

The rise of a southern anthropology: the creation of the Institute of Anthropology in Santa Catarina

*Amurabi Oliveira*¹

¹Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis/SC, Brasil

Abstract

The continuous examination of the formation and development of the social sciences is part of the intellectual tradition of Brazilian anthropology. The inaugural landmark in the institutionalization of anthropological science in the country is usually taken to be the advent of higher education courses in social sciences in the 1930s. This article looks to contribute to the debate on the history of Brazilian anthropology by analysing the creation and functioning of the Institute of Anthropology at the Federal University of Santa Catarina in the 1960s. This analysis seeks to problematize the idea that the anthropology produced far from the major centres was 'provincial,' demonstrating the dynamics assumed in this context in the academic training and the research produced at this institute.

Keywords: History of Anthropology, Brazilian Anthropology, Institute of Anthropology, Anthropology in Santa Catarina.

O surgimento de uma antropologia meridional: a criação do Instituto de Antropologia em Santa Catarina

Resumo

O exame contínuo da formação e desenvolvimento das ciências sociais faz parte da tradição intelectual da antropologia brasileira, que recorrentemente toma como marco inaugural do processo de institucionalização da ciência antropológica o advento dos cursos superiores de ciências sociais na década de 1930. O presente trabalho visa contribuir para o debate acerca da história da antropologia brasileira, analisando a criação e o funcionamento do Instituto de Antropologia na Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina na década de 1960. Através desta análise busca-se problematizar a ideia de que a antropologia produzida longe dos grandes centros seria “provinciana”, demonstrando a dinâmica assumida neste contexto em termos de formação acadêmica e produção de pesquisas neste Instituto.

Palavras-chave: história da antropologia, antropologia brasileira, Instituto de Antropologia, antropologia em Santa Catarina.

The rise of a southern anthropology: the creation of the Institute of Anthropology in Santa Catarina

Amurabi Oliveira

Introduction

One of the most prominent features of Brazilian anthropology is its self-reflective dimension, which involves regularly revisiting its formation, configuration and challenges (Peirano, 1981). In this sense, one of the milestones considered fundamental for understanding the institutionalization of anthropology in Brazil is the creation of the first higher education courses in social sciences in the 1930s,¹ understood as a locus par excellence for academic and professional training in the areas of anthropology, political science and sociology.

In this sociohistorical formation of the social sciences in Brazil, it is important to consider three aspects: a) the conception of the social sciences in the first half of the twentieth century was broader than what we recognize today, also encompassing related disciplines such as psychology, economics, history and so on; b) in Brazil, in contrast to the intellectual tradition established in other countries, including in Latin America, interdisciplinary academic training was developed in the social sciences, pushing the formation of disciplinary careers into the background; c) initially there was a strong concentration of social science courses in the Southeast region of Brazil, mainly in the cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, which was also accompanied by a greater density of publishers, specialized journals, research funding, and the like.

These aspects meant that the process of institutionalization and the production of knowledge in the social sciences was less visible outside the large centres, especially in places where undergraduate courses in this area had yet to be created. Such is the case of the state of Santa Catarina, whose first social science courses were founded only in the 1970s at the University of Planalto Catarinense (UNIPLAC) in Lages,² and the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC)³ in Florianópolis.

It is emblematic that the survey by Pinto and Carneiro (1955) of the social sciences in Brazil refers only to the states of Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul when analysing the case of the South region. This reflects a certain pattern of analysis in the field of Brazilian social sciences that excludes institutions and agents of Santa Catarina as being far from the standard of scientificity and institutionalization of the social sciences that came into force mainly from the 1930s onwards, a period seen to mark a 'break' from the 'pre-scientific' period of these sciences (Fernandes, 1958; Liedke Filho, 2005).

However, the webs forming the fabric of the social sciences in Brazil are more complex than they initially appear, obliging us to recognize the distinct temporalities and ways of institutionalizing these sciences found in different regions of the country. In this sense, it is important to understand that the formation of a field is always marked by tensions and disputes over the establishment of a legitimate view of the world (Bourdieu, 2001). This equally applies to the formation of the field of Brazilian anthropology.

1 The first social science courses created in Brazil were those at the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política de São Paulo (Free School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo) in 1933, the Universidade de São Paulo (University of São Paulo) in 1934, the Universidade do Distrito Federal (Federal District University) in 1935, the Faculdade de Filosofia Ciências e Letras do Paraná (Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters of Paraná) in 1938, and the Faculdade de Filosofia da Bahia (Faculty of Philosophy of Bahia) in 1941.

2 In Portuguese, Universidade do Planalto Catarinense. The UNIPLAC course was closed down and is no longer offered by this institution.

3 In Portuguese, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Although it is not the central axis of this text, it is important to consider some questions in more depth. A certain invisibility of the anthropology produced in Santa Catarina is recognized here as part of the history of national anthropology. This absence can be identified in specialized publications, such as the collections organized by Miceli (1989b, 1995), or articles like those by Melatti (1984),⁴ Corrêa (1988) and Peirano (1999), which constitute fundamental references in the historical development of the field. More recent works, such as the one by Salzano (2009), when referring to Brazilian anthropologists active in the formative period of the discipline, spanning from 1934 to 1954, also make no mention of researchers working in Santa Catarina.

By this I mean that, despite its recent development, anthropology in Santa Catarina is not included in the consecrated reviews on the history of anthropology in Brazil. There are occasional references to the works developed by Silvio Coelho dos Santos from the 1970s onwards, but ignoring the activities developed in this state in earlier years. I believe that especially in the time interval from the foundation of the Santa Catarina Faculty of Philosophy (FCF)⁵ to the period of activity of the Anthropology Institute of the Federal University of Santa Catarina, there is evidence of intense teaching and research activity in the field of anthropology that needs to be made visible and included in the debate on the history of Brazilian anthropology.

The present work thus seeks to contribute to a broader endeavour of revisiting the history of the social sciences in Brazil, and more specifically the history of anthropology. This aim in mind, I focus my attention on the Institute of Anthropology at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC) from 1965 to 1969, whose main instigator was Professor Oswaldo Rodrigues Cabral (1903-1978), supported by a group of other researchers, as will be explored in this text. The primary documentary source for my analysis is the central archive of UFSC, which contains the documents relating to the FCF, as well as the archives of the UFSC Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology⁶, which hold the Annals of the Institute of Anthropology⁷.

The main objective of this article is, therefore, to analyse the formation and functioning of the Institute of Anthropology at UFSC in the 1960s, also providing a brief contextualization of the emergence of anthropology in Santa Catarina in the previous decade when the first chairs in the discipline were created in Florianópolis. I conclude the text by indicating how the institutionalization of anthropology continued to unfold in the state in the 1970s, a period when undergraduate and postgraduate courses in social sciences were created and the Institute of Anthropology itself was transformed into a University Museum.

The emergence of anthropology in Santa Catarina

To understand the emergence of the Institute of Anthropology in Santa Catarina, we first need to contextualize how the teaching of this science became institutionalized in the state, which inevitably leads us to the formation of the first higher education institutions in the city of Florianópolis.

In the first decades of the twentieth century, Santa Catarina – and its capital – had undergone intense social and cultural transformations. These included the advent of new institutions understood as important to the process of ‘modernization’ of the state, such as the Catarinense Academy of Letters,⁸ created in 1924, and the Florianópolis Museum of Modern Art, founded in 1949.

Also part of this process was the establishment of the first academic faculties, whose main purpose was to train the state’s elites and specialized staff in various areas of knowledge. The first faculties created were those of Law (1932), Economic Sciences (1943), Pharmacy and Dentistry (1947), and Medicine (1955).

4 In Melatti’s work we find a single reference to the work of Silvio Coelho dos Santos (1938-2008), already referring to his research carried out in the 1970s.

5 In Portuguese, Faculdade Carinense de Filosofia.

6 In Portuguese, Museu de Antropologia e Etnologia da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC).

7 In Portuguese, Anais do Instituto de Antropologia.

8 In Portuguese, Academia Catarinense de Letras.

The Faculty of Philosophy (FCF) was created in 1951; however, its activities only began in 1955. The first chairs of anthropology and related disciplines emerged in the FCF context, although influenced by different theoretical and methodological guidelines.

FCF followed the model already consolidated by the National Faculty of Philosophy (FNF),⁹ linked to the University of Brazil (UB),¹⁰ which had also been reproduced by other Faculties of Philosophy (Oliveira, 2018), which were then proliferating across the country: between 1949 and 1957, there was a jump from 22 to 52 institutions, which tended to be similarly structured (CAPES, 1958). These faculties concentrated on offering courses that could form cultural elites, but also simultaneously meet the demands for secondary education that were then growing (Oliveira, 2018). The first courses offered at the FCF itself were Philosophy, Classical Literature, Neo-Latin Literature, Anglo-Germanic Literature, History and Geography.

Access to such courses was obtained through written and oral examinations, the subjects to be evaluated varying according to the intended course. For the History and Geography courses, on which anthropology was taught, the tests covered Portuguese, General and Brazilian history, General and Brazilian geography, and English or French. The pass rate from the first to the second year between 1955 and 1958 did not exceed 50%, which suggests the high degree of selectivity and academic demand existing at the faculty. This strengthens the hypothesis that the courses were profoundly elitist, even though we are mainly talking about local elites at this time.

The teaching of anthropology was limited to the History and Geography courses, as already indicated, with the subject of cultural anthropology present on both courses, physical anthropology on the geography course, and Brazilian ethnography on the course of history. Jaldyr Baering Faustino da Silva (1914-1994), a law graduate and head of Brazilian ethnography, became responsible for these disciplines. Father Alvinio Bertholdo Braun (1908-1984), with a background in philosophy and theology, became professor of physical anthropology, while Oswaldo Rodrigues Cabral (1903-1978), trained in medicine, assumed the chair of cultural anthropology (Santos, 2006). Cabral and Braun, both involved in the founding of the FCF, also circulated in other spaces: Cabral was a professor at the Faculty of Law, and Braun was a professor at the Colégio Catarinense, a Jesuit school institution founded in 1905, responsible for training local elites to a secondary educational level.

As Santos (1997) indicates, the general tendency between the late 1950s and early 1960s in southern Brazil anthropology was for professors to be self-taught and Catholic. This is also attested by the presence of the physician José de Loureiro Fernandes (1903-1977) at the Faculty of Philosophy of Paraná and Father Balduino Rambo (1906-1961) in Rio Grande do Sul. In Santa Catarina, although professors from other states were hired for some chairs, the professors teaching subjects related to anthropology came from the local cultural elites, and most of them also held other chairs in that context.

Although outside the focus and scope of the present article, it is important to signal the role played by the Catholic Church in this process of constituting the field of higher education in Santa Catarina. Its influence is readily perceptible in the presence of teachers who were also active as priests, as well as the use of the physical space of the Colégio Catarinense, a religious teaching institution, at the beginning of the FCF's academic activities. Notably, despite the FCF having emerged as a private institution, it also received public funds, which points to an intimate relationship between the State, the Catholic Church and local elites in the process of building this project. In the 1950s, the Catholic Church was deeply mobilized around the issue of education, particularly the debates surrounding the first Education Guidelines and Framework Law,¹¹ begun in 1948, which reflected the advances made by the Catholic Church in the educational field over the previous decade.

9 In Portuguese, Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia.

10 In Portuguese, Universidade do Brasil.

11 In Portuguese, Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação.

These had taken place in the context of the reforms introduced by Gustavo Capanema (1900-1985), Brazil's minister of education between 1937 and 1945.

Above all, the figure of Oswaldo Cabral will be central in this process, given the intellectual leadership he achieved over the period, both locally and nationally. In 1937 Cabral had already published the book *Santa Catarina – History, Evolution*¹² (1937) in the 'Brasiliana' collection published by Companhia Editora Nacional. This collection, together with 'Documentos Brasileiros' and 'Biblioteca Histórica Brasileira,' constituted one of the privileged spaces for the production and circulation of knowledge in science, thus meeting one of the 'institutional requirements' of the intellectual field of the time (Pontes, 1989).

In 1948, Cabral assumed the position of undersecretary of the newly-founded Santa Catarina Folklore Commission (founded during the 1st Santa Catarina History Congress held the same year in which he was general secretary). The latter in turn was linked to the National Folklore Commission, created a year earlier, which brought together various actors prominent in the formation of the field of anthropology in Brazil, such as Arthur Ramos (1903-1949), Gilberto Freyre (1900-1987), Edgar Roquette Pinto (1884-1954), and Edison Carneiro (1912-1972). Other intellectuals who headed the regional commissions played a relevant role in the process of institutionalizing anthropology in their respective states, mainly through the professorships at the Faculties of Philosophy. This was the case of Theo Brandão (1907-1981) in Alagoas, Thales de Azevedo (1904-1995) in Bahia, and Câmara Cascudo (1898-1986) in Rio Grande do Norte.¹³

It is important to emphasize that the Brazilian Anthropology Association (ABA)¹⁴ had not yet been created at this time,¹⁵ and the Brazilian Society of Anthropology and Ethnology,¹⁶ founded by Arthur Ramos in 1941, had only a brief existence. Consequently, the National Folklore Commission proved to be one of the most important spaces in the process of bringing together researchers linked to anthropology. In Santa Catarina from 1949 onwards, the folklore subcommittee started to issue its own publication, the *Bulletin of the Catarinense Folklore Commission*¹⁷, which published original articles and news items relating to the national commission and submission to the state commission.

My point here is to demonstrate how Cabral was deeply involved in the debates of his time and in the spaces where aspirants to the label 'anthropologist' could become legitimized (Oliveira & Barbosa, 2018). Thus, in 1956, when Cabral submitted his request to Father Wener José Soell, then the director of the FCF, to assume the chair of cultural anthropology, one of the elements cited in support of his application was publication of *Culture and Folklore*¹⁸ (1954). Recipient of an award from the National Folklore Commission, the book contained a preface by Roger Bastide (1898-1974), reflecting the prestige Cabral had acquired during this period.

Comparatively, it is interesting to note that the chair of sociology only existed as an adjunct to the philosophy course and later, from 1960 onwards, the complementary course in didactics, indicating a certain predominance of anthropology in the debate on social sciences at the local level. At the same time, the coexistence of the disciplines of cultural anthropology, physical anthropology and Brazilian ethnography demonstrates the plurality of perspectives that existed at that time, accompanied by the disputes over a certain conception of anthropology, which, during this period, was strongly linked to archaeology.

12 In Portuguese, *Santa Catarina – História, Evolução*.

13 Here I do not mean to imply that these intellectuals had 'only' a regional role, but rather that, in addition to their insertion in national terms, they maintained a constant concern with the process of institutionalization and consolidation of anthropology in their home states.

14 In Portuguese, *Associação Brasileira de Antropologia*.

15 The first ABA meeting took place in Rio de Janeiro in 1953, having been officially founded in 1955 at the meeting held in Salvador.

16 In Portuguese, *Sociedade Brasileira de Antropologia e Etnologia*.

17 In Portuguese, *Boletim da Comissão Catarinense de Folclore*.

18 In Portuguese, *Cultura e Folclore*.

Furthermore, we can observe from this curricular organization that the debate between cultural anthropology and physical anthropology was strong at that time in the FCF, although physical anthropology was losing ground in social science departments at national level. In the 1960s, Durham and Cardoso (1961) had already pointed out the limitations in the teaching of physical anthropology compared to cultural anthropology, which included the students' limited interest and training in natural sciences, as well as the limited resources available for their teaching, which would consequently cover general information only.

Castro Faria (1952) also emphasized the challenges posed to physical anthropology in Brazil at the time, highlighting the advances made during the first half of the twentieth century. Writing at a later date, Melatti (1984) drew attention to the difficulties of training staff in the field of physical anthropology from the 1950s onwards, indicating the existence of only a few specific courses. In this sense, the anthropological debate developed at FCF in the 1950s seems to point to another temporality since physical anthropology found an important space in the academic training offered at this institution (Oliveira, 2020).

The first FCF class enrolled on the History and Geography course, which was later divided into two courses following a legal ruling. Graduates from this training program could subsequently choose one or more areas of specialization. Among the eight graduates in the first class was Walter Piazza (1925-2016), who selected Cultural Anthropology, Human Geography and the History of Santa Catarina as his areas of specialization. This data is interesting since it shows that in the absence of a higher education course in social sciences, history and geography courses were conceived to be suitable spaces for training of anthropologists, indicating anthropology as one of the possible areas of specialization on the course.

Here it is interesting to note that what differentiates the institutionalization of anthropology in Santa Catarina is not its interdisciplinarity, since this was also present in social science courses (Oliveira, 2019), but rather the specific arrangement produced through the approximation between anthropology, history and geography. On this point, it is worth highlighting that the understanding of social sciences existing then was quite broad, narrowing over the following decades, especially after the University Reform of 1968, which enabled the development of separate postgraduate training in the disciplinary fields of anthropology, political science and sociology.

Concluding this initial account of the debate on the institutionalization of anthropology in Santa Catarina, it is important to emphasize that in the 1960s, the FCF ceased to exist as an autonomous institution and became part of UFSC incorporate its faculty and students. At the same time that this movement resulted in less administrative autonomy for the FCF, it also brought new possibilities in terms of institutional arrangements, since the status of university enabled the emergence of other academic structures, and it is in this context that the Institute of Anthropology was created. This loss of autonomy of the faculty accelerated in the military period, mainly considering the reorganization given to the federal universities in that period.

The creation of the Institute of Anthropology

The Institute of Anthropology was created by Resolution n. 89 of December 30, 1965, although the project for its creation dates back significantly earlier. As the main documentary source on the Institute's creation and functioning, the research consulted the Annals of the Anthropology Institute¹⁹, which began to be published in 1968. Four annals were found, referring to the years 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971 (Anais do Instituto de Antropologia, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971). All contained articles based on research carried out at the Institute, along with a section referring to the 'news,' plus the occasional reviews, documents and information relating to

¹⁹ In Portuguese, Anais do Instituto de Antropologia.

the Institute's research projects. It is worth noting that from 1970 onwards the publication was renamed *Annals of the Anthropology Museum*²⁰, which reflected the changes in the administrative and academic structure underwent by UFSC at that time.

In the annals of 1968, the following articles were published: 'On the rarity of platform zooliths' by Oswaldo Cabral, 'On economic integration' by Silvio Coelho dos Santos, 'The Sambaqui of Congonhas I' by Anamaria Beck, 'Alveolo-dental affections' by Édison Araújo, and 'The Laguna Stone' by Egas Godinho.

Silvio Coelho dos Santos and Anamaria Beck had carried out their initial academic training at the FCF, working directly with Cabral, and became professors at UFSC. Both conducted doctoral training at the University of São Paulo in the areas of Social Anthropology and Archaeology respectively. Édison Araújo was a dentist. He also worked directly at the Institute and became a professor at UFSC. Finally, Egas Godinho is a pseudonym of Cabral, which he used more frequently to publish works of literature.

In the news section, there is a transcription of the Institute's inauguration speech, given by Oswaldo Cabral, indicating May 29, 1967, as the precise date of the event. Present was the state governor, the metropolitan archbishop, the deans of the Federal Universities of Espírito Santo, Fluminense and Paraíba, the Federal Rural University of Rio Grande do Sul,²¹ and the Catholic University of Salvador, as well as the directors of the Faculties of Pharmacy, Engineering and Philosophy, in addition to other authorities and professors.

Interestingly, although an opening speech was given by João David Ferreira Lima (1910-2001), the first rector of UFSC, only Cabral's speech is reproduced in the annals. It is indicated that the idea of creating the Institute arose from the team working in the anthropology section and that it was perceived that it was necessary to go beyond the didactic limits of the chair itself.

The inaugural speech also highlights the fact that although a wealth of ethnological and archaeological material existed in Santa Catarina, few researchers had developed studies of this empirical field. The works of Father João Alfredo Rohr²² and Walter Piazza, the latter the occupant of the chair of American History at the time, are cited. But most of this material would be collected and analysed by researchers from other parts of the world, whether from other museums in Brazil – especially the National Museum²³ – or from European museums.

There is an indication that the process of formation of the Institute of Anthropology also involved a series of nationwide visits and exchanges, which in turn implied the elaboration of a certain model of academic organization. The visit to the Anthropology Institute of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN)²⁴ seems to have been significant in this regard, identified by Cabral as responsible for inspiring the UFSC rector with '(...) the enthusiasm we expected from him to take this work forward' (*Anais do Instituto de Antropologia*, 1968: 110). Also highlighted is a visit to the Joaquim Nabuco Institute for Social Research,²⁵ founded by Gilberto Freyre and under the direction of Mauro Mota (1911-1984) at that time. However, the impossibility of doing something along similar lines in Santa Catarina is recognized. As the testimony of Beck (1995: 21) clearly points out, it was a project developed before the founding of the institute, primarily aimed at the development of research and the training of an initial cohort of staff.

20 In Portuguese, *Anais do Museu de Antropologia*.

21 Today the Federal University of Pelotas, which was called the Rural University of the South between 1960 and 1967, and the Federal Rural University of Rio Grande do Sul between 1967 and 1969.

22 It is notable that from 1964 onwards, Father Rohr started to organize the *Museu do Homem do Sambaqui* (Sambaqui Man Museum) which is run at the Colégio Catarinense.

23 In Portuguese, *Museu Nacional*.

24 In Portuguese, *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte*. The UFRN Anthropology Institute was created in 1960, becoming a museum in 1975.

25 In Portuguese, *Instituto Joaquim Nabuco de Pesquisas Sociais*. The institute was created in 1949 under the auspices of Gilberto Freyre when he was a federal deputy, later transformed into a foundation in 1979.

The Museum actually began as an Anthropology Institute. It was an idea that started to be developed in the early 1960s when Dr Cabral, Professor Walter Fernando Piazza and Professor Sílvio Coelho dos Santos (at the time assistant to Dr Cabral) decided to assemble a group of not only professors but also researchers; a group of anthropologists. It was a very interesting idea because the process of building this group, the idea of having an Institute of Anthropology, became consolidated. Initially, to train people, several students were chosen from the anthropology disciplines on the History and Geography courses as part of this process. Moreover, in this sense, for example, we started to receive scholarships from national institutions to do our training outside of Santa Catarina, as was the initial case of Professor Sílvio Coelho dos Santos, Marclio Dias dos Santos, myself, Professor Luís Carlos Halfpap, Alroino Baltazar Eble, now deceased, who was also director of the Museum, Professors Maria José Reis, Neusa Maria Sens Bloemer, Sônia Ferrari and Giralda Seiferth. Sônia Ferrari is currently at USP, and Giralda Seiferth is at the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro. This group of professors (initially we were students) wanted a postgraduate course to streamline this group of Anthropology studies, which was formed into the Institute of Anthropology. As we started to come back from our graduate studies, the idea of having a larger physical space than we had in the Faculty of Philosophy, the former Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters, was consolidated, and we opted for an area at the university campus that had been abandoned, formerly a stable. The laboratory, for example, was the pen where the cows were milked. Initially it was transformed into the Laboratory of Archaeology and Physical Anthropology, currently simply the Laboratory of Archaeology.

Setting up the institute, therefore, required finding an academic model that would enable the articulation of activities already being developed by a relatively dispersed team of researchers – in addition to those linked to UFSC, other collaborators scattered throughout the state are also mentioned – and, simultaneously, an advance in the field of research and specific training in archaeology and anthropology. To this end, Cabral also indicates that, concurrently with the constitution of the institute and its facilities, a personnel training process was launched (as evinced in Beck's testimony). This primarily involved sending of researchers to other institutions to engage in specific academic training. As Cabral stated:

(...) we took care to prepare the necessary human resources, selected from among my most outstanding students. Three of them went to do their postgraduate studies at the National Museum, two in Social Anthropology and one in Archaeology, while among those already trained, one [went to] Alto Solimões, among the indigenous populations, and the other [obtained a] Rotary Club scholarship, for two years, in Mexico. An assistant at the Faculty of Dentistry, he became an excellent archaeologist and restorer of pieces; he joined the team with a modelling course in São Paulo. On our and their initiatives, we brought several professors to teach intensive courses here: Conceição Becker, Castro Farias, Oldemar Blasi, and, more recently, our fellow countryman Egon Schaden, from the University of São Paulo. Later this year, we will welcome Roquette de Barros Laraia from the National Museum and Paulo Duarte from the Institute of Prehistory at the University of São Paulo. (*Anais do Instituto de Antropologia*, 1968: 109-110)

This passage is extremely significant, I believe, as it allows us to question a certain reading widespread in the narrative on the history of social sciences in Brazil, which situates experiences outside large centres as provincial and pre-scientific (Reesink & Campos 2014). The emergence of the Institute of Anthropology in Santa Catarina was clearly in tune with the scientific standards of its time, which was reinforced by the exchange of researchers and the investment in postgraduate training of its staff.²⁶

Here I wish to emphasize that recognizing that the social sciences had different temporalities, with different degrees of institutionality in different regions of the country, does not mean that the temporality developed in Santa Catarina between the 1950s and 1960s can be classified as provincial or pre-scientific.

²⁶ It is important to stress that although masters and doctoral degrees have been awarded in Brazil since the 1940s, at least, the postgraduate system as known today began with the University Reform of 1968 with the first courses towards postgraduate degrees. In this period, the National Museum began to offer specialized courses in certain areas of knowledge from 1960 onwards.

On the contrary, the publication of the *Annals of the Anthropology Institute* from 1968 onwards pointed in another direction, investing not only in the development of research but also in the dissemination of its results,²⁷ affirming the scientificity of the academic project developed in Santa Catarina. By analysing the activities pursued by the Institute during this period, we will gain a better idea of how the centre sought to assert itself in the academic field, joining the disputes inherent to this universe.

At the foot of the first page of the *Annals*, the phrase ‘exchange is requested’ was written in English, Spanish, French, Italian, and German, in addition to Portuguese, highlighting the relevance of intellectual exchanges and the circulation of people, theories and objects. In other words, the publication, in addition to being conceived as a form of scientific dissemination, was also used to initiate academic exchanges, which would enable the expansion of the institution’s specialized bibliographic collection.

The functioning of the Institute: between local and national

Approval of the Institute’s internal regulations only took place in 1968. These set out its purposes, which included: a) the study and research of Anthropology and all related matters; b) the organization and administration of an Anthropological Museum; c) maintenance of training and information courses and provision of internships for the improvement of knowledge of Anthropology and related subjects, not only for undergraduate students but also those in graduate school; d) regularly publish research results; e) analyse issues related to the prehistoric cultural and social heritage of Santa Catarina state, providing solutions for the resolution of practical problems, especially those related to overcoming underdevelopment; f) develop analyses that allowed the application of anthropological knowledge in different areas of administration.

At least two important aspects stand out in the definition of the Institute’s purposes: a) the possibility of offering postgraduate courses, which pointed to a significant degree of consolidation of its staff of researchers at the time. Another (unnumbered) article of its by-laws also states that: ‘The Institute of Anthropology will confer the Master’s and Doctoral degrees to candidates who complete the Master’s and Doctorate courses’; b) an indication of the organization and administration of an anthropological museum to be a relevant element in the consolidation process of anthropology in Santa Catarina.

It is important to point out that museums played a prominent role in the development of Brazilian anthropology (Schwarcz, 1989), even to the point of constituting one of the main spaces for training researchers and disseminating knowledge in this area. There were already some experiences nearby related to the organization of archaeological and ethnological material, such as the Sambaqui Man Museum, organized by Father Rohr at Colégio Catarinense from 1964, or even the Paranaense Museum,²⁸ founded in 1876, which to some extent served as a model for the formation of the new anthropological museum in Santa Catarina. The Institute would initially contain three divisions – archaeology, physical anthropology and cultural anthropology – which also reflected the didactic organization of the chairs existing at the time, and the history and geography courses of the Faculty of Philosophy at UFSC.

The body of researchers and professors comprised: a) professors and researchers working full-time at the institute; b) professors and researchers hired temporarily; c) professors and researchers who taught periodic courses; d) associate professors and researchers. At the same time, regular students were to be ‘students of the History course at the Faculty of Philosophy who whose undergraduate course curriculum included Anthropology’ – a situation that could be extended to other students if their respective faculties included

²⁷ We can also note the publication of the archaeological series from 1966 onwards. This was designed to disseminate scientific research in archaeology and related areas, the first published work being ‘The Caves of São Joaquim and Urubici’ by Walter Piazza.

²⁸ In Portuguese, Museu Paranaense.

anthropology in their curriculum. This structure sought to provide greater autonomy for the development of the institute's activities. Although it is not made completely clear in the regulations, the full-time research professors would act as professors or assistants in anthropology and related areas.

With the approval of its by-laws, regular publication also began, annual in frequency, with the *Anais do Instituto de Antropologia*. This periodical also reported on the research currently in progress. Brief mention is made of a publication called the *Chair of Anthropology Bulletin*²⁹, previously edited by the Faculty of Philosophy, but no records of this publication were found in other materials. In 1968 there is an indication of two surveys conducted at the institute, the first called 'Anthropometry of material collected from archaeological deposits in Santa Catarina, determination of anthropometric constants and indexes,' coordinated by the teaching instructor of the Faculty of Dentistry, Edson Araújo; and the second entitled 'Study of the relationship between the Xokleng Indians and settlers in Santa Catarina,' coordinated by the teaching instructor at the Faculty of Philosophy, Silvio Coelho dos Santos. Still concerning the activities developed in 1968, four extracurricular courses were mentioned: a) a course on Brazilian ethnology, conducted by Egon Schaden from USP, between April 22nd and 26th, which had 120 students enrolled; b) a course on social anthropology between the 17th and 22nd of June, given by Roque de Barros Laraia from the National Museum; c) a cycle of studies on prehistory and the modern world, held between the 7th and 16th of August, provided by Paulo Duarte from USP; this series contained different modules, whose number of students varied between 59 and 317; and d) a seminar on sociology, education and anthropology, from October 21st to 29th, with the participation of Oswaldo Cabral, Silvio Coelho dos Santos, Marcílio Dias dos Santos, Anamaria Beck, all professors at the Faculty of Philosophy of UFSC; this had 52 enrolled students.

Again, what I wish to highlight here is the Institute's endeavour to produce anthropological knowledge according to the standards established by Brazil's national scientific community. This occurred not only through the development of research and the dissemination of its results, but especially through the circulation of people, including both graduates from the Faculty of Philosophy who took courses outside the state, and the arrival of renowned researchers, who would also enable training in anthropology and archaeology to be offered in Santa Catarina.

Intellectual circulation is highlighted in the information uncovered by the research. This circulation was operationalized by sending researchers to provide academic training at other centres and enabling the arrival of other researchers to Santa Catarina. In the 1969 *Annals*, reference is made not only to visits by professors from the University of Paraná, the University of São Paulo, the National Museum and the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, but also by political figures such as the Portuguese consul in Porto Alegre, members of the Superior War School, and the Public Ministry.

In the 1969 *Annals*, we also find the publication of two original works: 'The integration of the Indian in regional society' and 'Studies of the sambaqui of Lessa River,' along with two works in the 'Diverse Information' section, entitled 'The Laguna Stone' and 'The Laguna Stone and the 2nd expedition of Dr Carl Von Den Steinen to the Xingu, in 1887.' Mention is also made of excavations carried out at 'Ponta do Lessa' in Florianópolis, financed by UFSC and by the Directorate of National Artistic and Historical Heritage³⁰.

Notably, this publication also refers to some problems in the Institute's functioning, highlighted by the fact that the three courses planned for that year were not held. Aiming to draw attention to this issue, a second note is published, listing the main difficulties encountered by the Institute in carrying out the scheduled research. These were:

29 In Portuguese, *Boletim da Cadeira de Antropologia*.

30 In Portuguese, *Diretoria do Patrimônio Artístico e Histórico Nacional*.

1. The reduced number of researchers;
2. Existing researchers had not been included on a full-time basis;
3. Absolute need to combine research with didactic work (a guideline followed by the Institute and from which it did not intend to deviate), not always easy;
4. Accounting system, whose requirements prevented the application of research donations during the main academic holiday period (January and February). This period could be fully used in research, as teaching work was in recess. However, there was a difficulty obtaining funds, as those for the previous year had to be collected by December 15, and those for the year beginning in January/February had not yet been distributed. (*Annals of the Institute of Anthropology*, 1969: 219).

The situation highlights a certain precariousness of activities with research concentrated in the period of the June recess and a substantial number of researchers also committed to activities in other institutions. This effectively reflects how incipient the university system in Santa Catarina was during this period. Not insignificantly, the *Annals* also mention the existence of external collaborators, such as João José Bigarela (1923-2016), who was a professor at the Federal University of Paraná, and Carlos Gorfejee (1922-2005), a physician naturalist from Blumenau. Thus, the existing intellectual exchanges also seem to have played an important role in resolving the personnel difficulties existing at the Institute.

As already indicated, the *Annals of the Institute of Anthropology* publication would be named after the next issue of the *Annals of the Anthropology Museum*³¹, which reflected the changes substantiated by the 1968 University Reform and its consequences for the structure of UFSC from 1970 onwards, including the abolition of various chairs and faculties and the creation of new departments. In the new structuring of the university, there was no space for the institutes, and the three that had been operating at UFSC ceased to exist: the Labour Law Institute at the Faculty of Law, the Institute of Socioeconomic Studies at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, and the Institute of Anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy (Santos, 2006).

The solution found for the 'preservation' of research activities was the switch from Institute to Museum. However, the professors were incorporated into the Department of Sociology, which, together with other factors, led to the resignation of Cabral from his position as director of the Museum (Santos, 2006). Direction of the Museum was transferred to Sílvio Coelho dos Santos, assistant to Cabral at the time. The changes being implemented also had other implications, such as the inclusion of Sociology and Anthropology as disciplines making up the basic cycle of students of humanities and social sciences at UFSC. As indicated in the note signed by Santos and published in the first edition of the *Annals of the Anthropology Museum*:

The year 1970 brought several changes to our work environment. Initially, due to elements established in the reform project for the Federal University of Santa Catarina, we lost the name of the Institute and became a Museum. Then, due to the reform project, we saw Anthropology become a mandatory subject for all students in Social and Human Sciences at the Centre for Basic Studies. This meant that we went from an average of 80 students to 350. (...) To meet these changes, the Museum's team was expanded. Two new teachers were recruited; the library received new employees; and the administration was enriched with one more member of staff. (Santos, 1970: 3)

Also in his note, the absence of Oswaldo Cabral's leadership is lamented, indicating that he would have entered a period of extended leave for medical treatment. Activities that continued to be developed at the Museum are also mentioned, including two extension courses, the first called 'The foundations of social anthropology: social organization, kinship and resistance,' given by Cecilia Maria Vieira Helm (1937-) from the Federal University of Paraná, and the second in 'Religious Anthropology,' given by Maria Isaura Pereira de

³¹ In Portuguese, *Anais do Museu de Antropologia*.

Queiroz (1918-2018). Also noteworthy were the visits made by professors from other institutions, such as the rector of the University of Brasília and the rector of the University of Guadalajara in Mexico, Professor João Bigarella of the Federal University of Paraná, Edwin L McKee of the Geological Survey of the United States, Aloísio Costa Chaves (1920-1994) from the Federal University of Pará, John M. Hunter (1940-) from the State University of Michigan, and Emílio Willems (1905-1997) from USP.

This publication also indicates the continued investment in postgraduate training for graduates from UFSC, who would later join the institution's staff. Maria José Reis, who graduated in history, took a master's course at the Goeldi Museum of the Federal University of Pará in the area of Brazilian archaeology. Alroino Eble (1945-1990), also a history graduate, specialized in general anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania in the United States.³²

The description of these intense activities allows us to question the reading made by Miceli (1989a) concerning the development of social sciences in Brazil far from the big cities, moving closer instead to the image of a 'metropolitanism of the province,' in the terms put forward by Lins Ribeiro (2005). After all, the anthropologies developed in peripheral regions tend to have a relatively good knowledge of the academic production of the metropolis, while the metropolis tends to narrow its knowledge to its own contributions to the field. Nevertheless, it is still worth citing the argument developed by Reesink and Campos (2014: 67-68):

Thus, the consistency of the mythical project and its success as a hegemonic and qualified discourse is anchored by what we analyse as the interpretive key of this project of academic geopolitical hegemony: namely, the idea of institutionalization and its derivative, the institutionalized social sciences. As we can see, the classification, or not, of the institutionalization of the social sciences will be one of the great shapers of the 'Procrustean bed'; that is, it is originally from this north that the trainers and producers of the social sciences will be disqualified or qualified, in particular [those] of anthropology in Brazil.

The authors also draw attention to the fact that the debate between the 1930s and 1950s mainly centred on professionalization not institutionalization. However, pursuing another line of argument, I would like to reinforce the perception that the social sciences found different paths for their institutionalization in Brazil, which did not exclusively involve undergraduate courses in the social sciences. In the case of anthropology in Santa Catarina, this kind of institutionalization initially occurred with the history and geography course and later with the Institute of Anthropology. The latter brought together researchers dedicated to cultural and physical anthropology in Santa Catarina state, enabling the development of networks, exchanges and the circulation of people, works and theories.

Understanding the existence of other dynamics in the production of anthropological knowledge, or even another temporality in terms of the dynamics of social sciences, one not necessarily linked to higher education courses in this area, necessarily leads us to the concept of academic coloniality (Restrepo, 2007).

In this context, experiences such as the Institute of Anthropology at UFSC – or that of UFRN, which in a way served as a model for the former – deserve to be highlighted for promoting the formation of an autonomous field for anthropological science in their respective contexts, attuned to the scientific standards of the period. As becomes clear from examining these cases, we can rethink the history of social science, returning to an analysis from a geopolitical point of view of knowledge, understanding that the historical process of invisibilization of certain agents and institutions reflects academic hierarchies and disputes in the field more than the absence of a vibrant production of knowledge in certain regions.

32 Both entered the master's course in Archaeology at USP in 1973.

Final considerations

In the 1970s a graduate course in social science was created at UFSC, which afforded greater academic autonomy to anthropology, refining Santa Catarina's intellectual formation in this area in similar fashion to other centres, enabling anthropology to become more independent from other courses at the former Faculty of Philosophy, now the Centre for Philosophy and Human Sciences (CFH). During this period, postgraduate programs became consolidated in centres like the National Museum, the State University of Campinas (Unicamp) and the University of Brasília (UnB). Along these lines, I have also made an initial effort to describe the offer of postgraduate training in this area in Santa Catarina.

In the South of Brazil, everything relating to postgraduate training in anthropology originated slightly later than the Southeast of the country, beginning at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul in 1979 and the Federal University of Paraná in 1999. In a similar way to universities in the Northeast of Brazil, where anthropology developed mainly in the departments and courses of social sciences or sociology (Motta & Brandão 2004), the first postgraduate experiences in anthropology in Santa Catarina developed within the academic structure of the Department of Sociology and alongside a course in social sciences. According to Santos's account (1995: 17-18):

(...) In 1974, we thought about creating a specialization course in Anthropology. This idea had Professor Anamaria Beck at the forefront. The negotiations with the Department of Sociology were difficult. We were six or seven [in number], while the number of sociologists was ten or eleven. Meanwhile, sociology did not have enough postgraduate professors to provide a specialization course too. On the part of the Department of Sociology, there was a certain restriction to our proposal since it was limited to meeting the interests of Anthropology. To carry out the project, we had to include the Sociology area. The course ended with the denomination of a Postgraduate Course in Social Sciences, Specialization in Sociology and Anthropology, inaugurated in 1976. As of 1978, this course became a condition for the master's degree.

Concomitant to this process, in 1978, the project for the museum to become a research institution providing training received a strong blow. Resolution n. 65 transformed the Museum of Anthropology into a University Museum, effectively becoming an institution tasked exclusively with custodianship of the collection. To a large extent, this meant an end to the initial project proposed by Cabral for anthropology in Santa Catarina. However, the discipline became established, assimilating a 'bureaucratic' logic that began to characterize Brazilian anthropology from the 1970s (Oliveira, 2003).

In this analysis, we can perceive the characteristics of the emergence and development of anthropology in Santa Catarina, taking as a guiding thread the formation of the Institute of Anthropology. Although this academic structure did not last for very long, it provided the grounds for training in anthropology in the state and was far from being simply a 'provincial' experience: it was deeply tuned to the national and international debates, fostered by an intense circulation of influential figures, as demonstrated here.

The revisit to the history of Brazilian social science via a 'regional' case like the Institute of Anthropology at UFSC brings us back to the issues raised by Scott (2014) concerning qualitative internal plurality, values and suppressed national anthropologies. To describe the plurality of Brazilian anthropology completely requires a constant self-reflection, revisiting the diverse histories of anthropology embedded in the construction of national anthropology, analysing the different models of academic structure and their various temporalities – an endeavour that is long overdue.

Translated by David Rodgers

Submitted: October 30, 2019

Accepted: May 17, 2021

References

- ANAIS DO INSTITUTO DE ANTROPOLOGIA. 1968. *Ano I*. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- _____. 1969. *Ano II*. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- _____. 1970. *Ano III*. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- _____. 1971. *Ano IV*. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- BECK, Anamaria. 1995. "Depoimento dos diretores". In: *Museu Universitário UFSC: 30 anos*. Florianópolis: Editora Universitária UFSC. pp. 21-23.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 2001. *Para uma sociologia da ciência*. Lisboa: Edições 70.
- CABRAL, Oswaldo Rodrigues. 1954. *Cultura e folclore: bases científicas do folclore*. Florianópolis: Comissão Catarinense de Folclore.
- _____. 1937. *Santa Catharina – história, evolução*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional.
- CAPES. 1958. *Estabelecimentos de ensino superior*. Rio de Janeiro, Série informativa, mimeo.
- CASTRO FARIA, Celso. 1952. "Pesquisas de Antropologia Física no Brasil". *História. Bibliografia. Boletim do Museu Nacional, N.S., Antropologia*, 13: 1-106.
- CORRÊA, Mariza. 1988. "Traficantes do Excêntrico. 'Os Antropólogos no Brasil dos anos 30 aos Anos 60'". *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 3(6): 79-98.
- DURHAM, Eunice Ribeiro; CARDOSO, Ruth. 1961. "O ensino da antropologia no Brasil". *Revista de Antropologia*, 9 (1/2): 91-107.
- FERNANDES, Florestan. 1958. *A etnologia e a sociologia no Brasil*. São Paulo: Anhembi.
- LIEDKE FILHO, Enno. 2005. "A sociologia no Brasil: história, teorias e desafios". *Sociologias*, 7(14): 376-436.
- LINS RIBEIRO, Gustavo. 2005. "Antropologias Mundiais: cosmopolíticas, poder e teoria em antropologia". *Série Antropologia*, s/v(379): p. 1-16.
- MELATTI, Júlio César. 1984. "A antropologia no Brasil: um roteiro". *Boletim Informativo e Bibliográfico de Ciências Sociais (BIB)*, s/v(17): 1-92.
- MICELI, Sergio. 1989a. "Condicionantes do desenvolvimento das ciências sociais". In: S. Miceli (org.), *História das ciências sociais no Brasil. Vol. 1*. São Paulo: Vértice, Editora dos Tribunais, IDESP. pp. 72-110.
- ____ (org.). 1989.b *História das ciências sociais no Brasil. Vol. 1*. São Paulo: Vértice, Editora dos Tribunais, IDESP.
- ____ (org.). 1995. *História das ciências sociais no Brasil. Vol. 1*. São Paulo: Vértice, Editora dos Tribunais, IDESP.
- MOTTA, Antônio; BRANDÃO, Maria do Carmo. 2004. "O campo da antropologia e suas margens: A pesquisa e sua disseminação em diferentes instituições de ensino superior no nordeste". In: W. Trajano Filho, G. Lins Ribeiro (orgs.), *O campo da antropologia no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: ABA/Contra Capa. pp. 167-186.
- OLIVEIRA, Amurabi. 2018. "O ensino de ciências sociais na Faculdade Catarinense de Filosofia". *Ciências Sociais (UNISINOS)*, 54(1): 117-125.

- _____. 2019. “A identidade disciplinar de Gilberto Freyre e a institucionalização acadêmica da antropologia no Brasil”. *Etnográfica*, 23(3): 537-555.
- _____. 2020. “O ensino de Antropologia Física e Etnografia do Brasil em Santa Catarina na década de 1950”. *Anuário Antropológico*, 45(1): 269-286.
- OLIVEIRA, Amurabi & BARBOSA, Inaê. 2018. “Oswaldo Rodrigues Cabral e a formação da Antropologia em Santa Catarina”. *Áltera: revista de antropologia*, 1(6): 37-54.
- OLIVEIRA, Roberto C. 2003. *Sobre o pensamento antropológico*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.
- PEIRANO, Mariza. 1999. “Antropologia no Brasil (Alteridade Contextualizada)”. In: S. Miceli (org.), *O Que Ler Na Ciência Social Brasileira (1970-1995)*. São Paulo: Editora Sumaré. pp. 226-266.
- _____. 1981. *The anthropology of anthropology: the Brazilian case*. Tese de Doutorado em Antropologia. Harvard University – Cambridge.
- PINTO, Costa & CARNEIRO, Edison. 1955. *As ciências sociais no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: CAPES (Série Estudos e Ensaaios, nº 6).
- PONTES, Heloisa. 1989. “Retratos do Brasil: editores, editoras e ‘coleções brasileira’ nas décadas de 30, 40 e 50”. In: S. Miceli (org.), *História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil. Vol.1*. São Paulo: Vértice, Editora dos Tribunais, IDESP. pp. 359-409.
- REESINK, Mísia; CAMPOS, Roberta. 2014. “A Geopolítica da Antropologia no Brasil: ou como a província vem se submetendo ao Leito de Procusto”. In: P. Scott, R. B. Campos, F. Pereira (org.), *Rumos da Antropologia no Brasil e no Mundo: Geopolíticas Disciplinares*. Recife: EDUFEPE/ABA. pp. 55-81
- RESTREPO, Eduardo. 2007. “Antropología y colonialidad”. In: S. Castro-Gómez, R. Santiago, R. Grosfoguel (orgs.), *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Bogotá: Universidad Javeriana Instituto Pensar, Universidad Central-iesco, Siglo del Hombre Editores. pp. 289-304.
- SALZANO, Francisco. 2009. “Antropologia no Brasil: é a interdisciplinaridade possível?”. *Amazônica*, 1(1): 12-27.
- SANTOS, Sílvio Coelho dos. 2006. “A Antropologia em Santa Catarina”. In: S. C. Santos (org.), *Memória da Antropologia no Sul do Brasil*. Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, Associação Brasileira de Antropologia. pp. 15-77.
- _____. 1970. “Editorial”. *Anais do Museu de Antropologia*, s/v(1): 3-4.
- _____. 1995. “Depoimento dos diretores”. In: *Museu Universitário UFSC: 30 anos*. Florianópolis: Editora Universitária UFSC. pp. 15-18.
- _____. 1997. “Notas sobre a construção da antropologia no Brasil”. *Horizontes Antropológicos*, 3(7): 62-69.
- SCHWARCZ, Lília Moritz. 1989. “O nascimento dos museus brasileiros, 1870-1910”. In: S. Miceli (org.), *História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil. Vol. 1*. São Paulo: Vértice, Editora dos Tribunais, IDESP. pp. 20-71.
- SCOTT, Parry. 2014. “Poder, pluralidade estratégica e hierarquização interna em antropologias nacionais”. In: P. Scott, R. B. Campos, F. Pereira (org.), *Rumos da Antropologia no Brasil e no Mundo: Geopolíticas Disciplinares*. Recife: EDUFEPE/ABA. pp. 127-158.

Amurabi Oliveira

Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7856-1196>

E-mail: amurabi1986@gmail.com