Katarina Matiasek, Harald Wilfing

Evolutionary Anthropology, Colonial Histories and a Collection Reframed

Internal colonialism, colonial complicity and the rise of the sciences of man in the Habsburg Empire

In the last decade, there has been increasing discussion of the extent to which imperial expansion and colonial forms of rule can also be observed in Europe. Among the best-known examples for these deliberations is the Austro-Hungarian Empire in Central Europe.[1] While the Habsburg monarchy did make some brief, mostly abortive, attempts to acquire its own overseas territories, it largely remained a major imperial power without formal colonies, and its colonialist ambitions were played down as symbolic foreign policy at the time.[2] The sharp increase in European overseas expansion and the associated global traffic from the mid-nineteenth century onward, however, stimulated both popular and scientific interest in anthropological issues also in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As elsewhere in Europe, the new and rising sciences of man began to form outside university structures in civic-scientific associations and thus initially fed from different disciplinary sources.[3] Among the initiators of a first Anthropological Society in Vienna were the Assembly of German Natural Scientists and Physicians, which met almost every year at different locations in Germany and Austria from 1822,[4] the k. k. Geologische Reichsanstalt, the first geological survey institute of its kind on the European mainland from 1849, as well as several neighbouring disciplines.[5]

In his opening speech on the occasion of the founding of the Anthropological Society in Vienna in 1870, its first president, the pathological anatomist Carl von Rokitansky (1804–78), invoked the "promotion of anthropological enlightenment in Austria". He outlined the collective discipline of anthropology as a "natural history of Man" and described its subfields of physical anthropology, ethnology and prehistory as a "mutual interdependence and interpenetration" that would not be encountered

anywhere else.[6] In his outline of the association's scientific programme, von Rokitansky focused strongly on the specific conditions in the multi-ethnic Austro-Hungarian Empire and the possible merits of the new science of anthropology in this field.[7] These clearly reveal a political agenda of internal colonialism.[8] While the Anthropological Society's programme was based on the "wealth of anthropological material of every kind" within one's own borders[9] and thus suggests internal peripheries as a "substitute" for overseas colonies,[10] it was only hesitantly put into practice. During the first three decades of its existence, the focus was clearly on archaeological prehistory, reflecting the great influence of geologists within the Society.[11]

During the 1880s, anthropological research into the somatological composition of their peoples was considered worthy of support by the Ministry of Education, and a research programme to that effect was published in the proceedings of the Anthropological Society, but without conclusive results.[12] Likewise, repeated efforts to boost ethnography did not bear fruit until the 1890s, in the wake of the *Kronprinzenwerk*, a lavishly illustrated 24-volume encyclopaedia of the monarchy's peoples and lands initiated by Crown Prince Rudolf of Austria-Hungary (1858–89). Published between 1885 and 1902, it contained the contributions of an Ethnological Commission set up in 1884 by the incumbent president of the Anthropological Society, the Austrian geologist Ferdinand von Andrian-Werburg (1835–1914).[13] Here, too, scientific conclusions were subject to national impartiality and kept within conciliatory bounds.[14] Ultimately, it would certainly have been detrimental to the prestige of the entire Habsburg monarchy if it had been described as being composed of less developed peoples.[15]

The absence of overseas colonies was generally valued as a positive asset in the Empire's official self-representation. In 1902, for example, the foreign trade expert Moritz Engel von Jánosi (1858–1924) rated Austria-Hungary's non-participation in the competitive colonial race as "a most fortunate coincidence" because "with satisfaction it could now devote itself to its real task of colonial activity" in South-Eastern Europe.[16] In this, von Jánosi alludes to the "exception" of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which, from its occupation in 1878, represented the first "quasi-colonial" project of the Empire's army, administration and science.[17] Reaching beyond the "civilizing missions" as carried out within the Habsburg Empire,[18] a practice of "colonial science" can be identified in the case of the equally multi-ethnic territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina and its peoples. Under Ottoman rule until 1908, when it was forcefully annexed by Austria-Hungary, it also catered to the exoticism that was part of the fascination with exploring "colonial peoples" overseas.[19] However, the priority given to the colonization of South-Eastern Europe over own overseas territories was due more to a lack of colonial opportunities than to any strategic planning.[20]

The aforementioned dominance of geologists among the founding members of Vienna's Anthropological Society, including committee members Ferdinand von Hochstetter (1829–84) and Franz von Hauer (1822–99), secretaries Franz Heger (1853–1931) and Josef Szombathy, as well as long-standing president Ferdinand von Andrian-Werburg,[21] fostered an early reception of evolutionary theory. Like the linear stratigraphic succession of ages in geology, the various forms of human societies were conceived of as a succession of developmental stages. With those perceived to rank higher in their development appearing later in time than those ranking lower, geology also confirmed the idea of a hierarchical sequence among them.[22] Oriented towards evolutionary pasts "beyond memory" that would continuously unfold into the present,[23] the emerging sciences of anthropology, ethnology and prehistory transformed evolutionary theory into the first shared paradigm of "evolutionism" – the theory of a uniform upward development of human society.[24]

The main focus of evolutionism was on non-European cultures considered "primitive" in evolutionary proximity to an earlier stage of mankind and therefore understood as the key to reconstructing the history of human development. Against the spreading Western "civilization", they were not considered capable of survival.[25] The collection imperative for the sake of preserving data thought likely to become extinct led to an unprecedented "documentary furor"[26] for which Jakob Gruber coined the term "salvage anthropology" in 1970.[27] Unlike its German counterpart in Berlin, the Anthropological Society of Vienna readily espoused evolutionist concepts of cultural stages and impeding extinction of "primordial" races in the encounter with "superior" civilization.[28] With Charles Darwin among its first honorary members, the association's more influential representatives based their work on aspects of evolutionary theory. However, there was no aggressive Darwinist approach that would have encouraged competition between races and cultures.[29] Within the universalist framework of evolutionism, Austro-Hungarian scientists thus participated in a global anthropological discourse that mainly drew on observations and, importantly, collections gathered on colonial territories.

When taking a closer look at the individual biographies of early influential players in the environment of Vienna's Anthropological Society, their practical connection to international colonialism becomes immediately tangible. German-born geologist Ferdinand von Hochstetter, Austrian by choice, had participated in the prestigious world circumnavigation of the k. k. navy frigate *Novara* between 1857 and 1859. Officially dedicated to scientific exploration and trade contacts only, the expedition's hidden mission was to make up for the monarchy's colonial "omissions".[30] The strategy of scientific observation and collection during the *Novara* endeavour, as laid down beforehand by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, was to prominently meet

these obligations. The *Bemerkungen und Anweisungen* (1857) urges the participating scientists to "take possession of skulls of all human races" and to collect, as far as possible, "whatever they can".[31] The anthropological yield of the *Novara* expedition included over 100 human skulls[32] – collected illegally from Indigenous burial sites as well as from colonial hospitals and prisons.[33] When Ferdinand von Hochstetter was appointed first director of the newly built k. k. Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna in 1876, these human remains were transferred to form the "basis of today's anthropological collections".[34] Von Hochstetter also initiated the donation of the considerable collections of the Anthropological Society to the museum's new Anthropology-Ethnography Department in 1877.[35]

Austrian physician, archaeologist and anthropologist Felix von Luschan (1854–1924) began his medical studies in 1871 at the University of Vienna, where he was a student of Carl von Rokitansky.[36] As a long-time friend of the von Luschan family, Ferdinand von Hochstetter introduced the young man to the Anthropological Society in Vienna, which he joined while still a student.[37] Von Luschan became custodian of the society's collections from 1874 to 1877[38] and on its behalf installed a prehistoric exhibit at the Paris World's Fair of 1878. Later that year, he was drafted as a military doctor during the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where he took body measurements of the local population, established ethnographic collections and carried out excavations in hitherto unknown necropolises, which in turn increased Viennese museum holdings.[39] In 1882, von Luschan was awarded the first *venia legendi* for physical ethnography from the University of Vienna.[40] From 1885, the year of his marriage to Emma von Hochstetter (1864–1941), until his death, his career was inextricably entwined with Berlin, where he held a curatorial position at the Ethnological Museum until 1910 and a full professorship at the university from 1910 to 1922. In these years, his work ranged over "the entire anthropological map" and involved many field trips, mostly to the Near East.[41]

At Berlin's Ethnological Museum, von Luschan curated the Oceania and Africa collections, which happened to include the German colonies and protectorates of the time. True to its founding director Adolf Bastian's (1826–1905) "salvage" admonitions, he tirelessly lobbied colonial circles to promote systematic anthropological collecting for his museum while there was still time.[42] He published a series of detailed collection instructions between 1896 and 1914, which were aimed at commercial travellers, missionaries, colonial officials or explorers from other disciplines.[43] At the University of Berlin, von Luschan held an anthropological course from 1889 onwards, which was designed as "preparation for scientific travel" and supplemented by practical exercises in photography and other reproduction methods.[44] This regular course was directed at an audience designated for service in the German colonies, including future members

of the colonial troops. Anthropological documentation was also directly practised on Indigenous "models", mainly young men from Germany's African or Oceanic protectorates sojourning in Berlin,[45] and included the taking of plaster casts, hair samples and anthropometric measurement directly off their bodies.[46]

It was from this Berlin core around the prominent figure of Felix von Luschan that the career of another Austrian anthropologist took its starting point. Alongside his friend Richard Thurnwald (1869–1954), the young physician Rudolf Pöch (1870–1921), born in Galicia and trained in Vienna, took up an assistantship in the Ethnological Museum's Africa and Oceania collections while studying anthropology and ethnography under von Luschan in 1900. Pöch's professional photographic skills had previously qualified him to join the official Austrian Plague Expedition to Bombay in 1897 as a young assistant physician and likely spurred his interest in anthropology.[47] Like the Viennese Thurnwald, Pöch can be seen as a typical example of a scientist "inextricably linked with the colonial venture".[48] From 1904 to 1906, Rudolf Pöch conducted his first independent expedition to Oceania. Having declined an offer by his teacher von Luschan to commission and endow him for this enterprise,[49] Pöch planned his extensive journey on his own terms and also privately financed it. This single-handed approach can be explained by the fact that the Ethnological Museum in Berlin had secured preferential rights to all collections from German colonial territories acquired with imperial funds.[50] Bypassing these obligations, Pöch retained the rights to his own overseas collections, which were ultimately to form the material basis for the attainment of his scientific legitimacy and academic credentials.[51]

The Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna backed him with declarations of support directed to the German, British and Dutch colonial governments, respectively. On his return, Pöch succeeded in refinancing his expenses by selling his collected materials to various Viennese institutions, among them the Natural History Museum, Schönbrunn Zoo and the Anatomical Institute of the University of Vienna.[52] Shortly after, Pöch was assigned to a new two-year expedition to South Africa and the Kalahari by the Imperial Academy of Sciences from 1907 to 1909.[53] Both journeys were characterized by intensive collecting and documentation activities in the newest media of the time. While several hundred Indigenous human remains ruthlessly acquired in Oceania and in Southern Africa eventually formed the basis of Rudolf Pöch's teaching and research collection, his corresponding overseas photographs, films and sound recordings were used to popularize anthropological and ethnographic issues before their academic establishment.[54]

Based on his earlier travels in New Guinea, Rudolf Pöch was awarded the *venia legendi* for anthropology and ethnography in 1910 and promoted to the rank of associate professor at the University of Vienna in 1913. In 1915, he received a second

doctorate from the University of Munich with a dissertation on his previous observations and collections from Australia.[55] While anthropological and ethnographic studies had hitherto been conducted mainly in colonial territories, the prisoner-of-war camps that emerged on Austro-Hungarian and German soil during the First World War promised to become a new research terrain. Pöch conducted anthropometric measurements and documentation in a variety of media in Austro-Hungarian prisoner-of-war camps between 1915 and 1917. On the invitation of his former teacher Felix von Luschan, these surveys were extended to German prisoner-of-war camps up to 1918.[56] Pöch claimed to be prepared for investigations of a "large and important exotic mixture" of African and Indian colonial soldiers from the western front imprisoned there by his previous overseas expeditions.[57] After the war, Pöch became the country's first full professor of anthropology and ethnography, marking the birth of two scientific disciplines at the University of Vienna in 1919.[58] From 1907 until his sudden death in 1921, he remained a member of the Anthropological Society of Vienna.[59]

This small selection of biographies alone clearly implicates Austro-Hungarian anthropological sciences in the colonial project. Imbued by a sense of urgency in the tradition of salvage anthropology, their early protagonists' systematic documentation and acquisitions were largely carried out within the administrative, medical and judicial structures of the colonial apparatus[60] – in mission schools, police stations, military reserves, Indigenous hospitals and asylums, or in prisons. With the motto "knowledge is power", von Luschan expressed his conviction that ethnology would in turn make an indispensable contribution to a successful colonial policy.[61] The politics of difference on which colonial rule was ultimately based presupposed the notion of a clear and unbridgeable anthropological hierarchy, scientifically underpinned by evolutionist theories.[62] The formal academic establishment of anthropology and ethnography, as advocated by the Anthropological Society of Vienna,[63] was mainly driven by what can be called "colonial complicity." This term implies participation in hegemonic Western discourse and practices of dominance,[64] and connects the Habsburg monarchy to other countries that were neither historically situated among the colonial centres of Europe nor an "innocent victim" or mere outsider to the colonial project.[65]

Applied colonialism, colonial revisionism and the downfall of physical anthropology during the Nazi era

In the interwar years, anthropological survey methods primarily developed during the observation of colonial subjects, either on overseas expeditions or in the more laboratory setting of the prisoner-of-war camps of the First World War, were directed at the

country's own populace.[66] Otto Reche (1879–1966) from the University of Hamburg, who had also studied with Felix von Luschan, took on the vacant twin chair for anthropology and ethnography from 1924 to 1927. During these years, he made "hereditary biology" and "racial hygiene" the priority of the institute, and introduced a method for "proofs of paternity" for legal alimony suits based on the heredity of anthropological features such as blood groups.[67] After Reche had followed a call to the University of Leipzig, where he was to play a crucial role in shaping the Nazi race ideology, the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography was divided.

Josef Weninger (1886–1959), formerly Rudolf Pöch's first assistant in the prisoner-of-war studies, was appointed professor of physical anthropology in 1929.[68] Rudolf Pöch's unexpected death in 1921 had left his extensive anthropological and ethnological collections and documentation in an unevaluated state. Bequeathed with his scientific legacy and considerable earmarked funds, the Austrian Academy of Sciences organized its posthumous scientific evaluation, published in a twelve-volume *Rudolf Pöchs Nachlaß* series between 1927 and 1962. Pöch's former assistant Josef Weninger personally authored five of them, fashioning his teacher's predominantly visual rasterizations into what became known as the Viennese School of Anthropology. Weninger headed a Working Group for Hereditary Biology, which fostered specialization and the division of labour in "morphognostic" observations. Ultimately, these also allowed the issuing of an increasing number of paternity reports and reflect an intertwining of basic science and applied research – the defining characteristic of academic anthropology in interwar Vienna.[69]

With the annexation of Austria to the German Reich, engineered by National Socialists on both sides in March 1938, the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service passed in Berlin in 1933 also came into force in former Austria. This provided for the removal of politically opposing or "non-Aryan" state employees, and Josef Weninger was suspended because of his marriage to the Jewish anthropologist Margarete Weninger née Taubert (1896–1987), but was able to remain in Vienna with his wife.[70] The Pöch student Eberhard Geyer (1899–1943), the "most bustling member of the Working Group for Hereditary Biology"[71] and an illegal NSDAP member since 1933, was entrusted with heading the Institute for Anthropology after Weninger's forced retirement.[72] During his short era under the racial legislation of the German Reich, the procedures developed for the proof of paternity during the interwar years were increasingly abused to "clarify questions of dubious Aryan descent" on behalf of the Reich Office of Genealogy.[73]

While the Habsburg monarchy had consistently avoided disclosing its relationship to colonialism and displayed its own overseas missions as "pure service to the scientific cause,"[74] this attitude was assessed differently after its formal dissolution at the

Fig. 1 Josef Wastl, *Neu-Guinea, Land und Leute: Mit einer Lebensbeschreibung des ostmärkischen Forschers Rudolf Pöch,* © *private collection, Vienna*

end of the First World War. The division of the former German colonial empire into mandates of the League of Nations was deemed unsatisfactory not only in the Weimar Republic.[75] Colonial revisionist ideas also began to spread in the First Republic of Austria, where nationally inclined civil associations lobbied for an Austrian "acquisition of colonial or concessionary territory."[76] Subsequently, in the 1930s and early 1940s, overseas activities under Habsburg rule were glorified and portrayed as important precursors of German imperialism and colonialism.[77] After Austria's annexation in 1938, local associations with a colonial agenda were integrated into the Reich Colonial League. Under the maxim "Greater Germany's colonies – Greater Germany's right!" the League convened in Vienna for the first time in May 1939.[78] Its director, the German general and Nazi politician Franz von Epp (1868–1947), explained that the choice of venue for the conference was meaningful, as "domestic colonization, carried out by and in the Ostmark for centuries, and overseas colonization are not mutually exclusive, but complement each other."[79]

Later in 1939, the Natural History Museum staged a special exhibition on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary, again within the topical framework of colonial revisionism. German ornithologist Hans Kummerlöwe (1903–1995), an ardent Nazi propagandist who had just been appointed director general of the reorganized Scientific State Museums in Vienna,[80] was determined to orient museum anthropology to reflect "the significance of racial knowledge as a mainstay of National Socialist conviction."[81] Under the title *Ostmark Germans as Explorers and Collectors in our Colonies*, the special exhibition called for an "own sphere of influence in our robbed colonies"[82] and drew on earlier holdings collected overseas by different Austro-Hungarian scientists during the heyday of colonialism. The twenty different collections on display were all gathered on former German colonial territories, and show, according to Kummerlöwe, "that the Ostmark had a significant share in German colonial achievements before and after the World War."[83] In the case of the founding figure Rudolf Pöch, the Viennese

geographer and diplomat Oscar Baumann (1864–99), the museum anthropologist Viktor Lebzelter (1889–1936) as well as the Austrian Africanists Helene (1868–1922) and Rudolf Oldenburg (1879–1932), the showcases also included Indigenous human remains from both the Institute of Anthropology of the University of Vienna and the Anthropology Department at the Natural History Museum itself.[84]

Between 1940 and 1943, anthropological mass surveys of prisoners-of-war were resumed. An Anthropological Commission under museum anthropologist Josef Wastl (1892–1968), who had co-curated the exhibition *Ostmark Germans as Explorers and Collectors in our Colonies* the previous year and anticipated the opportunity to "systematically subject members of different peoples to German racial science" without costly travelling,[85] first investigated Polish soldiers interned after the German Reich's invasion of Poland in 1940. The war campaign for France brought thousands of new prisoners to the camps, including soldiers from the then French colonies in Africa and Indochina, later in the year.[86] These major *ersatz* expeditions were largely based on Rudolf Pöch's research design developed for the prisoner-of-war investigations of the First World War. After the war had taken an unfavourable turn for the German Reich with its Russian campaign, all activities relating to colonial ambitions were abandoned in February 1943.[87] Accordingly, the Viennese prisoner-of-war surveys came to a complete halt in the course of the same year. Wastl, who had taken up issuing "certificates of descent" for the Reich Office of Genealogy and also for courts from 1941 on, now continued this work. By the end of the war, he had authored several hundred racial and paternity assessments.[88]

Colonial amnesia, an orphaned collection and the waking of evolutionary anthropology to the postcolonial debate

After the Second World War, the Second Republic of Austria reclaimed its outsider status in relation to colonialism and characteristically revived the "discovery paradigm" of the Habsburg monarchy that presented the procurement of scientific information during overseas missions as the work of humble pioneers who voluntarily renounced any colonial involvement.[89] The narrative of being "unencumbered" by a colonial past served both to distance Austria from National Socialism and to subscribe to a politics of neutrality, also towards former colonies that had become independent.[90] Whereas the Natural History Museum of Vienna distanced itself from Nazi racial doctrine after 1945 and suspended advocates such as Josef Wastl from the museum service, colonial revisionism from the same period was never properly addressed. The propagandistic exhibition *Ostmark Germans as Explorers and Collectors in our Colonies* was merely

referred to as a "completely unnecessary colonial show".[91] In 1949 and 1951, two scientific conferences on the concept of race were convened by UNESCO, but without Austrian participation. The declarations adopted there were intended to put an end to all racial prejudice.[92]

Josef Weninger returned to his university chair of anthropology and restored his predominantly morphognostic approach from the pre-war years.[93] Under his successor Emil Breitinger (1904–2004), who had studied with Nazi anthropologist Theodor Mollison (1874–1952) in Munich, the Institute of Anthropology was eventually renamed Institute of Human Biology and affiliated with the Faculty of Natural Sciences.[94] In a landmark publication, social anthropologist Horst Seidler (b. 1944), who succeeded Breitinger as head of the Institute of Human Biology in 1984, documented for the first time the involvement of anthropology in the National Socialist policy of extermination.[95] In the run-up to the UNESCO conference "Against Racism, Violence and Discrimination" co-organized in 1995, a comprehensive statement on the obsolescence of the concept of race was drawn up under Seidler's guidance. This Declaration of Schlaining aimed at defining how "today's understanding of genetic diversity" could be implemented in the sense of prevention.[96] Around the year 2000, provenance research on the disastrous role of anthropology and racial science during the National Socialist era gained momentum in Austria's museum context.[97] In contrast, the colonial histories of anthropology and its related acquisition practices, especially those of the once more renamed Institute of Anthropology, were still largely "kept in silence."[98] This is all the more disturbing because prominent scholars from various disciplines have long anchored the genesis of totalitarian dictatorships, genocide and the Holocaust in the longer tradition of colonization and empire.[99]

The initiative to break through Austria's "colonial amnesia"[100] in a critical approach from a postcolonial point of view came from the respective countries of the *Indigenous groups* formerly under anthropological scrutiny. The research of South African historians has first addressed Rudolf Pöch's ruthless and illegal acquisition policy regarding human remains during his Kalahari expedition between 1907 and 1909.[101] An ensuing Austrian research project[102] aimed at an interdisciplinary re-contextualization of Pöch's research, collection and, not least, documenting methods that had hitherto been stylized into pioneering achievements.[103] These efforts have in the meantime led to repatriations of the remains of a South African couple known by name,[104] and of Australian ancestral remains[105] from Vienna's Natural History Museum and University Department of Evolutionary Anthropology to their countries of origin. Up to this time, the Anthropological Collection at the University of Vienna had fallen into increasing disarray, after decades of not being properly curated or even inventoried. Its

colonial human remains had nevertheless long been among the most intensely anthropologically studied of their kind internationally.[106]

The appropriate handling of human remains and related sensitive objects has become a topic of great importance and topicality for museums and collections worldwide. The discourse on colonial collections and their repatriation today revolves around the concept of a "context of injustice" which was first used in relation to human remains in the 2003 "Stuttgarter Empfehlungen".[107] These guidelines was developed in response to the controversial *Körperwelten* exhibition by the German impresario Gunther von Hagens and proposed ethical criteria to preserve the dignity of people from whom anatomical preparations were made, even beyond death.[108] Since the publication of the German Museum Association's recommendations in 2013, which also address non-museum collections, the discussion of the handling and repatriation of human remains mainly draws on this conception.[109] It is argued that a colonial context alone cannot justify restitution claims and that the decision as to whether the acquisition and circumstances of death are connected to a "context of injustice" must be made on a case-by-case basis.[110] This notion is neither a legal term nor an ethical standard, reflecting the fact that colonial injustice has also remained at the legal periphery.[111] A more suitable approach would be to examine whether and to what extent the entire colonial context must be understood as a "context of injustice".[112]

The current Austrian government programme mentions a continuation and expansion of provenance research for federal arts and cultural institutions, including an additional domain regarding postcolonial provenance research and the treatment of human remains.[113] We remain hopeful that these initiatives will not only be directed at the federal museums, but also at the university collections in this country – given their closely interwoven colonial histories. Our experience in provenance research and repatriation of human remains and anthropological photography to their communities of origin has shown over the last years that such processes have much wider implications and need to be addressed in a new relational approach.[114] The artistic research project "Far from Settled", commissioned by the 22nd Biennale of Sydney in 2020, for example, aimed at tracing the cultural, political and personal reverberations, which do not find closure in but rather resurface with acts of repatriation from the anthropological archive. In a series of informal interviews, the traditional owners of the Aboriginal ancestral remains repatriated from the Rudolf Pöch collection in 2011 were revisited and asked about what lingering repercussions from silenced violent pasts have been experienced, transformed and reinvested in the aftermath of repatriation within their communities. This includes the fate of a substantial number of unprovenanced remains, highlighting current efforts towards establishing a "National Resting Place" in Australia. The return of anthropological photographs taken by Pöch

in 1905 to their descendant communities in New South Wales was similarly examined with a view to the possible performance of sensitive objects and media in new and communal ways of critically commemorating a shared colonial history.[115]

Katarina Matiasek works as a curator and artistic researcher with a focus on anthropological media, currently for the Photoinstitut Bonartes, Vienna and for the Anthropological Collection, University of Vienna

Harald Wilfing is PI at the Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, University of Vienna, head of the working group for Human Ecology and responsible for the Anthropological Collection, University of Vienna.

Notes

1 Sebastian Conrad, *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte* (Munich, 2016), 96.

2 Walter Sauer, "Jenseits der 'Entdeckungsgeschichte': Forschungsergebnisse und Perspektiven", in Walter Sauer (ed.), *k. u. k. kolonial: Habsburgermonarchie und europäische Herrschaft in Afrika* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, 2002), 7–15, 7.

3 Irene Ranzmaier, *Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien und die akademische Etablierung anthropologischer Disziplinen an der Universität Wien 1870–1930* (Cologne/Vienna/Göttingen, 2013), 20 (Wissenschaft, Macht und Kultur in der modernen Geschichte 2).

4 Angelika Heinrich, "Vom Museum der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien zur Prähistorischen Sammlung im k. k. Naturhistorischen Hofmuseum 1870–1876–1889–1895", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 125/126 (1995/1996), 11–42, 13–14.

5 Ferdinand von Andrian-Werburg, "Festrede. Fest-Sitzung am 12. Februar 1895 zur Feier des fünfundzwanzigjährigen Bestehens", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 25 (1895), 17–24, 17.

6 Carl von Rokitansky, "Eröffnungsrede gehalten in der constituierenden Versammlung der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien am 13. Februar 1870", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 1 (1871), 1–10, 7.

7 Ranzmaier, *Anthropologische Gesellschaft*, 36.

8 Harald Wilfing, "Carl von Rokitansky und das Menschenbild der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft", in Helmut Rumpler and Helmut Denk (eds.), *Carl Freiherr von Rokitansky 1804–1878: Pathologe–Politiker–Philosoph–Gründer der Wiener Medizinischen Schule des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, 2005), 139–43, 142.

9 Von Rokitansky, "Eröffnungsrede", 7.

10 Andrea Komlosy, "Innere Peripherien als Ersatz für Kolonien? Zentrenbildung und Peripherisierung in der Habsburgermonarchie", in Endre Hárs et al. (eds.), *Zentren, Peripherien und kollektive Identitäten in Österreich-Ungarn* (Tübingen–Basel, 2006), 55–78, 55 (*Kultur–Herrschaft–Differenz* 9).

11 Irene Ranzmaier, "Der Beitrag der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien zur Etablierung anthropologischer Disziplinen in Österreich-Ungarn 1870–1900", in Reinelde Motz-Linhart et al. (eds.), *Tagungsbericht des 25. Österreichischen Historikertag St. Pölten, 16. bis 19. September 2008* (St. Pölten, 2010), 482–93, 485 (*Veröffentlichungen des Verbandes Österreichischer Historiker und Geschichtsvereine* 34).

12 Ranzmaier, "Beitrag", 486.

13 Sonja Fatouretchi, "Die Achse Berlin–Wien in den Anfängen der Ethnologie von 1869 bis 1906", unpublished diss., University of Vienna, 2009), 96.

14 See Peter Stachel, "Die Harmonisierung national-politischer Gegensätze und die Anfänge der Ethnographie in Österreich", in Karl Acham (ed.), *Geschichte und fremde Kulturen* (Vienna, 2002), 323–68 (*Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften* 4).

15 Ranzmaier, "Beitrag", 487.

16 Quoted in Ursula Prutsch, "Habsburg postcolonial", in Johannes Feichtinger et al. (eds.), *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis* (Innsbruck/Vienna/Munich/Bolzano, 2003), 33–43, 36.

17 Christian Marchetti, "Scientists with Guns: On the Ethnographic Exploration of the Balkans by Austria-Hungarian Scientists before and during World War I", in *Ab Imperio* 8 (2007) 1: 165–90, 167.

18 See Werner Telesko, "Colonialism without Colonies: The Civilizing Missions in the Habsburg Empire", in Michael S. Falser (ed.), *Cultural Heritage as Civilizing Mission: From Decay to Recovery* (Heidelberg/Berlin, 2011), 35–48.

19 Irene Ranzmaier, "Beitrag", 487.

20 Walter Sauer, "Jenseits", 7.

21 Fatouretchi, *Achse*, 43.

22 Alexander Gramsch, "Eine kurze Geschichte des archäologischen Denkens in Deutschland", in *Leipziger online-Beiträge zur Ur- und Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie*, 19 (2006), 1–18, 8.

23 Tony Bennett, *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonisation* (London/New York, 2004), 39–43.

24 Gramsch, "Kurze Geschichte", 8.

25 See Anja Laukötter, *Von der "Kultur" zur "Rasse" – vom Objekt zum Körper? Völkerkundemuseen und ihre Wissenschaften zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bielefeld, 2007), 37.

26 Wolfgang Kabatek, "Dokumentationsfuror und Rasterverfahren: Vom Umgang mit anthropologischen Fotografien", in Tanja Nusser et al. (eds.), *Rasterfahndungen. Darstellungstechniken – Normierungsverfahren – Wahrnehmungskonstitutionen* (Bielefeld, 2007), 35–53, 35.

27 Jacob W. Gruber, "Ethnographic Salvage and the Shaping of Anthropology", in *American Anthropologist*, 72 (1970) 6, 1289–99, 1290.

28 Von Rokitansky, "Eröffnungsrede", 6; Ranzmaier, *Anthropologische Gesellschaft*, 28.

29 Ranzmaier, *Anthropologische Gesellschaft*, 24.

30 Among them was the attempt to reclaim the Nicobar Islands; see Walter Sauer, "Kolonialgeschichte und ihre Folgen im Überblick – Österreich", in Dirk Göttsche et al. (eds.), *Handbuch Postkolonialismus und Literatur* (Stuttgart, 2017), 418–20, 419; on the Novara expedition see also Christa Rield-Dorn's contribution in this volume.

31 Quoted in Thomas Theye, "'Mathematische Racenmasken': Vermessen und Abbilden auf der Erdumsegelung der Fregatte 'Novara' in den Jahren 1857–1859", in Hermann Mückler (ed.), *Österreicher in der Südsee: Forscher, Reisende, Auswanderer* (Vienna/Berlin, 2012), 73–109, 79.

32 Maria Teschler-Nicola, "Das forMuse-Projekt und die Berforschung und Restitution überseeischer menschlicher Skelettreste in Wiener Sammlungen", in Holger Stoecker et al. (eds.), *Sammlen, Erforschen, Zurückgeben? Menschliche Gebeine aus der Kolonialzeit in akademischen und musealen Sammlungen* (Berlin, 2013), 259–78, 267.

33 Maria Teschler-Nicola, "'…der Barbar in der färbigen Hautdecke': Anthropologische Objekt- und Datenakquisition im Rahmen der Novara Forschungsreise 1857–185", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 136/137 (2006/2007), 41–65, 47.

34 Johann Szilvássy, *Führer durch die Anthropologische Schausammlung* (Vienna, 1978), 25 (*Veröffentlichungen aus dem Naturhistorischen Museum Wien, Neue Folge* 16).

35 Heinrich, "Vom Museum", 26.

36 Ursula Zängl-Kumpf, "Luschan, Felix (Ritter Edler) von (1854–1924)", in Frank Spencer (ed.), *History of Physical Anthropology: An Encyclopedia, Vol. 1: A–L* (New York–London: Garland, 1997), 622–3.

37 Maria Teschler-Nicola, "Felix von Luschan und die Wiener Anthropologische Gesellschaft", in Peter Ruggendorfer et. al (eds.), *Felix von Luschan 1854–1924: Leben und Wirken eines Universalgelehrten* (Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2009), 55–79, 57.

38 Zängl-Kumpf, "Luschan, Felix", 623.

39 Marion Melk-Koch, "'…denn Kuriositäten haben wir nachgerade genug in unseren Sammlungen…': Felix von Luschan als Kurator", in Ruggendorfer et al., *Felix von Luschan,* 81–98, 82.

40 Teschler-Nicola, "Felix von Luschan", 66.

41 Zängl-Kumpf, "Luschan, Felix", 623.

42 Hans Virchow, "Gedächtnisrede auf Felix von Luschan", *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie (Verhandlungen der Berliner Anthropologischen Gesellschaft)* 56 (1924), 112–17, 115.

43 See e.g. Felix von Luschan, "Instruktion für ethnographische Beobachtungen und Sammlungen in Deutsch-Ostafrika", *Mittheilungen von Forschungsreisenden und Gelehrten aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten* 9 (1896), 89–99; idem and Bernhard Ankermann, *Anleitung zum ethnologischen Beobachten und Sammeln* (Berlin, 1914).

44 Lothar Schott, "Zur Geschichte der Anthropologie an der Berliner Universität", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Reihe* 10 (1961) 1, 57–65, 61–2.

45 Andrew Zimmerman, "Adventures in the Skin Trade: German Anthropology and Colonial Corporeality", in H. Glenn Penny et al. (eds.), *Worldly Provincialism. German Anthropology in the Age of Empire* (Ann Arbor, 2003), 106–19, 109.

46 Felix von Luschan, *Völker, Rassen, Sprachen* (Berlin, 1922), 154.

47 Josef Weninger, "Das Denkmal für Rudolf Pöch an der Wiener Universität", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 63 (1933), 252–63, 260.

48 Jon Abbink, "Auf der Suche nach der menschlichen Gesellschaft: Richard Thurnwald (review)", in *American Anthropologist* 94 (1992) 2, 509–10, 510.

49 Teschler-Nicola, "Felix von Luschan", 71.

50 Marion Melk-Koch, "Kuriositäten", 86.

51 Maria Teschler-Nicola, "Rudolf Pöch's osteologische Lehr- und Forschungssammlung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Ethik," in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 141 (2011), 51–66, 55.

52 Teschler-Nicola, "Lehr- und Forschungssammlung", 53–4.

53 Eugen Oberhummer, "Rudolf Pöch (gestorben am 4. März 1921)", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 51 (1921), 96–104, 99.

54 Teschler-Nicola, "Felix von Luschan", 78.

55 Gerfried Ziegelmayer, "Pöch, Rudolf 1870–1921", in Frank Spencer (ed.), *History of Physical Anthropology: An Encyclopedia, Vol. 2: M—Z* (New York–London, 1997), 825–6.

56 Margit Berner, "Die 'rassenkundlichen' Untersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen in Kriegsgefangenenlagern 1915–1918", in *Zeitgeschichte* 30 (2003), 124–36, 126.

57 Quoted in Katarina Matiasek, "Rudolf Pöch's 'Revenants': Photography and Atavism in Austro-Hungarian Prisoner-of-War Studies 1915–1918", in *International Forum on Audio-Visual Research – Jahrbuch des Phonogrammarchivs*, 7 (2017), 30–45, 31–3.

58 Karl R. Wernhart, *Österreich und der Pazifische Raum: Die Erforschung der Kulturen Ozeaniens und Australiens* (Vienna, 2008), 26 (*Pazifik* Dossier 5).

59 "Sitzungsberichte", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 37 (1907), 1–62, 19; ibid. 51 (1921), 1–33, 15.

60 Britta Lange, *Die Wiener Forschungen an Kriegsgefangenen 1915–1918: Anthropologische und ethnografische Verfahren im Lager* (Vienna, 2013), 87–91.

61 Felix von Luschan, "Ziele und Wege der Völkerkunde in den deutschen Schutzgebieten", in *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Kolonialkongresses 1902* (Berlin, 1903), 163–74, 171.

62 Conrad, *Kolonialgeschichte*, 65–70.

63 Fatouretchi, *Achse*, 7.

64 Patricia Purtschert, Francesca Falk and Barbara Lüthi, "Switzerland and 'Colonialism without Colonies': Reflections on the Status of Colonial Outsiders", in *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 18 (2016) 2, 286–302, 289.

65 Ulla Vuorela, "Colonial Complicity: The 'Postcolonial' in a Nordic Context", in Suvi Keskinen et al. (eds.), *Complying with Colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region* (Farnham, 2009), 19–33, 19.

66 Margit Berner, "Die Bedeutung der biometrischen Erfassungsmethode in der österreichischen Anthropologie in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts", in Gerhard Baader et al. (eds.), *Eugenik in Österreich. Biopolitische Strukturen von 1900 bis 1945* (Vienna, 2007), 239–56, 249.

67 See Katja Geisenhainer, *"Rasse ist Schicksal": Otto Reche 1879–1966 – ein Leben als Anthropologe und Völkerkundler* (Leipzig, 2002).

68 Wilhelm Ehgartner, "Josef Weninger (Nachruf)", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 88/98 (1959), 1–7.

69 Margit Berner, "Race and Physical Anthropology in Interwar Austria", in *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 5 (2010), 16–31.

70 Margit Berner et al., "Wiener Anthropologien", in Karl Anton Fröschl et al. (eds.), *Reflexive Innensichten aus der Universität: Disziplinengeschichten zwischen Wissenschaft, Gesellschaft und Politik* (Vienna, 2015), 41–54, 44–5 (*650 Jahre Universität Wien – Aufbruch ins neue Jahrhundert* 4).

71 "Geyer Eberhard, Anthropologe", in Austrian Academy of Sciences (ed.), Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950*, Vol. 1* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Vienna, 1957), 433–4, 433.

72 Karl Pusman, *Die "Wissenschaften vom Menschen" auf Wiener Boden 1870–1959: die anthropologische Gesellschaft in Wien und die anthropologischen Disziplinen im Fokus von Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Wissenschafts- und Verdrängungspolitik* (Münster, 2008), 208.

73 Hans-Peter Kröner, "Von der Vaterschaftsbestimmung zum Rassegutachten: Der erbbiologische Ähnlichkeitsvergleich als 'österreichisch-deutsches Projekt' 1926–1945", in *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 22 (1999) 4, 257–64, 260.

74 Walter Sauer, "Jenseits", 7.

75 Edho Ekoko, "The British Attitude Towards Germany's Colonial Irredentism in Africa in the Inter-War Years", in *Journal of Contemporary History* 14 (1979) 2, 287–307, 287.

76 Objectives of the *Österreichische Kolonialverein* founded in 1933; quoted in Ingrid Oppenauer, "Ausstellungen und Tagungen mit kolonialem Hintergrund in Wien 1939–1940", unpublished diss., University of Vienna, 2002/2003), 7.

77 Walter Sauer, "Habsburg colonial: Austria-Hungary's Role in European Overseas Expansion Reconsidered", in *Austrian Studies* 20 (2012), 4–23, 6.

78 "Großdeutschlands Kolonien – Großdeutschlands Recht!"; Reichskolonialbund (ed.), *Festschrift zur Reichstagung des Reichskolonialbundes in Wien, 16. bis 18. Mai 1939* (Berlin, 1939), cover.

79 Quoted in Oppenauer, *Ausstellungen und Tagungen*, 13.

80 Maria Teschler-Nicola, "Richard Arthur Hans Kummerlöwe alias Kumerloeve 1903–1995: Erster Direktor der wissenschaftlichen Museen in Wien in der NS-Zeit", in *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 142 (2012), 279–304.

81 Hans Kummerlöwe, foreword to Josef Wastl, *Neu-Guinea, Land und Leute: Mit einer Lebensbeschreibung des ostmärkischen Forschers Rudolf Pöch*, (Vienna, 1940), back cover (*Wissenschaft ins Volk* 1).

82 Josef Wastl, *Neu-Guinea,* 2.

83 Hans Kummerlöwe, "Introduction", in Victor Pietschmann (ed.), *Führer durch die Sonderschau "Ostmarkdeutsche als Forscher und Sammler in unseren Kolonien": Ein Anteil der Ostmark an der Erforschung und Erschliessung der deutschen Kolonialgebiete* (Vienna, 1940), 3; on this exhibition and its context see also the contribution by Thomas Mayer and Katja Geiger in this volume.

84 Oppenauer, *Ausstellungen und Tagungen*, 35.

85 "Vortrag von Josef Wastl vor den Vertrauensmännern des R. D. B", unpublished typescript, 11 November 1941, inv. no. 2,735, Anthropology Department, Natural History Museum, Vienna.

86 Josef Wastl, "Konstitutions- und rassenanthropologische Untersuchungen an eurafrikanischen, europäischen und asiatischen Völkerschaften", unpublished proofsheet, 5 March 1959, inv. no. 11,092, Anthropology Department, Natural History Museum, Vienna.

87 Horst Gründer, *Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien* (Paderborn, 2000), 231.

88 Horst Seidler and Andreas Rett, *Das Reichssippenamt entscheidet: Rassenbiologie im Nationalsozialismus* (Vienna/Munich, 1982), 262–73.

89 Sauer, "Jenseits", 7–15.

90 Sauer, "Habsburg colonial", 4–23.

91 Andreas Mayer and Klaus Taschwer, 'Rassismus' im Museum: Zur Popularisierung anthropologischen Wissens im Wiener Naturhistorischen Museum", in *FORVM* 42 (1995) 496–8: 76–81, 78.

92 Berner et al., "Wiener Anthropologien", 47–9.

93 Pusman, *Die "Wissenschaften*", 261.

94 Brigitte Fuchs, *"Rasse", "Volk", Geschlecht: Anthropologische Diskurse in Österreich 1850–1960* (Frankfurt am Main/New York, 2003), 315.

95 Seidler, Rett, *Das Reichssippenamt*.

96 Gerald Mader (ed.), *Deklaration von Schlaining: Gegen Rassismus, Gewalt und Diskriminierung* (Stadtschlaining, 1995).

97 Maria Teschler-Nicola and Margit Berner, "Die anthropologische Abteilung des Naturhistorischen Museums in der NS-Zeit: Berichte und Dokumentation von Forschungs- und Sammlungsaktivitäten 1938–1945", in Gustav Spahn et al. (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur Anatomischen Wissenschaft in Wien 1938–1945* (Vienna, 1998), 333–58.

98 See Brook Andrew and Katarina Matiasek, "Kept in Silence – An Archival Travelogue", in Ian McLean et al. (eds.), *Indigenous Archives: The Making and Unmaking of Aboriginal Art* (Crawley, 2017), 383–412.

99 Among them were Hannah Arendt and Aimé Césaire; see Carsten Stahn, "Confronting Colonial Amnesia: Towards New Relational Engagement with Colonial Injustice and Cultural Colonial Objects", in *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 18 (2020), 793–824, 794–5.

100 Purtschert, Falk, Lüthi, "Switzerland", 4.

101 Martin Legassick and Ciraj Rassool *Skeletons in the Cupboard: South African Museums and the Trade in Human Remains 1907–1917* (Cape Town/Kimberley, 2000).

102 See the research project "Rudolf Pöch: A Scientific Pioneer" under the direction of Maria Teschler-Nicola and Harald Wilfing, funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF P17761-G6, 2005–2007).

103 Katarina Matiasek, "A Mutual Space? Stereo Photography on Viennese Anthropological Expeditions 1905–1945", in Marianne Klemun et al. (eds.), *Expeditions as Experiments: Practising Observation and Documentation* (Basingstoke, 2016), 187–212.

104 Walter Sauer, "Österreich – Südafrika: Die Geschichte von Klaas und Trooi Pienaar", in *INDABA* 74 (2012), 3–8.

105 Andrew, Matiasek, "Kept in Silence", 383–412.

106 Teschler-Nicola, "Lehr- und Forschungssammlung", 52.

107 Arbeitskreis Menschliche Präparate in Sammlungen, "Empfehlungen zum Umgang mit Präparaten aus menschlichem Gewebe in Sammlungen, Museen und öffentlichen Räumen", in *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 99 (2003) 8, 378–83, 378–9.

108 Robert Jütte, "Die Stuttgarter Empfehlungen zum Umgang mit Präparaten aus menschlichem Gewebe in Sammlungen, Museen und öffentlichen Räumen", in Cornelia Weber et al. (eds.), *Universitätmuseen und -sammlungen im Hochschulalltag – Aufgaben, Konzepte, Perspektiven* (Berlin, 2010), 43–8, 43.

109 Holger Stoecker, Thomas Schnalke and Andreas Winkelmann, "Zur Einführung", in Holger Stoecker et al. (eds.), *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben? Menschliche Gebeine aus der Kolonialzeit in akademischen und musealen Sammlungen* (Berlin, 2013), 9–22, 18 (*Studien zur Kolonialgeschichte* 5).

110 Deutscher Museumsbund, *Empfehlungen zum Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten in Museen und Sammlungen* (Berlin, 2013), 9–11.

111 Stahn, "Colonial Amnesia", 795.

112 Florence Stürmer and Julian Schramm, "Human Remains in deutschen Sammlungen: Rechtspflichten zur Rückgabe", in *Working Papers der Humboldt Law Clinic Grund und Menschenrechte* 18 (2019), 1–53, 9.

113 Republik Österreich, *Aus Verantwortung für Österreich. Regierungsprogramm 2020–2024* (Vienna, 2020), 36.

114 Stahn, "Colonial Amnesia", 824.

115 Katarina Matiasek, "Far from Settled", in Brook Andrew (ed.), *Nirin: Exhibition Catalogue of the 22nd Biennale of Sydney* (Sydney, 2020), 192–3, 192.