symbolic or interpretive anthropological. (As if to add insult to injury, the first hardcover translation of his book Works and Lives repeatedly mis-spells his name in the first pages.) Finally, German ethnologists have represented Geertz as the ‘paragon of influences, external to the discipline’ (cf. Stellrecht 1993).


This text was originally given as a paper in the AAA Annual Meeting in San Francisco on 23 November 1996, in an invited session of the American Ethnological Society entitled ‘German anthropology today’, organized by Tullio Maran. 1. The historical orientation of German speaking ethnology is itself the result of incisive historical events: Germany lost its colonial territories after World War I and German ethnology subsequently its field of application. In contrast to North America and Australia, ethnology in Germany could not be applied to “natives at home”, so that the self-understanding of the discipline was frequently to be a historische Hilfswissenschaft, providing the historical sciences with data about the former German colonies, in particular about the life of the natives before any contact with the West. 2. German ethnology’s compromise with Nazism, mainly through providing a pseudo-theoretical legitimation to Rassenlehre and politics, led in post-war Germany to a certain anxiety to go beyond a mere collection of data. It is only recently, that Volkskunde and Völkerkunde have begun to work up their entanglement with Nazism (cf. Gerndt ed. 1987 and Hauschild 1987). The co-existence of Volks- und Völkerkunde has a long tradition in German academia. As Völkerkunde, which is just a somewhat out-dated synonym for Ethnologie, could be seen as a historische Hilfswissenschaft, the understanding of Volkskunde was frequently to be a philologische Hilfswissenschaft, providing Germanistics, the study of German language and literature, with data about the oral literature (fairy-tales, songs, etc.) of the German people. As a consequence, the “68 student revolt the curriculum of Volkskunde was reordered and the most important institutes changed their names into Empirische Kulturwissenschaften or Europäische Ethnologie. Nowadays these different names are used at the same time and at the same place: as for example in Frankfurt/Main, where exists a Museum für Völkerkunde, an Institut für Historische Ethnologie and an Institut für Europäische Ethnologie.
Repercussions from the Église Saint-Bernard

On 23 August last year, riot police raided Saint Bernard’s church in the Goutte d’Or district of Paris, and evicted more than 200 undocumented workers, many of them Malians, who were seeking sanctuary and some of them on hunger strike. (A fair proportion of them actually had residence rights but lacked the documentation to prove it.) It was no doubt this drama which stimulated a table ronde entitled ‘Républiques et coutumes’ organized in Paris on 4 June by Catherine Quiminal for the Association Française des Anthropologues (AFA), and focused primarily on the issue of undocumented workers or sans papiers in France. Emmanuel Terray was the senior speaker, and he contended that this issue, far from being marginal, was at the heart of today’s political economy. Many of those represented in the Paris collective of sans papiers comprising over 30 different nationalities, with whom Terray has undertaken field research, are, he said, model citizens and workers, finding employment in restaurants and in the cleaning and garment industries. He argued that they help make the French economy more competitive by making possible ‘delocalization on the spot’, i.e. providing the same cost advantages as a business can gain through exporting jobs overseas. (According to one press report, there are up to one million sans papiers in France, in addition to some four million legal foreign residents.) Terray argued in his presentation that the French authorities at ground level were resorting to a policy of intimidation and that there was a gap between what the law said and how it was applied in practice.

Another speaker, Jean-Loup Amselle, said that, though a ‘racism of purity’ still characterized the Front National, the abandoning of racial categories by biologists had resulted in what he called a new form of racism based on the idea of lineage, which might well find some support in the Human Genome Project as popularly interpreted. The extreme right-wing political authorities in Toulon in the south of France (according to another paper, by Edouard Conte) seek to eliminate all reference to place of birth as legitimation for citizenship; in their publications they flatten Provençal and Alsatian regionalism, and also revive anti-Jewish caricatures of the 1930s with the effect that Arabs in the south can sometimes hear themselves described as ‘filthy Jews’. A Front National slogan goes: Étre français, ça s’hérète ou ça se mérite (‘Being French is inherited or merited’).

Terray and some of his AFA colleagues spoke at the meeting against the popular perception that Europe’s living standards are maintained by a tidal wave of immigrants seeking the benefits of health care, education and government aid. It is true that economists tend to be more positive about the overall effects of immigration than politicians, as well as perhaps less convinced that it can in practice be reduced. It is also true that migrants tend to be pre-selected in terms of ambition and willingness to work. But the reaction of the settled majority in countries such as France is clearly a social fact which has to be taken account of and studied, just as is the dream of so many poor people in North Africa, Latin America and elsewhere to build up personal links with a Western nation through emigration by a family member. One of the less publicized immigration routes is by Moroccans across the Straits of Gibraltar, with the result that the 60,000 Moroccans officially resident in...